



### 1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Owen welcomed all Councillors, Directors and observers and proxies and acknowledged that UWA is situated on Nyoongar land and paid his respects to elders past and present, and acknowledged 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), Maddie Mulholland (SOC President), Bec Doyle (Women's Officer), Max Riley (Welfare Officer), Michael Morrissey (Guild Sports Representative), Owen Myles (Chair & OGC), Alex Bennet (OGC), Rida Ahmed (OGC), Merredith Cully (OGC), Jonathan Lo (OGC), Aiden Depiazzi (OGC), Millie Dacre (OGC), Rebecca Lawrence (OGC), Avory Allen (Queer Officer), David Raitel (PSA President).

#### 1.2 Apologies

Cam Fitzgerald (Vice-President), Kenneth Woo (ISS & OGC), Bryn Howells (Environment Officer), Richie Wu (OGC), Francois Schiefler (OGC), Cameron Barnes (IPP & Senate Representative), Laura Clappinson (Queer Officer).

#### 1.3 Proxies

Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu), Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler), Natalia Verne (for Daniel Jo), Michael Morrissey (for Rida Ahmed), Max Riley (for Merredith Cully).

#### 1.4 Observers

None.

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

### 2.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

### 3.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

## 4.0 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

### 4.1 Managing Director's Report

Regarding the Guild Consolidation Project, Wayne said the ground floor component is at practical completion and at lock-up stage. He said there are still quite a few finishing touches to be done, but we will be able to move in on time. Wayne said we continue towards the target of being \$100,000 under budget and the longer the project progresses, the more chance that we will achieve that.

He said he has filed together the Masterplan with a few other projects, but will talk about the Students Central Hub Project first. At the last meeting Council endorsed the Masterplan and at the same time endorsed the commencement of the project. The name has officially been changed to the "Guild Student Central Hub Project" to ensure that it is clearly a Guild project and not a university project. The proposal has been developed to engage the architect. This document has been drafted and is being reviewed and checked by UWA Facilities Management and we expect that to go out in the week beginning 3 February 2014. Some of the key things that will come at us and will come to the student representative team and the student body around about March/April, when we expect to get into some intensive consultation with all the stakeholders.

This is running ahead of schedule with the appointment of the architect. He said they have also drafted and will lodge the Business Case to the University Facility Development Committee. That is a very good opportunity not only to present this project, but it is a forum where the Guild gets a chance to get in front of all the University Executive including the Vice Chancellor. When we get that opportunity we will also have the opportunity to set this whole Masterplan and this project in the context of what we are trying to do as an organisation and from an overall strategic point of view.

There is a cover letter which Tom has endorsed that will go to that committee and he said he thinks it is important for Council to have a snapshot of what the very broad strategy is so the Masterplan itself is seen as just one of the tools that we are using for our future planning. It is a tool that we are using to create organisational change and refreshment. The Masterplan and building new facilities gives the opportunity to assess and change the business processes and to improve the culture of the organisation. It sits with our other strategic tools that we are using such as the Future Directions paper that was issued last year with the Catering Strategy and Organisational Review. If you look at the Service Level Agreement as well there are five things all grouped together which will all help us move forward. He said the Masterplan itself is going to help drive that change.

Wayne said the Centenary Project had been wrapped up. One thing coming out of this is the prospect to use some of the remaining capital to develop Guild Alumni. Discussions are already underway with the university regarding this.

Regarding Human Resources, he said there have been quite a few staff moves recently. Some of those are planned and some are unexpected, and they are all for different reasons. He said that staff changes, whether planned or unexpected, are positive opportunities to move on, grow and develop.

Wayne said that Strategic Resources Committee (SRC) considered Subway and Boost earlier in the month and we have had a favourable response from Subway about the extra information we have provided to them and about the revised co-located outlet configuration with Boost. They have now come back and said they are ready to recommence commercial negotiations. SRC are now considering the negotiating strategy and once that is finalised we will commence. Boost is happy with the co-located outlet configuration and is ready to start negotiations, which will commence once we are underway with Subway.

Regarding Hackett Café, Wayne said we are now just waiting on the architect's fee proposal for a step-by-step approach to developing refurbishment options at Hackett Cafe.

## **4.2 Finance Report**

Wayne said there is a glitch with the Guild's bank records. At this meeting he would usually present the unaudited 2013 accounts, which he is unable to do as they are sorting this out. It appears to be associated with the extended sick leave of a staff member. Wayne said they are progressively rectifying it, but there will be some additional costs in order to cover that extended sick leave.

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

Ken said the month of December finished as expected; sales were good, but there were continued problems with cost of goods. Ken said overall they achieved a profit of about \$85,000 to \$95,000. He said important factors included the cost of goods, the bank charges, the unexpected costs of the EFTPOS facilities provided, which was about \$16,000, and the utility fees from the university, which went over budget by about \$40,000.

He said summing up 2013; Guild Catering contributed about \$400,000 in cash and \$550,000 in discounts to students.

Ken said 2014 has started well and that the Guild held a large function in the Ref, which will provide a good kick-start for the month.

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

Tony said that most of the team in Student Services are working at very high capacity levels at the moment, as they are very busy with orientation and enrolments, etc. so there is a lot of activity happening. He asked for patience as the team is very stretched in some areas and there has been some turnover in staff as well. He said they are putting in a lot of foundations at the moment for going forward which is very exciting.

He said they had a very positive meeting with Student Services with Tom, himself, Alex and Chloe regarding orientation and that John Stubbs was very impressed with the presentation that they have put together outlining exactly what they are providing for new students coming in.

He said the new website is progressing quite well. The events management policy and the training schedules that started today have been very well attended. This is all part of the new compliance measures with the university to ensure that they feel we are training our people more extensively.

In terms of where we are in the new Student Assist area, they are under a recruitment process at the moment. They have concluded the round interviews for student officer and will be making appointments later this week.

Owen moved a procedural motion to move to Items 7.2 and 7.3. Motion passed. Normal procedure of meeting then resumed.

## **5.0 REPORTS**

### **5.1 Guild President**

Report as tabled. Tom said the new Guild branding has been used for coffee and food. He said the PROSH directors have been working hard to organize PROSH in such a way that everyone is happy and there are a lot of recommendations that have been put forward. He said they are busy organizing training for people who will be involved in PROSH. He said enrolments began today, so it is a very busy time for staff, particularly the Student Services team.

He said we have now signed a Joint Venture Agreement with the University and Volunteering WA, which means we can expand our volunteering program and the number of employers we have. This means that Aden Date will be working more closely with the University on their Service Learning agenda.

He said the results of the Quality Education Survey, which is a broad-reaching survey of all graduates over a year, has been released and UWA has scored very poorly across the board in terms of quality of teaching to provision of services, etc. He said the university is very keen to take a stance on this and is very keen to try to improve the way in which graduates value their time at UWA. They have a lot of issues in the way the survey is run and how accurate a view the survey has, but Tom and Lizzy are very keen to take this on and use it to our advantage. He said they hope to improve the perception and actual quality of the teaching and education experience at UWA.

### **5.2 Vice President**

Report as tabled.

### **5.3 Secretary**

Report as tabled.

### **5.4 Treasurer**

Report as tabled.

### **5.5 Education Council President**

Report as tabled. Lizzy said that she and Tom met with Alec Cameron and John Stubbs and that she is keen to align our targets for the year. Alec's target is to improve the perception and teaching quality at UWA, because we ranked last in a number of surveys. Lizzy said she will be using the SLETS results to show him what students want and then make sure that when they do put the changes through they are pro-student and reflect what students want. She said most of her time is going into setting up training at colleges for Resident Advisors in education advocacy.

### **5.6 Public Affairs Council President**

Report as tabled. Honny said that they have locked in some dates for major events this year. She said she would email anyone who wants to be involved.

### **5.7 Societies Council President**

Report as tabled.

## **5.8 Women's Department**

Report as tabled.

## **5.9 Welfare Department**

Report as tabled.

## **5.10 Environment Department**

Report as tabled.

## **5.11 International Student Services**

Report as tabled.

## **5.12 Queer Department**

Report as tabled.

## **5.13 Guild Sports Representative**

No report submitted.

## **5.14 Postgraduate Students' Association**

No report submitted. David said the PSA are working in a number of ways to bring in more revenue through events and sales.

## **5.15 Residential Students' Department**

No report submitted.

## **5.16 Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Students**

No report submitted.

## **5.17 UWA Sports Council**

No report submitted.

## **6.0 QUESTION TIME**

Millie said the previous there was a motion passed that Guild President each month provide a Wi-Fi update. Tom said he hasn't had a meeting with Information Services as yet, but he has one lined up for next week in which he would be discussing Wi-Fi and also the prospects of getting a Guild page put on LMS.

Rebecca asked about the Women's Department report. She said the report mentioned a statement being put out condemning the men's studies course at the University of South Australia. She asked why it is an appropriate action to take on behalf of the Guild Department, because in the statement it said "we express distaste on decisions made by a group of professionals on another side of the country" where a UWA Student Guild is a body that represents UWA, the Women's Department represents the women on campus. Rebecca said the statement was essentially an opinion piece questioning the suitability of lecturer choices at another institution, and asked why this was appropriate on behalf of a Guild department?

Bec said that the statement was circulated to all Guild councillors beforehand out of courtesy and that she had four replies. She said two replies were amendments; one slight change by Sam Shipley regarding the link included and another by Aiden, which specified that the statement should state "UWA Student Guild Women's Department". Bec said she made those amendments to the statement, and based on the feedback felt it was okay to proceed. She said circulating the statement to Council was not necessarily a step that needed to be taken, but was taken more as a courtesy matter. She said she represents the Women's Department, which is an autonomous department and she was elected to represent those people. That statement was also put together in conjunction with the Women's Department group, which is a Facebook page at the moment.

Bec said the reason she found it important to take a stance on the matter is because some of the proposed lecturers are not actually academics, but have come out previously through men's rights websites overseas and have used inappropriate language about women and about the feminist movement. If the initial course was about men's health and assessing men's health in the wider society that is now the amended course she didn't think there would be as many problems and the course has now since been downgraded. She said the statement also makes a point to look at the importance of Gender Studies and as far as she is concerned Gender Studies is studied at UWA therefore it is relevant to us. Our gender studies major also has a specific unit called Men and Masculinity which looks at men's studies so therefore she thinks it is important to UWA students.

Aiden asked about the transcripts of the previous minutes. He asked when the September and October minutes would be listed on the Guild website.

Maddie said they have been submitted and should be uploaded by a staff member. She said she would chase it up.

Aiden asked Tom what was the reason behind the delay in the SLETS results?

Tom said there were two delays: one was that he didn't get them out and the second was that they lost the password and had some access issues.

Lizzy said she would like to go through and process the results.

Aiden asked what was the reason behind buying the new furniture in certain student offices?

Maddie said Guild councillors have a tendency to buy their own furniture and that many of the elected Office Bearers had elected to buy their own furniture.

Honny said she bought all her furniture herself and she prefers to have that set up because of consultation with other club reps. She said it is a bit closed off if she has her back to them sitting at a computer so it's more of a preference for her to face them with a computer in front of them.

Tom said that Alex Pond, in consultation with the architects and the Project Manager Jono, has been buying furniture for the appropriate for the new Student Area.

Lizzy said regarding the sourcing of the furniture, the university had contributed money and have preferred suppliers, which limits what the Guild may buy with the money they contributed.

Millie asked whether there any plans for the Women's Department budget to go towards the NOWSA Conference?

Bec said that will be a decision that will be made by the Women's Collective. She said that the Women's Department's budget comes from SSAF and that she cannot give money towards a conference that will benefit students from other universities, as well as UWA students. She said she would probably set aside an amount in the budget and then UWA Women students that would like to attend the conference can then apply for sponsorship in that manner. She said this would ensure that that money is spent on UWA students and not students from another university.



## 7.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

- 7.1** That Council accepts the amended UWA Student Guild Standing Orders, as attached, to replace the current Standing Orders for use at all official meetings of the Guild.

*Moved: Owen Myles; Seconded: Rebecca Doyle.*

Owen moved the chair to Honny.

Owen said that most of what is in there are very minor updates including updates that were approved by Council without specific wording and also one update that was included with a very specific wording. He said where it didn't have wording; they tried to create the closest thing to the proposal by Council. The only other real changes are numerical changes to where it refers to Guild Regulations and the change to university working days as opposed to just working days, so that we are in line with the university. He said it passed through Governance Committee.

Bec reinforced what Owen had said and stated that these are positive changes to the regulations.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.1 passed unanimously.**

The chair was moved back to Owen.

- 7.2** That Council approves the 2014 Student Services and Amenities Fee Service Level Agreement, as attached.

*Moved: Tom Henderson; Sam Shipley.*

Tom said this is to formalise our agreement with the university for our SSAF funding. This should usually be done in October of the previous year, however due to issues with Student Services and ongoing negotiation that wasn't the case. He said the first section outlines our requirements or our provisional services and then there is some KPI's that we are expected to make over the course of the year.

Aiden asked about the three schedules referred to in the document.

Tom said the full document was 24 pages, although some people only received 11 pages.

Owen moved a procedural motion that Motion 7.2 be deferred to circular. Motion passed.

- 7.3** That Council approves the 2014 Guild Events Management Policy (including camps and multiple-location events), as attached, for inclusion in the Guild Statute Book.

*Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Owen Myles.*

Maddie said that the line referring to BAC should say, "ensure a zero alcohol content".

Tom said Chloe has been working on this over the summer in conjunction with Student Services and John Stubbs in particular. It has now come down to a fairly well rounded policy, so both parties get what they want where risk management, etc. is minimised but keeping as much freedom as possible to clubs and societies within reason.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.3 passed unanimously.**

- 7.4** That Council approves the Education Council Rules, as attached.

*Moved: Lizzy O'Shea; Seconded: Alex Bennet.*

Tom moved a procedural motion that Motions 7.4 and 7.5 be considered en bloc. Motion passed.

- 7.5** That Council approves the Welfare Department Rules, as attached.  
*Moved: Max Riley; Seconded: Cameron Fitzgerald.*

Lizzy said she circulated a detailed explaining document for the Education Council Rules. She said they have passed with Ed Council unanimously and they have passed through Governance with a small amendment to one of the changes. The main changes are RSD and PSA Vice-Presidents will be standing invitees, for reasons outlined in the document. EAN can be Chaired by a nominee of the Education Council Vice-President, but the nominee has to be accepted by Ed Council, which means the Vice-President can't just pick anyone.

Max said the Welfare Rules has been passed through Welfare & Advocacy Committee and Governance Committee and there weren't any major amendments throughout those. He said he would like to thank the members of Governance and Welfare & Advocacy in particular for being recalled at the start of the year whilst we were all on holidays to see these through. He said he is happy that the rules were approved so quickly.

The motions were put. **Motions 7.4 and 7.5 passed unanimously en bloc.**

- 7.6** That Council must be notified by circular when the Executive Committee takes a stance on a student issue that is not already expressed in the Guild Policy Book.  
*Moved: Sam Shipley; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Sam said that the intention of the motion was to improve transparency and to ensure that all of Council are aware about important decisions made by the Executive.

Tom said the Executive may make decisions that may then be ratified by Council and that this will ensure that everyone knows what is going on.

Aiden moved an amendment to the motion to read "...and the motion require Council's approval before the statement is released and that the stance require Council's approval before a stance is released".

Owen ruled under Standing Order 48 that that Aiden's amendment rendered the motion substantially different. The amendment was withdrawn.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.6 passed.**

**For:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Maddie Mulholland, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Alex Bennet, Rida Ahmed, Merredith Cully, Jonathan Lo, Rebecca Lawrence, Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu).

**Against:** None.

**Abstaining:** Aiden Depiazzi, Millie Dacre, Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler).

- 7.7** That the UWA Student Guild does not support the \$5 fee for visits to bulk-billing doctors that is currently under consideration by the government.  
*Moved: Lizzy O'Shea; Seconded: Tom Henderson.*

Lizzy said it is not confirmed and is not a decision made, but it is under consideration that the government will introduce a \$5 upfront fee to visit Medicare doctors, which will mean every time you go in for a consult you will have to pay \$5. She said this disproportionately affects students, as they are often lower income earners, or they will often need to visit health carers for various reasons. For a lot of students who are already living underneath the poverty line, a \$5 fee every time they need to see a doctor is the difference between going to the doctor and getting antibiotics, or having lunch, or paying the rego on their car. She said she thinks it is an important stance for the Guild to take and the reason it has come to Council is because we need to ratify the decision made by the Executive in the interim between council meetings.



Tom said the actual amount may be \$6 and amended the motion to read “any fee” instead of “the \$5 fee”. He said this will affect a number of students and it would be a shame to see this come in especially for those who use medical services frequently.

Aiden moved an amendment to the motion that the motion reads with a full stop after “doctors” and the rest is deleted so the motion will now read “That the UWA Student Guild does not support any fee for visits to bulk-billing doctors.”

The movers accepted the amendment. Lizzy clarified that this is not just condemning private doctors.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.7 passed as amended:**

“That the UWA Student Guild does not support any fee for visits to bulk-billing doctors.”

**For:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O’Shea, Honny Palayukan, Maddie Mulholland, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Alex Bennet, Rida Ahmed, Merredith Cully, Jonathan Lo, Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu), Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler).

**Against:** None.

**Abstaining:** Aiden Depiazzi, Millie Dacre, Rebecca Lawrence.

- 7.8** That the endorsement or support of any campaign, petition, program, or cause by the UWA Student Guild must receive the approval of Council, before commencing, and before any Guild funds are contributed towards the cause in question.

*Moved: Aiden Depiazzi; Seconded: Millie Dacre*

Aiden said he feels this is a responsible process for us to take up in the future. He said the Guild needs to be very careful about putting our logo up or our name to things that could potentially reflect poorly on us.

He said the context of this is the Medicare Rally that was endorsed by the Guild. He said he was concerned at the manner in which the rally was executed. He said that had we all been asked our opinion on whether or not we would like to send the Guild to support such a thing before it happened then there would have been some difference in opinion as to concern about whether the Guild wants to lend its name to something of that nature.

Lizzy asked if this motion was nullified by Motion 7.6, in regard to the Executive making decisions and then notifying Council by circular?

Aiden said that the wording in Motion 7.6 does not establish that there is a principle by which Executive can simply by-pass decision-making responsibilities which are allocated to Council.

Millie said in reply to Lizzy, she did not think the Medicare rally was a "student issue" and that the Guild should not take a stance.

Lizzy said her question was simply whether the two motions could be passed at the same meeting.

Owen said that these two motions could be passed at the same meeting.

Avory said that the Queer Department runs as independently from the Guild as possible. He said their officers do not come from people who are interested in Guild politics; their officers come from people who have become involved in the department. They are passionate about protecting the students. The Guild Council as it currently stands doesn’t require a single person to be queer-identifying; it is largely a heterosexual and cis-gendered place and is not a place where queer issues are going to be understood easily. He said you cannot pass this motion and not expect queer students to suffer. He said it takes power away from people elected to run autonomous departments and puts it in the hands of people who are elected by a straight and cis-gender population.

Bec said she echoed what Avory had said. She said the difference between the Queer Department and the Women’s Department, is that the Women’s Officer is a position elected by people who are interested in Guild politics. She said that this motion would take away all department autonomy, which

is why these departments were created, because there are certain students on UWA campus who are not represented as equitably as they could be, which is why the Women's Department exists. She said the Guild should also be conscious that if something came up in the media that affected women students and that required rapid response by the Guild, that the current Executive is all-male, which is why the Guild needs autonomous departments.

Alex said that anyone on Council who has been in an executive position would understand the need for, and has used in the past the mobility of an executive. He said he agrees that the motion would be to the detriment of some departments, for example EAN, which would then have to come to Council for any expenditure to be approved. He said in some situations the Guild must act faster than that. He also said that there might be issues with the regulations relating to the motion.

Rebecca said it is important to have this check and balance so that Council can look at things that could be damaging to the Guild brand or to the Guild as an organization. She said regarding the Executive being all male and representing one kind of thing, this is a much more diverse board and so in decisions where it is not an autonomous department speaking but it is the entire brand of the Guild, it is important that it comes through this Council that has a much larger diversity of ideas.

Owen handed the Chair to Sam.

Owen addressed what Alex brought up regarding the regulations. He said that Regulation 3.10(1) states "where such a matter cannot be reasonably deferred until the next meeting of such a body or committee, referring to Guild Council, the Guild Executive may determine the matter".

He said this regulation in his view would nullify this motion at least in terms of the Executive because as the regulations require, they are the highest authority over us, other than Statute 20 and the University of Western Australia Act. We can't make rules or policies in this room that can go against the Guild Regulations and therefore he doesn't feel this is practical in terms of 3.10 of the Regulations.

The chair was handed back to Owen.

Sam said that if this motion were passed, we would have to allow a minimum of three university working days for the matter to be approved via circular. He said if one single person said "no" or disagreed, it would then have to then be delayed until the next Guild Council meeting. He said that hopefully it would not happen, but in the instance that it did, it could cause significant delay and prevent the Guild from responding to issues in a timely manner. Sam said that the Guild Regulations outline that the Guild supports the rights of women and LBGTI students. He said that it is particularly important that the Guild may be able to take stances on matters that affect unrepresented students, irrespective of politics. He said if the motion passed, departments would lose autonomy and the Guild would not always be able to respond quickly to issues affecting students.

Tom said that from time-to-time there are instances where the Guild President and the Executive need to make a decision very quickly. He said that an example would be if something were to go wrong with PROSH, he would like to be able to respond to any issue with the advice from the Executive and Directors. He said that waiting for three days for approval via circular or 30 days for a Guild Council meeting would not be suitable for an urgent matter. He said there is a level of trust and students and Council have placed responsibility on the Executive to organize and run the Guild. He said he thinks that it is important that we have the ability to do so in a timely manner.

Honny said with any other professional company, media statements would be made within a day and not three days later. She said it is important that the Guild and especially the Executive have the mobility to act and that we shouldn't have to wait three days to circular a motion for any kind of media statements to be released, as they are time critical. She said we shouldn't be held down by a three-day response in an emergency situation, or worse, having to wait until the next Guild Council meeting. She said it could be quite detrimental to the way that the Guild releases statements to the media and the press, if they are on our back for certain issues.

Owen moved a procedural motion to close the speaking list. Motion passed.

Aiden said that the Guild has been reckless in its endorsement of programs, which contain a high level of risk. He said he couldn't imagine KPMG endorsing something that they wouldn't have any risk protocols attached to, or that they were concerned would erupt and do something dangerous. He said this is not about preventing the Guild from responding, but this is about preventing the Guild logo or the Guild name from popping up on the news if something went very wrong.

Aiden said he could understand the reading of the Regulations in that respect but he doesn't think that it would nullify the motion, particularly as it refers specifically to the Executive. He moved an amendment to the motion to read:

"That the endorsement or support of any campaign, petition, program, or cause originating from an external source to the Guild by the UWA Student Guild must receive the approval of Council, before commencing, and before any Guild funds are contributed towards the cause in question."

Aiden said that the amended motion would not affect any program that had originally originated from the Guild such as PROSH or such as a campaign run by an autonomous department.

Millie said in the case of something like PROSH, Council would already approve it.

Tom said this would not apply if something were to go wrong.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.8 failed.**

**For:** Aiden Depiazzi, Millie Dacre, Rebecca Lawrence, Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler).

**Against:** Tom Henderson, Sam Shipley, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Rida Ahmed, Merredith Cully, Jonathan Lo, Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu).

**Abstaining:** Daniel Jo, Maddie Mulholland, Alex Bennet.

- 7.9** That the UWA Student Guild shall not provide endorsement or support to any campaign, petition, program or cause that benefits, explicitly or otherwise, a political party at the local, state or federal level.

*Moved: Aiden Depiazzi; Seconded: Millie Dacre*

Aiden said that as Sam said previously, it shouldn't matter which political parties are doing, the Guild should just stay out of it, because we have responsibilities about where our money can go. He said he looked through all the photos from the Medicare rally and counted all the times he saw the word "Medicare" and he noted this as being significantly less than how many times he saw the slogan "Save Labor's Legacy". He said as much as you can probably argue that it was about Medicare, between the "F\*\*\* Tony Abbott" and the "Save Labor's Legacy" slogans, it is pretty clear what the purpose of the rally was. This was to contribute support and for electoral purposes and we should be very careful about doing something like that. This motion will make sure that is the case.

Tom asked what is meant by "explicitly or otherwise"?

Aiden said that "explicitly" means that the UWA Student Guild will not share a status from its page which says something like "please vote for a political party" and "implicitly" means that UWA will not put its name to a rally where political party signs are being waved around, because it would put the Guild's name to something which is contributing to a political party's electoral success.

Sam asked if someone turns up to a Guild-run event like PROSH and holds up a political sign, does that mean the Guild can't support PROSH?

Aiden said this motion would prevent the UWA Student Guild from endorsing something that is supporting a political party. If someone from a political party comes along to something run by the Guild it is a different thing.

Alex said last year there were a number of rallies on campus against the cuts to higher education and he asked how that would factor into this motion and whether the Guild would be unable to support action

against those cuts?

Aiden said there is a difference between supporting an abstract and supporting the people who support that abstract. He said the Guild should deliver a perspective on an issue without contributing to one of the sides of the politics.

Max asked is there any reason that the motion says the word “benefit” and not “support”.

Aiden said there are cases where an organization has supported a political party that results in it not benefiting. Supporting something can mean going either way and benefiting something can mean it actually gains success or gets closer to success.

Thomas Beyer (proxy for Kenneth Woo) said his understanding of the motion is that it is okay for the Guild to support a cause that a political party doesn’t support, but the Guild cannot support a cause that a political party already supports. He asked what would happen if the Guild supports a social movement with no political affiliations, which is then supported by a political party; would the Guild then have to withdraw support?

Aiden said no and it is about where a concept originates. If the Guild comes up with a great policy for students and then a political party takes it on board, then we would not remove our support. This is about the Guild providing endorsement or support to something that benefits a political party.

Alex Hamilton (proxy for Richie Wu) said regarding the words “explicitly or otherwise”, if the Guild was discontent with a matter that affects students, for example the upfront Medicare costs, by not going to any rallies wouldn’t the Guild still be implicitly benefitting other political parties who do not support this?

Aiden said it is a matter of how you go about it and how it is worded.

Lizzy asked if something like the Medicare rally was organized by a regular student, as opposed to a political party, would that be fine?

Aiden said it would again depend on the time at which the Guild supported the cause and whether or not at the time a political party were already in support.

Lizzy said you would be hard-pressed to find any rally run in this state that is not backed by every other political party that does not support the cause.

David asked whether the Guild can predict what signs people bring to rallies? He said the issues may in some instances not be due to who organised the rally, but the signs that individuals brought along. He asked whether the Guild should be held responsible for what other independent parties attending a rally do, or the signs they bring?

Aiden said this was an unforeseeable risk. He said in the case of the Medicare rally, it had already been endorsed by the ALP and the Greens, and that the risks were foreseeable. He said the Guild should assess who is behind rallies and what the purpose is. He said it speaks to the idea of whether or not you think it is sufficient to simply speak out on an issue or actually endorse something done by somebody else. He said a statement released by the Guild saying “we oppose the Medicare fee” would be very different to the Guild endorsing a rally that explicitly or otherwise benefits political parties.

Tom said there is a difference between endorsement and support. The support of a campaign, being anything from same-sex marriage to Medicare fees, is going to benefit a particular political party because it is in its nature political. He said that certain political parties have made decisions that affect students, on both sides of the fence. He said this there is a policy about how we endorse certain events and that is something that could be taken to Governance Committee, along with a media policy.

Lizzy said it would be great if politicians did not make any detrimental changes to things that affect students, such as cuts to education funding, and the introduction of Medicare fees. She says these issues affecting students are a reality and that the Guild should be able speak out against these changes. She said that for example, by saying she supported equal marriage, she would inadvertently benefits the Greens or the Labor Party, as it is a stance that political parties may take.

Avory said according to Guild Regulations 4.12.1(b), the role of the Queer Officers is to work towards



achieving social, economic and educational equality for gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex students on campus, so supporting queer students means you are already supporting some political organisations, because they support the same things we do. He said we cannot achieve anything if this motion is passed and he asked what is so bad about standing with political organisations if they support ideas that benefit students? He asked if we can't stand with people that support us, then in what way do students have any power politically?

Max said the motion prohibits the Guild supporting any motion or rally in which there would be a conceivable benefit to a political party. He said when the Guild makes a decision to endorse a rally; he thinks the only consideration should be whether or not it will help students out. He said if the Guild was to take a stance that was in direct opposition to a political party's policy then it may harm that political party. He said in a situation where a political party is implementing policy, which is hurting students, should we prioritise the needs of that political party over the needs of students? He said he was not elected to this organisation to serve the needs of any political party, he was elected to serve the interests of students and he finds it a gross violation of our duties if the Guild were to prioritise the needs of political parties over the needs of students. He said it is not a relevant consideration here.

Rebecca said she thinks it is important that we maintain our entity as an independent board of directors and that we maintain our credibility as a representative body of the students of UWA. She said we are not here just as a group of political hacks, but we should be looking at the risks that are associated with the brand that we represent. She said if we want to be taken seriously by shareholders, we need to be considering the brand that we are building and if it is a brand that is consistently supporting different political causes then that might not be in line with other things that we need to be considering.

Thomas B moved an amendment on behalf Kenneth to delete the words "or otherwise" from the motion. He said the current wording is ambiguous, but there is a serious possibility that the Guild would be unable to take up any issue that may be inherently.

Aiden said that he would not amend the motion.

Aiden said he respects that concerns have been raised about what "or otherwise" can mean in this case but what he is wary of is another event like the Medicare rally where the lines are blurred and nothing is clear about who is supporting who. He said the amendment is not amenable to him and he does not actually see it as being acceptable within the limits of the motion, because this is about us supporting a cause that benefits political parties at an electoral level, whether or not we do it in an implicit way.

Bec said as a point of clarification for Council, she attended the rally and was there in her capacity as someone who is free to attend rallies. She said it is important to note that around the country many student associations are made up of two components: a union component that takes care of things like catering, and a Student Representative Council (SRC), which take care of political stances and involve things like autonomous departments, and would be responsible for the Medicare rallies. She said that the Guild is a model that combines both a union and an SRC. She said it baffles her that we cannot endorse something, as it is part of our implicit structure, as the Guild is a body that represents students.

Owen moved a procedural motion to close the speaking list. Motion passed.

Aiden said he emailed Tom about this matter to invite further debate, but he didn't get a response. He said regarding Bec's point we are both a body corporate with a multi-million dollar budget and also a student representative council, which has the responsibility of representing the students who elected them. He asked whether representing students is more important the Guild services such as catering? He said he doesn't mind when we preserve the latter by escaping risks that is induced by the former. He said he doesn't personally believe that this motion restricts us from doing anything we want to do other than to restrict going to a political rally, rather than simply release something from a website. He said the Medicare fee is under consideration by the Commission of Audit not the Government. In response to Max's comment about whether or not we want to support something that is supported by a political party, he said in this case the thing that we're opposing is not really happening at all and doesn't belong to any political party in question, and what we are actually doing is just feeding into political



propaganda by supporting the parties on the other side. He said it is risky and it doesn't make any sense. He said the Guild has a responsibility to provide services as a body corporate as well, so we should think about preserving our ability to do that, which may from time-to-time require a restriction on our other responsibilities.

Honny said she agreed with Aiden in that our number one priority is to support students' benefits and we need to draw a line as to what our kind of responses are. She said people should be behaving in a well-fashioned way, especially if you are sitting in the Board of Directors of the Student Council. She said she disagreed however with how he is trying to address this because she feels that if she wanted to stand and protest against something, that it is her civil duty to be able to voice her personal opinions. She said as a student body we shouldn't be saying that we don't have the right to do that on behalf of students, even though the cause that we are arguing might be of benefit to students, such as in the past when we had student cuts to tertiary level teaching. She said this might have been against her political views but she felt if she was to support the students' rights, she would stand in protest against whatever political party was putting out that kind of policy because at the end of the day we are here to protect the students' rights. She said that to stop people from participating in any kind of political activity outside of the university is restrictive to people and how autonomous they are in deciding what policies they uphold for the university and for the students that they represent. They should have the right to be able to stand up and say they agree or disagree with these kinds of things. She disagrees with what Rebecca said regarding being more consistently aligned to political activity, because any political party that could come up with a policy that could be completely detrimental to the university experience. She said we must make sure that the students' rights are upheld and that the Guild is standing for what they need.

Tom said it was a little extreme to say that commenting on something could result in the collapse of the Guild. He said the issue he has with this is that we are saying it is okay to release a statement on a website, but that doing so would inherently supporting a political party, explicitly or otherwise. He said the motion is vague and if the motion is passed, then every time he made a comment he would have to consider whether it may implicitly benefit a political party. He said essentially he would be censored and would have little ability to talk about anything at all political, be it Medicare or otherwise.

Millie said there is a difference between explicitly or otherwise supporting a statement or a cause supported by a political party rather than autonomously and independently stating your stance upon a matter.

Tom asked is taking a point of view against a political party not in detriment to them? He said it is indirect and that is why the "otherwise" is causing so much confusion, because where do you draw the line about what is explicitly or in-explicitly benefitting a political party?

Aiden said if it means that people who release statements on behalf of the Guild have to spend some time learning how to present a particular stance in a way that is perceived to be independent, then they should do that. He said part of the issue as well comes from the fact that what has happened in the past is not the Guild responding to a policy of a political party, it is the Guild responding to the media about what could be a policy of a party in the future and thereby explicitly benefitting the parties that stand in opposition to it. He said the wording of the motion would require us to do everything the right way every time whether it is a response to a policy or a response to some talk about a policy.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.9 failed.**

**For:** Aiden Depiazzi, Millie Dacre, Rebecca Lawrence, Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler).

**Against:** Tom Henderson, Daniel Jo, Lizzy O'Shea, Honny Palayukan, Maddie Mulholland, Bec Doyle, Alex Bennet, Merredith Cully, Jonathan Lo, Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu).

**Abstaining:** Sam Shipley, Owen Myles, Rida Ahmed, Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo).

- 7.10** (a) That a referendum of all students shall be held in the 2014 calendar year to determine whether or not the UWA Student Guild continues to pay:
- (i) an affiliation fee to the National Union of Students and/or
  - (ii) any financial support towards delegates attending any NUS conferences or meetings; and
- (b) That Council directs the Governance Committee in consultation with the Western Australian Electoral Commission to develop the referendum question in a fair and balanced fashion, in accordance with s.642 and s.643 of the Guild Election Regulations.

*Moved: Aiden Depiazzi; Seconded: Rebecca Lawrence.*

Aiden said there are two parts of this motion. The first calls on us to hold a referendum, the second directs the Governance Committee and WAEC to write the referendum question. He said regarding (b), there are two ways in which a referendum can be called at UWA. He said the Guild Council can call it or it can be called by a requisition of 500 Guild members. If it is called by a requisition of Guild members it has to have the question explicitly stated at the requisition and then we consider it and say whether the question is okay. He said regulations are very vague about what actually happens when Guild Council calls a referendum. There is no requirement how the question be written and no requirement about how detailed and this is probably something Governance should look at when we rewrite the regs. He said what is very certain in the regs is that the referendum must be held at the same time as the Guild election in 2014. All it would require is giving an extra ballot paper in the same way that it would in a year where the ISS directorship was contested. He said would not require a second election. He said he feels that this has been a point of contention between the two blocks of students that go to the Guild election and seek to represent the students of Guild Council, whether or not we agree that it is necessary or not to pay a fee to NUS and to continue paying towards NUS delegates attending NUS conference. He said a motion similar to this was moved last year and was voted down. Then at the budget meeting when he moved to defund NUS on behalf of UWA it was said that it was not the responsibility of NUS Representatives to make that decision about whether or not we should pay NUS. He said he thinks this will one way or another put a line under this issue at UWA for some time. He stressed this is not about NUS whether we like them or not, it is about giving students the opportunity to have their say.

Sam asked how much this would cost?

Aiden said he did not know but it is essentially just printing another ballot paper.

Max said Guild Regulations specify two different types of referendum. The first part of that is a Guild member only referendum where basically the proof of being able to vote is your Guild sticker. The other is a referendum of all UWA students, Guild members or otherwise. Which group of students would this referendum be?

Aiden said all UWA students.

Alex asked if you have an all student referendum would that not require a separate roll, which would require an investment to run the referendum?

Aiden said there is always an all-student roll.

Alex asked do we feel that even if there was a fair question put to it that it is still going to be fairly well biased on whom you talk to? He asked Aiden if he thought this would still be a fair process?

Aiden said yes and the reason is because all the regs are the same as for the Guild election, so if Guild elections are fair then the referendum will be fair as well. He said in terms of the people who will be campaigning on each side of the referendum, the provision is that certain students will register their opinion and there are also provisions for delegation from Guild Council to be the "yes" case and the "no" case and that is how they assign who gets to spend what on materials. He said his understanding is that if students raise the referendum, then those 500 students become the "yes" case and then there is provision for people who want to vote "no" to then register with the returning officer. In this case there is provision for members of Guild Council to be the yes or no case representatives if they choose. If there are none then the students will.

Alex asked if 500 signatures were to come to Council and there would be a "yes" case and a "no" case, depending on how the question was structured, does that not indicate that there would be a bias in the question?

Aiden said yes, if it is done by a requisition of students. The question would then go to Guild Council for approval.

Alex asked could Council then refer it to Governance or another body like the WAEC to ensure that it is a fair question?

Aiden said s642 says a referendum may be called by (a) the Guild Council, (b) 500 Guild members carrying signatures, and then there is a whole list of requirements as to what happens if the students do it. He said he thinks there are no restrictions linked to what happens if we just decide we want a referendum.

Alex said he was wondering if 500 people sign something that then comes to this Council as a question for referendum, if we can then refer that to Governance and the WAEC to determine whether it is fair or not, given that it is probably going to be made by 500 people who share the same opinion.

Aiden said his understanding is that because Council has the freedom to determine the question and also Council must approve the question, what he envisages happening is that Governance will come up with a proposal, contact the WAEC and then ask them if we can restructure if necessary.

Alex asked if this motion didn't go through and it was then brought to us by the signatures method, can it then be referred to the WAEC, because it needs to be approved by this Council?

Owen said his understanding of the regulations is that Guild Council would have to put the exact wording in that requisition to a vote.

Tom asked is it entirely necessary, given that traditionally the Guild tickets run on a policy platform of pro-NUS or anti-NUS? He asked whether the extra administrative burden of working out all these things to do with the WAEC, given that a lot of students are already making this decision based on each ticket's policy?

Aiden said he disagreed that students voted for tickets based on a commitment to keep funding NUS.

Max said he would like to point out that this is a private position. We have all gone to elections promising to implement funding or defunding from the NUS and he thinks it has been very clear what we ran on over the past year. He said the word "referendum" was not mentioned at the Guild election previously, so to a certain extent we are all coming up and using our best judgment to come up with a new position on this. He said his personal perspective is that he acknowledges in the late 1980's students voted overwhelmingly to affiliate to the NUS and whilst he respects that referendum result, he does believe that 25 years is a very long time and the conditions may be appropriate to review the mandate. He said whilst in principle he supports a referendum; he doesn't support this referendum. He said as Aiden said, the reason why we can't necessarily judge that an issue has been resolved at Guild elections of NUS funding, as we do for all other funding throughout the Guild, is because the NUS is part of a lot of issues which Guild tickets run on. No person just votes for NUS affiliation, as no person is a single-issue voter. He said it is incorrect to say that students vote for one issue. He said the concern he has is that any Guild referendum held during the election period would probably reflect more the results of the people voting on the Guild ballot as opposed to the referendum ballot. He said he would imagine that the various tickets who are pro and anti-NUS would probably include the "yes" and "no" on their how-to-vote cards, because presumably a ticket running in favour of the NUS would want a certain result in the referendum. So any referendum that should be run that would solve this issue for another 25 years would have to be somewhat distinct. He said this would take a period and a process to change Guild regulations. He said another thing that is lacking is a democratic want for it. He said the only people who mention NUS to him are either people who have gone to conference, or people who sit on Guild Council. He said when he talks to his student friends they talk about many things, some of them Guild related, but NUS has never come up and he is not convinced that students are concerned with this issue. For a requisition that will change and it could be through a popular campaign being run,

but he is not satisfied at this point in time that the democratic want is there. He said he is not 100% convinced that this wouldn't have some impact on the Guild's finances, as even the cost of printing ballots would be there. If it were run separate from the Guild Elections it would cost more money. If we could use the relevant provisions of referenda to apply this to policy and bind Guild Council for a number of years as referendums do, it may be appropriate to spend \$20,000 to sort out our funding level for the next 25 years, but is it justifiable to spend the money if it only binds Guild Council for a period of two months? He said he is in favour of referendums, but not this referendum and he thinks we need to have a constructive dialogue about what the referendum needs to be. It may not be accomplished within a year, but it may be accomplished within a couple of years and when the referendum does come around he will be on the yes side for it and will campaign vigorously for a referendum to occur. Aiden said a few questions arise. One is do all students who run in election campaigns have an explicit and heartfelt position on the NUS issue? He said he is not going to accept the idea that it can be a decision made at Guild election. As to the issue of democratic want, he said that UWA is celebrated for its high turnout at Guild elections and he commends the spirit of competition that has made that so, but at the end of the day we don't reach 50% of students. He referred to the regulations and clarified that we do not need to prove popular support amongst students to have a referendum. As to the other points raised against it, Aiden said he opposes a referendum that is held distinctly from Guild elections. He said it is the most cost-effective way of having the referendum to have it at Guild elections and there is a reason that it is explicitly regulated. He said he feels student attitudes have changed over the years and it has been a long time since a referendum has been held on this. He said the students who voted in the 80s to support NUS may not have liked the incarnation of NUS as it is in 2014. so he feels we should probably ask the 2014 students for their opinion.

Aiden said before voting on the motion there are people in the room who are state office bearers or past office bearers of NUS and he asked that the vote be taken with those people considering whether or not they have a conflict of interest.

Bec said as of 3.00pm today she is no longer the WA State NUS President.

Alex declared a conflict of interest and said he is the WA State General Secretary of NUS and that he is currently the interim WA President.

Lizzy declared a conflict of interest and said she sits on the National Executive of NUS.

Max declared a conflict of interest and said he is the WA State Welfare Officer of NUS, although he said it is not a voting position.

Max said he was directed by Meredith Cully to vote against this motion. Owen said the conflict of interest should not apply if Max is voting as a proxy.

Sam said he also had forms for Natalia to proxy for Daniel and for Michael to be proxy for Rida. The proxies were accepted.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.10 failed.**

**For:** Aiden Depiazzi, Millie Dacre, Rebecca Lawrence, Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler).

**Against:** Tom Henderson, Lizzy O'Shea, Jonathan Lo, Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Natalia Verne (for Daniel Jo), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Max Riley (for Merredith Cully).

**Abstaining:** Sam Shipley, Honny Palayukan, Maddie Mulholland, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Alex Bennet, Michael Morrissey (for Rida Ahmed), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu).

- 7.11** That Council strongly condemns any attempt by the National Tertiary Education Union or any similar body to conduct industrial action that leads to bans on teaching, release of academic and/or other application results, response to student enquiries, work related to student enrolment and assistance, and/or other bans that would negatively impact student welfare.

*Moved: Aiden Depiazzi; Seconded: Rebecca Lawrence.*

Aiden said he recently received an email that all staff members who are members of the NTEU and members of the Academic Staff Association will be balloted to conduct industrial action.



He said the NTEU is asking that UWA staff agree to an unlimited number of stoppages of work including:

1. consecutive stoppages of work between 5 minutes and 24 hours in duration;
2. indefinite stoppages of work,
3. bans or partial bans on the reporting and transmission to the employer of examination and/or assessment results,
4. bans or partial bans on participation of student recruitment activities and university improvement events,
5. bans or partial bans on responding to enquiries from people by phone, email or in person,
6. bans or partial bans on work related to student enrolment processes,
7. bans or partial bans on work associated with Transnational programmes,
8. bans or partial bans on overtime;
9. bans or partial bans on teaching and teaching related duties;
10. bans or partial bans on the participation in performance appraisal reviews, professional development review processes;
11. the transmission of union messages or telephone electronic communications to students.

He said NTEU basically want staff to agree to an indefinite number of hours of bans on enrolments, staff not teaching, staff not releasing academic results, staff not releasing results of applications, bans on staff responding to student enquiries, etc. He said this is about a ballot that is currently going on, but this is an issue for us because it is important that we support students and the students who elect us and we do not lend ourselves to be brought into something inappropriate where we end up defending staff and staff industrial action at the expense of students.

Lizzy said that she was a NTEU member and had been sent ballot papers for this ballot, so she will abstain on this motion. She clarified that on the ballot; each member may vote "yes" or "no" on each point that Aiden raised. She said the NTEU could only act on each of those points if they have a significant majority vote.

Bec asked are we talking about all those listed actions on the ballot, or simply the ones that Aiden has read out?

Aiden said the other points do not have any impact on students and he is only concerned about the points that will affect students negatively.

Tom said he agreed that we are looking out for the welfare of students, however he said he thinks it is a little short-sighted to strongly condemn a group of people that we have to work with every day. He said the way in which a student body relates to the teachers is very important and the way the student body can get things done often relies on the teaching body to get anything through, for example things like Academic Board and Academic Council. He said we need the support of groups that would be affected by this sort of thing. He said he thinks strongly condemning these individuals is putting our relationship with those groups in jeopardy and that we need to achieve things in this university. He said he also believes that we don't want to see any impact on student welfare during this period. This is unlikely to be considered by the mover, however he believes that it would be more appropriate for this Council to acknowledge the NTEU or any similar body's right to conduct industrial action and any results be discussed in conjunction with that group, to minimise any impact to student welfare because while we don't want any impact to students during this time, we require the NTEU support, they require our support and we don't want to put that in jeopardy.

Alex said the precedent that he has heard to be set by other industrial actions taken by teachers does not extensively or at all impact student welfare, for example withholding results. For students who make applications to have their results released, they are given to them. It is only a general delay for students. He said the precedent that is set is not necessarily to the detriment of the all-encompassing group of students and for those for whom it will be a detriment, there are cases where they let that go.

Rebecca said she understand that we need to make an effort to have a good working relationship with a number of other bodies and if we are going to work with NTEU and other bodies we need to make it



very clear whose interests we represent. She said we must make it clear that these representatives don't support action that would cause such significant and such obvious detriment to the student body. The NTEU obviously take care of their members and the people they represent and we need to be thinking about whom we represent when we make our decisions.

Tom said by strongly condemning we are putting that relationship at risk and if the teachers think the students are offside with them, then in the future when we need to make big decisions and we need their support we may not get it. We shouldn't be short-sighted because this has happened before and there has been no detrimental effect to students. If we strongly condemn these teachers we are basically saying we don't support them in their fight to get what they want, so when we want to get what we want, why should they support us?

Lizzy said that as Education Council President one of her roles is to explain to students why staff might be striking and why the staff do have such poor conditions that they feel the need to consider industrial action. She said she thinks you would be hard pressed to find a student who would want to come to university when there is no staff here. She said we need the staff and the students to be on the same side in that we are both fighting what is an underfunded tertiary education centre. She said she thinks our support with the staff is critically important.

Rebecca said there is no point in our relationship in working with them if we can't say we feel what they are doing is unacceptable for the people we represent. There is no point in the relationship if we are not going to stand up and say this is something that we find unacceptable.

Aiden moved a procedural motion that the speaking list be closed. Motion passed.

Alex said we all want good teachers and we all want good teaching. We also want teachers to teach well and to interact in appropriate working conditions, where they can deliver a quality education to us. He said he doesn't see why we should be injuring or condemning the only possible action they can take to say, "we want better conditions for our staff," because what we need to consider is these are the teachers' working conditions and those conditions are actually our learning conditions.

Honny said this discussion gives us an opportunity to look at where our opportunities lie to have better communications with teachers. She said she agrees with what Tom said that it would be detrimental if we stand up and put up a hard front and say we are completely against the way the teachers are behaving. The way to get around these types of situations is not to go in as in opposition to the university teachers, because we rely on them as much as they rely on us to give our students the best quality of education. She said the way to achieve what we want is to actually go into it in more of a negotiatory behaviour and actually sit down with them, because it is definitely an opportunity for us to communicate better to and for them to communicate better with us what kind of conditions work well for them. She said better conditions for the teachers means better learning experiences for our students.

Tom said he does not think that such a strong-armed approach that is strongly condemning the NTEU is the approach we should be taking. He said we should be discussing how we could assist them, in allowing them to do what they need to do to get the action they require, without negatively impacting students. We do not need to strongly condemn what they need to do to get what they need.

Aiden said if teachers went on strike and don't go to work, they are not there for classes. He said he finds it incredible that the comments are that we should support the staff striking to stop them from striking and not being at work. He said he is not condemning any individual members of the NTEU to exercise their right to industrial action, but are condemning NTEU for attempting to take industrial action where it negatively impacts students. He said regarding the point about how this would not directly impact students, there are a couple of deferred exams happening today and a few more over the coming week. If staff strike while those exams are being taken, they don't get marked or released to students. Regarding the issue about the relationship the student union has with the staff union and whether or not they will support us in the future; he said it is his position that two bodies should align

when their goals align. Their goal is to take their staff out of work in protest, our goal is to have those staff stay at work to teach students and conduct enrolment. Our goals don't align, therefore in future if the university says it is going to sack 10 staff and we say we don't like that, are they going to turn around and say the Student Guild has disagreed with us once before, so now we will support the redundancies. He said we are not prohibited from ever doing anything in line with the staff union again or speaking out on student welfare. If anyone thinks that our relationship with the staff is more important than our duties to the students, which are bound with regulations, and which come from the fact that they elected us to be here then there is a serious logical error there as well. The language of the motion is the same language, which has been used by autonomous departments of the Guild in condemning things, which are bad for students in the past.

Lizzy made a correction to what was previously said and stated that the NTEU do not necessarily just represent academic staff, they represent all staff of the university.

The motion was put. **Motion 7.11 failed.**

**For:** Aiden Depiazzi, Millie Dacre, Rebecca Lawrence, Ahmed Suliman (for Francois Schiefler).

**Against:** Tom Henderson, Honny Palayukan, Maddie Mulholland, Bec Doyle, Owen Myles, Alex Bennet, Samuel Shenton (for Cam Fitzgerald), Thomas Beyer (for Kenneth Woo), Alex Hamilton (for Richie Wu), Max Riley (for Merredith Cully).

**Abstaining:** Sam Shipley, Lizzy O'Shea, Jonathan Lo, Natalia Verne (for Daniel Jo), Michael Morrissey (for Rida Ahmed).

## 8.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

### 8.1 Other Business

Lizzy said there would be 5 national office bearers from NUS visiting for O-Day; they will be in the NUS tent and if you need to contact any of your national equivalents, the Women's, Welfare, Education, General Secretary and President of NUS will be over for a few days.

Tom said there are a lot of events coming up for orientation and assistance is required at those from Guild student reps. He said it is a chance to meet students, get them involved in FacSocs and clubs and to tell them about the services the Guild offers.

## 9.0 CLOSE / NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> February 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 and department officers will be available at 5.30pm. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.