



Voting Members: Rashdina Ramli (Chair (RR)), Prisha Goel (PG), Amitabh Jeganathan, Nicole Mcewen (NM), Aidan Mansfield (AM), Iknur Virik (IV), Melani De Alwis (MDA)

Non-voting/Co-opted Members:

Staff: Tony Goodman (TG), Mary Petrou (MP)

1.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

RR begins by acknowledging the Traditional Owners of the land on which we meet, and pays respects to Elders past, present and emerging.

2.0 WELCOME AND OPENING

Apologies: Amitabh

3.0 CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

N/A

4.0 BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

N/A

5.0 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.1 Election of Executive Officer

RR nominated PG for the role of EO. PG elected as EO.

5.2 Points of discussion brought up by committee members

Aim is to go through each of the points of discussion and to come to a recommendation on what changes can be made from proposed changes

PG brings up capping the number of OGCs to maximum of 13 per party to prevent the ballot from being overfilled. IV questions whether parties would ask OGCs to register as independent candidates but hand out election material for their office bearers.

PG says there are more specific changes which need to be made to the regulations to prevent splinter tickets which will be workshopped and discussed at the next meeting. MA says a cap might make it more difficult for new students to enter the guild and be recruited by parties. TG says policing parties is beyond the guild's control.

PG brings up that having a party register on the guild website with information on each party's values as well as their contact details will help new students to reach out if they want to be involved and help to solve the accessibility problem.

TG says it would be a good idea to increase the nomination fee from 10 dollars to 20 dollars.

MA questions the accessibility issues for students from low SES backgrounds who may feel the increase from 10 to 20 dollars, out of pocket, is a very big difference. Says that there is a risk of the guild environment being favored towards more affluent students.

TG brings up how the sheer number of students whose names get added to the ballot paper significant outweighs the accessibility issue. IV agrees.

MP says most students don't even pay their own nomination fee and get the money back because they only need 10% of the voting quota. If someone is a worthy candidate, it is likely that their friends would be willing to chip in money for nominations.

AM says that from a campaign manager perspective 10 to 20 dollars is a small increment for the individual but the net spending for a presidential candidate that pays for OGCs to run would go up significantly, deterring them from paying for their OGCs and running so many OGCs. MA says that Access can devise a scheme to help students who are financially disadvantaged.

MP suggests if one individual is a nominator, they can nominate multiple other people for multiple positions. TG adds on to say they should only be able to nominate one OGC. MP agrees and adds on to say that 2 seconders are required and can each only sign off on one person per position. For example, if you are serious about running in a election you will seek out 3 different people in your faculty to sign your nomination form, stopping people from being pressured into putting their name on the ballot paper. AM says that this will force students to think more critically about the candidates as they are nominating them instead of party leaders. IV says the form should be an original one from the guild office and not a photocopy because it makes it harder to nominate OGCs. MP says that there will be an alphabetized excel spreadsheet with the names and student numbers of nominators and seconders which will be cross-checked.

After getting 2 unique co-signatures each candidate nominating has to submit a 150 word personal statement. An electronic copy submitted before nomination via Turnitin and is checked by RO to see if points are legitimate and if student is within word limit. Hard copy submitted along with nomination.

MP strongly supports increasing common lunch hours to 1.5 hours instead of 1 hour.

MP would highly consider reducing nomination period to 1 week. TG says if students were more aware of what the different parties are and what they stand for a 2 week nomination period wouldn't be necessary. PG says that all electronic copies which have been approved by the returning officer are to be published onto the guild website and make public record. MP says that electronic copies will have to be submitted before nominations close. TG then goes on to suggest bringing forward some sort of education around party policies for students via Pelican.

AM wants to have more material that is made available electronically, that students can access in their own time instead of running an event where parties get to talk to students about their ideas. TG says articles could be released about each party. AM says a party register should be made public on the guild website including a statement from each party which is submitted along with the party nomination form and group agent's contact details.

Topics to be discussed in the following meeting

- **Formal changes to the regulations**
- **Changes to the nomination period and common lunch hour**
- **Timeline restructure of blackout**
- **Cultural changes which do not require formal editing of the regulations**

6.0 ALL OTHER BUSINESS

N/A

