



## 1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

**1.1 Attendance:** Bre Shanahan, Connor Price, Costa Toufexis, Anna Kimpton, Christopher John Daudu, Amy Hearder, Mike Anderson, Martha Mckinley, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Omar Mcintrye, Sophia Perkins, Max Tran, Emma Mezger, Daniel Roden, Nicole McEwen, Jacob Rosendaal, Ridhima Vinay, Meizchu Chen, David Hallam, Brett, Zhen You, Ahmad Hafizuddin, Viknash VM, William Norrish, Saleem Alodeh, Luke Thomas

**1.2 Proxies:** Scott Harney proxies for Nicole McEwen, Max Tran is proxy for Vin Kalim, Costa Toufexis proxies for Steven Okbay, Brett Madigan proxies for Riley Doleman

**1.3 Apologies:** Pauline Chiwawa

**1.4 Absent:** NA

**1.5 Observers:** Esa Chrulew

Amy moves a procedural motion to move to an in-camera discussion.

Amy moves a procedural motion to move out of an in-camera discussion.

## 2.0 DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

NA

## 3.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 The council confirms the minutes from the meeting on the 29 April as a true and accurate account.

Moved: Luke Thomas Seconded: Bre Shanahan

Luke states will change formation of minutes but other than that no issue with minutes

**Passed Unanimously.**

## 4.0 BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

## 5.0 BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

5.1 The 107th Guild Council requests the Managing Director writes to the WAEC with the approved timetables in order to conduct the 2020 Annual General Elections for the UWA Student Guild & NUS.

Moved: Luke Thomas Seconded: Bre Shanahan

**Motion Passed.**

5.2 The 107th Guild Council approves the 2019 SSAF Acquittal documents.

Moved: Luke Thomas Seconded: Bre Shanahan

**Motion Passed.**

## **6.0 BUSINESS FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

NA

## **7.0 DIRECTORS REPORTS**

### **7.1 Managing Director –**

Tony updates the council on the outcomes of the UWA risk audit meeting. The UWA administration were very pleased with managements response to the COVID-19 situation. Tony stated that the UWA staff applauded the Guilds work on the financials and expresses his admiration to the finance team for keeping the financial situation in good shape.

The meeting also included the approval of the Guild election timetable for the 2020 calendar year that was approved by the deputy electoral commissioner. The deputy approved the per normal timetable that was approved by council last month, while also acknowledging the alternative timetable was a suitable alternative if COVID-19 restrictions prevented the original election schedule going ahead as planned.

Tony updates council on Roll'd initial construction is now been undertaken , in preparation for semester two opening. Tony will update the council on the stages of the construction process as just the ground and foundational works are happening at this stage.

Tony also has met with potential tenants, trying to re-vamp interest in potential tenancy interest for semester two and beyond. Tony acknowledges the COVID-19 restrictions have meant demand for potential tenancy positions have decreased, but still some demand for potential tenancy occupations by some parties.

Tony outlines the Guild annual report for 2019 has been completed and been circulated to relevant parties. Tony thanks Chloe Keller for making the report look so appealing.

Tony updates council on the move by UWA and the Guild to create a new line of UWA and Guild merchandise that is projected to be implemented by semester two of 2020. Caitlin has secured prototypes from Champion and the Guild management will be looking at potential prototypes and designs for clothing and apparel that will appeal to students. Hoping to test with student audience when COVID-19 restrictions are lifted in semester two.

The university libraries such as Reid and Barry J Marshall are now open on a regular schedule and the Tavern is now open on a restricted opening hour schedule. The Tavern is bound by state government legislation of only having twenty people inside the premises at one time, but management are looking at ways for that figure to not include the staff that work at the Tavern. When students start coming back to campus in semester two, Tony is hopeful that small pockets of 50-100 people will be able to be in the premise at one time and have consulted with Alice and Leigh about which events could be implemented in the Tavern, while still obeying the social distancing rules and state government guidelines.

Jacob asks Tony if there is a specific time that campus is predicated to restart?

Tony answers that it is all up in the air and there is no specific guidance from the government as of yet when campus will be back to a full operational capacity. It is clear from the state government advice that whatever club or FACSOC events that do occur in semester two will need to abide by the social distancing regulations. Tony gives a rough estimate that by the end

of July the restrictions will lessen, and the Guild will be allowed to put on more events, but still no explicit information has been circulated by the university executive about the exact date campus will return to full operational capacity.

Tony also stresses that clubs will be keen to do events all at once, when the restrictions are lessened so Jacob and SOC needs to manage that in a safe and secure way.

Omar asks Tony if there have been any new updates on rent abatements for tenants?

Tony answers that the Guild is copying the university strategy on tenants by offering a rent abatement period accommodating the significant reduction of students that are using the tenancy services. Tony adds that because all tenancy agreements are confidential in nature, he cannot outline any specific information about tenancy occupants, as this should be discussed in an in-camera format to preserve tenancy confidentiality.

Anna asks what the communication strategy will be in communication the restrictions of club events to Guild departments and club executives?

Tony answers that this will be incorporated into the EMP process and will constitute a separate page that club executives will have to fill out to make sure their event is abiding by the state government restrictions. Alice, Leigh, and Jacob will ultimately have discretion on how this is communicated.

Anna asks what is the process about hosting events at the Tavern?

Tony answers that as long as food is being served at the event you can also have a drink with that meal, so as long as these guidelines are being followed, along with the twenty person rule the event should be approved to be hosted in the Tavern.

Anna asks for any advice the Guild management would like to disperse about hosting events next semester?

Tony reiterates the importance of any events that are hosted must abide by social distancing regulations. Events should be niche events that cater to club executives or smaller clubs as this will not threaten the state guidelines that are in place regarding no more than twenty persons congregating in a premise at the one time.

Tony adds that student departments should not try and cram in events that were planned for semester one into semester two, as this poses more of a risk to infringing upon the social distancing rules. The general consensus by management is that clubs and student departments should just focus on a couple key events throughout semester two. If there is any confusion about what clubs and are allowed to do, Jacob should be the first person to contact, along with Alice and Leigh.

7.2 Commercial – As tabled

7.3 Finance – As Tabled.

Mutya updates council on the financial situation, stating that we were off budget by 20,000\$ for the month of April, but this was better than expected. This was partly due to the Job-keeper scheme coming into effect to support cashflow last week to the effect of 200,000\$. On the employee departments, student services, and corporate services were well below budget due to the COVID-19 restrictions affecting the operation of these departments.

The Job-keeper scheme helped with managing the losses of the catering side even though most of the catering outlets are still operating at a loss. The supplement has also benefited the property losses and the fixed expenditure items such as Guild Council and utilities payments.

7.4 Student Services – As tabled

**Motion passes to accept all Directors Reports passes unanimously.**

## **8.0 ELECTIONS**

Luke moves a procedural motion to appoint Tony Goodman as the returning officer.

**Motion passes unanimously.**

Luke will email all candidates for each of the committee elections to council members which can vote for each member by a preferential voting system. Luke states the deadline for delivering their votes to Tony is Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> of June at 5pm and will update members via circular over the outcomes of the elections for 8.0.

### **8.1 Student Services Committee**

Two (2) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

### **8.2 Catering And Tavern Committee**

Three (3) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

Priscilia Janice Effendi, Jayden Truong, and Saskia Thomas are duly elected to the Catering And Tavern committee as the only applicants.

### **8.3 Corporate Services Committee**

Two (2) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

### **8.4 Equity And Diversity Committee**

Two (2) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

### **8.5 Welfare And Advocacy Committee**

Two (2) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

### **8.6 Volunteering And Community Engagement Committee**

Two (2) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

### **8.7 Governance Committee**

Three (3) Ordinary Committee Members, one of whom must be female.

## **9.0 STUDENT REPORTS**

9.1 President – As read – Bre announces that the final touches of the process to allow office bearers and ordinary guild councillors to gain transcript recognised volunteer hours will come into effect once approved by student services committee.

9.2 General Secretary – As tabled

9.3 Guild Chair – As tabled

9.4 Vice President – As tabled

9.5 Education Council President – As read – Emma states that week zero proposal was sent to student experience committee and initial consultation was positive. Emma also thanks those who engaged in the Save our Students Campaign.

9.6 Societies Council President – As tabled

- 9.7 Public Affairs Council President – As tabled
- 9.8 WASAC Chair – As tabled
- 9.9 Women’s Officer – As tabled
- 9.10 Welfare Officer – As tabled
- 9.11 Postgraduate Students’ Association President – As tabled
- 9.12 International Students’ Department President – As tabled
- 9.13 Residential Students’ Department President – As tabled
- 9.14 Environment Officer - As tabled
- 9.15 Sports Officer – As tabled
- 9.16 Access Department - As tabled
- 9.17 Pride Officers – As tabled
- 9.18 Ethnocultural Collective Conveners – As tabled

**All Student Reports accepted unanimously.**

## **10.0 QUESTION TIME**

Scott ask a question to Bre and Emma why the proposed fraction reduction to move to a nine-day fortnight was not included in both their monthly reports? Scott adds that this proposed change will adversely affect student conditions and it why this was not publicised in their report? Additionally, why is the Guild not mobilising student-based activism to oppose these changes?

Emma states that she is not aware of the full proposal regarding the fraction reduction and does not feel comfortable answering on behalf of a subject that she has no knowledge over. However, if the proposed changes will affect students learning conditions than she is open to running a campaign through the education action network and inform clubs executives through education council.

Bre echoes Emma’s answer in that the proposed fraction reduction is still being negotiated by the NTEU and the university staff and is not a matter to be discussed in council when it is not official university policy. Bre adds that she is happy to work with the education action network in implementing a campaign alongside the virtual staff sit in protests to oppose cuts, if the fraction reduction policy is accepted.

Scott moves a procedural motion to give Esa speaking rights.

Amy reminds council that to give an observer speaking rights that a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of council must vote in favour and the speaker must contribute significantly to the debate.

For the motion: Omar McIntyre, Zhen You, Viknash VM, Ridhima Vinyachandran, Scott Harney, Daniel Roden, Max Tran, Amy Hearder, William Norrish, Luke Thomas, Daniel Roden

Against the motion: Bre Shanahan, Costa Toufexis, Emma Mezger, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Callum Lindsay, Neve Staltari, Christopher John Daudu, Brett Madigan, David Hallam, Ahmad Hafizzudin

**Motion fails.**

## **11.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE (OPERATIONS)**

NA

## **12.0 MOTIONS ON NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)**

## 12.1 The 107<sup>th</sup> Guild Council:

12.1.1 Directs the Governance Committee to continue the work of the 2019 Communications & Transparency working group and create a Transparency and Accountability policy for student representatives'

12.1.2 Directs the Guild Executive to investigate an online live data dashboard for the Guild website providing up-to-date information about SSAF income, spending, and other important quantitative indicators.

12.1.3 Commits to recreating the Semester 1 SSAF Infographic with updated information following the Semester 2 SSAF allocation, in the case that no live dashboard is prepared.

12.1.4 Encourages all OGCs who take on leadership and projects to establish office hour consultation times to be more accountable.

Moved: Luke Thomas Seconded: Bre Shanahan

Luke speaks for the motion by contextualising that the transparency working group established under the 106<sup>th</sup> Guild council established a set of recommendations that make the guild more accountable with its SSAF expenditure.

Luke continues that that the Guild is one of the most transparent organisations in WA. The Guild opens council to observers, student representatives are always accountable to council, where SSAF is spent and allocated to is always made available either on the Guild website or on the social media pages. The Guild is constantly making sure that they are establishing new ways to be more transparent and this motion really is engendered for that purpose.

This motion establishes formal rules of transparency to make sure office bearers are all held to the same standards and that students know what to expect from their student representatives. Further, it shows how open and transparent the Guild is with important services like students assist and welfare and counselling, so students are more informed on the scope of services the Guild offers and where students SSAF is dispersed to.

Luke continues that by implementing the live data dashboard that students can be informed about grants that the Guild disperses to clubs and FACSOC's, while also institutionalising office bearer consultation hours to improve the consultation process between students and the student representatives. It also continues and communicates the great work Conrad and the 106<sup>th</sup> Guild council did last year.

Bre speaks on behalf of the motion stating that the motion allows for new and innovative ways for the Guild to be transparent and commends Luke work on this motion.

Callum asks when the motion was submitted and put on the agenda?

Luke answers that the motion was put on the Agenda after discussions with Adhish and Conrad the Wednesday before council.

Callum asks if the motion 12.2 had anything to do with pre-empting the current motion?

Luke answers that the current motion and 12.2 are different as 12.2 is phrased negatively and takes quite an oppositional angle but will let council decide about how they feel on the preceding motion.

Omar speaks for the motion saying that transparency is the cornerstone of good governance and good practice that should engrained into every organisation especially the Guild.

Transparency and accountability prevent any adverse behaviours from occurring and negates unaccountable actions.

Callum adds that this is a fantastic motion, as he believes council should keep the executive accountable and by communicating where SSAF is spent it gives an insight into what the executive chooses to approve or not approve.

Scott states that the content of the motion is good, it highlights the different opinions between the liberals and the independents on SSAF dispersion and how the liberals are against SSAF. Scott states the problem is not SSAF expenditure, it is the fact most of the services that SSAF goes towards should be free anyway. The Guild should be a body that fights for these services and fight for students' rights. Scott believes that this motion is a distraction from the bigger picture and that is which resources our student fees should be going towards.

### **Motion Passes Unanimously.**

12.2 The 107th Guild Council:

12.2.1 Acknowledges that students are no longer utilising the on-campus benefits provided by their SSAAF contribution.

12.2.2 Acknowledges the successful work of various departments as well as the university administration in supporting students via alternative means during the COVID-19 period.

12.2.3 Publishes updated figures outlining the current expenditure of SSAF to be made available for students

Moved: Neve Staltari Seconded: Callum Lindsay

Neve speaks to the motion stating that during this difficult time there is confusion over where SSAF is being distributed. This motion builds on the previous motion of transparency and provides clarity over where SSAF is going, and how to increase student confidence that there SSAF is being dispersed appropriately. She adds that this motion will improve opinion of the Guild among the student populace.

Callum speaks for the motion, stating that many of the tenants of the previous motion are incorporated into this motion. Callum clarifies that this is not a political motion and encourages council to endorse this.

Bre asks Neve what services students are not currently able to access that have not been transferred onto an online format?

Neve answers by acknowledging that the COVID-19 pandemic has had a massive disruption to learning and that students may not necessarily be accessing the services and benefits if they were attending physical classes. This is not to say that the Guild has not done a great job in making these services online, it is clarifying the disruption of services to students who would otherwise receive them.

Luke asks Neve if we were to return SSAF which staff should the Guild should make redundant and which club and student grants should we eliminate?

Neve clarifies that this is not the intention of the motion and believes that the motion has been misinterpreted and is not implying that the Guild should fire anyone or cut services to students. She reiterates that the Guild has done an amazing job in allowing for students to continue to use services in an online way, the motion is highlighting how SSAF expenditure has been re-distributed to services that have been utilised by students in other ways.

Saleem asks Neve if she believes that the 12.2.1 has underlying implications that the Guild may be not using SSAF expenditure appropriately?

Neve reiterates again that 12.2.1 does not imply that the Guild is using SSAF inappropriately it is stating that the 'on campus' benefits for students are no longer apparent and that the Guild should be transparent on the positive new areas that SSAF has been reallocated too, namely, the re-allocation of SSAF to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic and the move to online areas of examination for students.

Brett asks Neve what this motion significantly adds to the previous motion passed?

Neve adds that the motion intends to be an extra transparency measure, but it seems to be unsettling some council members and is more than happy to delete 12.2.1 if this has some underlying motivations attached.

Bre asks Neve that she is still confused over the notion that students are not benefiting from services that have moved to an online forum and adds that in some instances the services provided are more expensive when provided to students in an online forum than if they were provided in an in-person way. Can Neve provide some clarification over this implicit assumption embedded within the motion?

Neve explains that the motion is to highlight that the student experience has changed as there is no events that students are now able to attend which were an asset to the student experience which SSAF ultimately funds. This motion was not meant to criticise the Guild in anyway and again, is open to changing the wording of 12.2.1 or delete the entirety of 12.2.1, to rectify some of the issues that have been raised.

Callum suggest moving a friendly amendment to remove 12.2.1 as this will appease some of the council's issues with this motion.

Amy moves the motion into debate.

Bre speaks against the motion declaring that even if the amendment that Callum mentioned to remove 12.2.1 this is not substantially different from motion 12.1 and does a disservice to the methods endorsed to achieve 12.1 such as the live data dashboard. Bre also states this motion undermines the hard work that staff members such as student assist have taken to move all their services onto an online format.

Jacob speaks against the motion adding that the motion implies that the Guild is not contributing to on campus services, yet many of the clubs and societies that applied for grants are still been reimbursed even before the COVID-19 restrictions came in. The motion doesn't take into account the finance teams work in making sure clubs are financially sustainable when the eventual COVID-19 restrictions are lifted, and students return back to campus. He adds that is why he will be voting against this motion as it undermines the work the Guild has done while students have not been physically on campus.

Scott speaks against the motion stating that it highlights how the Liberals are opposed to SSAF and if the amendment is moved to remove 12.2.1 it is essentially the same as the 12.1 motion. Scott adds the reason why students are sceptical of where the SSAF goes is because there is no engagement with actual students on what happens with SSAF disbursement. Further, there is no political orientation of the Guild in fighting for students' rights as the strategy is to take sides with the university administration. This motion is nothing to do with transparency it is about how the university can save as much money as possible while cutting student services.



Luke speaks against the motion, reiterating that Callum misinterpreted and that the previous motion was not submitted the day before council. The reason why he will be voting against the motion is that it infers that the Guild is not acting appropriately with SSAF expenditure and students are being left behind because they are not getting back the SSAF money they contribute with services that the Guild and the university provide, which is not the case.

If the university or the Guild reduced SSAF expenditure, we wouldn't have a Guild to come back to after the COVID-19 pandemic. The motion is inherently geared to this 'gotcha' politics that invariably happens every year in regard to SSAF expenditure. The transparency measures passed in the previous motion allow for adequate SSAF expenditure transparency that students are able to access to keep them informed on the Guild's expenditure process.

Neve states that the intention's behind the motion has been misconstrued and positive ideas behind this motion were to highlight the staff's contributing to providing services via an online format which is embedded within the motion. The whole point of the motion was to provide clarity on the massive changes to the operations of the university due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Neve believes students are confused on how SSAF funding is being dispersed through these changes. This motion was never meant to be a critique of the Guild's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and urges council to support the motion.

For the Motion: Neve Saltari, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Callum Lindsay

Against the Motion: Costa Toufexis, Bre Shanahan, Luke Thomas, David Hallam, Zhen You, Ahmad Hafizuddin, Viknash VM, Jacob Rosendaal, Omar McIntyre, Max Tran, Scott Harney, Brett Madigan, Christopher John Daudu, Ridhima Vindyachandran, Emma Mezger, William Norrish, David Hallam, Daniel Roden

Abstaining Riley Klug.

**Motion Fails.**

### **13.0 MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

13.1 The 107th Guild Council:

13.1.1 Acknowledges the efforts made by the university staff and the International Students Department in supporting our international students currently studying in absentia due to international travel restrictions.

13.1.2 Endorses the "secure corridor" framework devised by the Group of Eight, which is currently under consideration by Federal, State and Territory governments.

13.1.3 Calls on Federal, State and Territory governments to finance or subsidise reparation efforts outlined in the secure corridor framework.

13.1.4 Recognises the disparity in the quality of learning that will engender the international students studying abroad in the event of a partial or full resumption of physical classes in semester two 2020.

13.1.5 Commits to working constructively with the university to consider explore ways to bridge this divide and, all things remaining equal, encourages the university to consider an appropriate reduction in fees for international students studying from abroad in semester two due to travel restrictions.

Moved: Omar McIntyre Seconded: Zhen You

Amy asks Omar the reason why the motion was late?

Omar answers that he was unaware of the changing circumstances and believes that the COVID-19 pandemic has drastically altered the learning conditions for international students

and believes it's the Guild's duty to have a frank and proper discussion about the ramifications of COVID-19 on international student's educational experience.

Amy states council must vote to hear the motion.

For hearing the motion: Emma Mezger, Jacob Rosendaal, Omar McIntyre, Max Tran, Scott Harney, Brett Madigan, Christopher John Dadau, Ridhima Vinayachandran, Neve Staltari, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Callum Lindsay, Zhen You, William Norrish, Ahmad Haffizudin, Daniel Roden, Amy Header, Viknash VM

Against hearing the motion: Bre Shanahan, Luke Thomas, David Hallam

### **Motion Passes.**

Omar acknowledges the work of Bre and Viknash who made necessary amendments to the motion and also thanks Zhen for seconding the motion. The motion is about the educational disparity between the international students who have had to return to their country of origin due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the resumption of in person classes that are likely to occur during semester two for domestic students. Omar emphasises that the parts of the motion enables an equal playing field for international students and calls upon the government and university to reduce the financial and emotional burdens for those who are continuing their studies at UWA via an online format.

Omar adds that the amendments to the motion that are included on the 107<sup>th</sup> Guild Council Facebook group were included to acknowledge that international students are at disproportionate disadvantage in regard to educational opportunities. Omar has spoken to international students and the consensus is that all the career aspirations are now not going to eventuate due to the interruption of studies, internships, and volunteer opportunities that international students use as a means to gain employment after their studies conclude. He emphasises that this motion calls upon the university to better assist international studies in resumption of their studies and recognise they will be an inequitable imbalance between domestic students who are able to attend in person classes should partial resumption to classes resume in an on-campus format, and international students who have been denied the opportunity to attend in person classes.

Omar continues that this motion calls upon the federal government, state and territory governments to finance the secure corridor framework. Omar highlights the 60-billion-dollar underspend on Job-Keeper legislation as further evidence for the need to support international students in this stressful and unprecedented situation, as the federal government has the money to fund this framework but is leaving international students at a disadvantage by not providing financial support to those who need it most.

Omar also emphasises that this motion is not just about reflecting the Guild's principles to support all students through advocacy and representation, it is about making sure that in society nobody is left behind and coming out of the COVID-19 pandemic we need to create a more equitable society, with international students providing invaluable services to the creation of this more equitable society. He furthers, that the framework endorsed in this motion is methodical and calculated and was formulated by the Group of Eight, which is an impartial body that UWA is a part of. The motion also adds that the Guild will work in partnership with the university to curtail this disparity that will occur if classes were to resume in an on-campus format, by making sure the fee's for international students were reduced.

Zhen adds that the secure corridor framework allows for international students from only a select amount of countries to return to UWA such as South Korea and Myanmar. Zhen wonders

if Omar would be open to changing the motion of 13.1.3 to 'acknowledges that the secure corridor program should have no discrimination against different countries according to where international students are from'.

Amy reminds Zhen that you have to propose an amendment in the debate section of a motion.

Bre asks Omar that the secure corridor framework intends to only include international students from a select few countries to return to UWA. The secure corridor framework also excludes Chinese students who are a large part of UWA's international student cohort. Given the inherent racism in the secure corridor policy why should the Guild endorse such a policy?

Omar states that there are no vices in this motion at all, in fact, the motion keeps with the government and scientific health advice that UWA international students should only be able to return to campus if there is no underlying health consequences or issues that are due to arise. Omar emphasises that students both domestic and international should have the right to study in a safe environment that if those countries have brought the COVID-19 pandemic under control and have flattened the curve, then it is only appropriate that international students from those countries are able to return to UWA first.

Saleem asks Omar that if the whole point of the motion is to reduce the disparity between domestic and international students, isn't this motion going to create a divide between international students due to the secure corridor framework allowing for some international students to return to UWA, while others are not allowed to return to campus?

Omar understands Saleem's point and states that the way he is perceiving the motion is that is deliberately excluding international students. However, it is in the interests of not only international students, but domestic students that the curve remains flat, and this presumption that international are been excluded is a negative and pessimistic way to look at the secure corridor policy. Omar states that most international students will not be able to return to campus until at least semester one 2021, this is a huge loss to the UWA community as international students constitute what makes UWA so great. In semester two 2020, there will be little to no international students and the council should not disregard the invaluable contributions international students make to UWA.

Bre asks that the secure corridor framework also requires international students to be tested before they travel to UWA from their country of origin. Given the strict health and medical standards that international students have to abide by to travel to Australia, why is it appropriate that the Guild endorses a framework that excludes international students from China?

Omar reiterates again that there is no malicious intent in this motion and that as long as international students are repatriated on certain criteria, and when it is safe to do so, the Guild should be prioritising that international students resume their studies in an in person setting. Omar emphasises that this is why the motion calls upon, federal, state, and territory governments to assist with the repatriation efforts of international students if it is safe for international students to return to campus.

Saleem asks Omar if he would be open to working with himself and Viknash on this motion and defer until next council meeting to alleviate some of the ambiguities and uncertainties of endorsing the secure corridor framework?

Omar understands Saleem's reservations and argues that a month ago it seemed inconceivable that campus would be able to return to some sort of normalcy by semester two. Due to the likelihood of COVID-19 restrictions been relaxed to allow for some classes to resume in an in person setting, this should be a priority of the Guild and the university to allow international

students who are eligible to benefit from the easing of restrictions. Omar adds that the government has money in the coffers and that these funds should go towards supporting international students assisting them return to campus and resume their studies. Omar adds that if students are unable to return the university should take this into account and reduce the fee's for these students, hence this is the reason why 13.1.5 states that 'all things remaining equal', to pre-empt the fact some international students may be unable to return to UWA for various reasons and that UWA should adjust the course fee's for those students accordingly.

Omar continues that the corridor provides a practical framework to facilitate the return of international students and that if the Guild endorse this framework it will keep the university accountable as the Guild will work in co-operation with the university to ensure some of the requirements of this framework are enacted.

Brett asks Omar if the motion could work still be approved if the council did not support the secure corridor framework?

Omar answers that the Group of Eight endorsed this framework and is an independent body that hears advice from other universities over how to proceed with allowing for repatriations of international students back to their enrolled universities. This motion reiterates the fact the university needs to be made accountable for international students learning and recognises the universities role in lessening the educational disparity that is bound to ensue if campus returns to in person classes in semester two and international students are not able to access this resource.

Bre asks Omar what would you like to see the Guild do in semester two that has not already been moved onto an online format?

Omar states that the Guild and the university can always do so much more to support international students. Omar juxtaposes how the majority of students will be able to return to campus if restrictions are eased and benefit from in person classes when there is going to be a minority that will not be able to access any of the services that are provided. Omar adds that he is more than willing to work with Viknash to revise this motion to allow for greater equitable education outcomes for international students.

Luke asks Omar if he would be willing to delay this motion to circular and work with Viknash and Saleem to correct some of the issues that have been raised by members of council?

Omar states that he believes that this is the time to have a proper discussion about international students and believes council is not appreciating the diversity and valuable contributions international students provide to UWA. Next semester the Guild and university needs to promote the continuation of studies for international students and Omar believes this is a way to facilitate that promotion.

Omar continues that the tertiary education sector is too dependent on international students as a revenue stream and needs to diversify its investments. He urges that the government should step up their financial responsibility over international students' welfare and this motion speaks to that principle by keeping the university and the government to account.

Emma asks Omar that by endorsing the secure corridor framework that the council is contradicting some of the demands of the save our students campaign which state that all international students should be supported regardless of background or country of origin?

Omar answers that this motion is focused on the continuation of studies that will actually aid some of the aims of the save our students campaign. He elaborates that the financial burden

international students are facing is disgusting and should be remedied by the university and the Guild taking proactive steps to ensure that this is remedied as quickly as possible. Omar believes that the save our students campaign and this motion is not contradictory as this motion calls on the government to reduce the financial burden that is been imposed upon international students, which is one of the aims of the save our students campaign.

Amy moves the motion into debate.

Viknash speaks against the motion stating that the motion is commending ISD, which is unnecessary. He then goes onto explain that there are several facets of the secure corridor which are not right, and the Guild should not endorse this policy. Viknash's main concern is that it is unclear whether the corridor's aim is to be primarily welfare focused or financially focused. He believes that the corridor may be used just to claim back some of the exorbitant fees that international are charged to help the university improve its financial situation.

Viknash elaborates that the secure corridor ensures that international students are paying for all the out of pocket expenses, such as the mandatory COVID-19 test they have to do in their country of origin, they have to pay for their flights to Australia and pay for their accommodation while in the two week quarantine period, all of these are out of pocket costs that international student has to provide to partake in the secure corridor policy.

Viknash continues that he understands the safety part of the secure corridor and that the policy should cater to the countries that have dealt with the COVID-19 pandemic the most appropriately. However, questions may be asked about whether selecting countries to allow for international students back into Australia is a financially driven process, rather than the welfare of all international students.

Viknash continues that in light of the recent export carrier that docked in Fremantle this week and the negative reactions this has received from the public due to some of the crew having COVID-19, he believes that this secure corridor program is been developed pre-maturely as some of the overseas countries have not yet dealt with COVID-19 effectively. He also believes that if some of the international students that used the corridor contracted COVID-19 that they would experience racism and suffer from the fact they are potentially exposing other people to the virus. Viknash adds that international students especially those from universities in the eastern states have already experienced racism as a result of the COVID-19 situation. Viknash states that he does not want this motion to be a means that facilitates increased anti-Asian sentiment.

Viknash updates council on his meeting with Sue Ellory the state education minister, with other student representatives from Curtin, Murdoch and ECU. Sue Ellory's views on the corridor program was that it was pre-mature to suggest that international students are able to come back to campus when many of the nations in the suggested corridor still have a higher number of cases. She also said in regard to increased funding to help international students cope with the COVID-19 pandemic that many of the non for profits are helping out these international students and the education department have not forecast an increase in government expenditure to help international students who are still in Perth.

Viknash declares that because many international students are currently struggling that are present in Perth it would not make any sense to bring more international students over to WA, for them to suffer and compete with other international students over jobs that are no longer available. Sue Ellory also updated Viknash that the state government have not even reviewed the proposal for the secure corridor and will only view it after they have reviewed proposals on extensions to international student visa's which will be in September.

Viknash furthers, that international students are not going to come back to WA for one month because the academic semester will almost be over by the time the secure corridor comes into place. If provisions come into place that remedy the concerns outlined, we can think about endorsing the secure corridor program, but due to the constantly changing situation of the COVID-19 pandemic it would be premature to endorse such a policy when there is confusion about the ramifications for international students.

Viknash also states that the educational disparity is not as pronounced as the Vice Chancellor has acknowledged for semester two all classes will be online, and there are heaps of online resources that are available to students to continue studying online. He also states that even when students have had to go back to their country of origin, that exam centres are available to those students if they do not want to sit an online exam and would prefer to do a physical, on paper exam.

Viknash also updates the council on ISD's plans to host a racism forum on how COVID-19 has stirred up racist sentiment and that the Guild needs to work constructively with the university to combat this rising sentiment. Viknash does not want to support a motion that may facilitate racism and only would endorse a measure that he can be sure will put the interests of international students first. He also states that in previous councils we have called upon the federal government to financially support international students and so there is no need in this motion to do it again.

Omar answers that he understands Viknash's concern. He states that in last month's council we commended the work of PROSH and so it is only natural that ISD is commended for their efforts in promoting international students' interests.

Omar addresses some of the points Viknash raised stating that in consultation with the international students he talked to, they themselves have stated they would like to return to campus as all of their careers prospects that international students lined up for themselves are now up in the air. Omar believes that the Guild should be providing a sense of stability for international students to return to campus in accordance with the health and medical advice. He understands that there is a tendency for the university to view international students as cash cows but this is not the purpose of this motion, it is to allow for the continuation of international students' studies, calling upon the government to assist in this process by making the secure corridor financially viable to those students who would like to return to campus.

Omar states that in terms of the export carrier, those cases are managed and contained. If any discrimination or possible scapegoating of international students happens as a result of this policy this will be condemned by the Guild. Omar adds that this secure corridor scheme is based off the current medical advice and should be relied upon and the Guild should trust the experts that have formulated this policy to put international students' health first.

Omar states that Sue Ellory's comments are unprofessional and are a dereliction of duty on her part as she must acknowledge that all international students are suffering in this time. That is the reason why in the motion it states to call upon the federal, state, and territory governments as international students should not have to suffer or be under any financial burden throughout this crisis.

Saleem speaks against the motion and uses the analogy of a donut to describe this motion, saying that it looks sweet but has a huge hole in the middle. He acknowledges that all international students are suffering in this time and believes that this motion will enable international students to come back to campus just to address the financial situation of the university.

Saleem states that many of the conditions of this motion have already been addressed in previous council meetings. Saleem cites demand 11.9 of the save our student campaign and did not see Omar engage with that section of the save our students campaign that explicitly helps international students. Saleem argues what is the point of putting forward a motion that is inherently flawed and does nothing to engage with issues that will help international students get through the COVID-19 pandemic.

Saleem also states that on the Group of Eight website all the articles that are attached to that website are articles about how much money the Australian university sector is going to lose as a result of international students not enrolling in semester two. This highlights how many of the universities are treating international universities as cash cows and the corridor is the first step in making up for the lost revenue that universities have lost due to COVID-19. He states that this motion is bad at worst and terrible at best and will not be supporting this motion.

Amy passes a procedural motion to limit speakers' speeches to three minutes each.

### **Motion Passes Unanimously.**

Scott speaks against the motion stating that he shares the scepticism of many of the councillors that have expressed their concerns about this motion. He believes that the university administration is formulating policy from a financial standpoint and many international students and the university is only trying to think of new ways to gain lost revenue from the exorbitant fee's international students have to pay each semester. He believes that the Government does not care about the well-being of international students as many have been left in positions of financial destitution due to governments saying to international to just leave the country, not providing financial assistance to those in need.

Scott also states his view on the Group of Eight is a cynical one as the secure corridor is trying obscure the bigger picture that the university has become dependent on international student fee's for the past decade. The profit driven university admin is not going to have the best interests of international students at heart.

Scott continues that the motion calls upon federal government assistance, but federal government assistance has been incredibly lacklustre and have bailed out corporate companies instead of bailing out universities and so why would this motion expect the government to help international students.

Viknash states that the main concern is with 13.1.2 and 13.1.3. Would Omar be open to removing these sections of the motion?

Omar states that he believes that 13.1.2 and 13.1.3 is important as it establishes that the federal, state, and territory governments should fund the repatriation efforts. However, he is open to merging 13.1.2 and 13.1.3 to 'calls on federal, state and territory governments to finance in its totality the secure corridor framework formulated by the group of eight, only then the UWA Student Guild endorses the secure corridor framework'.

Bre provides context that the framework has not been endorses or approved by the WA state government. Bre states we should not endorse a framework that might not even eventuate, even with the amendment that Omar has just approved, the framework in itself has some major flaws that have not been clarified.

Viknash echoes Bre's world that he is not comfortable endorsing this motion even with the proposed amendment as it is difficult to envisage what semester two will look like. It may be

appropriate to endorse such a framework in the July council as then it will be clearer to discern what the secure corridor framework will look like.

Mike moves a procedural motion that the 13.1 now be voted on.

### **Motion Passes Unanimously.**

Amy instructs Omar that he now has two minutes to summarise the motion and to convince council why the council should support this motion.

Omar states that the motion was drafted with Bre and Viknash and if they had concerns about the secure corridor, they should have expressed them. Omar continues that this motion comes from an ethical standpoint and is about creating equity and a fair go for international students that have been adversely affected by the transition to online learning.

Omar denounces the lack of support for international students by the government and stresses that is not just himself that has expressed concerns, it is the international students who have expressed concerns to him. The Guild and the university need to come up with mechanisms that reduce the educational disparity that is bound to ensue if on campus classes resume.

Omar states that he is happy to remove 13.1.2 and 13.1.3 so the motion now reads.

13.1 The 107th Guild Council:

13.1.1 Acknowledges the efforts made by the university staff and the International Students Department in supporting our international students currently studying in absentia due to international travel restrictions.

13.1.2 Recognises the disparity in the quality of learning that will engender the international students studying abroad in the event of a partial or full resumption of physical classes in semester two 2020.

13.1.3 Commits to working constructively with the university to consider explore ways to bridge this divide and, all things remaining equal, encourages the university to consider an appropriate reduction in fees for international students studying from abroad in semester two due to travel restrictions.

For the motion: Ahmad Hafizuddin, Zhen You, Omar McIntyre

Against the motion: Costa Toufenexis, Bre Shanahan, Luke Thomas, David Hallam, Viknash VM, Jacob Rosendall, Max Tran, Scott Harney, Brett Madigan, Christopher John Daudu, Ridhima Vindyachandran, Emma Mezger, William Norrish, David Hallam, Daniel Roden, Callum Lindsay, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Amy Header

Abstaining: Neve Saltari, Ahmad Hafizuddin

### **Motion Fails.**

13.2 The 107th Guild Council:

13.2.1 Recognises that the Australian higher education sector is facing financial crisis as a result of public underfunding and the neoliberalisation of education

13.2.2 Opposes looming attacks to the education sector that make university staff and students pay for the loss in revenue from the coronavirus crisis.

13.2.3 Commits to laying the groundwork for an education campaign at UWA - UWA Student Against Cuts - which includes:

13.2.4 Circulating any known information about unit cuts or faculty restructures to all students



- 13.2.5 Emailing Faculty Societies and Unit Representatives the content of this motion and recommends they inform the Guild of any cuts to units, staff, courses and course content that they become aware
- 13.2.6 Creates a media release and Facebook post opposing cuts to education on a federal and campus level.
- 13.2.7 Calls an Education Action Network meeting to discuss the state of higher education
- 13.2.8 Running education protests against cuts when safe to do so

Moved: Nicole McEwen (proxied Scott Harney) Seconded: Emma Mezger

Amy asks Scott why this motion is late and cannot wait until next council?

Scott states this motion cannot wait as the cuts to student services and staff have already begun and that the Guild should be fighting these cuts at every opportunity to preserve educational qualities for students.

Amy states that council must vote to hear motion.

### **Motion Passes Unanimously.**

Scott moves a procedural motion to give speaking rights to Esa reminding council again that a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of council must be achieved to give observers speaking rights.

For Motion: Costa Toufenexis, Bre Shanahan, Luke Thomas, David Hallam, Viknash VM, Max Tran, Scott Harney, Brett Madigan, Christopher John Dadau, Ridhima Vindyachandran, Emma Mezger, William Norrish, Daniel Roden, Callum Lindsay, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Omar McIntyre, Amy Header, Zhen You, Ahmad Hafizzudin

Against Motion: Jacob Rosendall, Neve Saltari, David Hallam

### **Motion Passes.**

Esa states that the COVID-19 pandemic has exposed UWA's reliance on international students and the loss of international students' enrolments represent a massive funding shortfall. This is exacerbated by the state of tertiary education that has seen mass commercialisation of education and universities basing their structures of a profit maximisation models. The restructures which are going to occur have been seen in the University of Tasmania that has cut 75% of its arts courses and may cut as much as 400 staff members. The cuts to education are indicative of how education experience is not a priority to the university as it is using the COVID-19 crisis to push through staff cuts that will damage the student experience.

The Guild needs to fight for educational quality and this motion reflects that by calling on the Guild to enact an active campaign that fights these education and staff cuts. The proposed fraction reduction policy proposes a 10% cut to pay and a nine-day fortnight will reduce the amount of work hours while increasing the workload for academic staff. On average staff will lose 300 dollars a week due to the cut in hours and the Guild needs to fight back against these proposed cuts.

Esa continues that the Guild needs to utilise its resources and position of influence in the university to highlight these cuts and the adversarial affects they will have on students. This motion calls upon the Guild to use platforms to disburse information about the proposed cuts and to mobilise students to protect staff and student's learning conditions.

Emma adds that this motion highlights how long this campaign is going to be, as the university has lost billions of dollars and this lost revenue will not be recuperated for years to come. This motion will tie in nicely with the virtual staff sit in the Guild is hosting to oppose cuts to staff and students' conditions.

Brett asks Emma if the main concern that the Guild has is with permanent cuts or cuts that are happening immediately?

Brett also asks if the university is losing billions of dollars what organisation does the Guild call upon to assist the universities financially in this time?

Emma states that she is unsure of the time frame of the cuts which may happen to educational services and courses, they are most likely to be ongoing cuts that go into the future. Emma adds that the campaign against these cuts will be a long one as the universities teaching and educational standards are going to be drastically affected by the shortfall of international student enrolments, and so the campaign will call upon the federal government to assist in making sure students all have an equitable and high standard education.

Scott adds that one of the cuts that is immediately on the table is the fraction reduction and nine-day fortnight which will entail the start of the sector wide cuts. We need to mobilise students to oppose these cuts and the only way to do this is by having a campaign that directly targets the university administration. The university administration needs to know that when they cut educational services such as arts courses that they cannot get away with it. The Guild in the past has been very passive in relation to educational cuts and the Guild needs to make a stance on the current cuts that are being proposed, such as the cutting of units and the restructuring of certain faculties to make staff redundant while at the same time maximising profits by streamlining their services.

Scott continues that the university has lots of assets and that they do not have to implement cuts straight away, rather, UWA is just using the COVID-19 crisis as an excuse to implement cuts. The university is sensing an opportunity to cut courses because they have always wanted to and now have the opportunity. This motion contextualises the student lead campaign that will call upon the federal government to inject more money into the tertiary sector, which they have failed to do so far.

Callum asks Emma if this will be a new campaign or integrated into the save our students campaign that is currently happening?

Emma answers that the save our students campaign is orchestrated by the NUS, whereas this campaign will be a campaign just for WA.

Amy moves the motion into debate.

Anna speaks for the motion saying a lot of students fail to realise the quality of their own education at UWA. Anna recently had an experience when one of her tutors sent out an email to say nice things about the unit co-ordinator as she was afraid that she was going to lose her job. The university is cutting staff with the highest qualifications and students are missing out on the valuable knowledge and industry experience that these academics provide.  
Debate:

Luke speaks for the motion stating that this motion contextualises that staff conditions are also students' conditions. This motion is good as it respects the autonomy of the NTEU while also advocating for a student perspective on the looming educational cuts.

Bre adds that it is important to remember that it is not just academic staff that make up the staff of UWA, there are professional staff as well as swathes of casuals working in the libraries and cafés. Bre adds she looks forward to endorsing this motion as this will be a long fight between the Guild and the government to make sure that the government uses its due diligence to fund student learning experience, given the extenuating financial circumstances the university is under.

Jacob speaks for the motion stating that this is a large-scale issue and it is great the Guild is acting pro-actively as this will yield the best results for the students and the educational experience of UWA. Jacob adds that this motion also gives the role of the FACSOC's to make sure they report potential cuts to the Guild, which he supports.

Scott speaks for the motion but notes that the current strategy that the Guild has adopted has been slow as most of the casual academic staff have been sacked on mass. It is good that the Guild has recognised that staff working conditions are students learning conditions, but the Guild needs to challenge the university by first opposing the proposed fraction reduction and then making sure that the rumoured cuts are not just accepted passively. Scott adds that the rumoured political science is going to be targeted as one of the first courses to be cut. The Guild should put its money where its mouth is, using social media to communicate to students the proposed cuts that are happening currently.

Costa speaks for the motion saying that most of the university casual staff that work in the libraries are all casual and are not eligible for Job-keeper legislation. He states that we are still employed but most of the shifts have been cut back significantly. Costa states he is looking forward to endorsing this motion to support those specific students.

Emma speaks for the motion stating that all staff regardless of being casual, part time, or full time are facing job losses and this motion establishes a framework that allows for FACSOC's and class representatives to communicate those educational cuts to the Guild. The motion also entails that the Guild will run protests when it is safe to do so, so when the COVID-19 restrictions are lessened, the Guild can communicate the proposed cuts in a safe and secure manner. Emma continues that the proposed plan is to a walk-through of UWA to communicate how these cuts will affect all students.

Scott states the main question is being dodged in the debate of this motion and that is the current proposal that is going on about the fraction reduction. This proposal means that students will lose a day of learning and still be paying the same fee's for less on campus learning time. The current discussions show how the independents are in theory opposing the cuts but do not want to take action to oppose the university administration. In Scott's meeting's with NTEU activists he states that they were shocked that this proposed fraction reduction has not been communicated by the university student populace and should be sent out to all student and staff emails. These activists are already starting to mobilise and shows how slow the Guild has been to oppose these cuts. He adds that the university needs to realise they are going to have a fight on their hands if they are going to take away our learning experience.

For the Motion: Costa Toufenexis, Bre Shanahan, Luke Thomas, David Hallam, Viknash VM, Max Tran, Scott Harney, Brett Madigan, Christopher John Dadau, Ridhima Vindyachandran, Emma Mezger, William Norrish, Daniel Roden, Callum Lindsay, Rahul MS, Riley Klug, Omar Mcintyre, Amy Header, Zhen You, Ahmad Hafizzudin, Jacob Rosendall, David Hallam

Neve Absteins.

**Motion passes.**

#### **14.0 GENERAL BUSINESS**

The May legend of 107<sup>th</sup> Guild Council is Jacob as he is really working hard to make sure clubs are supported in this time.

Luke reminds council to please give Tony votes for elections of the Guild committee's by Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> June by the latest 3pm.

#### **15.0 CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING**

Next meeting will be held 24 June at 6:00 PM. Please contact the Guild General Secretary (secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au) with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.

