



1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Lucy welcomed everyone and acknowledged that UWA is situated on Noongar 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), Charlie Viska (Vice President) Peter Derbyshire (PSA President), Lucy Moyle (Chair), Jack Looby (SOC President), Megan Lee (PAC President), Emily Law (Welfare Officer), Ben Martin (OGC), Brad Forbes(OGC), Jess Porter-Langson (OGC), Jesse Martino (OGC), Steph Munro (OGC), Tyson McEwan (WASAC Chair), Kenneth Foo (ISS), Torey Rickerby (Sports Representative), Joanne Lim (OGC), Reece Gherardi (Queer Officer), Kate Prendergast (Pelican Editor), Laura Mwiragua (Women's Officer).

1.2 Apologies

Shyaam Patel (RSD President), Denisse Fierro Arcos (VACE Chair), Nick Brown (OGC), Emilie Fitzgerald (PROSH & Relay For Life Director), Matt Clarke-Massera (PROSH Director).

1.3 Proxies

Hannah Matthews (for Emma Boogaardt), Stefan Raovic (for Chad Bensky), Antonio Lumely (for Dennis Venning), Raychard Wong (for Jacky Chiang), Emily Law (for Julian Coleman), Ellen Cohen (for Fraser Windsor).

1.4 Observers

None

Accepted

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None

3.0 DELOITTE AUDITOR PRESENTATION

The audit is effectively complete. It was a first time audit, so there was not any learning curb to go off. This audit opinion is clean and unmodified.

Report as tabled.

Lastly, the auditors said they maintained their independence throughout the audit and they have not come across any issues regarding non-compliance with laws and regulations that apply to the Guild. Procedural was moved to discuss item 11.5. Motion carried.

4.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.1 Guild Council Meeting 27th January 2016

4.2 Guild Council Meeting 2nd March 2016

Accepted

5.0 APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

5.1 Catering and Tavern

5.2 Corporate Services

5.3 Equity and Diversity

5.4 Governance

5.5 Student Services

5.6 Volunteering and Community Engagement

5.7 Welfare and Advocacy

5.8 Workplace Health & safety

5.9 Tenancy

Michael added that Chairs should ensure that their minutes include attendance as it is important to know if quorum was reached.

Accepted

6.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Maddie had a few things to update council on:

- **TASK:** Approved physical servers by SRC, which now means the POS system is good to go ahead.
- (SFR) Students For Refugees – Maddie has been in touch with the club following Council's #letthemstay motion, and is looking to work with them.
- Legal advice – Maddie and Tony, following Council's request, sought legal advice on the Brain & Poulter consultants' Commercial Masterplan. Maddie provided an in camera update.
- SRC have developed a process for the Enviro room & the room next to Pelican.

7.0 DIRECTORS' REPORTS

7.1 Managing Director's Report

Tony said it has been busy on campus. Tony introduced Jack Spagnuolo the new Commercial Director.

Maddie gave a little more information about Jack. He originally graduated from UWA with BSc and completed postgraduate studies in Business. Currently completing Masters in Finance. He has worked in a number international, national, and state roles in Marketing, Trade Marketing, and Sales management with large international companies. Developing strong commercial experience across different markets, and working with strong brands such as Absolut Vodka, Jacobs Creek, Penfolds, and Moet & Chandon.

He also has held the following positions:

- Pernod Ricard – International Market Manager USA based in North America. Part of the team that launched Jacobs Creek Reserves into the Americas

- Pernod Ricard - Trade Marketing Manager – Successfully developed Absolut on premise strategy
- Treasury Estates – Key Account executive
- Moët Hennessy – Key account Executive

He has 2 sons who love sport especially football. He has spent a lot of time overseas and travel there as often as possible on holidays.

Jack said he looking forward to developing a strong commercial strategy for the Guild, and ensure we get the best possible outcomes for students.

Tony continued his report. The Tavern fence project will be beginning as of Friday. The tender process for the internal part of the Tavern is underway.

Report as Tabled.

7.2 Associate Director Corporate Services & Finance Report

Report as Tabled.

7.3 Associate Director of Student Services Report

Report as Tabled.

Accepted

8.0 ELECTIONS

Tony Goodman appointed as Returning Officer.

8.1 Catering & Tavern Committee (Three positions, one of whom must be female)
Calvin Rokich, Ella Prihatini and Andrew Gordon elected.

8.2 Student Services Committee (Two positions, one of whom must be female)
Will Stowell and Emma Dodgson elected.

8.3 Corporate Services Committee (Two positions, one of whom must be female)
Jessica Young and Cameron Mitchell elected.

8.4 Governance Committee (Three positions, one of whom must be female)
Andre Schoombée and Emma McCormack elected.

8.5 Welfare & Advocacy Committee (Two positions, one of whom must be female)
Pheobe Ho and Chris Hendrickson elected.

8.6 Equity & Diversity Committee (Two positions, one of whom must be female)
Zoe Louke and Sophie Harwood elected.

8.7 Volunteering & Community Engagement Committee (Two positions, one of whom must be female)



Catherine Tu and Thomas Coltrona elected.

9.0 REPORTS

9.1 Guild President

Maddie had a couple of comments to make. Firstly, a huge thank you to all the Councillors, Office Bearers and Staff who have worked hard over the last month. We have Sarah Hamilton (Engagement Manager) and Rebecca Hayes (Executive Assistant), who have now joined us in addition to Jack. We have put out a catering survey.

Report as Tabled.

9.2 Vice-President

Report as Tabled.

9.3 Secretary

Report as Tabled.

9.4 Treasurer

There were just a couple of changes since Tom wrote the report. The UEC overdraft has now been approved to a maximum of \$33,500 for their ball.

Report as Tabled.

9.5 Education Council President

Report as Tabled.

9.6 Public Affairs Council President

Megan said firstly there is a type error, the estimated expenditure total should have been \$6,367, also the actual ticket sells as of today are just under \$1,000 but the ticket site has had issues so she's working on getting that fixed.

Report as Tabled.

9.7 Societies Council President

Jack wanted to highlight the O-day numbers are finally in, and as he mentioned in his report over 9,082 students were signed up as club members, which corresponds to about 8,431 Guild members. That's not of course the total number of members but memberships. We also had three gracious submissions by FacSocs, which bumps it up to a lot more students.

Report as Tabled.

9.8 Women's Department

Report as Tabled.

9.9 Welfare Department

Report as Tabled.

9.10 Environment Department

Report as Tabled.

9.11 International Student Services

Report as Tabled.

9.12 Queer Department

Report as Tabled.

9.13 Guild Sports Representative

Report as Tabled.

9.14 WASAC Chair

Report as Tabled.

9.15 Postgraduate Student's Association President

Report as Tabled.

9.16 Residential Student's Department President

Report as Tabled.

9.17 Pelican Editors

Report as Tabled.

9.18 PROSH Directors

Report as Tabled.

9.19 Relay For Life Chair

Report as Tabled.

9.20 Volunteering & Community Engagement Committee Chair

No report submitted.

9.21 Councillor Reports

Lucy Moyle

SRC approved for funding for the Guild Regulations to be taken to Jackson McDonald. We are getting on the documentation to go to them. Lucy will send a briefing document to councillors before it is sent to Jackson McDonald. Once complete it will be sent to the Senate Legislative Committee and from there Governance will approve the document, which will be sent to Guild Council for approval. It is quite a long process but it is aiming for completion for the August 22nd Senate Meeting.

Jesse Martino

Report as Tabled.

Accepted

10.0 QUESTION TIME



None.

11.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

11.1 That Guild Council approves the following for inclusion in the Guild Policy Book:

- a) **The Guild believes all students should have access to a safe campus environment, in particular freedom from any form of harassment, be it verbal, physical or other. Therefore, the Guild condemns all forms of bullying on campus via any medium.**
- b) **The Guild recognises that all affiliate bodies should, as far as possible, uphold the above principle of freedom from harassment and bullying.**
Moved: Jack Looby Seconded: Reece Gherardi

Jack said it's fairly self-explanatory, the purpose of this is to have something in the Policy Book that says we are anti-bullying. If anyone has any amendments, he is amendable.

Ben asked if there was anything prompting this motion?

Jack said, it sorts of comes from clubs he's dealt with. What this lets us do is say as an institution we don't allow bullying.

Ben and Ellen raised concerns about the term "safe campus". Ben questioned the scope of the term "safe campus".

Ellen expressed concerns that the term would be used in a way that discriminates against members of the queer community.

Reece said upon consideration of Ben and Ellen's concerns of the wording of the motion in regards to the "safe campus" and it being open to interpretation he was amenable to changing the wording.

The motion was amended:

That Guild Council approves the following for inclusion in the Guild Policy Book:

- a) The Guild believes all students should be free from all forms of harassment, be it verbal, physical or other. Therefore, the Guild condemns all forms of bullying on campus via any medium.
- b) The Guild recognises that all affiliate bodies should, as far as possible, uphold the above principle of freedom from harassment and bullying.
Moved: Jack Looby Seconded: Reece Gherardi

The motion was put. **Passed as amended**

For: Maddie Mulholland, Tom Burke, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Peter Derbyshire, Lucy Moyle, Jack Looby, Megan Lee, Emily Law, Ben Martin, Brad Forbes, Jess Porter-Langson, Jesse

Martino, Steph Munro, Tyson McEwan, Kenneth Foo, Joanne Lim, Hannah Matthews, Raychard Wong, Laura Mwiragua.

Against: Stefan Raovic

Abstain: None

11.2 That Guild Council:

- a. Re-affirms its stance on social, economic, and educational equality for LGBT+ students.
- b. Opposes the plebiscite on marriage equality proposed by the Federal Government.
- c. Recognises that the proposed plebiscite will delay the legalisation of marriage equality.
- d. Supports the legalisation of full marriage equality in all Australian states and territories.

Moved: Reece Gherardi, Seconded: Fraser Windsor

Reece said for part a) coming from section 4.12.1b of the Guild Regulations, it is the role of the Queer Officer to work to achieve social, economic and educational equality for LGBT+ students. Does this not assume automatically a stance that LGBT+ students are equal in these areas?

Maddie suggested rather than re-affirms the stance use “adopts the stance”, as she was not sure if Guild Council had previously taken this stance. Reece was unable to confirm, and accepted the amendment.

The motion was amended:

That Guild Council:

- a. Adopts a stance on social, economic, and educational equality for LGBT+ students.
- b. Opposes the plebiscite on marriage equality proposed by the Federal Government.
- c. Recognises that the proposed plebiscite will delay the legalisation of marriage equality.
- d. Supports the legalisation of full marriage equality in all Australian states and territories.

Moved: Reece Gherardi, Seconded: Ellen Cohen [Fraser Windsor]

Reece continued. Part b) he said the reason for this is because state government have the power to do this. The majority of Australians already support same sex marriage. A plebiscite is effectively pointless, even if it is found that the majority of Australians are for same sex marriage it will still fall on the government to make a decision. An important thing to note is voting in plebiscites is not compulsory so it can be politically motivated, this can tend to skew the statistics. A big point he’s questioning is the point of the plebiscite. Part c), at the earliest it could delay marriage equality until 2020.

Ellen added that basically we’re here to discuss an issue, on which we don’t have a stance as Guild Council. We might be the only state in Australia that doesn’t even have civil unions. In regards to the plebiscite, it seems to be a stalling tactic to portray the current government as equality seeking without actually having to take any action, this is because plebiscites are not legally binding and do not require the government to act on them. She finished off by saying that she’s a lesbian and she would like to get married some day and it would be nice know that her Guild supported her rights as it should be.

Jack asked how important this is for the Queer Department?

Reece said, it has been brought up in their discussions and people are against it. The motion is not his personal agenda but a view of their whole department.

Ben said it wouldn't be Guild Council without him saying he will be abstaining from the motion because he doesn't believe it should be on the agenda. We shouldn't be making decisions debating Federal government policy. He is sympathetic to the remarks and what Reece said, but he'll have to draw the same line he's drawn which is that motions of this nature should not be on the agenda. This is the reason he is abstaining from it.

Charlie disagreed with Ben, in that it is relevant for students. Noting that young people are some of the most vocal supporters for marriage equality. He also thinks it wouldn't be out of place for the Guild to come out calling for legalisation for marriage equality. The marriage equality movement Australia has over 850 corporate organisations including, the AFL, Commonwealth Bank, MasterCard, McDonalds, Kmart to name a few. He thinks it's ridiculous to suggest that it isn't within our place to support this and he knows it means a lot to many students so it is entirely relevant.

Jack can understand the logic Ben had for last month's motion, but for this one there is a department saying that its members care enough about something to bring it to Guild Council. It is a very clear link between we have a department to represent those views on campus and we value them, and we want them to sit at our Guild Council. It would be a strange thing to say we want their voice on Guild Council but we don't want them to push the things that their members care about. So that's why he'll be voting in favour of the motion.

Reece had his right of reply. He thanked Charlie and Jack for their support. He asked if Ben if he would vote on this motion based on the fact that it affects students quite a bit and that there are LGBT+ students on campus. Research shows the negative effects on LGBT+ in countries where same sex marriage was voted down, so he is concerned over the welfare of students if this is put forth.

The motion was put. **Passed as amended.**

For: Maddie Mulholland, Tom Burke, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Peter Derbyshire, Lucy Moyle, Jack Looby, Megan Lee, Brad Forbes, Jess Porter-Langson, Jesse Martino, Tyson McEwan, Kenneth Foo, Joanne Lim, Hannah Matthews, Raychard Wong, Laura Mwiragua.

Against: None

Abstain: Stefan Raovic, Ben Martin, Steph Munro.

11.3 That Guild Council requests the Strategic Resources Committee review the NUS West room, noting in particular:

- **The current use of the room by the branch and the general student body;**
- **The compliance of the NUS West branch with appropriate tenancy policies;**
- **The viability of a NUS West room moving forward as a part of the Masterplan project;**
- **Potential alternative uses for the room.**

This review should be circulated to Guild Council as soon as possible.

Moved: Stephanie Munro; Seconded: Ben Martin

Steph said the motion itself is quite self-explanatory. As a number of you know having done the Tour of Cameron Hall, the space that we have is very limited. From what she's aware of the use of the NUS is infrequent and she believes the space itself should be reconsidered and reviewed, so it can be reallocated to a group who will use this space.

Maddie proposed an amendment. SRC have resolved to look at the spaces around campus and one of the rooms was the NUS West Room. She suggested, to amend the motion that “Guild Council notes the SRC will review the NUS West room, noting in particular (the list) As part of the ongoing review”.

Steph was amendable.

The motion was amended:

That Guild Council notes the Strategic Resources Committee will review the NUS West room, noting in particular:

- The current use of the room by the branch and the general student body;
- The compliance of the NUS West branch with appropriate tenancy policies;
- The viability of a NUS West room moving forward as a part of the Masterplan project;
- Potential alternative uses for the room.

As part of the ongoing review.

Moved: Stephanie Munro; Seconded: Ben Martin

The motion was put. **Passed as amended.**

For: Maddie Mulholland, Tom Burke, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Peter Derbyshire, Lucy Moyle, Jack Looby, Ben Martin, Brad Forbes, Jess Porter-Langson, Jesse Martino, Steph Munro, Tyson McEwan, Kenneth Foo, Joanne Lim, Hannah Matthews, Raychard Wong, Stefan Raovic.

Against: None.

Abstain: Laura Mwiragua, Megan Lee.

11.4 That Guild Council:

- approves a further \$60,000 to be invested in the capital expenditure for the Reid Café Development, to be taken from the existing budget for café capital expenditure; and**
- authorises the Strategic Resources Committee to consider the capital requirements for each café to identify where the \$60,000 can be sourced; where**
- the University provide the Guild with a written assurance that the Guild will not be removed from the café for at least 3 years.**

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Tom Burke

Maddie reminded Council that at the last meeting we approved \$50,000 to be invested into the Reid Café development as a gesture of good will to the University because they are running over budget. The day after the last meeting, they came back to us saying they wanted to cut the display bench space unless we invest a further \$60,000. Tony and Maddie have had a think about this and if it was worth the investment. They came to the decision that it is worthwhile to have a café that is adequate to cater to student’s needs. However, they didn’t feel comfortable coming back to council to ask for another \$60,000, so what is being proposed is that SRC consider what other projects that were budgeted for this year can the money be taken from and re-allocate the funding to this project. If we are making such a significant investment, we would like more re-assurance of the space.

Discussion went in camera.

The motion was amended:

That Guild Council:

- (a) authorises the Strategic Resources Committee to consider the capital requirements for each café to identify where \$60,000 from the capital budget could be sourced; and
 - (b) approves a further \$60,000, where found, to be diverted to the capital expenditure for the Reid Café Development;
- and that the University provide the Guild with a written assurance that the Guild will have a lease for at least 5 years with further options to renew.

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Tom Burke

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

11.5 That Guild Council accepts the 2015 Deloitte Audit.

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Tom Burke

Maddie and Tom deferred answering any questions if any, to Mutya and Tony.

Lucy asked if Mutya could simplistically explain what a clean audit was?

Mutya responded. There are different types of opinions; firstly, there's a "Clean opinion" which means they haven't found anything that is materially misstated. A "Qualified opinion", when there's something significant found and that material significance has caused an effect on your financial statements.

The motion was put. **Passed Unanimously**

11.6 That Guild Council approves the attached Albany Student Association Rules.

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Lucy Moyle

Maddie said the rules were created based on a number of current regulations we have, that have been looked at by the Albany staff and students, and Governance Committee. They seem to look like what Albany need because they currently have none.

Lucy moved a motion to defer the Chair to Charlie. Motion carried.

Lucy added, that this was done fast within late notice. Essentially the way the committee is running at the moment requires solid guidelines. Albany will also become a Guild department in the review of the regulations. Doing this just ensures consistency between departments.

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

Charlie moved a motion to pass the Chair back to Lucy. Motion carried.

11.7 That Guild Council:

- (a) will not provide commercial data or financial information to the Commercial Masterplan consultants without the motion passed 27 January 2016 being fulfilled; however**
- (b) will provide the consultants with the Guild's aspirations for UWA commercial activity.**

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Charlie Viska

Maddie withdrew the motion because it was discussed in 12.3.

Motion Withdrawn

11.8 The UWA Guild Council

- a) Recognises that the decision of the Adelaide University Union Board to no longer make its affiliation payments to the National Union of Students will have a crippling effect on the Unions financial capacity to operate; and**
- b) Ceases and does not authorise any further payments to the National Union of Students.**
Moved: Ben Martin; Seconded: Steph Munro

Ben stated that “he wanted to draw to the Council’s attention the recent decision of the Adelaide University Union’s board, a decision which sees them refusing to make any further payments the National Union of Students. The AU was a significant contributor in affiliation fees to the National Union of Students and as such, their refusal to make payments places further pressure on an organisation infamous for its ongoing financial turmoil, despite compulsory student unionism or SSAF payments. The refusal of AU to make payments to the NUS has changed the situation for all other affiliated student unions, and it’s vital that the Guild takes this time to adequately reflect on its position as a member of the union. The removal of Adelaide Uni drops the number of affiliated bodies down to just 16 out of 44 Australian universities or just 36%. Not only this but considering the university’s status as a Group of 8 Uni, it decreases the representation of the organisation to only 3 states plus Canberra amongst the Go8. Previously he has sat in this room and made arguments with respect to the organisations heavy militant tactics, criticised the NUS for disgracing the term “organisation” and challenged the transparency and accountability of the student peak representative. These aren’t the arguments he’s using to convince council.

This debate centres around the financial responsibility that we as councillors and student representatives have been entrusted with. You can no longer argue that it is still viable to devote student funds to this organisation without a key contributor such as AUU. His concern is that UWA will be forced to devote further funds in response to AUU withdrawing and doesn’t believe that is neither our responsibility, nor within our realm of capability.

28 other student unions have seen fit to withdraw from the organisation and there will be more. The NUS is on a slowly sinking ship and so we have two options. Either continue to make payments of \$20,000 per year to the NUS for however many years the organisation continues to limp on until it finally collapses, or we can cease payments now and redirect the huge amounts of savings into areas of need- for example when just approved for the SRC to search for \$60,00 in the budget to fund the cafe capital expenditure. The organisation has an increasingly diminished representation function- 36% of universities- Why do we continue to fund and sustain an unrepresentative and barely national body, which is so clearly on its last legs, when there are areas at home where the finances can be better used. This is a motion about stabilising the future of UWA, money thrown at the NUS is allowing it to simply get by- not to adequately function as a peak representative body. So with the AUU’s decision, it shifts the onus of responsibility ever more into UWA’s hands, something that we can’t allow to get in the way of our own financial requirements and we have the responsibility as elected councillors, to make the best decision with student funds, a decision he doesn’t believe is best

made by handing money to a body which is on its last legs.” Ben requested his transcript be minuted.

Reece asked about the wording of part B. He asked if it was all payments or increasing our payments because Adelaide Uni dropping out?

Ben was happy to drop the word “further”.

The motion was amended.

The UWA Guild Council

- a) Recognises that the decision of the Adelaide University Union Board to no longer make its affiliation payments to the National Union of Students will have a crippling effect on the Unions financial capacity to operate; and
- b) Ceases and does not authorise any payments to the National Union of Students.

Moved: Ben Martin; Seconded: Steph Munro

Hannah inquired into whether anyone had any documents with the NUS budget?

Ben mentioned that he had documents from people over east, and they are very alarming numbers in considering that from the numbers he has seen, where the bottom margin has been cut by a very significant amount.

Guild Council noted that no financial documents were available on the NUS website to confirm Ben’s claim.

The motion was put to debate.

Jack thought this motion doesn’t hold up because it doesn’t show that the loss of Adelaide University has a crippling blow on NUS and that therefore it is on its death nails. If Ben wanted to make that case, he thinks they would need to be a very clear budget amount and some sort of evidence to back up that claim.

Laura added she says this motion is founded on a weak foundation, saying the absence of one university signifies the collapse of a massive student organisation.

Jesse said firstly, we need to recognise the discrepancy between affiliation and accreditation fees, which means the motion is redundant because most universities in Australia are affiliated. It’s the accreditation fee that is paid to have services provided to us as a result of paying that fee, so it’s an accreditation fee we are arguing and not an affiliation fee. Moving onto the specific monetary values, Adelaide payed a total of \$14,625 altogether, overall the payment is \$9,000 for affiliation fees. This number is small in comparison to the fee we pay which is \$22,000, and that doesn’t cripple NUS. He also wanted to acknowledge that NUS ended on a surplus of \$107,000 according to the National Executive Minutes from July 2015, on the NUS website. Lastly, during the 2014 national conference a significant amount of policies were passed to increase and improve the physical amounts of responsibility and budget responsibility of the Union and that was carried through last year, which was the reason NUS ended up on a

surplus. He also noted the \$22,000 we pay is only 2% of our annual output which is insignificant in comparison to the other services we provide.

Maddie said, if Ben's figures were correct and we had any kind of solid understanding of these financial figures, what it would indicate is that we need to discuss this with NUS, not move to automatic dis-accreditation. But it doesn't look like we have concern with any of the figures discussed, as we are unable to confirm or deny their accuracy.

Charlie noted that the President of the Student Representative Council of Adelaide Uni is not supportive of this decision, as he sees value in maintaining affiliation. It's not due to value but internal politics within that campus. Additionally, he doesn't follow the logic of pulling out our funds "before it goes to turmoil" when it meets our KPI's.

Jack said the only time he would think for us to withdraw our funds is if NUS was actually on its death nails and going bankrupt, which is the only criteria he thinks this motion would be appropriate.

Ben had his right of reply. Looking at the numbers he has, NUS are in more debt. If you are going to look at two different numbers, the ones he has and the one's Jesse has that just again pinpoints the fact that there's transparency concerns in this organisation. The argument he is using, is that with the Adelaide University's decision, it does have a major impact on the bottom line and the organisation. As he mentioned before, this organisation has a history of financial turmoil and struggling to make ends meet. With this critical blow, he would like to see the UWA Guild make a decision on this and withdrawal its affiliation or accreditation fees. Make no further payments to the NUS, back out while we can and save our funds so they can be re-allocated to other areas, where they are required.

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

For: Ben Martin, Steph Munro.

Against: Maddie Mulholland, Michael Kabondo, Charlie Viska, Peter Derbyshire, Lucy Moyle, Jack Looby, Megan Lee, Jesse Martino, Tyson McEwan, Kenneth Foo, Joanne Lim, Hannah Matthews, Laura Mwiragua.

Abstain: Stefan Raovic, Brad Forbes, Jess Porter-Langson.

11.9 That Guild Council approves the attached Tenancy Allocation Policy as prepared by the Tenancy Committee and approved by the Governance Committee.

Moved: Jesse Martino; Seconded: Jack Looby.

Jesse said due to time constraints the policy hasn't yet been approved so he would like it deferred until next meeting.

Motion was put to defer the motion. **Motion carried.**

Motion Deferred.

11.10 "That Guild Council approves and consents to the incorporation of the Australasian Intersity Debating Championships club"

Moved: Jack Looby; Seconded: Michael Kabondo [Emily Law]

Michael seconded the motion in the absence of Emily.

Jack stated the motion is here because essentially it's not clear whether this is an incorporated club that's affiliating or incorporating and that is covered by two different sections in the Guild regulations. Governance committee have accepted the constitution of the incorporating club, but with Guild Regulations Council needs to consent.

Lucy asked, whether we are approving the constitution or whether it's incorporating?

Jack said Guild Council just needs to consent and not approve the constitution.

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

11.11 That Guild Council:

- a) recognises the University Senate's approval of the Renewal Project;**
- b) will not run any protests on the Renewal Project;**
- c) Recognises the NTEU's right to protest; and**
- d) will seek to engage with the University and Faculties to promote the student experience and student education as the key concerns in the Renewal Project.**

Moved: Maddie Mulholland; Seconded: Peter Derbyshire

Guild Council discussed the Renewal Project in General Business item 12.1.

Council commenced with discussion on the wording of the motion.

Maddie said this motion doesn't override students engaging with the NTEU, but it does indicate a change in stance.

Maddie said the motion could wait, but she's concerned that there will be more protests run between now and next Council meeting and there is urgency to discussing the motion now.

A procedural motion was moved that this motion be considered. Motion carried.

Lucy limited speaking time to two minutes.

Maddie asked if we want to consider the NTEU and how we should engage, and if changes happen in ALVA, do we want to have leeway to respond or should we defer that decision to the Education Council, EAN or Guild Council?

Hannah is concerned about deciding to not run protests because Emma and Lina aren't here.

Maddie said we have never run protests, only supported the NTEU's protest.

Hannah said we want the ability to run protests if we need to.
Reece suggested adding in support for the NTEU protests.

Jack and Peter suggested "we respect the right of the NTEU to protest".

Stefan asked why you wouldn't run a protest if you support it?

Jack suggested the wording “we will not endorse protests”?

Lucy said that seems to be worse – we still want to be able to endorse protests.

Ben said if we are changing the stance, it should be against or for protests.

Charlie said we want to have the freedom to run protests.

Maddie said if things continue as they are, she doesn't support student protests because they are not the best way to have input. If we are supportive generally of student-run protests, the water gets muddy. She has already been questioned by members of the University about the Guild's involvement in protests and questioning whether they should be engaging in discussions with students. She approves of our right to protest when we need to, but here she doesn't want us to get locked out of the process because of protests that the Guild didn't run and didn't support.

Peter suggested that further protests would have to be approved by Guild Council.

Jack said that exists, because EAN send protests to Guild Council anyway.

Hannah said we can communicate to students that at this stage we have run or endorsed any student protests.

Charlie suggested “the Guild Council is not affiliated with the UWA Uncut campaign”.

Jesse said that is only one group – there may be other groups.

Maddie said if things change, we may want to work with UWA Uncut if that will be the most powerful way to oppose a certain issue that might crop up.

Council discussed a loose phrase that would allow future protests, and resolved not to add it.

Jack asked if we want to include something about transparency?

Maddie said (d) is about as much input as we will be allowed because we have been repeatedly told this is a staff process not a student process. If we are involved it's not because we have a right to be involved, it's because we've pushed for it.

Hannah said we have supported one of the UWA Uncut protests – the EAN logo was on it.

Lucy sought approval for the wording of the motion?

Ben said he didn't support us supporting the NTEU's protest.

Maddie asked if Guild Council will be supportive of Guild Executive making interim stances for protests?

Megan said it could be done by or in consultation with the Education Council Executive.

Jack asked if we're taking power away from EAN? It doesn't make sense to create a separate group.

Hannah and Megan said if it is Guild Executive and Emma it allows for a quicker response.

Ben said he would like to return to the first motion. He doesn't support a "working party" to respond to protests.

Jack said we don't want to say we don't have faith in the Education Council Committee. Guild Council should approve it.

Ben asked if we are supporting the Renewal Project?

Peter said we aren't supporting it, we are noting it.

Megan said she doesn't support it as there are still significant concerns around where ALVA will be placed in the new structure, and we may want to be able to respond to that with a protest.

Maddie asked if Council would like to give the power to the Education Council Committee?

Lucy said no, Guild Council is the representative body for all students.

Maddie said the Renewal Project is heavily education focused, but not purely education. But EAN is a huge part of it. Guild Executive have the power to take an interim stance and have it endorsed by Council retrospectively at the next meeting.

It was decided to stay with the original motion, and to add respecting the NTEU's right to protest. The motion was put as:

That Guild Council:

- e) recognises the University Senate's approval of the Renewal Project;
- f) will not run any protests on the Renewal Project;
- g) Recognises the NTEU's right to protest; and
- h) will seek to engage with the University and Faculties to promote the student experience and student education as the key concerns in the Renewal Project.

Megan asked if another group wanted to run a protest, should we support those? Will this allow us to recognize other protests?

Maddie said if anything further was the happen, Guild Executive can consider the stance. The motion isn't limiting us to only supporting the NTEU.

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

For: Stefan Raovic, Brad Forbes, Maddie Mulholland, Michael Kabondo, Jess Porter-Langson Peter Derbyshire, Jack Looby, Tyson McEwan, Kenneth Foo, Joanne Lim.

Against: Charlie Viska, Hannah Matthews.

Abstain: Jesse Martino, Lucy Moyle, Ben Martin, Steph Munro, Megan Lee.

12.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

12.1 Renewal Project.

Maddie wanted to discuss the status of the Renewal Project, with the outcome being for us to see if we are happy with the stance we currently have or if we want to have a new stance. Our discussion so far has only been leading up to the decision. The decision has now gone to the Senate, and the University is going along with something along the line of the original proposal. The changes are that the faculties will be called "Faculties" instead of "Colleges", there will be four of them, and the working group will now be considering which schools and faculties will be grouped in each of these four Faculties. The next step after that is to consider the methodology for academic and professional redundancy.

Peter said that this methodology is already being developed in the Science faculty.

Maddie referred to the motion passed by Guild Council on 16 December 2015. There are sections that are not event specific and remain relevant. She is aware the NTEU continue with actions.

We now need to consider our engagement with the process moving forward. She thinks it's beneficial for us to have a certain level of productive engagement where we try and push what students want onto the decision making. She noted that the Guild has never run our own student protests, however other student groups have run protests and have tried to speak on behalf of the Guild. Maddie reiterated that she, following the policy stance set by Guild Council, is the only spokesperson of the Guild. The easiest thing would be for us to continue with the current stance we have, unless anyone has any strong feelings to sway from that. Through the EAN we would continue to let students know about the NTEU protests, and continue to inform students on the progress.

Peter said, he thinks not going on as we are now is better, because most of his push during the renewal proposal was asking why four faculties, and seeking the information he was ultimately provided with in Senate. Although he can't disclose the information, it was enough to convince him that four faculties isn't a bad thing. It also convinced him that this university can be bad at managing performance of staff. If this is done properly, and this is where students need to be involved, it can free up extra capital to invest in important things. Done properly, this can be a good thing.

Jack asked if there is a rationale for four?

Maddie and Peter said yes they have seen the financial rationale, and the university have tested different numbers with four being the best option.

Maddie said she is aware students are upset by this and want to express their concerns, which should be balanced with the opportunities of the renewal.

Megan said four faculties will decimate architecture - moving architecture to Arts will devalue that degree. We already have students leaving UWA to other universities because the major 'Integrated Design' is not good. Changing the faculty will not fix the degree, and will instead devalue the degree around the world. The Renewal Project will be a disaster here, instead the university should consider reviewing the double major.

Maddie said this may be better discussed under the Review of Courses.

Peter said that the administration will see a difference, but the university have said the outward facing parts of the universities would still be the schools. Most students don't identify with their faculty, it is with their school or their major.

Maddie said this discussion is something she and Peter are privy to, and they have said the university needs to share the information they are privy to with students. She said there is a significant information gap.

Megan said this is important in architecture, because the degree has already decreased in quality. If the university is going to make a decision, it now needs to be more transparent about what's going to happen.

Maddie said we want more certainty but at the moment they don't even have a decision. It's not a case of transparency, it's a case of communication that there is nothing to consider yet.

Lucy said it seems the new document that was released is not different from the original one that was released, so for most of us it is difficult for us to change our stance as we aren't privy to the information Maddie and Peter know. She is hesitant to adopt a new position.

Maddie said the new information comprises financials that support a four faculty system, and discussions around the Functional Review and issues they have with efficiency, as broad language, that will be addressed by this process without it really digging into what we are scared of which is losing good lecturers and researchers.

Jack said the thing that has changed is that this process is locked in, and will be happening regardless of if we declare war on the uni. There is enough information for us to pivot from condemning the university to wanting to ensure there are good outcomes for students. It is appropriate for us to ask for more transparency, want to promote student outcomes, and to respect the NTEU but recognise our aims are now unaligned.

Peter said 200 staff members are professional and will get a redundancy based on streamlining services.

Jack said there are Senate reps to give us guidance on things that are happening in the university, and it is worth taking the advice of the people who have seen the documents.

Hannah said a reason for reviewing the Guild's stance is because groups at Education Council have requested a review of the stance. Their faculties think the Guild were endorsing UWA Uncut or were behind those protests. With a pivoted stance we aren't. Students want to see clarification.

Jack asked whether that means moving a motion?

Maddie said if we want to adopt a new stance, a motion is how we would do that.

There was general consensus to discuss a motion. Motion 11.11 was put.

12.2 Review of Courses.

Maddie said we are now at the point where the review is more or less complete, but there is room for feedback and it still needs to go to Academic Board for approval. So she wanted to bring it here and invite anybody who has feedback to engage in the discussion.

Steph:

- She echoed the concerns of the review about student experience and quality of teaching were not consulted.
- The ATAR cut-offs were interesting.
- She's really glad there looking at prerequisites.
- Hopes that they will embark on improving the CARS online module, because it's pretty shocking.
- A few mixed reviews on the mathematics content.
- Specialisation is so late.
- The lack of connection between undergrad and postgrad.
- Introducing specific industry specific software.

Jack:

- Recommendation 12 is very applicable to ALVA
- He's worried about recommendation 13, he thinks this could be used to justify getting rid of units such as gender studies.
- Recommendation 15 is quite interesting; it could be news to argue for smaller tutorial sizes.
- Recommendation 17, he was a bit confused by.
- Accommodation 7 is quite gratifying.
- He has a couple of concerns about changing the ATAR Requirements. Transfer of degrees could be interesting or taking up a second major.

Meg:

- Recommendation 12, should be further on in their further recommendations.
- Resending the Bachelor of design and moving into Arts as a double major into arts will fix the issues, when really the issue's the integrated design major. They should be reviewing the majors available in the Bachelor of design and streamlining them.

If there are further concerns, please send them through to Maddie.

12.3 Commercial Masterplan -Aspirations.

Discussion was moved to go in Camera. Carried.

12.4 Cameron Hall / 2nd Floor Central Wing

Following the tour of Cameron Hall and the Central wing 2nd floor held before the Council

meeting, Jesse asked if members of Guild Council had ideas and feedback on Cameron Hall.

Jack said, personally he'd like to see a bit of Cameron Hall branding and also extend this to the second floor. Having a big sign at the entrance and improving the stairs could make it more of a welcoming space.

Jesse gave the timeline of the CapEx proposal. The proposal should be finalised by April 28th which is the next Tenancy general meeting. The tenant clubs have sent their priorities for the spaces in terms, the purpose of the tour this afternoon was for councillors to see the spaces and also come up with some suggestions for improvements and maintenance. There are some suggestions in his reports, if there are any further ones please email him.

Emily thanked Jesse for the tour and added, we didn't get to meet some club executive members but they sent her information that she would relay for them. Two main groups brought up some issues.

Group 1:

1. The use of rooms;

They caught a few clubs breaking university by-laws and they called Security and there was no follow up.

Maddie noted that Security don't always notify the Guild when incidents are reported, so if the clubs report something to them, please ask them report it to the Guild as well.

2. Large events mean drunk people wonder through especially Leisure and Science Union.

3. The UDS, Science Union, Leisure rooms are only open around events.

Group 2: (Catholic Society)

1. Leisure lock the door from the inside sometimes so they can't get through to get to their room.

2. Leisure's room is always messy which means the Catholic Society cannot be competent to bring new members, especially freshers into their common room.

3. Recently there was disgusting material found on the white board.

4. Leisure's blatant disregard for no Alcohol on Campus.

5. In the past the odour in the room was overpowering.

Maddie asked if they have reported this to Jesse and Jack?

Emily said that they did.

Jesse responded. Firstly, the President of the Catholic Society President made a formal complaint against Leisure to him, which is the proper process. In that formal complaint he put forward three allegations and those were dealt with by the Tenancy Executive. We came to a conclusion of which allegations were proved and not proved. The ones that were proved were, alcohol in the room and inappropriate things on the wall and someone sleeping in the room. The fourth allegation which was someone breaking in through the door was said to be not proved because it was not in the Security report. So we met with Leisure and discussed all of the things and we came to the discussion that a number of allegations were proved and gave

them a formal warning. That is all we can do at this point because we don't have a mandated method of dealing with this, but we made it very clear that this is a formal warning and if anything else happens we will be taking this very seriously.

13.0 CLOSE / NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 27th April 2016 at 6.00pm. Please contact the Guild Secretary (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.

