

Item 1: Meeting Opens and Apologies

Meeting Opened at 6:16pm
Quorum achieved.

Acknowledgement of Country
Given by James Connolly - President

Item 2: Minutes from the Previous Meeting

Motion that the minutes from the previous meeting be accepted

Proposed: Nick

Seconded: James

PASSED

Item 3: Executive Reports

3.1 President's Report

I take my report as read, just a note that I had a meeting today regarding the MOU. I hope we will make further progress on that in a later meeting this week.

Questions for the President

- **Eliza:** SRC5 you said public report on payment requirements.
- **James:** I acknowledge that has fallen by the wayside. The timing is unfortunate as it happened over winter break and last term was jam-packed. Should be done in the next few weeks.
- **Alana:** SRC6 you spoke about diversity on the exec working group. Has any further action taken place. Secondly, upon reading the minutes of the last meeting. Prior to the meeting discussion centred around women, then focused on other identities. How did you make this decision?
- **James:** I've been in contact with the dep officers asking them to meet with their collectives to try and capture lived experiences that may be associated with that identity. It was always intended to try and capture diversity more broadly than gender. I acknowledge that there was originally a stronger focus on gender. This was partly to engage the student body, and also to do with part of what motivated me to start the review process in the first place. We've always acknowledged it was broader than gender, but it was the initial motivating factor.

- **Ben:** Where are we up to on the progress against the NUS things that was passed at SRC2?
- **James:** Progress is slow. I've met with NUS national exec and the path forward on those KPIs. They are mapping out the way to deliver those KPIs, but I'm yet to see a completed action plan.
- **Ben:** That is still expected to be done in order for us to be accredited at national conference?
- **James:** I don't know. It depends if they deliver it on time. I can follow it up, but it's on them.

- **Ben:** I understand that recently the UC SRC voted to not accredit. If we are not currently accredited and neither are they; is there still a state-branch of the NUS.
- **James:** Accreditation affects the next year. So if this decision stands at UC and we remain not accredited, then the ACT state branch will not exist. Again, I don't represent the NUS.

Motion to accept the President's report.

Harry

Lewis

PASSED

3.2 Vice President's Report

- Eleanor: My report will go as read, I want to flag that I forgot to say that the main thing in here is the ASA project proposals. Feedback is due on the newest proposal - the final proposal - by the 28th. This is next thursday. If you have feedback on this, members on SRC will have received emails, I'd like it by next Wednesday. Please use question time to give feedback and clarify.
I'm still looking for someone to help coordinate our annual report.
On the ASA project - they're setting up a communications subgroup, to work out how it will look communicating with current students in year 11. I'd like to see a student on that sub-group. Someone closer to being a year 11 student than myself. If you'd like to be a part of how we communicate to students, if you're a rural student, that could be helpful - if you're interested just let me know. Yay, communication.

Questions for the Vice President

- Michael: ASA is the admissions changes?
- Elle: Yes.

Motion to accept the VP's report

James

Marcus

PASSED

3.3 Treasurer's Report

- Harry: I take it as read, just one thing, open invitation to current and 2018 ANUSA reps. Basically a fun thing for you to do stuff, if you have ideas, or a plan, then please send me an email and I will help you with the rest. It will build a foundation for next year.

Questions to the Treasurer

- Nick: Is there something missing from your report?
- Harry: No.

Motion to accept the Treasurer's report.

Georgia

Harry

PASSED

Motion to pass the chair to James Connolly

3.4 General Secretary's Report

- Kat: The only thing I want to flag is the fact that with the motion we passed regarding the policy register. It originally said I would present it here - I've written most of it, but as I became ill I have not been able to put it together for this SRC. I can circulate it later on before next SRC. I acknowledge I set that deadline and due to personal circumstance I could not meet that deadline.

Motion to pass the Gen Sec's report

Nick

Fred

PASSED

Motion to pass the chair back to Kat Reed

Apologies received from the Social Officer and Education Officer.

4. Department Officer Reports

4.1 Indigenous Officer's Report

- Makayla-May: Hello. I'm going to speak to my report. I'd like to flag that Clinton's Walk for Justice happened, we supported - he walked for justice across Australia for a whole year to bring awareness to issues in his community - and as he walked along he met with elders across the country and discovered more issues. It became a huge walk for justice.

The indigenous department donated to that. We also saw him as he arrived in Canberra. I haven't been back since I went to Canada, so there is a detailed discussion of that in my report.

I forgot to include - the from little things big things grow campaign, I just want to flag that's still an ongoing conversation, but things are sort of happenign that things are happening on the outskirts. I also want to acknowledge that it's pride week and it's great to see so many diverse events.

Motion to accept Indigenous Officer's report

Ria

Sarah

PASSED

Motion to pass the Education Officer's Report

Holly

Ash

PASSED

Abstained - Tom Kesina

Motion to pass the Social Officer's Report

Ajun

Tanika

- Howard - Speaking Against: So, just really briefly, everyone - it seems if the report is identical to the last report submitted, then I don't know if we can accept this report, considering we have a report that is identical. Accepting it sets a bad precedent. I aware there are constitutional ramifications. I think we need to consider this.
- Amy: Anyone who is talking please speak at a Microphone.
- Fred - Question: Has anyone confirmed if this is the exact same report?
- Kat: We can confirm it is the same.
- Harry - Question: Howard mentioned constitutional ramification. Can we get a run down of what they are?
- Kat: Yep, I'll answer that first, then move to the point of clarification. Please don't speak out of turn. I believe Howard mentioned constitutional ramification. What I know to be the case is if a report is unsatisfactory, then SRC can not accept it. If that happens enough times then SRC can call an SGM to debate the matter of unsatisfactory reports.
- Eleanor: I just had a look back at SRC6 event. Cam posted his report in the event - but it wasn't in the agenda, so I'm not sure if it was passed at SRC. This adds complexity. Shall we pause to figure this out.
- Kat: I will look to see if we passed this report or not. *pause* We did pass this same report last meeting. ALL those in favour of accepting?
- Ria - Question: WHat happens if we don't pass it?
- Kat: Nothing. What resolutions we want, that can be discussed in other business. I am more than willing to take suggestions. I will need to communicate this decision to Cam to

ensure his next report passes. It is worth noting even the mere idea of not accepting a report can motivate somebody to take another look at their behaviour regarding reports. If it does not pass we will discuss in general business.

- Michael - Clarification: Can you confirm for everyone that an abstention counts as a no vote?
- Kat: Practically it does. It is your right to abstain. We interpret at General Meetings that a specific clauses specifies those present and voting. Constitutional changes can't be passed if the entire floor abstains. I don't believe this is the case for SRC. I will now call a revote.
- Michael - Clarification: If everyone abstains except 3, 2 vote yes and 1 votes no, would that report pass?
- Kat: Yes. If you actually want to vote no, vote no.
- Howard - Clarification: Is that result valid?
- Kat: Yes, because everyone is still in the meeting.
- Nick - Question: Did Cam send apologies?
- Kat: Yes.

FAILS

4.2 Women's Officer's Report

- Kat: I did not receive a report from the Women's Department.
- Holly: I'm happy to speak regarding it during other business.

4.3 Queer* Officer's Report

- Ari: I will take my report as read. This week is Pride Week so I encourage you all to come along to all the non-autonomous events. Also come to Queer ball. Invite friends from different unis. That's all.

Questions to the Queer* Officer

- Ben: I'm reading your report and I have to say it's moderately spicy. Would you consider that the NUS LGBTI Officers have even slightly fulfilled their duties this year?
- Ari: No, they've breached their constitutional requirements.
- Tanika - Clarification: When a proxy asks a question is that from the proxy or the voter.
- Ben: The proxy is just the vote, everything else is Ben Creelman.
- Ben: Have any of the delegates elected at the elections been in touch with you yet?
- Ari: Only one, so I encourage the others to contact me before natcon.

- Ben: To both Ari and the Ed Officer, there isn't any mention of the marriage equality campaign. Is the Ed Officer running that?
- Ari: Robyn was in touch about a month ago, I've since not heard anything from her. I've been in touch with Celeste regarding the phone call thing. I'm taking time out and delegating for the most part.

Motion to accept the Queer* Officer's Report

Fred

Holly

PASSED

4.4 International Students' Officer's Report

Kat: I did not receive this report.

4.5 Disabilities Officer's Report

Kat: I did not receive this report

4.6 Environment Officer's Report

Next week is our green week. We'll be having events and will post regarding them when they're ready to go.

Motion to accept the Environment Officer's report

Felicity

Ria

PASSED

4.7 Ethnocultural Officer's Report

Kat: I didn't get this report on time, so I will not be allowing space to speak to that.

5. Discussion Items

Motion to move the Chair to James Connolly

PASSED

5.1 Motion to accept the Disputes Report of the Probity Officers

Proposed: Kat Reed

Seconded: Ben Creelman

Kat: I'm not really sure what else to say. Please read the report, many hours of time went into it. It is a summary of what happened during elections. We receive the report usually at SRC6 but this was not the case due to the timeline at the end of Term 1

Ben: I commend this report. It opens with a great line. Elections are always an exciting time. Probity, some particularly, put in an insane amount of effort. I know many of us ran and also saw how much work they put in. Congratulations to all those who put in so much work, in particular to the Probity Team.

Motion to accept the Disputes Report of the Probity Officers

PASSED

5.2 Motion to accept the Financial Report of the Probity Officers

Proposed: Kat Reed

Seconded: Ben Creelman

Kat: I waive my speaking rights.

Ben: I waive my speaking rights.

Motion to accept the Financial Report of the Probity Officers

PASSED

5.3 Motion: That the Association award Joel Baker \$500 or equivalent as honoraria for contributions made as a Probity Officer in the 2017 ANUSA Elections

Joel: recuses himself and passes minute-taking to Lewis

Moved: James Connolly

Seconded: Eleanor Kay

James (speech): This is not personal. In the past ANUSA has been bad at doing honoraria - it's been very unclear and this was highlighted at SRC 6. Honoraria go through SRC only because of precedent - is this good? There is a motion in Other Business to provide a clearer structure. Most importantly is to note the definition of honoraria. We sought advice from ANUSA's financial and legal experts. Three criteria: (1) it is unexpected and should come as a surprise, (2) it is not calculated in a dollar/hour basis, and (3) it is token, so the amount needs to have a token value. Financial controller advice is that any more than \$500 is more than token, therefore this is the maximum on advice.

Eleanor waives her speaking rights.

Kat seeks to move the chair, Holly volunteers.

Michael Turvey: Questions about honoraria: it's pretty common and has a lot of history. Most notable is the \$6k/year for the editors and is very stable. Also S&C week is an example. What are the consequences for crossing this line? Will it be dire? Why haven't these risks eventuated?

James: Perhaps student media are using the term wrong? It won't invalidate everything if we continue down this path, but the best thing to do here is be in the right now.

Makayla-May: What precedent might this set? Won't by definition any award create an expectation of that award being repeated?

James: I think Joel did great, but we need to make it clear that being Probity doesn't come with an automatic entitlement.

Ashish: James did you consider the other members of Probity? What kind of future expectations and impacts do you think will occur?

James: We're doing Joel tonight because that was raised last time. Any additional honoraria can be seen in that prescribed process.

Holly passes the chair to Rashna.

Holly: I get that we want to pay people in a timely way, but what's the thinking in not waiting on this to give it to Joel through the formal process later?

James: Some infrastructure still needs to be set up. We want to resolve it now as an equity issue because it had already been raised and debated, so it is time sensitive so as not to drag Joel through this.

Fred (point of clarification): why the "or equivalent" bit?

James: It provides the option to pay in gift cards rather than requiring ABN's to invoice.

Howard: Posting amendment in the Facebook event.

James: Howard should we post in Slack for privacy?

Howard: Would this be in violation of policy? Only Kat can say.

Kat: Howard is correct, it should be on Facebook.

Howard moving an amendment:

That the Association award Joel Baker \$800 and Tandee Wang \$200 or equivalent as Honoraria for contributions made as a Probity Officer in the 2017 Elections.

Seconded by Kat Reed

Howard: At the Woroni AGM \$1500 was just passed on a quarterly basis for each of the Editors - explicitly stated that it was hourly based. President's argument regarding this is unconvincing, especially as we just paid Sex and Consent Week directors \$1000 each.

It is a recognition that we can afford to make, and one that there is no legal recognition

Kat: I worked closely with the probity team during the elections, not to the same as sex and consent week, but Joel himself put in a lot of hours

Not going to talk about hours as that becomes murky legally

Okay with setting the precedent that probity gets honoraria for the future

Support Tandee as well, and for the other probity officers would recommend them to the proposed committee.

Ben (speaking for): it is incredibly hard to be a Probity Officer, people message you at all points and expect you to respond as well as the patience to deal with sometimes unreasonable
We have this moderately functioning set of elections, and it is entirely impossible to do it without the set of Probity Officers.

James C (speaking against): \$500 is not something that is now only coming out as a magic cap
The amount was based on the advice of our professional staff - financial controller and legal team. I appreciate the arbitrary nature of honoraria in the past, but will be relying on their advice.
Not comparable to Sex and Consent Week as they are different events
Hours don't necessarily matter
Tokenism is part of the definition of honoraria, and anything more than that according to prof staff exceed the notion of tokenism.

Holly (questions):

What are the other amounts of honoraria given this year for reference?

Maybe Harry F can answer, how big is the pool that the committee would pool from?

James answering: Bush Week and O-Week were contractors, so not paid honoraria, Sex and Consent were \$1000 each and last year two probity officers were paid \$150 each

Alana (question): I know you don't support this motion but if it did go through, would you support splitting whatever does get passed between Joel and Tandee?

James: No, Tandee would be covered by the committee

Ari (for): I think hours do really matter - S&C Week put in about 100 hours and Joel did about that as well

He sacrificed your mental wellbeing just to do this job, in light of the time he has sacrificed he should be getting honoraria

Harry F (against): as treasurer it's my job to hold the association accountable, from the financial point of view it looks really bad especially for people close to Joel, to be giving him up to 600% of the honoraria in the past

From an outside perspective, it would not look good

Joel has gone above and beyond, but it should not be moved by people close to him

James C moves a procedural to move to a vote on the amendment

Seconded by Fred

Motion to amend passed

That the Association award Joel Baker \$800 and Tandee Wang \$200 or equivalent as Honoraria for contributions made as a Probity Officer in the 2017 Elections.

For: 12

Against: 5

Abstentions: 8

Amendment passed

Voting on the motion

Lewis (for): have spent the last few hours looking at honoraria according to the Fair Work Commission - worry is that Joel could be counted as an employee and sue ANUSA for not paying him enough

Joel could only satisfy 3 out of 10 criteria

Vote:

Motion passed

Procedural to break for 10 minutes for food

PASSED

5.4 Motion for the SRC to endorse the ANU Student Partnership Agreement

Proposed: James Connolly

Seconded: Eleanor Kay

- James: This has been in circulation for quite a while. It passed on August 1st at SRC 5. I want this to formally be passed through SRC. It has been approved by Academic Board to be signed in October. Lots of consultation has gone into this.
- Eleanor: I think often things like this come up and they're wierdly technical, so I want to say that as a student body we should be grateful, this is the first agreement of its kind. It has potential to be ground breaking in Australian tertiary education. Let's appreciate the work that has gone into it.
- Ben - Question: Just to clarify, is this retrospectively approving the agreement?
- James: Yes.
- Eben - Question: Are we allowed to retrospectively approve this, constitutionally or otherwise?
- James: Look, there is plenty of past precedent of us doing this. I would argue there are no ramifications. Though I readily acknowledge it would ideally be endorsed before hand. I did not have the time to do so.

PASSED

Abstained - Tom Kesina

Item 6: Other Business

Item 6.1: Motion for the SRC to establish a committee to determine honoraria (see Agenda)

Proposed: Eleanor Kay

Seconded: James Connolly

- Eleanor: We acknowledge there have been some issues this year and we want to create a process to finalise this for 2017. This is not the ideal process, there are some issues with this motion, however with Kat having 6 elections to coordinate, and in the interest practicality, and in discussion with the legal team, we feel this is a good motion to put forward. We acknowledge that the concept of honoraria needs a bigger, longer, and more fruitful conversation. We recommend that the 2018 team undertake this. This is to tide us through 2017, so we don't have to go through long conversations at SRC again.
- James: I waive my speaking rights.
- Michael - Question: So firstly, it's unclear if this would apply to departments. Secondly it notes these decisions are final, so if they come back with a decision that SRC disagrees with, then SRC can't disagree?
- Eleanor: As for departments, the thought was no. As for the decision being final, that was to encapsulate that if we're giving the committee the power to discuss that issue in depth, then it doesn't help to bring that conversation back to SRC. If you're asking if there should be a time limit on it, then we could consider that. If there's, yeah, the reason it was put to be final was to not let the SRC come to that decision without the full information that the committee would have seen.
- Alana - Question: This is arising out of fairly substantial debates in SRC. The President or Treasurer tonight have spoken the same, perhaps reasonably, tonight. Is this right to have the committee chaired by two people who would speak the same?
- Eleanor: The role of the trustees is to consider this. The whole Executive has been trained in directorship training. This means the insights we bring are important to be listened to. This doesn't mean the President's voice should have a trump effect. SRC has spoken regarding that tonight. I think it is really important that a trustee chairs that as they have things that they, legally, need to keep in mind.
- Alana - Question: Noting what you've said there, would there be scope for an amendment to this motion stating it would be chaired by trustees who have not been so vocal on this topic.
- Eleanor: To clarify, we three are the trustees. So your choice would be one of us. I think that we are all able to be considerate of the issues that are point forward and consider them as they arise.
- Ben - Question: So I have a number of questions. The first is; this seems like an incredibly long motion with a detailed structure for honoraria, based on something we haven't done before. It's come to SRC very late. It also reads like it was written at the last minute. Why has there been so little time given to the SRC to consider this?
- Eleanor: It came through late, I apologise. I think it's been done before in some way. There's been very little clarity and so we're acknowledging there are significant issues and if not moved tonight it would not be moved until SRC 8 and then it's too late. This is our method to try and address that lack of clarity. To acknowledge this is an issue that needs to be properly considered in 2018.
- Howard - Amendment: I'd like to present the amendment as it has currently circulated.

Substantive: That, as a policy of the association, the SRC establish a Committee of the Association under s 13 3 (b) of the Constitution, for the purposes of determining Honouraria of Representatives and Officers of the Association for 201 ('The Honouraria Committee'), in a manner specified by the Terms of Reference below.

Terms of Reference:

1. Responsibilities & Powers
 - a. The Honouraria Committee exists to determine for Honouraria for Officers and Representatives of the Association.
 - i. These include but are not limited to General Representatives, College Representatives, Clubs Council Executive Members, Probity Officers.
 - ii. The Committee may also consider Honouraria for individuals who are not Officers and Representatives if the Committee is unanimously resolved.
 - b. The Committee will receive nominations for Honouraria.
 - i. The Committee will determine its own procedure for nominations.
 - c. The Committee will receive a set amount of funding from the ANUSA Treasurer.
 - i. Notice of the allocation of this funding must be made to the SRC and made publicly available
2. Honouraria Criteria
 - a. In determining Honouraria, the Committee will consider the efforts of nominees that go above and beyond the call of duty in their capacity.
 - b. In determining Honouraria, the Committee will be aware of the legal and financial risks associated with awarding Honouraria.
3. Membership
 - a. Schedule A
 - i. Four Ordinary Members of the Association, elected at OGM 4.
 - ii. Schedule A committee members may not be a Representative or Officer of the Association or otherwise be eligible for Honouraria.
 - b. Schedule B
 - i. 1 General Representative, elected by the General Representatives.
 - ii. 1 College Representative, elected by the College Representatives.
 - iii. 1 Executive Member, elected by the Executive.
 - c. Where applicable, the ANUSA Electoral Regulations Apply.
 - d. The Chair of the Committee must be a Schedule A member.
 - e. Members must declare any conflicts of interest, and recuse themselves if appropriate.
 - f. In the event of a tie, any voting matter will be decided by a majority of Schedule A members present and voting.
 - i. In the event of tie of Schedule A members, the chair has the deliberative vote.
4. Honouraria determinations to be ratified

- a. The Committee will submit their determinations of Honouraria to SRC 8, and will include a report on the process.

Proposed: Howard

Seconded: Ari

- Howard: First of all, I apologise, there were a few of us who were responsible for drafting this amendment, but it was not as collaborative as I wanted. In an ideal world we would have had a long process - at least a week - and time to discuss. But we only had 6 hours. Substantive basis were based on these concerns. As read, every member of this committee is an executive or appointed by the executive. As we have seen tonight, members of the Executive have very strong opinions on this topic and this is a contentious topic. These processes should be as non-political as possible. We want a majority of members on this committee to be separate from the Association. The only other thing worth mentioning is that I don't believe it is possible for us to pass a policy that we can't later overturn. I think this is a topic we should endeavour to get right and we should have had more notice.
- Ari: This motion was submitted pretty late so, we also had to submit our amendment late. This is essentially, seeing that the Executive have such a strong opinion, that it's important that we have people on the outside helping to decide this, but also have members of SRC involved so that there is a good understanding of the process. We've included 'not limited to' so that this can extend to other members of ANUSA.
- Kat: We will now move to a debate on this amendment.
- Ben - Speaking For: A number of us worked on this. The main things I want to highlight; I have doubts about the constitutional ability of the first motion particularly regarding SRC. This is based on other remuneration panels. I think the broad brush strokes of this are good. There's other questions in the original motion that we've fixed here, including the executive appointing a staff member. I hope we can establish this as a standing committee next year. There will need to be tweaks, but I think this is great.
- Eleanor - Speaking Against: I want to thank the movers of this amendment. I think it is thorough. I understand there was late notice. I have some serious concerns. I am disappointed to see things said against our staff. Staff are there to understand the difficult financial and legal aspects that are at play in discussing honoraria. My concerns are mostly that I think this is something we should move towards but also something that needs more time to consider. I think we need to have that conversation with full time, so I propose we have that conversation in 2018. Reports given to SRC 8; that's in 4 weeks time. Our time resources are low and this is too much to ask with assessments. The original motion is put forward to follow what has been done in previous years. This amendment has a lot of issues so we should move forward with our more basic version.
- Rashna - Procedural: Move straight to a vote.

Proposed: Rashna

Seconded: Felicity

FAILS

- Holly - Question: When is the next OGM?
- Kat: October 6.

- Holly: Next SRC is then...?
- Kat: October 17.
- Eben - Speaking For: I will be remarkably quick. This motion just deals with the way the committee is elected, giving more oversight on executive power and giving power to the SRC.
- Holly - Question: What is the date of the SRC after the next.
- Kat: There are no other SRCs.
- James - Speaking Against: Okay, I need to make clear as the employer of staff of here. The discourse tonight that is criticism of staff is inappropriate. When they provide advice I pass that on to SRC and you may choose to disregard it as is your right. The dismissal of the role of staff and the advice they provide is inappropriate. If you have not considered this amendment, then you should not vote for it.
- Alana - Question: Can you repeat the sentence about not voting for something you haven't considered.
- James: If you haven't had time to consider a motion then you should vote against it.
- Joel: if we haven't had enough time to consider the amendment, we haven't had enough time to consider the motion. So if you haven't had adequate time for either, vote against both.
- Ben moves a procedural to give right of reply to amendment mover. Seconded by Eben. Motion passes, allowing Howard two minutes speaking
- Howard: Sorry about time frames, but this is symptomatic of the motion. We need to decide before the last SRC, so we're doing it now. Essentially the only change is that it's a committee of and chosen by the Executive, but under this amendment there is no substantive majority or voting bloc by getting more diversity into the honoraria policy. Want to put it beyond the political processes of the SRC. I value the advice of staff and would like if it were supplied directly by the SRC.
- Kat rereads the amendment and takes a vote. Holly's abstention is noted. Vote was 6 for, 9 against (recount on the latter requested by Ben).
- Holly seeks to move an amendment, which Kat requests in writing.
- Eleanor moves procedural for a 5 minute discussion break, seconded by Braedyn. Procedural passes. Adjourned at 8:34 to resume at 8:39.
- Meeting resumes: 8.45.
- Friendly amendment; motion now reads:

"To establish a committee to determine Honoraria for 2017. This committee will be chaired by the President or Treasurer and will be comprised of one other executive member, 2 college reps, 2 general representatives and one member of staff. Those interested in sitting on the committee should nominate to the General Secretary to be on the committee. The Gen Reps will vote on two gen rep representatives for the committee, the college reps will vote on two college rep representatives for the committee, and the executive will vote on one executive member, aside from the chair.

The committee will receive nominations for Gen Reps, College Reps, Clubs Council, Committee Chairs, and Probity who someone thinks should receive honoraria. The committee will set their own nomination procedure. The committee will receive a set amount of funding (as advised by the Treasurer) to allocate as honoraria, keeping in mind the legal and financial risks associated with honoraria. Individuals on the committee must declare conflicts of interest as they arise.

The committee will publish a report to the SRC outlining to whom honoraria has been awarded, how much, and for what key reasons.”

- Ria: “final” was taken out is this to give SRC oversight?
- Eleanor: Constitutionality is a bit vague, so the spirit is that SRC won't come in and micromanage but has the final say.
- Arjun: would the committee run on to next year? That is would the process be the same next year?
- Eleanor: Only 2017, hopefully things will be way better in 2018.
- Howard: This is second-most-popular model. This spreads the power out beyond the executive. We're on a clock so we should vote for this one because we can't kick the can down the road to src 8.
- Holly: 2 additional points. First it's hard for work to be dissected in such a panel, so perhaps groups should decide among themselves who the outstanding people are. Peers should nominate one another. Secondly, realistically there's no time to reject the report so people should take action and be proactive to make sure their voices are heard.
- Eleanor: It's come together now, but we definitely need to consider the ways we should talk to one another beforehand; that's on everyone including me. There's concern about opinionated exec, but we're essentially elected to have strong opinions, so.... Also people should nominate for this.
- Motion passes unanimously.

Motion: {PUT THIS IN LATER}

Moved: Rashna

Seconded: Tanika

- Rashna: there should be a uniform policy that isn't up to individual lecturer discretion. There's not a lot of catering to non-christian/-western holidays. These should be cause for deferred exams.
- Tanika: Yes I've had experience in this is well. People should be able to message their lecturer and just get a yes response rather than being uncertain.
- Alana: would you like this to be a one-off thing and they would approach ad hoc, or that people new at the ANU could put their name down on some sort of registry that this procedure would exist almost automatically?
- Rashna: That hasn't been discussed in the collective. We're just looking for SRC endorsement so we can speak on this with more weight. It's hard to administer with regularity because for instance Eid is dependent on seeing the moon, so it's unsure what particular day it would be on. Just getting SRC backing, not asking for blank cheque on the specifics.
- Anya: are there already mechanisms in place for things like this? How dependent is it on the lecturer.
- Rashna: Right now is contingent on lecturer and some don't think it's a good enough reason, so this is for a uni-wide policy.
- Motion passes.

Kat passes the chair to move a motion. James is chair without dissent.

Motion: on the matter of unsatisfactory reports, SRC calls to convene a Women's Dep report.
(paraphrased)

Moved: Kat

Seconded: Eleanor Kay

- Kat: This is the third time I've not gotten a report from Holly. Holly has been notified of this motion, but there are constitutional provisions for this and ultimately it's my job. This is ANUSA's way of asking the relevant department just for an update because there is no accountability mechanism other than reporting. This isn't necessarily punitive, but I've given a lot of notice and I'm left without a choice here.
- Eleanor waives seconder speaking rights.
- No speakers of questions
- Motion passes

OTHER BUSINESS

Kat passes chair to James.

Motion: that the SRC note the update from the Women's Officer

Moved by Holly

- Holly: I've posted the update in slack - any questions? Sorry about the lack of reports, I've not really been able to get them in during campaigning sessions. Lots in the Women's dept have also been very busy so not sure how effective delegating would have been?
- Tom: How goes handover?
- Holly: It's been... good? It's started. There might be some use in doing a joint department officer handover kind of thing. Will be ongoing until the end of the year. A combination of written notes from previous years and also fortnightly checkins. We're writing more down than in the past, but we've decided that even on sensitive things it's worth it.

No need to vote or pass.

Motion: that the 2017 committee open an online feedback form to collect anonymous feedback from all members eligible for consideration for honoraria to be summarised in a handover document to be passed on the the 2018 SRC, to inform future discussions on this subject.

Moved: Holly Zhang

Seconded: Eleanor Kay

- Nobody wishing to speak or question, moving straight to a vote.
- Motion passes.

Meeting closes, nec meeting 27 oct