

Monash Student Council

Confirmed Non-Confidential Minutes

Meeting 02a/08 of the Monash Student Council held at 3pm on Wednesday the 16th of January 2008 in Wholefoods.

Mr Hilakari asks for a female chair. All women refuse. Mr Hilakari assumes chair, noting his disappointment that this Affirmative Action requirement is lapsing. Regarding voting by chairs, he suggests perhaps the standing orders need to be amended to allow the chair to vote.

Meeting opened at 3:07pm.

1. Attendance:

President:	Mat Hilakari	(chair)
Secretary:	Julian Campbell	(minutes)
Treasurer:	Yuliya Mik	
Education (Public):	Mark Baker	
Education (Academic):	Dash Jayasuriya	Proxy to Jane Armstrong
Activities:	Sarah Cousins	
Welfare:		
Environment:	Nils Wiebkin	Apology
Women's:	Caroline Shipley	
Female Queer:	Allegra Lofgren	
Male Queer:	Rowan Butler	Absent
C&S:	Haydn Steel	
MUISS:	Ronny Tsee Woon Yuen	Apology
MAPS:	Matthew Shields	
General Representative:	Tegan Dobbie	Proxy to Chris Holmes
General Representative:	Simon Singer	
General Representative:	Adam Taranto	Proxy to Michael Keane
General Representative:	Jeremy Healsmith	Proxy to James Mentor
General Representative:	Dara Conduit	Proxy to Naomi Snell
Indigenous:	Billy Gray	Absent
Observers:	Lisa Ritchie Emily Laidlaw Kieran Fitzgerald	

Procedural Motion:

"That this MSC should suspend all standing orders pertaining to stopping Mathew Hilakari from assuming the chair for this meeting."
Moved through the chair.

For: 13
Against 0
Procedural Carried

Mr Hilakari assumes the chair.

2. Acknowledgment of traditional owners of land

This MSC acknowledges and pays respect to the people of the Kulin nations as the original and ongoing owners and custodians of this land. The MSA commits itself to actively fight alongside Indigenous peoples for reconciliation and justice for all Indigenous Australians.

3. Confirmation of agenda order

Laughter ensues at this concept in a special MSC.

4. Space Changes

Procedural Motion:

“That each speaker’s time be limited to 2 minutes.”
Moved through the chair.

For: 13
Against: 0
Procedural Carried.

Draft Motion #1:

“That this MSC revokes the decision of MSC 20/07 in motion #5 and that discussion on space changes be reopened.”

Moved: Matthew Shields
Seconded: Caroline Shipley

Mr Shields outlines that the process followed was not consultative enough, and the outcome was untenable for MAPS.

Ms Shipley argues that consultation problems are the main reason for the motion. She argues it wouldn’t hurt to reopen discussion.

Mr Holmes argues that the motion tabled does nothing to the original executive decision. MSC cannot make a retrospective decision. MSC Executive’s decision stands unless this body formally revokes it. In regards to consultation, the question is whether the executive aware of MAPS concerns, and were they taken into account in decision-making.

Ms Mik argues in regards to consultation that MSC vacillated extensively on why the decision should be made by the Executive. Those meetings argued that the Executive should take the decision because officebearers at MSC are inherently self-interested. Meanwhile, some departments have no voice on MSC. The discussion was publicised extensively, yet MAPS didn’t enter a submission. On the point of whether it doesn’t hurt to reopen discussion, Ms Mik argues that any new proposal has had less than a day’s notice for people to consider, and we are in danger of making a horrible decision because people do not know about it.

Ms Lofgren questions whether this could have been dealt with in conversation with the executive.

Mr Shields replies that MAPS did enter into discussion with the executive to try to minimise impact on the organisation. He acknowledges that MAPS could have had more input into the consultation stage of the process. He reiterates that they raised a couple of proposals late in the day but they were put down.

Ms Shipley argues that until Thursday last week, we were all working off one single model. She states that she intended to attend the space plan meeting and represent MAPS, however due to personal circumstances she couldn’t come.

Mr Shields reiterates that the MAPS committee is uncomfortable at relocating to Lot’s, however they recognise that they do need to move with the times. However the view of the MAPS committee is that the utility room (current Survival Centre) is untenable.

Mr Mentor enters at 3:23pm.

Mr Holmes states that going back through this process again is a waste of everybody's time and resources. Could listen to MAPS, restart, or stick as is.

Ms Ritchie asks what MAPS concerns aren't being met.

Mr Hilakari interjects that discussion should be kept to the motion for now.

Ms Ritchie points out that Ms Shipley proposed the original motion to give the executive control of this decision, hence it seems that now that they do not like the decision they've chosen to fight it in MSC. This doesn't seem like an efficient process. Ms Mik agrees that MSC was asked to have faith in the process, but then those same people have turned around and bagged that very process. She argues that the vast majority of people decided that they had faith in executive to do this properly and that there is an onus on those bringing the motion to show what has changed since then.

Mr Hilakari responds by arguing the motion pertains to MAPS very significant concerns surrounding a model which was not put forward and distributed for some time, unlike his own. The model put forward by executive changed significantly, very quickly. Ms Shipley agrees that MAPS is not saying it doesn't have faith in executive, rather it simply has some potential minor changes it would like heard, where Lot's Wife would not have to move.

Procedural Motion:

"That the chair should call for last speakers and end discussion."

Moved: Yuliya Mik

For: 10

Against 3

Procedural Carried.

Mr Campbell outlines in detail the consultation process, from OB camp, through MSC 20/07, through the 2007 executive's deferral of a decision to 2008, to the GEMA circulation of multiple models, the space change discussion day, a long executive meeting, the proposal of two alternative models to MAPS, the rejection of both and triggering of a further executive meeting, and the formal hearing of MAPS at the further executive meeting before a final decision was made, concluding that consultation on the decision was full and thorough, however he argues that provided MAPS are bringing something new to the table at this special MSC that they should be heard.

Ms Ritchie asks why council cannot hear the MAPS solution before the vote. Mr Hilakari explains that the vote will take place on whether we listen to the MAPS proposed space changes.

Mr Holmes reiterates that MSC needs to make a decision as soon as possible. Ms Mik agrees, highlighting the decision made last year for executive to pursue this. Ms Shipley counters that this decision was taken because MAPS felt the executive understood the needs of MAPS. Further, she argues that a division has a slightly different need to a department, and it is not acceptable to have an office across the hall, no other division puts up with this. Mr Hilakari asks Ms Shipley to speak to the motion at hand. Ms Shipley reiterates that the Executive hasn't had sufficient consultation with MAPS and was told "tough luck".

Mr Shields argues that the space changes are indefensible. MAPS have lost half their floor area and been screwed by the whole process. He feels he's lost MAPS on some technicality.

Ms Mik responds that the process was extremely drawn out. Despite multiple opportunities, MAPS never submitted a complete plan to the executive. MAPS decided the executive was the most appropriate body last year, however this year they've changed their mind. She feels that MAPS have made a judgement based on where they feel they have the numbers.

Ms Shipley reiterates that there are different people on the exec this year. She was told that her proposal was stupid – not in those exact words, but that’s how she was made to feel. She feels that it is inappropriate that she couldn’t put forward a proposal at all.

Ms Snell agrees with Ms Mik that it sounds like MAPS are doing the numbers rather than making a rational argument, but given the events of last year, she is reluctant to silence student dissent in any way.

Mr Hilakari believes he may agree with Ms Snell.

Laughter ensues at this unbelievable concept.

Mr Hilakari reminds council members that at no point should they be representing their own constituency. He understands that perhaps the process could have been done better. In defence of MAPS, many departments didn’t submit space needs. If we told a department such as finance yesterday that they were moving, there would have been massive problems. MAPS were always under the impression that they would move to Lots or stay put.

Motion #1 is put.

For: 4
Against: 9
Abstained: 1
Motion failed.

Mr Hilakari attempts to close the meeting. Discussion ensues surrounding whether it is legitimate to receive a motion from Chris Holmes and continue discussion. Ultimately council decides to continue.

Motion #2 (tabled):

“That this MSC ratifies executive’s decision with the following amendments made: MAPS remain in the current MAPS space; the Activist Lounge moves to the current Survival Centre; the activist computer room moves to the current marketing office of Chris Holmes; and the activist breakout room moves to the current fishbowl office.”

Moved: Chris Holmes
Seconded: Caroline Shipley

Foreshadowed Motion #3 (tabled):

“That this MSC ratifies the space changes decision of MSC executive, and directs it to implement these changes.”

Moved: Haydn Steel
Seconded: Simon Singer

Procedural Motion:

That discussion be limited to half an hour from now.
Moved: Yuliya Mik

For: 11
Against 3
Procedural carried

Procedural Motion:

That the meeting should adjourn for 10 minutes.
Moved: Simon Singer.

For: 2

Against: 6
Procedural failed.

Mr Steel, Mr Singer and Mr Holmes argue the meeting and discussion has gone on for quite some time, and we should vote as soon as possible. Mr Holmes argues both have merits, but there are minor differences between the two which we need to hear reasons for.

Ms Shipley argues motion #2 involves the least changes – asks why we should move 2 departments when we only need to move one. A cohesive space for MAPS is maintained. The Student Liaison Officer will be able to share with the Student Development Manager.

Mr Campbell asks specifically where will the student development manager go under motion #2.

Motion #2a (amended):

“That this MSC ratifies executive’s decision with the following amendments made: MAPS remain in the current MAPS space; the Activist Lounge moves to the current Survival Centre; the activist computer room moves to the current marketing office of Chris Holmes; the activist breakout room moves to the current fishbowl office, *and the Student Development Manager moves to the current office of Jennifer Leung.*”

Moved: Chris Holmes

Seconded: Caroline Shipley

Ms Mik argues that the survival centre is a massive space, with an adjoining computer room, and on the issue of having a staff member separated, they are literally as far away as across the MSC table from the lounge. She argues that perhaps MAPS wants are not met, but their needs are. She argues the executive understood their needs, and provided space that addresses them.

Ms Mik is cut off as discussion ensues over whether the 2 minute speaking limit procedural still applies at this point of the meeting.

Procedural Motion:

“That speaking time for each speaker be limited to 2 minutes following the conclusion of Ms Mik’s speech.”

Moved: Julian Campbell

For: 13

Against: 0

Motion Carried.

Ms Mik has nothing more to say anyway.

Discussion ensues over how the current discussion is different to the previous discussion and exactly what council will be voting on.

Mr Hilakari and Mr Singer exit at 4:07. Ms Mik assumes the chair.

Mr Hilakari returns at 4:08 and reassumes the chair.

Ms Shipley outlines that a self-contained space is afforded to all divisions, and asks why is MAPS different. C&S and MUISS would also find this unacceptable.

On questioning from Mr Mentor on just what the activist space will mean under motion #2, Mr Holmes outlines that an advantage is that the space could be laid out in any number of ways. If everybody drives each other insane, there could be four separate offices. In response to questioning on who the activists are, an amendment is called for.

Motion #2b (amended):

“That this MSC ratifies executive’s decision with the following amendments made: MAPS remain in the current MAPS space; the Activist Lounge (*including Education Public Affairs, Women’s and Environment Officebearers*) moves to the current Survival Centre; the activist computer room moves to the current marketing office of Chris Holmes; the activist breakout room moves to the current fishbowl office, and the Student Development Manager moves to the current office of Jennifer Leung.”

Moved: Chris Holmes

Seconded: Caroline Shipley

Ms Lofgren points out that all proposals move the Women’s Office away from the women’s lounge. Why is this ok with the Women’s office, but not the MAPS office?

Mr Singer enters at 4:12.

Motion #4 (foreshadowed):

“That this MSC directs that all current office bearer space allocations remain unchanged for 2008.”

Moved: Naomi Snell

Seconded: Matthew Shields

Ms Mik argues that no division is self-contained. MAPS are a part of the MSA, a valuable and active part. In regards to their staff member being separate – they are in the equivalent of one day a week. They don’t take hundreds of students’ enquiries. Ms Mik argues the positive of moving a department into the centre of MSA space. To be separate is an unrealistic idea of autonomy, to be separate is to do what MPA did and break off.

Mr Hilakari argues any model should be enhancing our ability to serve students. He reminds council that he circulated his own plan, and would like it if somebody proposed it. In response to Ms Snell’s proposal, he argues that getting Student Rights and the Education Academic officers into a welfare space is far superior than the 2007 model.

Ms Shipley outlines that under motion #2 the Queer and Women’s Offices will be closer to their lounges. She argues that it is important that divisions have their own space as they require a cohesive space to have their own community.

Mr Campbell asks why the SLO must be connected to, as opposed to 3 metres away from, the lounge.

Mr Holmes outlines that the current model is appalling and has resulted in random offices being shoved anywhere that they will fit for some time. Activists need more space.

Discussion at this moment is confidential and can only be read by members of MSC.

Ms Ritchie, Mr Fitzgerald and Ms Laidlaw return to their seats.

Mr Hilakari reminds Mr Keane that we are discussing the livelihood of a person, that this MSC could sack someone, and to please not be a jerk in MSC.

Discussion ensues around the motions for a few more minutes before they are put.

Motion #4 is put.

For: 2

Against 9

Abstentions: 2

Motion failed.

Motion #3 is put.
For: 11
Against: 3
Abstentions: 0
MOTION CARRIED.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at 8am on Wednesday the 23rd of January, 2008 in the Conference Room.

Meeting closed at 4:46pm.