



Australian
National
University

AGENDA – ANUSA ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING (OGM) 3 2022

Wednesday, 5 October 2022

6:15pm, Zoom (with in-person option in the Granee Room)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://anu.zoom.us/j/89960621848?pwd=eEhRUes1TWZJeXoyc2lwblM2QU5XZz09>

Meeting ID: 899 6062 1848

Password: 445422

Item 1: Meeting Opens and Apologies

Meeting Opens 6:19pm

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

1.2 Apologies

1.3 Chair outlines standing orders for the meeting (please also see the following:

<https://anusa.com.au/pageassets/about/meetings/ANUSA-Standing-Orders-Guide.pdf>)

1.4 Declaration of conflicts of interest

Item 2: Passing the previous meetings minutes

2.1 Passing OGM 2, 2022 minutes [MINUTES OGM 2 2022.docx.pdf](#)

- Have been distributed to the SRC via Slack

Mover: Freya

Seconder: Luke

•

Item 3: Reports

Item 4: Motions on notice

Motion 4.1: ANUSA 2022 Budget

Withdrawn

Procedural to Move Motion 5.1 immediately before 4.4

Mover: Mira

Passes

Motion 4.2: ANUSA 2023 Provisional Budget

Preamble:

These budgets have been kindly prepared by Jaya over the past weeks for the benefit of the 2023 team. The rationale for passing two budgets, activated by a condition based on funding is that ANUSA still has a level of uncertainty about our budget in the near term. It is important that no matter what funding we receive for 2023, we have a viable provisional budget to use over the summer period.

In the preferable scenario in which we receive enough funding to activate the higher budget, this budget will permit us to make the staffing increases that are required to serve postgraduates.

Like this year, it will likely be necessary to pass new budgets at each general meeting in order to redistribute money as effectively as possible.

Motion:

ANUSA approves the 2023 Provisional Budgets:

- If ANUSA's anticipated funding meets or exceeds \$3.5 million in 2023, ANUSA approves the provisional budget attached. [2023 Budget Ideal Scenario.pdf](#)
- If ANUSA's anticipated funding is less than \$3.5 million in 2023, ANUSA approves the provisional budget in Reference D. [2023 Budget Non-Ideal Scenario.pdf](#)

Mover: Katrina Ha

Seconded: Ben Yates

Katrina:

- two budgets to accommodate for potential to have more funding (due to PARSA)

Ben Y:

- thanks to Jaya for preparing these over the past few weeks
- one is obviously more ideal and we want to actualise it
- only a provisional budget for over the summer - we can continue to reflect and evolve over the year
- mostly to pay stuff and cover required costs over the summer

Questions:

Lara: Are extra staff accommodated for in ideal budget

Ben Y: PARSA is operating business as usual, staff are being prioritised, exact solution is being figured out, has to be in

Ben H: ¼ towards night cafe, if this doesn't cont. what happens to it

Jaya: will speak more to night cafe in SRC report next week

Amendment on Notice:

Preamble:

Student unionism and collaboration with other student unions is key to fighting the issues that students currently face. Our education has been attacked nationally, starting with John Howard's removal of compulsory student unionism. History has shown us that one student body that is overworked with pastoral care demands cannot do it alone. These national attacks require a national response and working with other student unions.

If we want to commit to undoing these attacks, we need to properly fund our student union. Many of the office bearers go unpaid. This undermines the work they can do.

Motion:

ANUSA will commit to the full \$45,000 National Union of Students' funding in the Ideal Situation Provisional Budget.

Mover: Isabella Harding

Seconder: Azraa Hussain

Isabella:

- we know about the importance of the NUS, we know the impact they have
- half of the NUS OBs don't get paid
- impacts the importance and effectiveness of unpaid OBs and the connection they have to individual campuses
- we need to begin considering committing to this if we care about student unionism
- in the ideal sitch where we get PARSA funding we need to be representing all the students we cover

Against: Chido:

- the NUS can choke, they don't deserve our money and they never have
- ANSUA is struggling due to SSAF
- Labor besties in the NUS need to talk to their staff about bringing back Mandatory Student Unionism
- Ethno-con was a sham, didn't get an equity ticket
- Shouldn't be giving money that we can use on the ground that we can be giving to students and also to their welfare
- I HATE THE NUS

For: Carter:

- for boosting amount of money in both
- against Labor infiltrating and accommodating to Labor gov
- political reason for funding the NUS
- main thing in this budget is the fact of ANUSA going broke due to years of being service provision body rather than fighting back
- fight for uni to provide these services for students rather than ANUSA being a charitable organisation

Procedural: Move to a vote on amendment

Moved by: Avan

Procedural fails

Against: Katrina

- important but we discussed it last SRC
- not the cause of our budget issues, already agreed on \$10,000
- if we add \$35,000 brings up operating to \$3.8M
- not sure if we are getting that much money
- pointless to do it now when we haven't secured that money and also have high op. costs

For: Chris

- voice in the NUS is the best way to salvage it
- how can we stand up against a Lab gov if we can't stand up
- it's on us to fund it and all
- two-pronged approach to activism - ANU and nationally

Against: Jaya

- friend who is member of the SDA, leave the SDA instead of quadruple the SDA
- full of resume stackers, send them money doesn't help
- embezzlement earlier this year - no guarantee that it doesn't get up
- two main faction that don't rep the student view
- this is going to go towards a corrupt body

F: Aveline

- continuation of student unionism
- this is a suggestion to move away from this - step back and do nothing about corruption and also weak political stance of the NUS
- embezzlement is bad, we should actually do something
- go there and put an argument
- Jaya: by sending them more money?
- go back and put the argument that we need to be better

Amendment: Kai - increase to \$20,000

- agnostic to the NUS
- double the revue from SSAF, proportionally increase to the NUS

F: Isabella

- VSU is a result of Howard gov,
- cannot go back to compulsory student unionism with a single campaign has to be national campaign
- embezzlement was bad, this was dealt with and called out by the NUS and their internal processes
- still an ongoing dispute
- not a useful analogy to think about the SDA where there isn't the same process

A: Ben H

- officers of the NUS is unpaid
- unclear how this can make sure the officers are paid,
- loosely oversee that the OBs on campus
- no-one has made a clear argument on what it can do other than be embezzled
- there are people on our own campus who should be paid better

F: Yerin

- \$10,000 isn't that much compared to other unions
- argument that you don't like what the NUS does and hence not paying as much is a scab argument
- broader issues that students face aren't exclusive to ANU and cannot solely be solved at ANU
- The way to combat them is to combat different uni managements on a national scale and the Lab gov.
- the more funding we put in should be put towards that campaign on a federal level
- 2014 campaign

No dissent to closing the speaking list

A: Phoebe

- beauty of a national union is that we can deal with national issues
- need to send delos to ask the NUS to be better
- cannot see how giving more money can make sure that the NUS can be better, cannot justify increasing
-

F: Nick

- long term withdrawal and decline of funding to the NUS, thanks to libs and lib aligned people who are fighting against the union movement
- union needs more money to run campaigns on a national level
- withdrawing funding as a punitive measure is scabbing
- service provision model represents an anti-union rhetoric, stop treating unionism as an investment
- most unions are corrupt

A: Remi

- participate in the NUS, i went to Edcon
- factions argument, chanting yelling over each other
- believe in funding unions but current function is terrible
- \$45,000 in its current state is not worth it
- if there is representation on ANU campus from the NUS why are they not active

F: Louis

- worth reiterating Nick's points
- financially undermining union due to objectionable politics - scab argument, seeing it as a form of transaction
- when sufficiently funded and left wing it can be effective

A: Aarfa

- people who have spoken, non-proportional representation of international students
- proportionally funded by SSAF
- NUS is an abstract on our campus - there isn't
- on campus OBs work long hours without compensation
- giving them more money doesn't mean that people will do more work

Vote on \$45,000 NUS Affiliation in ideal budget

Amendment fails

Procedural to cease speaking

Procedural passes

Amendment: \$20,000 to NUS Affiliation in ideal budget

Passes

Friendly amendment: Ed committee budget to be amended to \$12K in ideal and \$6K for ideal

Moved by: Bea

Passes

Voting on Budget with amended \$20K NUS and \$12K Edcomm in the ideal budget.

Passes

Motion 4.3 Constitutional changes for postgraduate membership and related purposes

Motion:

Add to section 2: “Postgraduate Student means a student active in a postgraduate program as defined by the University.” and “Student means an Undergraduate Student or Postgraduate Student.”

Delete ‘undergraduate’ from section 4(1)(a) and 4(1)(c).

Amend section 5 to read:

5. MEMBERSHIP
 1. The Association has one class of membership, being ordinary membership.
 2. An ordinary member of the Association is any person who is a Student in an undergraduate or postgraduate degree at ANU.
 3. A person, with immediate effect, may terminate their membership in the Association by writing to the General Secretary of the Association specifically stating that they do not wish to be a member of the Association.

Amend section 9(9)(a) to read ‘cease to be a Student’.

Amend ‘an undergraduate Student’ in section 9(10)(a) with ‘a student’.

Amend s 10(8)(k) to read ‘liaise with the University Council student members on issues relevant to students’.

Remove the word ‘undergraduate’ from section 10(9)(a) and (b).

Amend section 12 to:

12. UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBER
 1. The University Council Members are the two persons elected according to the Election Regulations, provided they are consistent with the requirements of the University's enabling Act, and any relevant statutes of the University.
 2. The University Council Members must:
 1. attend meetings of the University Council; and
 2. comply with the University's enabling Act and any statutes of the University as they apply to members of the University Council.
 3. The General Secretary must invite the University Council Members to attend meetings of the SRC.
 4. A University Council Member is neither a Representative of the Association, nor an Officer of the Association for the purposes of the Constitution and Regulations.
 5. A University Council Member may not be removed from their position otherwise than in accordance with the University's enabling Act, any relevant statutes of the University.
 6. One University Council Member shall be elected by Undergraduate Students as provided in the Election Regulations.
 7. One University Council Member shall be elected by Postgraduate Students as provided in the Election Regulations.

Amend section 18 to:

18. PARENTS AND CARERS COMMITTEE
 1. There is to be a Parents and Carers Committee to promote community among students who are parents or carers and to raise awareness and facilitate action and discussion on the issues facing these students.

2. Membership of the committee is to be open, unless otherwise provided for in a regulation or policy made under this Constitution or by resolution of the Parents and Carers Committee.
3. The Welfare Officer must, unless the Parents and Carers' Committee provides otherwise:
 1. manage the administrative affairs of the Parent and Carers Committee;
 2. convene a meeting of the Committee at least twice in every Teaching Period;
 3. convene the Committee within seven (7) Teaching Days of being presented with a petition signed by five (5) members of the Association; and
 4. provide notice for convening the Committee of no less than three (3) Teaching Days. Notice should be posted on the front door of the Association offices, on the website of the Association.
4. Subject to the Constitution, the Regulations and Policies of the Association, policy proposals of the Committee must be determined by meetings of the Committee, at which all members of the Committee may vote.
5. The Welfare Officer is bound to present these policy proposals to the Executive or the next meeting of the SRC, whichever is first, which may then choose to ratify or reject the proposed policy.

Add a new section 19(3)(c) and renumber accordingly: "seek to recruit to active participation in the Education Committee students who are undertaking undergraduate or postgraduate course work degrees, students who are undertaking an honours program, and candidates who are undertaking higher degree research;"

Add a new section 19(5) and renumber accordingly: "The Education Committee may establish sub-committees to specifically address issues of concern to undergraduate coursework students, postgraduate coursework students and higher degree research candidates, respectively."

Add a new section 31:

31. TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS 2022-23

Entry into Effect

1. The changes adopted to this Constitution at the October General Meeting of the Association (Ordinary General Meeting 2022, No. 3). (including this section) enter into effect on a date declared in writing by the General Secretary, after a vote of the Executive in favour of declaring the commencement of the provisions and after consultation with the SRC.
2. The date of commencement shall be after ratification of those amendments by ANU Council.

Ad Hoc Representatives

3. These provisions allow for the election of additional Representatives, who are Postgraduate Students, pending further reform of the ANUSA Constitution and the commencement on 1 December 2023 of the term of office of Representatives elected in 2023 at the annual ANUSA election.
4. Representatives elected under this provision holds office until 30 November following their election.
5. By Special Resolution a General Meeting may create Ad Hoc Representative roles.
6. The Special Resolution will:
 1. name the role(s);
 2. number how many members are to be appointed to the role(s);
 3. name any eligibility criteria for nomination, including that the person is a Postgraduate Student;
 4. give a description of the role(s).
7. An Ad Hoc Representative role created under this provision may not overlap with or have any of the same or similar functions as a unique Representative role already provided for in this Constitution.

8. An Ad Hoc Representative role created under this section 31 may be filled by a majority vote of a General Meeting.
9. The General Secretary must advertise for nominations for an Ad Hoc Representative Role at least 10 days before the General Meeting at which the election is to be held. The call for nominations must be advertised through:
 1. ANUSA's social media;
 2. The ANUSA Website; and,
 3. The front door of the Association.
10. For avoidance of doubt, a ballot to fill the Ad Hoc Representative role may take place at the same meeting as the special resolution creating that role. The General Secretary may advertise for nominations after giving notice of the proposed special resolution. The call for nominations must note that the election will not be held unless the special resolution passes.
11. This section 31 ceases to have effect immediately on 30 November 2023, and shall be deleted from this Constitution at that time.

Moved: Christian Flynn

Seconded: Ben Yates

Christian: This is a pretty big amendment, something we have spent lots of time working towards. Shoutout to Ben who did draft the amendments. Broadly, will walk thru purpose and why its important that it passes. In essence, passing these solidifies ANUSA's involvement and position in the debated about postgrad representation and services at the ANU. We are seeing a big threat to student unionism at the ANU this year. PARSAs was defunded this year, due to governance issues. Considering this and SSAF, we have three options: 1, PARSAs is somehow able to create a new postgrad organisation that gets funded, won't be independent from ANU. 2, ANU agrees to have some small postgrad council, gives most of funds to ANU Thrive or similar, not in students' interest. 3, ANUSA steps in, and we have the capability to grow, take on this money, meet requirements. Good political argument to a single union: postgrads and undergrads share more issues than differences. There are differences between cohorts, however those are not so significant as to justify a division between us. Working together, despite those differences provides far bigger benefits. We wouldn't have a union for each academic college. Stronger, unified advocacy front, with more funding. If we don't pass these amendments, we won't get more than 3.5mil. If you want to see the ideal budget in action, worth voting for these amendments.

Ben: Actual changes: word undergrad to student, adding provision for ANUSA to administer PMAC election, parents and carers committee which we should have anyway, slightly adjusts education committee to include postgraduate advocacy, transitional provisions. There is no scenario in which we will not get funding and then have to commence these provisions. Ad hoc representatives would allow us to appoint postgraduates, likely college reps in the case that PARSAs collapses to avoid situation in which postgrads are unrepresented. These amendments are the necessity for us to receive extra funding. Huge, exciting change for our union.

Question (Oscar): about facilitating PMAC elections, how does that work with PARSAs aspiring to carry on business as usual.

Ben: PARSAs has said they will continue operating until June next year, Council election is later in the year. This will allow the Council election to stay in the hands of a student union.

Question (Isabella): with the entry into effect provision 1, why is it a vote of the executive, not the whole SRC?

Ben: the executive can meet the entire year, SRC can only meet during teaching periods, being not before March this year

Azraa: could we not have an SGM?

Ben: not outside teaching periods

Oscar: consultation would essentially act as a vote yes?

Ben: yes, SRC would be able to hold executive to account.

Question: we a

I am confused, sorry folks

Ben: if we support this today, the things that are required to make these commence is consultation with SRC, vote by exec, gen sec writing to SRC to confirm

Chido (for): truly believe this is some of the best work from Christian and Ben and everybody who has helped out. Such an act of faith towards postgrads, who we have already been providing services to. We went out and spoke to postgrads, really want continuity. The Uni has left postgrads. We should be proud of the way Christian has stepped up to ensure that nobody goes without anything. Excited for a place like the BKSS to be where postgrads will never be turned away. Will revolutionise what we are able to do, across departments, across everything. Shoutout to Christian.

Question (Max): Ad hoc rep, will it be postgrads voting on that?

Ben: Those reps will be voted on at a general meeting, where all students will be able to vote. Could be made into an autonomous vote but would be quite complicated to administer. Not worth creating a huge amount of infrastructure to allow that. Eligibility for the positions will be set out.

Katrina (for): Emphasising the department side: all departments will agree that it was really difficult to separate postgrads in representation, and including them in our membership will be much better.

Passes

(to 5.1)

Motion 4.4: Remove Kambri from the campaigning exclusion zones

Preamble:

ANUSA elections have some of the most draconian, anti-democratic measures to limit campaigning in the country. A key measure which limits the capacity for campaigners to intersect with and talk to voters is the existence of exclusion zones.

Kambri is the main thoroughfare of campus and should be the heart of student life, including student activism and politics. From its establishment, the ANU intended Kambri to be a corporate haven. Students have successfully pushed back against this in the past, winning the right for student clubs to hold information stalls in Kambri free of charge.

Removing Kambri from the list of exclusion zones and establishing it as a campaigning space in the ANUSA elections is another important way we can push back against the corporatisation of this space. Kambri should be a place where candidates and tickets running in the election are able to have political discussions with students about the direction of ANUSA, the key political issues facing students and the strategy needed to fight back against attacks on our rights. No other university campus prohibits student union campaigning in the central thoroughfare.

The expansion of exclusion zones in recent years to include spaces like Kambri has been a measure used by the larger incumbent tickets in ANUSA to disadvantage smaller tickets who rely more on campaigning during election week to convince students to vote for them. Incumbent tickets with existing social networks and voting bases don't need to talk to as many new students to win votes. This makes the existence of exclusion zones in the most central parts of campus an undemocratic measure that helps to privilege the incumbents and depoliticise the campus.

Motion:

Remove number 1 (Kambri precinct) from the list of exclusion zones in schedule B (in relation to section 3.1.3) of the ANUSA constitution.

Moved: Carter Chryse

Seconded: Nick Reich

Motion 4.5: Robson Rotation

Preamble

This motion strips the requirement to order the ballots and replaces them with the method that the software we already use requires. Each of the last four elections have been run using this method and literally nobody except me noticed. Also, this method is fairer as it entirely eliminates the advantage that may be gained by appearing first on the ballot.

This motion also removes the ability for tickets to order their NUS and Gen Rep tickets - only one NUS ticket and zero Gen Rep tickets tried to order themselves this year, so I can't imagine it will be missed. Tickets will still have the ability to tell people how to vote for Gen Rep or NUS if they so desire.

Text

Replace the text of Regulation 2.4.3 which currently states

‘Except as provided for in section 2.4.5, the position of candidates on the ballot must be determined by the drawing of lots by the Returning Officer or their nominee.’

With the new text

‘Except as provided for in section 2.4.5, the position of candidates shall appear randomly on each ballot.’

Replace the text of Regulation 2.4.5 which currently states

2.4.5 The ballot for the election of General Representatives to the SRC:

(a) must group candidates according to the ticket or party to which they are aligned, and group together all

"Group Unspecified" candidates in a single group titled "Not Grouped";

(b) must display these groups in an order determined by the drawing of lots by the Returning Officer or their nominee;

(c) must list the registered ticket name at the top of each group endorsed by each registered ticket;

(d) must list candidates within these groups: (i) in the order requested by that group, if that request is received in writing by the Returning Officer or their nominee before the date of the drawing of lots; or (ii) if no order is requested, in an order determined by the drawing of lots by the Returning Officer or their nominee in accordance with section 2.4.3; and

(e) must display the group entitled "Not Grouped" to the right of the groups endorsed by each registered ticket; and

(f) must list candidates within the group entitled "Not Grouped" in an order determined by the drawing of lots by the Returning Officer or their nominee in accordance with section 2.4.3.

With the new text

‘Candidates for General Representative shall be ordered randomly, except that those candidates who belong to a ticket shall appear together under the heading of their ticket. Also, those candidates who do not belong to a ticket shall appear together under the heading “Not Grouped”

Moved: Sarah Strange

Seconded: Isabella Gockel

Amendment on notice:

Change the text to replace R 2.4.5 with:

2.4.5 The ballot for the election of General Representatives to the SRC:

- (a) must group candidates according to the ticket or party to which they are aligned, and group together all "Group Unspecified" candidates in a single group titled "Not Grouped";
- (b) must display these groups in a random order;
- (c) must list the registered ticket name at the top of each group endorsed by each registered ticket;
- (d) must list candidates within these groups in a random order.

Moved: Ben Yates

Seconded: Christian Flynn

No dissent to the amendment

Sarah: Was a probity officer this year. The software we paid for years ago only does this, and we've been ignoring what the Constitution does. We should have had eConstitution say what the software does. It's also way more fair because it removes the benefit of being listed first. ACT and TAS do this.

Isabella: We think this is a really straightforward system and we just want to put it in the Constitution

Amendment (Nick): good to randomise the tickets, but should still be provisions to allow tickets to establish their own orders, particularly for tickets that don't get so many votes

Sarah: if we allowed tickets to order their gen reps, tickets that choose not to random would have to stay in a static order, that is the only way the software we can run. Nobody actually utilised function.

Azraa: ANUSA comms sent out request about ordering candidates.

Sarah: one ticket tried to order NUS reps, but wasn't covered in constitution. Much fairer to simply randomise. Tickets can still publish how to votes and that's what they did this year. We can't do the proposed solution where one ticket has non-random and others have random.

Against amendment (Chido): know from history of the system that it's not able to do it, they have tried and it fails, some tickets get upset. This year, not that much of an issue. What is far more important is that there is no system perfect for us. This system could be perfect for us, tickets can put out their own how to votes and it can be easier that way. We are relying on an external system that can produce the fairest ordering possible. Thank you to probity for trying to fix this ongoing issue.

For amendment (Aveline): lost as to why it's fairer to randomise within a ticket. On the practicality, it is totally fine to have the RO randomise the tickets that want to be randomised. It does disadvantage smaller tickets if they cannot order their ballot.

Against amendment (Christian): understands the point about smaller tickets, but really think that the way the system works is that there will be so much randomisation that, if somebody is keen to vote for a particular ticket, they will usually go to the effort of finding the how to vote. Alternative is that donkey vote bias is not eliminated. Robson rotation method is the only system that eliminates the top of the ballot bias. If you look at the ANUSA elections, most students would think the tickets and candidates are ordered randomly. It doesn't seem otherwise. The donkey vote bias is bad enough that we should try and eliminate it, and this is what the system is capable of at the moment.

For amendment (Nick): the point of voting for a ticket is because you support their policies, particular vision for the student union. More democratic to put forward a whole ticket of gen reps... in terms of donkey vote bias, the preferences flow within the ticket pretty steadily. Fine for tickets who won't do a how to vote, voters just vote down the line. The problem for smaller tickets is that if it is randomised, and voters don't follow the how to vote, vote is scattered across individuals, and they can be knocked out in earlier rounds of counting. Should be open and an option for people to be able to order, to give the best chance of one person from tickets getting above quota. Doesn't disadvantage other tickets. Voters will still be able to see which ticket they are voting for.

Against amendment (Sarah): just to exactly clarify the options, option 1 is to randomise every single candidate within every ticket every time you refresh the page. Option 2 is to fix every single candidate within tickets, so refresh would be in the same order (this amendment). We don't have the option of having some tickets stay in order, while others randomise.

Nick to clarify: tickets can still be randomised?

Sarah: yes

Amendment fails

Return to actual motion

Isha (question): this means that it will always be random always?

Sarah: yes

Motion passes

Motion 4.6: Spending Caps

Preamble

The student politicians here somehow succeeded in removing graphic design and photography expenses from the spending caps, apparently due to concerns about underpaying artists. That's all well and good, but those expenses make up a significant majority of spending for tickets! One ticket this year spent more than 1000 dollars on these expenses and under 500 dollars on capped expenses. Why even have a cap?

This motion adds those expenses back into the spending cap and raises it by 20% (rounded to the nearest dollar) to compensate. If you want to pay artists more, we could raise it more. The language about inflation is to allow for the case in which the current inflation crisis leads to year-over-year inflation exceeding 20%, though that seems unlikely.

Text

Amend the Electoral Regulations by removing subpoint 2.9.4(a) and renumbering the following subpoints accordingly.

Add the following subpoint at the end of Regulation 2.9.2

‘For 2023. the value of min shall be 260 dollars, or the 2022 value adjusted for inflation, whichever is higher. The value of max shall be 1589 dollars or the 2022 value adjusted for inflation, whichever is higher.’

Moved: Sarah Strange

Seconded: Isabella Gockel

Sarah:

- Probably controversial, spending caps applied to everything until this year, photography and graphic design were excluded this year
- This motion moves to change this to include spending caps for photography and design, accounting for this to also increase cap

Isabella:

- Why are we looking at the spending cap if the biggest expenses dont even account for them
-

A: Ben Y:

- I removed this motion a couple meetings ago
- I also convened the ticket referred to
- \$1140 paid for graphic design and photography
- Has a marginal impact that printing, ads etc have and hence why we should have caps
- The question of keeping them in the cap is whether we wage theft people for their work (or friends/yourself do it if you have the skill)
- Not keeping them in the cap is a question of financial inequality
- Excluding it doesn't necessarily stop favours from being called in

F: Oscar:

- Uncomfortable keeping it uncapped
- Either including it in current cap or partition the cap, but it's outrageous to have it uncapped
- Equalising the spending for tickets is a good scope

A: Jaya:

- Agree with some of Oscar's point
- If someone is happy to put a motion to partition the cap it stops the financial inequity
- Support lowering the cap or putting a cap on graphic designers/photography

Q: Isha:

- AEC has done something like this on a much larger scale.... [Zoom disconnected]

Q: Chido

- Can we make an amendment
- Sarah accepts that as friendly

Q: Ben Y:

- Propose to move this to conversation to the Gen Sec to be reviewed in the Election reform group
- Sarah initially does not accept as friendly

Procedural for break passes

Friendly amendment accepted: ANUSA directs the General Secretary to review spending caps in the Governance and Election Reform Working Group, including specifically looking into spending caps that apply to photography and graphic design, as separate categories, while ensuring student artists are not insufficiently remunerated. The working group will present models for reform to the cap at OGM1, 2023.

Accepted with no dissent

F: Isha

- ANUSA could look at reimbursing independent candidates for small amounts
- Look at in the working group

Motion passes

Motion 4.7: Withdrawals

Preamble

It turns out there are no provisions anywhere in the Regulations allowing candidates to withdraw at any point. This is very dumb, and this motion will now allow candidates to withdraw at any time before the voting period. Our practice has been to allow this anyway. Withdrawing during or after the voting period, under this motion, will lead to a recount of votes with the candidate excluded.

Motion

Create a new subsection in the Electoral Regulations under section 2 that reads as follows

‘2.12 Withdrawals

2.12.1 A candidate may withdraw from their candidacy at any time in writing by informing the Returning Officer or Probity Officers.

2.12.2 If a candidate withdraws before the voting period, that candidate’s name will be removed from the ballot and the funding cap of any ticket that candidate belonged to decreases accordingly.

2.12.3 If a candidate withdraws during the voting period or after it but before the votes for every position are counted and announced, their name remains on the ballot. Ballots for the election of the positions that candidate was running for shall be counted as normal, except the withdrawn candidate shall be excluded and their votes redistributed before any other step is taken. In the case that a candidate withdraws after the votes for the position they are running for are counted but before all the votes are counted and announced, the votes for the position they were running for will be recounted in this way.

2.12.4 Any attempt to withdraw a candidacy after votes are counted will lead to a casual vacancy under the Constitution.

Moved: Sarah Strange

Seconded: Isabella Gockel

Amendment on notice:

Reads not friendly from Sarah

Amend the proposed R 2.12.3 and 2.12.4 to read:

2.12.3 If a candidate withdraws during the voting period or after the voting period but before the declaration of results, their name remains on the ballot. Ballots for the election of the positions that candidate was running for shall be counted as normal, except the withdrawn candidate shall be excluded and votes for that candidate shall be redistributed. In the case that a candidate withdraws after the votes for the position they are running for are counted but before the declaration of results, the votes for the position they were running for will be recounted in this way.

2.12.4 Any attempt to withdraw a candidacy after the declaration of results will lead to a casual vacancy under the Constitution.

Moved: Ben Yates

Seconded: Christian Flynn

Sarah:

Isabella :

- Introducing legislation wasn’t there

Ben:

- Stops people from withdrawing at

Sarah:

- Add back in the section about “before any other step is taken” to make it friendly

No dissent to amendment

F: Chido

- Shout out to probity and out RO Roxanne for identifying this and working on this issue that came up at the last hour

Motion passes

Motion 4.8: No In-Person Voting

Preamble

There's a requirement for ANUSA to run in-person voting in the Kambri precinct. If that means paper ballots, that would cost thousands of unbudgeted dollars and at least 20 hours of time, not including counting time. Given that ANUSA moved to solely online voting years ago and strict compliance with this requirement would have substantial costs, we should get rid of it.

In its place, I have put a requirement for ANUSA to assist people in casting their ballots and to prominently advertise the fact that they do so. This will address any accessibility concerns and help those people who, for example, cannot afford or access a computer or cannot complete a ballot unassisted for disability reasons.

Text

Replace the text of Electoral Regulation 2.5.1 which currently reads.

'On each of the four Teaching Days upon which the Annual Elections are held, at least 5 hours of polling must be conducted in the Kambri precinct. The Returning Officer or their nominee must ensure procedures are in place to enable ordinary members of the Association to cast their vote in the Kambri precinct at these times.'

With

'Voting shall be conducted entirely online. ANUSA shall make sure that impartial students or staff, as well as internet devices, are available to assist students to cast their vote through all business hours in which the Annual Elections are held. Further, the availability of assistance in casting a vote shall be advertised on ANUSA social media platforms.'

Moved: Sarah Strange

Seconded: Isabella Gockel

Sarah: there's a reason this rule has been ignored for the last 5 years. We shouldn't have things required in the constitution that aren't seen through. This would also require further work on accessibility.

Isabella: Sorry for not consulting with relevant persons for this amendment due to short timing but we wanted to make these changes which felt relevant.

Question (Katchmirr): Will there be consultation after this motion should it pass?

Sarah: we've passed a motion saying we'll be required to consult after this on the entire voting process.

(Against) Matthew: A lot of student unions around Australia have in person voting and their engagement is higher. The option should be there as it increases engagement.

(For) Christian: The current text implied that paper ballots must be used. Accessibility wise the wisest way to go about this is to say that ANUSA will facilitate you having a laptop if you don't have one and need it to vote. Many get the AEC to run their elections which we don't. All the benefits can be met without us going back to paper ballots. We'd have to reorder regulations such as robs and rotations. The administrative process is a beast. We can advertise the aforementioned in-person hub a lot better, I don't think that is restricted in this motion.

(Against) Chris: we should be in favor of in person voting. This opens the door for in person campaigning as well. We should do everything we can to increase engagement, that's a cost we should cop. That's where we should spend our money, not Friday Night Party.

(For) Azraa: I was very confused about in person voting as a ticket convenor. Online voting increases accessibility, students who don't want to walk up to a booth and be bombarded or just want to vote from their own home, this is better for them. We should be for this motion. We should consult the departments and consider this as part of the electoral reform working group.

Friendly amendment to change title to "No paper ballots"

(Against) Yerin: constant theme about low ANUSA voting turnout. Bring it back to ANUSA not being a political body and that inducing apathy among the student body. In universities that have in person voting the turnout is a lot higher, i don't think it's the solution and we should still have online voting but in person voting needs to make a return as a basic democratic measure

(For) Christian: There's a difference between in-person and paper ballots. We can just do in-person digitally. If we're going to be accessible yes we need to have online but we can also have digital in person voting to reduce the administrative nightmare of returning to paper ballots. These things do not cancel each other out

(Against) Matthew: Clarifies that I don't think we should remove in

Refer the question of how to use an in-person voting hub to the GenSec

Question -Ben H: the motion already specifies the process a little bit

Katchmirr: I think the entire thing needs to be figured out.

Christian: We need to keep voting should remain online.

Phoenix (clarification): Ben has just added an election working reform group consideration of implementation of in-person voting. This does not change the motion

Yerin: Security concern raised by CompSci students.

Christian: We moved to online voting after WadGate in the 90s to avoid the insecurity. We've had no issues with the security of the online platform until now. If we propose to return to in-person ballots we need to consider this much further.

Question - Chris: a lot of voters had some technical errors

Christian: if any of those voters come to us we can look into that for them. Sometimes it's a matter of certain degrees being ineligible to vote.

Sarah: this motion requires ANUSA to help people to vote anyway so that's accounted for in the motion.

Amendment taken as friendly

Ben H (clarification): are we still passing to add these details into the electoral regulations. DO you thinkwe should alter the wording of what's being put into the regulations

Ben Y: the question of someone being available to assist someone with voting is separate to this. We don't have to be required by the constitution to do things. We can have ipads that people would login on and people can log in and vote there, learnt this at a workshop. This motion doesn't inhibit or require things like this. The operationalising of this should come first.

Amendment added to motion.

Sarah (right of reply): this motion removes the requirement for 5 hours of in person voting in Kambri precinct and instead requires that ANUSA provides any student with assistance in all business hours of the voting period. that's a floor not a ceiling, next year we can add more. This simply removes the outdated requirement. It also doesn't follow the election requirements. Voting closes at 12pm on the Thursday. 5 hours would mean that it opens at 7am. This simply removes the requirement, all else can be revisited later including no paper ballots.

Passes.

5 minute break procedural.

Item 5: Other Business

Motion 5.1: Investigating election accessibility and improving democratic engagement

Over the course of the last few weeks, both Mira and myself as Disabilities Co-Officers have received numerous complaints from students in our collective about the inaccessibility of the election and campaigning processes. These covered a lot of points including the voting website, lanyard availability, information dissemination and so on, but by far the most common complaint we heard is about in person campaigning on University Avenue. The way in which campaigners approach and try to engage students beyond the level that they wish to be engaged with is at best annoying, at worst inaccessible and potentially triggering. We have heard that multiple members from our collective decided to take longer, less accessible paths to avoid Uni Ave just because they wished to avoid campaigners. That the location of our autonomous department space is in Copland exacerbates this issue.

Expanding campaigning zones to include Kambri would require a whole lot of consultation with us, the future DSA officers and our wider collective, because although it is definitely important to ensure that the campaigning process is democratic, equal, and fair, it is equally important to ensure that campus accessibility is maintained for ALL students. Writing a motion to change key election processes with a week's notice, and for it to be decided at a meeting which is notoriously inaccessible to most students from our collective, is not acceptable. Changes like these need thorough consultation with the disability officers, and although we have talked with various people on ANUSA about this motion this past weekend, one week of consulting without all key stakeholders (primarily our collective members, but also other students) is not enough.

That being said, this motion will compel next year's Gen Sec to conduct a review, consult with everyone, but most importantly the Disabilities Officer, and arrive at any and all changes that address the concerns of everyone, making sure the process is both democratic and fair, but also accessible. We need to make sure any changes benefit everyone and that these have been thoroughly consulted on by all of the affected parties.

Motion:

1. ANUSA directs the 2023 General Secretary to conduct a review, within the Governance and Election Reform Working Group and in collaboration with the Disabilities Officer(s) that investigates
 - a. the accessibility of elections, including campaigning, voting, candidacy and other interactions,
 - b. the potential to provide more open and less restricted options for campaigning while balancing accessibility concerns,
 - c. the potential to counteract substantial relative disadvantages and advantages between different tickets and electoral groupings with a view towards making the elections a more genuine contest of ideas.
2. The General Secretary shall present any reforms produced by the review and the working group at the 2023 Annual General Meeting or sooner.
3. The review shall be a standing agenda item at the Governance and Election Reform Working Group.

Moved: Maddi McCarthy

Seconded: Mira Robson

Maddi reads the motion aloud as her mover speech.

Mira: Additionally, we've just had an election. We have time to do an adequate consultation process *now*. This would best be done in early 2023 in time for the next election. We are sympathetic to the cause. We represent the interests of our collective and its members, they were not represented or consulted in this process.

Against: Carter : These motions are not counterposed. The original motion is in the interests of the union movement, freedom to debate, freedom to run. Kambri was made an exclusion zone in 2019 to disproportionately impact other tickets and exclude them from the election process. Freedom to debate is discussed in the language of harm such as domestic abuse. To table the motion is undemocratic when campaigning starts well before August.

Procedural moved by Phoenix to limit speakers.

Maddi (Right of Reply): I have bad social anxiety, I've been on campus or in lectures and in tutes where I'm already overwhelmed, I plan my days around less interactions. To have people chase and harass you on uni ave when you have social anxiety is harmful. It sends me home, forces me to not be able to go to my class. Secondly, people go around uni ave to avoid these campaigners are forced onto less physically accessible routes. Third, your motion can pass now, why would we not do the work before passing and achieve the same thing after consensus has been reached rather than work on a flawed motion.

Move to vote.

Passes.

Procedural to move to table Motion 4.4

Passes

Procedural for 5 minute break.

Motion 5.2 “We are all Mahsa” Solidarity with the uprising in Iran

Preamble

The murder of Mahsa Amini by the morality police, who was arrested for allegedly not wearing her Hijab properly, sparked a mass revolt in Iran. At the time of writing the Iranian uprising is entering its third week, and has now spread to over 100 cities and 30 provinces. The explosive nature of this struggle has come out of the deep dissatisfaction that ordinary people feel over both the broader economic crisis facing the Iranian people as well as the regime’s ramping up of oppressive measures against women.

Iran’s economy has been deteriorating for some years now under the pressure of rising inflation, and the effects of COVID-19. Trump’s ‘Maximum Pressure’ sanctions against Iran, which have not been eased by Biden, have had an extremely destructive effect on Iran’s economy, the effects of which have been pushed onto ordinary people. The unemployment rate in Iran is continuously on the rise and almost one-third of the population lives in abject poverty. Since coming to power in 2021, conservative hardliner, Ebrahim Raisi has banned access to basic birth control, implemented a new hijab and chastity law which gave the right to bosses to fire women for dressing “improperly”, as well as increasing the patrols of the morality police. The morality police, created in 2005 to enforce mandatory hijab laws, prosecute over 16,000 Iranian women every year. These two factors are inextricably linked. Women in Iran face the brunt of the economic crisis making up the poorest 10% of society, and Raisi’s new workplace laws will likely worsen the economic situation women face.

Mahsa Amini was also a Kurdish woman, and the protests against her murder began in the Kurdistan province. The Kurdish ethnic minority is persecuted in Iran, and Kurdish women face horrific sexual abuse at the hands of the country’s military and police forces. As a result of this Kurdistan has often been a hotbed of resistance to the state, which is another important dynamic of the current protests.

Students have played leading roles in this movement. Fourteen student organisations have jointly issued a set of demands on the government - which include: the dissolution of the morality police, legislating the right to abortion and equal pay for women as well as abolishing sexist family laws that have shackled women to the home.

The protests face serious repression from the regime, alongside rolling blackouts of the internet and the blocking of social media platforms, security forces have murdered at least 133 protesters, hundreds more have been arrested and thousands of activists have been arrested in an effort to suppress the movement.

Ordinary people in Iran bravely resisting repression to fight for their liberation have called on the international community for solidarity. In Canberra, there have already been two solidarity protests held here, with more being organised. As a student union, it is vital that we express our support and solidarity with this resistance, not just in words but also materially by promoting further solidarity protests organised in Canberra and providing money for printing materials for these protests.

Action

1. ANUSA stands in solidarity with the uprising in Iran and supports the demands of the movement.
2. ANUSA will promote and provide material support to solidarity protests being organized in Canberra.
3. ANUSA opposes the sanctions which have been imposed against Iran and recognises that sanctions materially worsen the already intense economic crisis, disproportionately affecting ordinary people.

Moved: Yerin Park

Seconded:

Amendment on notice

Amend title to: "Solidarity with the revolutionary uprisings in Iran"

Add action 4: "ANUSA condemns the human rights abuses committed by the Islamic Regime against the people of Iran"

Moved: Paria Najafzadeh

These amendments are friendly to the mover and will be incorporated unless there is dissent from the meeting.

#ANUSAOGM <3

So true ^

Meow

No dissent to amendments

Yerin (mover): the murder of a 22 year old Kurdish woman in the custody of the morality police has sparked widespread, inspiring uprising of ordinary ppl in Iran against the government. This is something to follow and support, partially because Iran has seen these kinds of uprisings every time there has been a pushback from gov, but also because the rhetoric coming from the right has been blatant islamophobia. We should be supporting of ordinary people and their right to choose. Solidarity protests have been going on around the world, including quite radical approaches such as death to the dictator. Not just a question of women's oppression. One thing that has come up was the we are all Mahsa chant. Her death under this religious context has sparked a wider societal uprising, and it is quite inspiring. Not about somebody wearing or not wearing a hijab, but having control over their lives. That has spread widely and into international solidarity is something we need to follow. Also worth noting that students have taken a leading role in this, University in Tehran was surrounded by police. We have seen bravery, as a student union, we need to support.

Louis (seconder): Emphasise the extent student have played, pivotal in the struggle. Police had essentially sieged the carpark, fired tear gas. Lecturers and other staff members helped blockade police to protect students. Role that students play in solidarity with workers is incredible. More workers need to go on strike, etc. Inspiring to see protests around Aus and the world in solidarity with Iranians fighting against oppressive government and entrenched right with clergy, overall for a better world.

Paria's amendment to remove 'material' accepted as friendly

Paria: thought it was my responsibility, as an Iranian student and as somebody who this personally impacts. Decided to remove material support because some of the activist groups in Canberra have a detrimental agenda to the Iranian people. We need to be careful and don't want to make ANUSA support groups that we don't know are ethically sound, requires a lot of consultation.

No speakers against

Paria (for): speaking from the heart, just addressing why changed title. The saying 'we're all Mahsa' is very relevant for Iranian students, people but for our context as Australian students at a privileged university, not appropriate for us to include ourselves in that group. Not our struggle, we are here to support.

Grace (for): also, if you're a white woman, stop cutting your hair. Context is that Iranian people have been cutting their hair in protest, and white people in Australia have been taking this up. Really important that we de-centre this idea that we all have this experience, and that we change the language and maintain that.

Yerin (ror): there are monarchists at these protests, and that is not something to support. Generally, there have been protests in solidarity across the world, which assume is quite heartening to people in Iran.

Motion passes

.

Item 6: Meeting Close

Expected Close of Meeting: 9:30pm

Released: 3 October 2022 by Ben Yates

The next general meeting of ANUSA is in 2023, date and time TBC.