



### 1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Owen welcomed all councillors, directors and observers and proxies and acknowledged that UWA is situated on Nyoongar land and the Nyoongar people remain the spiritual and cultural custodians of their land and that they continue to practice their beliefs, languages, values and knowledge.

#### 1.1 Attendance

Tom Henderson (Guild President), Sam Shipley (Secretary), Daniel Jo (Treasurer), Lizzy O'Shea (Ed Council President), Honny Palayukan (PAC President), Bec Doyle (Women's Officer), Max Riley (Welfare Officer), Bryn Howells (Environment Officer), Michael Morrissey (Guild Sports Representative), Owen Myles (Chair of Council), Alex Bennet (OGC), Jonathan Lo (OGC), Aiden Depiazzi (OGC), Millie Dacre (OGC), Francois Schiefler (OGC), Cameron Barnes (IPP & Senate Representative), Laura Clappinson (Queer Officer).

#### 1.2 Apologies

Cam Fitzgerald (Vice-President), Maddie Mulholland (SOC President), Kenneth Woo (ISS Director & OGC), Rida Ahmed (OGC), Richie Wu (OGC), Meredith Cully (OGC) Rebecca Lawrence (OGC), Ivory Allen (Queer Officer), David Raithel (PSA President).

#### 1.3 Proxies

Joshua Bamford (for Cam Fitzgerald), Samuel Shenton (for Maddie Mulholland), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Kaila Stevens (for Rida Ahmed), Judith Carr (for Meredith Cully), Cameron Payne (for Rebecca Lawrence), Peter Derbyshire (for David Raithel).

#### 1.4 Observers

None.

Owen moved to accept all attendances and proxies. Attendances and proxies accepted.

Owen moved a procedural motion to consider Item 6.8. Motion passed. Normal procedure of meeting then resumed.

### 2.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

#### 2.1 Guild Council Meeting September (October 9, 2013)

Raj Sing and Cameron Payne to be added to attendances.

Minutes approved.

#### 2.2 Guild Council Meeting October (October 30, 2013)

Minutes approved.

## 2.3 Guild Council Meeting November (December 2, 2013)

Minutes approved.

### 3.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Alex Bennet said that the minutes stated that the Tavern refurbishment was to start on 2 December and asked whether it had started. Ken said yes it had.

### 4.0 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

Owen moved a procedural motion that questions be allowed at the end of each report. Motion passed.

#### 4.1 Managing Director's Report

Wayne said the refurbishment at Hackett as per the priority refurbishment outlined in the catering strategy has been commenced today. He said he had a discussion with the architect about concept options and how we would refurbish it.

They are starting at the top and looking at aspirational refurbishments for the whole of the production and service areas. They are not looking at the dining hall or the courtyard, but only at initial steps. The first step is to agree on design options back through strategic resources. Regarding Subway and Boost both parties have been redesigned a co-located configuration and we have had some positive feedback from Boost but have not heard back from Subway as yet.

The Guild consolidation project is happening and there is a fair bit of budget pressure with variations. They still have a target in excess of \$100,000. They do have one item, which is problematic, being UWA information services and the networking services supplied to both ground floor and first floor sections. They are starting to throw a lot of emphasis to trying to get those services through the university. They don't have an option to go anywhere else to another supplier so they are totally dependent on them responding.

Sam asked whether the internal policy compilation would be presided over by Executive Management or by Corporate Services?

Wayne said the staff would put them forward; in the regulations and outlines that these are staff guided policies so we are aiming to get involved with a lot of student representative generated policy and I think it's wise that staff themselves put the first draft on the table and bring it to Council.

Tom asked Wayne that given the university's decision regarding copyright and how we manage our commercial leases, how confident does he feel that the status quo will be maintained for the immediate future.

Wayne said we have a "comfort" email, which has been typical of the relationship in the past so it would be very disappointing if the university reneged on that. The email basically says although the legal position on the buildings may change, the practicalities of your usage rights and your rights to an income from the buildings don't change.

Tom asked have we received any legal advice in this regard?

Wayne said we are definitely on that pathway but he has to get some reconfirmation from the previous President.

Barnes said we do have assurances from the university both verbally and in writing that they are willing

to sign a legally binding side agreement with us but they have been taking their time nutting out that side agreement but that agreement will effectively state that the status quo position will remain despite changes to the legal semantics of our relationship.

Max asked is this part of the broad negotiation concerning the Guild Relationship Agreement and if it were, when would we have a finalised version come before Council?

Wayne said he would think that this would be a long protracted negotiation and it should be. Unless we are going to throw the whole Guild team an intensive chunk of effort into it in a compact time and you won't get the responses back immediately. It's a long journey and it is an important journey that we get the best out of this relationship negotiation.

Max asked is there any definite point in time where we have to sign the Guild Relationship Agreement, or is it open-ended?

Wayne said it is open ended but not in our interests.

#### **4.2 Finance Director's Report**

Wayne said that regarding the SSAF line; it is on budget for the year to date. This could be in the \$50,000 to \$80,000 figure, which will help restore some on our income line. On the property line there is a shortfall, which is a timing difference, with some legal expenses there from the leases, which were discussed before. The tavern has had a bit of a rollercoaster report. The Guild council is a large figure there and a good chunk of that are the redundancies that were announced in November in the kitchen and as we have done in previous circumstances like that, those once off structured costs have then been under Council.

So year to date line for Guild Council is approximately 5% over budget. A good chunk of that includes fairly big structural costs, as it is not the only restructuring we have done this year. Conferences for year to date have some unfavourable variances. We need to look at that in line with staff training because there is some element in that conferences line that classify as training. There is a large positive variance in staff training.

In memberships and communication, it's again a timing difference; the diary is done near the end of the financial year and the budget is in line with that. With design we have had some changes in the way we do our internal charges and we have a positive year to date.

#### **4.3 Catering Director's Report**

Report as circulated. Ken said November was a fairly good trading month. There is a surplus against the budget. Overall the surplus now remains at \$120,000 against the mid-year revised budget of \$199,000. Basically it is in cost of goods that we are still struggling but we are very close to the end of year budget of \$112,000.

Regarding the tavern it has now stopped trading for the current year and the refurbishments are on. Overall the tavern surplus for the year is just under \$60,000 against a budget of \$104,000. Basically we have had very low sales in the tavern for the year and the sales income is down by about \$125,000 for the year. Other than that we are gearing to shut down everywhere this Friday and we start again on 6 February, except for Dentistry and Science Café, which will open closer to O-Week.

Sam asked by what date do we expect the tavern to be operational again next year? Ken said it should be operating between the 10 and 20 February.

Barnes said that effectively the tavern could be making a lot more revenue, particularly when you look at other university taverns around the country and this year there were periods where it was a bit below budget. He said there are two aspects to that. There is the tavern as a functions centre or as a

commercial arm which is that kind of food/catering side of things as well as the way a tavern runs, operating hours, refurbishments, etc. Then there is the other side of things, which is what events we run in the tavern, how we promote in the tavern, student services, etc. What kind of improvements do we need from that back-end side of the tavern to make it more usable for students? He said that the refurbishment is obviously a step in the right direction but in an ideal world where does the tavern need to be at to be effectively a really good venue?

Wayne said there is a provision in the budget in special projects to conduct a review of the Tavern, in a similar way to the Catering Review.

Barnes asked when are we looking at doing this. Wayne said he is not sure but it is in the budget. Barnes withdrew his question and said that he thought it was an excellent idea.

#### **4.4 Director of Student and Corporate Services' Report**

Tony said that the migration to the new servers has been completed and it looks like it is functioning well.

He said one point to be aware of is that they are actually going to a new website production and creating a variety of satellite sites to really service the student requirements much better. This is well and truly under way.

Josh asked what is happening to the old website. There are parts of the previous generation website that are still around and are still searchable on Google, etc.

Tony said that the new website is being built separately and there will be one main site and a variety of satellite sites, one for students, one for events, one for SOC Council, one for Catering, one for guild volunteering, etc. They will be built on the side and when we are ready we will switch the others off. There is a lot of interlocking with the old site and the new site, as apparently the other site was never finished. A lot has to do with the way it is constructed but it will be fine until the new site is completed which will hopefully be before O-week.

Aiden asked what is wrong with the current website.

Tony said the current website is very corporate and what we need to do is have a site that is talking to students. The current site is very flat. When you look at the various sections you just go into it and go out. What they really want to do taking events as an example is to go onsite as a club society president, etc. and type in your E & P requirements, do your risk assessment online, push a button, it will go straight to the events team and you will know within 24 hours if your event has been approved. What they are trying to do is streamline as much as they can. Likewise with student assist they are doing the same thing there as well as there is quite a lot of streamlining involved in applying for grants, etc.

Tony said Cameron Fitzgerald is currently building the website in his spare time while at Google.

#### **5.0 QUESTION TIME**

Barnes asked how the new committee structure is working out.

Tom said a lot of members are out at the moment but we will kick into it in the new year but everyone has been notified of their committees and it is much easier on Sam negotiating 5 committees instead of 23.

Barnes asked have any issues or gaps come up so far?

Sam said not as yet but we will probably find that out in January or February.

Owen moved a procedural motion to move to Item 7.1 – motion passed. Normal procedure of meeting then resumed.

## 6.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

### 6.1 That Council approve (from 11 January 2014) the conversion of the HR Officer position from fixed term to permanent part time at 20 hours per week and appoint Jenny Ophel to that position.

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Tom deferred his speaking rights to Wayne.

Wayne said that this has his full support. He acknowledged that as it started from the organizational review and the discussion of having an HR resource he has had to fight tooth and nail to retain this position and to some extent prove to everybody that it is something that we should do for the organization. It protects us and it also really helps support directors and to a large extent which we didn't expect, student representatives as well. It isn't a high cost position.

He said we implemented it in the organizational review and specifically set it aside as a fixed term position as it was basically a "try before you buy" and on a long-term basis he said he feels it has proven its worth. We do also have negotiations to not continually roll over fixed term positions.

Aiden asked about the reference to Level 7 – is that the university's general salary scheme?

Wayne said the Guild does have its own EBA. To be fair there is some comparison to the university.

The motion was put. **Motion 6.1 was passed unanimously.**

### 6.2 That Council approve that the current Events Consultant contract position (held by Chloe Jackson) be converted to the permanent Events Manager position.

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Wayne referred to the Organisation Review where the flavour was to identify that we should make a certain amount of positions fixed term while we understand what the impacts were of that fairly wide ranging organization review and the modifications that are put in for positions. At the time of that review it very specifically stated that we should look at all these positions progressively and either not have them or make them permanent. He said you can see examples happening recently where it has been decided not to continue some of those fixed term positions that came out of the org review.

He said for this position everyone is aware of the challenges and the opportunities that we have for an appropriate investment in the events team. It sends a really good message to the people involved to get some stability, to get some skill base in there and provide them with opportunity, which is important. He said he wanted to clarify in the document in the dot points under the KPI's it says "successfully plan and logistically deliver a O-Day with no more than three..." – it should read "no more than five legitimate complaints".

Tom said everyone who has met Chloe knows how well she has taken to this role. She has been a very good resource not only with regard to compliance to our SLA and to the university, but also helping FacSocs clubs make the most of their events and make them bigger and better. He said he is really looking forward to seeing what she can achieve with the Events Department next year and it is a very important role given how much focus the uni is going to put on the Events Department.

Samuel Shenton (proxy for Maddie Mulholland) asked if the current event training is included in the

SLA?

Tony said that as part of the website plan as well they are actually looking at restructuring the website so that it operates on podcast and online training because it is going to be difficult to get a lot of students in one room at the same time to ensure that they go through the processes and make sure they are fully equipped. He said they recognize completely that students are event planners by day and we need to provide them with support as much as we can. They do want to hold at least 2 or 3 of those online training sessions where they can. They had one session completed in November and this went really well. He said they will always be tweaking and changing but if they can they are also going to try to put some elements online as well.

Max said we got \$100,000 extra from the uni for events on top of our initial SSAF allocation. Is this conversion of this contract position to a permanent position contingent on us getting that \$100,000 this year and every year after that?

Wayne said it is a permanent move and what we are being asked to do in events in regard to compliance and in delivery of services to students. He said we underinvested in events and got caught out and he highly recommends we don't go with the vagaries of funding from the university and SSAF, that we stand our ground and put the right people in and that everything is done right.

Tony said if we do a good job in events it might turn it from a weakness into a strength and actually turn it into quite a useful tool for the Guild that will be more productive. With that \$100,000 there is a small allocation for some of that to go towards training as well. We have to have someone who is going to be there to develop training and facilitate it. It is a bit of a mix of everything.

The motion was put. **Motion 6.2 was passed unanimously.**

### **6.3 That Council approve the 2014 Preliminary Budget as per the attached Budget Pack.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Owen said there are some specific standing orders for the budget debate and that means that we will have to move on the deficit or surplus first and then consider any amendments in line items pairs. Other than that it is essentially the same.

Daniel said that essentially what we are trying to go for is a sustainable budget and that involves trying to create a balanced budget with preferably a surplus or a minimum break-even or credit cashflow. That is achieved by making each Guild department more financially sustainable, by making things more efficient, getting rid of costs that shouldn't be there and looking at alternative sources of revenue for each Guild department.

He said sustainability is a very important thing for this budget especially given the uncertain outlook for 2015 and beyond. In 2015 there is going to be a severely reduced student cohort, which will no doubt affect our operating income from SSAF and also catering, tavern and other frontline resources. So we have strived to achieve the most efficient and sustainable budget that we can hopefully implement in the new financial year without reducing any frontline services to students and staff.

Tom said he thinks it is quite a stingy budget. We are asking quite a lot of each of the departments to find creative ways of doing more with less but it is very important that we look to the future of the Guild and move in the right direction providing ourselves with a financial buffer for the future.

Aiden asked what the consequences are in place for department heads if they don't meet their budget? Daniel said at the moment we are looking at trying to meet up with them once a month, allocate them KPI's and if they go over their budget then this will be discussed. He said he can't say at this stage what the consequences would be, it would depend on each individual situation.

Aiden asked are there any positive incentives in place for anyone who achieves or exceeds their budget. Daniel said no not at this point.

Aiden asked if there are no positive incentives for being on budget and no negative incentives for not achieving budget, what is the incentive to stick to their budget? Daniel said if they go over their budget then the Guild wouldn't allocate them more money for future activities or events they want to hold.

Aiden said if say welfare blows its entire budget in Semester One does that mean there will be no free self-defence, free breakfasts, etc.

Daniel said that is the point of meeting up with them each month to make sure that they are meeting their budget and figuring out whether they are doing the right thing. He said it is better to be constructive about it and meet up with them and make sure they don't get into that situation.

Peter Derbyshire (proxy for David) asked about this being a preliminary budget, is this still a work in progress and not something that is set in stone at the moment.

Daniel said it is a preliminary budget and in regard to PSA we are still in discussions with PSA about their allocation as there has been a bit of back and forth over the past 3 or 4 days. What we are approving is what we will work off for the next month or so. We have to continue working on it and we will approve it in stone probably in January, then with further changes. We will then conduct a mid-year budget review in June/July, which will be another amendment on top of that, so it is a budget of three stages.

Wayne clarified that we wouldn't be so restrictive to say that is the budget and you can't do anything else. Of course as things come up, circumstances change. On a month-to-month basis things have come to Council, which need Council approval to be a budget variation, which is very important. If we want to do something outside of the budget it must come to Council but there is the opportunity to do this. Ideally it doesn't happen but it can be put to debate at Council, so the opportunity is there.

Aiden said he had a series of amendments to move under 80, 81 and 82. He requested leave to move these amendments en bloc.

Amendment No. 1 is to reduce the Affiliations line item by \$3,000.00 under Item 81 and to increase the RSD budget by \$3,000.00. Amendment No. 2 is to reduce Affiliations by \$6,000.00 under 81 and to increase ISS by \$6,000.00. Amendment No. 3 is to reduce Affiliations by \$11,000.00 and increase Club Grants by \$11,000.00. Amendment No. 4 is to reduce Affiliations by \$11,000.00 and increase Faculty Society Grants by \$11,000.00.

Aiden said what he has done is cut out the Affiliations budget, the majority of which \$30,000 out of the \$31,000 listed goes towards paying NUS fees. He said he has just come back from NUS National Conference, which he found to be disgraceful. Approximately 17% of time spent that was allocated to debate policy was spent debating policy; the rest was spent with student representatives held up in buildings protected by security by other student representatives who had attacked them previously. He said that three complaints were lodged with the Victorian Police at the conference.

He said he thinks it is disastrous that the Guild when it is trying to improve its reputation across the board affiliates to an organization that approves inappropriate behaviour.

He said if we have \$30,000 sitting here to spend to affiliate to an organization which is terrible for our reputation and which has facilitated the assault of a number of people at the most recent national conference and he expects many national conference before that as well, that this system of distributing that money amongst residential students, international students, club grants and faculty society grants is an excellent way to spend that money in a way that actually benefits UWA students as opposed to benefiting people at the NUS.

Sam asked Aiden if he knew how much the RSD got last year in funding? Aiden said that he didn't know

the amount but that he could find out. Sam said that as an ex-College President that he would be thrilled if the RSD received more money, but that RSD fared well in the budget compared to other departments and that it would be silly to hand out more money to a department that already had sufficient funds allocated.

Aiden said an amendment could be moved to shift that \$3,000 somewhere else but otherwise he thinks if we allocate RSD enough money to explore their opportunities to support residential students further then he thinks it is a good opportunity.

Max said he was at NUS National Conference and was a member of Secretariat. He was one of the people in the room at the time when socialists were banging on the windows and threatening to break things. He said this went on for about 45 minutes. He said he doesn't think anyone can excuse that behaviour. He pointed out that that affiliation fees and the affiliation line of this budget refers to a couple of organisations, not just the NUS. He said he thinks that CAPA (The Council of Postgraduate Associations) does a great job with their affiliation fee.

He said he personally thinks that if we are going to reduce our affiliation fee it should be targeted at organisations and this line of reduction doesn't do that. He said secondly, the big issue he has with this is that affiliation fees don't actually pay for the conference itself. That is paid under the conferences fee. To be very clear about this, reducing the affiliation fee provided to the NUS will not result in a single less cent going to sending UWA students to conference. He said that he worked for the NUS at the time he went to conference. They didn't pay him any money for that. They did put him up in accommodation for that week. He said there are a number of people in this room who had their flights and accommodation paid for by the university for a week so if the issue is national conference then let's reduce the conference affiliation fee. He said he believes the NUS do a great job with the affiliation money, which we give them. This has been evidenced over time and he believes that it matters to international students that there is a strong international student department of the NUS but also a strong NUS to fight for international students as they are disproportionately victimized by higher course charges, by the sort of fees which domestic students don't pay and he feels that we are leaving international students out in the cold if we abandon a Western Australian voice of this national union.

He said it is true that if we disaffiliate from NUS then we would spend less money affiliating to NUS but it is also true that if we disaffiliate from NUS, NUS continues to exist. The socialists who go to NUS every year and rattle the walls will still go there, the ALSF who goes there and throws their ballots on the grounds in a remarkable display of disrespect for the people who sent them there in the first place, still go there. The people who don't go there are the Western Australian attendants who he was very proud to see elected to the position of National Queer Officer for the first time who aim to make conference better and you don't see movements to try to make the NUS more accountable any more. If anything, NUS becomes a substantially worse organization if we disaffiliate from them. He said there are better things we can cut money from. He said he wants to see more money go to RSD, to international students, to club grants, but if we are going to do it we shouldn't cut a whole group of students out from an organization which can offer them any sort of protection in order to do that so he will oppose this on every level.

Owen reminded everyone of Standing Order 41 that you must keep your speeches compliant with the subject matter and you have to avoid repetition not only of yourself but also of people who have spoken before you.

Francois said he would support this amendment because it gives money back to clubs and societies, and gives money back to students in WA and not to people in the Eastern States.

Barnes said we are a representative organization and in a year where we saw the impact of \$2.3 billion on the higher education sector, we are going to feel that impact next year. Class sizes will be bigger, staff will be laid off, and students will experience a worse educational experience because of the decisions made by a national government. He said we are a representative body and we have a duty to our students to ensure that their needs are represented at a national level. As far as a tangible impact is



concerned he gave the example that he moved out of home just before he turned 22. There was a 6 month period when he wasn't on Centrelink and it was the hardest 6 months of his life. He was trying to run Blackstone, was totally broke, struggling to pay his rent and was relying on Guild interest free loans. NUS fought a really hard campaign to lower the automatic age of independence and they won that campaign and he was able to go on Centrelink. He said he owed that to NUS and it got him \$480 per fortnight. He said he is forever grateful to the NUS for what they have done for him and it does have a tangible impact for our students. He said he paid \$1.30 a year for that in his SSAF contribution, which is absolutely nothing for a national advocacy that can affect the expenditure of billions of dollars of the national government.

He said the other point is are we having an impact on the National Union of Students? The simple answer is yes. The national convener of the second largest faction at NUS this year was Barnes. He said the reality is that we had people such as Tom Henderson, Lizzy who was on the negotiation team, and Bec who had a huge impact on the policy discussions particularly around the women's policy platform. We are having an impact on our national union and we should continue as one of the leading universities in Australia to have an impact on our national union and to represent our students. We have a duty. It is not a false dichotomy between spending money on education advocacy and spending money on clubs. In 2012 when they cut NUS affiliation they said they were not going to take away from education and give it to another area of the budget, they were just going to cut NUS and spend the money on other education areas. However they found they couldn't actually run effective education campaigns because they were completely missing a part of the jigsaw puzzle. It is not a false dichotomy between clubs versus education; it is about our education aspect of the budget. We are a representative organization. Education is our business and we shouldn't be trying to redistribute money away from education towards other sections.

Tom said for the most part he agrees with Aiden. He said there were a lot of times at NUS where the actions of a few were deplorable but he doesn't feel that those actions while deplorable should affect us substantially in reducing our ability to influence education policy and education advocacy on a national level. He said that we can see the impact we have had. We have a Western Australian national Queer Officer that was negotiated by members in this room. We have members in this room that have and will next year sit on the national executive and have an impact on the National Union of Students. We have the WA State President sitting in this room for the National Union of Students, again having impact and giving our voice to the National Union and where it goes from here. He said he would also like to clarify that the \$31,000 does not have a \$30,000 affiliation fee to NUS; it has a \$20,000 affiliation fee to NUS. So the money that is being redistributed is also taking the affiliation fee away from CAPA – I'm sure the PSA would not like to lose their affiliation to CAPA.

Peter said although he wasn't at NUS he would be unwilling to suggest we remove ourselves from such a valuable body based on one occasion. He suggested we at least wait to see if this is a more common occurrence than just this once off time. As far as CAPA is concerned, we have an amazing relationship with them. We send at least two people – usually our current president and future president every year. They come to us every year and help us organize inter-university events between us, Murdoch, Curtin and hopefully ECU in the year ahead. He said it is a fantastic body that has helped us present post-graduate issues on a national level to national parliament. He said to remove the affiliation fee to CAPA would hurt the PSA in particular quite significantly and would be against post-graduate interests.

Owen moved a procedural motion that the speaking list now be closed as it stands with Aiden having a right of reply at the end. Motion passed.

Aiden said that he didn't know what the NUS affiliation fee was, as it wasn't specified. He said he would amend his amendment to read: \$3,000 from Affiliations to RSD, \$5,000 from Affiliations to ISS, \$6,000 from Affiliations to Club Grants, \$6,000 from Affiliations to Faculty and Society Grants, such that the total sum reduced from affiliations is only \$20,000. He said he thinks that CAPA is more valuable because people report back, that they do good things for students.

He said he is not suggesting that cutting the affiliations is going to prevent anything from happening

that does happen at the NUS national conference. He thinks it will show to students that we are serious about preserving the reputation of this organization and that we will not risk that reputation by affiliating with NUS. If we don't affiliate then he can't see why we would go and it would logically follow that if we haven't paid our affiliation fee and therefore our vote is not valid, then it would not be in the minds of the Guild Executive to authorize payment for delegates to go. He said he won't cut the conference budget because he doesn't know how much of that is allocated specifically to staff PD, training for students, but if he leaves the conferences line out of it then when we decide not to send delegates to NUS, then more money could be spent on things like RSA training and manager training. In response to Barnes' comments he said he would dispute that NUS has an ability to affect Commonwealth Government policy. He said he understands that there are one or two examples of where this has happened before or appears to have happened but he doesn't see it happening at this time.

He said regarding Barnes' comments about having a duty to provide a level of national representation for our students, he is not sure that duty is really fixed for a body created by a state act of Parliament and he would say that the most important representation we can do is with the university because the Commonwealth Government has said they will cut funding and that is something no-one can change at this stage. The people who decide where that money gets cut from are not in Canberra. The people we need to be talking to about making sure that it is admin costs that are scaled down are not in Canberra, they are in Hackett Hall. Those are the people we can go to, to say can we please keep the front line services running and cut down and scale back on admin costs, which are extremely high. He said he doesn't believe that there is a legitimate duty we have to affiliate to a national organization. He said we should provide national representation and talk to the people who are key stakeholders in this debate definitely, but that doesn't require affiliation to NUS and there is no way to stretch that logic. He said in response to the idea that NUS is an education area of the budget and the education budget is being cut, this is completely wrong. This affiliation fee does not buy us educational advocacy, it doesn't buy us educational representation – it pushes money into a budget that is held by people who have no concept of budgetary management or responsible fiscal management. Those are the people who are running the show now and they are not people that he feels we can trust to spend that money wisely as it has never been done before. He said as to the claim that in 2012 when there was no affiliation paid that we couldn't run local campaigns was not true. One of the most effective campaigns that was run in 2012 when affiliations was fixed at zero was the "Keep Calm and Ask a Lecturer" campaign and this led to a significant and visible increase in the number of lectures which were available for download. This was done by a group of lecturers in this building by printing posters in this room and in this building and putting them up around the university and talking to students. It didn't require any support from the NUS.

Regarding comments about how NUS somehow supported the acts of some members' inappropriate behaviour, Lizzy said that she was in the room when the students were locked in. She said the NUS organisers were equally as terrified, that they called security and dealt with the situation; they definitely did not support it. She said she finds it to be a little disingenuous to blame everything that happened at the conference on the body as well as the organisers. It was the acts of what she believes were a small number of members from a socialist alternative group that led to behaviour that she obviously does not support. She said also if you have a problem with how conference is run then it is not just some socialists that are doing things that are wrong, it is also various other factions like ALSF, who threw their ballots up in the air, instead of filling them out. She said she understood that Aiden sat with the ALSF, but that she wasn't sure whether Aiden tried to change them from the inside or not. She said that there was not just one group who acted up at the conference. She said we should not disaffiliate by cutting our affiliation fee and she doesn't think that is being honest to our students. If we want to disaffiliate we should have a referendum, you can't just take the money out when we have said we are affiliating, which would be dishonest to students. She said we have budgeted money in these areas where the extra money is being allocated. Putting more money into these areas and departments is great, but in no way is the Guild sacrificing services in those areas by budgeting for NUS affiliation where we get national representation, and a national office bearer team who reports back to us. She said that she has been very impressed with the NUS Office Bearers for this year, with the presidential candidate for next year and also some of the other candidates.

Aiden moved a procedural motion to be allowed to respond to Lizzy's comments. Motion passed.

Aiden said it is true that he sat with the ALSF. He said he didn't make that decision for any other reason other than that he agreed with their policy platforms and they weren't echoed in any other fashion. These are platforms such as supporting the abolition of parallel import restrictions on textbooks, which members of this Guild, members representing UWA students, voted such that the system would maintain those import restrictions. In terms of throwing ballots on the floor it is true that some of the ballots from the Victorian State election section were thrown on the ground and he wasn't a part of that. He said it is possible that other ballots were thrown on the floor and the small and regional ballots were thrown on the ground because someone said that the person who had 75% of the ballot walked past them to go and lodge them in his name and they realized then that their ballots weren't worth anything.

He said he is not sure what his involvement with the ALSF has to do with the motion at hand. Aiden said that no affiliation money to NUS is money that goes to actual students at this campus who pay the SSAF fees that support what we do as Guild Council and who elected this Council to represent them.

The amendment is now a four step reduction from Affiliations from \$31,000 to \$11,000, an increase to the RSD line item of \$3,000, an increase to the ISS line item of \$5,000, an increase to the Club Grants line item of \$6,000.00 and an increase of \$6,000 to Faculty and Society grants.

The amendment was put. **Amendment failed.**

**For:** Aiden Depiazzi, Francois Schiefler, Millie Dacre, Cameron Payne (proxy for Rebecca Lawrence).

**Abstaining:** Kaila Stevens (proxy for Rida Ahmed), Judith Carr (proxy for Merredith Cully).

**Against:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Kenneth Woo, Alex Bennet, Richie Wu, Jonathan Lo, Joshua Bamford (proxy for Cam Fitzgerald), Samuel Shenton (proxy for Maddie Mulholland).

Barnes commended the Strategic Resources Committee for finding an operating cash surplus, which he said is a real achievement. He said it is something we tried hard to do in the mid-year budget review and at the end of the day fell short.

Motion was put. **Motion 6.3 was passed.**

**For:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Kenneth Woo, Alex Bennet, Richie Wu, Jonathan Lo, Joshua Bamford (proxy for Cam Fitzgerald), Samuel Shenton (proxy for Maddie Mulholland), Kaila Stevens (proxy for Rida Ahmed), Judith Carr (proxy for Merredith Cully).

**Abstaining:** Aiden Depiazzi, Francois Schiefler, Millie Dacre, Cameron Payne (proxy for Rebecca Lawrence).

**Against:** None.

**6.4 That Council endorse the Limited Outline Masterplan for the Guild Village precinct (phase 1) and approve the commencement of phase 2 (complete comprehensive Masterplan) at a budgeted cost of \$13,000.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Daniel deferred his speaking right to Wayne. Wayne said the Limited Outline Masterplan is a revision of the original Masterplan 2009 and the main project, which has come from that is the Guild Consolidation Project, which is currently underway. He said things have changed in the Guild environment and also our relationship with the university and student representatives' thoughts coming through had different views on master plans over the past 4 years.

He said the current Limited Outline Masterplan sought to review the 2009 Masterplan, incorporate all changes to the environment and the relationship with the university and seek fresh consultation with students. A different approach this time was to engage the university at the very start of the Masterplan by forums and consultation when in 2009 to a large extent we went ahead with it and it was presented to the university when we were at the end of the process.

It was approved in February and a cautious approach was taken by suggesting that the actual completion of the Masterplan be cut into two phases. One is the Limited Outline with handwritten sketches, etc. but enough to get a conceptual idea there and the narrative to support it. The next phase is to do the presentation document in 3D, which is to complete a lot of the detail and that is the sort of document you need to make presentations to support funding applications in a complete Masterplan.

He said the Masterplan is on the table for endorsement and if accepted as a planning guidance document we go back to the original Council approval of February 2013 and say are we going to head to Phase 2 to complete the presentation document. It is budgeted and we are ready to get that finished in amongst the next business case that comes up in Item 6.5.

Tom said that we are on track for the completion of the consolidation project in the south wing. Wayne said that indications are that the ground floor will be on target and the first floor may well be ahead of target.

Tom said with that in mind it is important that this Council utilize the opportunity that SSAF has given us over the past few years especially with the university's willingness to give us 100% of the capital component of that expenditure for us to take steps in the right direction to create a Guild that we can all be proud of. The Guild itself hasn't had any work done on it for a very long time and we have been fortunate enough to be able to do so now and he thinks it is very important that we move into this next phase now that the first stage has been completed and make sure that we finish this the way it should be finished.

Barnes said that we should be forward-thinking and that it would be great for students.

The motion was put. **Motion 6.4 was passed.**

**For:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Kenneth Woo, Alex Bennet, Richie Wu, Jonathan Lo, Joshua Bamford (proxy for Cam Fitzgerald), Samuel Shenton (proxy for Maddie Mulholland), Kaila Stevens (proxy for Rida Ahmed), Judith Carr (proxy for Merredith Cully).

**Abstaining:** Aiden Depiazzi, Francois Schiefler, Millie Dacre, Cameron Payne (proxy for Rebecca Lawrence).

**Against:** None.

#### 6.5 That Council:

- **Endorse the establishment of the Student Central Hub Project;**
- **Approve the commencement of the Concept and Feasibility phase of Part A of the Student Central Hub Project;**
- **Approve the appointment of the external Project Manager for the Concept and Feasibility phase at a cost of \$16,350 as included in the 2014 Capital budget.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Daniel deferred his speaking rights to Wayne. Wayne said this is the priority project out of the Master Plan and is the first "child" suggested. The original 2009 Master Plan did very globally suggest that we do what we are doing with the Guild Consolidation Project. Once we have done that and some floor space is vacated let's prioritise in the student facilities to finish off the two core areas of our business in this

precinct of our headquarters and our volunteer hub as central customer service areas, and then to providing all student facilities.

He said that those who are involved in the Guild Consolidation Project journey would have a good handle on what we need to go through. It is intensive and it takes a long time. Every step of the way Council will be given updates and will approve the financial commitments step by step. There are several steps involved. The concept has been tabled and there is also the financial commitment that is to be absorbed. There are two elements of it. The first step makes a solid commitment for \$16,000 but hooked into that is an expectation of also a commitment of at least \$25,000 to go ahead and appoint an architect to complete the Concept and Feasibility phase. It is a big investment when you look at it on a percentage of the old potential project. If we don't do it we won't know and we won't be able to firm up budget estimates and concepts, and we won't be able to make well-informed decisions.

He clarified the wording under the section which says, "vacate Cameron Hall", where it says "phase relocation over a period of time with current tenants". He said this is not the intent, the intent is that there is space made available under the Student Central Hub Project and that clubs through an application process would fill the space. Those applications would be based on clubs that have specific needs like clubrooms with four walls or other spaces of a different configuration.

He said there is also discussion on finance. He has tried to point out how we start the journey we have to start with an indicative figure and we need to spend money to get to that point. We have got to this point even though we have had some professional work done for us as we have had that done on a pro bono basis.

He said there is a figure of \$1.5 million there. There is a contingency in there and the university when we go through their process will force us to have very large contingencies. We learned that in the Guild Consolidation Project where we employed a professional Project Manager, they came up with an estimate, and they had their contingencies already in there. It was called the Guild Consolidation Project. It was \$1.5 million that had at least \$100,000 of contingencies in there. The university made us load on almost another \$300,000 or they would enforce it. The project looks like it is going to be delivered at \$1.35 million. We would hope that doesn't happen in the reverse.

He said they will be doing everything they can to maintain the outcome, whatever the concept when it is finally designed and on a cost basis to deliver it without compromising the essential outcome.

Also he has outlined where we might source the funds from; there is an update for the unspent balance for 2013 SSAF CapEx. He has received confirmation that it will be quite a bit higher, so we are looking at another \$50,000 to \$60,000 there. If we are happy to roll over savings and are happy to prioritise SSAF CapEx for 2, possibly 3 years, we can limit any use of the Guild investment pool. He said reflecting back on the Guild investment pool, and if we didn't have some favourable outcomes this year, for example getting a \$1.5 million waiver for the South Wing, which had been committed and would have expected a large chunk of it to come out of the investment pool. That money is not being used out of the investment pool and is still sitting there and the university is obviously aware that they have waived \$1.5 million.

He said if Council approve this motion then he would recommend that we begin looking for alternative funding sources for capital works, not just for this project but also for the other projects, which are stepped out throughout this project and the balance of the Master Plan. We have a huge array of projects ready to go into the Concept and Feasibility phase and there is also the one about Hackett Café so we have the ability and to some extent the resources ready to go. He is not sure how many we can handle at once but we can press a lot of buttons to find out which ones we want to prioritise. If we look forward and look for funds that may not come to us for two years or so, we need to start doing the leg work now to try to secure that money either from a fund raising campaign or from the university.

Tom said he thinks we can all look down the hallway and downstairs and see the need for this project to go ahead. It has probably been 30 or so years since anything has been done and we are also in a much different time where clubs require a different style of support than they may have done 30 years ago.

Millie asked how will it work exactly and will there be any regulations or rules as to how it is used or allocated and if so who will be involved in making these?

Tom said he thinks the Tenancy Committee, Clubs and FacSocs and any stakeholder who has access to these areas will have a say. It is obviously quite challenging about the number of students who may or may not have access to this area and making sure each club is respected and the space is maintained adequately but this will be for discussion when we actually decide how much open space there is, and what exactly is going to go in this area which will be done with this money.

Barnes said part of the idea behind not having the first floor as all open plan space and having some single use space was that we think the autonomous space is really important and being on the second floor isn't actually ideal. Being on the first floor makes them more accessible, so if you have that mix that would be ideal. That is part of the rationale behind having a mix on the first floor so there is a very good opportunity there for autonomous spaces.

The motion was put. **Motion 6.5 was passed unanimously.**

Owen moved a procedural motion to move to Item 6.9 at Wayne's request. Motion passed. Normal procedure of meeting then resumed.

#### **6.6 That Council appoints the Memberships & Communications Manager as the publisher and manager of Pelican Magazine.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Daniel said that the Pelican Magazine was operating at a massive deficit every year and losing the Guild a lot of money so Tony, himself and Alex Pond discussed these issues and figured out steps to fix the problems. One of these was to employ Alex, the Memberships & Communications Manager, as the publisher of Pelican Magazine. She will create deadlines and make sure all editors meet those deadlines. That will go a long way in raising more revenue from different companies.

Tony said basically one of the key things as to why Pelican has gone a little astray is the fact that there isn't any structure around it so therefore putting together a proper publishing structure with someone in charge of publication, making sure deadlines are hit, both from receiving editorial as well as receiving advertising, will mean that it gives the sales people a chance to properly sell the product. It is a good product in that it has a good following and there is also the shift now that we are moving into a digital age and we need to move with that time as well. They are looking at cutting print product drastically and moving to more of an E-mag format and ensuring that every student gets it in their mailbox. 25,000 students should have access to Pelican every time it comes out. It has been run quite loosely for many years and now is the time to bring it into line and put some restrictions on it. He said he is quite impressed with the way Daniel has handled the whole management structure with the editors who are very precious about the product as they should be as it is their words that go out and make and shape the popularity of the publication.

The most important element of this is that this probably needs to be part of a two year operation going forward, so we can really start to sell the publication. We want to get Alex's team down there selling against budget and making money out of it.

Daniel said the Pelican editors are completely on board with this and they completely agree that there

are structural issues with the magazine. Hopefully this is just one of many ways to turn a massive operating deficit into a modest operating surplus.

Tom said there are thousands of back editions of Pelican that have been printed and not read by students, so this is an efficiency measure that needs to happen.

Tony said the model we are adopting is what is known as 'free magazine' publishing, which is where you have an online element as well as a few publications so we are not just cutting away the entire printed product. We still have some physical product actually out on the streets and in the high volume areas where it is very visible and that is critically important to the advertisers, and is quite a good economical model too.

Thomas B (proxy for Kenneth) asked in terms of generating revenue, is that just primarily from advertising?

Daniel said yes at the moment.

Thomas B asked in terms of deadlines is there much flexibility as in speaking to the editors and sub-editors, one of the pragmatic realities of having all stories given by students are given on a volunteer basis and this can be quite difficult so is there much back and forth about that element in discussing with the editors?

Daniel said they are completely on board with it. They realize that if they don't meet deadlines it is detrimental for Pelican. We set deadlines as soon as semester starts, in the lead up to big events, so they recognize that is probably when Pelican is going to be read most. Daniel said he is not 100% sure of what the pragmatic problems would be in setting those deadlines but that he has complete trust and confidence in the editors.

Tony said an editor's job is to hit the deadline. If they can't get enough content together from whatever source then it is their job to go and find other editorial pieces. There should be no excuse for missing a deadline.

Thomas B asked in terms of reaching the advertising goals to generate profit, what portion of the magazine would be advertising for that to happen?

Daniel said about 20%.

Tony said when you look at a pagination balance a lot of the publications that we have done in the past have been up to 60% advertising, and 40% editorial. He said he thinks we are taking a very generous opportunity to say it is about 20% advertising, 80% editorial. We don't want to lose the essence of the product at all but we do have to make it an economic reality. He said we shouldn't expect miracles this year but within the next few years we should be able to turn that product around.

Barnes said he thinks it is a great idea. He said Sue Boyd received a criminal record if she was legally named as the publisher when Pelican put nude photos on the front cover so having a staff member as the publisher does raise some interesting legal questions. He said he thinks it is worth governance having a look into just to check that it doesn't open up any potential problems. Another thing worth thinking about is that in the regulations there is now a somewhat out-dated section on our media policy and how that relates to Pelican members and staff members and it might be worth looking to correct and update those sections.

Max said that was an issue at the University of Sydney Student Representative Council earlier this year, where a number of editors were charged with breaching obscenity laws for publishing inappropriate

images on the front of the cover, so that is something Governance Committee should certainly look into.

Motion was put. **Motion 6.6 was passed unanimously.**

**6.7 That Council appoints Wade McCagh and Zoe Kilbourn as the Editors of Pelican Magazine 2014.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Tom said there was a thorough process, with three pairs of individuals who were interviewed twice, so they could provide more editorial content. Wade and Zoe were by far the best.

Aiden asked if the Guild HR Officer was involved in the process. Tom said yes.

Aiden said that as part of the existing contract, there was a clause to edit regulation 6.888, which is about the appointment of the Pelican Editor. There was a contractual arrangement between the Guild Executive and the Pelican Committee to edit that regulation to make that process an official one. Aiden asked whether this had been done.

Tom said they could make that happen through Governance Committee.

Motion was put. **Motion 6.7 was passed unanimously.**

**6.8 That Council re-affirms the UWA Student Guild Standing Orders for use during all formal meetings of the Guild.**

*Moved: Owen Myles; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland*

Sam said that since the last Guild meeting Lucas Tan (as the previous Chair of Council) advised that the standing orders must be reaffirmed each year. There are changes that still need to be made to the standing orders and this motion does not get rid of these – they simply reaffirm the standing orders as they are until the governance committee makes the changes.

Owen said this motion was submitted to Sam a day late so we need to move a procedural motion to waive notice based on the definition of urgent business in that this should be done at the first meeting of Guild Council. Procedural motion moved to waive notice requirements. Motion passed.

Motion was put. **Motion 6.8 was passed unanimously.**

**6.9 That Council should delegate to the Strategic Resources Committee the responsibility to commit up to \$25,000 to engage the Architect (and other required consultants) after considering recommendations from the External Project Manager, for the Concept and Feasibility phase.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Owen said this motion did come in late and was meant to be part of Motion 6.5, therefore procedural motion moved to waive notice requirements was moved. Motion passed.

The motion was put. **Motion 6.9 was passed.**

**For:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O’Shea, Honny Palayukan, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Kenneth Woo, Alex Bennet, Richie Wu, Jonathan Lo, Aiden Depiazzi, Joshua Bamford (proxy for Cam Fitzgerald), Samuel Shenton (proxy for Maddie Mulholland), Kaila Stevens (proxy for Rida Ahmed), Judith Carr (proxy for Merredith Cully).

**Abstaining:** Francois Schiefler, Millie Dacre, Cameron Payne (proxy for Rebecca Lawrence).

**Against:** None.

Tom Henderson moved a procedural motion to move to Item 6.10 whilst the Directors are still in attendance.



Motion passed. Normal procedure of meeting then resumed.

**6.10 That Council approves a 3.5% administrative payrise for employees covered by the EBA from the first full pay period after 1 January 2014.**

*Moved: Daniel Jo; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Daniel deferred his speaking right to Wayne. Wayne said the Enterprise Bargaining team got together quite quickly after they were formed and attempted to deal with this and get it done before the start of the new year. This year has been a relatively smooth process to get where we are on the Enterprise Bargaining team, with comparisons of the Guild's current university situation, other CPI and national wage. They basically get presented with data and then they consider our position strategically. The budget estimates have been put in the draft budget and basically provided in this case with some direction and a range to work within, and we have managed to be fair in the mid-point of that range, just slightly under budget.

The motion was put. **Motion 6.10 was passed.**

**For:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Kenneth Woo, Alex Bennet, Richie Wu, Jonathan Lo, Francois Schiefler, Millie Dacre, Joshua Bamford (proxy for Cam Fitzgerald), Samuel Shenton (proxy for Maddie Mulholland), Kaila Stevens (proxy for Rida Ahmed), Judith Carr (proxy for Merredith Cully), Cameron Payne (proxy for Rebecca Lawrence).

**Abstaining:** Aiden Depiazzi.

**Against:** None.

## **7.0 GENERAL BUSINESS**

### **7.1 Re-Election of the Tenancy Chair Position.**

Owen moved a procedural motion that we accept Wayne as the returning officer for the election. Motion passed.

Owen opened nominations from the floor for the position of Tenancy Chair. Alex Bennet nominated himself. There were no other nominations. **Wayne declared Alex elected.**

Owen said they had found an inconsistency with the Tenancy Agreement, which essentially meant that Maddie couldn't remain in the position while being Societies Council President.

### **7.2 Other Business**

Joshua (proxy for Cam Fitzgerald) said when he started this time last year, Statutes Committee noticed that in Section 23 of the Guild Regulations made under Statute 20 the Guild has a Statute book, which contains all of the Guild regulations, rules, by-laws, etc. He has spent a long time trying to find this but was not able to find a current statute book. The last version he was able to find was from 1958. He said there are bits and pieces scattered across the website and in digital archives that he managed to find.

He said they had this idea as a joint thing between Statutes Committee and Centenary Committee to reinstate the statute book, which the Centenary Committee has commissioned and the Statutes Committee compiled the pages of. On behalf of the 100<sup>th</sup> Guild Council Centenary and Statutes Committee he presented this book to the 101<sup>st</sup> Council.

He said according to Section 23, the Guild President has to sign every page of the Statute book so

Tom Henderson is to sign every page of the book.

Owen moved the chair to Joshua so he could speak as the chair of Governance Committee. He said recently he was reading through the regulations and noted that it states that all committee chairs have to provide minutes of meetings to Guild Council. This hasn't been done in practice but considering it is in the regulations it is required to be done otherwise the meetings are not official so please provide these to Council.

Barnes said that duty is now contingent on Executive Management Committee. He said in the review he did he identified that was a problem so the idea is that Executive Management Group now pro-actively remind and chase after committee chairs, review their minutes and then send minutes to Council. It is very important that chairs know they need to report to Executive Management and Executive Management knows that they need to be regularly receiving those reports, reviewing them, and then sending them onto Council. The Chair was moved back to Owen.

Millie asked about training for camp leaders. There is only enough in the budget to have one session, what happens if people can't attend those training days?

Tom said there is contingent in special projects for more training sessions. They prefer not to run anymore and think that if a society or club wants to run a camp they will avail themselves of the session. If they can't attend themselves they can send a representative instead. Ideally they would just like to have the single session.

Millie asked if members of this Council would be notified when the policy and EMP processes are approved.

Tom said the current camps and pub crawl policy is with John Stubbs. He is withholding it because there are timeframes involved with that policy, so if he holds onto it for a long enough time camps wouldn't be able to occur in the first three weeks of semester. We are trying to get that pushed forward as quickly as possible.

## **8.0 CLOSE / NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 29 January 2014 at 6.00pm. Please contact the Guild Secretary ([secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au](mailto:secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au)) with any apologies or proxies. All office bearers will be available at 5.30pm, prior to the meeting. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.