

2.1 Minutes 2(22)

Motion: To defer acceptance of the previous minutes as a true and accurate record of meeting to the next meeting 4(22).

Mover: Millie Macwhirter

Seconded: Marcie Di Bartolomeo

CARRIED

3. Correspondence

4. Changes under Consideration

4.1. CEO Oversight Committee

Millie flags this as a high priority issue in this working group in the lead up to the AGM and presents the idea of the establishment of a People and Governance Committee to replace the CEO oversight committee. Presents that these recommendations were endorsed by council in respect to governance renewal process at UMSU.

Lauren highlights the report received as a member of council on this topic was vague.

Agreement that a more rigorous discussion would be best held at a meeting next week when Sophie and/or Phoebe can present their views on the issue and further our understanding of the topic.

Marcie questions whether, in the proposal and recommendations, the University's involvement is minimal to reduce their involvement and accountability.

Millie read it this way too. Highlights that this could be helped by the recommendation to recruit qualified members from the community.

Lauren agrees with the recommendation to have external members brought in, as it would bring increased impartiality and accountability from the university. It is presented that given UMSU is a student union it is its role to work for the students and hold the university and its staff to account.

Josh thinks that although limiting the universities role in some cases could bring conflict, however does not believe this is one of those circumstances and bringing in external staff would be beneficial.

Overall agreement that the recommendations are positive.

Marcie highlights a need for a proposed timeline for how we approach this in the future and how it will play out in a way that is positive and achieves the desired outcome, without encroaching on departments and its funding too much. Marcie concludes we need a more fleshed out framework in terms of finance etc.

Agreement that a fleshed out proposal for the oversight committee and discussion with Sophie and/or Phoebe would be beneficial and will be on top of the agenda for next weeks meeting.

4.2. Renumeration of UMSU International Office Bearers

Acknowledgement that no UMSU International Office Bearers or those associated with UMSU international are present. Millie presents her understanding of the issue surrounding UMSU International Office Bearers gathered from past minutes. Sets expectations around UMSU office bearers and communicated her understanding that a clear proposal has not been delivered. Further communicated how the rapidly approaching AGM means that this is likely an unrealistic pursuit.

Marcie was present in the last meeting and questions whether this applies to backpay. Highlights that this is already in the constitution and questions whether this will be fulfilled and what barriers prevent this.

Josh raises that it was his understanding that there was some plan about to be presented in its final stages and just missed the last step. Josh understood that there were steps taken to presenting it but was unsure where this issue was raised. Was unsure if this was presented to this working group, the General Secretary or within internal UMSU International processes. Recommends seeking additional information around how far into this process we are.

Millie actions task that she'll seek out further information around this and whether the presented barriers apply to backpay as raised by Marcie.

4.3. Student Email Campaigning

Millie presents that this issue was put on the agenda as it appeared to be unresolved in the last meeting, from what was gathered from the minutes. Wanted to give people a chance to speak on this again.

Marcie presents what was discussed during the last meeting. The issue was raised that some tickets had access to all student emails and were able to send mass emails to students, while others were not. Last meeting the topic of whether to ban mass emails came up and Marcie stressed that they didn't want to ban emails altogether but ensure that if one ticket is able to send mass emails, other tickets should as well. Additionally, the question of whether we place limits on the number of emails sent during elections.

Josh raised that he had questioned how these lists were obtained. Presented that one ticket had access to the mailing list and one does not. However, Josh was told that this list was publicly accessible but he does not personally have access or know how to obtain it. Josh would be skeptical of equity tickets or measures as in theory any ticket could access the information and it hasn't been obtained through the trading of students private information

or data. In terms of ethical issues, Josh agrees with Marcie and would be hesitant to put a ban or restriction on emails, but that guidelines around election time may be helpful.

Ben adds that the university currently has official rules around email lists, but these are not enforced. You are required to check your emails twice a week and are only permitted to email students from our course according to the terms and conditions at the time of enrolment.

Lauren highlights that all communication influencing the election has to be approved by the returning officer and here there are already some checks in place. Here, it might not be necessary to add strict guidelines or rules and the requirement for returning officer approval could alleviate some of the concern associated with this topic.

Marcie raises the accessibility point brought up by Josh. It might be worth having a guide of how to access that public domain. Felt it didn't sit right that those who have access are gatekeeping it to an extent.

Josh agrees with the equity issue that may pose, however doesn't believe tickets are gatekeeping accessing to the lists. More so a question of whether we set rules or precedent around everyone who runs for a ticket having access to mailing lists etc. This would be a big step and Josh would be reluctant to have UMSU have certain tickets present all their emails so that every ticket as the same access. Especially if said lists are already accessible.

Millie questions whether something is truly accessible if people are unsure how to access it. Additionally asks whether this was raised with the intention of changing the constitution and which sections are relevant.

Josh says this arose with the intent of changing regulations around elections.

Millie asks how people perceive this as an accessibility issue. How strongly do we all feel about this and do we think a guideline would be sufficient or regulations should be changed.

Lauren doesn't view this as a huge issue but does not believe people will listen to loose guides around limiting emails etc.

Marcie highlights that the last meeting saw an intense debate and that they would like this to be further discussed in the next meeting with additional attendees present but only in a respectful manner. Likes the idea of an informal guide.

Josh thinks an informal guide or suggestion is not strong enough and that if we felt we needed a returning officer involved in enforcing this it would need a policy change in terms of electoral regulations. Conscious of bringing it up again if it would lead to unproductive discussion but would be keen to see how people at the next meeting feel. It can fall off the agenda if in the next meeting people do not feel strongly but would be nice to give additionally attendees a chance to speak on it.

Overall agreement reached to leave this topic on the agenda as a low priority item for the next meeting.

5. New Changes under Consideration

Marcie presents that Amelia was in the process of costing extra media and Southbank OB's and whether Millie would be continuing with this.

Millie agrees to look into it and take this further. Additionally, Millie acknowledges that Amelia was looking into constitutional changes regarding adding an Assistant General Secretary, or something of this nature, but that as the General Secretary she would not be pursuing this further.

Marcie also raised that they saw room for an extra C&S OB or staff member depending on what is feasible.

Ben questions whether this would be affirmed in the next AGM and they'd be elected in September.

Marcie says this was the proposed timeline.

Millie will look into the costing of additional Media, Southbank and C&S OBs.

6. Actions from Previous Meeting

7. Other Business

8. Next Meeting

Moved from fortnightly to next week, Thursday the 21st of April 11am.

9. Close

Meeting closed at 12.05