



SRC 2 Minutes

Tuesday 20 March 2018

STB S1

Appendix A: SRC 1 Agenda, including reports and other reference material

Item 1: Meeting Opens and Apologies:

Meeting opens: 6:10 PM

Apologies received from:

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.

Item 2: Minutes from the previous meeting

2.1 SRC1

Motion: That the minutes from SRC1 be accepted.

Moved: Lachie Day

Seconded: Harry Needham

Status: Passed

Item 3: Executive Reports

3.1 Eleanor President Report (E. Kay)

Report taken as read.

Questions

Q: Were the inclusion of timesheets by the department officers a direction from the executive?

R: No, it was of their own choice.

Q: You spoke on academic integrity at the

R: I was invited to speak on it by Deputy Vice-Chancellor Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington. I have been working with the university over the past year. The university has traditionally taken a punitive approach towards academic integrity, and while there's a space for that, there is also the educational approach. We jointly talked about the new digital spaces and how they can be utilised in this space. We can use technology to catch students in plagiarism, or we can treat students as partners and respect their online privacy.

Q: Is it appropriate that a general representative be gagged by the ANUSA media policy?

R: The ANUSA media policy stands.

Q: Do you or the executive plan to close SRC's to the general public in future?

R: We haven't discussed it, but won't rule it out.

Q: When was the media policy passed?

R: I will take that on notice, email me for a response.

Q: What was the consultation for the reaccreditation KPIs?

R: We will talk at length on this later in the SRC. Casual ANUSA Tuesdays is a new thing introduced this year. At one of these NUS president came, next week there was no formal agenda but the upcoming NUS vote was casually discussed.

Q: What would it mean if the media policy was never passed?

R: I will take that on notice.

Motion: That the President's report be accepted.

Moved: Matthew Mottola

Seconded: Braedyn Edwards

Status: Passed

3.2

Vice President Report (T. Masters)

Report taken as read.

Questions

Q: Regarding the SR & CC consultation: who are you exactly consulting?

R: Hear from those who've accessed services, SRs, CC's, members of staff, residents' committees and others to get an idea of what needs to be done in the space.

Q: Concerning the report on the Union Court Redevelopment, is there a possibility on there being a clubs space?

R: We're talking about it still, and are trying to make spaces are used effectively. There will be more space for casual study and more space for clubs.

Q: Can you provide more info on the schools review?

R: Periodically the academic colleges review the programs on offer and all things related to the school.

Q: Is it possible to see the results of the reviews once they are finished?

R: Possibly, it's not run by me, but I can push for those to be public.

Motion: That the Vice President's report be accepted.

Moved: Isabelle Lee

Seconded: Edan Habel

Status: Passed

3.3

Treasurer Report (M. Chang)

Report taken as read.

Questions

Q: In expenditure reports there are donations listed, where are they from?

R: BKSS has a cash deposit for use of cups, and it's leftover from that.

Q: You mention student engagement in the report, can you elaborate on this?

R: It's all outlined in the budget. Things like the last lecture, the social committee, international student engagement, honours program, Less Stresstival.

Q: Has the international engagement fund been accessed yet?

R: Not as of yet.

Q: How does the loss from Friday Night Party compare to last year.

R: I can't remember from top of my head, last year there was a small profit this year there was not.

Motion: That the Treasurer's report be accepted.

Moved: Annabelle Nshuti

Seconded: Petal Wang

Status: Passed

The Chair passes to Benjamin Lawrence. Ben's nomination was not subject to dissent.

3.4 General Secretary Report (E.Lim)

Report taken as read.

Questions

Motion: That the General Secretary's report be accepted.

Moved: Tess

Seconded: Mariah

Status: Passed

The Chair passes to Eden Lim. Eden's nomination was not subject to dissent.

3.5

Education Officer Report (H.Needham)

Report taken as read. Noting that there will be protest at 2pm tomorrow against the Federal Government's cuts to higher education.

Questions

Q: What will the discussions on the future of camps consist of?

R: The exec, the coordinator will sit and talk about the future of the camps.

Q: How's the response to the Ramsey centre going.

R: I think it's going well.

Q: What support from the NUS on the protest tomorrow?

R: Almost all the organising has been done by the NUS Queer* officer.

Q: Regarding First Year Camps, could you clarify if college reps will be involved in the discussion?

R: Yeah they will be.

Motion: that the Education Officer's report be accepted.

Moved: Matthew Mottola

Seconded: Sam Cass

Status: Passed

3.6

Social Officer Report (A.Bonan)

Report taken as read. Noting that the first ANUSA social committee meeting is this Sunday 12-2pm.

Questions

Q: In your report you talked about the financial risk of FNP, what are your initial thoughts on this?

R: Ticket sales is main revenue source, we'll look at a more low-key event next year. Cutting expenditure. It really depends on what the next exec and the contractors want to do.

Motion: That the Social Officer's report be accepted.

Moved: Lily Pang

Seconded: Annabelle Nshuti

Status: Passed

Item 4: Department Reports

4.1 Indigenous Department (B. Edwards):

Report taken as read.

Motion: That the Indigenous Department Officer's report be accepted. **Moved:** Matthew Mottola

Seconded: Amy Bryan

Status: Passed

4.2 Women's Department (L. Perkov):

Report taken as read.

Motion: That the Women's Department Officer's report be accepted.

Moved: Tess Masters

Seconded: Angela Chen

Status: Passed

4.3

Queer* Department (M. Mottola)

Report taken as read. Apologies, the project table has some errors and incorrect updates. We've had elections and the deputies. Apologies for those reading report on reading devices due to typos. Pride party has been approved.

Questions

Q: GSAs reviews, what's the end goal?

R: It started last year. Had meeting with GSAs, Women's, Men's and Queer* officers from the halls and residences.

Q: Where will the funds for pride party come from?

R: SIC will make a SEEF application, a small amount of money will probably come from the Queer* department budget.

Q: Was there no expenditure since last SRC?

R: It is a constitutional requirement that the department's expenditure be uploaded in the report, I have spoken to the executive and they are aware of the reasons why it has not been in this instance. It is an autonomous matter.

Q: What do you see the future of the pride party being?

R: It will be a host of local queer* talent. There will be a bar, and a party on Menzies lawn.

Q: A follow-up to the previous question. Noting that it's an autonomous matter, can the report be accepted?

R: The question you raised is an autonomous matter. The fact that the executive was aware and elected to include it in the agenda regardless is indicative of the status of the report.

Motion: That the Queer* Department Officer's report be accepted. **Moved:** Amy

Seconded: Braedyn

Status: Passed

4.4 International Student's Department (M. Kim)

Report taken as read. Noting that since submitting the report I have received a resignation from the ISD secretary, nominations are open until Thursday to accommodate the already scheduled SGM. If we feel that nominations need to be open longer, they will.

Questions

Q: Facebook group, how's it going?

R: Launched yesterday and shared through Facebook, will be on WeChat soon. Over 100 members. Questions included to verify that they are international students.

Q: The ISD Vice-President and secretary both resigned, is there a particular reason?

R: Personal reasons.

Motion: That the International Student's Department Officer's report be accepted.

Moved: Victor

Seconded: Tess

Status: Passed

4.5

Disabilities Department (A. Bryan)

Report taken as read. Use the report space to highlight. CW AHRC report, sexual assault, sexual harassment.

Due to bikes being chained to stairs there will now be more bike things installed in the coming week.

Sexual assault survey, those with disabilities have been lost in this report. We know 70% or more of women with disability experience sexual abuse or assault. Psychiatrically disabled persons – which is particularly important at university considering climbing rates of mental illness. Women with disabilities in residential settings is another major group. There's quite a big problem and a lot of barriers to reporting: stigma relating to sexuality, people with disabilities can be seen as less worthy reporters by police. Lot to do with power imbalances in relationships. I want to clarify that women with disabilities do have a voice, and it's not that there are power imbalances, but others perceive power imbalances. To address these issues, we have to address stigma, stigma surrounding the word 'disability' and we need to recognise all as people.

Questions

Q: Disability action plan meeting with Richard Baker cuts off in report the report, could you please conclude that?

R: The university has committed to this. A&I is understaffed at the moment which is hampering work and progress. I believe it's their responsibility.

Q: Mental health advisory group – what policies are you proposing?

R: Work in progress, believe the dean of A&I is working on an online program. The challenge is engagement from the broader staff and academic body. Engaging with some academics and staff on what will work.

Q: Footpaths near the School of Art are problematic for wheelchair access, what can you do about that?

R: I will raise it with the university and will talk more with you after delivering report.

Q: What was the substance of the capital works bid?

R: To do with the spoons space – requirements for furniture accessibility. Looking at getting a webcam for use in meetings. Not a huge bid, looking to go into negotiations soon.

Q: Clarifying that there has been no expenditure since last SRC?

R: That is correct.

Motion: That the Disabilities Department Officer's Report be accepted.

Moved: Matthew

Seconded: Braedyn

Status: Passed

4.6

Environment Department (P. P-Evans)

Report taken as read.

Questions

Q: No finance section, has there been no expenditure since December 1st ?

R: We have spent but has been all on a reimbursement basis, due to our treasurer being overseas which made us unable to access the account. There'll be a full financial report in the next report.

Q: The tent embassy collaboration, what happened there?

R: There were volunteers from the Environment Department at the Enlighten Festival working with the Aboriginal Tent Embassy, we collaborate consistently with them.

Motion: that the Environment Department Officer's Report be accepted.

Moved: Lachie Day

Seconded: Jharna Chamlagai

Status: Passed

4.7

Ethnocultural Department (J. Chamlagai)

Report taken as read.

Questions

Q: Where & when is Ethnocultural Review happening?

R: The courtyard studio or another venue, in the week of 17th September.

Motion: That the Ethnocultural Department Officer's report be accepted.

Moved: Annabelle

Seconded: Matthew

Status: Passed

Item 5: Clubs Council Report

1. **Clubs Council Chair** (L.Pope)

Report taken as read. Noting another resignation from Jonathon (faith and religion branch officer). We passed some policy at the last Clubs Council meeting. We are working to improving transparency through livestreaming and releasing minutes of executive meetings. We will be reviving the jotform as a transition until MSL system comes in. There is a lot of administrative work to filter through at the moment due to the transition involved in this form.

Q: Noting that you highlight Mental Health First Aid as a training priority, is this going to be compulsory or available to clubs?

R: As yet undetermined. Concern due to balls, we are working to make a specific set of trainings compulsory in order to receive funding for balls.

Motion: That the Clubs Council Report be accepted.

Moved: Gaia Ewing

Seconded: Lachie

Status: Passed

Item 6: Disputes Committee Election

Notifying the SRC that two candidates dropped out and due to that we will be voting for each candidate individually. Noting that neither candidate answered the questions by the deadline and that the current disputes committee did not provide any questions even when approached to. Because of these factors each candidate has 1 minute to introduce themselves, 30 seconds to answer each question from the SRC, followed by questions from the floor, then voting for each individual as they leave the room. We need a 2/3 majority of members present or who have submitted proxy votes for each candidate to be approved. We don't have to vote anyone in. Then we will invite the candidates back in and notify them of the results.

Nominees: Andrew Mitchell, Isabella DiMattina-Beven

Submitted Questions

Q: How will you manage conflicts of interests you have with your role and decision-making on the disputes committee?

Bella: Only conflict is that I'm on the TV team on Woroni, I have limited involvement there. I am not reporting on ANUSA or anything related.

Andrew: I am not aware of any conflicts except friendships, but not close enough to impact decisions. I will declare them as they arise.

Q: How would you deal with other members of the disputes committee with differing opinions?

Andrew: Discuss, respect opinions, and respect the process of collective decision making.

Bella: This is a reality, I try and mitigate conflict. Ask for reasoning and not pursue beyond that.

Q: What is your experience with reading and interpreting constitutions?

Andrew: Law student. Was CC at Ursula Hall and went through many policies there. Australian-Indonesian Association secretary. Law competitions.

Bella: Law student. Last year reporting on ANUSA familiarised me, different, but required analysis. Was involved with the Queer* Department constitution working group.

Q: What does department autonomy mean to you and how would you approach a conflict relating to that?

Andrew: Not overly familiar, my understanding is that the departments do their thing and ANUSA just supports them.

Bella: My understanding is that ANUSA can't exercise undue influence.

Questions from the floor

Q: How do you define professionalism, or how do you conduct yourself in a role?

Andrew: Professionalism is doing the prescribed job.

Bella: Fulfilling the role expected, but also be respectful of those you're working with.

Q: Did either of you read the latest report of the disputes committee? If so what is your response to that? Favourite high court judge?

Andrew: No I haven't. Gibbs J.

Bella: No I haven't. Kirby J.

Q: Did anyone suggest that you run for the role, if so who?

Andrew: No one suggested, Eleanor Kay mentioned the vacancy and I thought about running.

Bella: Think I saw it on an ANUSA email or a Facebook post. Applied of my own choice, having thought about it on previous occasions and being unable to do so then.

Q: Do you intend to run again at SRC 3 for the 2018 term? Have you ever been a member of a political party or society?

Andrew: No. Last time I was a member of a party was in 2013, club in 2015.

Bella: Yeah I'd love to. No, I've never been politically affiliated.

Motion: That non-SRC members exit the room as the vote is declared confidential.

Moved: Anya

Seconded: Victor

Against: Always concerned when the SRC makes votes in secret, it is anti-thetical to the function of a public representative body.

For: We are accountable at a general election. This is a non-issue.

Against: Will be putting student media and general members out. Could be seen poorly.

For: This is a non-issue. I question the value in recording each member of the SRC votes. Also, we are not voting for a motion but for a person.

Against: What precedent is this setting? The SRC is within its rights to do so. It seems unreasonable to ask the student body to leave the room for a trivial matter.

For: We need to have respect for the people we are voting for.

Ben Creelman is named for swearing.

Status: Passed.

Andrew Mitchel and Isabella Dimatiina are duly elected to the disputes committee having received at least a 2/3 majority vote from those members of the SRC present and voting.

Procedural: That we adjourn for a five-minute break at 7:55pm

Moved: Ben Lawrence

Second: Petal

Status: Passed

Meeting resumed at 8:08 pm

Item 7: Discussion Items/Motions on Notice

Motion 7.1

Preamble:

ANUSA SRC members and general members should be made aware of all contentious motions and discussions that affect ANUSA's representation at a national level.

Contrary to this, the ANUSA executive have engaged in a number of backroom discussions and deals regarding reaccreditation to the NUS and KPIs.

Some members of the SRC were not made aware that these discussions were taking place, likely due to their views regarding NUS and/or their political affiliations. These members of the SRC were not able to negotiate what they believed the KPIs should include or express any other opinions.

The Executive selectively provided some SRC members with access to this information, notably Department Officers, in an attempt to influence votes. This severely interfered with autonomous Collective discussions.

Where discussions are had on behalf of ANUSA, details of these discussions should be provided to the entire SRC, if not the Association generally. Any other outcome is blatantly disrespectful to the independence of the SRC and does not enable them to make informed contribution.

Members of SRC must be given sufficient time to consult with those they represent on important matters.

Motion: The SRC requires that, for matters regarding ANUSA's accreditation with NUS in 2018:

1. Any KPIs or conditions that are to be linked to ANUSA's accreditation be provided to all members of the Association at least 14 days before any vote.
2. Any modifications to such KPIs or conditions must be provided to all members within 2 days. To enable this, the SRC requires any vote on reaccreditation at this SRC be postponed to SRC3/2018.

Discussion:

Mover: On 28th February, Presidents across the country agreed on the KPIs after SRC1, the general student body did not receive it until the agenda was published 48hrs before. Why was the SRC not consulted? It seems deceptive. These KPIs are laughable in my opinion, it merely requires that the NUS follow its own constitution. The SRC must have adequate time to evaluate and analyse. I encourage all members of the SRC to read past ANU Observer reports, and the NUS constitution.

Seconder: These KPIs are laughable, I was elected to hold the executive accountable. I was not consulted until there was a feedback form, and I had many amendments to make. The KPIs themselves are filled with loopholes and require further consultation.

Eleanor: As the person who's done the most in this KPI formulation. I reject the notion that backroom deals were done. It is not feasible to consult with all 39 members of the SRC. These

began formulation in January. These were mentioned in the first SRC, then the NUS president came to ANU. The department officers asked for copies for an informed discussion in their departments. I gave 4 days' notice to the SRC which was more than last year when KPIs were moved as motions from the floor.

Right of Reply: We shouldn't be locked in to what other universities do, we should be able to make our own requirements, and we need time to do this. I reject the time sensitive argument because these KPIs are for the end of the year. One department officer said that they had to demand the KPIs, and I question whether the SRC was really aware. People need time to consider.

Anya: **Point of clarification:** Harry Needham mentioned the KPIs in his NUS report presented in SRC 1.

Amy: **Point of clarification:** Department officers requested the KPIs, they didn't demand them.

Moved: Ariel Scott

Seconded: Ashish Nagesh

Status: Failed

Motion 7.2 [Reference O]

Motion:

That the ANU Students' Association reaccredit with the National Union of Students for 2018, on condition of exit KPIs being met. The KPIs for accreditation are outlined in Reference O.

Discussion:

Mover: None of us would run for ANUSA if we didn't believe in institutions. I believe that we need a national union of students to represent students to the government. These KPIs aren't for a perfect system, they're a reflection of reality: the NUS is broken, as we've heard before. We need a union, and these KPIs will allow us to work collectively with other universities. In past we've had very marginal success on our own, but through collective action we can actually make change. Substantive change to the KPIs as they appear here would undermine collective action. These KPIs are the minimum standards that we expect from the NUS.

Seconder: Note EI's decisive role in drafting these KPIs. I believe these KPIs can work because we're going with the other universities. I believe in unions, it's not perfect but it's important. Note the success of NUS in defeating fund deregulation in 2014.

Amendment: Ashish: amendment 1

I move to amend Exit Performance Indicator 2 to revise the exit date from "1 December 2018" to "Four weeks prior to the 2018 NUS National Conference". This gives us the required opportunity to withhold the accreditation fee if we determine the KPI has not been met.

Mover: Move this date prior to the National Conference, so we won't have paid the fee.

Harry: **Point of clarification:** The point of the KPIs is that if they are not met we (ANUSA) does not pay the accreditation fees. So it doesn't matter when the date is set.

Seconder: It's the role for the general representatives to scrutinise the KPIs and things before the SRC. Ashish has put in a lot of effort into his amendments and deserves the attention of the SRC.

Eleanor: Part of the reason the KPIs have been put forward as they are is due to constraints on coordinating and considering the different processes in other universities.

Moved: Ashish

Seconded: Kathryn

Status: Failed

Eben: **Point of Clarification:** Are there any friendly amendments?

Mover: One friendly: number 7 from the UWA to student body at affiliated universities.

The following amendment was then reworked and declared friendly:

"I move to amend Exit Performance Indicator 8 to append "and publish the results of this audit on the NUS website" to ensure that students get to see the results of the audit. Exit Performance Indicator 8 will now read:

That the NUS shall conduct an independent annual audit of their finances and publish the results of this audit on the NUS website.

By 31 December 2018 I move to amend Exit Performance Indicator 8 to append "and publish the results of this audit on the NUS website" to ensure that students get to see the results of the audit. Exit Performance Indicator 8 will now read:

That the NUS shall conduct an independent annual audit of their finances and publish the results of this audit on the NUS website.

By 31 December 2018”

Procedural: That all non-friendly amendments be moved en bloc.

Moved: Eben

Seconded: Luke

Mover: These are all going up or down together, still encourage debate, but one vote. En bloc means that they are all voted on together.

Against: I don't think it's warranted. Each requires specific consideration, we need to spend time on everything. If we truly value consultation, then we should not vote on these as a block.

For: I would highlight that a lot of the KPIs are empty and unenforceable – natcon can pretty much do what it wants. So it's largely an empty gesture.

Status: Failed

Point of clarification: How would it function if we now change the KPIs in terms of the coordination?

Eleanor: We would have to discuss with the other universities, and maybe amend them. Or we might be excluded from the collective action.

Amendment: Ashish: amendment 2

I move to amend Exit Performance Indicator 3 to remove the explicit exclusion of members of political parties from the criteria, and instead append “nor has a conflict of interest with relation to NUS factions”, and to correct the typo “week” to “weeks”. Exit Performance Indicator 3 will now read: to remove the explicit exclusion of member

Mover: We all know factions are a big problem in NUS; we need a truly independent Returning Officer. This amendment makes it very clear that the Returning Officer can't be a politically aligned person.

Against: Just because you're a member of a political party doesn't mean you've been aligned to a youth faction. You're allowed to be aligned to a party in the community. The youth groups are not their national body equivalents.

Moved: Ashish

Seconded: Kathryn

Status: Failed

Amendment: Ashish: amendment 3

I move to amend Exit Performance Indicator 4 to change the words "may include" to "should, at a minimum, include" to compel the NUS to take, at a minimum, the outlined steps to minimise the risk of violence.

Mover: The NUS has been grappling with bullying and we want to make this KPI stronger. Changing the wording will force office bearers to act.

Point of clarification: To clarify do you mean violence at protests or bullying at natcon?

Ashish: I mean both, the amendment will include both.

Seconder: I think this is a reasonable change, and that the other unis won't mind. It is just a move to stronger language.

Kim Stern is named

Procedural: I move that the question now be put (closure motion)

Moved: Howard

Seconded: Tess

Status: Passed

Mover: Ashish

Seconder: Kathryn

Amendment status: failed

The meeting is postponed whilst the presence of a non-ANU student, and therefore not a member of the association, is asked to leave.

Meeting resumes at 10:05

Amendment: Ashish amendment 4

I move to amend Exit Performance Indicator 8 to append “and publish the results of this audit on the NUS website” to ensure that students get to see the results of the audit, and to revise the exit date from “31 December 2018” to “Four weeks prior to the 2018 NUS National Conference”, to give us the required opportunity to withhold the accreditation fee if the KPI is not met.

Mover: Ashish

Seconder: Kathryn

Procedural: That all the remaining amendments be moved en bloc.

Moved: Lachie Day

Seconded: Sam Cass

Moved to a vote, Ashish dissented the chair for the lack of opportunity to speak to the motion.

The Chair passes to Eleanor Kay. Eleanor’s nomination was not subject to dissent.

Ashish: Deserved an opportunity to speak.

Eden: I had already called for a vote when Ashish wished to speak. Unwarranted especially considering we had already considered a similar motion and the relevant arguments had already been voiced.

Motion: “That the chair’s ruling be upheld”

Moved: Ashish

Status: Passed

The Chair's ruling is upheld, and the previous vote was resumed. Eden resumes the chair.

Status: Passed – *the remaining amendments will be voted on block.*

Moved: Ashish

Seconded: Kathryn

Procedural: That the meeting be adjourned until SRC3

Moved: Ari

Seconded: Ashish

Mover: It is getting late (10:30pm), I estimate here for another hour. Concerning given the time given to consider both the KPIs and the many amendments.

Against: I would be willing to adjourn if these amendments were good, but they're not.

For: We're all tired, these motions and amendments are too important to be making decisions on at this time.

Against: My understanding is that if we pass these amendments we're no longer in a collective action with the other universities.

Status: Failed

Discussion returns to the consideration of the combined amendments:

Ashish: It's disappointing that these were not considered all together, however I'm happy that the SRC considered them all. I look forward to the discussion.

Kathryn: *Waives speaking rights*

Against: If we vote for these amendments undermine the collective action with other universities. I think President empowered to some degree to represent the SRC and ANUSA at the national level. I am speaking against these amendments.

Moved: Ashish

Seconded: Kathryn

Status: Failed

Noting Amel and Victor abstained.

Discussion now returns to the speaking list of motion 7.2, incorporating the friendly amendments.

Against, Matthew: As a department officer my vote is bound and I have been instructed by the collective to read a statement. Noting that this does not necessarily reflect how I personally feel on this topic.

[Statement read from Queer Collective]*

For, Tess (CW: AHRC survey):

In 2016 I received support from the National Women's Officer at the NUS. It made me realise that the problems faced at ANU are faced across the country. Last year when the report was delivered, she was visible, and she was heard and represented students.

Against, Ashish: The NUS has helped in the past. But the KPIs talk about a minimum standard, which we cannot expect from the NUS. The behaviours, and attitudes means they've failed us.

For: Noting my vote is bound by department, voting yes. We're accrediting because of the KPIs and we see the value in a national body advocating for students. Saying that, Natcon is extremely inaccessible for students with a disability. This has flow-on effects for not including disabled students, and this presents a barrier to change to payment for the National disabilities officer.

Against, Ari: These KPIs are laughable because NUS is subject to their own constitution. Last year we put forward the KPIs and the NUS didn't do anything, and then blatantly broke compliance. The KPIs are babysitting an organisation that should know better but never will.

As a queer student the NUS has repeatedly failed queer students, and this is noted across the country. Queer* Officers are always from the Socialist Alternative faction – last year the Australian Queer* Students Network endorsed a candidate at Natcon, but NUS rejected him, showing that NUS does not respect autonomy.

For, Anya: This time last year I was a general representative on ANUSA and I was pretty unsure and confused. It's challenging and it's a hard decision, especially if you have not been involved in political clubs, so I empathise with first time members of SRC. I want to urge you to think back to when you ran for ANUSA and remember that you wanted to make a difference. I've been a student leader for a long time and I can tell you that we need support, especially from a

national body. We need that national standard and need to band together with other universities to improve the NUS.

Against, Kathryn: I am saying no to the NUS after two weeks of concerted research. I have tried to contact the NUS International Officer, sent them multiple emails weeks in advance, and I have not yet heard from them. It is not effective for international students, who make up a huge part of students in universities. We can put funding into more effective bodies which can do more with less. I believe that the NUS claim to protect all students, but they don't do anything for international students. I am making a strong stance for international student representation despite my exhaustion from this meeting.

For, Braydon: The Indigenous Department voted in favour. We do need a national representative body for students. There are new Indigenous bodies emerging, but we feel that we need a backup. We need to trust our executive to pursue the best interests of ANUSA and the student body.

Eleanor waives right of reply.

Moved: Eleanor Kay

Seconded: Harry Needham

Status: Passed

Noting Amy, Annabelle, Harry, Braedyn, Edan, Jharna, Laura & Petal, vote for the motion.

Noting Ashish, Kathryn, Matthew, Mina & Victor vote against the motion.

Noting Amel abstains.

Motion 7.3

Motion:

That the ANU Students Association reaccredit to the National Union of Students for \$10,000, on condition of assessable KPIs being met. The assessable KPIs are outlined in Reference N.

Discussion:

Eleanor: 10K is a totally arbitrary number, invoiced based on the number of full time students. Chosen for 2 reasons, can be absorbed by ANUSA budget and double what we had last year. If

we want our national members to run a union, we need to fund them. They run on less than ANUSA. Funding NUS does not preclude us funding other national groups.

Harry: I think Elle said it all.

Against, Howard: What Kathryn said earlier about how NUS functions is true. Tonight has demonstrated what NUS does, a non-members holding up votes is a regular feature.

For, Matthew: The amount of 10K gives ANU more credibility in NUS, on Queer* issues, NUS gives money to AQSN. So, by giving NUS more money they can do more things like support queer* students.

Against, Ari: What has the NUS done to earn more money? I think this is both a ransom and a bribe.

For, Tess: Assessable KPIs work differently to exit KPIs. We are not voting to give the NUS 10K right now. At the end of the year at another SRC we will receive performance assessments and based on that we will decide how much money to give the NUS. The funding amount will be determined then.

Against, Ramon Bouckart: When you pay someone to do the job and they take the money and then fail to do the job and you take the money back from them, do you then proceed to give them double the amount you originally gave them? So, we are proposing to give double the amount of money.

For, Mariah: There are opportunities in reaccrediting. It is also a sign of commitment to the other universities involved in the KPIs. This is an opportunity to build relationships with other universities. We have funding within the budget.

Eleanor, exercising right of reply: I want to thank you all. We've seen the incredible engagement and tenacity of ANU student leaders. To student media for their commitment. And to our student representatives. Also, I think we should vote for the motion.

Moved: Eleanor

Seconded: Harry

Status: Passed

Noting Amy, Anabelle, Jharna & Lachie vote for the motion.

Noting Ashish, Kathryn, Mina & Victor vote against the motion.

The Chair passes to Eleanor Kay. Eleanor's nomination was not subject to dissent.

Motion 7.4

This SRC notes the failure of the NUS to satisfy our expectations and calls on the General Secretary to conduct a Referendum on the issue of our continued affiliation with the NUS.

This SRC:

1) Notes the failure of the NUS to make meaningful progress over the past three years to satisfy expectations of ANU students with regards to:

- Transparency
- Accountability
- Representation of students from marginalised groups
- Independence
- Good Governance
- Conduct and safety at National Conference

2) Notes that disaccreditation is only a temporary fix to a long standing problem. ANUSA has been disaccredited from the NUS for two years.

3) Calls on the General Secretary to conduct a referendum on the issue of our continued affiliation with the NUS. This is to affirm ANUSA's stance on taking feedback, being transparent and accountable to students.

Discussion:

Ashish: I choose to withdraw this motion

Mover: Ashish Nagesh

Seconder: Kathryn Lee

Status: Withdrawn

The Chair passes to Eden Lim. Eden's nomination was not subject to dissent.

Motion from the floor

Motion: That the amendments submitted by Kathryn to the Chair will be heard at SRC3

Moved: Kathryn

Seconded: Tess

Status: Passed

Point of Clarification, Matthew: I want it noted that I voted no to motion 7.2 but voted for motion 7.3. I felt that having voted to accredit, the next best thing was to vote to fund NUS.

Ari: I guess you'll be accountable to the next collective meeting.

Item 8: Meeting Close (at 11:30pm)

The next meeting of the Student Representative Council is scheduled to be on Tuesday, 17th April 2018 at 6pm in STB S1.