

SRC 2013 December

Meeting declared open at 3:54pm.

Present:

Lyndal Butler, Lucy Bonanno, Maggie Sheen, Alison Whittaker, Douglas McDonald, Akshay Raj Kumar, Mustafa Agha, Rudi Bremer, Chris Augustine, Jess Xu, Chanelle Ramos, Jade Tyrell, Andy Maclean, Danielle Vieira, Kate Alway, Leticia Centrone, Tim Roylett, Josh Rebolledo

Apologies:

Azal Khan, Lani Bushelle, Zie Zhang, Adwoa Humphries, Zohaib Raza

1. Acknowledgement of Country

2. Election of Returning Officer

Danielle Vieira nominated for Returning Officer.

Elected unanimously.

3. Returning Officer's Report

Nominations opened for:

- Education Vice-President (general councilor)
- Assistant Secretary (general councilor)
- Welfare Officer (general councilor)
- 2 Directors of Student Publications
- 3 Members of Budget Committee

The nature of each position was explained.

Nominations were to be indicated on paper or by hand. Nominations were opened at 3:58pm and closed at 4:08pm.

Nominations:

EVP: Lucy Bonanno

Assistant Secretary: Raj Kumar, Maggie Sheen

Welfare Officer: Adwoa Humphries

Directors of Student Publications: Lyndal Butler, Lucy Bonanno

Budget Committee: Azal Khan

Due to insufficient nominations for Budget Committee, nominations for two positions were opened at 4:10pm for 10 minutes (to be discussed at the end of the meeting).

4. Ballot for Assistant Secretary

Proxies:

Lani proxies Lyndal Butler.

Adwoa proxies Lucy Bonanno.
Zie proxies Jade Tyrell.

Proxy ballots and regular ballots were allocated, and a vote taken.

The Returning Officer went outside to count ballots, Tim Roylett assisting.

5. Report from Equity and Diversity Unit (Tracy)

An officer of the Equity and Diversity Unit was invited by Jade Tyrell, outgoing President, to present to the first meeting of new SRC. Tracy stressed her desire to maintain a good relationship with the new officeholders.

Tracy outlined her plans for the next year:

- reinvigoration of the 'Ally Program'
 - training students as new allies
 - seeking to promote contact between staff members and students, and greater accessibility of students
- a review of the Student Grievance Policy
 - redressing current difficulties in launching grievances
 - seeking student input and feedback
- 'Building Cultures of Respect' in UTS Housing
 - surveys and an initial training program (on 'Sex and Ethics') have already been conducted
 - next year, training of RNs and student officer-holders
- SHOUTS ('Sexual Harassment Out Of UTS') program
 - planned for beginning of first semester
 - may rely on SA for distribution of posters and materials
- Better support for disabled students in practice
 - continued resistance amongst some academics to practice inclusive teaching and learning; inappropriate questions asked, or failures to recognise the rights and needs of disabled students
- Reconciliation Program
 - seek to promote non-Indigenous people in Reconciliation program
 - traditionally, reconciliation initiatives at UTS driven by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff and students – despite the fact that they have nothing to reconcile for

Tracy signaled her intent to report back every few months to report on progress of programs and policies, and to educate SRC members on their responsibilities and duties towards the university and towards each other.

Josh asked whether Ethno-Cultural Collective would be consulted on sexual health programmes, given the need for cultural sensitivity.

Tracy responded that they were very interested to consult all stakeholders, and respond to their concerns. She noted that the Ally Program were unwilling to waver from their aim to target homophobia, even though this may lead to clashes with some cultural groups.

Josh clarified that outreach does not have to mean wavering on fighting homophobia; it can mean different kinds of responses and approaches. For example, Australian culture is unusually upfront about these issues, but other cultures may be pursued through other routes.

Tracy responded that she would be very happy to consult with anyone interested in contributing to the future of the program.

Tracy noted that the Ally Program is a gesture to the UTS community that it is not OK to be homophobic. She observed that we are fortunate to be sitting in the centre of a large city with a large LGBT community; we hence do not face the challenges confronting a rural community in outreach.

Andy asked whether a contact number or email could be provided; Tracy stated that she would be happy to forward along contact details.

Jade said that Tracy's contact details would be forwarded to the Secretary, to forward to the new SRC.

Tracy said that EO Online is an online learning module (being updated); it can be a good introduction to student representatives in their roles.

Jade said that over the last year, there have been a number of issues regarding respect around SRC meetings. Tracy has been brought in to promote a greater culture of respect.

6. Declaration of Ballot

Maggie Sheen was declared elected as Assistant Secretary.

Nominations for Budget Committee were closed. One further nomination was received, from Jess Xu. Jess Xu declared elected.

Election of final member of Budget Committee deferred until next meeting.

Motion to accept returning officer's report

Moved: Alison

Seconded: Lucy

Carried

7. Endorsement of Collective-appointed Convenors

The new Queer Convenors, Enviro Collective Convenors and DAGS Convenors were endorsed.

Queer Collective: Andie Yates, Angela Dacunto, Andy Maclean, Jasper Pool

Enviro Collective: Alana West, Sashin Ranasinghe

DAGS: Alice Anderson

Motion: That the new Collective Convenors be endorsed.

Moved: Maggie

Seconded: Jess

Carried

8. Constitution Working Group and Review

Motions discussed at last meeting:

Motion to move the Constitution change working group and review to the 2013 Executive (to provide a draft first to the Collectives and SA, then to the students of UTS to give feedback) (no mover or seconder).

Motion to defer the discussion to this meeting,

Lyndal stated that there has been an ongoing process to update SA Constitution, a process kicked off in 2009. The Constitution is currently under review by a lawyer, to check definitions of various terms.

The motion was opened to floor for discussion; Lyndal reminded the SRC to keep discussion respectful.

Jade stated that constitutional change is a long, drawn-out process. After amended draft, notice must be given to all student members of the SA, then successive meetings held (to ensure proposal passed by at least 100 students), then amendments passed by UTS Council.

There is no clear date as to when the Constitution will be cleared by the lawyer.

Maggie said that there is no current timeframe as to when a proposed Committee would be able to even begin looking at the Constitution, given unclear timeframe as to when the lawyer would finish looking at it.

Andy added that William, reviewing the Constitution, goes away next week for a month and a half.

Maggie asked how long William has had the Constitution; the answer was 'several months'.

Jade said that the process of constitutional reform does not have to begin with William. Work can begin on drafting, which can then be given to William later.

An amended Motion was proposed: To consult with William on timeframe for conclusion of review of Constitution.

Maggie said that, if we have this month-and-a-half period, we might as well use it. She was not opposed to members who nominated for Working Party to consult on drafting of Constitution.

Lyndal stated that executives are elected by the student body and are accountable to the SRC, in a way that the working party is not. The executive is furthermore in closer contact with the SRC.

Jess asked what was the goal of the original working party, as set out in the last meeting. Jade answered that these issues were not made clear in the last meeting.

Andy stated that empowering those people from outside the Executive who have expressed interest in constitutional reform may be desirable. Maggie added that merging original working group with Executive would not lead to a group of undue size.

Lyndal replied that the group is expected to meet. The larger the group, the more difficult it will be to create a workable constitution.

Alison said that she was not opposed to the drafting group being only the Executive, as more accessible for students to get a Constitution drafted (which makes sense to non-legally-trained students).

Jade stated that constitutionally, the Executive are responsible for the day-to-day operations of the SRC. They are currently tasked with dealing with important issues when the SRC can't.

Andy asked how many people from the Executive have experience in the workings of the Constitution. Jade replied that the Secretary, Douglas, has experience.

Andy stated that the experience of people who have in the past expressed concerns about the workings of the Constitution should be taken on board.

Alison proposed that a joint email address could be set up to incorporate the concerns of people around the operations of the Constitution.

Andy said that, if the working group is based on the Executive, communication is necessary to allow everyone to put through their ideas.

Motion to move the Constitution change working group and review to the 2013 Executive (to provide a draft first to the Collectives and SA, then to the students of UTS to give feedback).

Moved: Alison

Seconded: Lucy

Carried

Motion to create a group email address for those with concerns regarding the operation of the current Constitution to provide feedback

Moved: Andy

Seconded: Jess

Motion to direct the President to place the current Constitution online with appropriate security measures as soon as possible.

Moved: Andy

Seconded: Jess

Carried

9. CAPA

Kate stated that CAPA are currently offering us non-financial membership.

Maggie asked whether there were differences between financial and non-financial membership. Kate replied that the voting power of members depends upon whether financial or non-financial.

Kate stated that, ultimately, it would be desirable to move to financial membership; the Students' Association would not be able to continue non-financial membership perpetually.

Jess asked what CAPA is. Kate replied that they are the Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations – the postgrad version of NUS.

Alison asked what we gain through affiliation with CAPA.

Kate replied that we gain support from CAPA; we gain their research, we gain the benefit of their office-bearers, and the same benefits we gain through NUS.

Jade asked what obligations affiliation requires. Would we have to run CAPA campaigns?

Kate replied no; we would not be required to run campaigns or alter internal structures.

Lyndal stated that, at the last meeting, Kate declared a conflict of interest in relation to this debate.

Lyndal asked what our expectations would be in future; there is currently no provision in the SSAF for postgraduate funds at UTS.

Kate said that a postgraduate association would not be required for affiliation.

Maggie asked if, were we to affiliate, in future, the postgrad officer would be sent as a delegate?

Kate replied not necessarily; any member of the affiliated body can be sent as a delegate.

Lyndal asked whether any separate election for delegates to a CAPA conference would be required.

Kate replied that not that she was aware of; it would be up to the Students Association to decide on how delegates were to be selected. When Kate went

to conference, she was merely 'endorsed' by the President of the Students Association.

Kate clarified that anyone can go to the annual meeting of the CAPA, but they would not go 'on behalf' of the Students Association unless the Students' Association said so.

Kate said that she had offered several times to bring a CAPA spokesperson to come to speak to these meetings.

Jess said that she was interested in the proposal, but unwilling to put her full support behind it until she had more information.

Motion: to affiliate non-financially to CAPA.

Amendment: to promote between now and the next SRC meeting information regarding the nature of CAPA

Motion: to defer discussion of this motion to the next SRC.

Alison said that we need more information on the nature of the organisation. She said she was suspicious of any organisation which lets you affiliate for free and then confers no obligations.

Kate replied that we get to decide every year whether we reaffiliate.

Alison said that we need something clearly delineated, in writing, from the relevant authority, outlining our obligations.

Motion: to request from CAPA a detailed document outlining the obligations that come with non-financial membership.

Move: Alison

Second: Lucy

Carried

Maggie said she was happy to request information from CAPA.

Josh said that it seems inappropriate for discussion of CAPA affiliation without consulting Postgrad Collective.

Jade said that Postgrad Collective currently exists on Facebook.

Alison said that it was inappropriate to be seen as making this decision on behalf of postgraduate students without consultation.

Kate asked how we were to engage postgraduate students, given the current inactivity of the Collective.

Andy said that there was a need for a structure and association dealing particularly with the needs of postgrad students. He said that affiliating with CAPA would help with revitalization of Collective.

Jade replied that various staff members have responsibility for postgraduate issues.

Andy said that, in the absence of a postgrad collective, the welfare of postgraduate students is the responsibility of the Students Association.

Jess said that we can consult postgraduate students more widely after we have looked into the issue.

Andy asked whether the only representative of a postgrad student on the SRC is the postgrad officer.

Jade replied that the postgraduate member of University Council is also a member of SRC.

Lyndal said that postgraduate students can run for SRC positions directly; if they want to change things in the SRC they can do so via that route. She stressed that postgrad involvement not restricted to just the postgrad officer.

10. Questions and Comments about 2013 SRC

Alison asked how to contact the Disability Convenor. Maggie and Jess stressed the need for a detailed contact database for members and executive of SRC.

Lyndal said that SRC meetings are held once a month, with notice given one week in advance. Notice will be given via email, but that she was open to ideas as to how notice could be distributed. She stressed that observers welcome at SRC meetings.

Lyndal said that discussions are ongoing as to where to put up SRC notices; it has to be once a month, but this is not predetermined. She said that they have not set particular dates, as meetings should be as open as possible. (Otherwise, it will always be the same group of people able to come at that time, and less open to other members and observers.)

Kate said that it is currently not very open for observers at all, as notice is not publicly distributed. She said it would be easier to attend if there was a regularly-scheduled time.

Andy asked if, when the email is sent out, a public notice could be put up?

Motion: to put up a physical notice resembling the email sent out regarding general knowledge of SRC meetings.

Mover: Andy

Maggie asked whether there are hours in which the noticeboard would not be accessible? Tim replied that the noticeboard is accessible whenever UTS have not locked away the SA.

Lyndal asked whether one person should be empowered to put up the notice? Andy said that the Secretary should be so empowered. Danielle said that, in the Constitution, secretary calls meetings; hence, unnecessary to note the Secretary's unique responsibility in this instance.

The issue of false notices was raised; Danielle noted that the SA stamp could be used.

Motion: to defer Andy's motion to the next meeting.

Move: Lyndal.

Secunder: Lucy.

Carried.

Meeting declared closed at 5:27pm.