



1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

- 1.1 Attendance: Megan Lee, James Leipold, Yerim Won, Conrad Hogg, Joseph Chan, Roshni Kaila, Basundhara Dutta, Molly Goldacre, Peter Watson, Adhish Kastha, Jacob Fowler, Raaghav Raj, Nevin Jayawardena, Kate Fletcher, Yanjia Song, Kristel Li, Ben Perry, Jacob Colangelo, Su Sugandha, Bradan Sonnendecker, Suchi Kaila, Dylan Perkins, Fraser Windsor, Brianne Yarran, Charlotte Pennell.
- 1.2 Apologies: Pheobe Ho and Desiree Tan.
- 1.3 Proxies: None.
- 1.4 Observers: Joshua Cahill, Sophie Minissale, and Cormac Power.
- 1.5 Absent: Jade Mawby and Ivan Roncevich.

2.0 DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest.

3.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

September Guild Council Meeting Minutes confirmed.

4.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

5.0 APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

- 5.1 Catering and Tavern
- 5.2 Equity & Diversity
- 5.3 Governance
- 5.4 Volunteering & Community Engagement
- 5.5 Workplace Health & Safety
- 5.6 Corporate Services

Committee Minutes approved.



6.0 DIRECTOR'S RERPORT

6.1 Managing Director's Report
As tabled.

6.2 Finance Director's Report
Mutya says that for the month of September there was an accounting loss of \$14000 opposed to a budgeting income of \$6000. Mutya says that most of this is attributed to the SSAF difference but that has been revised and the budget has since been changed.

Mutya says that the property income is lower than what has been budgeted due to the changes in the Co-Op bookshop. Mutya says the Catering property has made a loss of \$9000 as opposed to a budgeted income of \$5000. Mutya explains that when this budget was completed, they believed that the Refectory would be functioning by now. Mutya says this is why a loss was made.

Mutya says that the Guild has already started the depreciation for the Ref and for the Secondhand Bookshop there has been a loss, but performed better than what was budgeted. Mutya says that the Tavern has come in with an income of \$30000 opposed to a budget of \$5000.

Mutya says that most of the expenses are on budget.

6.3 Associate Director of Commercial's Report
As tabled.

6.4 Associate Director of Student Services' Report
As tabled.



DIRECTOR'S REPORTS ACCEPTED.

7.0 CIRCULAR MOTION PREVIOUSLY PASSED BY COUNCIL

- 7.1 The 105th Guild Council approve the attached changes to the Albany Student Association Rules.
Moved: Ben Perry; Seconded: Molly Goldacre

8.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE (OPERATIONS)

- 8.1 The 105th Guild Council accepts the Terms of Reference for the Young Leaders Council as approved by the Governance Committee.
Moved: Nevin Jayawardena; Seconded: Molly Goldacre.

Molly moves the Chair to Megan for this motion.

Nevin says that the Terms of References were passed last year, and there are a few minor changes after discussion with Future Student Services. Nevin says that the YLC is a collection of head prefects that have opted in to be part of the Council for networking and idea sharing purposes. Nevin says to promote what the Guild is all about to these high school students and to get feedback on the strategic priorities of the Guild.

Molly says that these Terms of Reference had been accepted by the previous Guild Council, and have been accepted by the Governance Committee with one minor amendment. Molly says this was in regards to the terms of the functioning by the Council but nothing in terms of the composition, or how the YLC will work with the schools.

Bradán moves a procedural motion to move this to the next Guild Council. *MOTION FAILS.*



Bradan says he has a couple of things he would like to ask about and if the movers of the motion could answer these concerns. Bradan asks why specifically this is talking about Head Boys and Head Girls? Bradan feels that this could lead the perception of elitism that the invitation is only being extended to the head prefects. Bradan feels that at it's core this is a good idea, as it is promoting UWA and the Guild to high school students and the community in an effort to try and get them to attend university here instead of other tertiary institutions. Bradan suggests that the invitation could be extended to other leaders within the high schools.

Nevin says that Future Student Services already offers leadership development courses to all high school students, by offering the chance to go out to high schools and run leadership workshops or having a leadership conference. Nevin says that this program is only being offered to head prefects because the Guild is limited in capability and it would not be wise to create a council where absolutely anyone could attend. Nevin said the priority was getting as many schools as possible involved and that is why only the head prefects are targeted. Nevin says if it were open to anyone within the schools, a cap would need to be set of how many people can attend which would mean that fewer schools would be able to participate.

Jacob F asks if it the YLC will be asking schools for specifically their head prefects, or for two leaders? Jacob F says allowing for the option of letting other high school leaders are available if say the head prefects are busy or just to allow other students a go.

Nevin says some schools don't have a head prefect, so the email out to these schools would be asking for two leaders to come and sit on the Council to participate. Nevin says that this would preferably be the Head boy and Head girl so that the



leadership skills they learn can be relayed back to the rest of the council. Nevin says if the head prefect isn't willing and able they can nominate someone else.

Bradán asks what is the benefit of the YLC being a subsidiary body, and what is its point of differentiation from other leadership programs as a committee instead of a conference? Nevin says that he wants to ingrain the culture that this is something that will be happening all year, and the idea of a conference that will be happening once off. Nevin says a Council will encourage the idea that there will be 3 or 4 different meetings throughout year, encouraging idea sharing and networking.

Molly says that we have to remind ourselves that high school students may not want to provide feedback to university students as they may not feel comfortable straight away. Molly says that overtime they will be more comfortable to be involved, and a one off calendar event won't maintain open dialogue.

Bradán says that he just wanted to acknowledge that at a previous Guild Council meeting where this was discussed there were concerns raised about the political implications of Guild tickets using this YLC as an opportunity to recruit future guild councillor candidates. Bradán was wondering if anything had been done to address these concerns?

Nevin says that this is essentially the same Terms of Reference that were passed last year, and it will come down to a situation like the Guild Discipline committee where the YLC committee will be a bipartisan committee. Nevin says everyone will have the opportunity to engage with the committee. Nevin says the scope and primary aims of the YLC will be to promote UWA and the role of the Guild. Nevin hopes that members of the YLC will be involved for the right reasons.



For: Megan Lee, James Leipold, Yerim Won, Conrad Hogg, Joseph Chan, Roshni Kaila, Pheobe Ho, Basundhara Dutta, Molly Goldacre, Peter Watson, Adhish Kastha, Jacob Fowler, Raaghav Raj, Nevin Jayawardena, Kate Fletcher, Ben Perry, Yanjia Song, Kristel Li.

Against: None

Abstaining: Bradan Sonnendecker, Jacob Colangelo, Jim Leipold.

MOTION PASSED.

Megan moves the Chair back to Molly.

- 8.2 The 105th Guild Council appoints Jim Leipold and Megan Lee as the 2019 PROSH Directors.

Moved: Conrad Hogg; Seconded: Su Sugandha

Conrad says the regulations dictate that Guild Council must appoint the PROSH Directors. Conrad says a panel was put together which had himself as President-elect, Su Sugandha, Lana as the Volunteering Manager, Jenny as the HR manager and Danielle as a the engagement manager and James Royer as a current PROSH director. Conrad says that there were three applications, and after a lot of consideration it was decided that Megan and Jim would be the best team for PROSH in 2019.

Su has nothing further to add.

Ben asks what the process is for selecting the PROSH Directors?

Conrad says that all candidates write an application centred around their understanding of PROSH, what direction that they



want to take it and their resume. Lana puts together a series of questions for the candidates about how they would run PROSH. Conrad says that in consideration of the applications and the resumes the candidates are selected.

Jacob C says there are normally about five or so questions which discuss how you act in a team and what your goals and plans for PROSH are. Jacob C says that as a Director you need to be effective with event management and being a team leader. Jacob C says that the Director is running a team six individuals who create PROSH. Jacob C says that it is a HR job and in the past editors and directors are selected at the same time, but because Jacob C and James Royer pushed for Editors to be appointed later. Jacob C says this was because Directors might want to be involved in the Editor selection process, or want to be an editor themselves. Jacob C says it is a long process which looks at things such as how you cope with stress, how you deal with time pressure as it is trying to gauge how you will perform in the month leading up to PROSH.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

- 8.3 The 105th Guild Council approves the attached International Students Department Rules.

Moved: Su Sugandha; Seconded: Suchi Kaila

Su says that the department rules constitutes a couple of key changes such as the name being changed, from ISS to ISD. Su says that the main reason behind this was that a lot of students would confuse ISS and Student Services rather than a department of the Guild. Su says that the MCW would be moved out and become independent and be ran similar to Relay for Life and PROSH operate. Su says the third major change would be creating an Education and Welfare Director as separate roles. Su says there have been some changes to the



executive directors and there is now a General Secretary. Su says that these rules have been approved at the SGM and AGM.

Megan says that these rules have been approved at a General Meeting of the Department, and therefore should be approved by Guild Council.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

8.4 The 105th Guild Council:

- a) Amends CAPA KPI to read: 'That the Audited Financial statements of CAPA are distributed in line with all auditing and reporting legislation and provides the 2016 and 2017 Audited Financial Statements to the Guild Council for consideration.
- b) Accepts the KPI report and affiliated for the recommended amount of \$8000

Moved: Megan Lee; Seconded: Ben Perry.

Megan says these KPIs are similar to the NUS KPIs, and obviously the same issue arises with posting minutes and audited accounts online and making them publicly available. Megan says that it is all legally above board, and that the precedent set with the NUS KPIs should be followed with CAPA KPIs.

Ben says that there isn't anything really to add, and that it is important external organisations are earning the money that the Guild provides them with.

FOR: Megan Lee, James Leipold, Yerim Won, Conrad Hogg, Joseph Chan, Roshni Kaila, Pheobe Ho, Basundhara Dutta, Molly Goldacre, Adhish Kastha, Jacob Fowler, Raaghav Raj, Nevin



Jayawardena, Kate Fletcher, Ben Perry, Yanjia Song, Bradan Sonnendecker, Jim Leipold, Jacob Colangelo, Kristel Li.

AGAINST: None.

ABSTAINING: Peter Watson.

MOTION PASSES.

9.0 REPORTS

9.1 President

Megan says that in regards to campus management, all of the ovals lights went on for few weeks but have now been turned off apparently due to the creation of more dark spots. Megan says that this isn't really an issue so she will be reopening discussions with Campus Management so that the lights are put back on. Megan says that the creation of dark shadows aren't an issue going down the main thoroughfare due to the multiple ovals, so this is something she will be negotiating about.

Megan says that the 2030 strategy has been presented to Senate and will be finalised at the December Senate Meeting.

Megan says that at Academic Board, the Freedom of Expression Working Group has been created as an intensive process for about five months. Megan has nominated Conrad to be on the committee.

Megan says that the three changes for Guild Regulations have come into action as passed by Guild Council and since then the OGM. Megan says she is working with Molly for the rest of the



General Regulations. Megan says these changes will be completed in accordance with the wider regulation changes of the university.

Megan says that she is in the handover process with Conrad.

Megan says that the Guild Statute Book has been updated and that the Save our Semesters campaign has had over 2000 responses. Megan says that planning for orientation is happening and has been based off some of the work of Bradan and Jacob F. Megan says that there is a new body that has been constituted by Chris Massey in regards to orientation. Megan is confident that this should translate into better outcomes for incoming students. Megan has gotten preliminary approval from the university to have alcohol at ODay and are in the final process of getting this confirmed with the Deputy Vice Chancellor of Education.

As tabled.

9.2 Vice President

Su says the Su Superstar for the month is Yerim Won. Su says that SOC has gone through a lot of changes such as the Treasury and Yerim has worked very hard with Jim.

9.3 Treasurer

Jim attended most meetings.

9.4 Secretary

As tabled.

9.5 Education Council President

As tabled.

9.6 Societies Council President



UWA STUDENT GUILD

The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009
(08)64882295, hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild

105th Guild Council

Guild Council Meeting Minutes
31 October 2018

As tabled.

9.7 Public Affairs Council President
As tabled.

9.8 Welfare Officer
As tabled.

9.9 Sports Officer
As tabled.

9.10 Womens' Officer
As tabled.

9.11 Environment Officer
As tabled.

9.12 PSA President
As tabled.

9.13 Pride Officer
As tabled.

9.14 ISS Officer
As tabled.

9.15 RSD President
As tabled.

9.16 Access Officer
Charlotte says thanks all Guild Councillors for coming to the OGM, and that there have been a couple of events such as the Lived Experience event which inspired in Charlotte how important these events are. Charlotte was very happy with the attendance for the event. Charlotte attended the NUS



Disabilities conference in Melbourne, but she believes that this conference wasn't a useful aspect of Guild spending. Charlotte says that this spending wasn't helpful as she hasn't been able to use anything that she learnt at the conference during her time as Access Officer. Charlotte says unless the date of the conference is changed and made earlier, student money shouldn't be wasted.

REPORTS APPROVED.

10.0 QUESTION TIME

Megan asks Charlotte if she will be submitting a report about her time at the NUS Disabilities Conference? Charlotte says yes, she will be submitting a report.

Ben asks for an update about National NUS KPIs? Megan says that these KPIs have been passed by most university Guilds but they are still waiting on ANU and Newcastle University. Megan says she hasn't received updates from those campuses. Megan says USYD removed their name from the open letter, but as far as she is aware of all of the Guilds that put the KPIs to their council they have been passed.

Ben asks Roshni about the ActivE app. Roshni says that she was approached by the National manager of this organisation that are wanting to take this app anywhere and everywhere that they believe there could be a market for. Roshni says that this is a user based app, with the app on their phone can mark incidents or safety issues on campuses. Roshni says this will provide real time safety updates. Roshni says for example if people are able to pin a location on a map of the campus in areas where suspicious activity is. Roshni says it can indicate what kind of safety incident has occurred so that people can avoid a potentially dangerous area. Roshni says it can also relate



to areas of poor lighting and that it is a very new app. Roshni says that the Guild highlighted some issues with the app such as the removal and time limit on pins. Roshni says Megan has sent an email to Chris Massey, about taking this to other student platforms such as LMS. Roshni says that this app needs a critical mass of people using this, and if potentially a lot of students on campus used it, the app could be very useful.

Megan says that push notifications are created for people that have downloaded the app. Megan says there seems to be two kinds of 'activity' such as an incident or a live issue.

11.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)

12.0 MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

- 12.1 The 105th Guild Council approve \$30000 to handle engineering and project management for the fitout in the Refectory.
Moved: Jim Leipold; Seconded: Megan Lee.

Jim says that this motion is late because of a recent meeting with Lease-Equity, and that the results of this meeting were only made available from LE recently. Jim says that this motion needs to be approved now so that outlets can come into the Refectory as soon as possible.

Council votes to hear the motion.

Jim says this fee is for the contractor that will be fitting out the outlets within the Refectory for when residents come.

Megan says as per university requirements there needs to be a project manager from the Guild and a project manager delegated from the university. Megan says that this motion is for the project manager that will be appointed by the Guild.



Megan says that this is required so that the outlet fit out can commence.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

12.2 The 105th Guild Council:

1. Supports and values research endeavours across all disciplines and acknowledges that the distribution of research funding should be done by an on-merit basis by an independent body;
 2. Condemns the actions of former Education Minister Simon Birmingham in vetoing over \$4 million in ARC funding to humanities related projects; and
 3. Endorses and encourages students to support the NTEU petition and writing campaign to current minister Dan Tehan.
- Moved: Peter Watson; Seconded: Conrad Hogg.

Peter says that this motion wasn't submitted on time because at the Senate Estimates Committee meeting last Thursday which was after the due time for motions being submitted to Guild Council. Peter says that there are a few action items in regards to the NTEU and what CAPA is also doing. Peter says that he would prefer that this happens sooner rather than later.

Council votes to hear the motion.

Peter amends Part 3 by adding 'opposes any measure that would politicise the selection process' to the end of the motion.

Peter says at Senate Estimates last Thursday, it was revealed that Simon Birmingham the former Education Minister utilised his veto power to veto 11 grants recommended to him by the Australian Research Council worth about \$4.2 million. Peter says that these projects related to humanities and social sciences. Peter says that this was followed by an uproar within the Higher education



sector in Australia from groups such as Universities Australia, the Deputy Vice Chancellor of Research and the Group of 8. Peter says that for those of you that have done a lot of talking to academics they have also found that there has been a negative review of this decision. Peter explains that there are three kinds of grants including discovery, developmental early career research awards, and future fellowship grants. Peter says almost all of these categories have some basis for providing student support directly, by exercising veto powers on any grant provided to him by the ARC the minister is essentially denying placements for students and potentially jobs. Peter says that this is very problematic. Peter says the process is that a grant application is seen by normally six academics, four from within the same discipline and two from the ARC and then collectively judged by the 150 members of the ARC. The recommendations are then provided to the minister.

Conrad says that ideologically this represents a potential movement of our research system of politically aligned research funding. Conrad says the reason why bodies exist such as the ARC are to depoliticise the research funding process. Conrad says that it allows for actual academics to recommend what research projects receive funding. Conrad says it is really inappropriate arguably and most probably to deny funding to research projects that don't align with their world view or political values as the power to determine which applications deserve funding should lie with the ARC. Conrad says Dan Tehan's moves in the last few days have reinforced what Birmingham did. Conrad says that this is why it is important that the Guild is against this, because it is important universities research academically rigorous things and aren't just a tool of major party politics.

Jacob F asks how often research applications recommended by the ARC are vetoed by an Education Minister?



Peter says that he thinks the last time this happened was in 2005 when Brendon Nelson at the time exercised the same power and fired the Chair of the ARC.

Peter says that a template for a drafted letter which can be written to your local member of parliament or Dan Tehan that you want the allocation of funds to not be a political issue. Peter says that the PSA will be promoting this template and also letting people know about the decision by the Education Minister as a grassroots campaign.

Kate F asks where this promotion will occur, will it be online or will there be events happening?

Peter says primarily online and that most of the information to postgrads will be provided online as the PSA has a relatively high engagement through facebook and email. Peter says that this template and campaign has been sent to all of the CAPA affiliates.

Conrad says that this isn't a distant, eastern states issue and that a lot of Postgrad students something they are verbally very angry about.

Molly passes the Chair onto Megan. Molly says that as a student that as of today has just put in her own PHD application for research funding and grant application that were due today, from the 14th of December they are expecting results of these applications. Molly says this is a one month turnaround that determines your career in the industry and hearing results of the veto is very disturbing. Molly says that as a woman in a science research degree, she doesn't like the thought of her research being denied because of what politicians believe is best. Molly says that when industry and career leaders at universities are



wanting to pursue solutions to problems through research, she doesn't think it is write for the research to be knocked back. Molly says that she has worked for four years very hard on her degree and she wouldn't want to see her PHD funding rejected because it isn't a politically needed issue or someones' pet project. Molly says that if she did have a vote tonight, she would be voting in favour of this motion as she thinks it is incredibly important that research remains in control of researchers and people within the industry and not an Education Minister that doesn't have the adequate knowledge.

Jacob F asks what happens to the research funding money that gets rejected?

Peter says that there is no back up list for other research projects, that it just doesn't get spent.

Jacob F clarifies and asks if it stays in the overall education budget?

Peter says that it sits in the overall ARC budget for another year. Peter says when the budget is reassessed, if there is money left over from the year before the funding won't be fully reimbursed with each budget allocation as there is money left over from the previous year.

Conrad says that it literally just goes into the bottom line of the Senate.

Jacob F asks if it could be used for another research project?

Megan says no.

Peter says that in terms of what Dan Tehan has introduced in the last few days is criteria specifying that research projects should



align with the national interest. Peter says that this is set by the Government of the day. Peter says that currently within the application researchers must specify the aims and the significance as well as the outcomes. Peter says that in terms of researching this can include things such as broader job creation, revenue earned from the research, and the potentially adoption of this researching being used by the government or other organisations. Peter says that researchers also get assessed on their previous record. Peter adds that the ARC also assigns research priorities for the national interest and this plays a role in judging what applications receive funding. Peter says what the current minister is actually asking for is a set of national interests of what he wants, and not what the ARC has developed.

Jacob F asks if retrospectively condemning the actions of a former Education Minister, whom probably has other things to worry about and not what the UWA Student Guild think of him is a useful thing to do?

Conrad says that he thinks it says that what he did was wrong and shouldn't be repeated and that the ARC should be receiving funding on a merit based system.

Jacob F asks the movers of the motion if they believe the passing of this motion will change the future decisions of any Education Minister?

Peter says that this would be captured in Part C of the motion. Peter says that the current minister is Dan Tehan.

Bradán asks if anyone knows if any of the applications rejected were for research at UWA?



Peter says no, and that he posted a list of the rejected applications on the Guild Council facebook page earlier today. Peter says that the list is provisional, and quite often applications encourage collaboration between universities. Peter gives an example of an application in the University of Sydney that is a collaboration with the University of London and the University of Melbourne. Peter says that even though the principle applicant may come from a different university it doesn't mean other universities aren't involved.

Molly says that working in solidarity is important, as a lot of current academics feel under pressure in this environment. Molly says that the cuts to funding to research are felt throughout every faculty and throughout every school. Molly says that it is really important that we don't want to limit this funding, and as a research-intensive university we are making sure students aren't being rejected on based on what area they are submitting their research under. Molly says research applications need to be assessed for their content and quality and what future solutions are brought to the table.

Roshni says that we don't want to limit any students that can include other universities, pursuing a PHD simply because it isn't in the Government's best interests.

Bradán asks what the ideology was behind rejecting these applications?

Peter says that he is limited in how much as he isn't Simon Birmingham. Peter says that there is traditionally a higher return on investment for STEM related projects then there are for humanities.

Megan says she had a meeting today with the Planning and Resources Committee, and the university executive which



included both the DVCR and UWA's government liaison quite explicitly said it isn't an election talking point to endorse humanities and social science research for the minister. Megan says this is a reason why Dan Tehan has upheld this decision, and presumably not in their re-election interests to be endorsing humanities research projects. Megan says this is why he explains his change of decision where he had no comment and now is endorsing Simon Birmingham's decision.

Peter says that this speaks to the politicisation of the process.

Megan says inherently the GO8 and Universities Australia identify this as a politicisation of our funding of research at universities.

Peter says inherently a government intervention process is always politicised.

Jacob F asks if they mean politicised as in the right wing Liberal Party didn't want to support the 'left wing' research, or that the research didn't fit into the Government's broader view of what is useful research?

Conrad says that the Government has made a choice to set up the ARC to advise and determine what should be funded and now they have gone against what this organisation is advising. Conrad says that even though experts in the field have decided these projects deserved the funding as balanced against other applicants.

Fraser says that it doesn't matter if we think that the Government had really good intentions in rejecting this funding, but the fact is they are making academic's lives harder and student's lives harder. Fraser says that this is exactly the kind of thing that the Guild exists for and opposing this kind of action.



For: Megan Lee, James Leipold, Yerim Won, Conrad Hogg, Joseph Chan, Roshni Kaila, Pheobe Ho, Basundhara Dutta, Molly Goldacre, Adhish Kastha, Raaghav Raj, Nevin Jayawardena, Ben Perry, Yanjia Song, Jim Leipold, Jacob Colangelo, Peter Watson, Kristel Li.

Against: Jacob Fowler and Bradan Sonnendecker.

Abstaining: Kate Fletcher.

Megan passes the Chair back to Molly.

12.3 The 105th Guild Council appoints Caitlin Owyong, and Sophie Minissale as the 2019 Pelican Editors.

Moved: Conrad Hogg; Seconded: Megan Lee.

Conrad says the reason this is late and needs to be approved at this Council meeting is because we need to appoint Pelican Directors before the first of November. Conrad says that there has been a few issues around the motion which meant it wasn't submitted on time.

Council votes to hear the motion.

Conrad says that he is amending the motion to remove Caitlin Owyong from the motion, because after reviewing the eligibility requirements and chatting further with the applicants. Conrad says that this application process occurred in a very similar way to PROSH as was discussed earlier in the evening which involves a panel interview with himself, Megan and the engagement team and Jenny. Conrad says this panel has selected Sophie as the Editor.

Megan says that there was a three-way application Bridget Rumbell who is the current lifestyle sub-editor. Megan says that



the discussion at the time of the meeting was that it would be Sophie and Bridget, and Bridget has since come back after reviewing her workload next year as a JD student said she would like to take a step back. Caitlin and Sophie were then decided as the successful applicants, however after reviewing the regulations Caitlin cannot be an editor as she has been a candidate in a previous Guild election. Megan says that Sophie is being selected as the sole candidate for the role.

Ben discusses the background about how Caitlin was selected as one of the Head Editors for Pelican, however she ran for STAR he believes two years ago as an OGC candidate.

Megan says that to clarify the panel decided that Caitlin and Sophie were the best options for the role of Co-Editors for Pelican. Megan said that Jenny vetted the two candidates and they were cleared, but then outside of the panel meeting things changed and there wasn't time to change the agenda item. Megan says that this was a mistake and has since been rectified so she doesn't think it is a big constitutional crisis but it will be taken into account in the future. Megan says she wants to make it clear that Jenny has done her job appropriately and has followed all of the correct processes.

Kate F asks what the process is for selecting the editors of Pelican?

Megan says that the panel has the incumbent President, the incoming President, the existing Editor of Pelican, and the engagement team. Megan asks Josh to circulate the applications for the Pelican Editor positions.

Kate F says that in that case, if Caitlin did go through the interview and the panel how come nobody realised that this was one of STAR's candidates previously?



Megan says that they asked why the application was being submitted as a three-way application, and they then came to the conclusion that it was going to be just Sophie and Bridget. Megan says that Caitlin would be a semi-advisor to the head Pelican editors.

Megan says she would like to move a procedural to give Josh Cahill speaking rights. *Motion carried.*

Kate F asks again what occurred in the selection process for the editors, and if Caitlin will be an unofficial editor?

Josh says that what was brought to the panel, was that Caitlin's role was as an administrative person this year, and this wasn't going to change in her role as an Editor. Josh says that Sophie would be responsible for what Pelican represents and the vision aspects. Josh says that Caitlin's role would be communicating between the Sub-Editors such as Science and Lifestyle and topics that don't really have Guild concerns. Josh says that therefore Caitlin's previous alignment with STAR wasn't picked up. Josh says once the interview was completed, he sat down at the beginning of the handover process to discuss responsibilities, at which point Bridget said she wouldn't be able to handle the role. Josh says at this point he moved Caitlin up into the Editor position without realising her past. Josh says that Caitlin won't be reporting on any news, however she will be an admin person that helps to lighten the load of the head editor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

- 12.4 The 105th Guild Council appoints Mike Anderson and Lauren Espinoza as interim Access Officers.
Moved: Charlotte Pennell; Seconded: Jacob Fowler



Charlotte says that the motion was submitted late, because Tuesday last week the Access Department OGM was meant to appoint Mike and Lauren as Access Officers for 2019 but as quorum was met this couldn't be achieved. Charlotte says that it took time to figure out what to do and who to appoint as the interim officers. Charlotte then came to the conclusion of Mike and Lauren and this is why the motion was late. Charlotte says that the sooner this is completed the sooner handover can also be completed.

Jacob F has nothing further to add.

Council votes to hear the motion.

Charlotte says that both of the people being proposed as interim officers were both nominees at the OGM. Charlotte says that as is being approved by the Governance Committee, we currently have a singular officer role for the Access Department but this issue has been brought up again at the OGM to switch back to the Co-Officer situation. Charlotte says that if two people wanted to run together they could run together. Charlotte says in light of this if the motion had passed there was the possibility of Mike and Lauren serving in their role together. Charlotte says that appointing these two people will mean that the Access Department will have direction over the summer break for orientation discussion. Charlotte says she became Access Officer in Week 4 of Semester One and that made her role tougher, that is why it is important interim officers are appointed now. Charlotte says that both Mike and Lauren have been on the committee, with Lauren being the right hand lady this year as someone who is very competent.

Jacob F says that Charlotte summed it up beautifully.



Raaghav asks why two people are required for this interim position instead of just one person?

Charlotte says it is difficult in how she answers that, because there can only really be one person appointed and in Semester One the interim officers will need to be properly appointed. Charlotte says that by Semester One Lauren will however be ineligible, and will only be able to serve as a Co-Chair over the summer. Charlotte says the reason why she is an excellent person to complete this is that her unique skills and expertise will be critical over the summer period, however it will be detrimental to have her only without Mike over the summer. Charlotte says that this could create continuity issues and that is why both Lauren and Mike are being nominated.

Peter asks if Lauren and Mike have a good working relationship?

Charlotte says yes and that they have both had meetings with herself about the direction of the Access Department. Charlotte says that for the OGM they were planning on running together for the role of Chair. Charlotte says that they were planning to be co-officers.

Fraser says that from when she was Access Officer a million years ago, Mike and Lauren were both on her committee then and they were both great and had a strong working relationship.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

13.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

Ben Perry asks about the activities of the Appeals Committee for the Arts Union and ECOMS general elections? Megan says she cannot give an update as of yet, and that she would prefer to wait and provide an update to those who are involved in the appeal the



UWA STUDENT GUILD

The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009
(08)64882295, hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
[facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild](https://www.facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild)

105th Guild Council

Guild Council Meeting Minutes
31 October 2018

report first as this is procedurally fair. Megan says that she will also be formalising a policy for appeals for Faculty Society elections.

Megan reminds everyone to check their emails for the end of year Christmas Party, and that everyone needs to submit their Annual Report.

14.0 CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING