



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 91st SRC held on 3rd April **2019**. Meeting held in the new Law LT 026, New Law Annex.

The Secretary to Council would like to note for all reading that the following minutes contain discussion and references to sexual assault, abortion, pregnancy and child abuse.

*The Secretary to Council called a quorum count at 6:17
The meeting was no quorate*

Motion to wait for quorum for another 10 minutes
Moved: Dane Luo
Seconded: Gabi Stricker-Phelps
The motion was put and CARRIED

*Quorum count called at 6:28
The meeting was found quorate*

A. Meeting opened at 6:29 pm

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.

A1. Election of Deputy Chairperson

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

It was noted that Dr Jeremy Sammut from the Centre for Independent Studies was in attendance as an observer. The council was asked if they would like open the meeting to visitors (those who

are not members of the University student body) the council agreed to let the meeting be open to visitors.

C. Apologies, Proxies and Leaves of Absence

Apologies were received from:

Proxies:

Jingxian Wu proxies to Yuxuan Yang
Jayesh Joshi to Liam Thomas
Xiaoyu Jin to Jingrui Xu
John-Paul Baladi to Jack Abadee
Hartley Dhyon to William Olive
Ella Finlay to Ellie Wilson
Shangyue Mu to Jiale Wang
Manchen Wen to Peiqing Fan
Guipeng Jiao to Yulan Sheng
Josie Jakovac to Julia Kokic

Motion: that the apologies be accepted

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Xiaxi Hou

The motion was put and **CARREID**

D. Changes to Membership

E. Electoral Report

E1. Consideration of any resignations

Yiting Feng and James Newbold resign as joint Education Officer

Yiting Feng resigns her council seat to Xinyue Zhang

Jingrui Xu resigns as DSP

Motion: That the Council accept the resignations.

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Xiaxi Hou

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

Lily Campbell noted her dissent to the resignations

F. Minutes of the previous Council meeting.

Minutes of the 2nd regular meeting of the 91st SRC held on 6th March 2019 were circulated.

Motion: that the minutes of the 6th March 2019 be accepted.

Moved: Jack Abadee
Seconded: Caitlin Chu
The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

G. Business Arising from the Minutes

Correction it was March not February

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

I. Visitor's Business

There was no business for this item.

J. Report of the Undergraduate Fellow of Senate

K. Elections

The chair moved that the Secretary to Council be appointed as the Returning Officer (RO) for the elections.

There was no dissent.

The president moved the chair to the RO.

Secretary to Council called for nominations.

K1. Election of 1 Mature Aged Students' Officer

No nominations were received

K2. Election of 1 Indigenous Students' Officer

No nominations were received

K3. Election of the Education Officer

Nomination of Lily Campbell

Moved: Vinil Kumar

Seconded: James Newbold

Join nomination of James Newbold and Jingrui Xu

Moved: Caitlyn Chu

Seconded: Yihi Li

There being no other nominations the nominees were asked if they wished to speak to their nomination.

Lily Campbell spoke to her nomination and noted that she did not think she would win this election but wanted to nominate to remind the council of the importance and seriousness of the role, especially with an upcoming federal election. She told the council she believed that the position needed to push hard and be a strong activist presence considering both major parties

have not supported higher education or students and that more needs to be done to protect student rights than simply handing out for the Labor party.

James Newbold spoke to his nomination outlining the issues they will be working on including working on fighting against deportation of refugees, fighting on climate action and supporting the NTEU as well as keeping an eye on the Ramsey Centre.

Results:

12 Campbell

16 Newbold/Xu

5 Informal

K4. Election of 1 Director of Student Publications

1 nomination from Sean Perry

moved: Caitlyn Chu

seconded: Victor Li

There being no other nominations and after checking that the nomination would not violate AA provisions, Sean was declared elected unopposed.

The President resumed the chair

L. Report of the President and Executive

L1. Executive Minutes

Minutes of the Executive meetings from the 19th February and the 8th March 2019.

Motion: that the minutes of the executive meetings from 19th February and the 8th March 2019 be accepted.

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Gabi Stricker-Phelps

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

L2. Report of the Executive

Report of the executive from the 19th February and the 8th March 2019.

Vinil Kumar asked what the \$925 party was, and why that much was spent

Jakey He said that more details on the event will be in in his report but that is was a start of year party, open to all undergraduate students, and that the event complied with SSAF conditions.

Jazzlyn Breen asked why \$925 had been spent on a party but the money for the women's collective had been rescinded.

Layla Mkhayber said that they were promised an explanation at the last council meeting and there has been no communication with the women's collective or Sexual Harassment Officers.

Dane Luo said that the funding rescission was explained in the Executive minutes.

Jazzlyn Breen said that a clear explanation as to why the Executive decided to rescind the funding approved under the previous Executive should not have taken six months to be given.

Vinil Kumar said that it was not transparent, and that as Niamh Callinan was not present, could not be asked directly about it. Adding that the reasoning behind the rescission motion was not clear and it was unfair considering there was \$925 spent on food and drinks for a party.

Swapnik Sanagavarapu noted that Niamh Callinan was not present and that the council has been told that this would be resolved by the Friday following the last council meeting and that this has not occurred.

Jazzlyn Breen said that the funding request had been made before November 1st last year by the previous women's officers and that it had been approved, so it was disappointing that this year's Executive decided to retroactively disapprove of that expenditure. Adding that an answer for why this has happened had not been provided and it's been over a month and she has still heard nothing as to why last year's budget was affected by this year's Executive.

Motion: to accept the report of the Executive.

Moved: Yuxuan Yang

Seconded: James Ardouin

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

Procedural motion to move to R1 general business

Moved: James Newbold

Seconded: Hektor Vineburg

R. Other business

Will Edwards moved a motion from the floor:

R.1 Don't Deport Disabilities, Rally for Kinley

Preamble:

Kinley Wangchuck is an 18 year old student with hearing loss living in Queanbeyan, NSW. His family moved to Australia from Bhutan in 2012 and for 7 years have thrived in the community as students, cleaners, childcare workers, and aged care workers. Kinley's teachers describe him as warm, friendly, responsible, independent, and a benefit to the community.

But Kinley and his family are set to be deported within weeks because Kinley, as a deaf person, doesn't meet the health requirements for permanent residency.

Kinley and his family are valued and upstanding members of their school, work, and local communities. If deported, Kinley would lose the learning and social supports which enable him to thrive in Australia. Deporting Kinley and his family would be unfair and unjust, and a striking example of prejudice against people with disabilities.

Yet Kinley is not without hope: The Minister for Immigration, David Coleman, can exercise his discretionary powers to grant Kinley and his family permanent residency.

Platform:

1. The SRC believes that deporting Kinley and his family on the basis of his disability would be grossly ableist. People with disabilities are not liabilities or burdens as the government's permanent residency "health requirements" imply.
2. The SRC endorses the Rally for Kinley outside Australian Parliament House this Friday and any further actions organised by NUS Disabilities to support Kinley.

Action:

1. The SRC will publicise the Rally for Kinley and any further actions organised by NUS Disabilities to support Kinley on its social media profiles.

Will Edwards spoke to the motion saying that the policy was disgusting and that he has called for a protest in Canberra this Friday (April 5th). The protest was called on Monday, and asked for the SRC to should support for the action to put pressure on the immigration minister to step in and use his discretion and allow Kinley and his family to remain in Australia. Adding that this was an important issue that is was hard to get attention for during budget week and that deporting people for having a disability was a disgusting and unethical practise.

James Newbold waved his speaking rights as seconder.

Swapnik Sanagavarapu spoke in favour of the motion and said that those who would oppose it are abhorrent human beings.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying that it was an abhorrent situation and that Australia should not judge people on their economic output and that disabled people should not be considered a liability or cost. Adding that this is an important issue which was very relevant right now with the cuts to the NDIS in the budget and that the idea that people should be about profit making was disgusting. She concluded reaffirming her support for the motion.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that situations like this had happened before and that student activism had been key is stopping it. Adding that when anyone from a marginalised community was being attacked by the government there was an obligation to fight and show that such discriminatory policies would not be accepted and what they are doing is wrong. Adding that Healthcare and support services are a right for everyone regardless of background.

Moved: Will Edwards

Seconded: James Newbold

The motion was put and CARRIED.

The meeting returned to the standing orders

The President deferred the Chair to the Deputy Chairperson.

L3. President's Report

Jacky He tabled a written report:

University's Code of Conduct Review

Over the past two weeks, the SRC has been working with the University to update and change the university's student code of conduct protocols. Our caseworkers Mel and Sharon, along with myself, has met with the university executives, and raised valuable student feedbacks and opinions from student organisations. I have raised that whilst the code of conduct rules should define expectations of student behaviours and provide some guidelines about student-staff interaction on campus, the university should also be mindful to not restrict speech freedom and each individual's right to exercise their beliefs. I have also suggested that the university should actively communicate with the Colleges to set similar code of conduct guidelines in their vicinity. The new code of conducts, when published, would include more expectations about social media behaviour and academic dishonesty.

Progress with Open Learning Environment

Pursuing our meeting with Professor Peter McCallum, the Chair of Interdisciplinary Board, representatives from the SRC sitting on the Academic Board and I have eventually been able to make a pivotal progress in restructuring and improving the Open Learning Environment. We have discussed potential solutions such as introducing more 6 credit point OLE units, collaborate with universities overseas to make some of the OLE units transferrable through exchange, and allocating more supporting staff for better feedbacks to students. These ideas will be discussed at the next Interdisciplinary Board Meeting this month, and if passed, will subsequently be raised at UE Education Committee and Academic Board.

Open Learning Environment beyond all doubt has been one of my biggest focus for change this semester, and because it is a big structural reform it has been a difficult journey trying to persuade and inform the university executives about the problems that students have raised regarding the OLE. I would like to thank the entire senior executive team, caseworker team for providing me with essential advices that have allowed me to proceed this far with reforming the OLE. I would also like to thank Sean Perry and Chanum Torres who have both presented eloquently at the March Academic Board to raise a voice about OLE

SRC Pizza and Beer Party Review

Last Thursday, the SRC has successfully held a Pizza and Beer Party at Courtyard that has attracted the attendance of over 100 undergraduate students. We have received very positive feedbacks from the students, commending us on the fantastic experience they had networking with other

undergraduate students and getting access to free food and drinks. We also had office bearers setting up a face painting stall at the Courtyard performing free face painting for the students.

Hereby I would like to thank the entire senior executive team, especially Caitlyn who has been responsible for organising the marketing and organising helpers for the event. I would also like to thank our international student officers Visspa, Ken, Janet and Jahanzaib for their works in preparing and setting up the event. I would also like to thank our caseworker Mel for providing safety advices that have allowed the event to proceed without any safety issues.

SRC Housing Seminar

Last Friday, the SRC held an undergraduate student housing seminar at New Law Building Seminar Room 020, where our Caseworker Melissa de Silva explained the legal definitions of a tenant and a landlord, the different kinds of student housing and the different issues that may arise from them. Each student was also consulted on the kind of rental agreements that they have arranged, and Mel patiently explained the potential risks and solutions to their respective situations. Hereby, I would like to thank the student housing officers for organising parts of the event along the way and definitely a huge thank you to Mel for being a passionate and insightful speaker to all the undergraduate students present.

Seminar on Consent Matters

Recently a speaker from the 2018 Radical Education Week has reached out to me expressing an interest to run a workshop/seminar on consent matters, which also resonates with the University's recently introduced Consent Policies and Consent Modules. There have been continuing discussions, but we are looking at conducting a consent matters seminar with both the speaker herself and a caseworker who has experience dealing with sexual consent issues.

Jacky He read his report.

Lily Campbell asked about the SRC housing seminar saying that it sounded like a really good event and she was disappointed that she had not heard about it asking where it had been promoted and who it was promoted too? Adding that it seemed like it was only promoted to a small number of students and why hadn't the councillors heard about it and why were there no leaflets around considering the money spent on other events.

Jacky He said that the event had been advertised on the SRC Facebook page, that is was open to all undergraduate students and that there was nothing wrong with promoting the SRC services.

Julia Kovic said she supported the report adding that she had attended that start of semester party and that is was a fun event attended by a large cross section of the student body.

Jacky He thanked Julia Kovic for her comments.

Jazzlyn Breen asked how much money had been spent on face painting, how many people took part and why was there face painting at a university event with no children? She also asked why the Sexual Harassment officers had not been contacted regarding the consent matters talk and why the Presidents report lacked any update on any of the political actions that has taken place recently.

Jakey He said there was nothing wrong with having face painting at the event and that adults could enjoy it just as much, and that the funding for the event was broken down in the Executive minutes. Jakey added that he had not contacted the Sexual Harassment officers yet as the meeting had only happened that day and did not have a chance to contact others before council tonight. Speaking to the comment on political action Jacky said that he did not believe the SRC should be a political organisation and that it can't be politically affiliated.

Alex Yang said he had also attended the party but had not seen Julia Kokic there. Adding that he thought there was a lot of effort put into the event but there was no clear message as to what it was aiming to achieve that it was just people eating pizza and drinking but not learning anything.

Jacky He thanked Alex Yang for acknowledging that there was a lot of work put in, adding that there could be improvements but felt it was overall a good event for students.

Swapnik Sanagavarapu asked if Jacky He had attended the Vigil for the victims of the Christchurch massacre and asked why when the event co-ordinators who were SRC Office Bearers sent a co-host invitation to the SRC no one responded. Swapnik also asked why Jacky He had said that the SRC provided mental health support when as the President he should be aware it does not.

Jacky He Said that he did not receive the request to co-host the event and was unable to attend due to urgent SRC business. On the second question Jacky said there has been an inaccuracy and it had been corrected and that if something like that happened again there was a process for handling it.

Declan Godwin asked if there would be balloons and a clown at the next party. Also, asking why there was not mention of the NTEU really in the report and asked if Jacky had attended the rally or was he siding with Vice Chancellor Michael Spence.

Jacky He said he supported the NTEU and their actions.

Vinil Kumar said that the SRC was not an apolitical organisation adding that it had a long history of political action including hiding draft dodgers during the Vietnam War. Vinil continued saying that the SRC has a responsibility to stand up for student rights and that it was the responsibility of the President to do that and it was a responsibility that cannot be abdicated. Vinil concluded that we live in a political society and that doing nothing says that you don't think these issues matter.

Jacky He said that social justice and politics were not the same thing and that if Vinil Kumar wanted the SRC to be a political organisation he would need to change the constitution.

Alev Saracoglu noted that people were celebrating this party but at the last council the council turned down a \$1000 grant to the biggest and oldest student climate action group – people are celebrating this party but turned down a \$1000 grant on the biggest and oldest student climate action groups. So, she did not agree that this Council could claim they cared about climate change.

Ellie Wilson said she had opened the event and there was a pending request to the SRC page to co-host still there, adding that she was aware that Office Bearers has spoken to Jacky He about supporting the event. Ellie added that Jacky He had said they promoted the student housing talk on the day of it and how did he think that was adequate notice for students?

Jacky He said that while the Facebook event (for the student housing talk) may have only shown 2 people has attending there were a lot more there and that this could be confirmed by the caseworkers who spoke at the event. Jacky He added that with the Red Cross Society and ACAR event he had not received a follow up confirmation.

Ellie Wilson clarified that the ACAR event was different to that one held by the Red Cross Society.

Swapnik Sanagavarapu said it was his understanding that this event was unrelated to the Red Cross Event.

Layla Mkhayber said that she has asked Jacky He if the SRC would support and co-host ACAR's vigil a few days before the event. Adding that there was another event run by the Red Cross Society on the Friday and it was a separated event

Jacky He confirmed that he had spoken to Layla Mkhayber and agreed to support the event but there had been no follow up.

Ellie Wilson said that she was looking at the pending co-host request right now.

Jazzlyn Breen asked if Jacky He never received the request why does is show a pending requests. Also, asking if Jacky He did not have access to SRC Facebook admin privileges and was there proof the request wasn't received or had a mistake been made? She concluded saying this wasn't a conspiracy against the President and it was not made up.

Jacky He said that he could prove he did not receive it but did not want to hold up the meeting.

Elli Stephenson said that ACAR (Autonomous Collective Against Racism) has proof that the request was sent and that there was no proof that this was not sent. Adding that Jacky He could say he didn't wasn't to be political but where there is a massacre of 50 people while at Prayer it's not political and it is important to make a statement.

Jacky he said it is important and he had made a post about it on the SRC's public Facebook page he added that did not receive the request and he is not lying.

There was a cry of disagreement.

Procedural motion to close the speaking list

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Julia Kokic

The motion was put and CARRIED

Motion to accept the report of the President.

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Lara Glase

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

Jacky He resumed the Chair.

M. Report of the Vice-Presidents

Caitlyn Chu and Dane Luo tabled a written report:

Health Days

We are organising Health Days at our satellite campuses. This is analogous to bringing Welfare Week and the SRC's Welcome Week presence to our satellite campuses. In the past, our satellite campuses have felt ignored compared to the many events and activities that take place at Darlington/Camperdown. We believe that it's extremely important that all students, no matter the campus they're completing their course in, have access to student support services.

The first Health Day is going to be at the Mallet Street campus for Nursing and Midwifery students on Tuesday 16 April 2019. We chose a day in week 8 because third year Bachelor of Nursing students have clinical preparations after the mid-semester break. Also, BN Honours students have seminars in week 8. That way, we can make sure we can find a suitable time that brings together as many undergraduate Nursing students as possible. The second Health Day is going to be at the Cumberland campus on Tuesday 30 April 2019 for Health Sciences students at that campus.

We are liaising with relevant Faculty Societies, NGOs and support services to come out and support this event. This includes NSW Fire & Rescue, the RPA Sexual Health Clinic, Headspace, Surf Lifesaving, Nurses & Midwives' Association, Unions NSW, USU's Language Exchange program, Beyond Blue and Twenty10. In addition to providing a free lunch and handing out information, we are hoping to hold interactive games to engage students. For example, we will ask students to rank a bunch of soft drinks and energy drinks from the lowest to highest amount of sugar. We have partnered with SUPRA and we will be sharing the cost of running this event between our two organisations.

We have notified unit of study coordinators with classes on that day to tell them about the event and bring their students to the ground floor after their classes.

If any Officers or Representatives wish to join us, please let us know. You can tell students about your campaigns or even just lend a hand promoting the SRC's services.

Satellite campus visits

Dane will be joining our caseworkers for another round of satellite campus visits to Camden, Conservatorium, Rozelle (Sydney College of the Arts), Surry Hills (Sydney Dental Hospital) and

Westmead before the end of semester 1. We are looking to hold this round in weeks 9-11. If any Officers or Representatives wish to join us, please let us know.

Research and Policy Officer

At the last meeting, we asked the Council to create a Research and Policy Officer. This position would begin research on models for affordable student housing, which is something that we're very passionate with. After Council accepted our report, we asked the Executive to start advertising the position. The job description was developed between Dane and the entire Casework and Policy Department and advertised on NCOSS, Ethical Jobs, CareerHub, the SRC website and more. The deadline for applications has closed. There were 35 applications received. The selection committee, composed by Jacky (President), Niamh (General Secretary), Melissa (Acting Casework and Policy Manager) and Lorna (Casework and Policy Officer), will be conducting interviews on Friday 5 April 2019.

We're turning 90!

This year, the SRC celebrates 90 years of representing and serving undergraduate students. Since 1929, the SRC has been defending and advancing the interests of students at our University and in the community. We are working with Julia and our staff to host a 90th year fundraiser in October/November. This will be an event to bring back alumni Presidents, Representatives and Officers. Over the next few months, we will be looking for silent auction items, decorations, keynote speakers and contacting past alumni. We will be looking through past *Honi Soit* editions to find past alumni.

Engaging with Faculty Societies

On Saturday 30 March 2019, Dane joined HealthSoc to host a picnic at Victoria Park for Health Sciences students who are studying on the Camperdown/Darlington campus. Since our really successful wall planners, Welcome Week bags and Orientation Handbook/Counter Course publications have basically all been handed out (which is really good!), we handed out information packs with important information and flyers in smaller bags for the event. Dane spoke to many students about the transition from Cumberland to Camperdown/Darlington. Many issues were raised including conflicting classes and significant travel time for timetables are created, the difficulty to attend consultation periods and how services have been affected. We will be bringing these issues directly to the Faculty of Health Sciences, Cumberland Student Guild and University management over the next week.

Caitlyn started the mentor program for Science students and received around 45 mentees. She also found 8 mentors with high grades in each major to connect with mentees. We still want to carry out the mentor program for other faculties and we welcome all of the executives to discuss it with us.

Many Faculty Society Presidents have been directly raising in our meetings that they are having many issues with the USU and their C&S Office. Not only are there many issues with the new funding arrangements but there have been onerous requests for risk assessments and formalities, as well as very slow response times from their Office. We will be working with them to make representations to the USU and their C&S Office.

WeChat Interaction and International Student Engagement

Caitlyn has been posting WeChat articles weekly, including a review of our Welcome sessions. The article for Welcome sessions attracted a wide readership and helped many students who didn't come to the Welcome session. Additionally, Caitlyn has organised a weekly schedule to post an article once a week. We find that these articles are helping many international students hear about services and support available to them inside and out of the University. At the same time, we are communicating with the International Student Officers. Caitlyn helped out at the International Student Collective BBQ on Saturday 23 March 2019 and we are working on a SRC presence on WhatsApp soon.

SSAF Acquittal and Audit

Since the last meeting, Dane has been working on several parts of the SSAF acquittal, which has now been submitted. We want to thank the Senior Executive and all of our staff department heads (Chitra, Mel, Thomas, Mickie and Amanda) for all their assistance in getting this submitted. Dane participated and signed off on the audit of the 90th Council. Details are in the report of the General Secretaries.

Regulations Review

We have been working on reviewing our *Regulations* with Cameron and Julia. So far, we have gone through the document to identify issues in parts 8, 12 and 13 of the *Regulations*. If anyone would like to express a view or contribute in any way, please email us at vice.president@src.usyd.edu.au.

Centrelink Payments Session

In the past, our caseworkers and solicitors would run seminars and sessions about relevant topics. This hasn't happened for a while. We have been working with a new group, Square One Skills, who are hosting a Centrelink 101 session on Thursday 11 April 2019 from 1pm to 3pm. A staff member from Centrelink will be explaining the application process for Youth Allowance, Rent Assistance and Centrelink benefits. We are working to see if our caseworkers will be speaking there as well so that students are aware that they can receive professional support from our organisation.

Enterprise Bargaining Agreement

Dane has been nominated to serve as a representative of our organisation in the negotiations for an Enterprise Bargaining Agreement. This will begin very soon and likely take several months to conclude.

Welfare Week

We are starting to prepare for Welfare Week in semester 2 week 3 on Eastern Avenue. Welfare Week provides an opportunity to promote welfare and wellbeing services offered by NGOs, student organisations, community groups and the University. Many students are not aware of the services available to them and this is our work to promote how they can get help. We would love for all departments and collectives to get involved. If any Officers like to get involved, please let us know. You can tell students about your campaigns and the work you have been doing.

Updated and upgraded SRC website

Our Publications Managers have been incredibly busy working to update and upgrade our website. We have been working with them to redesign the website to make it more intuitive to use and delineate clearly the SRC's different services and objectives, thus encouraging greater engagement with the student body more generally. One of the improvements that we are keen on is for Officers to upload their reports or make blog posts, giving them a platform to showcase their work. In addition, we are improving the way that our advice guides from the Casework and Policy Department are displayed.

This morning, our website was upgraded to a new template! This is the first stage of our website upgrade initiative. As part of this stage, we also updated many pages so they are clearer and archived old content.

The second stage is to continue updating the content of our website and include new materials from the Casework and Policy Department and SRC Legal Service.

The third stage is to address our current web address www.srcusyd.net.au, which is difficult to find. We will be looking to move content over to a new web address www.src.usyd.edu.au so it can more easily located. This is the same as the endings of our SRC email addresses.

Depending on the availability of funds and time, the fourth stage that we would like to see the website translated in several languages as well. Suggestions from last year include translating to Malay and Chinese to make its resources accessible to a wider range of students. Our website's most commonly viewed pages are the key advice guides for common student problems (e.g. Centrelink) developed by the Casework and Policy Department so having those in students' first language would allow broader engagement with important information provided by the SRC. It may be something we take up towards the end of the year once the new website is launched first.

For discussion – Campaigning in a language other than English

Part 8 section 27(c) of the *Regulations* (R8.27(c)) prescribes:

No person shall campaign in a language other than English, except for printed material following an EO approved third-party translation.

In the 2018 Annual Elections, Karen Chau interpreted this provision to mean that the *Regulations* bar campaigning in a language apart from English, excepting printed material approved by the Electoral Officer. The term 'printed material' was broadly interpreted as to include things printed on paper (such as pamphlets and posters) and other materials (such as A frames). She interpreted this provision to not include online materials.

In the 2018 Annual Elections, Karen Chau also specifically sought a translator for Chinese language material. She also informed campaign managers that she would find someone else as an appropriate translator for another language. The translator verified material before they could be used at any point during the physical campaigning. In recommendation 3.2, which was accepted by the Council, Karen Chau recommended that the 2019 Electoral Officer should continue to appoint relevant third party translators for the quick verification of printed campaign materials in other languages to continue increasing accessibility of the Annual Elections for voters and campaigners.

In the 2018 EO Report, Karen Chau wrote:

Broadly, issues relating to other language campaigning can now be construed as a matter of accessibility, balanced against the risk of potentially defamatory behaviour that would be more difficult to detect. I call into question the current relevance of the latter part of that consideration, considering the high number of students at the University who are able to communicate in a number of languages other than English. It would require a large suspension of disbelief that any defamatory comment made in another language is so much harder to detect that it inherently gives any group of individuals or any campaigns an unreasonable advantage.

...

I do not otherwise have an opinion nor guidance as to whether this provision should be altered or allowed to stand, except to say that Council should consider whether addressing particular problem that this provision appeared to be addressing (defamatory statements in another language) outweighs its obvious exclusive affect upon students who may not have English as their first language. In practice, this provision is extremely hard to enforce with regard to online campaigning and communication, but relatively easily addressed when it occurs in a physical campaigning context.

Dane Luo and Caitlyn Chu read their report.

Caitlyn noted that there has been a lot of positive feedback from the WeChat posts.

Dane noted that the Caseworkers said that many students are eligible for Centrelink and other assistance and are not claiming it or don't know they're eligible and hopes that the upcoming Centrelink information event.

Jacky He asked if there were any questions for the Vice Presidents.

Lily Campbell asked why they were running a number of events around student welfare and Centrelink but not anything addressing the reasons why students are in these stressful situations to begin with and if the Vice Presidents intended to take a political position on these issues in order to fight for student rights.

Dane Luo responded saying that he thought Centrelink treats students and the general public awfully, and that there shouldn't be 90 minutes wait times, that it should have a proper working website. Dane Luo continued saying he wanted to draw attention to the interpretations at the bottom of his report with regard to printed materials in other languages. Dane noted the Karen Chau did not see online material as printed materials and therefore campaigning online in languages other than English was not allowed.

Lily Campbell spoke about the interpretation saying she believed that campaigning in other languages should be allowed beyond just printed materials, and that the idea that people would lie if allowed to speak in other languages is racist.

Dane Luo said he wanted to mention the history of this section of the electoral regulations noting that it was only added in 2009 when materials in other languages were found to be spreading misinformation and the recommendation at that time was to ban all campaigning in languages other than English, in 2017 this was altered to allow printed materials in languages other than English with a third-party translation provided.

Lily Campbell said there should be provisions made to allow for translators at booths and the Polling Booth Attendants should be able to understand what it being said.

Crystal Xu said that people should be allowed to speak in any language as long as they are engaging students to make the SRC more diverse.

Jiaqi (Abbey) Shi said that campaigning in other languages is allowed at other elections and should be allowed at SRC elections.

Alex Yang said that if campaigners were allowed to campaign in their own languages it would allow them to better express themselves and engage with voters.

Jiaqi (Abbey) Shi said it is needed to allow for better engagement with students.

Jack Mansell said that he had been involved in campaigns for a while not and had heard a number of inaccuracies being spread in English and that it was racist to suggest that people lie in other languages when people lie all the time anyway

Vinil Kumar drew attention to the SRC's new website citing concern that the SRC was working within the University of Sydney's infrastructure and that it was important that the SRC remain independent.

Dane Luo agreed that the SRC's independence was important and that it is and that the change lined up the website with the SRC's emails which the university has no control over.

Vinil Kumar said that the University often says that they aren't going to do something then do and that this was no guarantee of independence.

The Secretary to Council clarified that the University has no control over the SRC websites, emails or server and cannot get control over them, that the Administration Manager Chitra Narayanan manages out IT infrastructure and if the University wanted the SRC domain name they would have to get it the same way anyone wanting that domain name would, by buying it.

Swapnik Sanagavarapu noted he did not think it was good for the SRC to be associated with the university in anyway.

Dane Luo added that he had raised this in January and that the new address would make the SRC website easier to find as it was what is used for SRC emails already.

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

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Yuxyan Yang

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

N. Report of the General Secretaries

Niamh Callinan and Yuxuan Yang tabled a written report

Acquittal

The acquittal required by the University for last year's expenditure of the SRC's SAFF allocation was submitted on the 18th of March (last Monday). During the preparation of the acquittal, a significant amount of time was spent reading and cataloguing the work of last year's SRC, in particular the work undertaken by all Student Representatives. This was highly insightful as it was an opportunity to understand the progression of the SRC last year both in terms of projects and expenditure. Also, from this, there are a number of initiatives and projects run last year that will be expanded upon throughout this year as well, which provides us with a great platform to continue improving student representation of ongoing issues and build upon the momentum created through the hard work of the representatives last year. One challenge from writing the acquittal particularly in relation to Student Representative Stipends and Student Representative Projects was a limited amount of numerical data, particularly in regards to event turnout and collective growth. Therefore, throughout this year, we will try to collect and collate some

numerical data from various events, initiatives and projects from all OBs to ensure that next year's SRC executive have both qualitative and quantitative data to write the acquittal.

We would like to thank Dane for also assisting in writing the acquittal and Jacky for editing and submitting the acquittal.

Audit

A few weeks ago, Jacky, Dane and myself had a meeting with the Auditors, who took us through the accounts from the period of November 30st 2017 – November 31st 2018, and also December 31st 2017- December 31st 2018. The breakdown in income and expenditure over the last year, has been useful in understanding the financial side of the SRC and I would like to thank the Auditors for taking the time to answer our questions, explaining each item of income and expenditure and also providing us with some advice to better improve the financial direction of the SRC.

We would like to thank Chitra for all the work that went into organising the accounts for the Auditors Report, and also her ongoing support in providing advice regarding the accounts of the SRC.

Fortnightly Breakfasts

As part of the SRC's focus on Outreach Initiatives this year, we have decided to commence a breakfast held fortnightly throughout the remainder of this semester and hopefully semester 2 (this will be subject to evaluation dependent upon the success of the breakfasts in semester 1).

The provision of food and drinks for students is one requirement of SSAF and we believe that there are a number of reasons fortnightly breakfasts are a viable approach to this.

Firstly, many students due to various factors, skip breakfast which significantly affects the ability of anybody to full perform throughout the day. We would like to ensure that students who have not been able to access breakfast are provided with an opportunity to do so.

Secondly, we will be using these breakfasts as an opportunity for students to have face-to-face time with their SRC representatives and also with the caseworkers. The purpose of this is to increase awareness and accessibility to the SRC services and provide ongoing information to students about what the SRC is doing and gaining feedback as to what issues students would like to see the SRC advocating for.

Thirdly, we would like to invite each of the Student Representative Departments and Collectives to attend one breakfast each (depending on interest). The purpose of this is to enable each Department and Collective another opportunity to promote a particular project or event or alternatively just another opportunity to engage with students without the expense of providing food and drinks. The logic behind this is twofold; one to provide another platform that all Departments and Collectives have access to advocate issues they have identified, and secondly to have an increased engagement with students who may not be as engaged with the SRC due to various circumstances.

Expenditure for the Year

I have started working on a breakdown of this year's SRC budget. Whilst as has been mentioned on a variety of occasions we are unaware as to what the total amount of money the SRC has access to yet based on our SSAF application and what we will be allocated. However, I have started to research previous years' budgets, particularly in regards to the breakdown of allocated amounts given to the Departments and Collectives. In doing so I have started to collate an outline of the past 5 years as a rough indicator as to what each year has previously allocated. For me this

provides a precedent from previous Councils, however I alongside Yuxuan will be having further discussions with all OBs and Collectives regarding their specific plans for the year and asking them for a rough budget to be provided by around Mid-May. Our hope is that we will know for certain what our SSAF allocation is, and can start finalising each Department and Collectives budget by this time.

We would also like to note that we are also recording the amount each Department has spent monthly in order to keep track of where the expenditure is at. The purpose of this is to allow each department a track of how much they have spent and to also allow the executive to have a record of the funding we have approved each month has gone to.

SSAF

We are at the stage now where our SSAF application is being discussed at various committees including;

UE Student Life Committee

At this point, nothing is get confirmed regarding any of the student organisation projects, and we are in the process of presenting our projects at these committees to ensure that the SRC is able to obtain as much as possible out of the Contestable Resource Pool.

Also, what should be noted is that this year, unlike previous years, we will not have the opportunity to apply for additional funding mid-way through the year. This is due to changes in policy from the university regarding the Contestable Resource Pool. This means that instead of allowing student organisations, like ourselves to access additional amounts from this year's SSAF, the money will instead roll over to next year's contestable resource pool. Due to this we are working hard to receive as much funding from the Contestable Pool to support all SRC projects for this year.

Yuxuan Yang spoke to his report reading over the major points. Adding that the breakfast can also be used to promote SRC events, services and collectives, and that this year's SSAF allocation was not as large as it had been in the past.

Prudence Wilkins-Wheat asked what the student life committee was and why was there another committee for SSAF.

The Secretary to Council noted that it was a university committee not an SRC committee.

Lily Campbell asked what the acquittal was?

Secretary to Council clarified that the acquittal was the checking that the budgets were balanced at the end of the year.

Note: It was not said but it is in fact the process of showing that out funds are used correctly and meet the requirements set when the SSAF was allocated.

Ellie Stephenson asked why Yuxuan Yang had missed two of the Executive's meetings.

Yuxuan Yang said he was overseas for the first 2 meetings and he arrived late for another. He noted he believed everyone should attend all meetings.

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

Moved: Julia Kokic

Seconded: Dane Luo

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

N1. Report of the Standing Legal Committee

Minutes of the 1st meeting of the Standing Legal Committee held on the 1st April 2019 were circulated.

Motion: that the minutes of the Standing Legal Committee meeting be accepted.

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Gabi Stricker-Phelps

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

O. Report of Committees and Officers

O1. Report of the Education Officers

James Newbold and tabled a written report:

The Education Officers have been organising Education Action Group meetings, going to protests, working with other activist groups and other SRC office bearers over the last month on several important student issues.

EAG members supported the NTEU rally against the university's incompetent managerialism which is negatively impacting both students and staff. Thanks to all who attended the rally and congratulations to staff for incredible organising in a short period of time. The EAG stands with students and staff being sidelined by issues with the Anderson Stuart building, and with all students and staff affected by the changes to student services like the helpdesk (which have seen waiting times more than double). EAG officers and members have been attending NTEU campaign committee meetings to liaise with staff about cooperation on actions and campaigns.

The last university Senate meeting was noticeably quiet on the Ramsay Centre. Nevertheless, the Education Officers will be working with the NTEU on taking action against USyd's ongoing negotiations with the Ramsay Centre. In the wake of Ramsay Board Member John Howard's defense of convicted pedophile Cardinal George Pell, and conservative legitimisation of the Islamophobic violence in Christchurch, the elitist, neo-colonial and racist Ramsay Centre cannot go unchallenged on campus. We stand with staff against the university's managerialism and the university's pursuit of Ramsay's threats to academia and inclusive curricula.

As usual, the Education Officers are happy to continue working alongside other OBs and supporting them through organising, turnout and printing.

The Education Officers are pleased to report that action around public transport access for students – especially international students, part-time students and working class students – will

likely take place in conjunction with other universities, likely even from interstate. Public transport should be completely free and paid for by taxing the wealthy. We will fight for cheaper public transport for all students, but especially those most disadvantaged by the current pricing model.

Vinil Kumar said they were happy to hear about the ongoing work on the Ramsey Centre and wanted to ask the he noticed the education officer seemed too busy to attend the EAGs from campaigning for labor in the state election and wanted to know how that worked out.

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

Motion: Nick Forbutt

Seconded: Yuxuan yang

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

O2. Report of the Wom*n's Officers

Crystal Xu and Gabi Stricker-Phelps tabled a written report

International Women's Day Celebrations:

(a) *UN Women Volunteering:* The major theme of the IWD breakfast was #MorePowerfulTogether and there was a strong focus on violence against women not only in Australia but in the Pacific Region more broadly. This was particularly poignant after 13 women have died from violence in Australia this year alone as of 13 March. 2/3 women in the Pacific Region experience violence. It was inspiring to learn about and actively support the innovative and change-agent programs that UN Women are so committed to. The volunteers from USYD relayed to us that they found the training session and the morning to be a very informative, interesting and rewarding opportunity. The UN International Women's Breakfast Committee expressed thanks to the USYD Women volunteers and sent each volunteer a certificate of appreciation. We will continue to contact UN Women to see if any other volunteer opportunities arise throughout the year.

(b) *Screening of Period End of Sentence.*

The event was held in the New Law Room with approximately 20-25 guests. The following food was purchased for the event: The total amount spent on the event for catering purpose was approximately \$52.69.

Sanitary Item Project:

We have purchased our first batch of sanitary items. We consulted Mel who helped us source affordable sanitary items from Woolworths. We also spoke to Laura about the administration of the project. We thank both Mel and Laura for their support and assistance.

The total cost was \$32.95 including the following items:

- Woolworths Select Regular Pads x 2 = \$3.60
- Woolworths Select Super Pads x2 = \$3.60
- Woolworths Select Tampons Regular x10 = \$22.50
- Woolworths Select Tampons Super x1 = \$2.25
- 1x Reusable Bag for packaging = \$1.00

We are also working on designing an update for the box at the front of the SRC office which contains the sanitary items. We are expecting to spend between \$5-\$10 on this.

We intend to refill stock each month and will estimate amounts depending on the demand observed in the next few weeks especially as posters start to go around in aim of increasing awareness of the project.

Women's Health Week and Mental Health:

We are proposing a Women's Health Week from 6-9th of September 2019. This would involve health focused talks, information sessions and workshops or classes. Some of our ideas are listed below:

- Zumba Classes (with the Breakfast Club)
- Contraception and Sex Talks
- Self-defence classes
- Meditation and the art of mindfulness
- Understanding abortion and options for women seeking an abortion
- Nutrition talks
- Focusing on helping students (particularly students who are not from Sydney or do not live locally) access reliable and affordable health care services such as GPs, dentists and sexual health clinics.

We are liaising with the University of Sydney Health Service, Health Education Officer Officer, Miriam Deshayes, who we engaged with after the Safer Communities Advisory Meeting/ Miriam also wants the University Health Service to collaborate with SUPRA and the SRC for University Mental Health Day on the 7th of May. Her proposal for the day would be to have a stall on Eastern Avenue to encourage USYD students and staff to write down ways in which they can use their voice to inspire action, spark discussion and foster change around mental health on a community level. She is open to our ideas and suggestions as well.

There is also a free one-day training workshop called *Sticky Stuff* on Thursday 4 April on campus aiming to upskill youth service staff and peer educators to confidently engage with young people regarding sexual health. If you are interested in registering for this event and attending the workshop the following link is provided: <https://www.eventbrite.com.au/e/sticky-stuff-camperdown-april-2019-tickets-56293337889?aff=erelexpmlt>

External Events:

We have four event promotions which have been or will be promoted on our Facebook page:

- Vege-Table Mondays- Addison Road Community Centre Marrickville from 18th March
- Shared Table Project for Local Homeless Women: 28th March
- #Feminist Conversation between Roxane Gay and Christina Hoff Sommers 29th March (10% discount applies)
- Women's Legal Service: A feminist legal perspectives seminar based on the topic of "*Connecting Communities: A Project to Prevent Modern Slavery*" 10th April

The Shared Table event gave us the opportunity to meet and converse with 50 women from diverse backgrounds over plates of food and packing 'the Good box' for local homeless women.

We would like to adopt a similar event structure and invite 'The Good Box' to Sydney University to run a similar event bringing young women of different cultures together to help other women.

Meetings:

We met with Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence and Sophia Zeritis. It was a highly constructive meeting where we discussed our major project ideas, sexual assault and harassment policy and the ways in which the university can work with the SRC to deliver the best outcomes for USYD students. This was accompanied by a follow up meeting with Sophia Zeritis and the senior manager of diversity, leadership and inclusion department, Sarah Abbott, to discuss potential collaboration between the SRC and the university on promoting women health projects and leadership panels. We submitted a student survey result about university career services and pointed out several problem areas that the career centre could focus on including a lack of awareness of university career services and inconvenient location and office hours. In addition to working with them to improve such services particularly increasing accessibility for women and intentional students we also intend to run a panel discussion forum in Semester 2 with female alumni.

Female Journalism and Online Platform:

We met together with the following girls who responded to our call out including: Kate Scott, Holly McDonald, Amy Mifsud, Caroline Song, Angel Opie, Charlotte Plashik, Sonia Gao, Olivia-James Mckeown, Connie Zhang, Sarah Sekandar and Hannah Kingsmill. Together, with these women we are working on promoting women's issues and opinions via the platform, currently the infrastructure used is called the ENID network which was created two years ago by former USYD students who have since left university and are wanting us to continue the legacy of the site. This USYD Women committee are also attending lectures over the next few weeks to raise awareness about USYD Women and the projects we are running this year from the SRC office.

We are also seeking out women for the #WomenofUSYD project to share their stories and experiences.

Posters:

We have made contact with Maya Eswaran, the Women's portfolio holder on the USU in terms of how the USU and SRC may work together in promoting women's issues on campus. In particular, we would like to get our sanitary item posters printed and placed on the backs of bathroom doors around campus.

Additionally, we have made posters to gather contributors for the online platform, ENID, and also to promote the USYD Women Facebook Channel.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps said that as it's a written report, in the interest of time if the council would like to read through it and just ask questions, but added than in addition to the report they had been contacted about a free event around sexual health and that they are working on a career and mentoring development program with University administration to put students in touch with interested alumnus. And that the Sanitary Project was going well and was benefitting from the extra promotion.

Crystal Xu added that she was getting feedback from students for the university careers centre so if there were any areas you think need improvements for student to get in touch. She added that the meeting with the women in Journalism was very inspiring with lot of different views and perspectives as feminists to guide us on dealing with women's issues at the university.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps added that they had been invited by Future Women to an event called Her Vote, on women running for parliament, and that there were free tickets available for anyone interested.

Lily Campbell noted that there was a terrible result for women of NSW at the state election with relation to the decriminalisation of abortion. And asked what the women's officers view on abortion rights were and if they would be front and centre in their work as it will be by the women's collective. Adding that as there was a protest on the day of the unborn child that was run by the collective and there are people in the room who do not agree on women's right to choose she wanted the women's officers to clarify their positions.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps said that she was pro-choice and that we should be fighting for decriminalisation and fighting for a woman's right to choose. Adding that there was a motion on this later in the agenda and she commended that motion to council. Gabi also noted that the Women's Electoral Commission have contacted her saying they will be having a statement come out on this issue later and they are keen for the SRC to show support for that.

Crystal Xu said she had no issues with legalising abortion and that is was an important health servers for women to have access to but understood that some religions have issues with it and that should be respected.

Elli Stephenson noted that one the women's health talks there is a discussion on nutrition and that these areas are fraught and it need to be ensured that these talks are friendly to vulnerable groups such as those who have experience with eating disorders and fat shaming.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps said that she agreed that that should be at the forefront when putting the women's health day talks together and added it would be lovely to get some support for putting things together for the universities mental health day.

Jazzlyn Breen noted that the women's health day seemed very similar to Radical Sex and Consent week sun by the USU which has been reduced to one days this year. She asked why the women's officer are doing a new day that's more 'small L' liberal, and not collaborate with Radicle Sex and Consent Week and? Jazzlyn concluded by saying that the women's officers shouldn't take credit for the sanitary items being available at the SRC as they have been available for years.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps said she had spoken to USU women's officer Maya Eswaran about the women's health day and that it was being planned in conjunction the pre-existing Women's Health Week and was intended

to piggy back of that. She also added that the sanitary items were now being provided out of the Women's Officers budget not general SRC funds as they had been in the last

Jazzlyn Breen retorted that this was a budget stolen from the women's collective when autonomy was not recognised.

Motion: that the report of the Women's Officers be accepted.

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Yuxuan Yang

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Prudence Wilkins-Wheat, and Layla Mkhayber noted their dissent.

In line with the regulations the council took a 15 at break after 2.5 hours

At 9:14 there was a 15-minute break.

At 9:16 Jiaqi Shi proxies to Declan Godwin

At 9:19 Alex Yang proxies to Vinil Kumar

At 9:20 Daniel Hu proxies to Sophie Hastan

There was a quorum count at 9:31

The meeting was found quorate

The meeting resumed at 9:32

O3. Report of the Disabilities Officers

Over the past month, we have started running the Disabilities collective. We had our first social event on Friday March 8 at 5 pm at Courtyard where we invited new members to get to know other collective members. We want to extend our welcome to all our new members, and we hope to run some more events soon.

We are also looking at getting a space on campus for students and staff with disability. Students with disability can be incredibly isolated especially when they don't know others like them. We believe that having a disabilities space would be beneficial for the social inclusion, mental health and wellbeing of disabled students on campus. This space would need to be accessible and could potentially be in the old Queer Space in Holme Building. We have contacted the USU about finding a space and plan to follow up on it.

As you are all aware, we have submitted two Regulation Changes for this meeting which are in the Notice of Meeting.

1. SRC Regulations amendment regarding *Disabled Honi*.

Last year we were excited to have the first disability edition of *Honi Soit*. We hope to continue this and have it stipulated in the SRC Regulations. We value disabled-led activism and literature and hope the SRC can give disabled students a voice.

2. Motion: Amendment to the SRC Regulations regarding the Disabilities Officers

We believe that the current affirmative action provisions are inadequate. Firstly, while carers are important to many disabled students, they are not infallible. There is a long and fraught history of carers speaking over and on behalf of disabled people. As disabled students, we believe that only disabled students should represent us. This is not to say that we are infallible, nor that we can represent students of every disability, but that we should be aiming to increase disabled voices, including “nothing about us without us”, a phrase that began in disability activism in the 1990s. As such we would like to change the Regulations so that it is clear that we represent disabled students and not carers. And that the affirmative action provisions allow for a broader definition of disability recognising as per the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), “that disability is an evolving concept and that disability results from the interaction between persons with impairments and attitudinal and environmental barriers that hinders their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.”

We would like to thank the Disabilities officers last year, including Robin Eames for their contribution to the motions and to Dane and Julia for their help.

As always, we welcome new members into our collective who have disabilities including mental, chronic, or terminal illnesses; people who are neurodivergent; and people who are D/deaf or hard of hearing, even if they don’t identify as disabled or as having a disability.

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

Motion: Layla Mkhayber

Seconded: Jazzlyn Breen

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

O3. Report of the Sexual Harassment Officers

TALK WITH USU OFFICIALS AROUND SEXUAL ASSULT POLICY

1. Jazz had a meeting with exec members of SHADES, and USU clubs and societies officials to discuss the problem of sexual assaulters in clubs and societies placing a risk to members. Without proper avenues to expel them, or proper training for exec members to deal with this issue, this problem will only get worse. Follow up meetings have been made to continue discussions and create change around this.

INTERNATIONAL WOMENS DAY

1. We painted a banner for the IWD rally, many WoCo members attended this event in the SRC. The message on the banner highlights the women’s collective’s commitment to solidarity which all kinds of women, especially those who are particularly disadvantaged.
2. We attended the IWD rally as a collective.
3. Layla performed poetry at an IWD youth event.
4. Jazz co-hosted a segment on 2ser FM radio on IWD to promote the work of the women’s collective.

SNAP RALLY AGAINST LIFE CHOICES

1. Life choices, an anti-choice group on campus held their annual ‘life week’ on eastern avenue. We were contacted anonymously beforehand letting us know that they would have an event on eastern avenue at some point during the week. When we found out

exactly when and where it was, we called a snap rally, attracting a large crowd of people all opposed to the abhorrent message of the stall. Speakers at the rally spoke out against the dangerous and pseudo-scientific rhetoric being shared by life choices.

2. We had 40+ people attend at 30 minutes' notice and the rally was covered by Honi Soit and Pulp.

DAY OF THE UNBORN CHILD

1. The annual 'day of the unborn child' protest was held at St. Mary's cathedral on Sunday the 24th. As always, it was attended by the alt right, known fascists, anti-choice fanatics and your usual hyper catholic families who somehow think it's their place to tell other people what to do with their bodies. The rally went well, with numbers on our side increased from last year, which is a trend we have seen each year the rally is held.
2. We had many speakers share their experiences and opinions on the topic, and filmed these to make into a campaign video eventually. We marched to NSW parliament house with a banner petition to take our message to the newly elected members of NSW parliament.
3. We emailed and posted a media release, which was successful in spreading the coverage of our rally onto all media platforms. We were interviewed for radio and print.
4. In attendance at the rally were women's officers from UNSW, MQU, UON and the SRC presents of UNSW and UOW. As well as our own SRC's representatives and members from ACAR, the disabilities collective, the enviro collective and QuAC.

WATER RUN

1. Jazz spent a weekend traveling up to north west NSW to deliver water to towns affected by water mismanagement and drought. Please donate to this ongoing campaign via the FIRE (fighting in resistance equally) Facebook page.

RALLY ATTENDANCE

2. Contingents were sent to; the climate strike, the vigil at the NZ consulate in the wake of Christchurch, ACAR's event "stand with Muslims: Campus speak out against fascist terror" and the NTEU staff vs management rally.

NOWSA

3. NOWSA is an annual feminist conference which is in the process of being organised in Sydney. It will be held at Macquarie university. We are in contact with other women's officers and women's collectives from different universities to organise this.

MEETINGS

4. We have continued to have weekly meetings with high attendance of members, in which we discuss and plan our upcoming actions and events. We are very excited for the rest of the year, working with the incredible collective of people we have involved.

See our Facebook, Instagram and Twitter profiles for regular updates on our day to day activities. Photos available in appendix 1.

Jazzlyn Breen and Layla Mkhayber spoke to their report highlighting the major point and adding some extra detail such as: there was a number of pseudoscientific information and images being presented which were misleading; The Collective's Facebook page had 17000 interactions after the protest for the day of the unborn child and collective attendance has been between 10 and 30 members each week. It was also noted that Layla Mkhayber has been working with the women's officer at Macquarie and other universities in preparation for NOSWA.

Jazzlyn Breen said that they were in the process of finalising their budget requests and that the collective has members attend fEMPOWER training which is a program which goes out to high schools and talks about feminism. She added that they had also contacted them about the Future Women: Her Vote event and offered the collective tickets, and that the women contacting was a former collective member. Jazzlyn also noted that they had also been working with the Environment collective on the community garden which donates produce to a local homeless shelter kitchen.

Jazzlyn Breen and Layla Mkhayber added they were disappointed at the lack of communication from the executive with regards to the women's collective funding. Adding that they do a lot of work and aren't paid, they both work and study full time as well as doing their officers duties, adding that the work they are doing would normally be paid but they were rolled by this SRC for the Women's Officer role and as such are overworked, tired and unpaid.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps asked that since in the regulations organising NOWSA is one of the women's Officer duties and the Collective have made it clear they do not wish to work with the Women's Officers can they assist on that.

Jazzlyn Breen said the Women's Officers were welcome to ask the Macquarie officers who were organising it but doubted they would want to work with them.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps added she thought it was unfair to suggest that the Sexual Harassment Officers were doing more than the Women's Officers.

Jazzlyn Breen said that the evidence they were could be seen by comparing the two reports and the hours that the Sexual Harassment Officers were in the SRC Offices compared to the Women's Officers.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps disagreed with that assessment.

Zac O'Farrell asked what the sexual Harassment officers defined as pseudoscientific rhetoric?

Jazzlyn Breen responded that showing a foetus at 12 days as though it has arms and legs when it is in fact the smaller than an apple seed.

Zac O'Farrell said that no such images were shown at the Life Choices stall.

Jazzlyn Breen clarified that she was unable to see the content herself and was going off what others had told her was there and that she considered USyd reproductive researchers a better source on women's bodies than Life Choices.

Zac O'Farrell said that what was at the Life Choices stall was scientific and she shouldn't claim it wasn't if she didn't see it.

Jazzlyn Breen noted that she was unable to see the content as Life Choice has decided to put her through misconduct as so wasn't able to get close enough to inspect, but feel free to ask those who were.

Zac O'Farrell said that he thought it was interesting that the Sexual Harassment Officers were confident to condemn what they had not seen and that all the claims made by Life Choices were backed up by peer reviews articles some of which were from the Harvard Medical School.

Jazzlyn Breen said that you can distort facts to suit your arguments.

Zac O'Farrell added he thought that they were quick to attack things they had not read.

Jazzlyn Breen said that they did not agree on this issue and she did not want to continue this conversation.

Vinil Kumar asked when people are concerned about scientific rigour in relation to pro-choice arguments are they concerned about scientific rigour or controlling women's bodies.

Jazzlyn Breen said she felt it was more the latter.

Vinil Kumar asked if Jazzlyn has seen concern for women's health and well-being in pro-life arguments

Jazzlyn Breen said she had not.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps said that there were a lot of things in the women's room of the SRC and did the Sexual Harassment Officer want help in cleaning it up.

Layla Mkhayber said that it was mostly women's collective things and while they were aware of WHS issues with the room they were working with the SRC WHS officer on that and that the room was for all non-male identifying officers of the SRC.

Jazzlyn Breen noted she would be hesitant to let the Women's Officers help with the clean-up in light of what happened in the Office Bears Room.

Motion: that the report of the Sexual Harassment Officers be accepted.

Motion: Prudence Wilkins-Wheat

Seconded: Shaan Patel

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Procedural motion to move to Q motions on notice

Moved: Jazzlyn Breen

Seconded: James Ardouin

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q. Motions of Notice

Q1. Condemnation of Bettina Arndt's attack on university students.

Content warning – sexual assault and victim blaming

Summary of points raised in this motion

- Arndt's rhetoric is damaging to student welfare in a variety of ways.
- Arndt's rhetoric is detrimental to the mental health and general safety of sexual assault survivors who attend university.
- Arndt's rhetoric is one which must not go unchallenged on university campus.

On Wednesday the 27th of February, infamous 'sex therapist' and 'defender of men' Bettina Arndt was on university of Sydney Camperdown campus and within the university residential colleges handing out flyers titled "MALE college students - warning, the system is stacked against you". The information within these flyers contained blatant lies and misinformation, demonising the work of women's collectives and feminist activists around the country in fighting against the high prevalence of sexual assault in a university setting. Bettina has misconstrued the fight against rape culture as a 'fight against men' in general. She lists the problems men supposedly face when they are accused of sexual assault as of greater cause for action than the impact on the mental health and physical damage done to survivors. She claims that the real problem facing students is instances of "fake rape accusations", however within this she rejects the majority of the legal definition of rape as counting as "real rape". Her rhetoric is damaging to the recovery of those who have experienced instances of sexual assault, and undermines the work done to make campus a safer place for all, students regardless of gender.

The facts are stacked against Bettina's cause, with men actually being 230 times more likely to be raped than falsely accused of rape, and 94% of sexual assault survivors experiencing some form of PTSD related stress. It's incredibly clear that this is a much larger problem than the potentially ruined high paying legal jobs of accused rapists.

Just today I became aware that around 30% of disclosures to the university are made by male identifying students. Bettina's cause as a 'defender of men' does not take this into account at all.

The problem of 'rape culture' on university campuses has been outlined in great detail through independent reports into the issue, such as the Broderick review and the red zone report, there is no denying that there is a massive problem when you look at the facts and statistics.

Bettina has a long history of pushing a dangerous agenda in relation to the issue of sexual assault. The University of Western Australia's student guild's women's department summed it up well in a

statement which they released in opposition to a planned talk by Bettina on their university campus, which went ahead tonight.

“Bettina's commentary perpetuates several harmful myths about sexual violence:

1. A 15-year-old girl groomed and sexually molested by her 58-year old maths teacher was labelled “sexually provocative” by Arndt. Arndt implied victims of child sex offences “exploit their seductive power to ruin the lives of men”. As we know, legally minors cannot consent. (SOURCE: <https://www.news.com.au/.../.../d7cec55508471578898d7163393f2bc1>)

2. Arndt has implied that measuring rape as including as being sexually penetrated “when you were drunk, high, drugged or passed out and unable to consent” was “inflating” rape statistics. She also writes that a definition of rape that includes being “forced, coerced or tricked into sexual acts against their will, or without their consent, including when they have withdrawn themselves” is a “loose definition” that again inflates statistics (though it is in fact the law). This perpetuates a harmful mentality of victim-blaming.

(SOURCE: <http://www.bettinaarndt.com.au/.../uploa.../Campaign-of-Fear.pdf>)

3. She suggests that young men will be discouraged from attending university and perpetuates the myth of high rates of false rape allegations (in reality, the rate for all fake sexual assault allegations sits between 2 and 10% for the entire community). This contributes to the barriers that face survivors in reporting sexual assault. The Australian Human Rights Commissions report found that a common barrier was not wanting to cause trouble or impact the perpetrator’s life.

(SOURCE: <http://www.bettinaarndt.com.au/.../uploads/In-The-Accusers-Fa...>)

4. She states that “Sexual consent courses should teach ‘don’t get raped’ as well as ‘don’t rape’”.

The Change the Course Report identifies the prevalence of victim-blaming as a key barrier to reporting their experience in the first place. The second recommendation of the report requires universities to provide education to change these harmful attitudes. She minimises survivor's experience of sexual assault as "regret sex"

(SOURCE: <http://www.bettinaarndt.com.au/.../sexual-consent-yes-no-may.../>)”

Bettina’s dangerous rhetoric is exemplary of the political right’s continued attack on the liberty, freedom and liberation of women around the world. While Bettina is nothing but a ‘has been’ low grade celebrity, the crowd of supporters she has gathered are the real risk to students’ safety. A group of people determined to undermine all efforts of feminist activists who are just trying to make the world a safer place for women.

Bettina is not only dangerous in her anti-feminist rhetoric spread on campus, but also in her personal attacks of university students online. Last week she posted photos and personal details of myself and Layla onto her Facebook page, including information about my degree which is not publicly available without a lot of digging. This, as she intended, opened the both of us up to attacks from her followers which threatened our personal safety and greatly affected our mental health. This is not the first time this has happened to a university of Sydney student, and it is essential that we stand against these kinds of dangerous attacks against individuals who do not share her views.

Bettina is also currently trying to put people through the universities misconduct system for simply attending a protest organised against a talk she gave on campus last year. I find it ironic that a self-proclaimed free speech warrior is trying to silence those who oppose her views.

As I have described, Bettina Arndt is a danger to the safety and wellbeing of students on university campuses around Australia.

I hope as a council we agree that this problem needs to be addressed. We recognise the discrimination which affects women in a material way on university campus and in real life. And that we agree that one rape is too many, and that we won't stop fighting until we have won.

I hope that this council will see this to be the problem it is, and also realise that condemnation of rhetoric is not a violation of free speech, rather an active use of it in defending the safety of others.

I call on the University of Sydney student representative council to

1. Fully condemn Bettina's actions of on university campus to spread dangerous propaganda.
2. Fully condemn the rhetoric in which she undermines the work of feminist activists in trying to make campus a safer place for women and non-binary students.
3. Acknowledge that victim blaming rhetoric is dangerous to student welfare on a multitude of levels.
4. Stand against Bettina in all her future endeavours on university campuses.
5. Stand in solidarity with the University of Western Australia's student guild in their fight against Bettina's talk on their campus.
6. Post this motion in full on the university of Sydney SRC Facebook page to pledge public support for feminist activism, and to stand against Bettina Arndt and her followers.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying that Bettina Arndt came onto campus handing out leaflet that blamed women for their sexual assault and vile things like that, and it come from a move from the right to attack women and their rights. She told the council that just recently in Canada a man killed people saying it was part of an "incel" (involuntarily celibate) movement and that he was inspired by the words of Jordan Peterson. Lily continued that this motion was about free speech as there are a number of student going through misconduct for a protest against Arndt, and that was not a challenge to others free speech as challenging ideas with counters is not preventing free speech. Concluding that challenging this rhetoric is necessary.

James Ardouin spoke to the motion saying that the men who allegedly trespassed on the colleges are being investigated and I hope they are found out. Adding that what they distributed was foul and disgusting and that, as Jazzlyn Breen has said in before, "every rape is one rape too many".

Gabi Stricker-Phelps commended the motion to council adding that she was supportive of the movers and the work they do.

Maddie Powell spoke to the motion saying that misogyny doesn't trespass on the colleges it is bread there. And that if you are against the words spread by those men you need to see why the colleges were targeted by them and it is because they reflect those same sentiments.

James Ardouin said that he strongly believes in cultural renewal at the colleges but understands that there will be very different opinions on the extent of the outcome of that renewal.

Moved: Jazz Breen

Seconded: Venkata Sai

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q2. SRC visibility

Preamble

It is highly concerning that a large proportion of undergraduate students do not know about the Student Representative Council. The SRC is here to represent, advocate for and help promote the safety and wellbeing of all undergraduate USYD students regardless of their background. The free caseworker and legal services that the SRC provides should be common-knowledge of all students at the University of Sydney. We should also be attempting to spread awareness about how students can write for our student publications to enable voicing of a diverse range of student opinion and creativity. Many students also seem not to know where the SRC office is located limiting their ability to access our services. As a Council, we need to have a discussion on how we can assist the executive in their efforts to raise awareness about the SRC.

Action

- (1) All Representatives make an effort to talk about the SRC to other students whether this be informally or through more formal mechanisms such as before lectures.
- (2) Members of Council seek out resources from the SRC Executive and staff in order to help them raise the SRC's visibility.
- (3) The SRC works with the University on ways in which the University can promote awareness regarding the existence of services we provide and how to contact their elected student representatives, particularly to first year students.

The Chair moved a procedural motion to set the speaking time to 1 minute.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

The Chair moved a procedural motion that there be a limit of six speakers per motion.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Dane spoke to the motion and that it was important to engage with as many students as possible

Grace Bowskill said she thought it was funny that the movers thought that face painting would make people care about issues and that instead they should be promoting events like the Christchurch vigil and standing up for students' rights.

Vinil Kumar said that in light of what was happening it was has been going on and that the SRC has done nothing it's pretty awful to have a self-congratulatory motion, there's nothing to celebrate.

Moved: Gabi Stricker-Phelps

Seconded: Dane Luo

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q3. SRC Regulations amendment regarding *Disabled Honi*

In 2018, we produced the very first special disability edition of *Honi Soit*. We hope to see *Disabled Honi* flourish in future years, and so its existence should be stipulated in the SRC Regulations.

Platform

1. The SRC recognises the value of disabled-led activism and literature.
2. The SRC affirms its commitment to supporting the Disabilities Collective to produce an annual special disability issue of *Honi Soit*.

Action

1. The SRC will add the following to Part 6 Section 4 of the *Regulations*:

(j) One issue of *Honi Soit* each year shall be titled *Honi Soit Disabilities Edition (Disabled Honi)* and shall be organised as follows:

(i) The Disabilities edition of *Honi Soit* shall, where possible, be organised to coincide with Disability Inclusion Week.

(ii) In the two editions prior to the copy deadline for the Disabilities edition, a notice advertising a place and time for meeting of any interested disabled students to be involved in the writing, production and layout of the Disabilities Edition shall be placed in *Honi Soit*.

(iii) The issue shall be coordinated by the Disabilities Officers and edited by an open collective of interested disabled students.

Procedural motion to move straight to a vote

Moved: Layla Mkhayber

Seconded: Prudence Wilkins-Wheat

the motion was put and **CARREID**

Moved: Wilson Huang

Seconded: Hayden Moon

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q4. Amendment to the SRC Regulations regarding the Disabilities Officers

The SRC's affirmative action provisions currently specify that 'The Disabilities Officers shall identify as having a disability, or as having a long-term chronic illness, or as being directly affected by disability rights issues such as being a carer'.

As of 2018 the Disabilities Collective is autonomous to disabled students, and there is a concurrent Caregivers Network for students who are carers.

While the Disabilities Officers should still be responsible for the Caregivers Network, carers cannot and should not be responsible for representing disabled students unless they are also disabled themselves.

Carers are part of our community, and the best of them are our valued comrades and allies. At the same time, there is a long and fraught history of carers speaking over and on behalf of disabled people, as if their proximity to disability gives them more insight into the subject than people who are actually disabled. Disabled people are also at disproportionate risk of violence from family members and caregivers, so much so that the Autistic Self Advocacy Network keeps a record of disabled people who are murdered by relatives and caregivers, and holds an annual day of mourning, in part to combat the irresponsible media coverage that sympathises with the murderers over the victims. The capitalist exploitation of unpaid labour by carers is defended at all costs, to the extent where carers are valorised and martyred even when they are abusive, and their voices are raised above the voices of disabled people who are then framed as voiceless and without agency.

It is unfortunately common for abled people to use their proximity to disabled people to speak over us on issues of disability justice. Scott Morrison, for example, has repeatedly used his disabled brother-in-law as [media leverage](#) and to defend his atrocious budget decisions around the National Disability Inclusion Scheme.

Disabled students cannot be adequately represented by abled students, and it is inappropriate for the office bearers of a marginalised collective to be people who do not share that marginalised identity.

Platform

1. The SRC recognises that disabled students must be represented by office bearers who share their marginalisation.
2. The SRC affirms its commitment to principles of disability justice, including “nothing about us without us”, a phrase that began in disability activism in the 1990s.

Action

1. The SRC will amend Part 1 Section 3 (a) (xiii) of its *Regulations* to:

Omit “Two Disabilities and Carers Officers”
And substitute “Two Disabilities Officers”

2. The SRC will amend Part 1 Section 4 (i) of its *Regulations* to:

Omit “The Disabilities Officers shall identify as having a disability, or as having a long-term chronic illness, or as being directly affected by disability rights issues such as being a carer.”

And substitute “The Disabilities Officers shall be students who have a disability, defined by

the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) as “those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.” This includes but is not limited to people with mental, chronic, or terminal illnesses; people who are neurodivergent; people who are blind or partially sighted; and people who are D/deaf or hard of hearing.”

Procedural to move straight to a vote:

Moved: Layla Mkhayber

Seconded: Swapnik Sanagavarapu

the motion was put and **CARRIED**

Moved: Wilson Huang

Seconded: Hayden Moon

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q5. Free, safe abortion on demand!

Preamble

1. Approximately one third to one quarter of all women in Australia will have an abortion in their lifetime. Access to safe abortions is a matter of health and autonomy, and should be considered a fundamental right.
2. Despite decades of activism and popular support (surveys show support for legal abortion in Australia has remained around 83% since 2004), politicians lag behind the public on this issue and abortion remains illegal or inaccessible in most of the country.
3. For example, abortion remains on the criminal code in New South Wales. People seeking abortions - and their doctors - can face up to ten years' imprisonment if the abortion is not deemed 'necessary' for their mental or physical health. In Queensland, the recent victory for abortion legalisation is marred by a clause that allows doctors to object on 'moral' grounds and refuse to perform the procedure.
4. Where abortion is legal, it is often inaccessible. Abortion is legal in Tasmania, however the last clinic to provide abortion services closed last year. In Queensland, a mere two clinics - one in Townville and one in Rockhampton - service the entire state outside of the largest metropolitan areas. Abortion is also not fully subsidised by Medicare, leaving working class and rural women to spend exorbitant amounts on travel, accommodation and the procedure itself.
5. Denying the right to abortion is a key pillar of right wing conservatism and misogyny. A key example is Sydney's yearly 'Day of the Unborn Child' mass, in which a coalition of religious conservatives and right-wingers gather to denounce abortion. Another example is the presence of anti-abortion group Life Choice on this campus and others. Both of these

forces have been met with anti-sexist activists from this SRC organising counter-demonstrations so that their misogyny does not go unchallenged.

Platform

1. The University of Sydney SRC supports unequivocally the right of women to exercise full control over their bodies.
2. The SRC recognises that abortion is a human right and supports free, legal abortion on demand.
3. The SRC demands the decriminalisation of abortion in New South Wales.
4. The SRC condemns anti-abortion forces and their conservative, sexist disregard for women's health and autonomy.

Action

1. This motion will be shared from the SRC Facebook page.
2. The SRC will support campaigns that demand the decriminalisation of abortion through, though not limited to, sharing posts on social media, printing resources and press releases.
3. The SRC will support counter-demonstrations against measures seeking to restrict access to abortion and the outfits which support them.

Procedural motion to open up the speaking time and list for Q5.

Moved: James Ardouin

Seconded: Zac O'Farrell

the procedural was put and **CARRIED.**

Holly Hayne spoke to her motion saying that the SRC should be involved in political action in the defence of student's rights. 80% of Australians are for legal abortion, but it's still illegal. Adding that there are a lot of students who are appalled that Life Choices are on campus.

Maddie Powell waved her speaking rights to Layla Mkhayber.

Layla Mkhayber said that the council should support this motion and that you can't ban abortion as a whole, only safe abortion. Adding that if you are 'Pro-life' then what are you doing for children in off shore detention, or Aboriginal Children being taken away from their mothers?

Harriet (???) spoke to the to the motion and brought up comments made by Zac O'Farrell during the Sexual Harassment Officers report with regards to the content of the Life Choices information's credentials. Harriet said that she had just looked up the Harvard Medical School and has already found 5 articles that were pro-choice, one saying that abortion is safer than wisdom tooth extraction. She echoed Layla Mkhayber's comments saying that this is about access to safe abortion and that women have a human right to control their own bodies and not just be used by men for children and be cut off from social systems that are more easily accessible to men.

Prudence Wilkins-Wheat spoke to the motion saying that anyone who is pro-life is a slave to sexist rhetoric and that for those that life begins at conception, if having a physical body is all that is required to give you rights why can't come have their rights? Adding that the only person who has spoken from a pro-life stance tonight has been a man. She concluded saying that women have the right to control their bodies and we should be standing up for women so they feel free and safe to make that decision about their own bodies.

James Ardouin spoke to the motion saying that he recognised this is not an issue that affects men but that he thought it was important that men support women. James added that he believed that women have the right to choose and that the pro-life argument was based in a religious view and that he was from a secular group and it was not reasonable to impose religious beliefs on a secular issue. He concluded commending the motion to council.

Gabi Stricker-Phelps commended the motion to council and intended to do more on this issue as Women's Officer this year.

Zac O'Farrell spoke against the motion and wanted to clarify some point specifically regarding the Life Choices on campus. He said that comments suggesting that being pro-life was wanting suppress women's rights and bodily autonomy was a slur and he wanted to speak against that assumption. He continued saying that both sides of the debate needed to listen to each other more, he agreed that that some of the rhetoric put forward by pro-life supporters was inappropriate but that was not exemplary of everyone with pro-life beliefs. He clarified that the Harvard Medical School Article raise in the Sexual Harassment Officers report was not done to say that there were not pro-choice articles but that the materials presented at the stall were peer reviewed. He added that the aim of Life Choices was not to prevent procedures but to provide women with support, they do this by working with an organisation called Diamond Women's Support in Redfern which provides counselling support for women and that unless women are able to access those counselling and resources it's not a real choice. Zac Concluded that this debate could use more introspection from both sides and knowing what Life Choices is actually about.

Laura Glase spoke against the motion noting that she was the only woman doing so and that it wasn't a religious perspective. She said that she found the assertion that being pro-life was a sexist standpoint offensive to her, and that while she has seen a lot of sexism she has never seen it in the pro-life community. She continued saying that Human and women's rights begin in the womb, and that you cannot have human rights without a human life. She concluded that a baby has a cardiovascular system at 22 days and at 12 weeks it has a separate life system, it might be dependent on the mother but it is a separate life system.

Gina Alias spoke to the motion saying that this isn't about religion, it's political, it's sexism, and when women aren't given access to safe abortion that is oppression. She continued saying that if women cannot control when and if they want children, at what point is a woman no longer human but a few cells are? She continued noting how much labour goes into having children, it's cost and how that can oppress women and that women who are a part of the ruling class and upholding these institutions aren't helping women and they are sexist. She asked that if pro-life supporters care so much about human life why are they doing about the stolen generation? Gina concluded saying that they only care about life when it is in the womb.

Maddie Powel spoke to the motion countering the argument that because an article is peer reviewed it is legitimised noting that eugenics was once considered scientifically sound. She continued saying that women are not walking wombs but are people, and the pro-life perspective cared about control not life. She asked where the outrage at the catholic church for its role in covering up child sexual abuse was? Or the outrage at the dead children underneath churches who were stolen from their mothers by pro-lifers and killed? She said that those who thought that life begins at conception seem to believe it also ends at 9 months. Maddie noted that all parties in all states have failed women and that when a greens senator in South Australia put forward a motion that women shouldn't need two doctors' opinions in order to get an abortion it was a women put forward to argue against that proposal, showing women can be sexist and oppressive to other women. Maddie concluded that abortion is never truly banned it just stops being safe and women die without access to safe abortion.

Sophie Hastan spoke to the motion saying that people often say disappointed but not surprised, but she was not disappointed she was outraged. Continuing Sophie said that the far-right have been moving to block abortion and using misogyny as a form of social control. Adding that it was the fault of everyone in government who has allowed as well as pushed for this far-right rhetoric. Sophie concluded saying that legalising abortion has been a popular policy for years and that Ireland ran as successful campaign for their right to abortion and that was in a deeply catholic country, and that fight has now moved to Northern Ireland.

Eli Stephenson said that people without a uterus don't need to speak about this issue but reminded council that trans and non-binary people also need abortions and the pregnancy can create serious gender dysphoria for some people. Adding that no being had the right to be insides someone's body in any capacity without their consent. If you believe in minor acceptations to abortion such as with rape or incest then you don't believe in the universal right to life you believe in the subordination of others.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that while the issue doesn't directly affect him, seeing how confident men are to speak against women's rights and as a man he felt she should speak up for women's rights and bodily autonomy. Adding that this has been an issue since the industrial revolution which forced women to take on the responsibility of creating the next generation of worker and is still the case that women are under paid and kept out of sully participating in society and are not allowed to be equal participants. Echoing Sophie Haslan Vinil Kumar noted this was not a religious issue when catholic majority countries like Ireland support the right to abortion. Concluding that you are either in support of women's rights or not, and that SRC should be in support of women's right to access abortion.

Prudence Wilkins-Wheat spoke to the motion saying that everyone has said what she wanted to but assed that denying women access to abortion is sexism, sex takes two people and men can just walk away and yet some suggest women should be left with 9 months of labour and a life time of care work, if you think that you have been indoctrinated with sexist ideas regardless of your gender.

Mover: Holly Hayne

Seconder: Madeleine Powell

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

Zac O'Farrell, William Olive and Laura Glase noted their dissent.

Q6. No to Islamophobia! Solidarity with the Muslim community in Christchurch.

Preamble

1. On the 15th of March 2019, a far-right terrorist murdered 51 men, women and children at the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch. This attack was premeditated and deliberately targeted at the Muslim community during the Friday prayers that many were attending at the two mosques.
2. This Islamophobic attack represents a horrific escalation in the confidence of the far right, who in recent years have been attempting to organize and mobilise their supporters around vicious racism against Muslims. This growing confidence has manifested in the form of organisations such as Reclaim Australia, The United Patriots Front, the True Blue Crew, Antipodean Resistance and has seen numerous far right demonstrations in the streets of major Australia cities and regional towns, as well as Nazi propaganda in public places targeted at Muslims, migrants, refugees, and the African, Jewish and Chinese communities. A racist far right fringe has also emerged in state and federal parliaments in the form of Pauline Hanson, ex-Labor leader turned One Nation senator Mark Latham and former One Nation senator Fraser Anning, who disgustingly attempted to blame this massacre on Muslim migration.
3. These instances of Islamophobia are not isolated. Muslim people are regularly vilified and harassed in public places, Mosques are vandalized with racist and fascist graffiti, Muslim women are attacked for choosing to wear Hijabs and Niqabs and Muslim prayer rooms have been vandalized on university campuses, including at the University of Sydney.
4. This Islamophobia and racism has been legitimized and driven by a two-decade long campaign of scapegoating and fear-mongering by both Liberal and Labor governments who, in conjunction with state institutions and the media, have presented Muslims, refugees and migrants as a constant threat to Australian society and have sought to blame these minority groups for social problems such as crumbling infrastructure and rising poverty. This is the climate that has legitimized suspicion, harassment and violence against Muslim people.
5. The Australian government has been a supporter of and an active participant in wars and military interventions into the Middle east and around the world. Decades of Western intervention have destroyed Muslim majority countries including Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Palestine, Bahrain, Nigeria, Mali and more. These wars have required and reinforced Islamophobia across the West. No politician has ever been held to account for these acts of violence committed against the Muslim world and this gives legitimacy to anti-Muslim violence.
6. Islamophobia has also been legitimised by the Australian government's treatment of refugees. By locking up refugee women, men and children in offshore detention centres on

Manus Island, Nauru and Christmas Island. By denying refugees their basic standards of living and healthcare, the government legitimises the idea that people can be treated with little to no regard for their basic human rights based on where they have come from. Denying these rights is justified on the grounds of 'security', which is dog-whistle racism attempting to link refugees, many of whom come from Middle Eastern countries destroyed by Western intervention, to the supposed threat of terrorism.

7. In the days following the attack, Australian prime minister Scott Morrison has attempted to cover over his own culpability in paving the road for such violent atrocities. In 2011, the Sydney Morning Herald reported that "Morrison [saw] votes in [an] anti-Muslim strategy" (17 February 2011). He has celebrated his role in persecuting refugees who seek asylum by boat with a trophy in his own office. His actions since the attack have showed how hollow and cynical his crocodile tears have been. He has refused to acknowledge or take action against anti-Muslim attitudes within his own party in an on-air interview with Waleed Aly, he has pledged to further cut immigration (blaming it for congestion and failing services in major cities) and has tried to appeal to the racism of One Nation supporters by pledging to take action to allay their concerns about immigration and overpopulation.
8. The need for solidarity with the Muslim community has never been urgent. It is the responsibility of everyone who stands against racism to show the Muslim community that they do not stand alone and that Islamophobia and racism will not be tolerated, and will be actively opposed.

Platform

1. The University of Sydney SRC stands against Islamophobia.
2. The University of Sydney SRC stands against all forms of racism, bigotry and oppression.
3. The University of Sydney SRC recognises its responsibility to stand and fight alongside oppressed minorities against their oppression.
4. The University of Sydney SRC acknowledges that Islamophobia has horrific effects on the lives of Muslim people, including students on-campus and off.
5. The University of Sydney SRC recognizes the importance of publicly confronting governments, institutions, groups and individuals trying to legitimise Islamophobia and racism.
6. The University of Sydney SRC condemns Fraser Anning, Pauline Hanson, Mark Latham, Scott Morrison and every politician who stokes rhetoric and enacts policies that demonise, oppress and marginalise the Muslim community.

Action

1. The SRC president will write to the Al Noor and Linwood Mosques in Christchurch expressing the condolences and solidarity of the SRC on behalf of the student body at Sydney University.
2. Upon the passing of this motion, council will take a solidarity photo to express its support for the Muslim community and its commitment to fighting Islamophobia. This photo will be posted on the SRC's Facebook page along with the text of this motion.

Moved: Layla Mkhayber

Seconded: Vinil Kumar

Procedural motion to move straight to a vote

Moved: Vinil Kumar

Seconded: Lily Campbell

the motion was put and CARRIED

The motion was put can CARRIED

There was a quorum count was called

The meeting was found inquorate

The meeting lapsed at 10:52.