Student Representative Council - Board Meeting	
Meeting time and date:	2 July 12pm – 2pm
Meeting venue:	**N16_-1.10A & Microsoft Teams**
Attendees 1. Spencer Holzheimer (SH) 2. Kore Opie (KO) 3. Kyle Low (KL) 4. Mariska Simpson (MS) 5. Kiara Harley-Craig (KHC) 6. Simarjot Kaur (SK)	
Observers 1. Holly Hawkins – Student Communities Coordinator & acting SRC Board Secretary (HH)	

	Meeting open Meeting opened at 12:05pm by SH
1..	Acknowledgement of Country - SH Delivered the Acknowledgement of Country
2.	Apologies & Proxies -Apologies received from Chloe Forbes -Proxy Received by Chloe nominating Kore as proxy, to vote at their discretion.
3.	Previous minutes & matters arising **Motion: Motion to accept the minutes as a true and accurate record of the previous meeting.** **Moved: KO** **Seconded: KL**

	Motion Carried unanimous • HH referred to the action items from the last meeting highlighting that all had been fulfilled. • SH spoke to some issues arising from the previous meeting regarding the policy subcommittee acknowledging the discussions outside of the meeting. • SH mentioned that there were some committees that he sat on in the capacity of SRC chair and as a student, which meant that there was an opportunity to nominate another SRC rep to fill the SRC representation on those committees. • SH spoke about writing an article in the upcoming Griffith Journal about the SRC and made a call for topics of discussion for that article. • KO Clarified that the call for Griffith Journal articles had been made to all reps and that the opportunity to write articles was open to all and that KL was drafting an article also. • KL Stated that the article written by SH should be written in a personal capacity rather than on behalf of the SRC.
4.	**Policy Review Subcommittee** • SH spoke to no changes being made since the last meeting, given the lack of time/capacity during exams he had not made any amendments. • SH spoke about issues that had been raised regarding the section on reporting and the powers for the subcommittee to produce their own reports. • SH proposed that the subcommittee should still be able to disseminate the meeting minutes as it sees fit. • KL- Spoke to section 3.1 seemingly giving the committee power that shouldn't be allowed. The SRC shouldn't be granting power to a group of unelected students. No decisions should be made by the subcommittee, and any decisions should be made via the SRC. • SH – Responded to say that the end goal of the committee is that it should co-exist with the SRC and not under it. To create a mechanism for the

University to use. The end goal is that it becomes its own thing separate from the SRC. Gives students an avenue to reach the University. Its ability to self-govern is important.

- KO- In its current stage, it should be accountable to the SRC, but if it was separate from the SRC then this poses greater issues, in terms of accountability with no election requirements.
- KO- It wouldn't be a good idea for the SRC to give the subcommittee an undisclosed number of powers.
- SH- Spoke to removing/amending the clauses relating to powers.
- KO- Proposed that it can't be accepted it in its current form, suggested waiting for an amended version before the SRC can make a decision.
- SH- Read out a section of the subcommittee charter.
- KL- Stated that it's important to talk about it, it is a large document that is in complex language, for the board to fully understand the powers of the document, it's important that proper consultation is conducted.
- SH- spoke to it not going above the board in terms of powers. Agrees that the powers should be limited and says those powers are very clear in the document.
- KO- Raised that fact that it is non-binding is not the point, no accountability to the student population is the real concern. Recommendations shouldn't be allowed from the sub-committee to the University but rather to the SRC board, for approval/recommendations.
- MS-Highlights that the conversation is going around in circles and stated that the SRC has the powers to form and disband any subcommittees.
- SH- Stated that its goal is as a permanent feedback mechanism.
- MS- Summarised it as essentially a focus group.
- KL- More discussion needed around the intentions of it going forward. Where to go from here- will need to see the updated charter before we vote on it.
- KO- Suggested that the SRC was being used to kickstart a personal project. It would be wrong for any recommendations to come forward from this

	subcommittee – students can't be held accountable for those recommendations. • SH- Refutes the personal project summation. The SRC has neglected policy review and feels that it's important that it is a focus. • MS – Spoke to the need for provisions to be in place to protect the SRC. Everything the subcommittee does should come via the SRC board. • KL- Suggested that it may be better placed being created outside of the SRC and independent. • MS- Suggested arranging another meeting to discuss this specifically. • KL- Recommended that it is spoken about in a full capacity board meeting. More time is required. • SH- To remove the discussed sections. **Tabled pending further review.** **Action: Spencer to update the charter, share it for further discussion and review. Add to the agenda for the next meeting.**
5.	**Plant Based Treaty** Tabled until next meeting at request of KHC **Action: Include it in the agenda of the next meeting.**
6.	**Debrief on DVCE meeting** • KO – Opportunity to discuss the meeting and next steps. Shaun spoke to communication and opening up committees and communication with student reps. • KO- Spoke to the importance of communicating with the broader student population. Highlighted the idea that it was expected that student reps should be disseminating information to students. Outside of the boards (guilds, src, gupsa), students on other committees shouldn't be expected to share information to the broader student board and this responsibility should lie with the University.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

KO- Shaun asked for a list of information that the SRC would like.
KO spoke to wanting the questions regarding the restructures answered.
The townhall at QCAD is a great opportunity for the university to communicate to students.
SH – I think it would be a good time to put questions to Liz Byrd about the wage theft/underpayments.
SH- has put questions to KL & KO around specific information that they would like.
KL- We should in our capacity as the board should be demanding that the University gives access to students to have access to this information. Should the university come back with ‘that’s confidential’ we should push back on that etc. Broad demand on the university to release the information.
SH- We can always file a freedom of information request because it is a public university.
KO- Suggested compiling a document outlining key topics and questions the board would like addressed. It was noted that students currently do not have clear or complete information regarding the restructure.
SH- Raised concerns about the lack of clarity around what information is confidential and what can be shared, which adds to confusion.
KL- Emphasised that relying on elected students to disseminate this information may not be effective, as some students may feel unsure or restricted about what they can communicate. KL recommended that communication should come directly from the university rather than through students.
KO- Proposes that the board put together a list of questions, put resources into the town hall at QCAD and hearing directly from the University.

Action: create a shared document to put together a list of questions or information requests to send to Shaun.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Proposed 2025 SRC Election Timeline</td>
</tr>
</table>

	• HH – Spoke to the circulated timeline • SH – Asked how it aligns with other committee election timelines. • MS- Spoke to the SRC timeline being restricted to the weeks outlined in the constitution. **Motion: To accept the proposed 2025 election timeline** **Moved: SH** **Seconded: KO** **Carried – unanimously.**
8.	**Terms of Office – positions for re-election** • HH spoke to the constitution Section 4.2 & Clause 5.4.2 relating to appointed reps • SK noted that she would be graduating in November and retiring. • Unanimous in the agreement that the rotational terms clause would be satisfied.
9.	**Anna Brandon Resignation – appointing a replacement** • HH- Spoke to the vacancy being open on the board due to Anna's resignation and the possibility to fill this vacancy. • MS – Questioned if there was any point in filling formally again, stating that they could choose from the most recent applicants. • SH- Not a high priority to fill the position with the proximity of the election. **Motion: For the vacant position to remain vacant until the next SRC election.** **Moved: KL** **Seconded: KO** **Carried – Unanimously.**
10.	**SRC Forums and QCAD Townhall – Confirm schedule & Rep availability** • HH – Spoke to the attached summary, asked that reps respond to calendar

	invites and confirm their availability.
11.	**SRC Funding Proposal - 'By any other name – Griffith Graduate Slate 2025'** • SH- Thinks it's a good initiative but frustrated that the funding needs to come from SRC and not the University. • KO – noted the awkwardness of the SRC funding what is essentially coursework, stating it feels like the SRC is paying the University so students can complete their degrees. • KL- argued that it's not feasible or fair to provide $3,000 to one group of students and not others. If funding were to be offered, it should be through an equitable model. Noted this lets the University off the hook for their responsibilities. • SH- agreed but acknowledged the lack of alternatives. Emphasised the importance of supporting students in need, though the University should ultimately be responsible. Also noted that the SRC often underspends its annual budget. • MS – confirmed that past years have left significant funding unspent. • KO- raised concerns about setting a precedent and sending mixed messages, like criticising the University while simultaneously funding its gaps. • MS- stated that the SRC tells students that we can help them - so should we help them or not because we are worried about the bigger picture. • KO- stressed the difference between club/event funding and coursework support, warning this could set a problematic precedent. • KL- Stated that the bigger picture is important, it puts SRC in a difficult position. The university should be covering these costs. The university shouldn't be offering a film degree that potentially puts students into debt. • KO- warned that if the SRC steps in financially, it could be seen by the University as a signal that the SRC will continue to fill funding gaps. • KL-suggested the SRC issue a public statement to both students and the University, clarifying that this is not the SRC's responsibility. **Motion: Motion to deny the funding of this funding proposal 'By any other name – Griffith Graduate Slate 2025' .** **Moved: KL** **Seconded: KO**

	For: KL, KO, SK & CF **Against: MS** **Abstain: SH & KHC** **Motion carried**
12.	SRC Funding Proposal – Street Library • SH- Loves it • KL – Questioned if there was a funding breakdown? • HH – provided a budget breakdown that was a missed attachment on the agenda. **Motion: To approve the funding proposal of the QCAD Street Library** **Moved: SH** **Seconded KO** **Carried: Unanimously**
13.	**General Business** • HH- Add an action item for the next meeting to review year-to-date budget tracking, projected expenditure for the remainder of the year and any estimated surplus
14.	**Scheduling of next meeting** 6th Aug Wednesday 12pm
15.	**Q&A Session**
16.	**Meeting close** 2pm

Summary of Motions

Motion	For	Against	Abstained
Motion to accept the minutes as a true and accurate record of the previous meeting.	All	-	-
To accept the proposed 2025 election timeline	All	-	-
For the vacant position to remain vacant until the next SRC election	All	-	-
To deny the funding of the funding proposal 'By any other name – Griffith Graduate Slate 2025'	**KL, KO, SK & CF**	**MS**	**SH & KHC**
To approve the funding proposal of the QCAD Street Library	All	-	-