



src activism
advocacy
representation

Julia Robins, Secretary to Council
secretary.council@src.usyd.edu.au

**Students' Representative Council,
University of Sydney**

Level 1, Wentworth Building (G01)
University of Sydney NSW 2006
PO Box 794 Broadway NSW 2007
t: (02) 9660 5222 f: (02) 9660 4260
int: 12871 www.src.usyd.edu.au
ABN: 597 391 306 68

MINUTES:

of the 3rd regular meeting of the 90th SRC held on **Wednesday 4th April 2018**. Meeting held in the New Law Annex Seminar Room 340.

*The Secretary to Council called a quorum count at 6:20pm.
The meeting was found quorate.*

A. Meeting opened at 6:22pm

A1. Election of Deputy Chairperson

The Chair moved that Adriana be elected Deputy Chairperson.
The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

B. Acknowledgement of Country

The University of Sydney Students' Representative Council acknowledges the traditional owners of this land (Sydney), the Gadigal people of the Eora nation. We stand on this land today as beneficiaries of an uncompensated and unreconciled dispossession that occurred over 200 years ago. Many of the descendants of those dispossessed live just down the road in abject poverty, and as young people it is important to recognise how this history of dislocation and disenfranchisement has contributed to the inequality we observe in modern society. We acknowledge both our privilege and our obligation to redress the situation as best we can: to remember the mistakes of the past, act on the problems of today, and build a future for everyone who now calls this place home, striving always for genuinely practical and meaningful reconciliation.

C. Apologies, Proxies and Leaves of Absence

Apologies were received from:

Mitch Gordon

Pranay Jha

Liam Thorne

Environment Officers Natalie Berry and Zachary Gillies-Palmer send their apologies

Women's officer Madeline Ward and Jessica Syed send their apologies

Sexual Harassment Officer Nicole Leong sends her apologies

Proxies:

James Gibson to Rebeccah Miller

Hao Zhou to Wenkai Lyv

Sean Young to Adriana Olguin Malavisi

Zixuan Wei to Kinven Luo

Yuxuan Yang to Xiangyuan Ji

Maya Eswaran to Lara Sonnenschein

Bella Pytka to Felix Faber
Hersha Kadkol to Emma Norton

Motion: that the apologies and proxies be accepted.

Moved: Tim Seguna

Seconded: Harry Gregg

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

D. Changes to Membership

E. Electoral Report

E1. Consideration of any resignations

Bridget Neave resigns as Sexual Harassment Officer

Motion: That the Council accept the resignations.

Moved: Harry Gregg

Seconded: Seth Dias

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

F. Minutes of the previous Council meeting.

Minutes of the meeting of 90th SRC Council held on 7th February and 7th March 2018 were circulated.

Motion: that the minutes of the 7th March and 7th February be accepted.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Adriana Olguin Malavisi

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

G. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business for this item.

H. Question Time of 15 minutes, which may be extended by resolution for a further 15 minutes.

Tim Seguna asked if Imogen was aware about the KPIs for NUS (National Union of Students) to meet in exchange for ANUSA (Australian National University Student Association) to return to NUS, and if she was aware her name was originally added to the letter with the demands.

Imogen Grant replied giving a brief background on the KPIs proposed by ANUSA and some of the problems she perceived with them. She then explained that the letter and KPIs had her name attached to them without her knowledge or consent, she had asked that her name be removed from the letter and KPIs, and expressed my concern with what the KPIs contained.

I. Visitor's Business

There was no business for this item.

J. Report of the Undergraduate Fellow of Senate

K. Elections

L. Report of the President and Executive

L1. Executive Minutes

Minutes of the Executive meetings from the 7th, 16th, and 21st February and 13th March 2018

George Bishop asked about the lending practices of the SRC with regards to the Memorandum in the minutes from the 13th March 2018.

Imogen explained the process that is carried out to get unpaid loans back, saying that phone calls and emails are sent to the students and a number of reminders are sent, after three years the loans not paid back are declared delinquent.

The Secretary to Council added that the majority of students who take out the loans return them within the month (it is a month long loan) and that students cannot get over the \$50 unless need is assessed by a caseworker.

Motion: that the minutes of the executive meetings from the 7th, 16th, and 21st February and 13th March 2018 be accepted.

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Harry Gregg

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

L2. Report of the Executive

Report of the executive from the 7th Feb – 3rd April 2018.

The report was circulated and noted.

The President deferred the Chair to the Deputy Chairperson.

L3. President's Report

Imogen Grant tabled a written report:

Orientation Week

The SRC has had a brilliant start of the year at Orientation Week. The SRC collected hundreds of signatures and sign ups from students who want to get active in their student union. We also gave out 1,500 tote bags and spoke to thousands of students about SRC campaigns, their rights on campus, and the incredible services we offer.

Bookshop

The SRC Bookshop has now officially shut down. It was the last of its kind in NSW and likely Australia. The SRC Bookshop has been serving students at USyd since the 1960s and has

been critical in removing some of the barriers, such as the price of readers and textbooks that many students face in coming to university. Thank you Julie for all your tireless work for the SRC over the past 13 years.

Fortunately, in the first few weeks of Semester students took up the opportunity to purchase heavily discounted textbooks and collect free books. As a result not a single book had to be pulped.

SSAF Negotiation

Professor Pip Patterson (DVC-Education) has contacted us with the 2018 timeline for the Acquittal and SSAF Submission process. This is the latest we have had SSAF negotiations since the legislation was introduced.

Nonetheless, we have almost finalised preparations to access SSAF funding. Nearly all the departments have finalised their SSAF applications and Chitra, our Administration Manager, will be collating them this week and finalising them alongside myself and the General Secretaries.

Afterwards, the SRC will be liaising with the other student organisations to discuss how much funding we will be requesting. Suggested projects thus far have included investments into video technology, a research officer, outreach caseworker and so on.

We will be submitting our financial acquittal (a report on all the 2017 funded activities) this Friday. The SSAF application will be submitted by Friday 20 April after we have negotiated over the contestable pool with the other student organisations.

Student Safety and Wellbeing - response to The Red Zone Report

In Orientation Week the SRC also protested in response to EROC's 'The Red Zone Report' which exposes vile college rituals and abuse at universities across the country, along with the complete failure of colleges to address rape and misogyny within their own communities. It recounted horrific incidents of abuse including swallowing live goldfish, setting pubic hair on fire, male residents habitually masturbating into womens' shampoo bottles, locking new students in bathrooms and tipping vats of dead fish on them, and forcing residents to consume more than a dozen drinks without a bathroom stop, causing them to wet their pants.

One of the case studies in the report also deals with Stuart Kelly, who took his own life after living in St Paul's College. His parents are demanding an inquest and suspect catastrophic hazing happened to their son on the one night he stayed at St Paul's College.

Relationship between hazing and sexual assault is a close one - hazing normalises a culture whereby personal boundaries and consent are ritually violated and contributes to a culture whereby students with more power feel entitled to the bodies of those in marginal positions.

Some statistics from the report:

- 1 in 8 attempted or completed rapes or sexual assault happened in a single week of the year, orientation week (12%);
- 1 in 12 students at Women's College had experienced attempted or completed rape or sexual assault since commencing;
- Overall around 1 in 17 women at college had experienced attempted or completed rape or sexual assault.
- Overall, this puts women college students at around 7 times more likely to be assaulted than non-college students.

The Broderick Review's Mysterious Third Report!

At yesterday's Academic Board meeting (Tuesday 6 March), Spence admitted to the existence of a third report from the Broderick Review that has been shielded from the public. For background, the 'first report' is the overarching report into college culture, the 'second report' is each of the individual college reviews, and the 'third report' includes all the case studies of sexual assault and abuse that were omitted from the previous two reports.

There is no ethical or pedagogical reason to omit the stories of survivors of sexual assault and hazing at the colleges. In fact, by failing to make a survivor centric report, the Broderick team failed the very students it was out to serve. The glossy, 100-page report paints a rosy picture of college life, and opens with a quote from a student who 'loved' their time at College, and is peppered with pull-out quotes from students testifying to how 'inclusive', 'supportive', and 'safe' the college community is. It could be an advertising brochure for the colleges; reading it, one forgets the brutal stories of rape, hazing and abuse within these institutions that have made headlines for decades.

It is clear that the decision to remove case studies and quotes from survivors of sexual assault was a tactical maneuver to protect the colleges' reputations. It seems that the colleges wielded their power to gain the upper hand, influencing the shape and direction of the review. Even the first report notes that 'the Survey instrument was developed in collaboration with the College Heads', meaning that the Heads had input into which questions were asked - and, critically, which weren't asked.

All in all, the project is little more than an expensive PR exercise to protect the colleges' reputations. It is a missed opportunity for change, and a slap in the face to survivors and their advocates, whose voices have been erased from the public reports.

However, through public pressure from student representatives we forced the colleges to backflip and release their individual reports. We can do that again so that the third report is publically released.

MYEFO

Just a brief update on MYEFO lobbying etc. The Federal Government has agreed that students entering 'vertically integrated degrees' (the combined bachelors/masters under the new curriculum) will be Commonwealth Supported Places for the duration of their time at university. For students entering these VIDs from 2019 onwards, they will be full fee paying students for the masters portion of their degree. Re performance funding -

there is complete uncertainty as to how the university will increase its funding after the cap. The University does not know how performance will be measured or what the performance criteria will consist of. E.g. Will it be just education performance? Or will it include research performance? The government is unable to give clear answers at this point, so it appears they do not even know how performance will be measured. It is clear this is just part of a government-led push toward the privatisation of universities and the rise of private sector-style management.

Anonymous Marking

In 2016, following a discussion paper by the SRC, consultation with student groups and faculties, the Academic Board approved changes to the Assessment Procedures 2011 to introduce anonymous marking.

The change was the introduction of Clause 5(7) of the Assessment Procedures 2011 which states:

In examinations, test or other assessments consisting of written elements, students should be identified on scripts, essay books or answers sheets by Student Identification Number only. Names should not be used.

Anonymous marking is now ready to commence with the first written assessments in Semester 1, and Canvas LMS and other University Systems have been adapted accordingly.

Anonymous marking was pushed by student members of Academic Board in 2016 to ensure fair marking for all students by reducing implicit bias which can affect all markers, regardless of their intention to discriminate against students. This phenomenon arises due to the 'expectancy effect' where markers will construct 'schema' to assign students to a pre-formed group, often drawing on stereotypes to do so. These unconscious processes are hardly remarkable when one considers the number of papers markers grade, and the speed at which they are expected to evaluate a student's work.

The policy change drew from widespread literature on the presence of bias in non-anonymous marking procedures. Research from a United Kingdom OFSTED study found that students with African or Asian names received 12% lower marks in institutions without anonymous marking. One study from the University of Wales following the implementation of anonymous marking found that the number of women achieving firsts (equivalent of HD) increased by 13%. University of College London has strict anonymous marking and multiple marking policies for all exams. ANU and Monash have already implemented anonymous marking to various extents.

University-wide there is no contestation that, in principle, anonymous marking is desirable. However, there has been some concerns from staff around how it may undermine the feedback process and create an extra burden on staff.

Imogen Grant spoke to her report adding that she was on a panel with Elizabeth Broderick recently and found her excuses for not releasing the third report unconvincing and saying that is it

not a report when it has been referred to as such in the past. On MYEFO () it's unclear how they are going to measure success of Vertically Integrated Degrees (VIDs) and the danger is it forces students to become full fee paying students earlier regardless of capacity. With Anonymous marking has caused some stress for staff as it is coming at a time of great upheaval in the university as it is unclear what the processes is going to be and also there are concerns that the lack of clear training and infrastructure means that students are more likely to

Motion to accept the report of the President.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Winston Ma

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

Adriana resigned the chair back to Imogen

M. Report of the Vice-Presidents

Adriana Olguin Malavisi tabled a written and gave a verbal report:

Planning for the 'Services Week' is underway. A post has been made on the OB's and councillors noticeboard, and all relevant collectives have been contacted on their SRC emails. I will be following up with any OB's who have yet to respond. It's very important that any collectives directly linked to services and student wellbeing are involved. If you have not been in contact with me, please reach out within the next few days to ensure your involvement. I'm very excited for this initiative, and I'm hopeful for the outcomes. I hope all people involved in the SRC can get excited about it as well.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi added to her report offering apologies that it was now out of date. She also apologises if it sounded mean and there is now a Facebook group. She would like as many departments involved as possible in Services Week and it's now looking to be closer to week 8-9 or 11 which is either before or after USU campaigning. Please get in touch and get involved.

Motion: that the report of the Vice President be accepted.

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Winston Ma

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

N. Report of the General Secretaries

Nina Dillon Britton and Yuxuan Yang tabled a written report

From Nina Dillon Britton:

O-Week this year was a week of firsts:

- Got 1500 SRC bags into the hands of students which is the largest ever amount the SRC has done. This will hopefully get more students than ever before
- Counter-Course was into Chinese for the first time in the SRC's history thanks to Yuxuan, which will help us reach out to more international students than ever before.

- We signed up more than 400 students to our new newsletter in order to get a back which will help us reach out more consistently to students than we have in the past.
- We've put up a prize to follow us on Facebook to stay in the loop with the SRC's activities. We advertised this through O-Week and will also do again so with our newsletter.
- The SRC Caseworkers had their own stall at O-Week which allowed them to reach out to more students and make them aware of our services.
- We would like to say a huge thank you to everyone who helped out at the stall and/or handed out our bags and other materials as well as everyone who helped pack the bags.

Radical Education Week

- Planning for Radical Education Week has started.
- Have set up a working group that will be meeting next Wednesday at 6pm at the SRC. If you're keen to get involved just request to join the FB group.
- I've posted it in a few collectives, but am obviously not part all collectives. If OBs can spread this in your collectives' FB groups that would be great!
- Am really excited for this! Last one was in 2016 and was fantastic so would really like to build on that.

Services Week

- Probably in Adriana's report but there will a meeting next Monday at 7pm in the SRC. Come along if keen!

SSAF Process

- Our deadline for SSAF submissions has been extended to allow us to negotiate with other student orgs. This hasn't really worked before, but SUPRA in particular has pushed for it, would be great if we could get agreement with student orgs.
- Initiatives that we're asking for a SSAF increase this year: creating stipends to all office bearers that facilitate collectives and raising the stipend of Honi Soit editors by about 50%; SRC website redesign and translation into Chinese and Malay; printing 10,000 comprehensive booklets that explain student services; the marquee purchased earlier this year; funding for Services Week and Radical Services Week. Want to check in whether Young Workers' Collective is still planning on holding an event as well.
- Note, these are just part of our wish list, and it's unlikely we will get funding for all of this. Creating stipends for minor office bearers is controversial, and is something that we would need to discuss at council in detail if we get the funds. Given its unclear that we will get the funds, probably a bit useless to debate now. If we get the SSAF increase we want though and are able to do so think we should because:
 - Make positions more accessible, especially for students already overworked and underpaid who can't afford to take on unpaid volunteer work.
 - Allow office bearers to dedicate more time to their work, because more financially secure
 - Recognise the important work office bearers do for their collectives and the student body more generally
 - Brings this more into line with other student organisations – look at the salaries of Pulp Editors and SUPRA office bearers for example, which are much more.

SSAF Acquittal

- Working on SSAF also has highlighted the need for better exchange between years of information about the projects we do.
- Obviously OBs do some handover but often still means important information about the projects done the previous year is lost.
- This harms our SSAF negotiating process because have to identify what was done with our SSAF funding from the year before and this is taken into account for our funding application each year. Because we hold elections at the end of the year, you don't have OBs carrying over who can share this information (unlike SUPRA or USU).
- Would like to implement yearly reporting requirements that focuses on collecting this information and passing it on to the next year. Will contact OBs about trying to start collecting data on e.g. how many collective members there are, how often they meet, how many events they hold.
- This is the information the university loves, and we just don't have systematic collection of it at the moment, which harms our SSAF application. I know this is very corporate and "KPI" focussed but at the end of the day this affects our funding for important campaigns and work.

Will also speak to the Audit documents (attached)

From Yuxuan Yang:

The 1500 bag have been ran out during oweek. Thank for everyone's contribution!
We have published counter-course handbook Chinese online version, there are over 1000 online reader (FB 200+wechat 800), and I will discuss with more society and let them forward our material to help more students.

I would like to published the counter course handbook in multiple languages, to help student from different background. However, I can only organize a Chinese version due to the limit of time and manpower resource. I would like to make our SRC diversity in the future, and please tell me if you are interested in.

SSAF is coming!

We will have a meeting with caseworker, legal service solicitor, and admin manager to talk about their2018 budget plan

There will be a division between Nina and Yang to meet with different OBS :

Nina :

Education,
Women's,
Indigenous,
Ethnocultural,
Sexual harassment,
Disabilities,

Queer,
Refugee rights.

Yang:
International student,
Environment,
Global solidarity,
Intercampus,
Mature age,
Interfaith,
Social justice,
Student housing
Residential college

Please contact us to talk about 2018 plan and budget!

I would like to set up investigating project.

Purpose

- One of the main functions of our council is representing students. Therefore, we should recognize the students' condition and their opinion clearly before representing them. Then, we could say "we are students' representative and we serve students"
- After we know students' condition and their opinion, we can propose a motion or agree/disagree a motion based on results.
- We can also give university management feedback based on results, being a bridge between students and university procedures.
- Organize 1 comprehensive investigation, and some specific investigations (for the motion). Open an interactive platform on social media to let students give us suggestions on the message board.
- Offline: Stall at a crowded place twice a month, and talk with students proactively to realize their condition and find out what they think about uni. Meanwhile, encourage the student to fill out the paper questionnaire.

During talking with students, let students know what is SRC and how SRC can help students.

At the same time, stalling activities can be carried out with other collective activities to reduce manpower and resources.

Hold a "SRC" festival or topical focus week (similar idea with Adriana), hold a "super stall", more volunteers, longer time, various interactions, to improve SRC popularity and to help students collectively and personally.

- Online: publish the questionnaire online, publish the investigation results/report, message board
- Exchange information with university management terms

Nina Dillon Britton spoke to the Audit documents and went through them explaining what each section was referring to, and asked that if the council had any detailed questions that they get in touch with the Administration Manager Chitra Narayanan.

George Bishop asked about cash flows in the 30th November stats and asked if the Executive are aware about potential cash flow issues now the book shop has closed.

Nina Dillon Britton said that on the whole the SRC lost money on the Bookshop due to an increase in rent, as a result she is not too worried about cash flow at this time and again if there are issues the administration manager will bring them to the executives attention.

Harry Gregg asked if Nina Dillon Britton knew if the emergency loan had gone up in recent years and if it was adjusted for inflation?

Nina Dillon Britton said she was not aware when it was set and if it has gone up, but she was aware that it was less than what the SRC used to offer.

The Secretary to council informed the council that from her understanding from the archives before voluntary student unionism (VSU) it was up to \$750 as the SRC had significantly better funded then. She was not aware how long it has been a \$50 loan.

Manning Jeffery asked why some office bearers stipend was taxed differently if it was the same amount?

Nina Dillon Britton said that this could be from if a paid officer bears has another job where they are claiming the tax free threshold they cannot claim it on their Stipend, so they will be taxed at a higher rate on their SRC stipend.

There being no other questions Nina Dillon Britton spoke to O-Week statistics, saying it was a year of firsts, and very successful.

Nina Dillon Britton went on to promote Radical Education Week and said it would be fantastic for people to get involved, and she is getting really productive feedback on past years and how it can be improved this year.

Nina Dillon Britton spoke to SSAF proposal and negotiations adding that many of the things the council and officers would like to do, and which are outlined in our SSAF proposals, will not occur unless the extra funding for them comes through.

Nina Dillon Britton said she was hoping to get funding to increase stipends to allow Office Bearer positions to not just be held by those who can afford not to work, and added that many of the existing stipends are traditional and not based on current work load or factors. Also that increasing the SRC's stipends would line the SRC up with other student organisations – SUPRA for example pay all Student Office Bearer positions and their President is paid almost double that of the SRC's President.

Motion: that the report of the General Secretaries be accepted.

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Adriana Olguin Malavisi
The motion was put and **CARRIED**

O. Report of Committees and Officers

O1. Report of the Education Officers

Lily Campbell and Lara Sonnenchein tabled a written report

So far this year we've held two demonstrations in light of the government's education cuts with both being framed around the 'books not bombs' theme as whilst the government has slashed 2.2 billion from higher education, it has given 3.8 billion in hand outs to weapons manufacturers. The first action was during O-Week and members from the USyd EAG along with a few people from various Sydney campuses headed down to Turnbull's office to make our voices heard. It was a lively protest that blocked an intersection at one point, and saw many first year students involved which was great. This was also an event designed to build for the upcoming National Day of Action which was held on March 21.

The National Day of Action was a successful protest with students from USyd, UNSW and UTS meeting outside Fisher Library to again demonstrate against both the government's cuts to education and increasing militarism. There were numerous speakers including Greens politician, David Shoebridge and NUS Ethnocultural officer and SRC councillor, Hersha amongst many others. The protest was accompanied by the Christians Students Uniting Band which was a really great and welcome edition, and provided a great backing track to the EAG's classic chants.

Further to this, I've been doing some digging into the university and their links with the defence industry. This involved talking to people such as the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research), the head of the Aeronautical, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering School, looking through government papers and information sourced under freedom-of-information laws regarding university investments. The results showed that the university invests over 4 million in weapons manufacturers through various fund managers. The university also opts into Vanguard's International Shares Select Exclusions Fund, which promotes itself as an 'ethical' fund. Whilst the university did not provide me with the list of companies in that specific fund as they number around 1500 different companies, I was able to find an excel spreadsheet which did that for me. It showed more investments in weapons manufacturers, including significant investments in United Technologies Corporation (\$762,932.55), Raytheon (\$452,535.49), Rolls Royce (\$133,333.90), ThyssenKrupp (\$102,069.92) and Thales (\$100,896.14) (our chancellor being the chairwoman of the Australian subsidiary) as at the 18th of March this year. This then takes the university's investments to over 5 million. Over 3 million of this was invested in Honeywell.

Honeywell is the company that developed cluster bombs during the Vietnam War which have killed over 20,000 people since. They are also part of the consortium that operates the Pantex plant, where all the United States' nuclear bombs are assembled. The company also provides the engine for the MQ-9 drone, the world's deadliest UAV, which is responsible for civilian deaths in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia. New Zealand Super Fund recently divested from Honeywell, citing ethical concerns.

I wrote an Honi Soit article which covers both the university's investments in these companies as well as looking into their research partnerships which are crucial to the global supply chains of

multinational weapons companies. It also received media attention from The Australian, the ABC and Junkee.

Members of the EAG also collaborated with the Environment collective in helping to build a protest against AECOM on campus as they were trying to recruit students on campus. AECOM is a corporation that has much to do with the construction of the Adani coal mine and is also heavily involved in the production of nuclear weapons in the United States. AECOM got word of our protest and cancelled their event, which was a great success.

Some upcoming events we will be attending include the various Palestinian solidarity actions including 'Stand with Gaza: Rally for Palestine', the speak out for Ahed Tamimi, a seventeen-year-old Palestinian political prisoner and the annual Nakba protest. There will also be a large protest against Black Deaths in Custody in May organized by FIRE, the same group that organize Invasion Day and we encourage all of you and the broader student body to attend.

Lara Sonnenschein read out her report.

Motion: that the report of the Education Officers be accepted.

Motion: Jazzlyn Breen

Seconded: Seth Dias

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

O2. Report of the Wom*n's Officers

Madeline Ward and Jessica Syed tabled a written report

Since last council, we held our counter protest to the pro life "Day Of The Unborn Child" event. It was important for us to non-platform rhetoric such as this which is violent towards people accessing abortion: pro life groups are demeaning, shame people and their tradition stems from a misogynistic and patriarchal idealisation of the nuclear family. We notified police of our intent to protest but our peaceful and legal assembly was thwarted by the riot squad and mounted police nonetheless. Some resisted and were arrested; protestors were pushed, shoved and, as video footage has shown, assaulted.

Our system of ushering patients into the Surry Hills abortion clinic is continuing and the pro-life protestors are not happy. They continue to send bulky cop-like male reinforcements to stand in front of us and intimidate us into not reappearing and providing the ushering service. We hope that the passage of the Safe Access Zones bill will put an end to this awful form of harassment faced by people accessing reproductive healthcare.

We are also trying to organise an internal roster to help the Martin Street Kitchen. Homelessness affects women in a profound way, particularly women who have been marginalised most by class, white supremacy, a disability, or by domestic violence.

Last week, we had a meeting with Vice Chancellor Michael Spence to discuss the Red Zone report, the college situation, the Consent Matters module and its efficacy, and other University policies with regard to wom*n's issues, such as how the university may deal with student/teacher relationships. We wouldn't say that the meeting was wholly productive per se as university

management is endemically useless at taking the information of student activists seriously. However, we believe that our push for a uniform sexual assault policy across all colleges will be taken as a consideration by the Vice Chancellor to his next meetings with the college bureaucracy. We also outlined some issues with Consent Matters (such as the module only needing to be completed by the time a student graduates, it not being compulsory for non-first year students, it being an awful consent module and why wasn't the RDVSA one that we recommended implemented, etc). These were things effectively ignored in our Safer Communities Working Group Meeting, however the VC seemed somewhat concerned at that fact.

So to anyone who wants to harangue the Wom*n's Officers about not engaging with the colleges or with university management in a productive way, please don't forget that we were elected into this position because a collective of people have elected us and trusted us to do our job (which, we are in fact, doing). If you have any issues with us, raise it with us in an official capacity rather than coming to a council meeting with a pre-formed holier-than-thou motion. Our email address is usydwomenscollective@gmail.com. If you identify as a wom*n or non-binary, as some motion makers may well do, you can literally come to a Wom*n's Collective meeting and raise it in the meeting. Wasting people's time during council is exactly that – a waste of time.

Hope you're all having a blessed Easter break, in anger and disgust,
Maddy and Jess

Motion: that the report of the Wom*n's Officers be accepted.

Motion: Caitlin Mcmenamin

Seconded: Jazzlyn Breen

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

P. Special Business

There were no items of special business.

Q. Motions of Notice

Procedural motion to move to General Business

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Brandon Hale

The Procedural motion was put and **CARRIED.**

R. General Business

R1. Motion from the Floor: We Must Act Against Anti-Semitism

(Final Version)

Preamble:

1. Antisemitism is often dismissed as a phenomenon of the past, both in public debate and academic discourse. People mistakenly assume that anti-Semitism is merely historical. The

opposite of this is true. 2017 saw a 9.5% rise* in recorded anti-Semitic incidents and a huge increase in anti-Semitic activity occurring on campuses across Australia.

*Executive Council of Australian Jewry 2016-2017 Report of Anti-Semitism in Australia (<http://www.ecaj.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/ECAJ-Antisemitism-Report-2017.pdf>)

2. One such example is an incident which occurred at the University of Sydney last year on 27th April. A man was seen handing out leaflets featuring anti-Semitic and Holocaust-denying content outside the Brendan McCallum Learning Hub in central campus, and was confronted by students. The material, distributed by Chemtrails Geelong, claimed the Holocaust was 'demonstrably false' and linked to a website filled with strongly anti-Semitic content.

3. In an increasingly hostile campus environment, it is becoming increasingly difficult to ensure the safety and security of Jewish students. It is vital that the University of Sydney Student Representative Council, the peak representative body for students at the university, acknowledges and acts to prevent the rise in anti-Semitism, consistent with the motion passed by the National Union of Students in December 2017.

Actions:

1. The Student Representative Council condemns anti-Semitism in all its forms as defined by the globally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition. This is the working definition used by both Australian and international Jewish representative bodies. This is also the definition that was adopted by the National Union of Students on 14 December 2017. It states that: *"Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities"*.

2. The Student Representative Council commits to working with the Australasian Union of Jewish Students (AUJS), as the peak representative body for Jewish students on campus in Australia and New Zealand, to ensure SRC activist spaces, events, and protests are inclusive and welcoming of Jewish voices and perspectives. There should be no pre-qualifications necessary for Jewish students to attend and/or feel included.

3. Going forward, the Student Representative Council will formally recognise and publicise January 27, as designated by the United Nations General Assembly, as International Holocaust Remembrance Day; and work with AUJS in either partnering or sharing material designed to educate and commemorate the atrocities of the Holocaust.

Moved: Brandon Hale

Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis

Brandon Hale spoke to the motion

Thomas Manousaridis waved his right to speak as seconder of the motion

Will Edwards asked to amend the motion to remove "and ethno-cultural spaces" from action point 2.

The Amendment was amenable to the movers and the motion was updated.

Ben Ezzes spoke to the motion saying that before being elected to the Sydney University AJUS (Australasian Union of Jewish Students) Presidency he had experienced a number of anti-Semitic attacks and language both on and off campus. Adding that Last year the SRC passed a motion condemning anti-Semitism on campus in the form of leaflets, posters and stickers which has been found around campus, and he hopes that this motion will be passed as it is about the same thing.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying that he and his faction would be voting in favour of the motion. He said that the reason the amendment has been put forward by William Edwards was simply for collective autonomy. He added that he and his faction would be voting in favour of the motion as supporters of Palestine and supporters for the end to the occupation of Gaza. But that the Council cannot turn a blind eye to anti-Semitism on campus, and that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism are not the same thing. Concluding that it was unfair and wrong to blame Jewish people for the corrupt behavior of the government of Israel, the same way every Australian is not responsible for our government's treatment of Indigenous Australians and refugees.

Emma Norton spoke to the motion saying she will be supporting the motion saying that the rise of anti-Semitism and the far right in general around the world is of great concern. Condemning anti-Semitism is very important, and that protesting against the far right and anti-Semitism is really important for making sure that anti-Semitism is not on the rise. Emma Norton informed the Council she would like to propose an amendment to the motion, to acknowledge that being Pro-Palestine and anti-Zionist are not the same thing as being anti-Semitic.

Amendment: "4. The SRC recognizes that criticism of the Israeli state and its treatment of Palestinians is often incorrectly equated with anti-Semitism. We reaffirm that the SRC does not in any way endorse this conflation"

There was a break in the existing speaking list to move discussion to the amendment.

Ben Ezzes spoke against the amendment saying it was unnecessary as the motion already clarifies that criticism of Israel is not the same as anti-Semitism.

Dana Segall spoke to the amendment thanking for the overall support for the motion, she noted that the motion has the definition of anti-Semitism as set by the IHRA, this definition acknowledges that anti-Zionism and criticism of the state of Israel is not anti-Semitic, but that some criticisms of Zionism are, such as denying the holocaust or its severity.

George Bishop spoke against the amendment believing it to radically change the motion and should not be seen as an amendment.

Eitan Harris spoke against the amendment speaking about the overlap that can occur between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. He spoke about personal experiences where he was excluded from conversations as a result of this, saying that a teacher said his being Jewish made inherently biased when they were talking about human rights in a high school legal studies class.

Emma Norton spoke to her amendment saying that there are many examples of people being attacked and labeled anti-Semitic for talking about the crimes committed against the Palestinian people as acknowledged by the UN. Adding that this is amendment about making very clear that the organization does not see supporting Palestinians as anti-Semitic. Emma concluded saying that being clear about that doesn't water down the definition, or the motion at all.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke to the amendment saying that clarity on this issues was important saying that as one of the current Queer Officers they recently experienced backlash for holding a banner in support of Palestine in a Facebook photo, as a result was called a Nazi and had threats sent to their personal facebook page.

William Edwards spoke against the amendment saying that the majority of the room already agreed that criticism of Israel isn't anti-Semitic. Adding that one of the issues with this amendment is that is already accounted for in the IHRA definition. William added they don't think there would be a similar amendment on any other motion calling for the condemnation of racism or support for any other identity based group. He reiterated his earlier point that he and other supported the State of Palestine and see nothing in this motion that would be in conflict to that position.

Caitlin Mcmenamin felt that the amendment was substantial enough to be passed as a separate motion and felt if the movers felt it necessary they could move it that way there was no need to amend the current motion.

Kim Murphy spoke in favour of the amendment, noting that there seemed to be a misunderstanding as to the intent of the amendment which was for clarity within in the motion that in the political sphere in which the SRC is engaged people have been labeled anti-Semitic for criticizing Israel and that because of this existing president it is important that there is clarity.

Emma Norton responded to William Edwards' comment saying that everything is in a – In answer to will's comment's everything is in a political context and we don't just move motions in a political vacuum. Adding that because that political context includes situation where support of Palestine and criticisms of Israel is often labeled anti-Semitic clarity is important. Emma Norton said she did not think that it is anti-Semitic to say that the state of Israel is a racist state, or that their policies are ones of the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians. Emma Continued saying that criticism of the state is not the same as being anti-Semitic, the same way that criticism of apartheid in South Africa caused political contention, there have been parallels drawn to apartheid South Africa and Israel, and while she does not think they are currently being debated, nothing is devoid of it's political context.

Dana Segall responded to Emma Norton's comments saying that she appreciates the concern that the motion could suppress pro-Palestinian activities, but wanted to reassure that this is not the intention of this motion, nor is it the aim. Dana continued saying that the IHRA definition is clear on this and the IHRA are the most qualified when it comes to defining what anti-Semitism. Dana added that as Jews are a traditionally persecuted ethnic minority the movers of the motion are approaching this from an angle that acknowledges this history. Dana concluded noting she agreed with William Edwards' comment that other minority groups would not be asked to add an amendment like this.

Lara Sonnenschein said that she thought the issue extends further than the IHRA definition, and that AUJS is a political body, and that as a Jewish student she did not feel welcome to participate in the organisation because of the conflation of Judaism and Zionism, anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. Lara continued saying that because Zionism is one of the 4 tenants of AUJS claiming to represent Jewish students means excluding anti-Zionist Jewish students like her. She concluded expressing her support for the amendment.

The amendment was put to and rejected by the movers of the motion.

The Amendment was put to council.

Motion to add the following to the tabled motion:

Amendment: "4. The SRC recognizes that criticism of the Israeli state and its treatment of Palestinians is often incorrectly equated with anti-Semitism. We reaffirm that the SRC does not in any way endorse this conflation"

Moved: Emma Norton

Seconded: Lara Sonnenschein

The motion was put and **FAILED**.

Debate of the original motion resumed.

George Bishop spoke to the motion saying that it was an important motion and it was important to show clear support for Jewish students on campus.

Dana Segall spoke to the motion noting that most of what she wanted to say had been expressed but wanted to clarify that AUJS says it represents the majority of Jewish students on campus not all Jewish students, and that as an ethnic minority it is important to speak on behalf of the majority of them.

Motion was put and **CARRIED**.

The President called a 15-minute recess at 8:10pm.

Quorum count was called at 8:25pm.

The meeting was found Inquorate.

Meeting lapsed at 8:30pm.