1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

1.1 Attendance
Amy Fels, Elselynn Leighton, Laura Smith, Tom Antoniazzi, Michael Forsbery, Aisling Blackmore, Emma Brede, Yannis Vrodos, Katy Wedderburn, Wayne Howells, Ken Saverimutto, Fiona Parker, Emily Denholm, Caitlin Fisher, Naomi Elford, Julian Rapattoni, Joshua Helsby, Matthew Mckenzie.

1.2 Apologies
Daniel Chai

1.3 Proxies
Zoe Bush for Anita Creasey, Cameron Barnes for Rajdeep Singh, Gemma Whiting for Ben Watson, Alexandra Lawson for Lewis Richards, Anton Redkon for Alistair Marchesi, Fraser Hall for Nicole Mumford, Myles Parish for Chris Colalillo, Tegan Harrington for Charles Pym.

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

2.1 Guild Council Meeting
2.1.1 1 December 2011
Amy expressed that she had met with Karen to discuss the minutes, and that the Guild was in the process of engaging a new secretarial service to transcribe the meetings. As such, no minutes can be produces at this stage.

3.0 ELECTIONS

3.1 Chairs of Committees

3.1.1 Catering
Josh nominated by Katy, seconded by Caitlin;
Yannis nominated by Tom, seconded by Laura.

3.1.2 Tavern
Chris nominated by Josh, seconded by Julian;
Emma nominated by Tom, seconded by Laura.

3.1.3 Activities
Julian nominated by Katy, seconded by Alexandra;
Emma nominated by Tom, seconded by Laura.

3.1.4 Memberships
Katy nominated by Naomi, seconded by Josh;
Raj nominated by Tom, seconded by Laura.

Procedural motion by Tom to move to motion 4.4 while Wayne prepares ballot papers. Procedural motion carried.

4.4 Motion: That Guild Council approve Naomi Elford’s submission in response to the consultation paper “The Allocation and Funding of Commonwealth Supported Postgraduate Places”.

Moved by Naomi Elford
Seconded by Matthew Mckenzie
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Cameron spoke to the motion to commend Naomi on doing a great job, and said that it was very important that we make these submissions.

Motion unanimously carried.

**Procedural motion** by Matthew to move to motion 4.3.
Procedural motion carried.

4.3 **Motion:** That the 99th Guild Council donated $500 to the Lord Mayor’s Distress Relief Fund Margaret River Fire 2011 Appeal on behalf of students studying at the University of Western Australia.

Moved by Yannis Vrodos
Seconded by Laura Smith.

Laura spoke to the motion lending her general support.

Gemma pointed out that the fund had almost reached its fundraising target, and that our donation may not be as useful to the appeal as we intend.

Katy expressed that the target would likely be an underestimate, and as such the money will be needed and used.

Naomi outlined some other charitable pursuits of the Guild, such as Prosh, for Councillors’ information.

Motion carried.

**Procedural motion** by Matthew to circulate voting papers while we discuss motion 4.1.
Procedural motion carried.

4.1 **Motion:** That Guild Council accets the 2012 Budget as attached.

Moved by Josh Helsby
Seconded by Matthew Mckenzie.

Josh went through what the Guild Budget means for 2012. He thanked Wayne for his work in the preparation of the budget documents. He also thanked the Finance and Planning Committee for their time and effort in these preparations.

Councillors were directed to page 5 of the budget pack (summary). Josh indicated that the Guild has 5 principle sources of revenue: the Amenities and Services Fee, Catering (including the tavern), the secondhand bookshop and rental income from commercial tenancies. The memberships amount is set to increase from $645,000 last year to $2,400,000 with the introduction of the compulsory SSAF in 2012. This year’s budget will therefore be larger than in previous years, and we have planned around that.

Regarding catering, we took into account the uncertain impact on the caterers’ budget of proposed independent outlets operating on campus next year, which was an election promise that Liberty ran on, as everybody is aware. We do not yet have details of these proposals, so there is a large amount of uncertainty.

Secondly, the compulsory SSAF will impact on catering. Because more people are now paying this fee, more will become Guild members. The membership base will increase, meaning catering will be offering more discounts, particularly with coffee. We are uncertain as to the effect this will have on our budget, but we foresee that it could potentially impact us by up to $400,000. However, Wayne and Ken seem confident that we will be able to manage the emerging trends next year by reviewing prices if necessary.

F&P decided to make a general price increase of 4% across all catering to hedge that risk. Prices may need to be reviewed mid-year.
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Ken is to be congratulated on improving the Catering budget by about $22,000 by applying some structural changes. There is also the possibility that cost of goods sold in catering will actually decrease next year, as some of the shocks this year (eg Queensland floods) settle.

In other sources of revenue, there is the possibility that some revenue sources will be found externally next year, perhaps through sponsorship initiatives for the Guild itself, or through event sponsorship. This has not been included as a line in the budget, because it is uncertain, and it is better to have a positive variance should it occur.

On a minor note, the secondhand bookstore contribution was also reduced by $5000 because we hope to introduce a text swap next which may eat into the bookshop’s sales, but should hopefully reduce the prices of books for students.

Moving to expenditure, the largest (by quantity) are driven by the implementation of the Guild Masterplan next year, and the Org Review. Under the Masterplan, in 2012 the Guild offices are set to move into the South Wing of the Guild Village, and there will be a renovation of the reception, to be amalgamated with the Volunteering Hub. The effect on the budget is to the tune of around $1.47 million in capital expenditure to buy the South Wing from the University. Regarding the renovation, $912,000 has been put aside, but this has been accounted for so will not affect the budget. With the $1 million grant, F&P thought it better to spend it on capital expenditure now while it is a good time to build, and before the value is eroded.

Moving to the $250,000 expenditure on the Dentistry Kiosk, this was budgeted for in 2011 but did not occur at that time, so we are being quite conservative including these projects in the budget in the event that they go ahead in the coming year.

The Org Review features a $243,000 increase in payroll expenses. In short, the Financial Director (Wayne) will be replaced by two positions: the Management Accountant, and Director of Corporate Services. We are also getting a HR Representative, and setting aside $25000 for external consultancy to ensure that the people hired to those positions are the best people for the job. It should be noted that caution should be exercised in comparing this to the 2011 figures, since we did not have a full time Finance Director at that time, so the increase is not so large as it appears.

Most departmental budgets were rolled over from 2011. We accounted for some new evens such as the Toga Party, and to expand Oktoberfest. These haven’t been given a line item though, because we anticipate that they will be run revenue-neutral, or if anything, contribute positively to the bottom line.

We made savings of $20,000 to the Presidential Budget, which reflects savings from cutting the losses made at the Guild Ball. F&P considered that this event should be run revenue-neutral next year as well.

There was a Special Projects allowance of $10,000. The secondhand bookstore gets most of its budget from students forgetting to collect their money after their books are sold, so while this is good for the budget, it is not good for students, and we will implement a system to try to increase uptake, but that will cost us significantly.

We have saved $56,000 by removing our contribution to the National Union of Students. While F&P generally supported the presence of a national representative body for students, it was felt that NUS was not effective or efficient in their representation of us at all. Instead, that money will be better spent at ground level by this Guild, especially given the introduction of New Courses, which students need to be informed about.

There was some concern in F&P that that money should be allocated very specifically in the budget to ensure that it wasn’t wasted. We have done that, and it can be seen that Fac Soc funding has been increased by $20,000; club funding has been increased by $10,000, which effectively doubles it compared to 2011 figures; the mental health budget has been increased by $2000; the College budget was increased by $5000; Education Council Campaigns were allocated $3000; $2,500 increase to emergency loans; and $11,500 allowance for the creation of the position of a Migration Officer; and $3000 International Student Services.

The mental health funding is proposed to be used to support fac soc mental health initiatives. The ed council campaign funding is appropriate with the introduction of New Courses — students need to be informed about that. The Migration Officer position will be designed to help international students by assisting with the procedures in applying for citizenship, permanent residency and working visas. Details are yet to be fleshed out.
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Other noteworthy miscellaneous items are the catering capital expenditure schedule, which provides for a number of improvements that Wayne and Ken are keen to implement in catering, that F&P have approved. The benefits of these will be to improve the efficiency of catering, and to decentralise it operations, so that each outlet isn’t dependent on one another. Kan and Wayne both see a large opportunity for Catering to target more function activity, so that they are making more revenue from third parties rather than students themselves. That will be a large source of revenue for this Guild.

There was a $30,000 increase in the Volunteering Centre budget, which includes the addition of a part time staff-member. This is fully costed, and includes rent forgone by the building, because of its operation in the Commercial Centre.

To improve campus security, it was proposed that we market self-defence classes, especially for women, but for both genders as a whole. This comes under the Women’s Department budget, and the increased Welfare Department budget.

There was also a $4000 allowance made for the cost of tavern manager transition, because Gary is retiring next year.

Josh passed speaking rights to Matthew.

Matthew thanked Josh and began by expressing how pleased he was with the budget, and the new direction that the Guild would be taking. The budget is within the principles of the Liberty party which was elected, and it is a budget for change. He is most proud of increases to club funding: faculty societies are receiving a 50% increase in their funding, and that is vital particularly going into new courses, because they will be at the coal face when it comes to negotiating with the University.

As regards club funding, in 2011, $30,000 was initially allocated for PAC and Soc Clubs, which has been increased to $60,000 this year, $5,000 of which will be made up via credit from Lion Nathan, but it is double that of last year, which is important, because we need to keep that money close to students, and clubs are our best indicator of what students want, because they live and die on that basis. By giving them more money, we give them more scope to deliver more services to students.

Secondly, there has been a fantastic increase in educational spending this year, particularly with the increase in the campaign allowance for the educational council of $3,000, which is important going into New Courses to work with the University to fix problems as they arise.

I am also pleased that there will be funding for mental health, and that has been included in the Welfare Budget where it has not been before. We are going to use that funding to support clubs and societies on campus who run events on mental health. I believe we will also be paying for yoga classes for students out of that allowance.

Finally, emergency loans are going to be doubled from $100 to $200. The value of these has not been increased in many years, and the value of them has been eroded by inflation. We feel that it is important to have that opportunity there for students who are doing it tough, even though these loans are not always recovered.

I am pleased to say that we will be implementing the start of the Guild’s Masterplan this year. It was shocking to discover that we had a $1.8 million deficit, but we have pruned that by at least $500,000, and there will be more work that will be done. It is important to know that that money will be moved from a managed fund, ie from one asset form to another. The Guild is purchasing the South Wing, and will look like an entirely different place in a few short years.

External funding is something we will be looking into this year. We want to try to move our funding base from students to external sources, because there are so many sponsorship opportunities for the Guild, and we could spend money we would be contributing to events etc elsewhere.

Finally, the Org Review will be implemented in the coming year, and with a Managing Director who is less burdened by juggling other roles and tasks, the Guild could really kick some goals next year.

Procedural motion moved by Tom to move to open up the floor to questions of the mover and seconder. Procedural motion carried.
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Tom asked about the “uncertain impact to catering” or independent outlets, as articulated by Josh. Can you outline what those proposed independent outlets are, and what effect, in your opinion, it will have on the budget?

Matthew asked to answer the question. He said that it couldn’t be said who the outlets would likely be, because it will be open for tender in a proper and businesslike manner. Obviously there is a preference for a Rocketfuel on campus, but other than that it cannot be said which outlets may feature. In the tender process, features such as student pricing, choice etc will be considered, not just rent revenue.

As regards impact on catering, this can be done successfully if it is done well. The question is whether you can make more money from rent, so if the figure from the rent exceeds the profit from the outlet as it stands, that is a clear increase. Where there may be a negative impact, outlets operated by catering may have a lower market share. There will also be effects on the central kitchen. There may be wastage in the kitchen by making outlets independent etc.

Wayne said that our strength lies in being an internal catering operation, but that doesn’t remove the scope when we look at the options of having external and independent contractors. I would be concerned if we made significant changes to our existing business model, and I think the way to go about it is to do it cautiously, and do a trial and any adjustment to our model.

Alex asked about the 4% price increases, and suggested that they went against Liberty’s election talk about catering being too expensive.

Josh responded that it would be irresponsible not to index the prices against inflation, and that CPI was all the 4% increases represented. In real terms, this is not an increase of prices for students any more than increases at Broadway might be.

Matthew said that the sensible thing at this point is to approve the changes suggested by the Managing, Finance and Catering Directors, and then make our own changes at the opportune times. To suggest that we were going to step into office and privatise everything immediately is unrealistic and irresponsible. This has to be a slow and cautious process. This is by no means the end of the catering debate.

Cameron asked about reports specifically addressing what the impact would be on Guild Catering for introducing independent catering outlets. Also asked for further reports to be released to council with any sensitive information whitened out or removed.

Matthew said he was happy to release that report and any further reports would be made public.

**Procedural motion** by Matthew to release the results of item 3.

Procedural motion carried.

Josh was declared duly elected as Chair of Catering Committee.

Chris was declared duly elected as Chair of Tavern Committee.

Julian was declared duly elected as Chair of Activities Committee

Katy was declared duly elected as Chair of Memberships Committee.

**Continuation of Questions on the Budget:**

Cameron asked that in providing justification for de-affiliating from the National Union of Students the primary reason was so that we could run our own campaigns more effectively. His question was:

(a) Why have we gone from $56,000.00 to campaigning on higher education to $3,000.00 campaigning on the AN?

(b) That money that was previously earmarked to the National Union ($56,000.00) that is being used on representation for higher education issues such as youth allowance, the Bradley Review into higher education, Australian Quality Frameworks – how can a local campaign address those issues when they are controlled exclusively by the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Matthew answered that it is not just the $3,000.00 for the Education Council Campaigns Department. It is also intrinsically linked to the increase in the Faculty Society. The total amount of that $56,000.00 that was redistributed to initiatives which are most clearly educational, the emergency loans, not necessarily something that NUS would have done, Mental Health funding, funding for Faculty Society and funding for Educational Council Campaign which is more in the order of half of the NUS de-affiliation money. We
haven’t de-affiliated from NUS – funding has been cut to zero but that is not de-affiliation. It is up to the National Union of Students to choose who is affiliated and who is not. He has expressed to people on next year’s NUS executive that he would be interested to work with them.

He also stated that NUS does not spend pro-rata $56,000.00 of our money on national campaigns. If you actually look at the NUS budget hundreds of thousands of dollars go on the wages of students.

Cameron stated he did not think this was relevant to his question. He stated that his question specifically pertains to the fact that Josh has said we are cutting $56,000.00 and replacing it with this. The funding that we’ve cut was previously earmarked for higher education campaigns but have you adequately replaced higher education allowance?

Matthew stated that pro-rata the $56,000.00 does not go to campaigns. The wage bill of NUS is in the hundreds of thousands of dollars which goes to full time office bearers. He said that the actual amount of money NUS spends on educational campaigns is something in the order of $60,000.00 which is distributed across 30 universities which is only about $2,000.00 each so we’re actually spending more on actual education representation than NUS are. So we’re going from spending $54,000.00 towards wages and $2,000.00 to educational campaigns and going to where we’re spending $25,000.00 on educational campaigns. He said that he was discussing effectiveness and the money that is spent on wages is not an effective spending of money. He stated that he felt Naomi Elford will achieve more next year with no wage from the Guild than most people from NUS will achieve with a wage therefore he feels you don’t need to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on sending people to rallies to have effective educational representation. He also stated that NUS focuses on national issues which may not be relevant to students but most importantly this represents a move from focussing on external advocacy to advocacy on this campus because this University is undergoing a once in a century transition to new courses. He said he believes that we are more effective in spending this money on this campus in making sure our students are looked after rather than spending it on what he believed would be ineffective lobbying on a national level. Our focus next year needs to be at UWA students.

Cameron asked if the money that has been spent from the earmarked $56,000.00 - $20,000.00 to Education Council – that money has not been earmarked for educational purposes and we do not know how that money will be spent. A lot of this $56,000.00 has not been earmarked. Is it anticipated that this money will be spent on new courses, do you want Education Council to earmark it for new courses and what are we going to do about the fact that we have now effectively cut money from the education part of our budget?

Matthew stated that the Education Council will be reviewing its funding system over the coming weeks and Naomi will be working hard to ensure there is a lot of consultation on this. There hasn’t been any money earmarked for new courses because any support for a faculty society is going to be important and any support for new courses is going to be important. There will be a review of the $20,000.00. He also said that the money cannot be used for other purposes for which it was not intended. There will be a review of how faculty societies receive their funding. He said that if that review is unsuccessful and this council believes it is not effective then we wouldn’t be increasing the funds for the faculty societies. He said that referring to the statement that we’re cutting our education budget we could say we’re spending for example $90,000.00 on education and because we’re removing NUS and only allocating some of that to education that amount is going down by $20,000.00 or $30,000.00 which may be correct but that $20,000.00 or $30,000.00 which when used by NUS was going directly to educational issues he didn’t believe was the full $20,000.00 or $30,000.00. He said that we have actually increased our educational budget because we are no longer going to be supporting wages for full-time staff.

He said that we pay $60,000.00 and only really get $3,000.00 out of it if you look at it pro-rata. You could make that case but he would disagree because that money is now going to be spent much more wisely than it was before.

Yannis asked if the RSD has been created yet or what stage it was at now.

Matthew replied that the stage of the RSD is that as he understood it was that the RSA was going to become an interim department of the Guild which wasn’t going to be given its own budget. It was going to be given a trial for a period of time and then once the trial was over it would formally become a department but he wasn’t 100% sure.

Tom said that the terms of reference of the Residential Department allowed for them to make applications for finance or planning so his understanding was there has been a certain sum allocated in the presidential budget. That sum is not directly accessible by the Department but may be made accessible.
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Yannis asked about the Society’s Council President and the President to explain what the $55,000.00 in the budget which is called the Club Grant includes. Does it include Lion Nathan grants, semester one and semester two grants, club awards, end of year awards?

Julian said it doesn’t include Lion Nathan grants. It hasn’t been allocated to each different set of grants at the moment. They are still going through the process of allocating which grants it will go to.

Yannis stated that in the past the $5,000.00 which Lion Nathan has given us has appeared in the actual Societies Council budget. Is this going to the Societies Council budget again or is it going to the club grants?

Wayne said the $5,000.00 Lion Nathan amount was net off against the club grants line.

Yannis asked if the club awards are included in that.

Julian said club awards are not in the Societies Council budget.

Yannis asked about the allocation of all semester grants. Under the club grant policy the Guild, F & P and Council is supposed to allocate the amount to go to semester grants, etc.

Matthew said he would like to see a review of club grants are issued more generally. He said he felt there were a few touch-ups that could be made.

Julian said he will reassess it under club grants policy.

Zoe said that Anita wanted to highlight the fact that the women’s department budget had been reduced by over half from $8,322.00 to $4,120.00 and queried why that is the case.

Matthew said the women’s budget had $3,000.00 provision last year for the replacement of the fridge and the repair of damaged furniture and carpet. These were only one off expenses and the $3,000.00 has been taken off the budget for 2012.

Anita asked about the $1,000.00 that has been taken out for publications.

Caitlin said that what she has been doing in the past month or so is to contact people with a view to cutting the expenditure of the department by utilising sponsorship from corporations that do support women. Looking at businesses that the Australian government have tagged as being supportive of women and looking at other not for profit organisations. So looking at the sponsorship we’re getting that’s actually an increase, we’re spending more but that’s not going to have an impact on treasury. Regarding publications the previous women’s office have not been very supportive and not left any financial documentation or details about the publications. Usually it’s traditional for the outgoing office to publish the Damsel in 2012 so we can hand it out on O Day and this has not been done. She is currently working with Alice Pond and some corporate sponsors to get those through. However it will be a slimmed down version but will also incorporate more corporate funding. So we’re seeing an increase and more events in the women’s department. The women’s department only spent $2,783.00 in 2011.

Zoe asked about the corporate sponsorship and whether we had had any definite commitments of sponsorship so we can be sure that the decrease in budget is not going to result in an actual decrease of available funds.

Caitlin said that she had been in contact with the women’s arm of a mining group and they are happy to fund some of it however because she doesn’t have full costings from Alice Pond as yet it has not been finalised but she was definitely sure that it would be going ahead.

Julian said that firms like Deloitte were looking to increase their sponsorship.

Zoe said with looking at corporate sponsorship we risk limiting ourselves to issues that the women’s department can address and most commonly will be a white upper class educated women’s experience. These are businesses that are interested in increasing equal opportunity and there are more issues that face women today than the ones that these businesses will be interested in addressing.

Caitlin said that as the women’s officer elected at UWA she understood that there are broader issues that all women should be concerned about and it is very important. She has tried to contact the women’s
collective who have not been forthcoming and she is happy to work with them through PAC council and
other things so they can continue with their advocacy. However the direction she is hoping to take the
women’s office is career focus, and trying to provide as many opportunities for women on this campus as
opposed to holding rallies. However she is happy to work with the women’s collective if they are happy to
work with her. She has sent emails.

Zoe said she is not sure what is happening with the women’s collective. Anita and her are
working with Emma Norton on feminist action network.

Laura asked the treasurer about Oktoberfest and Toga Party and that she understood the organising of
these events would be passed on to societies council because it is believed that Activities is stretched to
their limit. Asked for the justification in passing them to SOC while decreasing SOC funding. With two
huge events to organise how do we know that we will be able to break even or make a profit?

Josh said it that we should be able to accurately forecast what kind of revenue we will be able to get out of
these events and if we don’t feel that Toga party or Octoberfest will actually turn a profit then they probably
wouldn’t run or otherwise we would have to allocate funding from the budget for them. He said he has
spoken to the Activities Office who do feel that they are stretched in their capacity to run these events and
that is why it has been passed on to societies office.

Matthew said that the it’s not just the funding that is important with these events, it is also the capability and
experience of the SOC president and those on societies council and he felt that all those on the council are
well equipped for this. More importantly we have a man as SOC president who has organised plenty of big
events in his time and this is not a question of how much money Julian needs but it is a question of Julian’s
capability and he feels Julian is very capable and is going to do a great job.

Tom said on the topic of events and initiatives, it is noted in the executive summary that Guild Ball loses
$20,000 because of financial mismanagement, whereas we choose to make an investment of $20,000 in
order to make cheap ball tickets available to students who may not otherwise be able to afford $150 ball
tickets. It is concerning that you would propose to run this as revenue neutral as essentially what you are
doing is making a profit off students which seems to be against the theme of what you’re going for in this
budget. Likewise Oktoberfest has traditionally been a free event for Guild members and now we’re
proposing to potentially make it contribute to the bottom line which is slugging guild members and students
for events that are traditionally free. Why are we taking away these investments that the Guild has always
made and instead charging students for it?

Matthew stated that we have to understand the word investment and not misuse the word. He said it’s not
that we’re slugging students and that Guild Ball is another great opportunity for external sponsorship. What
we’re trying to do is manage the costs of the event. There are a lot of opportunities to make this event
cheaper for students without running up a massive loss on it. We would like to look at external funding and
rather than pouring money down on the drain on balloons etc that cost $50 it would be better to spend that
money on club funding, etc.

Matthew said if we’re looking at moving Oktoberfest from being in the tav to being an event out on Oak
Lawn you have to look at things like security and other costs that need to be covered. So if we’re going to
be making the event bigger and better for students it might well be that those people who attend the event
need to contribute. He said there were many students who are having financial problems and we shouldn’t
be charging them high Guild fees and then putting the money into drinking events. The money should be
spent on welfare and education and that is why we are not going to subsidise.

Tom said that the welfare department budget has been increased by $2,000.00 and the justification is for
mental health initiatives. The welfare department budget has had money allocated for mental health
initiatives since the time he was welfare officer and he said it doesn’t seem that it is anything different
proposed under these mental health initiatives. Why then does the extra $2,000.00 need to be allocated to
mental health initiatives?

Matthew said that he has spoken to Rachel Lee from Blackstone who ran an event about mental health.
Next year their funding source is going to be removed. They had an external funder who has withdrawn so
Blackstone has approached us about getting funding from the Guild so the $2,000.00 has been allocated to
Blackstone. He said he would like to see this expanded. What we are trying to establish is a funding for
clubs and societies who find it a lot easier to get students involved because they have a more spread out
network than the Guild may have.
Alex asked if PAC overspent what was actually allowed for it last year what is the rationale in not increasing it. She said she understood that PAC was actually under funded and could not understand why there wouldn’t be an increase.

She also asked in relation to the Toga party that she was under the impression that they were banned and if they were not banned she doesn’t believe they should be run as there is a problem with sexual assault that goes on which relates to the role of the women’s department. If you’re putting it towards a more corporate direction will there still be that allocated part for women’s welfare especially because a lot of sexual assault happens at the faculty’s camps.

Matthew said he didn’t receive a budget for public affairs council from Lewis and he feels that we will not need to increase this funding.

Matthew said he didn’t believe the Toga party has been banned.

Alex said the Manic Depressive Society was encouraged not to run it. It was not banned but they were asked not to run it.

Matthew said it is not an item in the budget so we don’t really need to discuss it but that we are going to try to run the Toga party.

Alex said it was very important to ensure that there no-one is sexually assaulted on campus at all times and not just with these parties. Security arrangements have to be in place.

Alex said that she doesn’t really see any security measures in place.

Matthew said that we make sure we have medics, equity officers, a risk management plan, we have an event management plan and everything is considered.

Naomi said that she had been an equity officer on a camp this year agreed that she could see that the risk of sexual assault was evident and it is an extremely important issue not only for Guild events but for every event. She said she had sent a link to everyone’s Guild council account to equity university training so they are aware of these issues and know how to handle them.

Alex said that sexual assault keeps on being an issue.

There was an amendment to the budget proposed by Cameron Barnes, seconded by Laura Smith, which suggested that we replace the line item for affiliations with $75,406.00 for the 2012 budget, and that we continue to affiliate with NUS but we will negotiate in good faith our affiliation fee.

Matthew said he had to move a motion before that amendment understanding Order 79 which states: “The Guild Council must first determine the proposed deficit or surplus when considering the budget.”

The motion is that the budget to be approved today be determined to have a surplus from operations expenditure of $350,298.00, we determine the accounting profit of $599,801.00 and a net cash surplus or deficit figure to be a deficit of $1.386199 million.

Cameron said that a prior amendment passed by Guild Council overrides a previous amendment so if Matthew proposes an amendment before his amendment which would seek to preclude its successful operation and then the subsequent amendment is passed, then it will override the first amendment.

Matthew said it says under No. 80 that you may only consider amendments to line items in pairs, the first amendment proposing only reductions in line items and the second amendment proposing only increases so Tom’s amendment is not valid at the moment. He said we now need to move a motion that determines what the figure is in terms of the budget surplus deficit figure and then Cameron will be able to move his motion under the standing orders in a pair with the reduction in line items and then the increase in line items.

Matthew moved the proposed motion as above. Seconded by Josh. Motion was carried.

Cameron moved the next amendment to Motion 4.1. That this Council shall replace the line item for Affiliations with $75,406.00 for 2012 budgeted with a notation that we will continue to negotiate with NUS but we will negotiate in good faith our affiliation fee. As per the request of the Guild President that will also come with the provision which will roll back any funding in the Guild President’s or Guild Treasurer’s report
which is set to stem from that funding cut, that is to say $2.5K increase in loans, $3K increase to the AN, $10K increase to clubs, $20K increase to faculty societies, $2K increase to mental health, $5K increase to colleges, $11K increase to the migration officer and the increase to access.

Matthew summarised the amendment as being that we replace the funding listed and replace all of that with the NUS funding. Cameron said that he had received advice that he would require clarification on that an amendment to a line item in the budget can seek to amend a previous motion as to what the level of the deficit or surplus will be.

It was stated that “the net effect of each pair of amendments must be to maintain the deficit or surplus determined by the meeting of the Guild Council and the second amendment in each pair may only be put if the first is carried”.

Matthew stated that now that an amendment to the budget has been passed you can only in your amendments mess with the figures as long as it stays within what has been put forward in the budget.

Cameron asked if he would like to add a line item which will increase $56,000.00 can he include with that amendment any form of provision or rider so as to adjust the final surplus of the Guild to take into account that $56,000.00?

Matthew said that now that the surplus or deficit has been ruled it cannot be altered. You must go within those figures when adjusting line items in the budget.

Yannis asked if that meant that for example in April of next year that the Council could make amendment to the expenditure of the Guild under the standing Orders 78 through to 82.

Josh said you would have to amend your budget surplus.

Cameron said he will introduce an amendment to the budget and he would like the amendment to be entertained subsequent with a motion of Guild Council to be that if his first amendment is successful to amend the surplus or deficit.

Matthew responded to the motion. We have picked the deficit or surplus figure and when we move a new motion to pick a new deficit or surplus figure we must still only consider amendments to line items in pairs. The first amendment only proposing reductions and the second amendment only proposing increases. Even if the determined deficit or surplus figure is changed you still have to include any extra expenditure or revenue decreases to make the items balance.

Cameron stated his amendment will now read. “That we replace the line item for affiliations with $75,406.00 for 2012 budgeted with the notation as previously described and that that amount will come from a reduction to the operating surplus of the Guild”.

Yannis seconded the amendment.

Cameron then stated he was going to address four things. First of all the issue of whether or not cutting $56,000.00 will lead to us being de-affiliated from the National Union of Students. Secondly why the National Union of Students is important and why what we’re effectively approving in this budget as it stands is a substantial reduction in the amount of money we are spending on campaigning for higher education at a national level. Said he will also address the free rider arguments and finally he will talk about how as a Guild Council and as a Guild that sends delegates to the National Union of Students we should be attempting to make the National Union more effective and more efficient and we cannot do that if we de-affiliate.

Regarding the cutting of the $56,000.00 Cameron stated that the Guild President had stated that he did not think this would not lead to us being de-affiliated. He said he has had no feedback from the National Executive as to whether or not they have received a formal proposal to still be affiliated regardless of the fact that we are not paying them anything. He also asked why would a National Union of Students affiliate a G8 university campus that pays them nothing because if they did that every campus in the country would cut that funding to zero and no-one would have to pay NUS affiliation fees. He said it defies logic that we can decide to not pay NUS its $56,000.00 affiliation fee and never pay it and still remain a full affiliate of the National Union of Students.

Cameron said that he approved of the fact that funding has been increased to a migration agent, to faculties, to clubs, etc. but let’s not forget that the Guild’s budget has been boosted by the fact that we now
have compulsory amenities and services fees and in fact our revenue from membership has more than doubled. So more than $1/2 million extra is flowing into Guild revenue, and this extra has come from us de-affiliating from the NUS and he feels this is a political ploy as most students are not aware of what the National Union of Students does.

Cameron asked what does the National Union do? They send people to negotiate with the Minister for Education. They send people to sit on boards who determine Australian quality frameworks, who determine how much HECs fees we pay, who determine how our education is rated as compared to other universities, who determine when we restructure new courses whether or not those courses are funded. The post-graduatisation of higher education is happening around the country and there are universities such as MacQuarie who have shifted their law degrees, engineering degrees and their architectural degrees to post-graduate and they are now contesting with us the contestable pool of HECs funding for higher education. If you read Naomi’s submission you will note that in 2014 our full Commonwealth funding for post-graduate courses will be reviewed. That means that you could be going to UWA and in order to do a law degree you would have to pay $30,000 up front and likewise for architecture, medicine or engineering. What we are confronted with is the fact that new courses makes it more important than ever that we are engaged on a national level talking to the Minister, talking to policy advisers from prime minister and cabinet, sitting on boards that determine the AQF level of our post-graduate degrees. The AQF level of post-graduate degrees suddenly jumped from a 7 to a 9 and a big influence behind that decision were representatives from the National Union of Students.

Cameron talked about NUS only spending $60,000 on campaigns because campaigns aren’t there to exist separately from NUS’s lobbying. The whole point of campaigns is to generate students to generate support. When we go to the government and ask for a HECs decrease go or to the education minister and ask for an increase in youth allowance we do so with this 10,000 signature petition and knowing that students came to National days of action on campuses across the country and supported us. That $60,000.00 has no tangible benefits, not to UWA not to any student. It is an intangible indirect benefit which gives NUS the mandate to lobby the government and yet the vast bulk of NUS funding goes on staff levels. As with at UWA we employ two education offices full-time to represent students, we employ a full-time Guild President to sit on boards. NUS is exactly the same. We pay full time office bearers not to study or do other extra-curricular activities but to spend all of their time as a full-time job advocating for students, sitting in on meetings with ministers and ministerial advisers, making sure that students are represented.

Cameron said that as a direct result of the $56,000 the automatic age of independence was decreased from 25 to 22 which means that when you turn 22 you get youth allowance. This represents hundreds of millions of dollars of tangible benefits to students that results from the $56,000. When you run a Guild campaign at Uni and there are students walking into voting tents it is easy to say we’ll cut NUS and spend the $56,000 on the students. The students don’t appreciate the various levels of money that goes to and they don’t appreciate that when they get a $900 bonus as occurred under the Rudd government the only reason why that $900 bonus came out was because NUS said that it was needed.

Cameron said it is also important to consider the argument that spending this money on staff is a waste of money. If it a waste of money why is it that every industry group in the country spends a substantial amount of resources lobbying the government, and paying full-time staff to do nothing but sit on boards and lobby the government. Companies such as BHP, Australian Mines and Metals and the Business Council of Australia pay that money. The reason why the free market pays that money is because it is cost effective because it pays to employ full-time staff to lobby the government that will have consequences to the value of hundreds of millions of dollars. The higher education sector is more dependent on government funding than any other industries so why would we not invest in that.

Cameron said that there is an argument that if we cut the $56,000 we’ll still get the full benefits of NUS lobbying without having to pay. Say you are a Western Australian Minister for Education and a national union comes to you and you know full well that a top G8 university has pulled its funding and pulled its support from the National Union. Do you think it is going to make the National Union weaker or stronger? Why is in the wake of the financial crisis that every other developed country in the world cut funding for that higher education sector, increased fees for students and yet Australia didn’t. This is because we have had an incredibly strong National Union of Students. Is de-affiliating from the National Union of Students going to give us as much “bang for our buck” as ensuring that we have a strong representative on a national level. He stated he believed you cannot run a local campaign for a national issue.

Cameron stated that some would argue that cutting affiliation fees sends a message to NUS. That we don’t like the fact that occasionally NUS has unprotracted arguments that are unresolved and that we don’t like the fact that NUS spends money on staff. He stated that the party which he represents STAR sent independent students to the last National Union of Students who fought the Labor factions, the Liberal
factions and the interest groups and they came incredibly close to getting the third highest position on the
National Union of Students, that is the National Education Officer. The National Education Officer was that
close to being a Western Australian independent as a result of us engaging in the National Union. The
National Union argue for Western Australia and they argue an independent line based on things like new
courses or the post-graduatisation of university. If funding is cut to NUS it will send the message that we
don’t care and are happy to sit back and let our changes go unresolved and unimplemented. If we want to
improve NUS we have to engage, show up and get executive members to the national conference. He said
he did not believe we could influence or engage with NUS or change NUS for the better in any way without
funding.

Cameron asked if we want to be the Guild that decides that increases are not important, that it is fine for the
federal government to go ahead and make our new courses inequitable. He stated at Melbourne University
they have undergone the exact same model as we have with the only difference being that if you want to
practice law and get in on HECs you need to do a lot better than someone who can pay $30,000 up front.
He stated that was buying education and is the sort of thing that we don’t want to happen in WA so we
shouldn’t be disengaging from the National Union of Students. He stated if anybody was not sure what the
ramifications of NUS are, if anybody did not fully understand NUS or fully appreciate our role in NUS then to
give it a year of staying or vote for this amendment. Give it a year on Guild Council, try to engage with the
National Union of Students, send three representatives and see if we can get outcomes. Then after a year
make up your mind. He said he thought it was very important that all councillors realize that we’re talking
about the future of higher education funding in Western Australia, the future of funding for post-
graduatisation that’s occurred on campuses such as UWA, and more importantly we’re talking about
sending a message to the Minister for Education that for the first time in history a G8 university does not
support the National Union of Students.

Matthew spoke on Cameron’s suggestion of giving it one year with NUS. He spoke about attending the
conference and the fact that when he attended the first part of the conference was delayed by an hour so
he missed the opening ceremony because he had a teleconference scheduled. The next part of the
conference was supposed to start at 5.00pm and didn’t start until 1.00am. He stated it was very poorly
managed.

Matthew stated in 2009 there was only one motion moved at the NUS conference. We spent thousands of
dollars in fees in sending people over there for the conference and tens of thousands of dollars in affiliation
fees and there was not even an executive elected – it was done by circular.

He stated we represent 10% of NUS’ budget so we’re effectively paying for the whole of WA although some
other universities do contribute. He stated that he was not aware of anybody being in a senior position on
the NUS executive who has come from WA in the time that he has been at university.

Emma said that Matthew Chuck was the general secretary in 2005.

Matthew said between the Labor left and Labor right faction they control two thirds of the floor of the
conference. What happened when they elected the President and the General Secretary is one faction of
the Labor party picked up all their Presidential butts and one section picked up all their General Secretary
butts and they switched them.

Matthew said that he didn’t think we should keep giving the NUS money and that this type of activity was
inappropriate. He said that they spend $56,000.00 on campaigns which is 10% of their budget. If we
reduce the funding they might be forced to have a look at their budget and see what they are doing wrong.

Matthew said that Cameron has talked about full-time employees. The Guild has full-time employees who
do a fantastic job. His understanding is that the students on NUS are still studying. He spoke to a member of
the Labor right faction who said that she thought the NUS was disgraceful and that all her predecessors
had done was to continue to study as students and attend rallies. She said she was appalled by it. They
would attend rallies and then write reports. He said that if we sent the students on this campus to an NUS
conference and they saw the motions they would be appalled that $60,000 is being spent on this type of
thing. He said he thinks there should be a national body to represent students and not be concerned about
such things as climate change, etc. as even though these issues are important they are not relevant to
students. He said that the students should be representing students and not their own interests.

Referring to Cameron’s point that we need to spend this money on a lobbying body, Matthew said that the
lobbying bodies actually lobby for the businesses. He said the NUS does not lobby for students because its
priorities are not just student issues and also the NUS is one of the biggest lobbyists for the student
services and amenities fee. This means students are going to have to pay $198 next year on Guild fees.
The NUS said to let students put it on HECs debts. If it actually cared about HECs debts it wouldn’t allow the government to make this compulsory and force students to put it on their HECs. One of the biggest things that stops students from going to university is the size of their HECs debts so why would we want to make it higher if we’re representing students. The National Union of Students isn’t a national body for students but the National Union of Student Unions. It is a union of unions and doesn’t represent the interests of students but of student unions. He said that students do not want this compulsory fee levied when they don’t know how the money is going to be spent and don’t even necessarily use the services of the Guild. He said he didn’t feel the students should have to pay the services and amenities fee if they weren’t going to use the services of the Guild.

Matthew mentioned NUS lobbying for youth allowance for students. He gave an example of a person whose parents had 7 or 8 children and couldn’t give her any money. Because her parents earned over a certain income threshold and because she was limited in her ability to apply for independent living allowances, she would work 25 hours a week and most of the money she got from youth allowance would be clawed back at 50% or 60% so she would get very little benefit from youth allowance. If students want to work hard they don’t get the benefit of youth allowance.

Matthew said that Macquarie is not affiliated, they de-affiliated in 2003. They are moving to post-graduatisation. He disagreed with Cameron that we are going to lose the benefits of NUS if we cut the funding. He said he believed if we want to send a message of change we need to basically punish NUS for their bad behaviour and remove their funds. We can still benefits from NUS. We’re not saying that all students from UWA are exempt when there are changes to the youth allowance system or HECs. We’ll still get those benefits, we’re just not paying for them. Perhaps they’ll work harder as they want to get our money back. He stated that Cameron had said withholding our money from NUS would damage the authority of NUS but that this is exactly what we are trying to do and to make them realize that what they are doing is wrong and they have to work to get their authority back. We want NUS to know that if they want the authority that UWA Guild affiliation brings they need to work hard and they need to work for WA students and not just for their own jobs on the east coast.

Matthew said that if we were de-affiliated he wouldn’t be concerned and once NUS loses the funding they will hopefully change their attitude and work harder to get us back on board again.

Matthew moved a motion that Rob Affleck and Anthony Spagnolo, observers, be given speaking rights on the issue at hand; seconded by Josh Helsby.

Cameron asked what the justification is for expanding the room to observers if we knew in advance that observers wouldn’t be able to speak. He said he thought that it was a bit hypocritical to say that the stand up representative for the UWA Guild who is an observer can’t speak but other observers can.

Matthew said there was a principle established at the last council meeting that we allow observers to speak. He said that he had invited Emma to speak later but not at the time when he was trying to answer a question about the budget. This would be the time now when the NUS amendment was being moved.

Matthew said he would like to propose a procedural that if people have questions of clarification for the composure of the amendment those questions be allowed. Seconded by Yannis. Motion carried.

Katy asked about the issue mentioned about students “buying a law degree” at Melbourne University and whether they were affiliated with NUS. Have they found that the money they have paid to affiliate with NUS hasn’t assisted with preventing the buying of degrees after the introduction of their equivalent of New Courses.

Matthew said that they were affiliated with NUS. NUS made a number of submissions on that basis and he wasn’t aware of the full extent of how that went out. He doesn’t know what the Melbourne University Law Students Society’s position was or the Guild’s position or NUS’s position. He stated that sometimes we have wins and sometimes we have losses. He said Melbourne University had some wins such as the AQF (Australian Quality Frameworks) level for law was increased which is a good thing for new post-graduate students and there were a number of improvements.

As a law society, as a guild and as a national union we went to the Minister and we said we were unhappy with how things happened at Melbourne and they took that on board. We have achieved progress at UWA as no law, engineering or medicine student is going to have to pay fully up front fees at least for now and that is a win.
Laura asked if we don’t pay the money are we barred from sending delegates and as a non-affiliated university we don’t get a voice.

Matthew said we can still send the delegates and they get to speak but they don’t have voting rights.

Yannis asked Cameron that with UWA not affiliating and removing its funding will this reduce the independents power to increase NUS.

Cameron said he will address this in his right of reply.

Katy asked if there was any way we could reach a medium between the two sides. Can we make some sort of assessment and say to NUS that we are only getting a certain amount of value out of it now and we are only going to pay a certain amount. Then see what decreasing the budget actually does for the NUS’ considerations to people from UWA and then actually make an assessment next year whether we want to de-affiliate or whether there are improvements towards the conditions towards UWA. We could then increase funding if we felt it was a worthwhile investment.

Tom said regarding the NUS conference and Matthew’s earlier comments that the conference goes over 4 days and that there is a flexible agenda. He said that over this time they were in negotiations with the Labor factions trying to negotiate a position for Nicholas Parkinson as National Education Officer and by the end of the week were successful. He said they successfully negotiated two national executive positions for independents. He said we won WA State Branch President, Tasmanian State Branch President and New South Wales State Branch President and also an independent office bearer position which is the International Students Officer so he considers that was a great success.

Tom said that he does not agree with Matthew that de-affiliating with the NUS will send a message. He believes that not only will it not send a message it will actually go to the favour of the Labor factions. If we don’t affiliate we don’t have delegate votes which effectively means that the proportion of the Labor factions increases.

Tom mentioned Matthew’s comments about Labor factions and other factions doing deals etc that certain WA delegates had signs in front of them saying “votes for sale”. Matthew said those signs were removed.

Tom said that it needs to be pointed out that we have worked very hard over the last year to create an operating surplus. He stated that $56,000.00 was roughly less than $2.50 per student. He said that he believed $2.50 for national advocacy was a small price to pay. We are not talking about taking money away from other projects which have been proposed. He asked that councillors vote for the amendment. He said he will be proposing a procedural motion that this vote is held by secret ballot as he is not convinced that councillors all have the same opinion on this issue and councillors have the right to express their option without the fear of being victimised by the leaders on the council.

Aisling said she had just come back from the CAPA Conference and she understands that organisations like NUS and CAPA are very frustrating to work with and don’t seem very effective but in terms of national level representation it is very important to have these bodies and the only way we are going to improve them is to continue to talk to them and engage with them. She said that by pulling their funding we’re tying their hands even further.

Cameron read out the amendment. “Amendment to Motion 4.1. To replace the line item for Affiliations with $75,406.00 for 2012 budget” which is an increase of $56,000.00 and there is a notation that we will continue to affiliate with NUS but will negotiate in good faith our affiliation fee to seek to reduce that fee.

Gemma said she would like to talk against this motion. She said she thought the “votes for sale” signs should be addressed. Regarding the NUS conference she stated that of the four days, three days is set aside for party policy discussion, caucusing and doing deals and the Thursday is purely spent in the ballot room. Balloting starts at 9.00am, collecting doesn’t start until 11.00am. She said that the “votes for sales” signs were done as a bit of a joke and they were only up for 2 or 3 minutes. She said that despite a group having 13% of the vote at this conference the factions would not deal with them and in negotiations weren’t interested. She said she tried to get in contact with the independents to talk to them about positions. She said that Nick Parkinson Education was not mentioned. They said they wanted national executive votes and clear ballots. They did not mention education. She said that she and the others were there in good faith to actually negotiate to try and see what could be brought about. She said she was very surprised that if they were really serious about getting a WA representative on the high end executive in the Education Council position that they did not mention it. She said she finds it offensive that it is said that we’re not
taking it seriously when they claim to have a serious run for a position and only just falling short, when they
did not talk to a group that could have gotten them over the line.

Emma said that at NUS everyone who gets elected under unity to NUS gave their votes to the leaders who
go and collect their votes. They stack them up in big piles and then trade them off because they’ve done
the deals. She said it is not representing students, it’s representing factionalism.

Gemma said it was very hard to engage in the conference when someone at the back of the room yelled an
offensive comment. The whole delegation was then removed despite the fact that there were three people
in the front row taking the debate very seriously, and were ready to contribute to it. The person who yelled
the offensive comment wasn’t even with the ALSF and wasn’t supposed to be there.

Gemma said she did not believe that just because you don’t pay the fee you de-affiliate. She said that QUT
hasn’t paid its fees for 6 years and it wasn’t until year 3 that the National Union actually stopped issuing
them delegate spots. We’ll still have delegate spots issued and it’s not even up to the NUS to decide this,
there’s actually an affiliation committee made up of two people from the Labor right faction and two people
from the Labor left faction and an independent who accredit universities. She said QUT was affiliated with
$500.00 because the factions wanted their votes. They still got their votes accredited. It’s all depending on
what the factions decide is going to be in their best interests at conference. The only way we’re actually
going to impact on an organisation like this is when you cut off their funding and say that they have to look
at what they are doing. This is essentially seen as a stepping path into the ALP. That is the way it is
treated and it is why the policy that is discussed does not relate to students. Most of the issues discussed
are about ideological debate that don’t really have an impact on any student in Australia. She said that if
the body could be reformed into something that could actually hold some benefit for the students then
maybe you could see the benefit in giving it some time. She said she doesn’t believe this would happen.

She said that in 2009 the conference was for a week and they were only on conference floor for a minute.
They couldn’t even hold their elections because they were pulling quorum on each other. The universities
spent thousands of dollars sending delegates, paying affiliation fees, paying conference delegation fees
and nothing was actually achieved. This is the body that we are paying money to. Any student is eligible to
run for position, go to the conference and have speaking rights. The universities spent thousands of
dollars sending delegates, paying affiliation fees, paying conference delegation fees
and nothing was actually achieved. This is the body that we are paying money to. Any student is eligible to
run for position, go to the conference and have speaking rights. The reason why the WA President is the
only president who gets paid salary is because the NUS Executive which is predominantly east coast and
will always be east coast says it’s too hard to fix things in WA – that’s what the WA President is for. Unless
by reforming the NUS and reforming WA’s involvement and UWA’s involvement and we align with one of
the major factions and then exploit the power of being a part of one of the major factions, we are not going
to achieve anything. Independents at this conference are too insignificant to actually have a big voice
because the Labor party factions can say that they won’t negotiate which is what happened to the
independents this year.

She said that anyone who thinks that this organisation is worth the money we put into it is severely deluded.
If you went over yourself you would see how factionalised it is and how it is not worth UWA’s money. She
said that even from the position of National Executive which she was elected to, it is not in UWA’s interests
to pay those affiliation fees next year. She said that she is UWA’s representative on that council next year.

Yannis asked about the comment that NUS benefits Labor students’ careers in the Labor party and asked if
Gemma would have advanced her political future in the Liberal Party.

Gemma said that no it would not benefit her political future to be on the NUS executive and it could
probably do the opposite.

Cameron stated that Matthew’s entire argument was criticising NUS National Conference and did not
criticise our good faith negotiations with ministers or what the research officers for NUS were doing or what
the education officer, the president or secretary were doing. Those people are the fundamental driving
force behind NUS.

Matthew stated he also talked about youth allowance and other issues, not just the conference.

Cameron stated that Matthew had claimed the NUS was not representative of students and didn’t achieve
aims. He said he agreed that youth allowance in this country is no good but he said it has been improving
over time and we have had a national union that has been focussing on youth allowance. The fact that
youth allowance was not cut in the wake of global financial crisis is fantastic.

He stated that the threshold for dependent youth allowance was tripled, the threshold for how much you
can earn before youth allowance starts getting reduced has substantially increased and the automatic age
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of independents was reduced as well to 22. He reiterated that on a national level you are going to have wins and losses and if you have a strong national voice you are going to have more wins and less losses.

He said he finds it hard to believe a guild president who stands up and tells us that all students do not benefit from Guild services and if that is true then we have failed as a Guild. He said he does not believe it is true because if you look through this budget a substantial amount of funding goes towards things that are intangible - services that impact everyone. He said he appreciates that Matthew's efforts benefit every student on campus and every student on campus benefits when Matthew puts time into representing students and attending meetings. He said that the reason the NUS pursue an anti-VUS line with the government was because they felt there were a lot of poor students who were paying our amenities and services fee but they had two issues. These poor students were paying the $60.00 per semester but were struggling as they had to pay it up front and even though they were paying the amenities and services fee, other students who were also benefiting weren't contributing and we had a free rider problem.

Cameron pointed out the fundamental thrust of the arguments against his amendment to the budget was that three people went to the national conference and didn't think it was run well and that it was a waste of time. He said that no organisation is perfect and this conference was about setting policy. It didn't change the fact that we are still paying full-time staff members to go out there and represent students to achieve hundreds of millions of dollars of benefit. He stated that the fact that the conference was run poorly is a reason to engage and to vote according to what will benefit my university. He asked Gemma if she wasn't able to effectively represent students at UWA because she was shut out of the conversation because she was part of the Australian Liberal Students Caucus, why was she not an independent?

Gemma replied because independents got shut out just as much as the liberal students.

Cameron said that we were a few votes away of having a national education officer who was an independent from this university. Those delegates did not go to the education ballot and the fact that they can argue that they never knew Nick Parkinson was running suggests that they didn’t fill out their own ballot forms as his name was on ballot forms.

Gemma said a lot of the names on the ballot forms were not running seriously.

Cameron said that he believed the concept that we can send a message and improve the union by not sending voting delegates and not sending funding is wrong and Gemma is right about the two Labor factions at NUS. He said he is a member of the Labor party and he will never stand and pledge his vote to NUS and will be an independent. He said he believes independents can look after UWA better. He asked why we would entertain two arguments when they conflict. One argument being that the National Union needs to be more effective and that is not more effective because it is controlled by two factions. The other argument is that we should send a message by not sending votes. He said that if you were a convener of the Labor left or right faction and you were told that the strongest state the independent movement has, has just de-affiliated from the Union and you have substantially more power, you have more positions and you can give more votes to your members. He stated they would be happy about that. He stated he did not believe you can deliver a consistent argument that withdrawing from a union and deciding not to show up and not to send voting delegates will make any improvements to the way that union is run. He said we need to vote with our conscience and recognise the issues of higher education are worth hundreds of millions of dollars to students. He said that $56,000.00 gives us the opportunity to engage with that union, to swing the votes towards the independents and to counteract the entrenched power balance and more importantly through our new courses regime, represent students on a national level and make sure that at no stage in the future will a law student or a medicine student or an engineering student have to pay up front for a degree.

Yannis asked if there was money in the budget for sending delegates from this council to the conference.

Matthew said he had a $1.3 million deficit.

Tom said that his procedural motion was that the vote on this amendment be held by secret ballot as stated earlier so that people can exercise their personal opinion on this vote without fear of being victimised for it.

Cameron said he did not support a secret ballot because Lewis Richards has said he wants it on paper that he is voting against this.

Cameron called descent in the chair and what this means is that under the standing orders at any time a ruling by the chair can be called into question by a member of council. If that occurs the chair has a
maximum of 2 minutes to justify that ruling. It then reverts to the person who called descent in the chair to justify it with a maximum of 2 minutes why they called descent. There is then a quick procedural vote.

Gemma said the reason she allowed for speaking on a procedural motion is that she knows for a fact there are people who want their vote registered on this issue and they want to be voting against maybe what their party ran for. She said when someone has registered that prior to the meeting that needs to be taken into consideration and it does not affect anyone by having the vote registered. She said that she didn’t think that having a secret ballot was considering the people who want their vote registered and it is not a good idea.

Gemma said she withdraws comments being allowed to be made on whether or not there is a secret ballot.

Cameron said that he had called descent in the chair to try and expedite things and requested that he be given 2 minutes to address why we should have a secret ballot. He said that secret ballots are commonly used by Guild Council and by other Guild Councils. He said that as chair of this council for over 2 years he granted every request for a secret ballot regardless of whether there was majority support because fundamentally we are all elected as independents. However the kind of behaviour which Matthew was addressing with the Labor left and right factions, the problem was there were no secret ballots and people felt intimidated about which way they were supposed to vote based on party allegiance. He said that he thinks the fundamental importance with this issue is that everyone in the room exercises a free conscience vote without any restriction. If you want to declare your vote you have the right to. A conscience vote means personal choice. You can use your own discretion as to whether you want to declare your vote or not.

Alexandra said she was under strict instructions to be adamantly against a secret vote however for the reason of what Lewis said at the last meeting he always wants his vote to be recorded for accountability purposes. She said that what she believes we are split over is people who are too scared to vote one way or the other, and people who know one way or another which way they are going to vote. She said that intimidation tactics as had been seen from Cameron and Matthew were very disturbing. She said that intimidation in any shape or form is not allowed inside this room and people should be allowed to vote how they want to.

Caitlin said it was important to note when voting that we have all been elected by other students and they would want to see how we are voting.

Gemma moved the procedural motion for a secret ballot. The motion was carried.

Cameron re-read the amendment to Motion 4.1 again.

Matthew moved that Kate O’sullivan be scrutineer. Seconded Caitlin. Carried.

Voting was done by secret ballot.

**Amendment failed: 10 against and 9 for.**

Cameron said he was moving two amendments to the budget.

The first amendment states: "Every line item in the budget which factors new corporate sponsorship into account should make note of the extent to which figures depend on new sponsorship arrangements."

Moved Cameron, Seconded Laura.

The second amendment states: "Every figure in the budget which is contingent on new sponsorship arrangements shall be adjusted to exclude anticipated sponsorship arrangements where:

(a) there is no identified sponsor; and
(b) there has been no expression of interest from an identified sponsor."

Cameron said that such figures will be amended and given to the council at the next meeting. He said he had also attached a rider saying that this will in no way affect our ability to pass the budget at this meeting.

Moved Cameron;
Seconded Naomi.
Naomi stated that it was to the best of her knowledge that what was contained in the budget does not contain sponsorship which is why PAC and SOC look like they have a huge funding cut. We're estimating they will get sponsorship in the future but that is not in fact included in the budget. If that is not included in the budget why is it an amendment to the budget.

Josh said the only circumstances where he believed an allowance has been made for sponsorship were in the reduction of the presidential budget to reflect the Guild ball.

Matthew said that in terms of the Guild Ball budget that was a general reduction and he hoped to get local sponsorship but it wasn’t included in there. The only issue is the $1,000.00 publication with the Women’s office.

Regarding O’Day, Matthew said we are going to seek external sponsorship but it hasn’t been factored in.

Cameron said he supported that Matthew and Josh had looked at corporate sponsorship. He said it’s not a matter of going back and reworking figures. He said that in approving budgets this council should be cautious and conservative and if in a line item we are saying something is going to cost $1,000 less because we will get sponsorship, that should have an identified sponsor.

Amendment was passed.

4.2 Motion “That Guild Council form a select committee to review Election Regulations and that the composition of this committee be determined by the Guild President, Matt McKenzie. The committee will report by Feb 29, 2012”.

Matthew said that it says in the regulations that if we appoint five people to a select committee or if council chooses to use its discretion to do otherwise it can do that. He said he thought it would be simpler to do this as above.

Laura said she wanted to clarify that any committee of the Guild can’t completely overwrite anything. They just advise Council.

Matthew said he approved the addition of the words “determined by Matthew McKenzie and approved by circular”.

Amendment accepted.

Yannis proposed another amendment that it also needs to be approved by Statutes Committee because they are the governing body of the election regulations and normally any review of those regulations need to go through Statutes.

Amendment accepted.

Motion was re-read as follows:

“That Guild Council form a select committee to review Election Regulations and that the composition of this committee be determined by the Guild President, Matt McKenzie and approved by circular by the Guild Council and Statutes Committee. The committee will report by Feb 29, 2012”.

Moved Matthew McKenzie;
Seconded Myles Parish.
Motion carried.

5.0 QUESTION TIME

Yannis asked Matthew that when booking flights to NUS conference she was told by the secretary that flights were booked at the last minute and asked why this happened and did they incur a larger cost to the council because they were booked at the last minute.
Matthew answered that you can often get lower prices by booking at the last minute. He said he didn’t know what the flights cost but would find out.

Yannis asked if the President would inform the Guild Council what Operation Lion is, and whether in exercising Operation Lion the President has been in consultation with the memberships officer and other members of staff in determining this.

Matthew said that Operation Lion was simply the name we had given to our external sponsorship initiatives, and that the staff of the Guild were familiar with it. To suggest that we were conducting some clandestine operation was humorous.

Yannis asked if we go forward to the Guild being sponsored by corporate sponsors will the President guarantee to council that the independents and Guild policy and the way that it operates as a policy body will not be influenced by these companies’ money.

Matthew said no and as an example if someone said they wanted to sponsor an event and said they didn’t think it appropriate for spirits to be served then it would influence his policy and he would be quite happy to go along with that. This is something that needs to be treated with some level of reasonability.

Yannis asked Josh as treasurer regarding the Guild Ball will he give an assurance to council that:

(a) an increase in ticket prices won’t occur and we won’t have ticket prices going above $100; and

(b) that the name of the Ball will not be changed from the Cruikshank Routley, which has been in place since the 1950s or 1960s when two students died after a ball in King’s Park due to drink diving.

Josh answered there may be a slight increase but it won’t go over $100.00. He said he doesn’t see any reason to change the name of the Ball.

Yannis asked Matthew regarding independent catering is he going to pass all discussion motions, papers, etc about independent catering before the catering committee under 6.5.1.1. She said that there is some breadth in the catering regulations of the catering committee’s power, for example it says: “to report to the Guild Council ways to improve the catering services supplied by the Guild, to control and manage the catering facilities owned occupied or controlled by the Guild”. Will the President be dealing with independent catering through the catering committee.

Matthew said he will consider it.

Yannis asked the President about determining who will sit on the Board of Studies for the various new courses coming in.

Matthew said that hasn’t yet been determined. He said he would like to have people on Education Council who are in the relevant degrees to actually sit on those bodies but unfortunately we are in a situation where all of the people there were Arts students. He said he would like to see science students on the science board, arts students on the arts board, etc. This can’t go through the Education Council but that is his intention at the moment and he doesn’t know how we are going to solve the issue of how we pick them.

Yannis asked a question to Ben Watson why have the solar panels been removed from the expenditure of the Guild budget.

Ben was not there and will answer this when he returns.

6.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil.

7.0 CLOSE/NEXT MEETING

Next meeting will be held on Wednesday 25 January 2012 at 6.00pm. Please contact the Guild Secretary (secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au) with any apologies or proxies.

Minutes – Guild Council 20 December 2011
If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.