Flinders University Student Council Meeting
Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 3rd March 2015.
Meeting Room, Flinders University Student Association.
5:00pm

Present: James Vigus (Student President), Grace Hill (General Secretary), Amy Hueppauff (Accessibility Officer), Caleb Pattinson (Education Officer), Brodie May (Environment Officer), Latoya Rule (Indigenous Officer), Siti Maesaroh (International Officer), Shannon Abeywardena (Post-Graduate Officer), Rosalie Dow (Queer Officer), Simone Jowett (Social Activities Officer, arrived at 5:13pm), Ella Keegan-Treloar (Welfare Officer), Riana Cermak (Women’s Officer), Michael Bezuidenhout, Kevin Clark, Jack Harrison, Mitchell Huffa, Catherine Wagg (Arrived at 6:02pm), Chris O’Grady (Manager, Student Engagement), Paul Harrison (Minutes), Jonathon Louth (Student Representation and Development Officer), Jess Nicole (Empire Times Editor).

Guest(s): Jonathon Louth

Apologies: Ann Raith, Catherine Wagg (Will be absent for beginning of meeting only)

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Meeting open
2. Apologies
3. Welcome Guests
4. Accept Minutes from previous meeting
5. Reports
   5.1. President’s Report
   5.2. General Secretary’s Report
   5.3. Education Officer’s Report
   5.4. Environment Officer’s Report
   5.5. Queer Officer’s Report
   5.6. Women’s Officer’s Report
   5.7. International Officer’s Report
   5.8. Welfare Officer’s Report
   5.9. Social Activities Officer’s Report
   5.10. Accessibility Officer’s Report – none received
   5.11. Post-Grad Officer’s Report – none received
   5.12. Indigenous Officer’s Report
   5.13. MSE Report
6. Matters for decision
   6.1. Approval of honoraria for February – Gen Sec
   6.2. Approval of spending approved by Executive – Gen Sec
   6.3. Honorarium payments to student council - MSE
   6.4. Election regulations – MSE
6.5. FUSA AGM agenda item - MSE
6.6. ET Regulation Changes
6.7. Student Council Standing Committee’s regulations – MSE
6.8. Proposal for Post-Graduate Student Event – Post-grad officer
6.9. Queer space lunch – Queer Officer
6.10. Office bearers financial responsibility – Queer Officer
6.11. Queer Officer O’Week spending – Queer Officer
6.15. Proposal for electronic billboard – Mitchel Huffa
7. Matters for discussion
   7.1. Resources for Sub-Committees - MSE
8. Matters for noting
9. Meeting closed

1. Welcome and Meeting open

It was acknowledged that the Student Council meeting was taking place on the land of the Kaurna people.

2. Apologies

Ann Raith will be absent for the meeting.

Catherine Wagg will be absent for the start of the meeting.

3. Welcome Guests

Jonathon Louth was welcomed to the meeting.

4. Accept Minutes from previous meeting

Note: Minutes are from December meeting, and not the previous meeting. They will be approved at the next meeting.

Motion: Accept the December meeting minutes.
Moved: James Vigus Seconded: Grace Hill
All in favour.
Motion carried.

5. Reports

Motion: Accept all of the submitted reports.
Moved: James Vigus Seconded: Caleb Pattinson
All in favour
Motion carried
Grace Hill: All of the ordinary council who submitted reports were all accepted by the executive

6. Matters for decision

6.0. Motions left un-starred to be moved en bloc:

6.2 Approval of spending approved by Executive – Gen Sec

Motion: I move that the spending approved by the executive for the Indigenous students welcome dinner be approved.

6.6 ET Regulation Changes

Motion: Student Council endorse the proposed changes to the Empire Times Regulations as attached to the Agenda.

6.7 Student Council Standing Committee’s regulations–Manager, Student Engagement

Motion: Student Council endorse the proposed changes to the Student Council Standing Committee’s - Regulations as attached to the Agenda.

6.8 Proposal for Post-Graduate Student Event – Post-grad officer

Motion: I move that the Postgraduate Conference proposal be approved.

6.9 Queer space lunch – Queer Officer

Motion: I move that Student Council approves $330 for catering for the launch of the 2015 Queer Space.

6.10 Office bearers’ financial responsibility – Queer Officer

Motion: I move that Student Council approves Office Bearers spending on items of up to $100, at their discretion. Office Bearers will reflect any spending in their monthly reports.

6.11 Queer Officer O’Week spending – Queer Officer

Motion: I move that Student Council approves $50 to pay for cupcakes used by the Queer Society during O’Week 2015.

6.13 Yoga Event Proposal – Welfare Officer
Motion: That Student Council approves the above proposal and allows for minor alterations as deemed appropriate by the Welfare Officer and the Sports Centre Manager with regards to the program and the budget.

Motion: Move un-starred motions en bloc.
Moved: James Vigus Seconded: Grace Hill
All in favour
Motion carried.

6.1. Approval of honoraria for February – General Secretary

Motion: Approve the honoraria for the following people:

- Kevin Clark
- Mitchell Huffa
- Catherine Wagg
- Jack Harrison
- Ann Raith
- Student President
- General Secretary
- Education Officer
- Queer Officer
- Women’s Officer
- International Officer
- Welfare Officer
- Social Activities Officer
- Indigenous Officer

Moved: James Vigus Seconded: Caleb Pattinson
All in favour
Motion carried.

Executive Committee Recommendation: Discussion of three motions that were not accepted into the agenda.

James Vigus: Exec has recommended that we discuss some motions that Caleb was unable to get on the agenda due to time constrains which I have printed and placed on the table

Caleb Pattinson: It’s all pretty much as is written. There are three motions in there.

One is to help set up School Associations here at Flinders Uni. We are hoping to create associations at a school level for every school in the university.

The second motion is to make council aware of the representative structure we are trying to establish here. It’s just a formal acceptance from FUSA to say we are heading in the right direction.
Third one is the first student rep network is going to be on April 1 and it looks like it should be pretty successful we already have a dozen students keen to come along. And hopefully we will have more confirm as it gets closer. Does anybody have anything they want to ask?

Jack Harrison: Do you have a meeting for the education collective coming up?

Caleb Pattinson: No, the Student Representative Network (SRN) is part of the collective. At this stage the education collective will focus on having more of a digital presence.

Kevin Clark: What time and location are you looking at running the SRN?

Caleb Pattinson: It will be in the Oasis function space at 12pm on April 1st.

17:13: Simone Jowett has entered the room.

James Vigus: It’s good in terms of formal endorsement by council to get the SRN and school based clubs and societies getting up and going. I think in a way that stuff is more important than just formally endorsing the motion

Caleb Pattinson: If any of you guys know any students who would be keen to help out, let me know. In particular in Behaviour and Social Sciences, CSEM and Humanities look to be the harder schools to establish groups.

Motion: Student Council approves the three motions submitted by the Education Officer

These motions consist of:

Motion 1: I move that Student Council supports the allocation of $1,000 of the Education Officer’s funds to help finance BBQ’s being held at newly formed school based association AGM and general elections.

Motion 2: I move that Student Council supports a fresh approach to representative structures at Flinders University and is in agreement that Jonathon Louth continues to liaise with student council regarding the make and model of the FUSA collectives. Student Council also supports the Education Collective and all members will actively promote and endorse students signing up to the inclusive project.

Motion 3: I move Student Council supports the allocation of $300 of the Education Officer’s funds to provide food and drink at the Student Representative Network launch on April 1st and that all SC support and endorse students signing up to the education collective as a result of joining the SRN.
Moved: James Vigus          Seconded: Grace Hill  
All in favour  
Motion carried  

6.4 has been raised for discussion and decision prior to 6.3.

6.4. Election Regulations – Manager, Student Engagement
Jack Harrison: Can I move an amendment?
Michael Bezuidenhout: Can we first get Jonathon to maybe walk us through?
Jonathon Louth: I mainly came along in case there were any questions, but I can walk you through it. There are some significant changes in it – one is that there is now a dispute mechanism. An independent body that will oversee any disputes that the or is unable to resolve. This way if you disagree with the RO or it’s a pretty significant breach, the RO can take the matter with the tribunal. That’s one of the pretty major changes in here.
Also significant is that there is actually a prohibited practices and offensive materials section as well regarding what you can and cannot do. I spoke to lots of people around Australia, mainly Victoria, and I identified that was one section that we absolutely needed to include.
NUS gets a mention now and ET gets a mention now. Another is getting voting booths and polling officials as well now. Another is on the notification of the elections, that was absent in there, it was pretty unclear as to how an election was called.
I can answer any specific questions if you would like to ask any.
Michael Bezuidenhout: With the definition of student, it’s gone back to explicitly stating that non-award students are not included. My question is, do non-award students pay SSAF? I just feel if they do pay it then it would be important to include non-award students.
Jonathon Louth: If they do pay SSAF I think that is a very relevant point.
James Vigus: They do.
Michael Bezuidenhout: I suppose in that case, maybe amend that out and include non-award students back in because they are paying SSAF
Chris O’Grady I know University Council does not include non-award students in their definition
Michael Bezuidenhout: With the appointment of returning officer on page 4. Do you mind giving me a bit of a rationale on the point that they can’t have been a candidate in the last five years? One good attribute to have in an RO is actually having experience in an election. So what was the sort of rationale for excluding that?
Chris O’Grady The rationale is to have as much independence as possible
Michael Bezuidenhout: You could have a hack from any other campus though; I’d rather have a hack from Flinders than from another University.

Jonathon Louth: Some have in their list that they must have a legal qualification, but this is a point of debate – that’s not for me to say.

Chris O’Grady I think 5 years without being a member of a student organization around Australia

Michael Bezuidenhout: The other thing on page 5, 4.2 – the Manager, Student Engagement will nominate the RO. I get that it needs Student Council authorization. I get that it’s about non-partisanship again?

Chris O’Grady At the moment it’s myself the RO, but with the power to delegate.

James Vigus: Does anyone else have any questions?

Simone Jowett: If you’ve got more questions Michael, go ahead.

Michael Bezuidenhout: Page 6, paragraph 2, is there a sentence missing there? 5.2 on page 6.

Jonathon Louth: It’s just a messy sentence.

Mitchell Huffa: It’s basically trying to cut every single loophole down.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I’d generally be on the air of let’s pass it, and fix it on a subsequent meeting.

Jonathon Louth: I think we should move to simple English where we can.

Jack Harrison: 4.1 is that meant to say RO?

Jonathon Louth: Yes it is.

Michael Bezuidenhout: Should it explicitly say that the RO has to call the election?

Jonathon Louth: Section 3 covers a lot of the calling of the election.

Mitchell Huffa: Technically the election is already called, they’re just asking for nominations.

Chris O’Grady Do you think section 3 covers it?

Michael Bezuidenhout: I think when I read it I must have read it weirdly because it’s making sense to me now.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I was wondering if having the flexibility of having the ability to call an election for 5 days, rather than just maximum 4, just in case Student Council need.

Mitchell Huffa: Will we ever call a 5 day election though?

Jack Harrison: Who decides how long it goes for? Is it just SC?

Rosalie Dow: Yes.

James Vigus: Can I take a straw poll on whether it should be 5 rather than 4.
(None against)

Michael Bezuidenhout: Okay, maybe we should do an amendment.

James Vigus: Yes, I think we should amend that.

Michael Bezuidenhout: On page 14.4 – I just wanted to get everyone’s opinion. At least a number of campuses candidates will authorize their material and the RO can say that’s bad, withdraw it. With this one everything has to go through the RO first. My opinion is that it is overly bureaucratic that every single piece of material needs to be approved by the RO first. There’s not needed to be a pre-approval. It should be everyone approves their own material and gets it rejected then they have to recall it.

Mitchell Huffa: I would prefer to be called out before I put my stuff out and be told “that’s inappropriate”.

Jack Harrison: On that, I’m sure that you could still send stuff to the RO and ask them if the material is okay without being forced to.

Amy Hueppauff: I think it’s better for it to be pre-approved as it’s settled straight away.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I think it’s a bit authoritarian

Simone Jowett: If we remove that it must be sent to them, can we please add in something that says that they must review any materials sent to them? Even if it’s just included in the information sent out to the candidates and not in the regulations

Chris O’Grady If you’re going to remove 14.4 and 14.5 you need to put something in there to say that the RO can case the publication of material that the RO deems to be inappropriate

Shannon has entered the room.

Chris O’Grady Do you think that it could be a bit detrimental to candidates who have sent masses of money on materials who then have to recall it?

Michael Bezuidenhout: I think the onus is on the candidates to check it

Amy Hueppauff: But if we get rid of it, that means that people can put up anything they want and that could influence voters because it could be up for any amount of time before it is taken down.

Simone Jowett: In terms of candidates who are punished for inappropriate materials, will students be informed if they have been forced to remove something.

Michael Bezuidenhout: 15.3, without limiting the generality or – it should be of.

Michael Bezuidenhout: 16.4 – it references other candidates of a ticket

Jonathon Louth: That’s a good point – that can be easily fixed up.
Michael Bezuidenhout: Overall though this document is significantly better than what we currently have. But how does everyone feel about the election tribunal being appointed by the Student Council rather than the Manager, Student Engagement?

Michael Bezuidenhout: I think ultimately we are the governing body of the association, the Manager, Student Engagement is a university employee.

Kevin Clark: All I was going to say was perhaps then, similar to how the RO is appointed where Manager, Student Engagement recommends someone and the Student Council approves – would that be an appropriate method for appointing the committee?

Mitchell Huffa: My only fear with having anything selected by the board of FUSA., is if there is ever an election where there is a white-wash election then there could be issues with people picking people who do not have the best interests of students.

Jack Harrison: If FUSA moves towards accepting this, we should also discuss whether it’s majority or two thirds.

Michael Bezuidenhout: Say you have two thirds; you can remove these regulations anyway. So I’d rather not be limiting ourselves to a two-thirds majority as you could change the whole document and just abolish the election tribunal.

Latoya Rule: I think it should be mixed race too.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I suppose we could make it, comprised of three person recommended by Manager, Student Engagement and approved by SC. If you’d like we could put something in there ensuring diversity. Perhaps seeing as that’s a large issue – we can revisit this and amend the document later.

Kevin Clark: perhaps if we could have some kind of affirmative action statement saying that someone needs to be from the international office or Yunggorendi.

Jonathon Louth: The problem is though, getting three people who are happy to do this over a long period of time.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I think it’s something we should look into.

Chris O’Grady I think I’d be amenable to your suggestion Michael – but I’d probably say that the Student Council would approve the recommendation by Manager, Student Engagement – and leave it at that rather than two-thirds majority. Maybe include a sentence in there that the Manager, Student Engagement will try to ensure sufficient diversity on the tribunal. That may keep a bit more flexibility in the regulations.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I certainly agree with what you’re saying, but we should maybe do that in a second revision of this document.

Kevin Clark: If we’re raising the issues with the returning officers exclusions – perhaps also reconsider 17.4 regarding Student Council, should it be from any Student Council in Australia.
James Vigus: Do you have any more questions Michael?

Simone Jowett: I have one; the RO will be completely separate of the tribunal and won’t be a member of the tribunal?

Jonathon Louth: Yes

Jack Harrison: 17.6(b) says unable to determine duties – who determines they are unable to determine their duties?

Jonathon Louth: In reality, that clause is to deal with death of a tribunal member. It’s a case of Student Council coming along with a two-thirds majority and saying they are unfit.

Chris O’Grady Would it be possible to pass these as they are and form a working group to go through and finalise all their amendments and submit them in a later meeting?

James Vigus: I feel like there are a lot of amendments that we should wait until the next meeting to pass them.

Grace Hill: I think there’s a lot to consider with these election regulations – I don’t see it’s a problem to take these away, consider the amendments, and pass them back to council.

Jack Harrison: My two cents, regarding 7.3 – I talked to Alison Taylor who is the national disabilities officer, if there’s an irregularity this runs the risk of NUS delegates not being elected. Only for the election of a NUS delegate though. 9.1 – we seem to have mentioned every autonomous caucus except for accessibilities.

James Vigus: There are three options:

First would be that we move what we’ve got in front of us without amendments and then put the amendments in at a later date

Second option is we go through each of the amendments

Third: We go through all of it at the next meeting.

Chris O’Grady Can I talk to that. There may not be an election between now and the next meeting, but there is the possibility that there is a casual vacancy.

James Vigus: Just a straw poll – who is in favour with moving what we’ve got in front of us and revising it at the next meeting.

**Motion:** Motion to approve the proposed election regulations as-is, without suggested amendments.

**Moved:** James Vigus  
**Seconded:** Brodie May

In favour: 13

Against: Amy Hueppauff, Michael Bezuidenhout, Simone Jowett.

**Motion carried.**

Jack Harrison: I’d like to move to amend the election regulations.
I’d like to change 7.3 to “the formal shall prevail, and the latter, to the extent of the inconsistency shall be invalid” (NUS regulations prevail over FUSA regulations if there is an inconsistency in the election of an NUS delegate)

Chris O’Grady: Can you add it to the end of it to specify that it is only for NUS delegates?

Jack Harrison: I’m happy to add onto the front “When electing NUS delegates”.

*Catherine Wagg has entered the room 6:02pm.*

**Motion:** To modify section 7.3 of the Election regulations to read:
“When a provision of the NUS Constitution or Regulations is inconsistent with the FUSA Constitution or Regulations, the former shall prevail and the later shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid.”

Moved: Jack Harrison Seconded: Mitchell Huffa

For: 14.
Abstentions: Rosalie Dow, Caleb Pattinson, Catherine Wagg

Motion carried.

Jack Harrison: I’d like to move to amend 9.1 (f) to add the words ‘only students who have a disability may run for accessibility officer.’

Simone Jowett: How do they identify that? Do they have to have a disability accessibility plan or anything?

Amy Hueppauf: No you just have to identify as having a disability. I think you have to tick a box in the student system or something.

**Motion:** Add subsection (f) to section 9.1 that states:
“Only students who identify with having a disability are eligible to be a candidate for the position of Accessibility Officer.”

Moved: Jack Harrison Seconded: Kevin Clark

All in favour

Motion carried.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I think it’s probably important to move these amendments now.

**Motion:** I move that section 17.2 of the Election Regulations be changed to read:
“the FUSA election tribunal shall be comprised of 3 persons recommended by the Manager, Student Engagement and approved by the Student Council.”

Moved: Michael Bezuidenhout Seconded: Jack Harrison

Abstention: Rosalie Dow

Motion carried.

Latoya Rule: Are we going to make other amendments next time as well?

Michael Bezuidenhout: Yes, I just wanted to do some emergency ones now.
Latoya Rule: I might do amendments next time then.

Michael Bezuidenhout: In section 17.5:

The FUSA election tribunal shall be reconfirmed … by the Manager, Student Engagement – should be replaced with Student Council.

**Motion:** Section 17.5:

“The FUSA Election Tribunal shall be reconfirmed or appointed for the following year by the Manager, Student Engagement once the notification of Election has occurred. In the event of a vacancy subsequent to this the Manager, Student Engagement shall fill any vacancy by appointment.”

Shall be amended to read

“The FUSA Election Tribunal shall be reconfirmed or appointed for the following year by the Manager, Student Engagement and approved by the Student Council once the notification of Election has occurred. In the event of a vacancy subsequent to this the Student Council shall fill any vacancy by appointment.”

**Moved:** Michael Bezuidenhout  
**Seconded:** Kevin Clark

Abstention: Catherine Wagg, Caleb Pattinson.

**Motion carried.**

James Vigus: Is that it for amendments for today?

Michael Bezuidenhout: That’s all from me anyway

James Vigus: Maybe we can have a break there

18:10: Meeting suspended.

18:26: Meeting resumed.

### 6.3. Honorarium payments to Student Council – Manager, Student Engagement

Chris O’Grady In terms of 6.3, my proposal is that we consider changing honorarium payments for Student Council and ET. My main concern is for ET editors, Student President and General Secretary who are relying on quite a bit of money throughout the year. Therefore, for us to get the most out of them – we don’t want them having to take on part-time jobs to survive while they take on their duties as well. It could be the case for Office Bearer’s and Ordinary Members as well. My proposal is that they get paid fortnightly and I’ll be happy to create a working group to to look at a fair process to deal with representatives if they are not performing in their role.
Kevin Clark: In terms of the mechanism as to gauge as to when to withhold the payments – the logical structure may be to keep the executive structure to review their performance.

Simone Jowett: I can put in a suggestion to this – there is a timesheet mechanism where there is a possibility that those timesheets be entered by Student Council and the Manager, Student Engagement approves.

Chris O’Grady: What I’m proposing is simpler than that; it is that they just get paid.

Caleb Pattinson: I would, it might just be logistically hard for the university, it would just be an automatic payment and that the exec can just stop it if need be.

Kevin Clark: In terms of the filling out the time-sheets the regulations currently allow is to carry forward or back-date ours when we “overwork” in a particular period, where as that might be hard with a time-sheet system.

Michael Bezuidenhout: I’m pretty happy with the proposal because executive will still have the power to withhold. Particularly Office Bearers have a duty to represent students; I think that as an OB that it is not acceptable to not submit your report. I don’t want anyone to think, it’s okay if I don’t submit it because I’ll get paid anyway. Because it’s important to inform students of what we’re doing.

Simone Jowett: To what Michael said, I’m not sure why Ordinary Council Members’ reports are private if we’re going to be holding Student Council members accountable.

**Motion:** Student Council endorse all Student Council Representatives and Empire Times Editors to be paid their honorarium on a fortnightly basis throughout the year. The Manager, Student Engagement will collaborate with a working party of Student Council Representatives to design a process whereby Student Council Representatives are given warnings and if necessary have their honoraria withheld for a period if they are not participating as per the expectations.

**Moved:** Caleb Pattinson  
**Seconded:** Grace Hill

All in favour.

**Motion carried.**

Grace Hill: In the meantime, while that’s being developed, will people be paid fortnightly?

Chris O’Grady: I’ll do whatever I possibly can as soon as I can to ensure that you will be.

**6.5. FUSA AGM agenda item – Manager, Student Engagement**

Jack Harrison: So just question, with the options – are we choosing an option or are all three options open to the AGM?

Chris O’Grady: What I’m hoping for is that Student Council can endorse one of these options and that option goes to the agenda at the AGM.
I’m just proposing that the tenure is changed for the reasons outlined in the document. From my two and a bit years in the role, it would make more sense and that the year would start off more smoothly.

James Vigus: I recommend that we do option 2, and that can be the transition year. I know there’s a few projects I’m working on that will go to the end of year. It sort of defies the term we were elected for as well.

Grace Hill: I also agree with option 2 as everyone ran for the election to be until 31st of December, it’d be pretty shit to change that now. I think that it will result in a more productive, better transition in the future.

Simone Jowett: In terms of option 2, in terms of Grace’s statement, it would also be a chance for Student Council members to create a guideline in December for future handovers.

Amy Hueppauff: Perhaps there should be an overlap so that students can be mentored.

Catherine Wagg: I feel if we had a meeting before Christmas that would be really beneficial for any of the council members – especially for those who don’t know what they’re doing.

Jack Harrison: Just putting it out there that a lot of students may not be in Adelaide in at that time.

Caleb Pattinson: As ordinary council member, December was a bit of a waste for me – as there’s not a lot to do as an OC in December. So I used the extra month to get started in December and it was definitely very helpful.

Latoya Rule: At the end of last year, we had an Indigenous Officer for just one month in December and she didn’t get to set up anything in one month.

Riana Cermak: I just thought of the opposite of Amy, but to just start a month early every year – it would have been great to have a more structured mentoring kind of thing. So it’d be 13 months instead of 12, but the last month is more mentoring role.

Amy Hueppauff: So yeah, it’s better they come early, that way they can utilize the experience.

Riana Cermak: I also didn’t want to step on any toes in December, I didn’t want to actively take away the role from Ella then when she was still technically in the role.

Kevin Clark: I would like to repeat what Simone said - currently that this is just a once off. And continuing from what Caleb said, that starting off in January and not having a meeting until February, I’m more in favour of option 1 – that would allow the council to get rolling from December the first time through. It would allow the whole council to have something to do across the summer.

Michael Bezuidenhout: For me, any option is outrageous. I’m assuming with a caretaker period, that both councils would get paid?
Chris O’Grady: Yes, both would get paid. Say option 1 happened, and this current Student Council decided to cease of 30th November they should get their full honorarium for this year.

Kevin Clark: I think for both one or two, that would happen.

Rosalie Dow: I was going to say that I think option 1 is really good particularly to start in December as a new council member. Particularly because O’week starts just after the start of the year. Your only option for materials is often to order it in December as it takes weeks sometimes. Particularly as introductory activities such as getting the email address can take up to a month before you can really get into your role.

James Vigus: We’ll go for a formal vote on the options.

   Option 1: Jack Harrison, Kevin Clark, Rosalie Dow, Amy Hueppauff, Riana Cermak, Ella Keegan-Treloar, Michael Bezuidenhout, Latoya Rule.

   Option 2: Grace Hill, Mitchell Huffa, Brodie May, Caleb Pattinson, Catherine Wagg, Siti Maesaroh.

   Option 1 is the option we have decided.

Chris O’Grady: I don’t know if ceasing should be done as a separate motion at the AGM.

Michael Bezuidenhout: Can I make a comment, considering were going to get paid for a month we’re technically not doing, can we still try and make sure we do things then?

James Vigus: It’s kind of like, most work is during the year anyway, and people will always do more work in those periods than December.

Caleb Pattinson: I feel like it was covered in option 2, if you wanted to do more it was in that option, not Option 1.

Rosalie Dow: It’s definitely more of just an informal thing that Michael is saying.

James Vigus: Let’s move to a vote on 6.5.

**Motion:** Student Council Endorses Option 1 of agenda item 6.5 to be submitted as the FUSA position at the FUSA AGM.

**Moved:** James Vigus **Seconded:** Mitchell Huffa


Against: Caleb Pattinson.

Abstention: Simone Jowett, Catherine Wagg.

**Motion carried.**

6.12. **Proposal for FUSA representation – Ann Raith**
James Vigus: Ann is not here, so I just wanted to talk to this myself. Most of Social Sciences South (SSS) is moving up here during semester 2 – so there’s a whole raft of people who are moving on to this side. SSS is getting gutted and redone. It’s happening in the middle of the year. I agree with Ann’s disconnect with the physical space of FUSA and students.

However, there are a number of spaces though that Student Council members could get to, to speak to students and engage with them about FUSA and be listening as well. These are events such as the movie nights that Simone is organizing as well as FUSA welfare breakfast. These are things that we can go along to and get involved with students.

On top of that, there’s also Relax Days. This semester there also going to be happening on a rotational basis at all three major campuses.

I think these are what we should be using rather than creating a new logistical structure.

Catherine Wagg: I feel like Ann’s idea is really valuable and why the Relax Days and welfare breakfasts are great – they have a different outlook than an event like this. If we set up a stall somewhere students are more likely to come up and engage rather than a welfare breakfast that they can walk up to and grab their breakfast.

I think it can just provide an outlet that makes you more approachable.

Kevin Clark: I’d like to expand on the concept and I really like it, but I’d just like to state that once a month I’d like to see it appear at Tonsley and I’d like to see it appear at Sturt. One thing I’d disagree with Catherine on, that rather than allowing it to promote ET; that is one thing that should be separate because ET is not the magazine of SC.

Riana Cermak: Mine was a not building on Catherine’s point that not everyone will go to the welfare breakfasts and not everyone will go to the movies. But everyone goes to the library at some point.

Caleb Pattinson: I agree with James mostly in principle. I did go to a welfare breakfast and stand there for an hour or two, and you do stop and talk to a lot of students there. You can really engage with them there. All I would say, if you were to do this, you should switch it up more. Go to Tonsley, Sturt and Med campus. Because they all feel very disengaged from the university and it’s important that we engage with them.

James Vigus: I think this is a good idea, but I’m just putting it out there that there are many FUSA events that we don’t do this at. In a way this feels over prescriptive – in that it will be once a week in the library. I’m just scared that this proposal means that we miss out at all of the stuff we’re already doing and then we just double up and then there’s just two people that just keep doing this and it becomes disappointing that the whole of Student Council cannot get involved in this.

Simone Jowett: So I understand the need to have something specific that it is just specifically FUSA. As has been noted, I put on a lot of events, it would be great to have active involvement in our already established events. A Student Council presence at every event...
would be fantastic. Make it a point to come along to one of the movie nights, one of the events. All of these events have been approved by us – but I think that they should have

Catherine Wagg: I think it’s important to target minority groups – because people like mature age students won’t be going to welfare breakfasts because unlike us they’ve already got their life sorted.

Jack Harrison: I was wondering if it’s possible – to move it to next meeting.

James Vigus: Yes. Ann’s not here, so I thought we’d have just a bit of a discussion. I will communicate and talk to Ann about the discussion this meeting.


Siti Maesaroh: The idea has come from my friends – who are new international students. They have an international dinner organized by the International Office. They would like to have another one for all international students. I’m still working on the event – but I can come back with more details and specifics. I also want to note that even though that while it’s for international students, it would also be inviting non-international students.

Grace Hill: Yeah, the major multicultural event is typically on the plaza, but it didn’t happen last year. The International Officer didn’t organize it.

Siti Maesaroh: I haven’t had the experience to see FUSA’s multicultural events before, so I haven’t had any

Caleb Pattinson: Do you want us to just motion support on this?

Chris O’Grady Just to say that the first Student Council meeting the events budget was passed and that included 10 or 11 thousand for the multicultural event of this year.

Motion: Student Council moves to support the preliminary plan of the event
Moved: Siti Maesaroh Seconded: Grace Hill
All in favour
Motion carried

6.15. Proposal for electronic billboard – Mitchel Huffa

Mitchel Huffa - I’d like to amend that as it includes page two which did not make it into the document.

The other part is basically deciding to go with a relatively inexpensive option or going all out with it. I would like opinions on what people would like or whether they actually think this is a good idea in the first place.

Brodie May: I think it’s great to have some sort of space which we can control and ET and clubs can submit to. I think the main issue is going to be Buildings and Property – I think it’s just best before approving any budget it may be best to approve investigating it.
Grace Hill: I’m all in favour of student controlled of student advertising spaces especially when they appear to be doing as much as they can to remove student advertising spaces on campus just like at the board at the library. I think we should push for as much student advertising space as possible.

Kevin Clark: I like the idea, and I’d just suggest one avenue to consider is how easy or difficult it is to also get permission to put advertising in SILC and IST. I imagine it’d be quite difficult, but it’s something to consider. As extra thing to consider, you’d have to check the security of the USB and also the security of the USB port if the advertising to be run off that.

Jack Harrison: I love the idea of student advertising and FUSA controlling spaces. I am just wondering if it may be better to have a motion to talk to the relevant people about this first. I was just wondering if the council moves a motion supporting it and requests to get more specifics about it.

Caleb Pattinson: I bloody support the idea as well. My only concern is next year they take them down in flinders laneway.

Mitchell Huffa: Worst case scenario is we relocate them to the FUSA area in the hub. So it could still be used by FUSA

Michael Bezuidenhout: I just had a few points; I suppose that it wouldn’t hurt to just try to get official confirmation either way. In terms of other things as well such as screensavers and access to existing TVs. I think it’s important to confirm that first before we go ahead spending students’ money. I think we need to make sure the university has said no to everything else first.

James Vigus: So, that’s it for the speaking list. What are we voting on?

Kevin Clark: I suggest that the motion that Student Council endorses is the concept of student advertising and FUSA branding in digital format and will investigate further options for this.

7. Matters for discussion
   7.1. Resources for Sub-Committees - Manager, Student Engagement

8. Matters for noting
   8.1. Other business

Caleb Pattinson: It’s not actually on the agenda, but I thought I’d raise it – there a couple of AGM’s for School Associations in the next couple of weeks. For Ordinary Council Members – if you want to come out and help out, let me know.

Jack Harrison: Would you be able to send an email to council with which times and where all the meetings are?
Caleb Pattinson: I can, yes.

Latoya Rule: I got approval for the comedy night this Friday.

Amy Hueppauff: I was just wondering: With the new FUSA premises in the hub, why doesn’t Accessibility get an autonomous room – because a lot of people with disabilities don’t necessarily want to open up openly.

James Vigus: I think it’s really disappointing and there should be more spaces in there.

Grace Hill: They were definitely highly resistant with many accessibility issues.

Simone Jowett: I just would like to note that the ‘Greatest Shave’ will go ahead.

9. Meeting closed

19:28: Meeting closed.