



1. WELCOME AND OPENING

JK opened the meeting at 10:03am and acknowledged the Whadjuk-Noongar nation.

1.1 Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rae Lin Yeo (RY), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ), and Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI)

1.2 Apologies

Paige Brandwood, Lauren Mocke, Chloe Keller

1.3 Proxies

Mutya Maraginot-Joseph (MM) (for Tony Goodman)

1.4 Absent

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

No previous minutes.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

No business.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

None.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1 Appointment of Executive Officer (EO).

JK initially appointed herself to be the EO of the Committee, however after consideration due to the workload of being an EO for two committees, JK has appointed LI to be the EO.

JK congratulates LI.

6.2 Appointment of someone to the Referendum Standing Committee.

This will officially take place in January Council, though JK wishes to have discussed who the appointee will be during this meeting. JK has also considered LI because they are a part of an autonomous department, and most referendum topics tend to revolve around social and advocacy matters. Since Pride has been historically quite advocacy oriented, JK thought that it would be an appropriate appointment for the committee.

JK opens the floor to other nominations. No other nominations were placed.



UWA STUDENT GUILD
The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway | Crawley, WA 6009
(08) 6488 2295 | hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild | @UWASStudentGuild

Governance Committee | Mintues
111th Guild Council
25 January, 2024
Online @ 10am

JK will nominate LI at January Council.

6.3 Tenancy Subcommittee regulations- reviewing the composition of the Tenancy Subcommittee, tenancy allocation process and the appeals process.

LI speaks to the topic. LI mentions that a review of the Tenancy Subcommittee (Tenancy) has been continuously in discussion, especially in the 110th Guild Council. The main point of discussion is the fact that the Tenancy is a Subcommittee of the Societies Council (SOC), which usually means that the Tenancy is subordinate to SOC.

LI mentions that not all tenants who go through the Tenancy process are affiliated to SOC. There are Education Council and Public Affairs Council affiliates, and Guild Departments who are tenants, these sub-councils and departments have no representation on Tenancy according to LI.

The other problem, according to LI, is that the Tenancy OCMs have a requirement of being a tenant club, which leads to there being little non-tenant representation on Tenancy. This has led to contention in the past, and the allocation process has seemed biased towards tenants and non-tenants because of this.

LI also requests that there be a review of the Subcommittee status of Tenancy, and whether Tenancy should be its own Committee. Tracking Tenancy expenditure becomes weird, as it is managed by the SOC Committee instead of directly by Tenancy, and having it be its own Committee would help with tracking Tenancy expenditure and letting Tenancy manage its money directly by giving it its own budget. LI also believes giving Tenancy more autonomy is crucial, since Tenancy manages part of Guild's property, and giving those powers to a subsidiary of a Sub-Council doesn't make much sense to LI.

JK asks if there are any questions or responses to LI's overview of the topic.

IC mentions that the Education Council and Public Affairs Council Presidents are Standing Invitees to Tenancy, for the same reasons that LI raised regarding representation. IC asks if LI is proposing to make those Sub-Council Presidents voting members of Tenancy. LI proposes that if Tenancy were to be a Standing Committee, it would make more sense to have the Sub-Council Presidents as voting members, and not have a nominated member of the Sub-Council executive also be on it, like how SOC currently does. IC clarifies that this will essentially balance the representation, so that Tenancy would be equal to all stakeholders invested in the process.

CJ asks if the main proposal is to separate Tenancy from being a Subcommittee of SOC. LI confirms, they are proposing that Tenancy become its own Committee like Governance or Election Culture.

CJ mentions that the utility of having Tenancy connected to SOC is that it gives Tenancy a platform to engage with clubs, and even though there are tenants who are not affiliated to SOC, most of the tenants are. CJ **proposes that there could be a** change the membership of Tenancy to be more equal but keep Tenancy as a Subcommittee of SOC. LI responds stating that it being a Subcommittee of SOC gives Tenancy a perception of being subordinate to SOC, when Tenancy tends to operate autonomously from SOC. Tenancy has its own general meetings (Tenancy Consultation Meetings) with tenants, it allocates Guild property by itself. SOC's involvement, according to LI, is the appointment of the Tenancy EO, and the appointment of Tenancy OCMs, which generally are appointed on recommendation from the Tenancy Chair.



CJ asks what precedent there is in giving a committee its own budget. IC states that there is precedent for committees to have their own budget, like Tavern and Catering, Corporate Services, and Volunteering. These committees have their own budgets that come under their own departments, and the committees exist to recommend how to exercise the budget to their relevant department. IC says that if we were proposing that Tenancy become its own committee, the tenancy chair would essentially be the executive for that budget, in the same way that the Associate Directors are executives for their budgets.

MM says that the difference with the committees IC mentioned and with LI's proposal is that Tavern and Catering have their own departments associated with them, and Tenancy would have no specific department that the budget would be under. If Tenancy were under Guild Council, it still would not have its own budget, and it would essentially be the same situation as it is under SOC. IC asks if Tenancy could have its own budget. MM says that for a committee to have its own budget, it would have to be created by Guild Council as its own Department, just like Pride or Ethno, which MM mentions would be its own process.

JK believes that it may be beneficial to have the Tenancy Chair (Shreya Bhardwaj) present for these discussions. IC believes that the discussion surrounding Tenancy membership can go on, however the Committee-Subcommittee discussion for Tenancy would be best to have with Shreya.

JK will invite Shreya to the next Governance meeting to aid in this discussion. LI also believes that the previous Tenancy Chair, Claudia Bruce, should also be invited as LI remembers that she also had some thoughts regarding Tenancy related to this discussion.

6.4 Update on Election Culture activities:

With Tony absent, it has been difficult for Election Culture Committee (ECC) to act on recommendations, however JK mentions that there have been good discussions with the Committee regarding the recommendations.

6.4.1 110th Council's recommendations for Autonomous Departments.

The 110th Council made various recommendations to ECC and Governance regarding how the Autonomous Departments operate. JK mentions that ECC has created a document to discuss the various reforms that need to take place. From there, ECC will make a draft resolution and see if it will pass ECC. ECC also has a vacancy, which will be filled in January Council.

JK asks if there are any questions.

CJ asks if the ECC resolution will go to Governance or if it will go straight to Guild Council. JK believes that Governance is higher in the hierarchy than ECC, so JK will try to achieve some consensus in ECC before proposing it to Governance.

IC asks what the timeline is for this to come before Governance and Guild Council. JK says that if the resolution passes the next ECC meeting, then Governance would be able to pass the recommendations start of March, where it would be taken to the March Council. JK wants there to be a consensus before anything occurs so the resolution is not contentious when it comes before Council, so it may take more time as the recommendations from the 110th Council were quite substantial.



IC says that she asked about the timeline since the Ethnocultural Department by-election would have to happen early March. IC asks if it is possible to have an earlier meeting or to pass the resolution via circular so that the new regulations were in place by March so that the new election would be run under the new regulations. JK will workshop this with RY and is happy to discuss the timeline outside of the meeting.

6.4.2 Independent campaigning for other candidates.

JK believes that this topic would have to happen with Tony. JK will have a meeting with Tony once he returns from his leave. Once JK has a draft resolution ready, it will become a topic for Governance. JK asks if IC has any expectations for this issue to be resolved.

IC would like this to be done ASAP as it would change the Guild Election Regulations would have to pass through the UWA Senate. IC would like to have this resolved by the May Senate session, so that it could be done before the Guild Elections. IC says that she is happy to explain the recommendation to ECC to anyone who was not in the group prior to the discussion took place.

LI asks if the change to the Election Regulations would be a single-line change, like: "Independent candidates may only campaign for themselves." JK says that there were two specific criteria which they believe were infringed at the last election. IC cites 622(2)(y) of the Election Regulations, which states: "An Independent Candidate must not distribute or display Election Material endorsing a Group or a member of a Group." IC states that this does not prohibit Independents from endorsing other Independents, so the issue ECC identified was that if a band of independents got together, their expenditure limit for election material would be much beyond any registered Group, essentially creating a "de-facto independent party" which is prohibited by the Election regulations and would negate the printing and candidate limit.

LI asks if we can change 622(2)(y) to include "another Independent Candidate". IC says that's most likely going to be the change. JK agrees that it would suffice. CJ says that a better wording could be "Independent Candidates may only campaign for themselves", or other words to that effect, as it would be unambiguous and avoid any loopholes.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

CJ asks how Governance will run this year, whether Governance will work on regulations together or if JK and RY will workshop regulations together and give it to Governance to review. JK says that it will probably be workshopping between herself and RY, however she would like input from everybody at every stage as this committee covers a lot of portfolios.

IC asks if JK had the chance to identify the regulations that need to be reviewed. JK hasn't had much guidance in general due to Tony's absence, and aside from what was raised in today's meeting, there isn't much that is super clear which needs to be done.

CJ asks that in terms of Venture and its Governance, it seems like a good idea to find some clarity with how it works. CJ mentions that the Venture Chair did not have any student input; it seems like it feels very different to how other departments or how Pelican or Prosh works, and Governance should get clarity of how and why Venture is different and what needs to be changed. IC mentions that Venture's regulations are not in the Guild Statute Book, the person to follow up would be Chloe Bull in that instance. IC spoke to Chloe, however, and she says the regulations do exist somewhere, but it's not in the Statute Book, so it's something to follow up with Tony in her opinion.



UWA STUDENT GUILD
The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway | Crawley, WA 6009
(08) 6488 2295 | hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild | [@UWASStudentGuild](https://twitter.com/UWASStudentGuild)

Governance Committee | Mintues
111th Guild Council
25 January, 2024
Online @ 10am

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

JK closes the meeting at 10:31am.

Next meeting will be held TBD. Please contact the Committee Chair; Jelena Kovacevic (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au) with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.



1. OPENING AND WELCOME

JK opens the meeting at 1:35pm and acknowledges the Whadjuk-Noongar nation.

1.1. Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rachel Yeo (RY), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), Tony Goodman (TG), and Lauren Mocke (LM).

1.2. Apologies

None.

1.3. Proxies

None.

1.4. Absent

None.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCIEVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

LI declares that they are friends with Nicolas Charnley, an OCM applicant.

RY declares that she is friends with Thomas Lenette, an OCM applicant.

CJ declares that he is an acquaintance of Nicolas Charnley, and recently appointed Mahima Jagadish, an OCM applicant, to the PSA committee.

IC declares that she is an acquaintance of Nicolas Charnley.

JK declares that she is a friend of Savani Daluwatta, an OCM applicant, and is an acquaintance of Nicolas Charnley.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTEES

3.1. Confirmation of March 19th Minutes

JK moves to confirm the March 19th Minutes. Seconded by IC. Motion passes unanimously.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.1. Bi-monthly meetings confirmation

JK confirms that the Governance Committee members are happy to meet bi-weekly. JK mentions how she discussed with LI that times for meetings will be picked so that one meeting time works well for JK and another meeting time works well for RY.

LI asks if the members of the Committee were comfortable attending a meeting on a Friday evening. Several members raised objections to having meetings after business hours. LI corrected themselves, stating that they meant Friday afternoons. No strong objections from the members. PB raises that Fridays are days where some members do not have classes, like herself, and might have to attend meetings on Fridays online.

IC requests that the student members of the Committee put their availabilities onto their Outlook Calendar, to aid JK and LI's search for a meeting time.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

No business.



6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1. Appointment of Ordinary Committee Members

CJ asks how we will be recommending members to the Committee, whether it is done by consensus or straw poll. JK says that the Committee will go into camera to discuss each candidate individually and decide from there.

JK moved to go into camera. Seconded by IC. Motion passes.

JK moved to out of camera. Seconded by IC. Motion passes.

JK moved that the Governance Committee appoints Mahima Jagadish to the committee, based on the advice of the committee chair. Seconded by LI. Motion passes with one abstention.

JK moved that the Governance Committee appoints Muhaimen Jonaidee to the committee, based on the advice of the committee chair. Seconded by RY. Motion passes unanimously.

JK moved that the Governance Committee appoints Nic Charnley to the committee, based on the advice of the committee chair. Seconded by PB. Motion passes with two abstentions.

JK Congratulates the OCMs.

6.2. Update on Tenancy Policy Discussion

LI speaks to the topic. LI says that JK, RY, Tenancy Chair Shreya Bhardwaj, SOC President Max Vinning, Tenancy Executive Officer Nic Charnley, and themselves met on the morning of March 27th to discuss the operations of the Tenancy Sub-Committee.

There were a series of questions prepared, which LI distributed to the members of the Committee, and LI read through the responses to the questions.

1. When selecting applicants to be allocated a clubroom, what were the criteria you used?

The members stated that they considered the proposed use of the room, which persons would have access to the room, and the sizes of the rooms. They also mentioned that criteria in the Tenancy Governing Document were considered as well.

Their key focus was clubroom usage, with a highlight towards member usage and not committee-exclusive usage. Clubs which stated that they would only use the room for committee meetings were less likely to get a clubroom, as the Guild provides spaces for committees to host meetings.

The members mentioned that historical and actual usage of the clubrooms, if applicable, were considered when deciding which applicants would be successful.

2. Are there any criteria you think should be mandatory when going through applications?

The members believe that the criteria that was in the application form should be a mandatory consideration, as well as if the applicant has an up-to-date Executive Registration Form (ERF). There were many applicants who had not submitted an up-to-date ERF and were consequently not considered for a clubroom. The members noted that they were quite confident in the application form as most unsuccessful applications were unsuccessful due to their answers on the application form.

When questioned regarding if affiliation to ED or PAC affecting the application, the members responded that PAC affiliations did not have an impact, whereas affiliations to ED were more likely than not rejected as it is encouraged that faculty societies contact their relevant school before applying for a clubroom.



3. What were the criteria used for giving tenants their specific rooms?
For continuing tenants, the Sub-Committee tried to minimize disruptions to the clubs, giving them the same room. Otherwise, the members mentioned that the application was what determined the size requirements for a club. They mentioned that there was a lot of moving around in the Guild Hall space as it was assessed that some tenants would benefit from larger rooms and others would benefit from smaller rooms.
4. What were some strengths of the tenancy allocation process as a whole?
The members noted that having members on the Sub-Committee who were knowledgeable of the clubs from the Guild and Cameron Halls was very useful when deciding allocations. The members also spoke favorably to the application process.
5. What can be changed in the allocation process as a whole? (Specifically: the actual process of going through and getting applications and giving people a room and announcing results, appeals, etc.)
The members noted that the previous Tenancy Sub-Committee should not have a say in the allocation process and should not be invited to any allocation meetings. They noted that in this year's process the members of the previous Sub-Committee did not contribute to the discussion and instead invited more conflicts of interest.

The timeframes of the application process were noted to need extending to allow for the Sub-Committee to do the entire allocations process from the start of term, and not have the previous Sub-Committee start the allocations and hand it off to the next Sub-Committee.

6. What are your thoughts on the proposed model of having the allocations process being done by a separate body?
LI mentioned that there the members were split on the decision. Two members were against, and one was in favor of the proposal.

The member in favor of the proposal noted that applicants would be less likely to have conflict with the committee if the allocation process was done by a separate body which was directly under the Guild Council and not composed of members of the Societies Council.

The members against the proposal were wary of losing insight from tenants in the allocation process. They believed that it was vital that the body performing the allocations should have working knowledge of prospective tenants and SOC. The members suggested that the Tenancy Sub-Committee become a Committee of Guild Council, with some members of staff sitting on the Committee and a member from the Guild Hall tenants and another from the Cameron Hall tenants.

All members stressed the importance of having tenants sit on the Committee, regardless of if it is a separate body or not but avoiding a tenant majority on the Committee. They also believed that having staff sit on the Committee may lessen conflicts with the Committee as clubs may be more hesitant to harass staff (though members of Governance do not believe this to be the case).

The members also believed that appeals should be done through Governance and not be done through the Managing Director.

IC asks LI if the recommendations could be presented in writing to the next Governance meeting. LI confirms that they will write the recommendations up to be presented.

CJ asks what the process is after this. JK mentions that any substantial changes should first pass Governance, and then possibly be passed by Tenancy. IC says that it may not have to go through Tenancy, and raises that it would have to go through SOC.



LI asks for clarification if there is a “staff tenancy officer” which oversees maintenance. TG says that its Jack and Brenda’s purview. Kelvin oversees the security of the spaces, like cameras and locks.

LI to write up the recommendations and present them to the Committee.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1. Permanent appointments for Pride Co-Officer, Environment Officer, and Access Co-Officer to be considered.

JK moved to go into camera. Seconded by LI. Motion passes.

JK moved to go out of camera. Seconded by RY. Motion passes.

7.2. Corporate Framework regarding Stakeholder Consultation

CJ asks if there are any updates to the framework. TG mentions that he has already tabled it with Governance, and it is now up to Governance to decide how to proceed. JK mentions that IC and herself will be reviewing the next steps regarding the framework.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

JK closes the meeting at 2:30pm.

Next meeting will be held on the 19th of April. Please contact the Committee Chair, **Jelena Kovacevic** (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au), with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.



1. WELCOME AND OPENING

JK opened the meeting at 3:01pm and acknowledged the Whadjuk-Noongar Nation.

1.1 Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rae Lin Yeo (RY), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), Nicolas Charnley (NC, invitee) and Tony Goodman (TG)

1.2 Apologies

Chloe Keller

1.3 Proxies

1.4 Absent

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

LI raises that they are a member of the Societies Council (SOC) Committee as an OCM and may have a conflict of interest for item 6.7.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1. Confirmation of January Minutes

*IC moved to confirm the January Minutes, LI seconded.
Motion passes unanimously.*

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Related business already included in the agenda.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

None.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1. Recommendation for the appointment of the Education Council President.

JK moves to recommend Akshata Jois (AJ) to be appointed Education Council President to the February Council Meeting. IC seconded.

IC mentions that in the interest of time and the urgency of having an Education Council President appointed, and to the same extent with the Wellbeing Officer, it makes most sense to appoint the Acting Education Council President to be installed as the Education Council President.

JK concurs that this is an urgent appointment, and that AJ is doing a great job so far.



Motion passes unanimously.

6.2. Recommendation for the appointment of the Wellbeing Officer.

JK moves to recommend Lauren Kohlen to be appointed Wellbeing Officer to the February Council Meeting. IC seconded.

Motion passes unanimously.

6.3. Update on Election Culture Activities.

JK mentions that the Election Culture Committee (ECC) will be having its next meetings
Week preparations.

6.3.2. Independent campaigning for other candidates.

JK raises a motion that recently passed via circular in ECC regarding Independents campaigning for other Independent Candidates. The wording of the motion is read.

ECC recommended to Governance to change 622(2)(y) of the Election Regulations from “An Independent Candidate must not distribute or display Election Material endorsing a Group or a member of a Group.” to “An Independent Candidate must not distribute or display Election Material endorsing a Group, a member of a Group or any other independent candidate.”

JK mentions that this should be changed soon as the Guild has had an unprecedented number of independent candidates’ campaign in the 2023 elections, and it is urgent that it passes so that it may go through the UWA Senate Process.

IC speaks to the motion. IC says that currently, there is a loophole in the regulations. While independents cannot form a party called the “Independent Party”, currently the regulations allow independents to campaign for other independents, essentially forming a *de facto* party. Since independents have separate printing limits to parties, an unlimited number of independents could form a collective and essentially have an unlimited printing limit. This also subverts the group candidate limit, as currently there is a limit to the number of Ordinary Guild Councillor candidate parties may nominate.

LI asks a question of procedure regarding how the proposed change will be adopted. IC answers that after this motion passes Governance, it goes to Guild Council, and then ends up in the Senate.

TG mentions that another election regulation will need to be raised in Senate later. IC enquires if Governance should send multiple changes in one package. TG says that it is best to submit at most one or two changes to the Election Regulations at a time, otherwise the changes may take years to complete the Senate process.

TG speaks to the amendment saying that this change makes sense. It preserves the meaning of an independent candidate, as someone who stands alone from other parties and candidates.



JK asks if we should get two changes to the Election Regulations through Senate later, or if we can propose this change now. TG explains that the Senate process includes putting the proposed change through the UWA Legislative Committee (UWALC). The more Governance proposes, the harder it becomes to pass as the UWALC would have to scrutinize more material and may raise more objections to the proposals. TG discourages Governance to propose large changes unless if it is critical.

IC asks if there are any other changes ECC wants made to the Election Regulations. JK says that other than the proposed independent candidates change, the Autonomous Departments were also raised by the 110th Council as needing review. IC mentions that those changes do not need to go through Senate.

*JK moves to propose the following amendment to the Election Regulations.
That 622(2)(y) of the Election Regulations be amended to read: "An Independent Candidate must not distribute or display Election Material endorsing a Group, a member of a Group or any other independent candidate." Seconded by LI.*

No questions to the motion.

TG says that the exact wording of the change may not be as passed, as the university is concerned with the preservation of freedom of speech. IC says that if the intention of the wording remains the same, there should not be any objections.

Motion passes unanimously.

6.3.1. 110th Council's recommendations for Autonomous Departments.

JK says that the recommendations were numerous and that ECC is going through the changes.

TG recalls that the main reason that the Autonomous Department (AD) regulations were not amended earlier was due to the changes made in the Election Regulations by the 109th Guild Council. TG believes that all Department Elections should have the same format in operation. TG raises SOC and PAC committee elections as an example of how the regulations should be modelled in terms of operation.

JK says that the primary concern is the Ethnocultural by-election is going to proceed. JK agrees that large scale changes to the AD elections should occur, but they should occur later. LI concurs with TG on the point that AD elections should be more uniform, raising the example that Pride elects its officers as individuals, whereas other departments elect pairs or individuals. LI also agrees with JK saying that there should be a concrete by-election policy, as this is the first time a by-election would occur, and this is the perfect opportunity to test a new policy and make amendments if needed.

IC agrees with LI and JK, saying that our current focus should be on the Ethnocultural by-election and if we should run the election under current or amended rules.



CJ asks if, under the current power divestment in the Guild, Governance has a mandate

the Acting Ethnocultural Officers have enough of a notice, as currently they do not know if or when the by-election will take place.

IC asks that if Governance proposed a few ideas to ECC, if it was possible ECC have a decision ready by the end of the month? JK says that it is possible.

IC suggests that we decide on how the Ethnocultural by-election should run to recommend to ECC. IC then lists the considerations given to the 111th Council by the 110th Council for the by-election. Including: venue of the vote; time period that ballots are open; duration for the registration to vote; method of registration to vote; method and deadline for nomination; and polling period (if needed).

LI suggests that the venue be held in the Guild Student Centre (GSC), as how RSD elections are run. TG mentions that staff do not want to have to run elections in the GSC. TG believes that the 111th Guild should decide how AD elections should be run now, so that it may apply to the by-election.

TG says that students who want to take advantage of the system always do, so it does not matter whether elections are done online or in person in his opinion. TG raises the example of PSA elections being done online and being successful and transparent. TG says that if the regulations are clear on candidate campaigning the PSA elections ran smoothly. TG says that the by-election could be run in a similar way to the PSA election.

Discussion over how the Ethnocultural by-election should take place included discussion over how other Departments handle their elections, how having two officers per Department is a new policy, and whether to do the election online or in person and the relevant considerations of either.

IC suggested to let ECC have their discussion over how the by-election should run, and that Governance should meet after ECC to go over what ECC decided and to vote on how to proceed with the by-election. This was supported by CJ, LI, and JK.

TG supports IC's suggestion and raises how election appeals should be run going forward, especially with the by-election happening. RY suggests creating an election appeals committee which works closely with Governance but is ultimately independent and handles AD election appeals.

LI suggests that we have probity officers for AD elections, who can scrutineer the RO. IC asks how this is different to the election appeals committee. LI responds that this would also apply to the General Elections. It was raised that General Elections were run by the WAEC and that the General Elections follow their process.

JK closes the discussion on 6.3.1. summarizing that ECC will meet to propose a by-election process, and Governance holds an extraordinary meeting to discuss the proposed process.



6.4. Tenancy Subcommittee regulations – review of the composition of the Tenancy

LI speaks to the topic. They summarize the previous month's meeting, stating that the

LI tables a memo written by Andrew Lawrence, a previous PAC treasurer and secretary for an applicant club, regarding whether the club should appeal Tenancy's clubroom allocation. LI believes that the memo includes good points regarding the Tenancy allocation process.

In summary, the memo states that the current appeals process under the current regulations do not allow for merits-based appeal and has a very limited scope for procedural appeals. It states that this concentrates too much power to the Tenancy Subcommittee and is prone to abuse. The memo lists three proposed amendments to the process which includes: a list of mandatory considerations for the tenancy process; full release of the Tenancy allocation meeting minutes, so that applicants check if the mandatory considerations have been followed; and allowing merits-based appeal to the Guild Executive as the Tenancy Subcommittee does not have dialogue with applicants, resulting in flawed decision making.

LI believes that the memo also speaks to the fact that as a Subcommittee of SOC, Tenancy has too much power, and the investigation of whether Tenancy should be its own committee under Guild Council, or if the Tenancy process should be reconsidered all together, should be conducted.

NC points out that the memo suggests mandatory considerations, but the current regulations already have a list of considerations that the Subcommittee may consider. LI asks if those considerations are mandatory, NC says that they are not. LI says that they think the memo is suggesting that those considerations be made mandatory.

On the point about procedural appeals, NC says that the regulation currently only has strict time frames that Tenancy must follow, everything else is up to Tenancy.

TG says that whether it is a subcommittee, the SOC and PAC presidents, or their representative, must be included in the consultation. LI raises the issue that Ed Council affiliated clubs also can apply, so the Ed Council President should also be included. TG sees merits in Tenancy being its own Committee.

LI raises that under current regulations, Ordinary Subcommittee Members must have been on the executive of a club and be a member of a tenant organization. CJ mentions that this essentially requires those members to have direct conflicts of interest. NC concurs and mentions that he believes that the regulation is bad.

IC requests that for the interest of time, a survey of the Governance Committee members be conducted for thoughts on Tenancy, and the results be discussed for the next Governance Meeting. LI says that should also be sent out to the Tenancy Chair and Tenancy EO.

6.5. Compilation of a list of Guild stances.

TG says that he has been in talks with the Guild Archivist, and they want a brief of what the Archivist should be compiling.



After discussion, JK will advise the Archivist to compile a list of motions on representation from

CJ suggests that Standing Orders be updated to include information about what counts as

6.6. Creation of a Corporate Responsibility Framework regarding stakeholder consultation in Guild business.

TG has been doing some background work on the Corporate Responsibility Framework/Social Responsibility Framework. He hopes to have some suggestions ready for Governance and Council soon.

CJ enquires if Governance can also discuss the creation of a form for motions to be submitted that includes information on whether stakeholders have been consulted before moving a motion, for example. LI asks if that would go to a Motions Committee. IC says that Guild Executive is tasked with reviewing motions.

6.7. Appeal from TownTeams regarding the interpretation of SOC regulation 144.

TownTeams is a disaffiliated club who wished to transfer the monies remaining in their Guild account to their parent organization. The SOC President declined the move, citing SOC regulation 144, stating that since TownTeams did not specify where they wanted the monies under Guild to go, that the monies entered the possession of the Societies Council. TownTeams appealed this decision.

LI says that the main issue with this appeal is that TownTeams' constitution was not provided, nor is there a constitution from the parent organization that Governance or SOC has access to. CJ asks if TownTeams was SOC affiliated. LI says that they were but were disaffiliated three years ago.

LI says that we should allow TownTeams to provide their constitution so that we may make an informed decision, but that we should give them a time frame. If they do not provide their constitution, then the appeal should be denied. PB raises the concern that TownTeams could provide a fake constitution. LI enquires if Guild has an archive of the affiliated Society Constitutions. IC will check.

IC says that an issue that might be ran into is if TownTeams was an Incorporated Association. If we take possession of their money, the Guild may run into trouble.

CJ suggests that we defer until we have a constitution. CJ asks if there is a specific timeline Governance must follow. LI says there is no specific timeline. IC suggests trying to find out if TownTeams was an Incorporated Association before proceeding.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING



UWA STUDENT GUILD
The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway | Crawley, WA 6009
(08) 6488 2295 | hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild | [@UWASStudentGuild](https://twitter.com/UWASStudentGuild)

Governance Committee | Minutes
111th Guild Council
19th February 2024
Meeting Room 1 @ 2pm

JK closes the meeting at 3:07pm.

Next meeting will be held TBD. Please contact the Committee Chair; Jelena Kovacevic

1. WELCOME AND OPENING

JK opens the meeting at 1:33pm and acknowledged the Whadjuk-Noongar nation..

1.1 Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rachel Yeo (RY) (late), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ) (online), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), and Tony Goodman (TG)

1.2 Apologies

Lauren Mocke and Chloe Keller.

1.3 Proxies

None.

1.4 Absent

None.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 Confirmation of February minutes

JK moves to confirm the minutes, LI seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.1 TownTeams Dispute- Deputy Chair update

As RY is running late, JK will provide the update. JK mentions that RY is waiting for the appellant to provide more information regarding their appeal, namely a copy of their constitution. JK asks given the little information provided by the appellant and given that they were given a reasonable time frame to provide aforementioned information if it's appropriate to dismiss the appeal. JK also mentioned how it appears that the appellant is not interested in continuing the appeal.

IC is happy to dismiss the case. LI asks for clarification on whether the proposal is to vote against the appeal or to do something else. JK confirms that that is essentially what the proposal aims to achieve.

JK moves to dismiss the appeal, IC seconds. The motion passes unanimously.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

There was no business completed via circular.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1 Clubs Grant Policy

JK confirms that the members of the committee have received the document detailing the recommended changes. The recommendations are read.

1. That 32.a be changed from "2023" to "YYYY" to ensure ongoing relevance.

2. To include the addition of point 36 under Orientation Grants, to read "The penalties which may be levelled against the maximum Orientation Day Grant amount a Societies Council Member may receive are set out in Table 1."

3. To include the addition of point 46 under Special Projects Grants, to read "The penalties which may be levelled against the maximum Special Project Grant amount a Societies Council Member may receive are set out in Table 1."

4. Amendments specific to Table 1:

4 (i). To replace the title to read "Penalties Affecting Grants" (removal of the word "semester").

4 (ii). To remove the word "Semester" from the Penalty column.

4 (iii). To remove the word "Semester" from Item 5 in the Breach Column.

PB asks for a clarification on the motion. IC explains that currently, the SOC grant penalties only apply to the Semester Grants, implying that clubs who do not attend SOCPAC meetings, or who do not complete Treasurer Training, are not penalized on O-Day Grants or Special Project Grants. IC and JK explains that Max Vinning (MV), the SOC President, just wants to ensure that the penalties are being applied uniformly, and that there was some confusion with the penalties, as they historically have been applied uniformly regardless.

LI asks if the amendments have ensured that any numerical references are updated with the additions of rules 36 and 46. JK says that any references can be amended easily and that they had not noticed any references that would need updating.

JK moved that the Governance Committee approves the recommended changes to the Clubs Grant Policy. RY seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

6.2 Draft Tenancy Policy - Lorenzo

LI mentions that they were helping sort a club's filing cabinet, and they had found a clubroom allocation policy from 2011. In the policy, LI explains that the procedure for clubroom allocations included a committee that was implied to be separate from the Tenancy Sub-Committee. LI says that this implies the allocations procedure was done by a separate body, other than the Tenancy Committee.

LI says how currently there appears to be a glaring conflict of interest within the Tenancy Sub-Committee, being both a Tenant's Organisation which represents tenant interests to SOC and the body who allocates the Leasable Spaces every three or so years. IC concurs with the assessment of the conflict of interest with the current Sub-Committee. LI says that the process should be separated.

RY joins the meeting at 1:41pm.

LI has proposed for discussion a draft policy that merges the current and 2011 policy together in a way that is cognate. LI says that the draft policy has a few points highlighted for discussion, but the main allocation system has stayed the same. The main parts for discussion are the composition of the proposed allocation committee, whether ED should be included in allocation discussions, and how the appeals process should proceed.

CJ asks if Shreya about the draft policy. He believes that the policy makes sense, but just to ensure that feedback from Shreya is or will be included in the process given her role in the recent allocation round this year. IC says that this is a great policy to raise for discussion and have something to present to Shreya and get her feedback on the product of the discussion in Governance, as there may be further changes to the procedure because of the "chaos" that occurred in this allocation cycle.

TG asks if the plan is to still make Tenancy its own Committee rather than being a Sub-Committee of SOC. IC says that this would separate the allocations process to be its own Committee under Guild Council and retain Tenancy as its own department or Sub-Committee under SOC. LI says that it would probably be sensible to still have Tenancy be under SOC as their function would then to make representations to the Sub-Council in charge of affiliated clubs. IC summarises that Tenancy would then become a Tenants Union and the Allocations would be under Council. The Committee agrees that further discussion with Shreya should occur and JK will organise a meeting with Shreya and other interested parties.



IC raises that with the current policy, the Tenancy Sub-Committee chair is the chair of the Allocation process, but in the 2011 policy this was not the case. LI says that in the 2011 policy it was the SOC President who chaired the meeting, and the SOC president had a final say on the Allocations where consensus could not be met. LI says that this should probably not be the case in any future policy as it would risk the chair deciding in a minority opinion where the rest of the committee may have a different opinion. IC asks who the EO was in the 2011 policy. LI says that there wasn't an EO in that policy, rather the Committee had an executive.

IC suggests that the draft policy should have the SOC President as the Chair and have the Tenancy Sub-Committee Chair as a member who advocates for the various tenants. IC elaborates on her suggestion by explaining that under the current process, it is hard for the Tenancy Sub-Committee Chair to be both an advocate for the various tenants and chair the allocation committee if or when there is contention with the results of the process. LI asks if the Tenancy Sub-Committee Chair have a vote in IC's suggestion. IC confirms.

CJ raises a concern with the SOC President being the chair of the allocation committee, regarding the workload of the SOC President during the allocation period. CJ notes that currently, the allocation process occurs during a peak time for SOC, with O-Day, and other events which occur start-of-year. CJ suggests the chair be the SOC VP or another executive.

TG comments on CJ's suggestion, stating that the Sub-Council Presidents are most likely the most knowledgeable persons who know which clubs should or should not be tenants. TG concurs that there should be two distinct processes with regards to advocating for the tenants and allocating leasable spaces to tenants but continues saying that it's hard to deny the knowledge that the advocates would have.

TG suggests starting the drafting process from scratch, as there are three areas that need to be reassessed completely. The first of these areas is the definition of tenant. Given that the Guild is looking at building storage areas for clubs, should those clubs be defined as tenants? The second area to reassess are the criteria for clubroom allocation.

TG circles back on who should be the chair for the allocation process and proposes that the Guild President, or Vice President should have been the chair. IC suggests the General-Secretary. TG says that the General-Secretary should be more focused on administration.

IC says that the allocation process has a lot of admin work, which was the concern raised by CJ regarding having the SOC President be the chair of the committee. TG concurs, saying that this ultimately returns to the second area that needs reassessing in the allocation process. Once a set of criteria is created, TG says that the question of composition would resolve itself.

TG says that the final area for reassessment is the process for setting up the allocations. TG says that the allocation process should be done a lot better. TG explains that there should be a questionnaire that outlines the criteria well and allows for the clubs to represent themselves. IC says that this is already the case, but the admin work that occurred this year was focused on selecting the applications that merited an allocation before the allocation meeting.

TG also raises a concern with the appeals process. TG explains that in a meeting with legal counsel for the Guild regarding proposed changes to the Guild Departments, a concern was raised that there are too many differing appeals procedures within the Guild's bureaucracy.

TG reiterates that after the criteria for clubroom allocations is hammered out, the allocations policy will "fall into place".

CJ concurs with TG regarding the criteria and asks if there should be a criteria rubric or marking key that is used for allocations that is returned to applicants after the allocation process. IC says that currently there are a loose set of criteria, but there are no set criteria that must be assessed for allocations. IC says that one of the problems this year was that the current set of criteria could have been applied to any club that a member of the sub-committee believed

should have a clubroom. Any future set of criteria, according to IC, should not allow for any subjective interpretation.

LI raises that with the advocacy-focused inclusions in the Allocations Committee, their proposal included representatives from Guild Hall and Cameron Hall tenants as standing invitees. IC and TG say that that proposal could go very well or very badly in the allocation meeting.

TG says that this should be a year-long project for governance. LI and IC agree. TG reiterates that the first step is getting a concrete set of criteria for clubroom allocation, and then to worry about the composition and workload of the committee.

IC suggests to JK RY and LI to have a meeting with Shreya regarding compiling a list of criteria for Tenancy. JK and LI also suggest including Nic as Nic was involved with selecting the applicants who were going to be allocated. IC then suggests including Max too, given his contributions. CJ suggests including ED and PAC in the meeting to get their input on relevant criteria from their portfolios.

JK, RY, and LI to have a meeting with relevant parties with Shreya, Nic and Max, with ED and PAC as optional attendees.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1. Albany

IC raises that the current regulations for the Albany Association is not in the Guild Statute Book. This was brought to IC's attention after discussions with the current President of the Association regarding an election for their committee. TG says that in the past Guild Council would appoint a Councillor, usually from Albany, to be the Guild-Albany Liaison. TG says that this an opportunity to utilise a new Department Policy to resolve how to manage the association.

TG mentions that currently, Albany has in the range of 100-200 students, so having a meaningful election does not seem practical. JK suggests having a form of compulsory voting. LI says that it would be difficult for the Guild to enforce. IC also raises that there is not a full list of students in Albany since there are students who study online in Crawley from Albany who are not included as Albany students.

IC's proposal is to work with the Albany Association President on an application process for the Albany Students' representative and for their committee. Over the course of the year, a full policy can be developed. TG suggests that an online election system for Albany might be how Governance should proceed, the Albany campus's unique demographic.

7.2. Timeline for Department Regulation Updates.

LI asked for an update on the changes to the Department Regulations, and if there could be a timeline provided at this stage. TG says that he recently came out of a meeting with Guild's legal counsel, and they will come back with a quote for updates to the regulations. At this stage, the legal counsel and TG have suggested that the Departments move to a standardized set of regulations, with relevant changes made for specific departments where needed.

TG also notes that the Guild should move away from calling the Departments "autonomous", since all their activities are associated with the Guild and any consequences from the activities are reflected on Guild Council and not the "autonomous" Department.

TG says that the regulations should move to a 'template' model, with all the Department regulations following a template regulation, that can be modified to better suit the



Department's needs. In this template, the Department positions, except for the Department heads, will be appointed by the Department head.

TG says that this also relates to Clubs, SOC, and PAC, with regards to standardizing how Departments and Clubs can remove or ban members from the department/club or their committee.

7.3. Guild Stances Register

TG says that there will be a proposal presented soon, a few things will need to be confirmed with the Archivist and the General Secretary. CJ asks about the process for ensuring that new motions that are presented are not similar to previous stances. IC says that she and Nikhi have had a review of a few proposals and would like to present them to Governance before the April Council Meeting. TG says that any changes to how motions are presented to Council can be done through the Guild Standing Orders.

7.4. Regular Meeting Time

LI asks if there can be a regular meeting time for Governance just so that there is regularity. TG mentions that there is no regulation saying that Governance only needs to meet once a month, it is possible for Governance to meet more regularly. JK was thinking of proposing having bi-weekly meetings for Governance but was afraid of there not being much to discuss given low engagement when agenda items are asked for. JK is open to having bi-weekly meetings though as it allows for more regular updates to projects and ensures that the members are engaged with the meeting.

JK asks if members are happy to have biweekly meetings and there are no objections. LI asks if this meeting time works for everyone. TG asks if the meeting can be earlier, JK says that it is hard for them to schedule around their work, so any time after 1:30 works best for her.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

Next meeting will be held on 2nd of April. Please contact the Committee Chair; **Jelena Kovacevic** (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au) with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.



1. OPENING AND WELCOME

JK opens the meeting and passes the chair to LI. LI acknowledges the Wadjuk-Noongar Nation.

1.1. Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rachel Yeo (RY), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), Tony Goodman (TG).

1.2. Apologies

None.

1.3. Proxies

None.

1.4. Absent

None.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCIEVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

LI: Pride Co-Officer recommendation.

IC: Knows one of the Pride Co-Officer candidates.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTEES

3.1. Confirmation of April 2nd Minutes

LI moves to accept the April 2nd Minutes. IC seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.1. Bi-monthly meeting times.

LI states that they have been going through the Scheduling Assistant on Outlook and they have found two candidates for a regular meeting time. The first proposal is every other Friday at 1:30pm, and the second proposal is the first Monday and the second-to-last Friday of the month at 1:30pm. LI asks for feedback on either proposal.

IC, CJ, and PB state that they prefer the first proposal.

Meetings to be held every other Friday at 1:30pm in Meeting Room 1.

4.2. OCM appointments.

LI states that the Governance Constitution has an abnormality with references in the OCM appointment procedure, however most other constitutions are written so that the OCM appointments are approved by Guild Council. OCMs will be confirmed for by Council before coming to Committee Meetings.

IC asks whether this has been the case in the past, as OCMs in the past were appointed at the Committee level, or if this is just the case for Governance. LI says that the Committee Constitutions that they have looked at all have the clause where OCMs are appointed by Council. TG states that as it stands, any appointments to a Guild Committee should be done by Guild Council, on recommendation from the individual Committees.

IC asks JK and LI if every Committee chair must table the OCM recommendations for the upcoming Guild Council. LI says that in theory the OCM recommendations should have been tabled in the March Council, otherwise it is the case that the Chairs should send in their recommendations. IC says that she will send out notice to the Committee Chairs so that nominations are submitted by this weekend.



5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

No business.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1. Appointment of the Environment Officer

IC is meeting with Anya, the Acting Officer, and requests to defer the recommendation to be done via circular until IC confirms that Anya is willing to continue being the Environment Officer.

The recommendation was deferred via circular by unanimous consent.

6.2. Appointment of the Access Co-Officer

JK speaks to the topic, the current Access Officer has said that they are confident in Lucinda, the Acting Officer to continue in the role. From JK's discussions with the Access Officer about the overall working relationship with the Acting Officer, JK is happy to put Lucinda as the Access Co-Officer.

LI moves to recommend the appointment of Lucinda Bartlett to the position of Access Co-Officer to Guild Council. IC seconds. Motion passes.

6.3. Appointment of the Pride Co-Officer

LI tables ATTACHMENT 1, which includes the candidates, and their statements, for the Pride Co-Officer position as recommended by the Pride Department Committee. LI states that for neutrality, they would prefer to not be included in the discussion and vote for the recommendation.

CJ is concerned that despite some members of the Governance Committee not being members of the Pride Department, the fact that there are two candidates feels like, to him, that the Committee is running a quasi-election within Governance.

IC states that she would prefer to go on the recommendation of the current Pride Co-Officer but is understanding of LI's hesitancy.

LI states that the wording of the motion in March Council was that the Governance Committee's recommendation be done in consultation with the Pride Committee, and not the Co-Officer. CJ reiterates his concern with the ethics of having to pick two candidates. LI clarifies that the two recommendations mean that the Committee has sanctioned both candidates and is comfortable with Governance picking one of the candidates.

TG clarifies that if the Pride Committee has recommended two candidates, it is the role of Governance to ensure that either candidate will be a good fit, not only within their department, but with their working relationship with the other Co-Officer and with Council and the Guild as a whole.

LI moves to go into camera. This motion passes.

LI moves to go out of camera. This motion passes.

JK moves to recommend the appointment of Alexia Wood to the position of Pride Co-Officer to Guild Council. RY seconds. Motion passes with one abstention.

6.4. Discussion of the recommendations from Tenancy Sub-Committee members.

LI passes the chair on to RY.



LI tables ATTACHEMENT 2, the recommendations from members of the Tenancy Sub-Committee. RY asks if everyone has had a chance to read the document. The members confirm. RY opens the floor to discussion.

IC states that she is comfortable with all the recommendations but believes it to be beneficial to discuss the composition of the meeting and the separation of powers in the Tenancy committee as there was a disagreement within the members of the Tenancy Sub-Committee. IC is more comfortable with the majority recommendation that Tenancy should become a full Guild Committee.

LI concurs with IC. Though they believe that, while it is true that the majority of the Tenancy Sub-Committee believes that there should not be any separation of powers from Tenancy with regards to allocations, there may be a conflict of interest with the members of Tenancy as they might err in preserving the status quo and is concerned with Tenants having the power to allocate tenancies to other clubs. CJ concurs with LI.

CJ asks if it is possible for there to be a compromise where the Tenancy Committee has an Allocations Sub-Committee that does not have any tenants as members of the Allocations Sub-Committee. LI and RY say this is what the minority recommendation is.

IC disagrees, as she believes that there is a potential risk in not including people who are knowledgeable in the Tenant space, and while IC believes that the merit criteria in the recommendation allows for impartial decision-making, if there are no members who are knowledgeable of the dynamics within the tenants, they may create decisions which are unsustainable.

IC also states that she finds it important that an absolute majority of the Committee should be non-Tenant, as mentioned in the recommendation, and finds that the inclusion of a representative from Cameron and Guild Hall to be useful.

RY asks if this will be going to Guild Council after the Committee votes on the recommendations. IC says that a new policy should be drafted first. LI adds that after the vote that the Committee should discuss the composition of the Tenancy Committee.

RY moves to adopt the majority recommendation, LI seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

RY opens the floor to discuss the composition of the Tenancy Committee.

IC says that the current composition has three non-tenant members to two tenant members and asks if it is prudent to increase the membership of non-tenants in the Committee. LI suggests adding a non-tenant club representative to the Committee. Members of the committee concurs.

LI asks how the Committee selects its tenant and non-tenant representatives. IC suggests that the process be like how OCMs are appointed to Committees.

LI asks for clarification on the “staff tenancy officer” as mentioned in the recommendation. TG says that it would be the Associate-Director Commercial, or their nominee.

CJ asks if there is a reason that the Education Council President and the Public Affairs Council President are standing invitees and not voting members. LI says that the members of the Tenancy Sub-Committee were concerned with the inclusion of the PAC and Ed Council Presidents biasing



the process to those clubs when there should not be any bias. CJ replies that the composition of Ed Council is being reviewed due to “Faculties” no longer existing. Degree-specific clubs, in CJ’s opinion, are unlikely to achieve a tenancy with their respective school and should have a chance at being assigned a Guild space.

LI suggests that the SOC, PAC, and Ed Council Presidents should be able to send in a nominee in place of the president, given that their roles are already substantial.

CJ raises the possibility of making the representatives Standing Invitees, because as it stands, their role is to give insight into the culture around Cameron and Guild Hall, and it would remove any outside influence on allocations.

Tenancy Policy including the above discussion and recommendations to be written.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1. Amending the Motion Notice Requirement

LI asks, given that the General Secretary has recently sent out a notice asking for motions to be sent in by the Friday before Council, if the notice requirement in the Standing Orders be shortened. IC clarifies that the General Secretary’s notice was so that any Motions Without Notice be included in the agenda for accessibility reasons.

7.2. Guild Departments providing a list of Committee Members

CJ asks if it is possible to move a motion in Governance or in Council, to require Departments to send in their student numbers to the Chair or General Secretary to confirm that the members of the Department Committees are students. IC agrees and believes that the General Secretary and the Executive Assistant to the Managing Director be given that information. TG concurs.

RY moves to recommend to Guild Council to require Department Officers to send in the names and student numbers of the Department Committees to the General Secretary and the Executive Assistant. IC seconds. Motion passes.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

RY closes the meeting at 2:26pm.

Next meeting will be held on the TBD. Please contact the Committee Chair, **Jelena Kovacevic** (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au), with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.



1. OPENING AND WELCOME

JK opens the meeting at 1:33pm and acknowledges the Whadjuk-Noongar nation.

1.1. Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rachel Yeo (RY), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), and Tony Goodman (TG).

1.2. Apologies

Lauren Mocke (LM)

1.3. Proxies

None.

1.4. Absent

None.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCIEVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTEES

3.1. Confirmation of April 19th Minutes

JK moves to accept the April 19th Minutes. IC seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

4.1. Tenancy Policy

LI says that they are going through the policies and has begun writing the required amendments. They note that due to exam season the completion of the draft policy and amendments will take some time.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

5.1. Environment Officer Recommendation

The Governance Committee recommends the appointment of Anya Kai to the position of Environment Officer to Guild Council. Moved by JK, seconded by IC. This motion passed.

JK and LI note that this will need to be confirmed by council along with the Committee OCM appointments.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1. Corporate Social Responsibility Framework

IC tables the Corporate Responsibility Framework draft document.

IC asks for input and any amendments to the draft document before it is finalized. Several minor wording and grammatical amendments were noted. IC notes a major amendment to the *Ethical Responsibilities* portion of the document. LI noted that the Guild is a not-for-profit entity and asks to amend the wording of any mention of “profit”. IC and TG suggest “financial sustainability”.

IC asks if it would be worthwhile to include wording regarding a commitment to advocacy. TG says that as advocacy is part of the purpose of the Guild, including it in the Framework would be redundant, but should not be a problem.

PB suggests that mentions of “society” could be changed to “our community” to better reflect the Guild’s role as a community-based organization.



IC notes that part of the reason the Corporate Social Responsibility Framework was commissioned was to answer the question regarding what adequate community consultation is. IC suggests that consultation is “fit for purpose”, that is, that the bodies and organizations who are represented by the motions can give input in the motions.

LI asks how the Standing Orders would be amended so that the Framework is integrated. TG suggest including that motions must be aligned with the Framework.

Final text to be adopted after amendments are incorporated and document will be formatted with Guild branding.

6.2. Review of Committee Constitutions

Several committee chairs have noted changes they want made to their respective constitutions. Notably, committees and staff wish to include Guild Staff Departments as standing invitees to the committees to improve the communication between the councilors and the staff.

TG mentions Venture’s organizational structure will be aligned closer to the ‘base model’ of Committees and Departments.

LI requests that all the committee constitutions be circulated to members of Governance to allow for members to be able to review them at their own time.

TG and JK note that amended constitutions should be first adopted by the respective committee before being accepted by Council.

Governance agrees that the Committee review will focus on “refocusing” the purpose of the committees. JK to begin consultation with committees and Council.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No business.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

JK closes the meeting at 2:26pm.

Next meeting will be held on the 17th of May at 1:30pm. Please contact the Committee Chair, **Jelena Kovacevic** (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au), with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.



1. OPENING AND WELCOME

JK opens the meeting at 1:39pm and acknowledges the Whadjuk-Noongar nation.

1.1. Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rachel Yeo (RY), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), Muhaimeen MJ (MMJ), and Tony Goodman (TG).

1.2. Apologies

Nicolas Charnley (NC), Mahima Shirdi (MS), Indi Creed (IC), and Christopher-John Daudu (CJ).

1.3. Proxies

None.

1.4. Absent

None.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCIEVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTEES

No minutes were available to confirm. LI apologizes and explains that the lack of minutes is due to exams.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

No business.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

No business.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1. OCM Introductions

The committee introduced themselves to the new OCM.

6.2. Review of Committee Constitutions

JK gives an overview of the requested changes from the Committees that she has received as of the 24th of May.

Corporate Services wishes to include a member of the Marketing Department. Equity and Diversity wishes to reduce the size of the committee by only allowing one Co-Officer from each Department to attend the meeting, with the other Co-Officer being able to attend as a Standing Invitee.

TG notes that from the All-hands Staff meeting, more input from students on committees was requested, so a refocus on student engagement on committees should be conducted. TG suggests doing a mid-year 'recap' with committees.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Governance to have next meetings in Mid-June after the Exam season.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

JK closes the meeting at 2:09pm.



UWA STUDENT GUILD
The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway | Crawley, WA 6009
(08) 6488 2295 | hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild | [@UWASStudentGuild](https://twitter.com/UWASStudentGuild)

Governance Committee | Agenda
111th Guild Council
24th of May, 2024
Meeting Room 1 @ 1:30pm

Next meeting will be held on the 22nd of June at 1:30pm. Please contact the Committee Chair, **Jelena Kovacevic** (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au), with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.



1. OPENING AND WELCOME

JK opens the meeting at 1:06pm and acknowledges the Whadjuk-Noongar nation.

1.1. Attendance

Jelena Kovacevic (JK), Rachel Yeo (RY), Indi Creed (IC), Christopher-John Daudu (CJ), Paige Brandwood (PB), Lorenzo Iannuzzi (LI), Nicolas Charnley (NC), Muhaimeen MJ (MMJ), Mahima Shirdi (MS), and Tony Goodman (TG).

1.2. Apologies

None.

1.3. Proxies

None.

1.4. Absent

None.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCIEVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No declarations.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTEES

No business.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

No business.

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

No business.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1. NUS KPI Review.

IC moves to go into camera. This motion passes.

IC moves to recommend to Guild Council to pay a 35% of the accreditation fee to the National Union of Students. JK seconds. This motion passes.

IC moves to go out of camera. This motion passes.

6.2. Tenancy Committee Constitution

LI comments that they had received feedback from one club which was received at 5:35am. LI has distributed the feedback to members of the committee but notes the length of the feedback. LI says that it is understandable if members wish to defer the review of the feedback to the next meeting to give members more time to go through the feedback.

The Governance Committee, via unanimous consent, deferred this agenda item to the next meeting.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No business.

8. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

JK closes the meeting at 2:42pm.



UWA STUDENT GUILD
The University of Western Australia
M300, 35 Stirling Highway | Crawley, WA 6009
(08) 6488 2295 | hello@guild.uwa.edu.au
facebook.com/UWASStudentGuild | [@UWASStudentGuild](https://twitter.com/UWASStudentGuild)

Governance Committee | Minutes
111th Guild Council
24 July, 2024
MR1 and online @ 1pm

Next meeting will be held on TBD. Please contact the Committee Chair, **Jelena Kovacevic** (chair@guild.uwa.edu.au), with any apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.