



MINUTES

100th Guild Council

1st December 2012

UWA Student Guild
University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley WA 6009
T: (08) 6488 2295
W: www.guild.uwa.edu.au

1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Cameron Barnes (Barnes) opened with some informal comments about how he would like to conduct Guild Council this year and about his Presidential style. He also made reference to the outstanding staff and suggested how councillors should act towards them.

Barnes then formally opened the meeting and in doing so recognised that we are currently situated on Nyoongar land and the Nyoongar people continue to practice their traditions, beliefs, and customs.

1.1 Attendance:

Annie Lei; Luca Tan; Luke Rodman; Madelene Mulholland; Julian Rapattoni; Dumi Mashinini; Georgina Carr; Joshua Bamford; Judith Carr; Cameron Barnes; Robert Purdew; Tom Henderson; Valentina Barron; Sophie Liley; Kelly Fitzsimmons; Daniel Stone; Emma Greeney; Simon Thuijs.

1.2 Apologies:

Rajdeep Singh (Councillor); Annie Lei (Councillor); Rida Ahmed (Councillor); Cameron Payne (Councillor); Lizzy O'Shea (Councillor); Laura Smith (SOC President); Cameron Fitzgerald (Welfare Officer); Felix Lim (ISS Officer); Gemma Bothe (PSA President); ATSID.

1.3 Proxies:

Daniel Stone for Rajdeep Singh; Amy Blitvich for Annie Lei (for part of Council); Oscar Morlet for Rida Ahmed; Daniel Searson for Cameron Payne; Priya Brown for Lizzy O'Shea; Kelly Fitzsimmons for Laura Smith.

All attendance, apologies and proxies unanimously approved by procedural motion.

2.0 ELECTIONS

Barnes moved a procedural motion to accept Shirley Bode as Returning Officer for the elections. Motion carried.

Shirley stated that the first position for consideration was Chair of Council.

Barnes said that he was happy to chair the process and then Shirley could duly declare people elected when they were either unopposed or had been decided by ballot. Barnes then clarified the election process.

2.1 Chair of Council

Lucas Tan nominated himself.

There were no other nominations for the position.

Shirley Bode declared Lucas elected.

Chairing of Council handed over to Lucas.

2.2 Vice President

Annie Lei nominated herself.

There were no other nominations for the position.

Lucas declared Annie elected.

2.3 Secretary

Maddie Mulholland nominated herself.

There were no other nominations for the position.

Lucas declared Maddie elected.

2.4 Statutes Committee

Joshua Bamford nominated by himself.

Cameron Payne nominated by his proxy, Daniel Searson.

Lizzy O'Shea nominated by Cameron Barnes.

There were no other nominations for the positions.

Lucas declared Cameron, Lizzy and Joshua duly elected.

It was noted that Lucas Tan is the automatic chair of this committee.

Barnes clarified the process for electing a chair of committee.

2.5 Finance and Planning Committee

Lucas Tan nominated by Cameron Barnes as a Guild Councillor Representative.

Lizzy O'Shea nominated by Cameron Barnes as a Guild Councillor Representative.

There were no other nominations for the positions.

Lucas declared himself and Lizzy elected.

Thomas Henderson nominated by Cameron Barnes as a Co-opted Member.

There were no other nominations for the position.

Lucas declared Tom elected.

2.6 Activities Committee

Rida Ahmed nominated by her proxy, Oscar Morlet.

Sophie Liley nominated herself.

Judith Carr nominated by Cameron Barnes.

Georgina Carr nominated herself.

Barnes moved a procedural motion to come back to activities.
Unanimously supported.

2.8 Memberships Committee

Rida Ahmed nominated by Oscar Morlet.

Rajdeep Singh nominated by his proxy, Daniel Stone.

There were no other nominations for the position.

Lucas declared Rida and Rajdeep elected.

Barnes moved a procedural motion to return to activities.
Unanimously supported.

2.6 Activities Committee

Georgina Carr withdrew her nomination.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Rida, Sophie and Judith elected.

Rida Ahmed nominated by Cameron Barnes as Chair of the Activities Committee.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Rida elected as chair of the Activities Committee.

2.7 Catering Committee

Lucas Tan nominated by himself.
Annie Lei nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Josh Bamford nominated by Cameron Barnes
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared himself, Annie and Josh elected.

Rob Purdew nominated himself as Chair of the Catering Committee.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Rob elected.

2.9 Tavern Committee

Luke Rodman nominated himself.
Judith Carr nominated herself.
Dumi Mashinini nominated himself.

Barnes questioned how many positions were available. He proposed a procedural motion to defer election for the Tavern Committee until the end of Elections.
Unanimously approved.

2.10 Welfare Committee

Georgina Carr nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Rajdeep Singh nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Cameron Payne nominated by his proxy, Daniel Searson.

As there are only two positions available and one must go to a female, a secret ballot occurs between Rajdeep and Cameron.
19 ballot slips handed out and recuperated.

Daniel Searson (proxy for Cameron Payne) requested to make a speech on behalf of Payne. As statements are not traditionally taken for elections, Searson moved a procedural motion to take statements.

Barnes confirmed that Searson wished to move a procedural motion to make brief statements for elections.

Priya Brown (proxy for Lizzy O'Shea) pointed out that Rajdeep Singh was not there to present a speech.

Tom Henderson said that Rajdeep was disadvantaged because he had not been told to prepare a speech as statements were not required.

Shirley consulted as Returning Officer. Procedural motion passed. Speech restricted to two minutes.

Searson then spoke on behalf of Payne.

Barnes moved a procedural that while the votes were counted, Council move back to the Tavern Committee. Passed unanimously.

2.9 Tavern Committee

Luke Rodman withdrew his nomination
There were no other nominations for the positions.
Lucas declared Judith and Dumi elected.

Judith nominated herself as Chair of the Tavern Committee.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Judith elected as Chair of the Tavern Committee.

2.11 Tenancy Committee Chair

Maddie Mulholland nominated by Cameron Barnes.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Maddie elected.

2.12 Personnel Board

Laura Smith nominated by Cameron Barnes.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Laura elected.

2.13 Discipline Committee

Laura Smith nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Joshua Bamford nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Julian Rapattoni nominated by Cameron Barnes.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Josh, Laura and Julian elected.

2.14 Joint Consultative Committee

Laura Smith nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Rob Purdew nominated by Cameron Barnes.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Laura and Rob elected.

2.15 Enterprise Bargaining Committee

Laura Smith nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Rob Purdew nominated by Cameron Barnes.
There were no other nominations for the position.
Lucas declared Laura and Rob elected.

2.16 Academic Board

Luke Rodman nominated by Cameron Barnes.
Lizzy O'Shea nominated by Cameron Barnes.
There were no other nominations for the position
Lucas declared Luke and Lizzy elected.

2.10 Welfare Committee

Georgina and Rajdeep declared elected by Lucas.

3.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.0 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

4.1 Managing Director's Report

Barnes explained that Directors don't normally present reports at the first Guild Council meeting but that it was a relic of the previous format for minutes and that he thought it would be a good opportunity for Wayne Howells to introduce himself and his portfolio.

Wayne explained that his portfolio is to look after the staff and work with the President to integrate the work of both the staff and student rep' teams. As such it is beneficial if he and Cam have a good relationship. Wayne said that he is open all hours for councillor enquiries, but would let Cam know that councillors are communicating with him on a specific issue, out of courtesy. Wayne said that there is quite an interesting fork in the road for the Guild with a lot of new things, such as a new Vice Chancellor and a new relationship with the Vice Chancellor. There are some big matters at hand – the SLA, negotiations on the SSAF distribution, the Masterplan and several capital projects, some of which will come to fruition in 2013 such as the Dentistry Kiosk and the Tavern refurbishment. There will also be a lot of activity in Catering as the Guild is committed to one Catering review and may well do two concurrently. Wayne then welcomed the year and said that he would move straight into the budget process with the Finance & Planning committee to work toward having it approved on the 18th December Meeting.

4.2 Finance Director's Report

Shirley presented herself as the Director of Student Corporate Services which means she is responsible for the Student Assist team, Finance and IT, Administration, Memberships and Communications and Events Management. They all report to her and she works across those teams. She has a broad background covering all of those areas. Since she started at the Guild 3 months ago, Shirley has been working on the SLA, for which she has met with John Stubbs, Matt McKenzie and the Managing Director, and it is close to a point of signing off. The SLA is a document outlining the KPI's the Guild must meet to get our funding. She has included clauses such as mediation and substantial performance to protect the Guild. Shirley has also been working on the EBA, which has been fully updated since 2005. It is keenly awaited by staff, and Wayne is very keen to get it going with the EBA Committee and the Joint Consultative Committee. She has reviewed the legality of various clauses like Fair Work Australia, Long Service Leave legislation, Superannuation legislation. Shirley also has Records Management as part of her portfolio because the Guild is not compliant with State Records and needs a number of policies and procedures put in place. She has been working on some fairly big areas as well as working with her teams to get them working together on projects and things.

Julian asked Shirley whether SOC grant applications could be scanned into the system?

Shirley said that he could definitely scan them and keep them. Shirley noted that they would not be saved on the shared drive because she has done a report on the Guild's drives and folders (to be released to Barnes at first instance). She said she would look at our disposal authority, look at the documents and then Julian and Shirley could make a judgement call on it.

Lucas moved to accept directors' reports. Unanimously carried.

5.0 REPORTS

5.1 President's Report

Barnes noted that there were traditionally no reports from Office Bearers at the first meeting, but that he had put in a verbal report for a couple of things of significance that he wanted to highlight to this council. He then moved that council go in camera, but that staff may stay. All council unanimously in favour.

Barnes explained the process of camera.

6.0 QUESTION TIME

Barnes put the question on record for future follow-up as to whether Office Bearers have received a handover or whether a handover has been scheduled.

Handovers received by Rob Purdew, Tom Henderson, Valentina Barron and Simon Thuijs.

Handovers in process for: Vice-President, Secretary, Barnes, Laura Smith and Sophie Liley.

Handovers not received by: Daniel Stone (handover has not been scheduled).

7.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

7.1 That this Guild Council approve project consultant fees of \$86,000 to complete the Detailed Design (Phase 2) of Stage 1 of the Guild Facilities Masterplan

Recommendation by Wayne Howells

Moved: Cameron Barnes

Seconded: Laura Smith

Barnes asked Wayne to speak to the motion. This motion came as a recommendation from Wayne which Barnes picked up and proposed.

Wayne spoke to the Motion saying that the Masterplan was first moved in 2009 and is a guiding document which can be looked at in sections; including details design, costs and reasons why you would do certain things. Stage One of the Masterplan is

substantially unchanged from the original. One of the major strategic decisions made a couple of years ago that underlines this was the opportunity to activate a buyback from the University of the first floor of the south wing of the Guild. We are now into Stage One of the Masterplan. The Business Case to proceed was put to Council on 31st Oct 2012 - there was a tied vote so it was held over. During the Masterplan there are three main phases: 1: Concept and Feasibility, 2: Detailed Design, 3: Construct and Deliver. We've completed Phase One, which means we've completed the Concept and Feasibility stage and have drafted Designs based on the Masterplan. We've done consultation processes with student representatives, staff, and all stakeholders which include the University. This Business Case supports and recommends that we can accept Phase One and spend \$86,000 to implement Phase Two; Details Design and Documentation that you go to tender with. In Phase Two you move from a budget (based on draft design) to knowledge of the real costs. Wayne asked the question of what we get if we spend this \$86,000? He responded that Council would get certainty of how much they would be spending in Phase Three. At the end of Phase Two, Council will potentially be asked to approve \$1.4 million. This process has been endorsed by the University and is the process that the University would undertake (a phased process). Wayne urged councillors to be comfortable with the process and to ask questions. He noted that we're already committed to spending \$30,000 for Phase One. And if Council approves this we will commit another \$86,000. As such, Council will have spent \$116,000 to feel very comfortable about approving the next Stage.

Dumi Mashinini asked whether there was a timeline of when Wayne expects Phase Two to be completed or Council to be voting for Phase Three?

Wayne responded that Phase Two will take at least a couple of months – completion expected for February/start of March. As for the implementation of Phase Three, the construction would occur in 2013. He doesn't know exactly when in 2013, but they have drafted a schedule and have a target date, provided there are no hurdles. Wayne said he could not guarantee the timeline, but that he could guarantee that he will continue to proceed through the plans as they go along.

Searson asked what the projected figure was for the Masterplan?

Wayne explained that the Guild, as per the approved university process, has appointed its own project manager and architect. This team has come up with a figure of \$1.45 million, which is just under the approved budget figure for this year. We took the project to the Facilities Development Committee, where the Vice Chancellor and all the university got the opportunity to look at it. The Facilities Development Committee endorsed us, but applied another \$300,000 contingency onto that project. Our plan already had contingencies accounted for and we don't expect to use the full \$300,000 amount that this committee has added on, as our team does not foresee major risks occurring from electrical works. The decision today is the \$86,000 decision of whether to proceed.

Georgina Carr asked what happens if Phase Two doesn't go through today – presuming it doesn't just stop, what else happens?

Wayne responded that he cannot proceed. He noted that the Project Manager has provided the Council and the university with a report covering their specific questions, and a budget that accounts for contingencies. The Project Manager is on the University's preferred supplier list. The Facilities Development Committee has only been adding this extra contingency for the last 5 months because of recent blowouts.

Georgina asked whether we have had any issues with blowouts?

Wayne said that the budget was set by a UWA representative and is just under the budget approved by the Guild Council in December 2011.

Luke Rodman asked where this money is going?

Wayne said it would go to the Project Manager, Architect and a degree of sub-consultants such as mechanical and electrical consultants, etc. The Guild needs to get a detailed design and get tender documents prepared, and a quantity surveyor to cost it all. There is a team of consultants.

Julian asked whether there is any chance of getting increased funding from the University in the future?

Wayne responded that there is a good chance of funding through BURF and that \$1 million has been set aside for the Guild.

Julian asked whether the Guild may be able to use some of the 10% SSAF allowance for Capital Expenditure straight away?

Wayne said that the Facilities Development Committee and the Vice Chancellor were very supportive of this project and of improvements to the Guild Village Precinct. Especially after we already pointed out that we think it needs improvements and that's why we have a Masterplan. So, no matter what happens with the SSAF formula, we can expect the Vice Chancellor to favour helping the Guild with Capital Expenditure to help Guild Village. He noted that the One-Stop-Shop project happening next door will bring more students to the precinct right next to ours.

Julian asked if Wayne could briefly talk about the One-Stop-Shop for councillors who are unaware of it?

Wayne said that the Vice Chancellor had asked if the Guild had made the connection between itself and the One-Stop-Shop – yes.

He then explained that the One-Stop-Shop project consolidates and relocates Student Services, Student Admin, and the International Centre, which are currently located at Hackett Hall. The project has been permutated because of lack of funding. The last version of the project saw each service being progressively brought down to the Social Sciences precinct. The project was due to start next year but there have been delays due to funding. The Guild is planning concurrently with them. One of the big benefits is that the Guild has the same Project Manager and Architect team as the One-Stop-Shop, and this team also refurbished the Medical Centre. So, hopefully Council is comfortable with this team and that this team knows the precinct, the university and what students want.

Emma followed up on Julian's question saying that the Guild would not immediately gain access to the Capital Expenditure allowance put aside from the SSAF fee. She will not know exactly what they plan to do until the next Senate meeting but she expects they will quarantine the money and ask all three cost centres (the Guild, Student Services and the Sports Association) to put forward bids for capital works. Emma, along with Senate, has also been working on establishing a Student Consultation Committee, with the support of Peter Curtis, to use for the allocation of SSAF funding – as student consultation is a requirement of the legislation and the University do not plan to actively seek student consultation. This committee will comprise Student Services reps', Sports Association, Guild, and regular students. If

the Guild is able to make a persuasive case at the level of this proposed committee, we may be able to secure a share of that funding. For the time being Emma thinks it is wise to plan as if we're not getting it in the next 12 months. She suspects it will not be released early.

Julian asked whether it was possible that the University will give the 10% SSAF funding to Student Services and not the Guild?

Emma responded yes.

Julian asked whether we think we'll be restricted to 30% SSAF funding, which is a lot less than expected?

Wayne responded that the Guild has put forward to the Registrar the issue of ownership of buildings. Some of the buildings are on our audited balance sheets, so the University, who have been receiving our accounts forever, will have to unwind that. There is some uncertainty and we will soon be negotiating the Guild relationships agreement – it will be difficult to put forward a new capital proponent of SSAF without clarifying what buildings we are responsible for at the moment. He suggested that we get the funding now, until we negotiate the ownership of buildings progressively in the future.

Tom said we needed to consider two different aspects: One being the \$86,000 we've got now and the other being how we are going to fund the actual construction in the future. He said that we need to start showing the University Executive that the Guild is serious and this \$86,000 is a step in the right direction to show that we are looking forward to making changes in and around the Guild, on an organisational and infrastructural level. He said that we may find that if we are very proactive in applying these funds to this Project Manager and Architect team, the university will start to look at us in a more favourable light and be more amenable to giving us a higher proportion of this 10%. He said we have to consider the \$86,000 as an individual fund that we have to do to continue this process regardless, and in the future we can look at how this is going to be funded.

Wayne said that he can ask the Project Manager to write a letter, distributed to Council as a comforter, explaining the situation of this contingency applied by the Facilities Development Committee to set it in context for you. Council may amend the motion to require this letter before the \$86,000 is spent.

Barnes said he thought that was a constructive suggestion.

Tom asked what the deliverables are for the Project Manager team – whether it is a single report at the end or is multiple stages?

Wayne said that it is in multiple stages.

Emma clarified that this team will hand out a report at the end of the Phase Two.

Cam said ideally these sorts of weighty matters would be put off until councillors have had time to find their feet, talk to staff and go through the consultation. However, this is effectively unfinished business from the 99th Guild Council, and we need to move on it as fast as possible. Barnes amended the motion to read:

"That this Guild Council approve project consultant fees of \$86,000 to complete the Detailed Design (Phase 2) of Stage 1 of the Guild Facilities Masterplan. However no

money shall be spent until Guild Executive is satisfied that Council has received sufficient information from the PM on the contingencies included in FDC and Guild budget.”

Cam spoke to the motion saying that the Masterplan is a very significant project. He said he envisages that Guild Council will be informed throughout the process and will be able to seek information from Barnes and Wayne, so that there will be a high level of consultation before the final Masterplan comes before Guild Council. The Masterplan has been stalled due to uncertainty about our fee environment and the cold-feet of the 99th Guild Executive, and we are in a position where it constitutes unfinished business. We need to proceed to get certainty to bring to our budget, the Guild Executive, the Finance & Planning committee, and our negotiations with the University on the SLA.

Lucas moved that the motion be put. Carried unanimously.

Motion passed.

7.2 That this Guild Council endorse the attached service level agreement recommendation passed by the 99th Guild Council.

Moved: Cameron Barnes

Seconded: Julian Rapattoni

Barnes identified that this Motion was passed unanimously by the 99th Guild Council at their last meeting. The reason he brought it up again at this council was simply to demonstrate to the University that the 100th Guild Council is satisfied with the agreement that has been negotiated by the 99th Council, and to provide the University with certainty. Barnes asked Julian if he had anything to add.

Julian followed-up saying that this agreement is in relation to the University's relationship with the Guild and the services each provides.

Rob asked how we measure KPI's?

Barnes referred this question to Shirley. Shirley said that she has been in consultation with John Stubbs – he wanted to apply quantitative values which are difficult because the SLA is about relationships. Nevertheless, this governs how SSAF money is distributed to us, so she has made sure all the figures are qualified; “approximately” or “estimated”, etc to give us more coverage. If you have hard figures and do not meet them, you have not met your KPI.

Rob questioned how we intended to enforce the training figure on page 12-13: “A majority of the executives from each club and society to complete training”.

Shirley said that it had been changed to read “at least one of” because they felt a majority was not reachable. She said this is why she put in the Substantial Performance clause – if we can show we've done our best to meet a KPI they cannot penalise us. There is also a Dispute Resolution Clause. We don't want this used as a weapon.

Priya asked when it will be reviewed in terms of if we have or haven't met the KPI's?

Shirley responded that every month we're required to give them a report on how we're achieving our KPI's, and by November/December next year we should know if we're not well on the way.

Priya asked whether that will go towards the following years?

Shirley said that yes it will. However, these things fluctuate so it's going to vary.

Lucas moved a procedural motion that the motion be put. Carried unanimously.

Motion passed unanimously.

7.3 That this Guild Council approve a \$30,000 affiliation fee for the National Union of Students in order to gain accreditation for the 2012 national conference.

Moved: Cameron Barnes

Seconded: Tom Henderson

Barnes said that he was very proud to put this forward and that we've managed to negotiate a fee for \$30,000 to pay our affiliation fee to the National Union of Students (NUS) for the 2012 year. Barnes asked what this means? He responded that every year for NUS, affiliation fees are due by the first Monday of December. If we have not paid our affiliation fee by then, we don't get votes, we're not considered to be members of the organisation in that respect and it means that we cannot take advantage of the immense opportunities for national advocacy. So, what does this mean? Barnes said that it means that we get votes for National and State Conference. Votes mean that we can go to National Conference and propose motions - we can propose policy motions on issues that are significant to UWA. It also means that we can propose motions which will direct NUS office bearers to undertake certain activities. Now next year UWA is going to be in an incredibly unique position - we will be one of the only universities in Australia to have new courses that are fully Commonwealth supported, and whether or not they retain their Commonwealth support will be reviewed by the Federal Government. We'll be a university that retains a number of individual agreements with the Commonwealth Minister for Education on everything from funding, to support for a wide array of things such as service learning issues. So it is incredibly important that NUS is not just accountable on a general level but also directly accountable to UWA. And by passing this motion, we will make that happen. Our accreditation also gives us votes at State Conference, it means that we can elect some of our own students onto the state executive of NUS who will then run campaigns, engage with the media, engage with the Minister's office on everything from education, welfare, women's issues, queer issues, and a whole different range of issues about student representation advocacy and support. Finally it also means that by re-funding NUS, we go into the next year as a strong player in national advocacy.

Barnes continued; now no one here I suspect will think that NUS is a perfect organisation. I think we can all agree that it has a number of significant faults. UWA has always stood out as a leader at National Conference by pushing accountability issues, by pushing issues of diversity and looking after every state and every campus. We've always been a leader on issues like making sure that NUS, as an organisation, is not bogged down by factional or party politics, but accountable to the important issues of the day. What are those issues? They're the Commonwealth

funding arrangements – are we going to continue to have 100% Commonwealth supported places? They're arrangements with things like new courses and the structure of our degrees, and TESCA, a national organisation that determines whether our new courses are level 7, level 8, or level 9. And that poses a wide range of different issues for us on an educational level. Now we've elected six delegates for national conference and I'm very confident that all six of us can act as strong advocates for UWA. If we have votes, we can use those votes to move motions directing office bearers through a number of different things. And I'm very happy for this council to provide directions to NUS office bearers about some of the things that you would like to see us pushing at National Conference. We will also be delivering a comprehensive report coming back from the National Conference in terms of what we achieved, what outcomes we seek to hope in the future, and how NUS will engage with us over the next year. And that's the final thing I wanted to touch on - the fact that if we want NUS to engage with us next year, if we want them to give us support for everything from campaigns to improving our relationship with the Vice Chancellery, we need to approve this fee today to ensure that we're going into the future as strong as possible. And with that I'm proud to move the motion.

Searson asked what the three top priorities are that the NUS delegates hope to achieve at the 2012 National Conference?

Barnes responded that his top priority is accountability. At the last budget meeting of this Council there was a very heated debate about NUS, and one of the big issues brought up was that we felt that, as an organisation, it is not accountable enough to independent students and it is not accountable enough to UWA. And there were a number of issues with the way the organisation is run - it is very intensely political, it is very intensely factionised, and information often doesn't get out when it needs to. Now in order to make sure that we're keeping that organisation accountable we need votes to A) be able to bargain with in conference floor and B) To be able to stand up and ask really probing questions and make motions to ensure that office bearers are doing things like visiting our campus; coming and meeting our council. One of the things that has always been great to see in the last couple of years is having the NUS National President come and sit in on a Guild Council meeting and answer questions from councillors. And that is something that I'm very confident we can arrange if we pass this motion today. So that's accountability.

The second thing is making sure that our unique issues with new course are being addressed by the National Union. We don't have the same model that most universities in Australia have and we need advocacy that is bringing up those issues, because other university campuses won't necessarily be. So that's making sure that in NUS policy, it's recognising some of the issues we've seen. For example, quality frameworks - which has been a huge issue at Melbourne and UWA and not really an issue at other campuses. So that's a good example of where we can make sure that NUS's advocacy is including some of the issues that we're facing on a local level.

The third thing would have to be campaigns and awareness. One of the things that NUS does very well is get media attention, and when it sits down with the Commonwealth Minister it has bargaining power - largely because they know that if you upset NUS or if you do the wrong thing, NUS will go out and run a campaign against you and it can be devastatingly effective. And so one of the things that I'd like to do is make sure that NUS is continuing to run strong campaigns and that we do our bit to support those campaigns.

Priya congratulated Barnes, Tom and Emma for getting that \$30,000 affiliation fee. She also commented on our situation at the moment stating that we've had such a good arrangement with having 70% in the SSAF from the University. When this occurred, NUS ran several media campaigns about how great UWA was and the fact

that Alan Robson did the right thing by students and the student Guild. The fact that we have had a bit of an issue this time round and we're only getting 30% is something we could take to NUS to gain media attention and help the scenario.

Barnes said he would treat Priya's comment as a question. He said he is very excited to go to NUS and bring up that issue and hear about how other campuses have dealt with it. To make sure that NUS is on our side and they are going to be making it very clear to the University Executive that they give us a raw deal, we're going to have NUS's backing. I think that's very important in terms of our bargaining position with the University.

Searson asked how much speaking time we receive amongst the six delegates?

Barnes replied that it depends on the conference floor. In the past all of our delegates have been able to bring up issues, speak, and engage in the conference.

Tom said that it is too hard to give a ball-park figure. He said that the conference floor works like an organism in which different groups align themselves with different ideologies and different parties. The way your speaking time is given to you is through your coordination with each of the different groups, and you can't do that without votes, and you can't do that if you don't have something to bring to the table. This is because there is often bargaining and negotiations regarding issues that you're concerned with and the ones of the other universities. It is up to the people who are going and our relationships with each of the negotiators from each of the parties as to how much speaking time you have. Tom said that he hasn't been, but is aware that Emma has previously done a good job of rallying other independent universities around Australia to get a bigger bargaining chip with these votes.

Priya commented that UWA used to have the WA Independents which developed into the National Independents – this group bands together to support individual issues that affect individual campuses.

Searson asked how you generally bargain with these groups?

Priya responded "votes".

Barnes said that it was a matter of votes. The reality is if you hold votes, you can bargain for speaking time.

Priya added that there is a mentality of "we will support you if you support us".

Barnes said that there is a lot of horse-trading, and that is one of the really big issues with NUS. But unfortunately sometimes to improve the system, you have to be part of the system.

Luke Rodman asked how much this \$30,000 equates to per student? He also asked whether the 100th Council will be asked to approve a second NUS payment in 2013?

Barnes responded that we have 23,000 students so it equates to a little over \$1.00 per student, which is a good investment. And we do have to think of it as an investment. A classic example is that recently, thanks to one of NUS's campaigns, the government increased the Youth Allowance threshold from \$180 a fortnight to \$400 a fortnight, which is a change that has probably benefitted a lot of us personally to the tune of several hundred, if not several thousand dollars over a long period of time. Paying a \$1.00 a year per student, he thinks, is a very good investment, and

when you look at some of the hundred million dollar wins that NUS has had, it is very much worthwhile on both a Guild level and per student basis. In terms of whether we will need to pass another affiliation fee - yes. This affiliation fee would have been expected of the 99th Council but luckily we're coming into the picture just in time to pay our affiliation fee for 2012. Why do we need to pay this affiliation fee now? The 2012 national conference is coming up in December and that's when all the important stuff happens, that's when we direct office bearers to act in UWA's interests and that's why we need to pay it now. Barnes expects that we will be including in the budget for another affiliation fee next year.

Julian asked whether this \$30,000 figure was markedly reduced because we didn't pay the affiliation in January and so we've missed out on 11 months of representation? He also requested that the delegates that do go to the conference post daily updates into the 100th Guild Council Facebook page so that everyone here is aware of what is actually getting done.

Priya noted that often delegates are locked in rooms or have their phones taken off them, and that sometimes posting to the Facebook page will not be an option. She said that obviously delegates will do reports.

Rob said that they would do their best given the circumstances.

Julian said that if delegates could do their best, that would be satisfactory. He said he would like notifications so that everyone on Council is aware of what is actually going on. He then built on his first question asking whether Barnes expects that our 2013 affiliation fee will be the same as what we were quoted this year; between \$65,000 to \$100,000. And what line of income this will be coming from?

Barnes responded in two parts. He said that to start with, our representation across the year stems from the previous national conference. So for example when we go to National Conference and we move motions on what we'd like to see NUS do, that establishes a relationship with NUS where they then get in contact with us over the next year. We sent voting delegates to the conference last year and a number of national office bearers that have attempted to look after UWA this year and have attempted to get in touch with us. The 99th Council decided that they didn't want to take up those opportunities and that was their discretion, and that's fine. But the reality is that our bang from our buck comes from having votes at that conference to be able to direct NUS. So if we want to be involved with NUS in the next calendar year, it is imperative that we have votes at this conference and it is imperative that we gain accreditation for this conference, or we will be effectively cut off from NUS for another 12 months and that will be a huge issue.

In terms of how much we'll be paying for the 2013 year, Barnes could not speculate exactly as to what that figure will be. He said that Julian mentioned that \$100,000 had been invoiced – he spoke to clarify this issue: Every year NUS invoices all the Universities based on their full-time equivalent load and a couple of other indices that they use to calculate the amount of you get charged – we always get charged in something around the \$100,000 line. Every single year we have consistently negotiated that down to less than \$70,000 and recently that figure has been falling. So what we've seen is that over time we've become much more effective in negotiating that fee down with NUS and that's what Barnes hopes to achieve again in the future.

Julian asked that if we negotiated so successfully this year in the last three days, why would we not do that again next year instead of having to pay the full amount? If we're getting the bang for the buck predominantly from that last month of the year,

why would we pay for the entire year when this conference is what directs the entire year.

Barnes said that there are two things you have to break down. The first is that Julian was asking about our current situation –at the very last minute we managed to pass through a negotiation and probably use the time pressure to help us. But there is an issue with repeating that in the future. The first is that to a large extent part of the discount would have come from the fact that we haven't engaged with NUS this year, they haven't had to spend a lot of money on us. And NUS are very keen to see us re-affiliated. However, NUS see this as an extenuating circumstance, they see this as a one-off - this \$30,000 is a gift. I think we would be lucky to ever get this again. It is very fortunately circumstances that have led to it.

Julian asked whether this expenditure is coming from the 2013 budget?

Barnes said that it was.

Julian asked which line item both affiliation fees are coming from?

Barnes said the affiliations line item.

Dumi said that Barnes had earlier stated his three main goals for re-affiliating with NUS. He asked whether we have any measurable, or KPI's, for that in terms of what we view as greater accessibility and accountability? What will happen if we do not meet these KPI's?

Barnes responded that the first issue is KPI's for NUS itself, and the second is our goals as a university Guild with NUS. NUS itself does have KPI's - they do have a strategic plan, they do have a number of ways that they operate on a structural level. For example, one of those things is ensuring an office bearer visits every affiliated campus throughout the year to ensure that their campaigns team touches base and provides support and campaign materials to every campus that affiliated. There are certain KPI's that NUS has that we can capitalise on and push to improve at National Conference. For example, that's why one of the things Barnes will bring up is making sure that UWA again sees the national president and potentially another high profile NUS office bearer visit and attend a council meeting. It is something Barnes would like to see but not something he can promise, because there is a degree of flexibility built into these things. But he will make sure that our engagement is as strong as possible

In terms of whether we need KPI's for us affiliating to NUS – Barnes feels it is hard to put KPI's on a relationship. He said he is very happy to set down concrete goals and plans and directions for how we want the relationship to proceed – this is something the NUS delegates would be very happy to draft up and send out to Council for feedback on.

Dumi said he wasn't against the motion but he did feel that goals for the year following the conference should be formulated, whether by the delegates, Guild Executive, or other persons. He said that this should then be brought back to Council, so that when we are voting on the second re-affiliation fee, we have something to work off other than ideals, what we hear on the radio and what we get told by people.

Barnes clarified that Dumi was requesting that in the reports the delegates draft up, they address what they feel we got out of it.

Judith asked how certain we can be that the NUS will lobby for those issues that are

quite specific to us, but not in the national student body interests?

Barnes said that the great thing about having votes is that we can achieve something like this - making sure that NUS are in touch with and representing our university. It is pretty uncontroversial to say that NUS will take a position to support UWA students on this particular issue. And we use our votes to bargain make sure that our unique issues are put on the table. It costs us nothing to support NUS helping Monash students on a particular issue, and it costs them nothing to get NUS to support us on a particular issue. There is a lot of mutual benefit that you can have from using your votes in that bargaining context.

Julian asked whether the six delegates were intending on meeting beforehand to go through policy relevant to UWA and WA universities to submit before the conference? He also asked whether Council will get some sort of the report afterwards at the same time as the agenda for the next council for the budget, which he assumes is when Finance & Planning are intending for Council to approve the affiliation fee for next year.

Rob responded that if Julian or any other councillors had anything they particularly want to say, they could post it on the 100th Guild Council Facebook and the delegates would be happy to look through it.

Julian noted that it may be worth posting something on the public UWA Student Guild Facebook page.

Priya commented that she was fairly supportive of this motion. She said she wanted to make mention of the fact that this year NUS hasn't had a presence on campus, so students don't know what they are getting for their money and that we have re-engaged. She thinks that this is incredibly important as students want to see where their money is going. She suggested sending a report out to students as well since the delegates were elected to represent the student body. She is not sure where the delegates are sitting in terms of parties, but is sure that they have developed policies. She says it is incredibly important that WA has a voice. UWA is the biggest WA campus and we do work incredibly well with the other WA universities at NUS.

Searson asked whether it was possible for the report to contain who UWA supported and bargained their votes with?

Priya noted that there may be a split – some delegates will support some things, others won't.

Barnes clarified that in the report, the delegates would include who they sat with and what that group did in terms of their votes and their positions. He said it was reasonable to expect this break down.

Searson said that educational issues were uncontroversial. However, he requested that UWA delegates do not sell off their votes to Federal and political issues such as refugees and Palestine.

Priya said that UWA students elected these delegates to make their decisions. It is like students electing Council to make the decisions we're going to make. It is a bit hard to restrict our delegates on certain issues.

Maddie said that delegates should be allowed to exercise their own discretion.

Priya said that the delegates are representing us, but on certain issues it is difficult to restrict them and say that they aren't allowed to vote for certain issues.

Rob said that delegates would largely be reflecting their own policy.

Lucas stepped in to call order.

Barnes responded that the reality is that student elected us not only to campaign for UWA issues, but also on political issues that are very significant for students on campus. One example he offered was GLBTI rights - when he ran for NUS as a delegate, he ran on a platform of being progressive and of supporting GLBTI rights, of supporting Women's rights and the NUS Women's department. And they're things he will very happily support at NUS, and those are political issues but as student we should shy away from them if that's what we've been elected to get out there and support.

Searson said that he feels that since all students now contribute to this \$30,000, they should all be represented, and he doesn't feel that taking up these Federal initiatives accurately represents everybody on campus. He thinks it would be fairer to just say that UWA delegates don't support any of these issues than to say that some delegates will and some won't.

Barnes responded by saying that the reality is that if you just go there and stand up on every majority issue you can find, that's simply not good enough. In order to represent all students you need to push minority issues. Now sure, you might be able to say GLBTI rights don't affect all students on campus, that it only affects a minority of students. But the whole point about being progressive and standing up for minority rights is that as a student body, the general consensus is that we support that and we want to support that. Now you're never going to get every single student agreeing with every single thing you do. That's how politics works, that's how elections work. We're never all going to all agree. But at the end of the day, our six NUS delegates have been voted in by a majority of UWA students in the largest turn out we've ever had in a Guild election, which is a testament to the fact that all six of those delegates ran hard on good policy, and Barnes thinks they'll go to NUS and represent that. And to simply say that they are minority issues that not every student can get behind, would be to suggest that we don't do anything, we don't speak for anyone and we don't stand up for any minority and that's something Barnes is very uncomfortable with, and that's something that our system of democracy is designed to protect against.

Barnes then moved that the motion be put. Unanimously carried.

Motion passed.

8.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

Barnes made the comment that for future meetings, he would like to try to improve the communication channel as much as possible. One of the measures he will put in place is a pre-council briefing. He will make himself and any officer bearers you require available at 5:30 before the 6:00 start of every meeting to answer questions, go through issues and take on feedback. Councillors should let Barnes and office bearers know (potentially via the Facebook page) whether they would like to meet them before the meeting.

The second measure is that Barnes will try to use the Facebook group as much as possible to communicate issues about agenda items, meeting up and communication. Whenever Barnes or the Secretary send out an email, they will attach it to the Facebook group and people can get an informal dialogue going. This will indicate to him when further information is needed.

Barnes also noted that councillors are responsible for passing information on to their proxies.

Kelly thanked the staff for coming in on a Saturday and helping us.

Sophie requested volunteers to help clean out the women's room.

Barnes moved a procedural motion that we waive notice requirements for Motions 7.2 and 7.3 on the ground that under Standing Order 29A both were urgent businesses.

Unanimously carried for both motions.

Barnes notes that the next council will be held Tuesday 18th December, and following meetings will be held on the last Wednesday of every month.

Barnes also noted that the prerogative will be on the Chair of each committee to call meetings and to liaise with the executive officer of each committee. He will personally be meeting up with each chair to make sure that they call set meeting dates and get in touch with the staff member that is the executive officer. Ordinary members will be elected at the February or March meeting.

9.0 CLOSE / NEXT MEETING

Next meeting will be held on Tuesday, 18th December 2012 at 6pm.
Please contact the Guild Secretary (secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au) with any apologies or proxies.

If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.