



Australian
National
University

DRAFT MINUTES – ANUSA ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 2020

Thursday, 21 May 2020 6:15pm, Zoom

Item 1: Meeting Open and Apologies

Meeting opened: 6:28pm

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

We acknowledge the Ngunnawal and Ngambri people as the Traditional Custodians of the land on which ANUSA operates. We recognise the continuing connection to lands, waters, and communities of all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. We pay our respect to Elders, past and present, and commit to standing with our First Nations people.

1.2 Apologies

Received by General Secretary via email

Item 2: Chair outlines standing orders for the meeting

Item 3: Passing the previous meetings minutes

Motion: That the minutes from the 2019 Annual General Meeting be passed

Mover: James

Seconder: Lachy

Outcome: Passed

Item 4: Reports

4.1 President's report (L. Day) [Reference A]

AGM is an annual meeting where finances and general state of ANUSA is reported back. Different to SRC meetings, I'll try to be a bit more summative. I'll finish it off flagging some concerns regarding ANUSA at the moment. Last 12 months have indeed been a time. Not the year I thought I'd be having when I put my hand up for this role. Last 12 months have shown why student unionism is absolutely essential to the good functioning of a student focused university. We saw some incredible successes. O-week for a phenomenal success, Friday Night Party was well received.

Early steps taken to deal with disasters. First of which occurred were the bushfires. Entire city was clouded in smoke, couldn't go outside and a lot of regional areas were affected. Some ANUSA members, in particular Madhu were key in response. This was seen through distribution of masks. Large string of protests, ANUSA's environment officer Grace led the protests well. Travel ban, in which LC and many ISD and ANUSA members supported and pushed the university for a package, including a fail mark not including to their grade if affected. Incredibly challenging time with campus shutting, ANUSA banded together incredibly well. We have given out hundreds of financial support grants with the half million gifted to us. Many academic wins. Many of these fights are still going on but confident with momentum and ability to mobilize students further. Next few months will be incredibly challenging. I back SRC and the executive and every group of staff and ANUSA. The best way to fight is to unite and stand up. I will now be going onto a few concerns

Firstly, Higher education is going to be changing. The nature of our learning will be shifted irreversibly. We don't know what next semester will have for us. Probably say goodbye to lecture halls filled with students. We have to stand up for future students' want. We need to be able to fight to make sure things will change for the better. We need to rethink how we look at student engagement.

Procedural: Extend Lachy's speaking time for 5 minutes

Moved: Jin

Outcome: Passed

Bush week is not going to run the way we intended. We need to look critically on how to engage students. Especially for students who are currently not here. There is currently mass student unemployment. If you need help reach out to ANUSA SA officers, we still have money. This is not a final solution and ANUSA needs to continue to fight the university and federal government to aid students who need it. Many are not on Jobkeeper and they need help. Jobkeeper will not be continuing after September if Liberal and Labor government get their way.

ANUSAs finances, if you looked through the financial audit, we are in a good financial position. This is a testament to the previous treasurers and previous office-bearers. SSAF is going to decrease, students are not going to enroll as much, and our budget will begin to decrease. I will not be surprised if even more of our SSAF money will be moved to university departments who are getting funding cuts due to COVID. We need to be looking at alternative forms of revenue if we are going to continue to provide welfare support and continue the events we run and levels of advocacy. I look forward to the upcoming election season. If you're not running, think of the policy platforms. Ask questions, grill them. This means students can have a proper say in what their reps are doing.

Q: Thanks for report. What you think the impact of current staffing levels and cost associated with that will be as a result of likelihood of fallen SSAF budget?

A: Every year ANUSA has to have a good chat with itself of what is essential and what needs to be bid for in SSAF to be best provided for students. Nature of SSAF bid allows us to split up the requests. We'd be shooting ourselves in the foot if we don't bid for things because we fear we won't get. If the university does cut it, we need to have a chat about how that works. That will most likely involve the NTEU as well.

Q: Any word on when EOI will go up for elections?

A: No. Don't believe the EOI has been released this early ever. Taken on notice but no.

Motion: To accept the President's report

Mover: Zoe
Second: James
Outcome: Passed

4.2 Treasurer's report (M. Wang) [Reference B]

Takes report as read.

Motion: To accept the Treasurer's report
Moved: Kriti
Second: Lachy
Outcome: Passed

4.3 Financial Review Committee report [Reference C]

Taylor: Did not receive a report from the FRC. We are electing a new committee so hopefully there will be a report for next AGM.

Item 5: Election of Financial Review Committee

Nominees: Sinead Winn and Benjamin Chesler

Procedural: Give each nominee 3 minutes to speak
Moved: James
Outcome: Passed

Sinead: First year in college of Arts and Social Sciences. Nominating because I think it is something that is important to the functioning of ANUSA and it's something I can help with. I have a background in finance and handling finances and this year I am the Queer* Department treasurer. This may come across as a conflict of interest, in the event of that, I will be perfectly happy to recuse myself. I really think I am the kind of person that likes to help out in this way. I really think the financial side of handling ANUSA is very underrated in its necessity and that's something I'd really love to help with. It's very important to me that we have a functioning student body that continues to voice its opinions with the university. If we can't do this, the student union of the ANU will not function as it should, we won't be able to help those who don't have a voice.

Benjamin: I am second year student studying PPE, I would like to assist with the oversight of ANUSA. I believe I have skills necessary to overlook disputes that are referred to the committee. I have a strong analytical mind. I can gather impressions fairly quickly and apply that clearly. I am interested in running for this position because I would like to further contribute to the running of ANUSA. I recognise the importance the committee plays in overseeing ANUSA's financial position as Lachy mentioned, we are looking at a more precarious financial position and that requires greater accountability. I believe I can help contribute to help make this society better.

Procedural: Allow for 10 minutes question time
Mover: Maddy
Outcome: Passes

Q: For the second year in a row the FRC has not submitted a report, which undermines a lot of the things you have both talked about. Can you clarify how both of you plan to make it through the year and are you going to put in any mechanism to ensure a report will be put in?

A (Sinead): Very sorry to hear financial review committee hasn't put in a report. Undermines the accountability side of the financial review committee in itself. If we are reviewing finances through means of auditing and governance, we should do that on a regular basis, not just

coming up to the AGM and reports should be filed on a regular basis. We have to do this regularly and balance this with other responsibilities within ANUSA. Take time to protect ourselves from being overwhelmed. Prevents feelings of this overwhelming sense of a lot of work. I think if we do regular check-ups on department spending and ANUSA spending in general and regular liaison with treasurer and financial controller, should help maintain our progress throughout the year.

A (Ben): I think that financial review committee should provide regular reports. I think implementing a mandated report perhaps on a quarterly basis will be prudent. We should try to support the FRC in whatever way manages to provide this information publicly. Ultimately, it's another aspect of committee's accountability role an oversight of ANUSA's finances so it's important to mandate a report on a regular basis.

Q: Are you aware of the various amounts of financial policies that you will need to know? If so, which document will be the central one you work off?

A (Sinead): Prepared to read any regulations that are required. In preparation for this, I was a little bit nervous, so I read the entire finance section of ANUSA constitution because I wanted to make sure I know what I'm saying. I haven't looked a lot at the separate financial regulations yet but definitely prepared to do it for when I would start in that role.

A (Ben): Very happy to read the 80 pages, we are all bit bored. Financial section is most important and associated regulation and policy. My background is less on accounting side of organisation, but I am very fast learner and keen to understand more about the finances of organisations.

Q: We haven't had an FRC in past 2 years, and you have the responsibility for you to be working 2018 and 2017 audit. Do you have any strategies?

A (Sinead): It's a lot of work, need to set strategies. Personally, I like to structure my time with my diary, I think it's really important to get this done in a timely manner. It's very important we schedule time that the previous year's get done in a timely manner without making sure it stresses us. I suggest allowing a few months to do 2018, more pressing and then 2017 once any immediate business has been handled by the committee that can make sure it will allow for our current commitments. Personally, really love to throw myself into a million things. I really like not only trying to help, but I think I am one of those people who thrives under pressure and the way I expel that energy is through I'm making sure I regulate my schedule.

Procedural: Extend question and answer time for 10 minutes

Moved: Ash

Outcome: Passed

A (Ben): I'd be able to handle the organisational pressures. I like to use a calendar to handle my multiple commitments, it's a bit light at the moment. As for managing for previous 2-year backload of FRC items, I think it's important to schedule regular meetings, two a month in the earlier stages to handle 2017 and 2018 items then move to 1 a month depending on the load. Certainly, able to handle pressures it entails. I like to work with a lot of commitments on my plate otherwise it gets boring, but I am able to handle when dealing with uni and extracurricular activities.

Q: suitability of financial policies, do you have suggestions of ways you wish financial policies can be improved?

A (Sinead): Very important part in reviewing policies to implement new policies, I have a few ideas on how to improve financial policy. A lot of it is centred around cohesive analysis surrounding department spending. As a treasurer of a department it can be daunting. A policy is a collated review of department spending every month to make sure records are being kept

orderly and timely. A lot of it will have to do with records being kept. Making sure we are keeping records of spending and making sure it's going to the right place. Not implying there will be misuse of money, but the aims and goals of ANUSA we can think about what we want our student body to think of when they see us spending SSAF money.

A (Ben): Two suggestions. First one fixing the superannuation predicament ANUSA has at the moment. Making sure our superannuation aligns with other aspects of ANUSA. My main answer would be to provide greater transparency and accessibility of financial information to the student body. When the annual budget is presented, it is an intimidating document to many students who may not grasp the complexity of each individual budget line item, so I think one potential policy is to break it down to different line level items. SSAF is a very complex issue to wrap your head around without experience in the area.

Procedural: Extend question and answer time by 5 minutes

Moved: Maddy

Outcome: Passes

Q: Given that ANUSA has external audits conducted, how do you plan to streamline your work, so you are minimizing amount of overlap?

A (Sinead): I think that the overlap of the external auditing and FRC's territory is very big. The key to make sure you don't overlap, is to clearly follow the guidelines of the policy and also to make sure you are contributing your work under your own guidelines. I know in the FRC section it outlines the FRC responsibilities. We have to work closely with financial controller and the treasurer. To support the external auditing, our work has to be streamlined and concise which I think I can maintain by making sure audits and internal reviews are regular.

A (Ben): clear and regular communication with treasurer and financial controller. I believe overlap could be a significant issue when considering work with the FRC. Referrals would be highly pressing to the committee. Ultimately, I believe it comes down to clear communication within the committee but also keeping well informed of the audits in progress. We have to know what our ToR and boundaries are.

Procedural: Move Sinead and Ben to a breakout room so meeting can move to a vote

Moved: Kriti

Outcome: Passes

Taylor: Each candidate needs to hit a 2/3 majority excluding student media that is 40 people, so minimum of 27 votes.

Motion: Accept Sinead Winn to the Financial Review Committee

Outcome: Elected to Financial Review Committee

Motion: Accept Benjamin Chesler to Financial Review Committee

Outcome: Elected to Financial Review Committee

Procedural: Move to a 5-minute break

Moved: Siang Jin Law

Outcome: Passed

Meeting re-opened at 7:28

Item 6: Discussion items/motions on notice

Motion 6.1

That the ANUSA AGM notes the 2019 financial statements
(<https://anusa.com.au/pageassets/about/financialreportsandssaf/Financial-Report-2019.pdf>).

Mover: Maddy Wang

Second: Lachy Day

Mover waived speaking rights

Seconder waived speaking rights

Mover waived right of reply

Outcome: Passed

Motion 6.2

Explanation:

Section 3.5.3 of the ANUSA Finance Regulations needs to be amended to bring it into compliance with superannuation law. At the moment the section states that superannuation is paid to ANUSA Executive as a *matter of policy*. This is inconsistent with the law as section 12 of the Superannuation Guarantee (Administration) Act requires that superannuation be paid to “A person who is entitled to payment for the performance of duties as a member of the executive body (whether described as the board of directors or otherwise) of a body corporate.” Members of the ANUSA Executive fall within this description. Also section 3.5.3 of the Finance Regulations provides a fixed rate for superannuation, whereas the law will increase or change that rate from time to time. In July 2021 the applicable rate will increase to 10% and will continue to increase after that. Finally section 3.5.3 provides that superannuation will be paid every fortnight, however practice is for payment to be made quarterly, as this reduces administrative costs of compliance. The amended version of section 3.5.3 below addresses these issues.

Motion:

Section 3.5.3 of the ANUSA Finance Regulations is amended by deleting section 3.5.3 and inserting instead:

The Association will, at least quarterly, make a superannuation contribution at the applicable rate required by superannuation law to a complying superannuation fund of the Executive member’s choice. Contributions must be able to be made by electronic funds transfer.

Mover: Maddy Wang

Second: Zoe Ranganathan

Procedural: Move motions 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9 and 6.11 en bloc

Mover: Ben Wicks

Outcome: Passed

Procedural: Move to motion 6.2 now

Mover: Ben Wicks

Outcome: Passed

Mover waives speaking rights

Seconder waives speaking rights

Mover waives right of reply

Outcome: Passes

Motion 6.3

Motion:

That the following amendments be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

2.10 Disclosure Requirements

2.10.1 Upon nomination, each ticket convener and independent candidate must complete and lodge with the Returning Officer or their nominee a statement of intention identifying anticipated sources of campaign funding. This statement must include all financial and non-financial contributions to the campaign. Non-financial contributions include but are not limited to the use of printing facilities, paper, paint, glue, T-shirts, advertising including online advertising, and other sundry items.

Change 2.10.2 from:

2.10.2 At 9am on each of the days that the election polls are open, the ticket convener or independent candidate will lodge with the Probity Officer a signed statement including:

- (a) completed expenditure to date;
- (b) copies of receipts and/or tax invoices corresponding to the items, services, materials and any other campaign-related expenditure which together account for the completed expenditure to date; and
- (c) where items, services or materials are acquired for less than market value, evidence of the market value of each such item, service, or material; and
- (d) an itemised list of all financial and non-financial contributions to the campaign, including but not limited to printing facilities, paper, paint, glue, T shirts, advertising including online advertising, and other sundry items.

To:

2.10.2 At 9am on the first day that the election polls are open, the ticket convener or independent candidate will lodge with the Probity Officer a signed statement including:

- (a) completed expenditure to date;
- (b) copies of receipts and/or tax invoices corresponding to the items, services, materials and any other campaign-related expenditure which together account for the completed expenditure to date; and
- (c) where items, services or materials are acquired for less than market value, evidence of the market value of each such item, service, or material; and
- (d) an itemised list of all financial and non-financial contributions to the campaign, including but not limited to printing facilities, paper, paint, glue, T shirts, advertising including online advertising, and other sundry items.

Add s 2.10.3:

2.10.3 Should any additional expenditure occur, any items, services, or materials be acquired for less than market value, or any other financial or non-financial contributions be made to the campaign after the first signed statement is lodged under s. 2.10.2, the ticket convenor or independent candidate will lodge with the Probity Officer a signed statement at 9am on the day after this occurs including:

- (a) the additional expenditure conducted;
- (b) copies of receipts and/or tax invoices corresponding to the additional items, services, materials and any other campaign-related expenditure which together account for the additional expenditure to date; and

(c) where additional items, services or materials are acquired for less than market value, evidence of the market value of each such item, service, or material; and

(d) an itemised list of all additional financial and non-financial contributions to the campaign, including but not limited to printing facilities, paper, paint, glue, T shirts, advertising including online advertising, and other sundry items.

Re-number s 2.10.3 and s 2.10.4:

2.10.4 All items, services or materials attributable to the campaign must be at the candidate's or ticket's own expense, except where those items, materials or services are provided by:

- (a) the Australian National University; or
- (b) the Australian National University Students' Association.

2.10.5 Any ordinary member of the Association may request information in relation to the campaign expenditure of any candidate or ticket that is disclosed under 2.10.1, 2.10.2 or 2.10.3. The Probity Officer(s) must provide such information as soon as reasonably practicable.

Mover: Jordyn Gibson

Seconder: James Eveille

Procedural: remove 6.3 and 6.8 from the motions bloc

Mover: Lachy

Outcome: Passes

Mover: Result in exact same information being passed onto the probity officer, only thing it does is streamline the process instead of submitting a report every day. Now candidates will submit one report at the beginning and provide updates as they arise before 9am the next day. Efficiency thing.

Seconder: Clear amendment to make things easier.

Against: Agree with the sentiment. What old system looked like at 9am everyone had to submit a form for the ticket if there were any financial changes. You wouldn't have to list your entire expenditure again. Either say yes and list costs, or no. I can appreciate this may seem like a burden, but alternative questions were never asked, and this was not a good thing.

Procedural: Kazimier to ask a question

Mover: Kazimier

Outcome: Passed

Kazimier: Very multi-faceted role, I just wanted to ask as being a past probity officer for ISD, have you consulted past probity officers?

Jordyn: Looking into that.

Jordyn (Right of reply): based off what Lachy said, we missed a bit of information and didn't understand the way this provision has been enacted in the past. If the motion did pass, would still be in the bounds.

Outcome: Fails

Motion 6.4

Preamble:

The reasoning for this section is to allow the Returning Officer to issue directions to waive the requirements of Election Regulation provisions where COVID-19 restrictions impact the elections. A change in policy that requires the university to shut down again in semester two could impact several Regulations, including the following sections: 2.3.5 (having a locked ballot box at the ANUSA office for nominations), 2.3.10 (displaying a list of nominations on the front door of ANUSA) and 2.5.1 (five hours of polling occurring in the Kambri precinct each day for people who are having troubles with online voting). This section gives the Returning Officer a clear basis for implementing alternative mechanisms to ensure that the election runs smoothly and fairly.

Motion:

That the following amendments be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Add section 3.3:

3.3 Force Majeure

3.3.1 If Force Majeure prevents or hinders the implementation of a provision of the Election Regulations the Returning Officer may issue directions waiving the requirements of that provision to the extent and for the period that its performance is affected by Force Majeure, subject to those directions providing alternative measures which promote the purposes of that provision.

3.3.2 Alternative measures set out in a direction made under Regulation 3.3.1 must be such as to:

- (a) promote a free and fair election;
- (b) promote the right and accessibility for every member of the Association to stand for office or vote in the election;
- (c) adhere to the spirit of these Regulations; and
- (d) depart as little as practicable from the provisions of these Regulations affected by Force Majeure.

3.3.3 For the purposes of this clause, Force Majeure includes any closure of any part of the University or the ANUSA offices on the grounds or health or safety or other events of the kind mentioned in this provision, and any event which prevents, impedes, or makes impossible, impracticable, unlawful or unsafe the performance or continued performance of a provision of these Regulations; including any natural or health disaster, civil unrest, riot, fire, flood, storm, explosion, terrorist or other attack, unavailability of essential services, any event involving serious injury, illness or harm to any person in connection with performance of the a provision of these Regulations, denial of access to any facility, resource, or location necessary for the performance of a provision of these Regulations.

Mover (motions 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 6.11): Taylor Heslington

Seconder (motions 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 6.11): Skanda Panditharatne

Procedural: Skip reading motion 6.4

Mover: James

Outcome: passes

Procedural: Skip reading of all motions

Mover: Ben

Outcome: Passes

Mover: All these amendments were worked on my electoral regulation working group, they all reach a broad consensus.

6.4 was force majeure close, enables returning officer to deal with any Covid-19 issues that arise.

6.5 was extending withdrawal of nominations, 2 teaching days before elections open to ensure people can withdraw if they like to

6.6 minor word change union court to Kambri

6.7 correcting an error, technically Probity wouldn't have to resign if they were running for NUS or Uni Council

6.19 Probity has to clarify what exclusion zones are before the campaign period, ANU teaching spaces was redefined.

6.11 fixes typos

Second: Congratulates Taylor and the working group for all their work.

Amendment one (motion 6.4):

Amend s 3.3.2 from 'must be such as to' to 'must be such as to, in the opinion of the Returning Officer'.

Mover: Jacob

Second: James

No dissent - amendment passes

Motion 6.4 now reads:

3.3 Force Majeure

3.3.1 If Force Majeure prevents or hinders the implementation of a provision of the Election Regulations the Returning Officer may issue directions waiving the requirements of that provision to the extent and for the period that its performance is affected by Force Majeure, subject to those directions providing alternative measures which promote the purposes of that provision.

3.3.2 Alternative measures set out in a direction made under Regulation 3.3.1 must be such as to, in the opinion of the Returning Officer:

- (a) promote a free and fair election;
- (b) promote the right and accessibility for every member of the Association to stand for office or vote in the election;
- (c) adhere to the spirit of these Regulations; and
- (d) depart as little as practicable from the provisions of these Regulations affected by Force Majeure.

3.3.3 For the purposes of this clause, Force Majeure includes any closure of any part of the University or the ANUSA offices on the grounds or health or safety or other events of the kind mentioned in this provision, and any event which prevents, impedes, or makes impossible, impracticable, unlawful or unsafe the performance or continued performance of a provision of these Regulations; including any natural or health disaster, civil unrest, riot, fire, flood, storm, explosion, terrorist or other attack, unavailability of essential services, any event involving serious injury, illness or harm to any person in connection with performance of the a provision of these Regulations, denial of access to any facility, resource, or location necessary for the performance of a provision of these Regulations.

Back to main motions (6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 6.11):

Mover waives right of reply

Outcome for motions 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.9, 6.11: Passes

Motion 6.5

Preamble:

This amendment will allow nominees to withdraw their nominations right up almost until the opening of the polls. The reasoning for the time limit of two Teaching Days (defined in the ANSUA Constitution as ‘any weekday that falls during a Teaching Period of the Colleges, excluding public holidays’) before the election is to provide enough time to allow changes to be made to the online voting system to remove the candidate.

Motion:

That the following amendment be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Amend s 2.3.9 of the Election Regulations from:

2.3.9 A nominee can withdraw their nomination at any time up until two Working Days after the date the Returning Officer confirms the nomination under section 2.3.7D.

To:

2.3.9 A nominee can withdraw their nomination at any time up until two Teaching Days before the polls open for the Annual Elections.

Mover: Taylor Heslington

Seconder: Skanda Panditharatne

Passes (above)

Motion 6.6

Preamble:

This amendment updates the language used in this section from ‘Union Court’ to ‘Kambri’.

Motion:

That the following amendment be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Amend s 2.5.1 of the Election Regulations from:

2.5.1 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 Union Court 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 Union Court precinct at these times.

To:

2.5.1 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.

Mover: Taylor Heslington

Seconder: Skanda Panditharatne

Passes (above)

Motion 6.7

Preamble:

This amendment corrects what I'm assuming was an oversight in the Probity system. In the current s 2.11.1(c), a Probity Officer would not be taken to have resigned from their position immediately upon tendering their nomination for NUS attendee or University Council member, as those positions do not fall under Schedule 1 to the Constitution. This stands in contrast to the current s 2.11.1(b), which states that '[n]o member of the Association who will be contesting a position at the next Annual Elections may nominate for the position of Probity Officer.' S 2.11.1(b) prevents people who will be contesting for NUS or Uni Council from nominating for Probity, so it makes sense to bring s 2.11.1(c) in line with this.

Motion:

That the following amendment be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Amend s 2.11.1(c) of the Election Regulations from:

(c) If, subsequent to their election under 2.11.1, a Probity Officer nominates for any position under Schedule 1 to this Constitution at any time, they are taken to have resigned from their position as Probity Officer immediately on tendering their nomination.

To:

(c) If, subsequent to their election under 2.11.1, a Probity Officer nominates for any position under Schedule 1 to this Constitution, for a position of delegate to the National Union of Students' National Conference, or for the position of University Council Member at any time, they are taken to have resigned from their position as Probity Officer immediately on tendering their nomination.

Mover: Taylor Heslington

Seconder: Skanda Panditharatne

Passes (above)

Motion 6.8

Motion:

That the following amendments be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Insert new Regulations 3.10-3.10B:

3.1.12 It is an offence to campaign outside of the Campaign Period.

3.1.12A For the purposes of 3.1.12A, the Campaign Period means the period starting when the Returning Officer issues the notice of the call for nominations under Regulation 2.2.1A and ending at the close of voting.

3.1.12B For the purposes of this Regulation 3.1, to campaign includes any of the following acts by a member of ANUSA: announcing an intention of any person to stand for office, announcing the purported name of any ticket or grouping for an ANUSA election, announcing any proposed policies of any person or ticket purportedly planning to stand for office, canvassing for votes for an office to be filled at an ANUSA election, publishing or distributing Electoral Publication, and any other action or measure the predominant effect or purpose of which is to promote an electoral outcome in an ANUSA election.

Insert new Regulation 2.2.1A

2.2 Call for Nominations

2.2.1 The Returning Officer must call for nominations at least 4 weeks before the commencement of polling, and nominations must remain open for at least 2 weeks.

2.2.1A The Returning Officer must issue notice of when the call for nominations will occur at least 2 weeks before the call for nominations.

Mover: Skanda Panditharatne

Secunder: Ben Wicks

Mover: This is an interesting one, came out of 2017 probity report that came out a while ago. Tickets launched very early at end of term 2 after exams which presented problems. 1. Probity had to work throughout the whole break to monitor regulations, not ideal. Unclear if probity would be able to rule on it and this clarifies that. Removing pressure for tickets to launch earlier and earlier. I understand there is a friendly amendment coming in through Jason to tie up the language to make sure it doesn't catch anyone unintentionally to say 'I'm planning to run' as a public pronouncement. It would also prevent year-round ticket we see at other campus which isn't necessarily in line with ANU's stupol culture.

Amendment one:

Amend s 3.1.12A from 'For the purposes of 3.1.12A' to 'For the purposes of 3.1.12'.

Amend s 3.1.12B from 'to campaign includes any of the following acts by a member of ANUSA' to 'to campaign includes any of the following acts by a member of ANUSA or the inducement of those following acts by another person by a member of ANUSA who intends to run for office'.

Amend s 3.1.12B from 'announcing an intention of any person to stand for office' to 'publicly announcing an intention of any person to stand for office'.

Amend s 3.1.12B from 'announcing the purported name of any ticket or grouping for an ANUSA election' to 'publicly announcing the purported name of any ticket or grouping for an ANUSA election'.

Amend s 3.1.12B from 'announcing any proposed policies of any person or ticket purportedly planning to stand for office' to 'publicly announcing any proposed policies of any person or ticket purportedly planning to stand for office'.

Mover: Jason

Secunder: Jordyn

No Dissent - Amendment Passes

Back to motion 6.8:

Seconder: Skanda covered it pretty concisely, I'd also say that hopefully this creates a culture where elections aren't a focus as early as they have been growingly becoming.

Against: Agree with sentiment of this motion but don't think it'll be actioned in the way intended. Firstly, there is no punishment mechanism for if someone breaks this regulation. All other regulations share clear discretions to probity. This one doesn't. This will be a problematic change because there is a world where someone was intending to run independently and have posted on their own Facebook page, that will be considered. When these people do run tickets, these haven't been allowed because retrospectively they've been allowed a critique when others have not. This didn't happen last year, in 2017, it didn't really work for Shakeup when they did the launch early. I back ANU students to be able to make the distinction between someone who has spoken early.

Point of clarification: Punishment for breaking Election Regs exist under 2.3.3 for all offenses, existing punishment would also apply to this new offence.

For: Long and difficult discussion we had in the electoral working group, quite fruitful discussion we had and amendments we have put forward are quite substantive and rightfully appropriate. I appreciate the concerns about independents running. We would be friendly to an amendment. Independents are in a unique position, broadly the aim of this change was to prevent a similar scenario to 2017. Intentions of ANU students and capacity to understand what's going, I think it's still important that a provision defines an electoral period. I think this proposal works whole-heartedly but if you want to amend it feel free.

Against: I agree with a lot of what Lachy said, I was a lot more concerned about this amendment before the other amendments were added but there are some consequences. In general, it has potential to bring various critiques of ANUSA people make into a dispute process later after making those critiques. I don't think this is the intention of the motion, and the intention is good, but I am concerned about handing the discretion about this to RO when I think it's been widely acknowledged that this is not the actual intention of it. Those punishments are already set out in later regulations. One of these punishments is removing ANUSA membership. Having this punishment hanging over people who critique ANUSA who then later run for elections is problematic to me. I'd also note that it is not necessary to fix the problems identified. Didn't work out well in the past. We just have quorum.

Amendment two:

Remove from s 3.1.12B 'publicly announcing any proposed policies of any person or ticket purportedly planning to stand for office reportedly stand for office,'.

Mover: Skanda

Seconder: James

Amendment is dissented

Mover of amendment: Recognise that it could be used by an over-eager probity/RO to catch up statements of policies, I think that's really unlikely given how RO has acted in the past. This provision will mean that the only thing left in the motion is unequivocally standing for office.

Seconder waives speaking rights

Against: I agree with intention of amendment, but my issue isn't with this sentence. If I am president now and suddenly rant on Facebook, a day later I announce I am running, it's me

promoting an electoral outcome. May or may not be a coincidence but it's the element that people could perceive as promoting an electoral outcome. This amendment would still allow for this to take place. I appreciate taking this out but the catch-all would still create issues

Outcome of amendment: Passes

Back to motion 6.8:

For: I appreciate the concern being raised by this motion. I think it'd be a massive reach for RO to ever make an interpretation 'you published something on fb page' and announce you are running and therefore that is bad. I personally think anyone the SRC appoints to RO is capable of making the distinction. Even if they are, disputes will be able to if it ever did need to be upheld. Benefits are very important so I would support it.

Amendment three:

Remove from s 3.1.12B 'and any other action or measure the predominant effect or purpose of which is to promote an electoral outcome in an ANUSA election.'

Add to 3.1.12B: 'and' before 'publishing or distributing Electoral Publication' and add a full-stop after 'Electoral Publication'.

Mover: Jason Pover

Secunder: James Eveille

No dissent – Amendment passed

Motion 6.8 now reads:

Insert new Regulations 3.10-3.10B:

3.1.12 It is an offence to campaign outside of the Campaign Period.

3.1.12A For the purposes of 3.1.12, the Campaign Period means the period starting when the Returning Officer issues the notice of the call for nominations under Regulation 2.2.1A and ending at the close of voting.

3.1.12B For the purposes of this Regulation 3.1, to campaign includes any of the following acts or the inducement of those following acts by another person by a member of ANUSA who intends to run for office: publicly announcing an intention of any person to stand for office, publicly announcing the purported name of any ticket or grouping for an ANUSA election, canvassing for votes for an office to be filled at an ANUSA election, and publishing or distributing Electoral Publication.

Insert new Regulation 2.2.1A

2.2 Call for Nominations

2.2.1 The Returning Officer must call for nominations at least 4 weeks before the commencement of polling, and nominations must remain open for at least 2 weeks.

2.2.1A The Returning Officer must issue notice of when the call for nominations will occur at least 2 weeks before the call for nominations.

Back to motion 6.8:

Right of reply: Thank you everyone for your concerns, which have been incorporated into the motion. Lots of electoral regs can be abused by the RO, this is unlikely. I don't think it's a reason to treat this section differently. More broadly speaking, I still think there is value in this motion, basically in the cultural change that has been noted, it is worth noting elections are becoming more and more contested, around the country there are similar provisions in other campuses which work well.

Outcome: Passed

Motion 6.9

Motion:

That the following amendments be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Amend Schedule B of the Election Regulations from:

SCHEDULE B – EXCLUSION ZONES

Section 3.1.3 provides that it is an offence to actively canvass votes within the areas specified in Schedule B to these Regulations.

For the avoidance of doubt, the following areas are 'exclusion zones':

1. Kambri Precinct (bound by North Road, the perimeter of Fellows Oval, Tangney Road and Kingsley Street)
2. The Melville Hall Student Space;
3. The Copland precinct;
4. The Chifley Library & associated walkways;
5. The Taibal Centre;
6. Outside the Childers Street UniLodge residences;
7. The small footpath next to University Avenue between the Copland Courtyard and Kambri;
8. ANU libraries;
9. ANU teaching spaces;
10. Daley Road;
11. David Cocking Sport and Recreation Centre; and
12. Hancock bridge;

Campaigners are permitted to campaign in all other areas.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Returning Officer or their nominee will clarify exclusion zones at the beginning of each general election. This include but is not limited to a map of exclusion zones.

The Returning Officer or their nominee may temporarily suspend an area so debates or other informative events may be informed

To:

SCHEDULE B – EXCLUSION ZONES

Section 3.1.3 provides that it is an offence to actively canvass votes within the areas specified in Schedule B to these Regulations.

For the avoidance of doubt, the following areas are 'exclusion zones':

1. Kambri Precinct (bound by North Road, the perimeter of Fellows Oval, Tangney Road and Kingsley Street)
2. Melville Hall;
3. The Copland precinct, including the ramp and stairway to Kingsley Street;
4. The Chifley Library & associated walkways;
5. The Tjabal Centre;
6. Outside the Childers Street UniLodge residences;
7. The small footpath next to University Avenue between the Copland Courtyard and Kambri;
8. ANU libraries;
9. ANU rooms where lectures, tutorials, labs or other teaching takes place, including online spaces;
10. Daley Road;
11. David Cocking Sport and Recreation Centre; and
12. Hancock bridge;

In addition, no campaigning other than putting up posters may take place inside any other building on the ANU campus.

Campaigners are permitted to campaign in all other areas.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Returning Officer or their nominee will clarify exclusion zones before the beginning of the Campaign Period. This includes but is not limited to a map of exclusion zones.

The Returning Officer or their nominee may temporarily suspend an area so debates or other informative events may be held.

Mover: Taylor Heslington

Seconder: Skanda Panditharatne

Passes (above)

Motion 6.10

Motion:

The meeting notes Appendix A.

Mover: Jordyn Gibson

Seconder: Georgette Mouawad

Quorum is lost.

Quorum is back 8:19pm

Procedural: Allow for 15 minutes of discussion

Moved: Jordyn

Outcome: Passed

- Mover: Have a quick read of the item in the appendix, it is fairly complicated and has a preamble that provides an overview of issues. This addresses issues of diversity. This year there are only 2 women in the Gen Rep pool which is bad given there are 14 positions. We saw this as a starting point for fixing those imbalances. Gender based, trialling that for a year and then expanding it further in the future. The wording should be inclusive of any person who is in most circumstances not a cis-male. It will prevent

any gen rep pool being dominated by 2/3 of any gender identity. It should be inclusive in that respect. The point of this discussion. We discussed with the Women's Department, but we want to expand this discussion further.

- Thank you to the people who have drafted this. The way it reads, what is most likely to happen is people will self-select their gender and it'll be difficult to self-select something less or more of a gender. Engage Queer* Department because this is their space. If done poorly this can disadvantage people further.
- You talked about trialling this for a year?
 - Mover: I don't have a strict ideal timeline. In an ideal world, we'd do heaps of consultation and then hold an SGM to get a proposal, something that will result in a more diverse SRC next year. I understand consultation is hard.
- I feel like I should weigh in as half the female Gen Rep, but also as someone who does care passionately about this. I am pro AA to an extent. I love consultation and how consultation is emphasized. Lachy nabbed my point about transgender and different gendered individuals, I would definitely like to see the Queer* Department consulted and making that a key focus. When AA is brought up, we need to keep it intersectional. I also think that this reminds me of that saying about planting trees under which the shade you will never sit under. If we strive in this to rush it through this election cycle or next cycle, we might be missing something, key for this will be slow and steady because last thing any of us wants to see is to see a group disadvantaged so that others can be empowered. Also, as a female Gen Rep, I do encourage anyone to reach up who wants to know the experience one out of 2 female Gen Reps out of 14. Shoot me a Facebook message.
- Emphasise that rushing this will not solve the problem, you mentioned there is only one international student. This proposal itself doesn't solve that problem; it's trying to achieve one diversity which can short-change another type of diversity. Reality this is proposed quite late in the year. I am not for acknowledging this proposal for the election. I think later there will be a motion to propose a working group.
- Building on what other people have said. I have concerns about the wording. Queer* Department has not been consulted. Concerns about implementing this at stages at a time. Governance perspective, I'm not entirely convinced this is the best mechanism to do it. Trying to get it done is rushed, if we do it for next year's elections, we can try out different systems. I'd rather take more time.
- I want to thank Jordyn for the work she has done. I think it's really important for gender representation. Glad we are having a fruitful discussion here. I wholeheartedly agree that more consultation needs to be done on this. I do want to note that discussion of gender diversity has been going on for a while. This needs to be considered clearly. I would hazard a warning to everyone, that these discussions and working groups they tend to be drawn out beyond terms of incumbents and beyond and nothing meaningful gets done.
- Something needs to be done about gender diversity in ANUSA. We have had cases where there have been more female than male. Sentiment of Collective to take their time to figure out what's going on. If it can be worked in a way that includes everyone, they would be very willing to support.

Procedural: 15 minutes more discussion time

Moved: Kriti

Outcome: Passed

- Current proposal only concerns gender equality but does not extend to other marginalized groups, trialling them for future years is problematic. Has potential to disadvantage other groups. As an Association we are capable of dealing with assisting and helping all marginalized groups. The working group might take a long time, but it's a good way to extend to all groups.
- Secunder: Two things I want to speak about. Intersectionality is very important to me. I did a bit of research into intersectionality about AA. ANU is a white wealthy university which can easily be linked that the university operates as a place of privilege. ANU is

not an intersectional university. Onus rests with Australia at large and working with these communities. While there should be change, half of the population at the university is women. There were many capable women who ran for Gen Rep but only 2 of them got in. This is a solution which has identified the problem. I believe in incremental change. After a year of discussion, we won't come back with a perfect solution.

- I am concerned about the nature of how this has been brought up, I don't quite know why this has been brought to the AGM before it has been properly consulted with the Queer* Department, particularly due to consequences. I think it's really important this motion moves toward AA in general. If it is about actual inclusivity and intersectionality as everyone is looking for. It's important we are not virtual signalling through this. I don't think that that should come at the cost of doing this properly. If this motion wasn't about virtual signalling, the motion could have been worded very very differently. We do need to have ANUSA endorsing AA but if that was the case, we could have had a different motion and discussion tonight. Perhaps a motion that just stated at SRC, ANUSA recognises AA is important. I think this process not wanting to go through working group process is unintentionally also saying that we are picking gender diversity and women diversity over diversity of people of colour and international students. It's such a difficult issue and I don't want to have ANUSA saying we can fix the gender diversity issue but also not going the full way. I don't want us to pick a certain identity over another.
- I just want to reiterate everyone's response. We constitute 20% of the undergraduate population. We inadvertently exclude another diversity. We have a lot of cis-gendered male identifying gen rep this year, I wanted to point out we have a high number of queer* identifying gen reps this year, we should not punish the gen rep community for doing a good job. I count this as a really good win. Curious to see how many probity officers and gen reps have been consulted. Also, curious to know how AA would work. Thank you for bringing up this discussion.
- I think for me personally, I have never been a gen rep. I think it has been gratifying to see the amount of emotions some speakers have brought in. A lot of passion and experiences navigating the world and these spaces because of that. My main thought is that I have many of my own thoughts about diversity in ANUSA. Without sounding presumptuous, to me the role of Departments is to be the official representative body of marginalized groups. I have my own thoughts, but I'd hesitate to elevate my voice over other Departments. Their role is to speak to the collective community.

Procedural: Extend discussion time by 15 minutes

Moved: Aryanne

Outcome: Passed

- Thanks for everyone for valuable take. I do think this is an important conversation to have. I wanted to provide some context of what thus would look like. Really valuable to have a broad discussion about this.
- Would like to add what people have said, people have dropped PoC and international students without raising how AA is going to address that. Motion has not been brought to ISD or Ethnocultural Department. Don't understand how these words are being moved around and nothing is being done to address it.
- Because electoral working group was late, we drafted these proposals late as well. Want to bring it to them next week. It has not been brought to ISD or Ethnocultural Department. The reason why this proposal is relatively narrow is because of the fact we would like to get more feedback. Don't want it to get kicked around in working groups for 10 years. Pick something that is easy. Implement that, see how it goes and then expand it later. Lots of debate over procedure to reach the end goal. This should include all groups and have wording that does not exclude anyone. I'd really encourage everyone to attend the working group that will hopefully be created by Jin. We shouldn't have to have another SRC with only 2 female Gen Reps. It isn't perfect right now, but we have to get there somehow.

- Thank you Jordyn for the time and energy you have put into drafting this. That said, I do take issue with one thing you did say in response. The whole something is better than nothing point. I do understand that for this side, but in doing something before other things the institution signals that that thing is the priority. Whether or not that is what we believe, doing one thing before another thing or accelerating over another group signals that group will be the priority of the institution. I think that puts into a different term one of the issues that some people have had. We all agree that we want the promotion of minorities. I just think that the act of doing one thing over another thing, sends a signal to the institution that group is priority A and next group is priority B. Second issue, we are focusing on Gen Reps now, while we are a big block, we do only make up only 14 people on the SRC and our exec this year is wonderful, and beautiful and super diverse and it's something I'm really proud of to be working with. It hasn't always been that way in history. My kind of issue would be that this year the Gen Reps the problem, but in other years it can be other elected groups that are the problem. It has made me feel really empowered when looking at my exec. I think if we are going to look at one part of the structure, we should look at all parts of the structure.
- I just want to touch on some other points. I am really uncomfortable with having people announcing their gender in order to run. Some people may not be comfortable in sharing that. Consulting with Queer* Department is very vital. You can just send them an email. We need to focus on why women are feeling uncomfortable applying and being voted in. Indigenous people have a very tough time getting into politics. What if the 11th person is Indigenous, and we are missing out on the Indigenous voice. Having this quota will just make it harder for other minorities get a voice on the SRC.
- There was a meeting Tuesday last week, I understand you wanted to bring a complete and most recent draft of the motion to a Queer* Department meeting but you brought a draft to the Women's Department meeting and didn't bring it to the Queer* Department meeting. Whilst it is important to get collectives to sign onto something, you can talk to the Officer. You haven't talked to me. I do represent my collective. If you take it to a working group, nothing will happen to it, you can include to work with the initial motion. We do speak for our collectives; we have that place within ANUSA and if you want to do meaningful consultation you need to talk to us.
- Want to reiterate my previous point and what Ary said that by introducing AA by focusing on one group we inadvertently disadvantage other groups. This should not occur without consultation. We have an extremely capable group of individuals and Departments. We should learn and navigate accordingly. Let's continue the discussion.

Procedural: Extend discussion time to 5 minutes of discussion time

Mover: Ben

Outcome: Passes

- Just want to clarify a few things, feel like people think this has been done to disadvantage other groups. I don't like the implication that I would maliciously do something to exclude these people. Yes, it got taken to Women's Department. We are all human beings; we all have a lot of commitments. We had 2 weeks between we drafted this and the AGM. There is a reason this is a discussion item. Consultation is not complete. There will be a whole working group that we will bring this to. The fact that this is a discussion item shows how deeply everyone cares about having consultation. Please consider we are all human beings; we are trying to consult, and we've had not much time. Not our intention to say that one group is more important than another. We all agree this is something that has to be broader than that in the future. I look forward to consulting with departments further. Please appreciate we are human beings, we have other things in our life than ANUSA, we aren't trying to cut out groups or speak over any department. I'd like to thank everyone for the feedback they have provided.

- There are two reasons why it was gender based. Firstly, someone mentioned earlier that women weren't putting their hands up 48% of candidates were women but only 2 were elected. Gender is a solid foundation considering 48% did but people didn't view them as competent enough. It would be beneficial to implement AA when we can, so we are diversifying the pool of Gen Reps.

Procedural: That the motion be laid on the table

Mover: Skanda

Outcome: Fails

Procedural: 10 more minutes of discussion time

Mover: Aryanne

Outcome: Passes

- I'll keep this short, this is more to Jordyn's last point, as someone who has been doing a lot of talking about consultation. Consultation points are not an attack for this. Whilst people are passionate about consultation, it's not an attack on the way you have developed this policy. I think you're great, but in this discussion, nobody has had any intentions of malice against you.
- Really appreciate you putting the time in this, I understand you worked in very short time restraints. Really appreciate being invited to electoral regs but it is a bit difficult when stuff like this affects large groups of people. Just want to bring something up. Some people felt like the new amendment didn't address some people's concerns and made them feel like they weren't being listened to, there is history in ANUSA of people stepping over and talking over Departments.

Procedural: Wrap up discussion time early

Mover: James

Outcome: Passed

Procedural: That the question now be put

Mover: James

Outcome: Passed

Right of reply: Thank you everyone for your contributions, consultation has always been and will continue to be part of the plan. Thank you everyone for emphasizing how important it is. If anyone has any concerns, I'd really encourage them to come to the working group Jin will create. Consultation is something I believe in deeply. Please stay engaged in this issue. Thanks to everyone.

Outcome for motion 6.10: Fails

Motion 6.11

Preamble:

These amendments fix typos that were noticed during the review of the Election Regulations.

Motion:

That the following amendments be made to the ANUSA Election Regulations.

Re-number:

2.3.7A to 2.3.8A

2.3.7B to 2.3.8B

2.3.7C to 2.3.8C
2.3.7D to 2.3.8D

Amend s 2.3.7A from '2.3.7 and 2.3.7C' to '2.3.8 and 2.3.8C'.

Amend s 2.3.7C from '2.3.7B' to '2.3.8B'.

Amend s 2.3.7D from '2.3.7' to '2.3.8'.

Amend s 2.7.5(a)(iv) from 'include' to 'including'.

Amend s 2.8.5 from 'It is an offence not comply' to 'It is an offence to not comply'.

Amend s 2.9.3 from 'provision' to 'provisions'.

Amend s 2.9.4 from 'provision' to 'provisions'.

Mover: Taylor Heslington

Seconder: Skanda Panditharatne

Passes (above)

Motion 6.12

Solidarity With Drew Pavlou

Preamble:

Drew Pavlou, an elected student representative on the University of Queensland (UQ) Senate, is facing expulsion from UQ in relation to a series of satirical stunts, social media posts and criticisms of the vice-chancellor, Peter Høj.

Over 30,000 people have signed an online petition in support of Mr Pavlou, in defence of his right to free speech, urging UQ to drop charges against him. Independent observers have reviewed the dossier of allegations against him, including Clive Hamilton, professor of public ethics at Charles Sturt University in Canberra; and Olivia Brumm, President of the student Guild at the Queensland University of Technology. These observers have claimed that the charges levelled against Mr Pavlou are absurdly trivial, and suggest a personal vendetta from the university against him.

Platform:

1. ANUSA stands in solidarity with Drew Pavlou, and calls for UQ to drop the current charges against him.
2. ANUSA stands for the expression of free speech by students, and legitimate criticism of university administrations.

Action:

1. ANUSA will forward a copy of this motion to Drew Pavlou.
2. ANUSA will continue to defend student rights to free speech and expression.

Mover: Skanda Panditharatne

Seconder: Ben Wicks

Procedural: That the motion be put

Mover: Skanda

Outcome: Fails

Mover: This motion is in solidarity about a student in UQ. This extends solidarity to free speech of student activism. Drew has been supported by NUS and politicians from the Greens, Labor and LNP, fairly strong support behind Drew's rights on this issue. Latest update: Yesterday was due to be the case, but he walked out, most likely it will end up in the courts. I'd like to say I'm bringing this to AGM because of time. It's a sensitive issue so be thoughtful on how you speak on the motion.

Secunder waives right to speak

Mover waives right of reply

Outcome: Passed

Item 7: Other Business

Other business 7.1

Preamble:

Gender inequality within ANUSA has been a longstanding and complicated issue. Whilst gender ratios are often the most obvious indicators of inequality, issues like these can often run deeper and in ways that are much less visible.

The Gender Equality Working Group would aim to evaluate the current ANUSA system as it stands and where it is failing to welcome women and non-binary students, and especially so where they are marginalised (for example, women of colour, disabled women, queer* women, international women and so on).

The Working Group would ideally be able to recognise any patterns or structures that are currently acting as barriers for women and non-binary students being represented in ANUSA, and be able to develop a better understanding of the dynamics at play. The Working Group would further evaluate what appropriate measures should be proposed to address these issues in an effective way.

Motion:

1. ANUSA establishes the Gender Equality Working Group.
2. The working group will be open to all members of the association.
3. The first meeting of the group shall be convened by the Women's Officer with a secretary elected at the first meeting to perform any secretarial duties henceforth.
4. The SRC recognises the importance of the Working Group being spearheaded by members of the Women's Department.
5. Each working group will be minuted and documentation will be uploaded to the ANUSA website and hard copies to be printed out for the ANUSA Office.
6. The findings of the working group will be presented at each SRC as part of the Women's Officer report.
 - a. The Working Group may, as it so chooses, present to the SRC a separate report of its findings.

Mover: Siang Jin Law

Secunder: LC

Mover: Figuring out dynamics, I will try by November 30th that this goes somewhere and doesn't get turned into another ANUSA working group. Hopefully we can pass something. I am planning on being accountable for it, I will be including it in every SRC report and hopefully we get something off the ground.

Secunder waives speaking rights

Mover waives right of reply

Outcome: Passed

Item 8: Meeting Close

Expected Close of Meeting: 9:30pm

Meeting closed at 9:24pm

Released: 18 May 2020 by Taylor Heslington

Reference A

This report will be provided verbally.

Reference B

TREASURER'S REPORT
Madeline Wang

Summary

1. Audit
2. Current Financial Position

Audit Statement

The ANUSA Financial Audit statements for 2019 will be available on the ANUSA website at this link: <https://anusa.com.au/pageassets/about/financialreportsandssaf/Financial-Report-2019.pdf>

Current Financial Position

We are currently \$450,806.41 in "profit" as of the year to date. This arises largely from the \$250,000 of funding from the University for COVID-19 relief. We have received our 3rd SSAF payment from the University as well as the payments for COVID relief funding. We have also sent out the invoice for our last COVID grant from the university (for \$125,000). Currently, the demand on COVID related student grants is decreasing.

Reference C

No report was received from the Financial Review Committee.

Appendix A

Affirmative Action for ANSUA General Representative Elections

How would this policy operate?

- At the time of election, candidates would be excluded from being elected to the genrep pool at the time that their election would result in 2/3+ of that pool sharing the same gender identity - e.g. in the current case, if the first 10 genreps elected were cis males, and the 11th gen rep who received the requisite quota of votes to be elected is also a cis male, that 11th gen rep would be excluded at that point and their preferences distributed accordingly. This would occur until a candidate with a different gender identity received the quota to be elected, at which point they would be elected as genrep 11
- Candidates for genrep would therefore have to disclose their gender identity to the returning officer. This information would be kept private, and the RO would only disclose whether that candidate's election would violate these provisions when voting is being counted (not the candidate's specific identity)
- In the event that there are not enough candidates of the non-dominant gender identity to fill the remaining genrep positions, AA provisions are disregarded and the first candidate who was excluded on the basis of the AA provisions would be elected to the next position
- The amendments necessary for this proposal are at the conclusion of this item

Why is this necessary?

- In the previous year's election, despite a reasonably gender-balanced candidate pool (nominations form here: <https://anusa.com.au/pageassets/about/elections/ANUSA-2019-Election-Nominations-7.pdf>), only 2 female genreps were elected to a total of 14 positions
- ANUSA elections appear to be trending towards being increasingly competitive - it's likely that this year's will be no exception and may be substantially more competitive than in previous years.
- This presents a number of potential flow-on problems:
 - A less diverse SRC is a less competent SRC. Policy that would benefit non cis-males is less likely to be recognised, created, or supported. Similarly, policy that would inadvertently disadvantage non cis-males is less likely to be recognised and criticised.
 - Departments have less ability to advocate when their representation on SRC is largely confined to their officer, and the audience they are advocating to is less likely to understand or care about their perspective. This compounds the above problem.
 - Non cis-male advocates who want to make change directly through SRC are more likely to be excluded from that body, which results in a deeper divide between activist groups and ANSUA.
 - Tickets find it harder to create teams that are both diverse and experienced, particularly for Executive candidates, when there is a lack of non cis-male genreps to draw from. Obviously tickets can look at other areas of ANUSA and the University for qualified candidates, but anything that makes assembling a diverse and experienced team harder should be opposed.
 - ANSUA as a whole is likely to grow less diverse when non cis-males don't see themselves represented by that body and therefore feel less able or willing to engage with it.

Potential problems created by this policy, and responses:

1. Candidates who are less qualified or unprepared will be elected due to AA provisions

- a. Tickets generally don't run candidates who are so unqualified that they would be unable to fulfil the role of genrep anyway - that candidate would be unlikely to gain the sufficient number of votes to be elected.
- b. The difference in qualifications between genrep 11 and genrep 12 is unlikely to be substantial.
- c. Genreps are not elected based exclusively on their qualifications anyway - if that were the aim, these positions would be appointed on a CV basis by an independent board.
- d. This is a problem that occurs regardless of these provisions - cis male genreps who are less qualified may be elected under the status quo due to the advantage that their gender gives them in the elections. The qualifications of non cis-male candidates are already overlooked (which is the problem this policy aims to solve), and so the actual effect is unlikely to produce a meaningfully less qualified genrep 11-14.
- e. Even if the individual genrep is slightly less qualified than the genrep who would have otherwise been elected but for these provisions, the SRC as a whole is substantially more competent when it includes people from a diverse range of backgrounds. If a candidate is truly unprepared (despite having chosen to run for the position) they are able to resign.

2. Candidates who are elected due to AA provisions will be undermined on that basis

- a. The only person who would seriously attack a genrep elected due to these provisions is probably already deeply misogynistic. Attacking someone in general is not something that people who are acting in good-faith do. It seems as though non cis-males who are elected would be attacked regardless of these provisions, and while this arguably does create an additional way of attacking those people, it is unlikely to increase the volume or intensity of those attacks.
- b. If the means of election or electoral success of genreps was something that was used to attack them, we would presumably see examples of bullying targeting the final few genreps who were elected. This doesn't seem to occur in the status quo.

3. Candidates may declare their gender identity in bad faith with the aim of gaining an edge at election time

- a. Realistically, this looks like cis men claiming to be genderqueer or trans*. The actual advantage that would be gained by an individual candidate is relatively small - they would have be somewhere between the 11th-20th genreps already, and be running in a year where a large number of cis male genreps have already been elected.
- b. The actual benefits of a genrep position to an individual, compared to other positions that they might choose to run for (within departments, Clubs Council, student clubs and societies, ANUSA committees, etc.) are relatively small.
- c. The combination of a low advantage and a low benefit means that candidates are unlikely to take the risk of their bad faith declaration being discovered (which would likely result in some degree of coverage and a permanent mark against them when it comes to employment).
- d. That means this is likely to occur very rarely, and this policy will overwhelmingly benefit the people it is actually intended to benefit. Without this policy, that candidate would be elected anyway, so it is best understood as a very small mark against the efficacy of this policy rather than a serious problem.
- e. If this did occur in a large number of circumstances, this policy could simply be removed - again noting that the policy itself wouldn't have actually disadvantaged non cis-males in this case compared to the status quo, it would have just failed to sufficiently benefit them.

4. This outs candidates who are elected due to AA provisions

- a. Gender identity nominations would be kept strictly confidential by the Returning Officer, and the only disclosure that would occur would be to scrutineers and vote counters. That disclosure would not include the candidate's actual gender identity, it would only refer to

the candidate's belonging or not belonging to the dominant gender identity that has already been elected.

b. Candidates who wish for vote breakdowns to be kept confidential already have the option of ensuring that they are kept confidential. Someone would have to request a private viewing of the results, and then do the math themselves, to work out whether a candidate was of the non-dominant gender identity.

c. Candidates who are unwilling to take the risk of outing themselves also have the option of nominating the gender identity that they do feel comfortable openly identifying as. This would, in some cases, mean that the AA provisions would not benefit them, but under the status quo they also don't receive any benefits either.

Other criticisms, and responses:

1. This policy requires more consultation

a. Agreed! That's why this is being brought to the AGM as a discussion item, and why we're intending on bringing it back to departments for consultation. If anyone has any ideas of further consultation that should be done, we'd be very happy to take them on board.

2. This policy doesn't go far enough to increase diversity

a. Given the amount of debate this policy created in the electoral working group, where it was first discussed, and in the Women's Collective that it was brought to, we thought it best to start small and gradually increase the aggressiveness of this policy over time. If anyone else wants to create AA policies targeting other groups, or that are more aggressive, we'd be happy to work with them and discuss those at future general meetings.

3. This policy is a band-aid solution that won't solve broader issues

a. AA isn't going to solve disadvantage, but an SRC that is broadly unrepresentative is far less equipped to make the bigger policies that are necessary to make broader progress. The very implementation of this policy sends a strong message that gender does matter in terms of how someone experiences student politics and activism, and it demonstrates the need to make positive change. If anyone suggests that this or any other policy aimed at alleviating disadvantage has 'solved the problem', a more diverse SRC is also better equipped to manage that and correct that perception.

4. This policy is undemocratic

a. The actual effect this would have on results is fairly small. Given that ANSUA already has a number of affirmative action policies in place in other areas (e.g. for department executives, the appointment of deputy heads of committees), we thought this policy also aligned with the goals of those policies and is consistent with things ANSUA has supported and continues to support.

AA Amendments:

Italicised: already existing provisions

Bolded: amendments

2.3 Nominations

2.3.1 Nominations for any position contested at the Annual Elections must:

- (a) be signed by two ordinary members of the Association (in addition to the nominee);*
- (b) contain a signed undertaking by the nominee that they will act in the position if elected; and*
- (c) contain a signed undertaking by the nominee that they will abide by these Regulations.*

2.3.2 A nominee may indicate on their nomination form:

- (a) if they are running as a candidate endorsed by a registered ticket; or*
- (b) if they wish to run as an Independent.*

2.3.3 Where a nominee indicates on their nomination form that they are running as a candidate endorsed by a registered ticket, the Returning Officer or their nominee shall verify the endorsement only if:

(a) at least one of the nominators is a signatory to the application to register the ticket name; or

(b) the Returning Officer or their nominee receives notice of the endorsement from a signatory to the application to register the ticket name.

2.3.4 Nominees must provide their full name on their nomination form. If a nominee wishes for an alternative name to be recorded on the ballot, they may specify their 'Preferred Name' on their nomination form. The Returning Officer must record the 'Preferred Name' on the ballot if it is a commonly accepted variation of the candidate's name, or a truncation of that name, or an alternative form of that name, or an alternative name by which the candidate is commonly known

Insert s. 2.3.5:

2.3.5 Nominees for the position of General Representative must also nominate their gender identity. This information is only to be disclosed to the Returning Officer, who is only permitted to use that information to inform those present at the counting of the votes whether a candidate must be excluded due to the affirmative action requirements of Schedule A Item 9. For this purpose, the Returning Officer may state that the exclusion is necessary to avoid breaching the affirmative action requirements of Schedule A Item 9.

Renumber subsequent sections accordingly

SCHEDULE A – ASCERTAINING RESULT OF POLL

8. EXCLUSION OF CANDIDATES

(1) Where clause 5 requires a candidate to be excluded, the candidate with the least total votes shall be excluded.

(2) Where 2 or more candidates each have the same total votes, being fewer total votes than any other candidate and—

a. 1 of those candidates had fewer total votes than any other of those candidates at the last count at which all those candidates had unequal votes—that candidate; or

b. There is no count at which all those candidates had unequal total votes—the candidate who, of those candidates, is determined by the Returning Officer by lot to be the candidate to be excluded; shall be excluded.

Amend 8(1)

(1) Where clause 5 **or clause 9** requires a candidate to be excluded, the candidate with the least total votes shall be excluded.

Insert clause 9:

9. Affirmative Action in the Election of General Representatives

(1) Subject to sub-clause (2), if a candidate for the position of General Representative achieves the quota of votes necessary to be elected, but that candidate's election would result in nine or more of the fourteen General Representatives sharing the same

gender identity, as nominated to the Returning Officer under s. 2.3.5 of the Election Regulations, that candidate is to be excluded.

(2) If however there are an insufficient number of candidates of other gender identities existing to fill any of the remaining General Representative positions, the candidate shall not be excluded under sub-clause (1).

(3) Subject to sub-clause (2), sub-clause (1) may be applied repeatedly until no more than eight candidates of one gender would be elected to serve as a General Representative.