



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 5th regular meeting of the 90th SRC held on Wednesday 6th June 2018. Meeting held in the New Law Seminar Room 344, New Law Annex.

Quorum count was called at 6:23

The meeting was found quorate

A. Meeting open at 6:23 pm

A1. Election of Deputy Chairperson

The Chair moved that Nina Dillon Britton be elected Deputy Chairperson.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

B. Acknowledgement of Country

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

Imogen Grant encouraged the Council to go to a protest for a coronial inquiry into the death of David Dungay, an Indigenous man who died in custody, on the 16th.

C. Apologies, Proxies and Leaves of Absence

Apologies were received from:

Hao Zhou

Timothy Berney-Gibson

Mitch Gordon

Proxies:

Bella Pytka to Rebecca Miller

Hersha Kadkol to Lily Campbell

James Gibson to Arlo Meylan

Pranay Jha to Lara Sonnenschein

Andrew Lee to Dane Luo

Motion to accept the apologies
Moved: Seth Dias
Seconded: Harry Gregg
the motion was put and **CARRIED.**

D. Changes to Membership

E. Electoral Report

E1. Consideration of any resignations

Duke Dinh resigns as Queer Officer
Han Yun Ding resigns to Harvey Wang as per the regulations

Jazzlyn Breen said that this resignation was expected, and the remaining Queer Officers would not be affected by this.

Motion: That the Council accept the resignations.
Moved: Steven Wu
Seconded: Harry Gregg
The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

E2. Suspensions

The following councilors have their voting rights suspended as they have not met attendance requirements:

- Han Yun Ding *
- Kinda Lin
- Yi Man

*no longer applicable if resignation as resignation was accepted

There was general discussion on the appropriate course of action in accordance with the regulations. It was determined that any action to expel the councillors would have to go to the Standing Legal Committee with regards their replacements and that it should go to the next person on the ticket.

Motion to expel Kida Lin and Yi Man from the 90th Council.
Moved: William Edwards
Seconded: Harry Gregg

Nina Dillion Britton spoke against expelling them councillors asking that their voting rights be reinstated till next council to give them a change to resign.

Connor Wherrett spoke to expelling them saying they have had the whole year to resign, and the same notice as all councillors. Adding that as they have not done this themselves he was not for reinstating them.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke against expelling them as it was not fair to exclude those people who haven't had a chance to respond.

Nina Dillon Britton spoke against expelling them saying that the people next on their ticket should have the opportunity to take the positions. Adding that if the councillors continue to not respond then we can deal with this next council.

The motion was put and **FAILED.**

Motion to maintain their suspension till next council

Moved: Liam Thorne

Seconded: Seth Dias

Motion was put and **CARRIED.**

F. Minutes of the previous Council meeting.

Minutes of the 4th meeting of 90th SRC Council held on 2nd May 2018 were circulated.

Motion: that the minutes of the 4th Regular meeting be accepted.

Moved: Liam Thorne

Seconded: Seth Dias

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

G. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business for this item.

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

Tim Seguna asked if co-General Secretary Yuxuan Yang was fulfilling the requirements of their role?

Imogen Grant responded noting that Yuxuan Yang was feeling unwell and had gone home to China. While Nina Dillon Britton has tried to be in contact she has not been able to get a hold of him for some time.

I. Visitor's Business

There was no business for this item.

J. Report of the Undergraduate Fellow of Senate

K. Elections

L. Report of the President and Executive

L1. Executive Minutes

Minutes of the Executive meetings from the April 19th and May 17th 2018

Motion: that the minutes of the executive meetings from April 19th and 17th May 2018 be accepted.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Liam Thorne

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

L2. Report of the Executive

Report of the executive from the 2nd May to 5th June 2018.

The report was circulated and noted.

The President deferred the Chair to the Deputy Chairperson.

L3. President's Report

Imogen Grant tabled a written report:

Student Wellbeing & Safety

There is an upcoming University wide thematic review of Student Wellbeing and Safety; the first of the Phase 5 University Executive / Academic Board reviews (as endorsed at the 28 November 2017 Academic Board meeting). The review comes following multiple reports into sexual assault & harassment and surveys that place the University at the bottom of the Group of Eight universities in student experience.

The report will be looking into the University's compliance with the TEQSA Higher Ed Standards and will involve a long series of interviews with students, academic and professional staff etc. I will be getting in touch with many of you in the upcoming weeks to be interviewees.

More about TEQSA [non-]compliance to come...

Office Bearers

I have emailed all OBs to have a meeting half way through their terms to discuss campaigns and any additional support I can provide them. Look forward to catching up with you all in the next week.

Ramsay Centre for Western Civilisation (RCWC)

ANU have pulled out of a bid for the Ramsay Centre of Western Civilisation citing concerns around academic freedom. It is likely that the University of Sydney will make attempts to host the RCWC as it is already making efforts to host their courses.

The Ramsay Centre is funded by a \$3 billion bequest by Australian businessman and top Liberal party donor Paul Ramsay. Despite Spence saying that academic freedom will be maintained, Ramsay Centre CEO Paul Haines said they will review all course content, not hire staff who have criticised Western civilisation and withdraw all funding if they don't think a course is sufficiently pro-West.

RCWC chairman and former prime minister John Howard described the degree as "an exercise in the unapologetic exposal of what Western Civilization has brought to mankind over the centuries." Members of RCWC board and its CEO have repeatedly said that the degree will only

address the positive aspects of Western civilization. Board member Tony Abbott said that RCWC is “not merely about Western Civilization but in favour of it.”

The RCWC will have oversight of the hiring & firing of staff, selecting the readings and the course content. We have a situation where a multi-billion dollar think tank with clear political ties is providing funding to the university in exchange for running its courses. The University is selling control over its curriculum to the highest bidder & turning a blind eye to academic freedom to do so.

Excerpt from Nick Reimer's (English lecturer, NTEU member) letter to Michael Spence -

“In the current social and political climate – rampant politically-driven Islamophobia, sharpening geopolitical tensions between the ‘West’ and China, the shocking ongoing legacies of settler violence in our own society – an institution like ours shouldn’t be digging students in behind the essentialist cultural trenches of a ‘Western’ identity that has little, or no, interest in difference or hybridity.

The centre’s courses have the purpose of fostering an appreciation of the supposedly distinctive ‘achievements’ of ‘Western’ ‘civilisation’ in undergraduates. The terms ‘achievements’ and ‘civilisation’ identify this as an intrinsically uncritical ambition. On its own, that makes it unworthy of humanities study, which should always be oriented to understanding and critique, not to ideological mystification or cultural triumphalism. Those running the Ramsay Centre evidently feel no necessity to complexify or question the nebulous and supremely ideological ‘achievements’ that they identify as distinctive to the European cultural tradition: ‘freedom’, ‘equality’, ‘the rule of law’, or, ironically, ‘tolerance’. They also evidently have no interest in Western ‘achievements’ like our brutal histories of colonial conquest and despoliation, racist violence, militarism or genocide that must, surely, be present in any serious attempt to analyse the legacy of Europe in the world. The superiority of Western civilisation has been used to justify a lot of terrible things: it’s frankly horrifying to consider that Sydney might be about to institutionalise an apologetics of European supremacism as part of its undergraduate education. Ramsay’s vision is for its courses to be taught in small tutorials at significantly more favourable student-staff ratios than subjects covering other cultural traditions. This on its own sends a powerful, and completely unacceptable, message about Western superiority.”

SRC Outreach

The SRC has recently purchased a new camera along with lights & other equipment. This will be available for all Office Bearers to use. Amanda (Publications Manager) will be emailing you all to arrange training sessions if you wish to learn about how to use the equipment and video editing software. We are now able to produce SRC promo videos etc in-house & use the camera to take high-quality photos of protests & SRC campaigns.

Great to see collectives using the SRC stall every week. We will be having a stall next week that is specific to academic support & SRC Casework. Let me know if you would like to help out. We are also promo-ing the SRC through our info-brochures in the Library in the lead up to exam time. E.g. most students don’t know that you can apply to discontinue a subject before the last day of semester you will get a Discontinue Fail (DF). You will incur HECS & it will affect your “academic

progression”, however, it will not affect your WAM. This is particularly important if you are avoiding Show Cause & Exclusion.

The Higher Education Support Legislation Amendment (Student Loan Sustainability) Bill 2018

The Higher Education Support Legislation Amendment (Student Loan Sustainability) Bill 2018 has been rammed through the parliamentary system and is tabled for the Federal Senate somewhere between June 18 - 28.

This legislation seeks to:

- (1) Lower the minimum HELP repayment threshold to \$45,000
- (2) Index repayment thresholds with CPI (over the mid-term this will push repayment thresholds to minimum wage)
- (3) Create a combined HELP loan cap of \$104,400 (or \$150,000 for Medicine & Dentistry)

By creating a HELP loan cap, the legislation will price tens of thousands of Australians from postgraduate qualifications due to the cumulative cost of common undergraduate & postgraduate degrees.

There are already almost 40,000 enrolments in programs of study where the combined cost of relevant courses typically exceed \$100,000 (Management and commerce (27,893); Law (9,634)). This means the legislation would have forced these students to pay up to \$50,000 of tuition fees upfront or seek dodgy private loans in order to pay for their qualifications.

Vexatious misconduct

There has been a worrying rise in misconduct being used to pursue political opponents. It is outrageous that people are using policies created to punish extreme cases of misconduct to censor political speech. Moreover, in some of these cases the University is pursuing cases outside of their jurisdiction.

There are also issues of the confidentiality constraints of the misconduct rules in silencing people subject to a complaint so they can't reveal the University is investigating or taking action against them, and thus isolating individuals and driving out collective politics.

Confidentiality/silence may be justified in some circumstances where individual complainants would be vulnerable to public counter-attack for making a complaint. So we might support the idea of the person complained about not being able to identify the complainant, but there should be limits. At the moment there are none- it can read as an absolute thing where you can't talk publicly about any complaint made against you, and as this case reveals this can also be subject to surveillance of emails etc.

Imogen Grant Spoke to her report.

Appointment of the Electoral Officer for the 91st SRC Election

Imogen presented to the council the findings of the Selection Committee for the appointment of the Electoral Officer.

The Selection Committee recommends that the council appoint Karen Chau for the position of Electoral Officer for the Election of the 91st Students' Representative Council 2018.

Connor Wherrett spoke to the appointment saying that he had already discussed concerns about the appointment with Imogen Grant, and while he is sure Karen Chau is a lovely person he felt her previous involvement with student politics as former board director for the USU were points of concern. Connor further suggested that there were other options available to the council that should be considered, such as Electoral Officers from other campuses, who have not been contacted yet, and the Australian Electoral Commission also as an option. He asked that the council take two weeks and look for other options.

Harry Gregg said that he would be supporting the findings of the selection committee adding that if there was concern about past and other political involvement then everyone would have had a problem with the Paulene who has been involved in the Labor party. Concluding that he thought political involvement did not make you incapable of doing the job properly.

Imogen Grant said that the SRC has contacted the Australian Electoral Commission and they were not able to conduct the elections.

Harry Gregg added that he disagreed with the option of the UNSW Electoral Officer as a possibility. Recalling that during the UNSW elections he allowed members of factions to touch the ballots while scrutineering and he thought this was problematic. Knowing this he suggested that Karen was the less controversial option.

Lily Campbell spoke to the appointment saying she doesn't know Karen beyond what has been said about her and that anyone who applies for the Electoral Officer position will have some involvement in politics. Lily Campbell asked Harry Gregg for a clarification about the UNSW electoral Officer's work.

Harry Gregg clarified that he felt that scrutineers being allowed to touch ballots in any election was bad.

Lily Campbell asked what contact with the Australian Electoral Commission there was.

Secretary to Council Julia Robins clarified she had emailed them and received an automatic response that stated that the AEC was not conducting any private elections at the present time.

Connor Wherrett spoke against the selections committee's findings saying there is a difference between Paulene Graham's involvement in a political party and Karen Chau's involvement in student politics and that the close proximity to student politics on this campus is what should be noted.

The Secretary to council Julia Robins clarified for the record and transparency that she had been involved in SRC and student politics prior to applying for the job. Adding that she feels her impartiality is demonstrated in her work and if the council has concerns about that they should raise them.

Sarah Cutter-Russel asked if Karen Chau had made a case for how she would ensure things would be fair and impartial.

Nina Dillon Britton Karen was asked that and said that there are regulations and she would adhere to them.

Dane Luo said that he has worked with her in the past and she is was very busy asking if she made clear how she would manage her time.

Nina Dillon Britton said she told the committee she would be studying part time, and while Karen Chau will be quite busy and most likely stressed that for her to decide. Nina Dillon Britton recommend that council not delay this for two more weeks.

Manning Jeffery asked if the position was properly advertised, and why are we just hearing now that Paulene Graham was not available.

Nina Dillon Britton informed the council that Paulene Graham did not apply for the role and that it was advertised online as it is every year.

Lily Campbell asked if the council was approving the appointment of Karen Chau.

Nina Dillon Britton said that there is a motion to approve her included in accepting the report of the President. If that motion is rejected, we will need to hold a special meeting later in the month.

Lily Campbell asked for a clarification that if Karen Chau is not approved tonight there will need to be a special meeting.

Nina Dillon Britton confirmed that that was the case.

Motion to accept the report of the President and the finding of the Selection Committee for the appointment of Karen Chau.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Dane Luo

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

M. Report of the Vice-Presidents

Adriana Olguin Malavisi gave a verbal report:

Adriana Olguin Malavisi updated the Council on her progress in organising services week which has been renamed welfare week. Adding that the list of organisations to reach out to has been finalised and the template to events was being worked on.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi asked that the Council please make some time to volunteer, invite friends and get involved.

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

Moved: Dane Luo

Seconded: Tim Seguna

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

N. Report of the General Secretaries

Nina Dillon Britton gave a verbal report

Reviving our image

- Pubs will be working on the website.
- Looking into getting a photographer to replace some of the images we have.
- Want to block out an hour during stuvac to shoot a promo video for the SRC. If you're interested in promoting the SRC (or getting some brand recognition if you're one of the millions of potential presidential candidates) can you shoot me a message and we can organise a time.

Radical Education

- We are planning to have this coincide with the SRC's 90th celebrations. If you're keen we're having a meeting tomorrow at 5pm.

Opal Card Campaign

- Want to organise a public meeting to (1) clarify where different parts of the campaign are and (2) plan for the future.
- Reaching out to different groups to do this.
- Hopefully we will do this in STUVAC let me know if you know people who would like to attend

SSAF

- Still don't have it. I think we might get it in July, but who knows! Earliest can pass the budget looks like August council.

- Nina

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

Moved: Maya Eswaran

Seconded: Steven Wu

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

O. Report of Committees and Officers

O1. Report of the Education Officers

Lily Campbell and Lara Sonnenschein tabled a written report

We have set up a new Disarm Unis working group and had our first meeting and working bee.

I have submitted a second FOI into university research and various agreements with weapons manufacturers.

Currently our goals for the campaign is to find out as much info as possible, make lots of materials for promotional purposes and then launch a national report in conjunction with other organisers at the beginning of semester two. Once the report is launched, we want to have a bunch of stunts on campus to publicise and promote the campaign, e.g die ins, occupations, banner drops, protests, performance art etc.

We have found a lot of good information from just doing google searches and reaching out to staff and would appreciate your help if you have any leads.

There's a lot of activity going on across the country on a lot of campuses. NUS has now taken up Books not Bombs as the national campaign - to be officially launched at the Education Conference. This campaign is set to run in collaboration with Disarm Unis but also as a campaign against the general militarisation of society, war, and attacks on higher education.

We have maintained close communication with other people involved in the campaign and I am running workshops at both SoS conference and the NUS Education Conference to talk to other national organisers.

If you would like to be added to the working group or can help in any way please let me know!

Lily spoke to her report adding that United States Study Centre (USSC) has a board director who is also on the board of Boeing which is one of the largest weapons manufactures particularly fighter jets which are expensive, don't work well, and are made to kill people. Lily Campbell added that she was looking forward to NUS Education conference and also attending Students of Sustainability.

Macy Reen spoke to the report adding that the Disarm UNSW campaign is also underway and the FOI has been placed to get more information that might not be available on the web. UNSW has the defence campus in Canberra which has obvious ties to military and also Chris Pyne has also announced that Australian universities and United States universities will be joining to do defence research.

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

Moved: Maya Eswaran

Seconded: Kim Murphy

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

02. Report of the Wom*n's Officers

Madeline Ward and Jessica Syed tabled a written report

There is mention of sexual assault and abortion in our report.

We would like to thank everyone who has been proactive in organising with us around Safe

Access Zones. We had a protest outside NSW Parliament on the day of the vote in the Upper House of Parliament, a stall on Eastern Avenue the week before, and tomorrow as the final vote happens in Parliament there will be a group of us standing outside making our point of view heard again. We are excited about the momentum this issue has gauged with regard to reproductive rights in NSW, regardless of how the vote goes. We invite members of the SRC of all genders to join us at our clinic escorting service in Surry Hills, get in touch with Maddy or Jess to be added to the group.

One of the 2016 demands the Wom*n's Collective made to University management as the campaign against sexual assault on campus gained momentum was the implementation of a stand alone sexual assault policy to be integrated into the University's policy framework. As it stands, your best bet for making a complaint regarding an experience of sexual assault is through the Bullying and Harassment policy. This is too pernicky, restrictive, and also ridiculous. We, alongside Imogen, have started consulting with the University as to the meaty aspects of the policy – what will and won't be covered by it. Our feeling is that the University is still reluctant to recognise an assault against a student perpetrated by another student that occurs off campus in the policy. This is problematic: many assaults occur in environments such as house parties for example and that these circumstances will not be under the auspices of the University's potential policy is tone-deaf.

Their incompetence has extended to 1800-SYD-HELP, which was inactive and inaccessible recently for a long enough period of time for it to be a problem. As we outlined in the SRC press release about the issue, those who called the Student Liaison Officer hotline were given a message that the hotline was "temporarily out of service". In addition to this, the 1800 SYDHLP hotline was automatically rerouting callers to the NSW Rape Crisis Centre during business hours instead of being answered by staff. Of course NSW RCC staff alongside students would have been confused in the midst of what is normally already a very traumatic phone call. The first response that survivors receive to a disclosure of assault is normally one that dictates their recovery process. The University outwardly projects that it takes the issue of sexual assault seriously. However, this incident reveals the giant fallacy in the University's public veneer. There is a distinct lack of coordination to make sure integral student services are functional and sufficiently staffed, however, the apparition of two huge new buildings has come about without any tangible issues.

We were recently publicly condemned by AUJS for publishing an image of Hamida Al Taher on the front cover of Honi Soit. In 1986 Hamida Al Taher carbombed an Israeli military encampment in occupied southern Lebanon, killing 20 military personnel. Her actions occurred in the context of a violent military occupation and must be considered as such. As we have already released a public statement regarding this issue I don't feel as though I need to say much more, except that: Israel is an apartheid, genocidal, settler colonial regime and it has been the stance of the Women's collective to oppose the existence of Israel and support Palestinian resistance for some years. The murder of Palestinian medic Razan Al Najjar on the 1st of June by an IDF Sniper whilst she attempted to tend to injured protesters is a pertinent and tragic reminder that a collective position of supporting the liberation of Palestine and condemning Israel is a necessity. What is the point of being a feminist if our feminism does not extend in solidarity to those fighting Israeli oppression in Palestine?

Madeline Ward spoke to her report and covered its main points, adding that they stand by their publishing of Hamida Al Taher on the cover on Honi.

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

Motion: Jazzlyn Breen

Seconded: Maya Eswaran

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

P. Special Business

There were no items of special business.

Q. Motions of Notice

Procedural motion to move to Q6.

Moved: Lily Campbell

Seconded: Emma Norton

Procedural motion was put and **CARRIED**.

Q6. Defend free speech - Student control of student affairs!

There has been a disturbing rise in the use of discourse around comfort and safety in order to censor progressive political speech.

Numerous students are facing disciplinary hearings for political campaigning against Liberals in SRC elections that was judged acceptable by the returning officer, anti-war activists have been formally warned for calling Saudi Arabia a repressive dictatorship in a lecture announcement, and now pro-Israel organisations have complained to the university about the editorial decision to support Palestinian resistance to Israeli occupation of Lebanese and Palestinian land.

Enough is enough.

Each of these attacks on free speech and independent student activism on campus has been done in the name of safety and anti-harassment. Ironically, the codes of conduct used to discipline the left in this way were fought for by students to protect the vulnerable, and yet they are being used to safeguard the privileged.

Defenders of recent Israeli massacres should be confronted about their bigoted views, that it doesn't happen more often is an indictment on the mainstream media and the political establishment. Supporters of the brutal Saudi monarchy should expect to be challenged about their views. And anyone running for public office should expect the full scrutiny and political contestation that will inevitably come with the voluntary decision to participate in such a process.

Platform

1. This SRC congratulates those who put together the women's edition of Honi for their brave and highly defensible cover depicting a Palestinian freedom fighter who sacrificed her life to oppose the illegal Israeli occupation of Lebanon and Palestine.

2. This SRC condemns AUJS for suggesting that the university should intervene to censor a student run publication, and reiterates its commitment to maintaining student control of student affairs.
3. The SRC opposes any attempt to apply regulations designed to protect women and other oppressed groups to censor political speech or constrict the democratic process.

Action:

1. The SRC president will write an open letter to the VC explaining our position on the right of progressive activists to speak their minds and challenge conservative ideas, especially in student run newspapers and elections.
2. The SRC will put out a press release pointing out the cynicism of the university administration using codes of conduct designed to make women safer to vilify progressive women for engaging in robust political debate.
3. The SRC will investigate a regulation change that would make SRC campaigners immune from university disciplinary hearings for political activity during elections, except in extreme cases.

Lily Campbell spoke to her motion noting Imogen report where vexious misconduct complaints and that these claims are being used to attack Queer and Women's editions of Honi. There is a worrying tend to silence free speech on campus and I look forward to what is going to be discussed.

Lara spoke to her motion agreeing with Lily Campbell's points and added that making misconduct complaints over political disagreements reminds her of Draco Malfoy running to his father, it's vexatious and looks ridiculous. This process can go on for months and is a draining process. Disagreements are fine, but air them, don't got to the University and take them to misconduct.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion and saying that they agree with the motion and have an amendment for this motion. Harry said that he had been taken to misconduct and had to explain to his family why, and he was looking after his sister the day he was called in for his interview which was distressing for him and her. He added that he has had a lot less issues than the Women's and Queer Officers it is still a difficult process and experience. Harry Gregg proposed to amend the platform 3 of the motion.

Amend the motion to say:

"The SRC oppose any attempt to apply regulations designed to protect women and other oppressed groups to censor political speech of left wing activists"

The amendment was acceptable to the movers.

Madeline Ward spoke to the motion saying that the women's officers have received a complaint from the registrar with regards to the Women's Honi edition and they were unable to inform the collective or the council and it would have prevented us from doing our job. Adding that they were happy to be condemned by AUJS publically especially compared to the misconduct process, but to do both means they are unable to respond to the public allegations without jeopardising their misconduct hearing.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke to the motion saying that she had to deal with a misconduct hearing as someone misidentified her as the person despite the fact that she had evidence to the contra and they had none other than knowing her name from her involvement in the Queer Collective. Jazzlyn said that despite having evidence, it was still a massive challenge and required assistance from the SRC caseworkers and legal service to prove her innocence, adding that LifeChoices were the ones who reported her but wouldn't talk to her to clarify the situation. She added that she had had a similar experience with the Queer Honi being brought up for misconduct.

Nina Dillon Britton spoke to the motion saying that while many talk about the left silencing free speech is it more often that the left has systems used against them. Adding that she felt it was the right who are trying to restrict free speech and have student kicked out for having opinions.

Emma Norton spoke to the motion saying that it is similar to the motion that failed last month and that it is important that the SRC recognises that these misconduct proceedings are kangaroo courts and do not acknowledge basic principals of the normal legal system. Adding that you have to prove you are innocent rather than be found guilty. Concluding that there has been a general movement towards shutting down general debate on campus particularly during election times.

Kim Murphy spoke to the motion echoing past speakers concern of misconduct being used to target activists on campus, adding that codes of conduct are being used not to protect people from actual harassment but to shut down debate. Adding that student elections are an important time for political debate and suggesting that having your political views challenged is intimidation is just a way to not have to justify your views. Concluding that it was the actions of reporting students for being politically active that highlights the importance of a fully independent SRC.

Manning Jeffery spoke to the motion saying that there has been a focus on this university has done and wanted to talk about what had happened at Queensland University of Technology where students were not taken through a misconduct proceedings, but were taken to the Human Rights Commission after they were removed from an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander computer room. He went on outline what happened to the students and say he found it hypocritical that the left is against university misconduct but support 18C which is used in the same way.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi spoke against the motion saying she remembered that two council meetings ago the SRC passed a motion calling for the USU to shut down the LifeChoices club. Adding that she doesn't agree with much of the content and the action point 3 was ridiculous as actions taken during the elections should not be exempt because it is labelled activism.

Madeline Ward spoke to the motion and said it seemed telling that it has been a white man who has brought up 18C twice in these debates and that it was not an appealing reflection on them. She continued adding that there is an argument in this motion that condemns shutting down LifeChoices however there is a difference between the political actions of say the conservative club and actually harassing women and telling them they are murderers for seeking an abortion and blocking them from accessing medical services. Adding that misconduct rules were supposed to be brought in to protect women from sexual assault on campus but that they often do no rule in favour of these women is seen time and time again.

Procedural motion to close the speaking list as it currently stands

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis

The procedural was put and **CARRIED**.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying it was a bout freedom of speech on campus and student rights not managements. Adding that if what is happening continues the University effectively has the right to overrule what student publications and representatives say, noting that they feel this is dangerous as universities are not neutral bodies they have their own agendas. Continuing saying that this has futher implications for the union movement as students can be called up for participating in NTEU pickets and other actions on campus if they see political action as bullying and harassment, adding that this is something that occurs already when bosses have been able to pull up workers for calling others scabs. Concluding Vinil said he agreed with Kim Murphys comments that political debates and disagreements should not be shut down on the grounds of harassment.

George Bishop said that he supported the right to put the photo on the cover of Honi Soit, and that it is important for free speech. Adding that he felt it was silly and an inappropriate action for a student paper to do this though. He agreed with Adriana Olguin Malavisi that there was a double standard at play in the debate, where distress for some was appropriate but distress for others was not. Saying that the distress caused to AUJS and how it made them feel was not important was an example of this. George Bishop suggesting that the Council needs to look at the dangers of policies that are poorly or broadly drafted, and the he believed the University is following a fair procedure and that if people have done no wrong it will be resolved accordingly. He concluded saying that elections and campaigners should be immune to misconduct is ridiculous as the code of conduct is there for a reason.

Emma Norton spoke to the motion and said that some of the comments made are correct in saying there is an inconsistency in this debate. Adding that what she doesn't think there is a moral equivalency in what happens but more often these policies are used against the left, and that there was only one example of them doing otherwise raised tonight exemplifies that. She concluded noting that people should be allowed to say what they like on campus and be called out for it by others but that university intrusion into these conflicts should not be encouraged, used, or respected as when they intervene they are not fair on how. Many of the activities that people are worried about such as violence are already illegal so are really not relevant.

Maya Eswaran spoke to the motion saying that the arguments against it's support are hypocritical and ignore this University's history with colonisation and support of people who did much worse than Hamida Al Taher, such as the namesake of the Wentworth building who supported the genocide of Indigenous Australians.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke to the motion saying that there is a difference between someone condemning the SRC in a motion, which does little to affect your capacity to respond or limit your speech compared to being brought to misconduct. Adding that the misconduct process is unclear and many have been targeted for simply being associated with this organisation and have their capacity to participate in public debate limited as a result. Concluded by saying political disagreements are different to harassment and bullying.

Moved: Lily Campbell

Seconded: Lara Sonnenschein

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

Procedural motion:

That each motion be limited to 8 speakers including the movers:

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Conner Wherrett

The procedural was put and **CARRIED**.

Q1. Arbitration SRC motion

Arbitration, the use of a supposed “independent umpire” to settle industrial disputes, is a tool of the bosses. The arbitration courts in Australia were established by right-wing politicians in the first decade of the 20th century after the defeat of the strike wave in the 1890s. The Reid government’s federal Arbitration Act identified its chief objective as preventing “lockouts and strikes in relation to industrial disputes.” Shamefully, many key figures of the Australian Labor Party who had suffered through the defeat of the 1890s strike wave saw arbitration as a way to protect workers’ rights without going through the risks of strike action.

As arbitration became more entrenched in the industrial relations system, the decisions of the court increasingly aligned entirely with the wishes of the bosses. When depression struck, the court enacted massive cuts to wages and conditions, unrivalled until the modern-day “Fair Work Commission” handed down penalty rate cuts to the country’s lowest paid workers.

The central problem of arbitration as a strategy for trade unions is that it entirely bypasses the power which makes unions strong in the first place. Unions exist to organise workers to defend and extend their wages and conditions by exercising their industrial power. Arbitration instead hands the responsibility to lawyers and institutions with no social power to win things, allowing industrial muscle to atrophy and contributing to the erosion of rank-and-file unionism.

Arbitration is no strategy for trade unions. Promoting industrial peace undermines the key strength of unions to fight for workers’ rights, as well as distancing rank-and-file activity from the actions of the union movement as a whole. The recent ruling of the “Fair Work Commission” to ban Sydney train drivers from striking is indicative of the inevitable result of unions relying on bureaucratic institutions.

1. SRC recognises that the organisation of rank-and-file workers for industrial action is the sole strategy capable of reviving the union movement.
2. SRC notes that any attempts to bypass rank-and-file organising as the strategy for unions will contribute to their decline.
3. SRC publicly condemns calls from ACTU leader Sally McManus to increase the powers of the Fair Work Commission to end disputes, noting that this strategy will inevitably play into the hands of the bosses in ending strikes and prosecuting unions.

Leda Wells spoke to her motion covering the history of the fair work commission and its actions against workers and noting that that history continues today with the ruling against the train strike. Adding that the point of strikes was economic disruption and so shouldn't be a reason to stop them.

Paul Bova spoke to the motion expressing disappointment in the trajectory of Sally McManus from calling to break unjust laws to the moderate change the rule campaign. Adding that it is the strong history of the labour movement of breaking the rules that has been crucial to its success.

Connor Wherrett said that he had a number of issues with the motion, including that it denies workers options, and that industrial relations should not be a one or the other situation. Adding they we should not be denying workers options should they wish to take them just because of a belief that striking is the only solution. Concluding that he flet the Sally McManus and the RBTU knew more about what workers need than the movers of the motion.

Brandon Hale said that the motion was naïve and unions provide resources to these worker. Adding while the essence of the motion was good it clearly lacks connection to rank and file union members and it was disgraceful that it condemns the union for the work they are doing.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying that they have worked for two trade unions and will not be told how they unions should work by those not involved. Adding that while he appreciated the work of Sally McManus he agrees that she has made the wrong call on this issue. Adding that the Fair Work Commission has cancelled EBA's that were agreed on. Continuing he said that Student Unity have often opposed expanding the right to strike so it is unsurprising they are doing so here. Concluding his remarks he said that the motion should be supported, the right to strike should not be confined as the workers own their labour and the economy, not the bosses.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying it was not arguing that there should never be agreements between unions and bosses, but that the fair work commission is not a neutral body and the council cannot expect that a body run by the state will be equal. Adding that she believed that the state is one sided against the working classes and this has been down by stripping away the right to strike. Concluding she noted that this didn't prevent agreements being made but that the arbitration court system will always favour the bosses and that needs to change.

Leda Wells spoke to her motion and responding to some of the comments saying they focused on talking about alternatives to striking ignoring that the issue was that striking was banned in many cases and they failed to name a single time that the fair work commission helped workers rather than bosses. Concluding that striking only being available during bargaining periods is ridiculous as works are always being exploited and have the right to withdraw their labour when they want too.

Moved: Leda Wells
Seconded: Paul Bova

The vote was split 10/10, being a tie the motion fails.

The motion was put and **FAILED**

Q2. Stop punishing the poor - Raise Newstart

The Newstart Allowance has not been raised since 1994. In a society with an increasing relative cost of housing, transport, and basic goods; and decreasing wages and jobs, Newstart forces people to survive on \$278 a week, or less than \$40 a day. A sizeable proportion of Newstart recipients are students or recent graduates. Newstart payments as they stand equate to receiving just 60% of the minimum wage. It is no wonder that 55% of people receiving Newstart payments live below the poverty line. While Newstart payments have not increased, Australia has seen 26 years of uninterrupted economic growth, which has had little material benefits in the lives of working class Australians.

Unsurprisingly the Liberals did not raise the Newstart allowance in the most recent budget, despite many advocacy and even business groups recommending it. Liberal MPs Julie Bishop and Julia Banks insultingly claimed that they could survive on the Newstart Allowance - their \$285 daily travel allowance is more than Newstart recipients earn weekly.

Unfortunately, Labor has also refused to commit to raising Newstart payments should they win the next election. Shorten has claimed that he will review Australian welfare payments, but made no definitive comment on Newstart, so it is highly likely that the 'review' will amount to nothing. The statistics and realities of the difficulties that people on Newstart face are already so obvious and accessible. It's an insult to people struggling on Newstart for Shorten to suggest a 'root and branch review' needs to be taken before there can be even a hint of maybe improving their situation.

Labor 'left' frontbencher Anthony Albanese came out in defense of his party's refusal to commit to increasing Newstart just after the budget was released. In response to the criticism of his party for this he argued that "you can't do everything, what you have to do is outline your priorities". Evidently, the hundreds of thousands of people living on Newstart, who are some of this country's poorest, most vulnerable, and often students, are not a priority for the ALP. Unfortunately, both major parties are committed to keeping welfare payments down, refusing to redistribute money from the corporations and high-income earners to increase welfare and social services that would benefit students, workers, and the poor.

Platform

1. The SRC condemns the government's refusal to raise the Newstart Allowance for unemployed Australians, and recognises this disproportionately affects students and recent graduates.
2. The SRC condemns the Labor Party's refusal to commit to increasing Newstart.
3. The SRC supports the right of students and other groups to be able access welfare payments that do not require them to undergo punitive processes of drug-testing, monitored job-searching, robo-debt collection, and long waiting and processing periods without backpay, and supports the right for immigrants and refugees to be able to access welfare in equal measure to Australian-born citizens.

4. The SRC supports a increase of Newstart to above the poverty line (currently \$426.30 pw), as well as significant increases to other welfare payments like Youth Allowance and AusStudy.
5. The SRC supports the Newstart 'age of independence' being lowered to 16 years old.

Action

1. The SRC will publish a note on their Facebook page outlining their opposition to the government's most recent budget and supporting the increase of welfare payments.

Sophie Haslam spoke to her motion saying that Newstart had not been raised in 24 years, and that this was under both Liberal and Labor governments. Adding that even John Howard has called for it to be raised. She concluded saying it was important that the SRC support this motion and that not paying new graduates, and the unemployed a living wages was wrong.

Macy Reen spoke to the motion saying that the money saved by not raising is not going to helping people find jobs, but going to military spending. Adding that saying that Newstart can't be a living amount or will stop people looking for work is inane as there are many issues and challenges to being on Newstart and a raise in it will not make for easy living.

William Edwards spoke to the motion adding that Newstart is and believed all Centrelink payments may be below the poverty line. Adding that suggesting people can afford to do the things needed to find work and the costs involved in that when their rent is not likely to be covered by those payments means that finding work becomes harder. He concluded saying that if you are against raising the Newstart allowance you effectively want to keep people on welfare longer rather than help them to get off it.

Kim Murphy spoke to the motion saying that Newstart is disgustingly low and that it was not surprising that after the Budget came out Bill Shorten did not commit to raising Newstart. Considering all that data showing the negative effects of it being so low it was shameful that he was to the right of John Howard on this issue. Adding that Bill Shorten said he would conduct a review into welfare even when it's dire condition is such that John Howard sees it a obvious, and that the Labor party should be ashamed for not helping those in need.

Vinil Kumar sooke to the motions and while he agrees with most of what has been said suggesting that we raise welfare to get people off welfare is not an issue the left should care about we should care that peoples basic needs are always met regardless, anything else is a right wing argument and langue.

Moved: Sophie Haslam

Seconded: Kim Murphy

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Manning Jeffery noted his dissent

Procedural Motion to move to R1. Motion from the floor

Will Edwards read the motion so the council was aware of the motion they were moving to.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis

The procedural was put and CARRIED

R1. No Ableism In Student Unions

Preamble

At the previous SRC meeting on May 2nd two motions regarding disabilities activism and issues were debated and passed.

The first motion was to establish an autonomous edition of Honi Soit for students with disability, similar to the existing Queer, Women's, Ethnocultural, and Indigenous editions of Honi. This motion was passed near unanimously by all councillors and proxies in attendance except for members of Socialist Alternative. Only one member of Socialist Alternative chose to defend their position, saying "Sorry I don't want to help pad someone's resume." Denying the right of students with disability to access the same platforms and modes of representation as other marginalised students is ableist, as is dismissing their struggle for representation as resume padding.

The second motion was to promote lecture recordings, which for many students with disability are the only way they can reliably access their classes and complete their education. Once again Socialist Alternative constituted the key opposition to this motion, with one member thereof telling a student with disability, who was explaining why their disability prevented them from attending lectures in person, that "We all have problems." It is a fact that many students with disability simply cannot complete their courses without lecture recordings, and it follows that denying them access to such necessary accessibility measures is ableist.

While all councillors and proxies are entitled to vote however they choose, Socialist Alternative's actions at the previous SRC meeting fit within an established pattern of ableist behaviour on the part of that organisation. Socialist Alternative has consistently rejected attempts by other members of the SRC to promote accessibility measures within the SRC itself, such as choosing physically accessible routes for protests and arranging AusLan interpreters at large rallies. A previous Socialist Alternative Education Officer summarised the organisation's approach to disability activism best when they defended their refusal to change a protest route in an Education Action Group meeting by saying "I'm not concerned about people who want to protest but can't, I'm concerned about making more people who physically can protest show up."

Disability activism is frequently neglected in student unions, where most young activists across the political spectrum prioritise political issues with higher public profiles. Students with disability deserve better – more activism, more consideration, and more support – from all student unions and the political groups within them. And they absolutely deserve to be able to engage with their student unions without experiencing ableism, intended or otherwise, from student representatives therein.

Platform

1. The SRC is committed to making all its events (council meetings, protests, organising meetings, socials, etc) accessible to students with disability. We will advocate that all events run by the university itself will share this commitment.
2. The SRC condemns Socialist Alternative for their consistent pattern of ableist behaviour. We call on them to consult with disability activists both within and without the SRC on how they can improve their understanding of disability activism and the issues affecting students with disability. We condemn all other forms of ableism in the SRC, the university, and broader society.

Action

1. The SRC will share the full text of this motion on its official Facebook page.

William Edwards spoke to his motion and wanted to highlight that disability activism is often neglected and was disappointed that Socialist Alternative who are the forefront of much activism don't care and have often disregarded disability activism.

Thomas Manousaridis spoke to the motion adding that Socialist Alternative were ableist at the National Union of Students' National Conference and as one of the most left-wing factions their actions are disappointing.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying that Socialist Alternative are not left wing if they don't think the voices of all oppressed people should be heard. Adding that having been on violent pickets, he thinks it is important that they are not the aim, the aim is to get as many different voices heard for those causes and that denying people a voice is a right-wing value.

Connor Wherret spoke to the motions noting that disability activism is often not seen as being of importance. Adding that Socialist Alternative's dismissal of these actions and ongoing issues with their activism is often deflected by changing the conversation and not apologising.

Vinil Kumar spoke against the motion saying that there was a motion that night condemning the liberals from cutting NDIS funding which Socialist Alternative amended to make sure it stated that disability support was fully funded. He continued saying that in Melbourne Socialist Alternative were responsible for the campaign to stop the deportation of a child who the Australian government had decided was a burden on the Australian system because of their disability, and that Labor did not support that campaign, they had condemned it. Vinil Kumar added that they voted against the lecture recording motion because it was an attack on workers and during that debate offered alternatives to students with a disability other than lecture recording which would allow their participation. He concluded by asking why the Liberals have never been condemned at these meetings.

Lily Campbell said that Socialist Alternative did not vote against the motion, they abstained because they do not think that Honi Soit is a paper of value and that it should be replaced with Red Flag. Adding that for the lecture recording motion they voted in line with the NTEU's stance on lecture recordings and spoke about why they hold that position.

Kim Murphy spoke against the motion calling it slander and that Socialist Alternative has run campaigns all over the country around disability rights. Adding that they don't patronise people with a disability but treated them like political individuals and that improving disability rights does not need to come at the expense of workers rights noting again the alternatives they suggested at the last council meeting.

William Edwards said that he was glad to hear they have done work in the area but are not the only ones and that they too have condemned other factions in their motions. William concluded saying that at the Socialist Alternative run Marxism Conference there were 95 motions and not one was about disability politics.

Mover: William Edwards

Secunder: Thomas Manousaridis

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q3. Why we need an independent refugee rights movement

Preamble

1. Refugees are still being detained on Manus and Nauru in indefinite detention, a result of the bipartisan consensus that no refugee arriving by boat will ever be settled in Australia. Men, women and children are routinely humiliated, deprived of resources, driven to suicide like the 52-yr-old Rohingya refugee last week, and denied medical treatment on the mainland.
2. The current policy is a result of successive Labor and Liberal governments. The mainstream media and the Liberal Party continually claim that the Labor Party is divided on the issue of refugees because they want to claim that the Liberals are the best defenders of Australian borders. However, there is no substantial agitation from the Labor Left faction within the Labor Party against offshore detention and to bring the refugees to Australia. The motion moved by Labor for Refugees in the Victorian State Labor Conference last month hardly deviated from the official position of Shorten, since it didn't address the key question of settling refugees in Australia.
3. Some figures like Ged Kearney make token criticism of the current situation for refugees as representatives of the Labor Left. However, this is merely signalling to those voters who are more sympathetic to refugees. Kearney's actual moderation on the issue was evident in her Q&A appearance in May, in which she fudged the main issue of resettlement by refusing to "talk in binaries".
4. Moreover, she engaged in fear-mongering rhetoric, suggesting that the racist concerns that refugees are responsible for deteriorating access to public services are legitimate reasons why Labor adopts a harsh border policy. However, Labor in government has been directly responsible for both attacking refugees and taking money away from public services. Another Labor Left leader, Luke Foley, made similar comments about "white flight" in the Western suburbs of Sydney. This scapegoating reflects the driving electoral strategy of Labor, which means they need to cater to everyone, racists included.

5. All of the above indicates that no section of the Labor Party can be relied upon to limit the time of offshore detention, let alone implement any left-wing policy regarding refugee rights. The left should not be blindsided by token sympathy towards the refugees stated by some Labor politicians and union leaders. This is not evidence of widening tensions in the Party on this issue. The actual effect of these statements is to provide left cover for the actual policy of the Party, which is indistinguishable from the that of the Liberals.
6. The parliamentary game is a distraction from a genuine strategy to fight for refugee rights. We need to engage in collective action separate from the twisted agendas of the major parties. The left needs to build protests, mobilising the sizeable minority of the population that supports refugee rights into a sustained campaign. It should not be beholden to the schedule of parliamentary politics and should not be afraid to be disruptive and militant where appropriate. In doing so, we show our best solidarity with the resistance bravely waged by the refugees themselves in Manus Island and Nauru.

Platform

1. The SRC affirms that the only strategy to win refugee rights is through sustained protest and mass action.
2. At times, protest movements for refugees call for civil disobedience that disrupts the polite functioning of society, even if it embarrasses politicians and other dignitaries.
3. The SRC recognises that the Labor Party cannot be relied upon to make progressive change on this issue. The Left faction of the Labor Party is not engaged in a serious project to change the Party policy, and instead merely provides cover for the policy of the Party as a whole.
4. The SRC affirms that the movement for refugee rights therefore needs to be firmly independent from the major political parties. It should not waiting for politicians to act or lend legitimacy to any section of the Labor Party.

Action

1. The SRC should build and attend all significant refugee protests organised in Sydney and encourage the involvement of the student body.

Gina Elias spoke to her motion saying that she was disappointed that both major parties have continued the same policies to turn back boats and that the newly elected member for the seat of Batman relied on racists tropes in her comment on Qand A around immigrations, and the 'white flight' comments made by NSW opposition leader Luke Foley. Adding that because of this there needs to be refugee activism away from the major parties who have shown this is not an issue they care about.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that the Labor party is no better than the Liberal party on this issue. Noting that it was Labor that started offshore detention in 1992 and reopened Manus and Naru. He clarified that while there may be some members of the Labor party who have condemned these policies in this room, no one with party power has done so for fear of harming their capacity to win, adding that it was the memebtrs who burnt their party cards over this issue who were the ones who did something. He hoped that everyone would vote for the motion and in support of the lives and wellbeing of refugees.

Connor Wherrett spoke against the motion saying there was a difference in policies and that under a labor government refugees would be better off than under a liberal government.

Harry Gregg said he will not be voting against the motion, and that what was said by Ged Kearney on QandA was disgusting and she should have said we will bring them here. However, he disagreed with the assumption that there were no differences between the Labor party and the Liberal party was wrong as it neglects policies around medicare and penalty rates which are threatened by Liberal governments. Harry continued by saying that many in the Labor party have been working to change its policies as well as being at the same protests as the movers of the motion. Harry concluded that while he agrees with many of the motions sentiments he cannot agree that Labor Left doesn't matter.

Lara Sonnenschein spoke to the motion citing it as an important motion and the Labor and Liberal parties have long had similar policies in these areas citing the policies during World War II where Jewish refugees could not come to Australia while fleeing genocide because they needed to stay below 0.3% of the population. She said she hoped that members of the Liberal and Labor parties look back at this, and the policy of today, and feel shameful.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke to the motion but added that even if there are only a few people in the Labor party who are fighting for a change in their policy that's a good thing and if there is a shift in policy that represents a shift in society. Concluding by encouraging everyone to come to the next rally.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying that the Labor party is not benevolent and that growing the left in it won't change anything. Adding that the Labor party was deeply racist and that it also didn't support marriage equality until after years of campaigning and was forced to change by public opinion. Concluding that the left of the labor party simply offers protection to the right when they commit atrocities and that she support those who burnt their party cards when Kevin Rudd Brought in the PNG solution.

William Edwards said there was a double standard in the motion, saying it was like when people attend a rally they are changing the world but when people change policies it's never enough. Adding that many grassroots campaigns are run by Labor party members and that its those people who are talking to voters rather than just protesting. Concluding saying if they were going to burn anything it would be copies of Red Flag.

Gina Elias said she found William Edwards comments disgusting and added that this motion was about saying that the Labor party is not an alternative to the liberal on refugee policy. She said there has been bipartisan consensus on the deplorable treatment of refugees and that the labor party will not even discuss changes to that policy at its own conferences. She concluded encouraging everyone to attend the rally on the July 21st at town hall if they wish to show support for refugee rights.

Moved: Gina Elias

Seconded: Hersha Kadkol

The motion was put and **FAILED**

Q4. Unlearn Mid-sem Break

As we would all be very aware of, the University of Sydney “mid-semester” break is placed in week 4 of a 13 week semester, rolled into Easter break. To our knowledge, this is in order to avoid reducing the number of teaching days, which would be Easter Friday and Easter Monday. However, it is difficult to understand how the University of Sydney does this when the majority of other Universities give students a break at a reasonable time.

Although this motion seems like a simple administrative point, there are two important reasons for which students must be given a break at actual mid-semester:

1. Mid-semester exams – the idea of holding this break is based on the idea of “STUVAC”. In fact, students from other universities will be heard referring to this break as such. Most students at USYD during week 6-8 will have to find the time to study for mid-semester exams and assessments, while continuing to keep up with general class commitments, and most likely external work and life pressures. In this way, it can be said that students would not have the opportunity to achieve their grades to their full potential. It is unnecessary to have a break so early in the semester when assessments are minimal.
2. In relation to the first point, the pressure and unnecessary pile up of assessments without break will take a toll on the welfare of students. It is very difficult to stay at 100% efficiency from week 5 all the way to week 13, and this could very possibly affect the mental and physical health of students.

This is not only a simple admin issue, but an issue of student welfare and student rights. It is an issue that has been complained about time and time again by students, and as student representatives, it should be in our interest to amend this in order to directly improve student lives.

Platform

1. The University of Sydney SRC supports the implementation of a real, one week study break during the middle of semester in the academic calendar, in replacement of the current dates.

Action

1. The president of the SRC will advocate this issue to the academic board
2. The SRC will take the necessary actions to back this change of the academic calendar.

Sean Young spoke to his motion saying that while this may seem like a minor issue if you talk to students it is clear that this is an issue of student welfare. Adding that it makes it hard to manage their work load and thought it may be a contributing factor to the dropout rate.

Thomas Manousaridis said that this was the only motion of substance relevant to the students at this university.

Procedural motion to move straight to a vote.

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Tim Seguna

The procedural was put and **CARRIED.**

Moved: Sean Young

Seconded: Tom Manousaridis

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q5. New Student Housing That Is Affordable

Preamble

The Student Housing and Student Welfare Office Bearers strongly believe that Student Housing on campus should be affordable and should be prioritising regional and international students. We also believe there should be strong support given to students who feel they have been short-changed or made to feel uncomfortable by the University administration running the accommodation, especially if a student feels they have been unfairly evicted. This is an area we believe the SRC as the advocates for students whose fees go towards paying for the University administration, should take seriously and fight for on behalf of these students.

In light of the University administration spending around \$40 million, an expenditure which students pay into with their money, our money, to redevelop 38 student terraces on Darlington Road and the Darlington House apartment block into a new complex for student accommodation, the SRC should fight to ensure this new accommodation is affordable for students to live in, at least no more costly than it currently is. A maximum of 150 students live in this current accommodation and the redevelopment should more than double this number, with slightly over 330 students being able to live here with shared facilities. This is an initiative that we should support given how this will allow more students to live on campus and become part of a community through these extensive shared facilities. However, given the fact that seven of these terraces to be part of the redevelopment were privately owned causing these residents to sacrifice their living arrangements for the sake of these students, the SRC should ensure that for the sake of the over 300 students who will live there and these residents who will have to move because of this redevelopment that this new student housing is affordable and isn't part of a ruthless scheme driven purely by capitalist greed for the University to increase its profits. Furthermore, the SRC should advocate for regional and international students applying to live in this accommodation to be prioritised. Regional and international students need this more than local students, especially more than students who are privileged enough to afford to live in the expensive College accommodation.

Platform

- The SRC supports new accommodation that is affordable for students
- The SRC believes regional and international students should be prioritised as applicants to new accommodation
- The SRC endorses the Make Rent Fair campaign

Actions

- the SRC should communicate to the University administration its views of the redevelopment
 - prioritising students
 - i. regional
 - ii. international

- -This new accommodation should be affordable, at least no more expensive
- than the current ones at Darlington road
- -The SRC will take future action through campaigns or protests if there is a raise in cost of this accommodation
- -Any developments around this new accommodation, whether it be in terms of revealed costs of living there, the demographics of which students are living there and planned actions of protests against the University administration should be publicised on the SRC Facebook page

Brandon Hale spoke to his motion saying the cost of new housing being developed needs to be affordable and that it needs to prioritise regional and international students.

Sean Young spoke to his motion saying that they currently live in the Darlington Terraces student accommodation. Adding that the University is planning to build another 700 capacity student accommodation nearby which they claim will be affordable, and that there needs to be pressure on the university to ensure it is.

Procedural to move strait to a vote

Moved: Tim Seguna

Seconded: Manning Jeffery

The procedural was put and **FAILED.**

Maya Eswaran spoke to the motion but had concerns with the motions phrasing that regional and international student get priority and felt that being from a working-class background should be enough citing that being from a regional area or an international student was not always the best indicator for affordable housing need.

Brandon amended the motion to included low SES and students with a disability.

Sophie Haslam spoke to the motion saying that as a rural student accommodation is hard to find. Adding that she felt that much of the reason behind the lack of affordable housing was capitalist greed. And that the lack of affordable housing was another tool to prevent working class students from accessing education.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi spoke to the motion saying they she lives in student housing currently, and the cost of living in Sydney means living out of student housing is not an option for her. Adriana Olguin Malavisi continued saying this is something the SRC needs to be working out and they university doesn't not think about affordable housing for students enough.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying that there is very little student housing to start with an even less that can be considered affordable. Much of the student housing that existed in Redfern was privately redeveloped and became unaffordable for most students, adding that the reason so little maintenance is done on the student houses in Darlington is mostly due to the prospect of redeveloping them for profit. Lily concluded saying that a smaller specific campaign may not resolve this issue but a broader one tackling the University's approach to students and education would be more affective.

Brandon Hale said if they do raise costs we should organise actions against that.

Moved: Brandon Hale

Seconded: Sean Young

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

Q7. Standardized Simple Extensions

Preamble:

For university students, issues with mental and physical health, work, and general misadventure are commonplace. Currently we are seeing the highest proportion of young people struggling with mental health issues, making it hard for many students to stay on top of course content and assignments. Many students also struggle with physical health and reoccurring illness. Students face issues at work and at home, and encounter general misadventure from day to day. With help being often inaccessible, the university has to be compassionate to students who are at times not able to complete assessments by the deadline. Although the special considerations system provides support for many students, it requires a substantial amount of documentation, and takes a while to be processed, often leaving students in panic. The special considerations system has many issues that need to be addressed- but until such a time comes, simple extensions are a system which provides a much less stressful, more personal way to extend deadlines. With simple extensions, students have the option to contact the unit coordinator to attain a 2 day extension on any assignment. It's an informal process, providing students with an outlet to explain their situation to their coordinator, and is often a much more compassionate system. However, there are several schools and faculties e.g the school of psychology and the school of pharmacology which don't allow simple extensions in any circumstances. This means students can only attain extensions through the special considerations system, which is troubling for students who experience misadventure, or students who struggle with mental and physical health but don't have documentation. Standardized simple extensions would ensure that all faculties must offer simple extensions as an option to students.

Platform

- The SRC supports a compassionate and consistent simple extension regime across every faculty.

Action:

- The SRC will investigate which schools and disciplines don't offer simple extensions.
- The SRC will bring up this issue to the University Executive and Academic Board, and will investigate how a university-wide policy could be implemented.
- The SRC will support this initiative, and any future campaigns surrounding the issue.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi spoke to her motion highlighting that the issue is that simple extensions are not consistent across the university and the special consideration system is not easy, clear and is very stressful for students and the short turn around means documentation can be difficult obtain.

Sean Young said he agreed with the points raised by Adriana Olguin Malavisi.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying simple extensions should be available to all students for whatever reason and the biggest issue is that University management don't care about student welfare and treat them like cogs in the machine. Adding that this needs to be part of a bigger campaign fighting for better education all round.

Mover: Adriana Malavisi

Secunder: Sean Young

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

R. General Business

The meeting closed at 10:23pm.