



SENATE MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE:	29/06/2018
MEETING TIME:	11am
MEETING LOCATION:	Council Chambers

1.0 - ATTENDANCE

President	Stewart Lee
General Secretary	Greg Warren
Vice President (Academic)	Sarah Cavanough
Vice President (Equity & Diversity)	Absent (with leave – Proxy Modjadji Mokoto)
Vice President (Social Activity)	Caitlin Gibbs
Environmental Sustainability Officer	Harrison Gray
International Officer	Absent (with leave – proxy Caitlin Gibbs)
Postgraduate Officer	Absent (with leave – proxy Sarah Cavanough)
South West Officer	Absent (with leave – proxy Stewart Lee)
General Senator	Modjadji Mokoto
General Senator	Faizan Akram
General Senator	Abishek Mehta
General Senator (SW)	Nicole Maskell

2.0 – APOLOGIES

3.0 – PRELIMINARY MATTERS

3.1 - Acknowledgement of Country

“The Guild acknowledges that we are meeting on Wadjuk Nyoongar land and also Wardandi Nyoongar land, and acknowledges their elders, both past and present. We recognise the land was stolen and never ceded, and always was and always will be Aboriginal land.”

3.2 - Approval of Previous Senate Meeting Minutes

SM1806/01 – Motion that the Senate approve the minutes from the April as formal, accurate, and correct.

Moved: Greg Warren

Seconded: Stewart Lee

Motion: Carried unanimously

Greg complained about the policy requiring him to make audio recordings of Senate meetings and compare this to minutes for accuracy as being overly onerous on him given his seat in an open plan office. Trying to listen to the recordings with headphones is difficult during office hours due to noise, and he can't play the minutes over speaker due to concerns about staff or students overhearing in-camera discussions of the Senate and possible conflicts with the Senate / Staff Communications policy.

3.3 - Declaration of Conflict of Interest

3.4 - Announcements

3.5 - Office Bearers Reports

3.5.1 - President – Stewart

Been working on staffing issues.

3.5.2 - General Secretary – Greg

Working on Schedule of Delegations & Authorities. Current version is a mess, mixing up approvals and delegations into the same list which leads people to mistakenly believe they are the same. Just because someone has been delegated the power to do something, doesn't mean they can then approve their own work. The idea is that someone delegated power needs to seek approval from someone else whenever they do something substantial.

Under the Constitution, approvals must always be made by two Senators and for anything involving expenditure of funds the Secretariat or the Senate are meant to be the approving body. This obviously hasn't been happening, so I've been trying to get that sorted out.

Additionally, there are currently multiple sources of delegation in the Guild, including the Constitution, Policies, the EA or other contracts which the Guild is a party to, and Resolutions of the Senate. This has been fairly laborious, but I now think I have all of our delegations recorded but at some point will have to go back through all previous Senate Resolutions to investigate if there are any others not recorded currently. Fortunately, the 2016 Senate abolished all delegations by motion which means I only have 2 years of minutes to read – but that motion was likely also a key factor leading the current state of affairs in relation to the Schedule.

I've also been working with Stewart to work with Governance on proposing changes to the Constitution and the Election Rules to correct the "debacle". The University is currently conducting a policy review of their own, so we've also been looking at changes they are proposing to: the SSAF deed, Statute 11, and the ECU Rules – Student Guild. This is a universal review being conducted on all Rules and Statutes of the University, with the University trying to make sure they are all laid out in the same way and using uniform terminology for all of these Statutes and Rules. This does affect us as our own Constitution and Policies are subject to some of the Uni's Statutes and Rules.

The Constitution changes put forward at the AGM are non-viable now. So we now need to go through the entire process again, submitting a proposed Constitution to the Senate, then to an SGM, and then back to the University. We have been working with Governance (Elham Saunders and Kathryn Clark) on preparing this

One of the major changes to the Constitution is we have to remove all the changes to rules for the Discipline Committee we proposed at the AGM for conflicting with Statute 11 Clause 7. Elham and Kathryn both agreed with us that our proposed rules were much more procedurally fair than the previous rules, so are amenable to proposing changes to Statute 11 to allow for the Constitution change. The problem is, changing Statute 11 will take a considerable amount of time as it needs to go to Parliament. So we may need to set our proposed Discipline Committee rules for a future Senate to implement when the Statute is changed.

I've also been dealing with student inquiries and club inquiries as I'm still typically the Senator most often in the office.

3.5.3 – Vice President (Academic) – Sarah

[illegible]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Age Group	Percentage of Respondents
18-29	90%
30-49	85%
50-64	80%
65+	70%

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

Meeting with a student regarding living a low carbon impact life, the student claims there are many ways the Guild could also lower our impact as well. The student would like to run a workshop on sustainability for the Guild in the future.

Harri has also been working with Caitlin, preparing to run events for her when she is away.

Harri also asked that Sarah talk to him about contributing to the student garden. He mentioned he had available funds which he could use to assist Nutrition Hub to purchase equipment or supplies for the garden.

3.5.7 - International Officer – Shariq

No tabled report.

3.5.8 - Postgraduate Officer – Vacant

No tabled report.

3.5.9 - South West Officer – Rebecca

No tabled report.

3.5.10 - General Senator – Faizan

Preparing for cricket tournament. He has prepared lists of the teams, and arranged supplies. He is currently working on getting a ground to play on organised which he expects to have sorted by the next meeting of the Senate.

3.5.11 - General Senator – Abhishek

I just did my exams so didn't do whole a lot other sitting in the office and assisting with the student quires. However I will be assisting Faizan and Catlin with cricket tournament, assisting Vesh with NAIDOC, supervising/making guild day bags and trying to do an event for which I am waiting for the conformation from a VP and International officer.

3.5.12 - General Senator - Modjadji

Modjadji has been working on templates for reporting for Senators, and now has one customised for every role. Hopefully this will make Senate reporting better in the future.

3.5.13 - General Senator (SW) - Nicole

No tabled report.

3.6 - Accredited Observer Reports

3.6.1 – CEO Report

N/A

3.6.2 – Immediate Past President Report (IPP)

N/A

4.0 – PRIORITY ITEMS

4.1 - Education Officer Stipend

Sarah tabled the following text in favour of this motion:

The motion below relates to the creation of a new budget line in the Academic budget to account for the introduction of payments to education officers (student reps) for meetings attended in the course of their duties (Teaching & Learning Committees and Undergraduate Studies Department Meetings.) This will be done to increase attendance rates at these meetings in preparation for the new powers granted to the teaching and learning committees by the Education Committee this month. It is essential that reps attend T&L's and report back to the Guild any concerns or changes that affect our membership.

Proposed stipend payment will be:

\$40 per meeting = 40 x 8 reps (for T&Ls) x 6 remaining meetings for 2018. = 1920.

= 40 x 16 x 6 (USD meetings) in Semester 2, 2018 (up to 2 reps per school to account for availability changes, sickness etc.) = 3840

I can surmise that based on past availabilities that I will not get full attendance at USD meetings so will round this amount down to 3000.00. so total amount will be approximately \$5000.00.

This payment will not be retrospective, and if it proves successful in increasing attendance at meetings than I will propose a motion to include the stipend permanently as part of my department policy in the future.

Stewart queried whether we should actually provide separate stipends for department meetings and T&L meetings, as this meant we could pay a person hundreds of dollars to sit on a University committee without ever feeding the information back to the Guild.

Greg pointed out that as we are looking at paying an honorarium we can easily only pay if they attend both meetings, but also be flexible where they attend the T&L meeting but are unable to attend the department meeting so long as the rep in question tables a report to the Department. Then it would be up to the relevant Senators as to whether or not to make the payment in a given month.

Sarah was happy with this model as a plan as the intent of the motion was to incentivise reps to provide the Guild with the up-to-date internal workings of the school and any elements of importance to our Members.

Greg went on to say it is very important to have the Department meetings as often as is possible, because the T&L meetings can be quite convoluted, with most of the faculty loving to use 3-letter acronyms and jargon. So it can be easy sometimes to struggle following the conversations faculty have in these meetings. Talking with someone back in the Office whether it be Sarah or Stewart or the GSA's about things talked about in the meetings has often led to me remembering or understanding many things I missed at the time. I think having the same support for the T&L reps in the form of a meeting where they can discuss the happenings of their specific School T&L meetings will make it much easier for students to pick up what is important to our Members in those meetings.

Stewart checked that Sarah would be fine with an \$80 stipend to attend both meetings (or provide the information from the T&L to the Senate) and she said she would be fine with that.

SM1806/02 – Motion that the Senate approve the creation of a new budget line item ACD18002_Education_Officer_Stipend_Payment within the budget category ACD_Student_Advocacy_Jobs, and approve the transfer of \$5000.00 from ACB_Contingency_(ACB_Study_Skill_Jobs) to this new line item.

Moved: Sarah Cavanough

Seconded: Abhishek Mehta

Motion carried without dissent.

Greg then mentioned that multiple General Senators had spoken to him about the fact they only get paid an honorarium, which doesn't incentivise them to work. Greg pointed out that historically Senates have not changed the pay conditions of the current Senate in the same term, instead they make the changes for the following term (which hopefully offsets corruption). Greg thought their arguments had merit, it does seem unfair that a General Senator is paid \$80 no matter how long they work, while a casual works 3 hours on a bbq and earns the same amount.

Stewart and Caitlin pointed out the same debate gets raised every year. Stewart said that in the previous term the same discussion was held around the same time, early July.

4.2 – Discussion regarding O'day

Greg told the Senate that he had been talking to both Paul and the School of Nursing about O'weeks. There looks like there is going to be a fair amount of change this semester.

Paul suggested only having a marquee per VP rather than requiring every club to have a table (which inevitably leads to empty tables or desultory displays for most tables). If a club is actually running some substantial workshop, event, or display then we will be happy to provide a table, but otherwise we'll just ask them to provide flyers or some other handout to be put in the relevant VP's marquee.

Apparently the University is also down-scaling the day, and has not invited many of the external groups they usually do. There will be much more focus now on inductions at a school level. The School of Nursing, for instance, is running four or five small inductions a week where we will have a Guild Table and students will come talk to us about the services the Guild provides, while grabbing a Guild Bag.

The School of Science is likely to do the same thing they did last semester, where they run a larger seminar but make the students form small groups and then run competitions to work out who can find something in SIMO or Blackboard, etc. for prizes for the fastest group. So the students make friends and also learn how to find information rather than sitting still for two hours in a lecture then not remembering a thing.

We need to contact the Schools and find out what each one wants to do with us.

4.3 – Discussion regarding Cadmus

Stewart met the developers of Cadmus in the previous month when he was in Melbourne, he was introduced to them by Angela Hill.

The developers told him they had moved Cadmus from originally being an anti-cheating tool, to one which they now were developing to be a training tool for students to learn to write at an academic level. They also showed him that you can copy references from End-Note into Cadmus documents, which was one of the key causes of complaint about the original version.

Greg mentioned that in the School of Business & Law a trial of Cadmus had caught 16 students contract cheating (the same assignment for all 16) while another unit without Cadmus had caught a similarly sized group of contract cheaters so there is obviously a need for the software. The group copying into Cadmus all typed in the assignment manually and made some changes to try to obfuscate the fact they were all using the same work. Cadmus still detected that they were not writing in the manner of someone writing their own work, but rather in the manner of someone copying work and identified the changed documents as all coming from the same source.

Greg also mentioned that the SBL T&L Committee had been shown a site where every ECU assignment from the last 7 years was published, and faculty were told to crack down on their staff reusing assignments, rather than rewriting them.

Clearly the cheating business has become big money and so programs like Cadmus are needed to combat the problems, we just need to make sure that the Guild makes sure that students are not punished with crippled functionality or lack of access to resources while the University starts to implement these tools.

Stewart mentioned Cadmus now works offline, which is better for Aboriginal students and others who may have limited access to the internet. Stewart was the only Senate member to have been in a trial unit for Cadmus and told the Senate it had been completely terrible (basically notepad but online) but it now looks like it is improving.

Greg went on to mention it is not just students with problems with Cadmus, it is also faculty. Multiple faculty present at the meeting were coordinating units which received the trials of Cadmus and all had horror-stories to tell about it. The largest problem was that Cadmus doesn't accept pictures or graphs being inserted into the document, while some of the units chosen for the trial had assignments requiring students to do this.

As a result, faculty spoke of the need to design units for Cadmus before implementing it, which Greg pointed out, could take a year to make it all the way through the various Committee's required to do so.

4.4 – Constitution Changes

Greg discussed the ongoing changes to the Changes to the Constitution, Election Regulations and other University documents relevant to the Guild.

He explained that most of the changes were either to bring all University documentation into the same format with terms having the same meaning: For instance, the "Election Rules" had changed title to "Election Regulations" to avoid confusion with the University documents called "Rules" while the "Election Regulations" was solely a Guild document not a University one.

There was the usual confusion related to wide-spread changes to policy in any large institution. For instance, at one point all references to "conflict of interest" were to change to "material personal interest." At a later meeting, Stewart and Greg were informed that due to complaints about whether people would understand what the new term meant, it was switched back to "conflict of interest."

Some changes are for clarity of reading. Instead of putting "subject to the Act, the Statute, and the Rules" in multiple clauses in a document, now there is an overarching clause at the beginning of each document stating what superseding documents the current document is subject to.

As mentioned before, we will need to have a Senate meeting to approve the Constitution before the SGM. As soon as we have a finalised Constitution with changes clearly labelled with the intended intent of the change, we'll get it to the Senate. This is a very laborious task, however, so we can't give an accurate time-line at the moment.

It was explained that Stewart and Greg were not making definitive decisions now, but rather simply getting Governance to sign off on proposed changes to the Constitution which would be submitted to the Senate and the SGM from scratch – but knowing it would likely pass muster when submitted to Council if it is approved by both the Senate and Members.

To answer Senate queries, Greg clarified further and said that due to having to roll back the Discipline Committee changes and move the elements of the Election Regulations into the Constitution it was hard to say that the current version is "in principle" the same as the one which passed the 2018 AGM. While it might be possible to fudge and claim it's all the same, Greg strongly recommended running through the entire process again to make sure there was complete clarity as to what the valid Constitution is in the future.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

5.0 – DISCUSSION ITEMS

This section is for items not at a priority level but for discussion.

6.0 – OTHER ITEMS

This section is for items that have not been submitted early enough to be included in the agenda but are discussed, items only appear in this section if they are of a very high level of importance, otherwise they will be left till the next meeting.

7.0 – APPENDICES

Appendices should be a separate document exported as an image file and dropped in one page at a time.

7.1 - Appendix 1 – Appendix Title

--

7.2 - Appendix 2 – Appendix Title

--

7.3 - Appendix 3 – Appendix Title

--

Next Meeting Date:	TBA
Next Meeting Time:	TBA
Next Meeting Location:	TBA