



## **1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING**

Lucy welcomed everyone and acknowledged that UWA is situated on Nyoongar land. She paid her respects to Noongar elders past and present, and acknowledged the Noongar 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**

Maddie Mulholland (Guild President), Tom Burke (Treasure), Michael Kabondo (Secretary), Peter Derbyshire (PSA President), Lucy Moyle (Chair), Emma Boogaardt (Ed Council President), Jack Looby (SOC President), Laura Mwiragua (Women's Officer), Emily Law (Welfare Officer), Ben Martin (OGC), Brad Forbes (OGC), Chad Bensky (OGC), Jacky Chiang (OGC), Jess Porter-Langson (OGC), Jesse Martino (OGC), Steph Munro (OGC), Shyaam Patel (RSD President), Fraser Windsor (Queer Officer), Tyson McEwan (WASAC Chair), Lizzy O'Shea (Immediate Past President), Alex Hamilton (NUS Representative).

### **1.2 Apologies**

Kenneth Foo (ISS), Nick Brown (OGC), Julian Coleman (OGC and Senate Representative), Torey Rickerby (Sports Representative), Liam Staltari (NUS Representative), Denisse Fierro Arcos (VACE Chair), Kate Prendergast (Pelican Editor), Hayden Dalziel (Pelican Editor), Emilie Fitzgerald (PROSH & Relay@UWA Director), Matt Clarke-Massera (PROSH & Relay@UWA Director).

### **1.3 Proxies**

James Prefumo (for Megan Lee), Cale Black (for Joanne Lim), Avory Allen (for Reece Gherardi).

### **1.4 Observers**

None

### **1.5 Absent**

Cass Greenwell (UWA Sports Council President)

## **2.0 DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

**2.1** Emma Boogaardt declared potential conflict of interest for motion 8.7, because she is on the National Executive of NUS for 2016.

## **3.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

**3.1** Guild Council Meeting 16<sup>th</sup> December 2015

**Accepted**

**3.2** 102<sup>nd</sup> Guild Council Meeting 25<sup>th</sup> November 2015

**Accepted**

## **4.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

#### 4.1 Guild President Report 15<sup>th</sup> December 2015

**Accepted**

### 5.0 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

#### 5.1 Managing Director's Report

Report as tabled.

Tony said things are moving rapidly for the operations side of the Guild. Staff are getting ready for the orientation of the phase of the year. The main focus of this report is catering, it has taken up a lot of the time but a lot of progress has been made with the key projects. A new Executive Chef has been hired and the outlets are going through major changes.

Emma asked when the relationship agreement would be finalised?

Tony replied, it will take a long time to organise and should not be rushed. However, hopefully it is done by the end of the year.

#### 5.2 Associate Director Corporate Services & Finance Report

Report as tabled.

Dennis said he had noticed money charged to his department when he had spent none in the past month.

Tony assumes it's a timing delay and anyone should email Mutya if they wanted information if this happens to them.

#### 5.3 Associate Director of Student Services Report

Report as tabled.

Lucy moved a motion to accept all the Director's reports. **Motion carried.**

### 6.0 REPORTS

#### 6.1 Guild President

Reports as tabled.

Quarterly meetings with the University Executive have been secured.

Open Staff Forum is happening on February 2<sup>nd</sup> about the Staff Cuts and Maddie will be attending it.

There's a new policy to eat in the Libraries, for semester one.

Orientation Day is soon and Maddie would love Councillors to help a little for the Guild.

#### 6.2 Vice-President



Report as tabled.

### **6.3 Secretary**

Report as tabled.

Reminder that Cultural Training Day on 8<sup>th</sup> of February.

### **6.4 Treasurer**

Report as tabled.

Tom said a number of overdrafts are currently being considered over the next few weeks.

### **6.5 Education Council President**

Report as tabled.

Emma has been meeting regularly with the NTEU before the Staff forum.

### **6.6 Public Affairs Council President**

Report as tabled.

### **6.7 Societies Council President**

Report as tabled.

If anyone one had any input regarding the points he made, he would like them to email him.

### **6.8 Women's Department**

Report as tabled.

### **6.9 Welfare Department**

Report as tabled.

### **6.10 Environment Department**

Report as tabled.

### **6.11 International Student Services**

Report as tabled.

### **6.12 Queer Department**

Report as tabled.

### **6.13 Guild Sports Representative**



Report as tabled.

#### **6.14 WASAC Chair**

Report as tabled.

#### **6.15 Postgraduate Student's Association**

Report as tabled.

#### **6.16 Residential Student's Department**

Report as tabled.

#### **6.17 Pelican Editors**

Report as tabled.

#### **6.18 PROSH Directors**

Report as tabled.

This week they have started meeting with the Charities.

#### **6.19 Relay@UWA Chair**

Report as tabled.

#### **6.20 Volunteering & Community Engagement Committee Chair**

No Report Submitted: There has not been a VACE meeting yet.

Nick asked about the details of the Staff forum and who organised it?

Emma replied and said the University Organised it.

Emma requested Maddie ran through the Academic Calendar proposal.

Maddie said the Academic Council has currently formed working parties to look at different models for the Academic Calendar and she will keep us updated.

Jesse asked how Emma foresees the Guilds relationship with Education Futures into the year and if they were opportunities for student feedback?

Emma said she's had two meetings with them and Student Feedback is an area that's been worked on. She would like to see SURF reformed providing more avenues for feedback.

#### **6.21 NUS Representative Reports**



**Alex Hamilton**

Report as tabled.

**Charlie Viska**

Report as tabled.

**Emma Boogaardt**

Report as tabled.

**Elizabeth O'Shea**

Report as tabled.

**Jesse Martino**

Report as tabled.

**Tom Beyer**

Report as tabled.

**Liam Staltari**

Report as tabled.

Nick Brown asked the representatives how people voted on the motion to get the Labor party elected?

Alex said it was not a "Vote Labor" Campaign, rather a door knocking campaign in support of candidates from any party who sign something that says they will not support cuts to higher education.

Ben started by quoting Tom's report where it said *"factions can simply refuse to attend floor for reasons as varied as not being able to agree upon a chapter to debate, needing time to preselect within their faction or wanting to go attend a protest in the CBD. The above issues meant that conference floor did not sit before lunchtime on any day and debate on chapters was often limited."* He added that this was echoed in Liam's report where he said *"This saw a handful of individuals become responsible for pulling quorum and terminating debate – sometimes for hours on end – on multiple occasions throughout Conference. Even then, it was common for the process of registration to last for multiple hours, ensuring that a significant portion of Conference was spent waiting in cramped hallways for NUS Secretariat to organise itself – a task that is was patently not up to achieving."*

He then asked, how do you justify the spending of thousands of dollars on a peak representative body, which can fairly organize its own conference?

Lizzy responded by saying, there were a few things in Liam's report that may be under representing the organisation of the conference, such as transport. She said it was sort of disorganised, but they did sit for a long time utilising every student's time who were there as possible.

Ben replied that the purpose of the question is that conference was so disorganised as an entity, then how can the peak body be trusted to organise different decisions all around the country?

Lizzie said, the conference has its quirks in that it is organised by students and if you don't get quorum you can't sit. The conference works in the confines of quorum - once you have quorum you sit for as long as possible and you get it done. She added, they probably had more policy discussed at this conference than any other one in the last five years, and that may not be reassuring for him but she says it's getting better. Some of the recommendations in the report do discuss how conference could be improved such as lowering quorum so that conference can sit more frequently.

Jack noted seeing a discrepancy in that Charlie's report said international policies were debated, whereas others say it wasn't.

Charlie said they weren't and that was just a mistake.

Jack asked if there were any measures that any of the delegates took to ensure International Policy was discussed at the meetings, seeing as the KPIs last year on this were the worst.

Emma said she tried really hard to get international policies debated. She noted the reason why international policy wasn't really discussed last year was that the international officer had a child in the middle of her term. She has met this year's international officer and he has a plan so it looks like it will be a better year.

Ben said in Liam's report he mentioned that he did not receive a formal itinerary, and isn't one to lie about these things. What he was wondering was if this was not necessarily a lack of organisation but in terms of because Liam was representing the ALSF, is there a potentially a reason that he didn't receive something or was blocked from receiving something because he wasn't representing the correct faction?

Lizzy said in the emails she received there was no formal day to day itinerary, but there were details of bus times, conference documents, which all came from the conference organisers.

Emma added that she thinks it was just an auto generated email to anyone who filled in the google docs form.

Following on Lizzy said, she doesn't think Liam lied about it but also doesn't think the organisers would go out of their way to block individuals from receiving things.

Fraser asked for clarification on what happened with the recommendation for the National Queer Officer?

Lizzy said, from a factional perspective there were many months of trying to endorse their Queer Officer, but due to formalities they weren't able to get him elected.

Jack noted in Alex's report that perhaps the faction wasn't getting the best outcomes for UWA students and that it was touched on in Toms report. He wanted to know how delegates would respond to say they achieved a lot for UWA Students?

Emma said, it depends on what your priorities are in what you define as good outcomes. One of the priorities this year was not particularly procuring any National Office Bearers because all people in the positions were quite competent and doing things on a campus level.

Alex replied saying what she referred to in her report was the way the faction operated, she didn't feel there was a lot of transparency and at times it made her feel uncomfortable. If anyone had any questions for her, please email her as she had to leave.

Maddie commented on the point "what did we achieve for UWA Students" by saying, a lot of the policy put up by our delegates were ones that were impactful for students. As well as forming relationships with the national office bearers who will visit our campus, and we'll have a say on how the union is operated.

Ben again drew on the similarities between Tom and Liam's report. Tom remarked that S.A.L.T was viciously disruptive towards delegates from the A.L.S.F and Liam mentioned that A.L.S.F were structurally barred from engaging in debate. This question was more aimed at Lizzy because in her report she mentioned she tried to assist the A.L.S.F delegates, he was wondering if she could elaborate on what she actually did specifically towards getting the speaker's Chair?

Lizzy said initially Grassroots didn't have Chair, they asked if they could have one and they got one. A.L.S.F didn't say anything about a Chair probably because they didn't think the Labor factions would agree to it, but in saying that when they all got to conference floor there was obvious antagonism going both ways. She added that she and others always pushed for Liam and A.L.S.F agenda to get on the agenda.

Emma said that she feels that if you have been elected by student unions and paid for you to go, you have a right to be there. She obviously disagrees with a large proportion of the Liberal party platform, but she believes in that case let the policy still be presented and debated.

Ben wanted Lizzy to expand on the operations of the business committee. He has heard on multiple occasions from multiple delegates that it is common practice for members of the business committee to physically eat the paper?



She replied, the way the business committee works has been outlined in her 2012 report - agenda items have to be passed through business committee to get to the chair. That is how items are prioritised. She added that it isn't common, but not unheard of that if there is something that may be deemed inappropriate, that no one may want to discuss it people would rip up paper. She's never done it, and thinks it's a disgusting behaviour, but it happens.

Ben said he had one more question and this one he found personally disgusting and repugnant, but he quoted from Liam's report "*A Palestinian student was violently prevented from speaking by Socialist Alternative, and nearly gagged during a ballot initiated jointly by Socialist Alternative and National Labor students. Following his obvious emotional distress, the attempts of many Delegates to leave the venue were thwarted when members of the Socialist Alternative physically barred the exits. Security were called but proved to be of little effect as members of Labor Unity broke into a physical scuffle with SA, with much of this being caught on video.*" Directly preceding this a speaker from the NLS made some deplorable anti-Islamic remarks without any sanctions from the chair. This is certainly not the action taken by A.L.S.F delegates. His question was, that is this something you can solve from a KPI, he knows that in Lizzy's reports she looked to opening up transparency by allowing filming on conference floor, and if the representatives were not concerned that some of this behaviour is alarmingly entrenched in some of the factions, that you didn't have to think about exposing this to everyday students before you can begin to stop it?

Lizzy started by saying, the whole Palestinian situation was unacceptable and she felt uncomfortable for conference to keep sitting. She explained there was no physical altercation involved in the situation and it was very complicated situation and could have been dealt with better. As far as filming goes, she thinks it is appropriate for these types of conferences to be recorded, unless it's sensitive topics being discussed.

Lastly in general, Ben asked if lack of transparency was responsible for fuelling this behaviour?

Emma said she thinks one of the problems is lack of disciplinary process, the Grievance officer is a factional position, there were recommendations made last year that the position may be from say a University council or some external a-political person to hand down appropriate discipline. She believes the problem now is when poor behaviour is exhibited such as said above, the Grievance officer which is a factional position is hesitant or will call it out but will not take appropriate action because they may be afraid of associated ramifications.

Lucy thanked everyone for giving their reports and moved a motion that all the reports be accepted.  
**Motion carried.**

## 7.0 QUESTION TIME

## 8.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

A procedural motion was moved to consider 8.2,8.3 and 8.5 to the front First. **Motion carried.**  
Outlined below.

- 8.1** That Guild Council approves and accepts the Club Collaborative Zone Policy to be included in the Guild Policy Book, as passed by the Governance Committee.  
*Moved: Jesse Martino; Seconded: Jack Looby*

Jesse gave a bit of background on the Policy. Jack and him were given the responsibility to create this policy and have it approved by the opening date 5<sup>th</sup> of February 2016. The policy went through the



appropriate channels while it was being created. He said this Policy will be used to govern the use of the facilities, adherence to relevant rules and regulations and it includes a relevant code of conduct. He further outlined what else was included in the policy.

Another issue came about, in that it was found difficult to decide whether the policy should be admitted by SOC and its President or Tenancy and its Chair. Jesse's view was that it should be admitted by the tenancy executive, but a different view was that it should be SOC and he thinks there are positives and negatives from both sides. Essentially Governance ruled that the policy will be administered by SOC and he respects the decision. Moving forward, he would like to outline the role of Tenancy as it relates to this policy.

Jack added that the reason the policy was given to SOC was under the current Guild Regulations, Tenancy doesn't exist. It exists solely in SOC committee as a sub-committee explicitly to do with leased property for clubs. As this isn't a leased property but a space for clubs, it didn't fall under Tenancy but under SOC.

Ben asked how SOC will deal would deal with FacSOCs if an issue arose in the CCZ?

Jack responded by saying the policy clearly outlines, if it is deemed a minor it can be dealt with by SOC if it a major incident it gets passed onto the Discipline Committee. The reason this debate is happening is because the Guild regulations aren't clear about where FacSOCs sit in the framework of the Guild.

Emma would be abstaining on this motion. She feels uncomfortable with the disciplinary processes and that's not in term of FacSOCs, but also that the club room will be used by a wide group of people including, NUS, Departments and Office Bearers using the room. She feels as if SOC committee disciplining Office Bearers would be inappropriate and a real breach of where the line falls in terms of SOC's reach. If we are not happy with giving Tenancy this particular policy, she doesn't see why we give them anything. Overall she still thinks it's a great policy.

Maddie said she thinks the facility will be well managed with this policy and she will be looking to give Tenancy an identity in the future.

The Motion was put. **Motion passed.**

**For:** Maddie Mulholland, Tom Burke, Michael Kabondo, Peter Derbyshire, James Prefumo (for Megan Lee), Brad Forbes, Charlie Viska, Jacky Chiang, Jess Porter-Langson, Jesse Martino, Steph Munro, Jack Looby, Lucy Moyle, Nick Brown, Chad Bensky.

**Against:** Ben Martin

**Abstain:** Emma Boogaardt, Laura Mwiragua, Cale Black (for Joanne Lim)

**8.2** That Guild Council endorses the Tavern Fence design as attached, within the approved budget expenditure amount.

*Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Tom Burke*

Tom said the design concept was made on the advice from the Catering and Tavern Committee, with a few different options accosted. What we want to do is endorse the design, as it has been approved by the Catering and Tavern Committee and Strategic Resource Committees.

Tony informed Council that UWA have almost given us a tick on this particular design, it is just left up to Western Australian Planning to be approved.

Tom mentioned the previous design from the architecture competition was abandoned, because it came at a high cost and was not the particular feel they wanted for the Tavern.

Steph asked, about potential pests with the plants that were an issue with the initial design and how that differs to the current one.

Tom said he hasn't looked into that, but it will be investigated soon, including what kind of plants are placed there.

The Motion was put. **Passed Unanimously**

- 8.3** That the Guild Council endorses the Tavern Refurbishment Project proposal, partly funded by the SSAF Capital Expenditure allocation, and approves an additional \$100,000 toward AV and furniture expenditure for this project.

*Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Tom Burke*

Tony informed council that the tavern refurbishment project is awaiting University approval, as to whether to re-allocate the Cap-Ex to it. The extra \$100,000 should be put into the project just as a contingency plan. He suggested we approve this as we would want to refurbish the whole Tavern at this time.

Dennis asked how much of the money we will actually use?

Tony said his aim is to not use it all, anything we can utilize can be saved or put into another project.

The motion was put. **Passed Unanimously**

- 8.4** That the Guild supports the National Day of Action, organised by the National Union of Students, for April 6th 2016 and strongly encourages all members of Guild Council to attend this event.

*Moved: Emma Boogaardt; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland*

Emma amended the motion due to a similar motion being on the agenda (8.8).

That the Guild supports the National Day of Action, organised by the National Union of Students, for April 6th 2016 and strongly encourages all members of Guild Council to attend this event. Endorses and will use its resources to help promote and build the NDA including; printing off posters, notifying students by email, and having Guild stalls during O-week and leading up to the event.

*Moved: Emma Boogaardt; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland*

Emma said the motion was to endorse the National day of action and the Guild has policy that we are anti-deregulation.

Maddie added, it is important especially in an election year that higher education is prioritised on the agenda.

Nick agrees that the Guild should take a lead in fighting for student rights and that Councillors should attend these events.

Steph said, although she supports National Days of Action she doesn't support this one being on university day, taking students away from classes. She thinks these students should be in class rooms furthering their education.

Ben certainly won't be attending, he'll be in class and advising fellow students to do so, as they should be. He doesn't also know what the protest will be supporting due to not having much information out on the protest.

Peter has two concerns, because we haven't been presented with what the NDA is standing up for Postgraduates.

Charlie said, NDAs are most effective when there are lots of people and he believes as representatives of the student body it is important that we attend this. What's good about them is that often, for example the last NDA, NTEU made sure there was no academic penalty for students who attended.

The Motion was put. **Motion passed as amended.**

**For:** Maddie Mulholland, Tom Burke, Michael Kabondo, Peter Derbyshire, James Prefumo (for Megan Lee), Brad Forbes, Charlie Viska, Jacky Chiang, Nick Brown, Jesse Martino, Emma Boogaerdt, Laura Mwiragua, Cale Black (for Joanne Lim).

**Against:** Ben Martin, Steph Munro.

**Abstain:** Jack Looby, Lucy Moyle, Chad Bensky, Jess Porter-Langson.

**8.5** That this council appoint Mutya Maraginot-Joseph and Hayden Greenham as standing invitees of the Catering and Tavern Committee

*Moved: Thomas Burke; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland*

Tom said, this is a regulatory procedure, that standing invitees are approved by this Council. Tom said it would be essential to have their expertise at the meetings.

Peter moved to make an amendment that the new Executive Chef be added to the list of invitees.

The addition was amendable to Tom and Maddie.

That this council appoint Mutya Maraginot-Joseph, Hayden Greenham and Debbie Quartermaine as standing invitees of the Catering and Tavern Committee

*Moved: Thomas Burke; Seconded: Maddie Mulholland*

The motion was put. **Passed Unanimously as Amended.**

**8.6** That the UWA Student Guild:

- a) condemns the Federal Government's move to cut \$650 million from bulk billing incentive

- payments in essential pathology services;
  - b) recognises that this move will see the cost of services like pap smears, blood tests, and MRI scans increase dramatically;
  - c) acknowledges that these cuts will impact on the health and financial position of women, people from low-SES backgrounds, and people with disabilities the most; and
  - d) calls on all students to attend the Perth rally against these cuts organised for 20th February 2016.
- Moved: Emma Boogaardt; Seconded: Laura Mwiragua*

Emma provided background to the motion, that the government was cutting subsidising for essential pathology tests. The motion is something we should vote for so that these services should remain free.

Laura says, it's something that will affect everyone. They will be encouraging students to attend.

Nick proposed a few amendments.

- c) Also condemns the Western Australian State Government to cut around 1100 health services jobs;
- f) Will share the event on its Facebook and website page.

Emma and Laura accepted one amendment f) Will share the event on its Facebook and website page.

A motion to vote for the addition of c) for the amendment was put. **Amendment Failed.**

Part (f) was changed to (e).

That the UWA Student Guild:

- a) condemns the Federal Government's move to cut \$650 million from bulk billing incentive payments in essential pathology services;
- b) recognises that this move will see the cost of services like pap smears, blood tests, and MRI scans increase dramatically;
- c) acknowledges that these cuts will impact on the health and financial position of women, people from low-SES backgrounds, and people with disabilities the most; and
- d) calls on all students to attend the Perth rally against these cuts organised for 20th February 2016.
- e) Will share the event on its Facebook and website page.

*Moved: Emma Boogaardt; Seconded: Laura Mwiragua*

Jack said he's voting against this motion and advised anyone else who didn't do their own research should vote against the motion. He said originally he was for this motion, but the more he did the research from a treasurer's perspective this is an appropriate step. The money is getting taken out of this project which isn't reaching the organisations aims and getting put to better use elsewhere.

Steph commented, that it has costed a lot of money to the government and she would like to see the money put into something like higher education.

Ben added that this policy isn't relevant to the student body and it shouldn't be on the agenda.

Peter said from a financial point of view if they remove this service in the long run it's going to cost more, because people won't be able to detect from lower SES backgrounds won't be able to get things detected earlier.

Nick said this is definitely a student issue, as many students are below the poverty line.

Maddie added it is definitely an issue that affects students. You have students that get pap-smears and they need to for their health, as well as blood tests and scans. It will be something that affects students especially from lower SES backgrounds as well as an issue that students care about. It is our role that students' voices are heard.

Emma agreed that this was relevant issue to students and she stated she had done the research before submitting the motion.

The Motion was put. **Motion passed as amended.**

**For:** Maddie Mulholland, Michael Kabondo, Peter Derbyshire, James Prefumo (for Megan Lee), Charlie Viska, Jacky Chiang, Nick Brown, Jesse Martino, Emma Boogaerd, Laura Mwiragua, Cale Black (for Joanne Lim).

**Against:** Ben Martin, Steph Munro, Chad Bensky, Brad Forbes, Jack Looby, Lucy Moyle, Jess Porter-Langson.

**Abstain:** Tom Burke.

#### 8.7 The motion reads:

- a) That a referendum of all students shall be held in September 2016, concurrently with the UWA Student Guild Elections, to determine whether or not the UWA Student Guild continues to pay an accreditation fee to the National Union of Students; and
- b) That, in accordance with s.632(2)(b) of the Guild Electoral Regulations, the referendum question be put to the student electorate as follows: "Should the UWA Student Guild continue its payment of accreditation fees to the National Union of Students?"

*Moved: Ben Martin; Seconded: Stephanie Munro*

Ben said it's all about giving students a voice on one of the most polarizing issues on campus. He is aware a similar motion was brought in the August meeting last year and he has addressed all the concerns surrounding that motion when considering this one. This is not to disaffiliate but rather disaccredit ourselves from NUS.

Steph thought it was important students got a voice, and went out and did their own research.

Jack clarified his comments about the timing of the referendum in the previous meeting, he said further down he said the motion would be wrong because NUS is an important entity for students.

Lizzy highlighted two things, firstly she highlighted the fact that this referendum would not remove us as a member of the NUS rather takes away any of the say we have in running the organisation and what it stands for. Secondly, as a President she only got one or two emails regarding disaffiliation or disaccreditation and did not think it was a big issue.

Jesse added the problem with this, is if we had any issue with NUS, UWA students wouldn't get any say on anything. Furthermore, there is some form of review which is done through an objective KPI analysis by the Governance committee, so he doesn't think a referendum would be required.

Laura said, when we campaign and get students to vote for NUS delegates there is an implication that they understand that there will be this affiliation. It seems unreasonable to disassociate this from other bodies we are affiliated with and she sees it as just an isolation of this particular union.

Peter referred back to elections stating that when students vote they usually know they are voting for a ticket that either supports or does not support NUS affiliation or accreditation. It's not something that really needs to have a referendum on because it is something that is already voted on, and we shouldn't

be spending more money, time and effort on a similar thing.

Chad said he has problems with NUS, but the idea of being affiliated with it and associated with its decisions and then purposely taking away our rights to vote in issues is even worse.

Emma's fear with this is in theory you would have to do every single year, which means every year the Guild elections are about NUS affiliation and it takes away from the elections purpose.

Ben had his right of reply. He started by saying he had a lot of things to address. Firstly, the reason it was 'disaccredited' rather than 'disaffiliated' is because the props of the motion is essentially around SSAF funding and the allocation of SSAF funding. Secondly, he noted that the whole motion was different, the whole point of the motion was different because he looked at the old minutes and pinpointed the main concerns that they had and that's why he completely changed the motion and brought this up at an earlier meeting because there were concerns there with the timing of when Liam's motion was moved, and he altered the wording because they thought it was politically charged, and that's why the motion's different. He understands that some don't believe it's a high amount of funds and he agrees in terms of the percentage of the output, but it's certainly one of the allocations that are of high contention of the SSAF funds. He also doesn't believe that Guild elections are appropriately mandated, He does not believe that an everyday student is voting purely on NUS, they vote on the platform or policy. The NUS debate is certainly giving the impassionate student a vote or a say on those issues. He hopes that he had managed to sway Council.

The Motion was put. **Motion Failed.**

**For:** Ben Martin, Steph Munro.

**Against:** Maddie Mulholland. Tom Burke, Michael Kabondo, Peter Derbyshire, Chad Bensky, James Prefumo (for Megan Lee), Brad Forbes, Charlie Viska, Jacky Chiang, Nick Brown, Jesse Martino, Emma Boogaardt, Laura Mwiragua, Lucy Moyle, Cale Black (for Joanne Lim).

**Abstain:** Jack Looby, Jess Porter-Langson.

#### 8.8 The UWA Student Guild:

- a) Continues to oppose the attacks on students and university staff by both the university administration and government, most notably the recent proposal to sack 300 UWA staff.
- b) Sees student protests as a key way of countering these attacks and therefore endorses actions taken by students, staff and the National Union of Students.
- c) Endorses and will use its resources to help promote and build the latest National Day of Action called by NUS. Building and promoting meaning printing off posters, including promotional material in the Guild Weekly email, specific all-student emails and Guild stalls during O-week and leading up to the event.

*Moved: Nick Brown*

**Motion Withdrawn**

## 9.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

Maddie Updated the Council on the Disciplinary Committee Decision.

Michael asked Councillors to like posts on all the Guilds social media to boost engagement.

Charlie reminded everyone for the March meeting he has booked in records training which we all need to do and an email will be sent soon with the relevant information.

## **10.0 CLOSE / NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2016 at 6.00pm. Please contact the Guild Secretary ([secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au](mailto:secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au)) with apologies or proxies. All office bearers will be available from 5.30pm. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.

