

Agenda for AUScA General Committee Meeting – Wed 23 August 2017, 6:10pm
Braggs Meeting Room 313/314

Chair: Emi Schutz

Minutes: Ellen Swan

Attendance: Phil Grace, Michael Capoccia, Dominick Hentschke, Tobi Threadgold, Joshua Chey, Catherine Douglas-Hill, Zane Marks, Jason Oliver, Jack Moran, Brittany Howell, Karl Asmussen, Maggie Potts

Apologies: Declan Price-Brooks, Tamika Burrowes

OUTLINE

1. Acceptance of minutes from meeting on 2/8/17
2. Resolution of Committee, Faculty Relationship, and SRC nominations
 - a. Permission to record this section
 - b. Declan's recusal letter
 - c. Meeting 16/8/17
 - d. Emails/recordings
 - e. Faculty relationship (ScienceNetwork)
 - f. SRC and Clubs nominations (including political involvement)
 - g. Moving forwards/recommendations (whiteboard discussions)
3. Acceptance of Khalia's resignation
4. AUScA Institutional Response to Sexual Harassment and Assault Forum
5. First Year Representative Nominations & New VP
6. Sub-committee reports
 - a. Watson, Crick and Morty Pub-Crawl (Provided by Zane)
 - b. Networking events (to be provided next meeting, as Khalia has resigned)
 - c. Quiz night (provided by Emi)
 - d. Games night (provided by Zane)
7. Gratuity Letter Nominations
8. BBQ reflection
9. Battle of the Sciences Reflection
10. Magazine
11. Questions without notice

THE DOWN-LOW

NOTICE

Whilst it is customary for minutes to typically only report what was done, not necessarily everything that was said, I have included pieces of discussion from this meeting, partly for transparency, and partly for perspectives that future committees should be aware of. Also, several items (#4, 7-11) were not discussed at this meeting, and will be addressed in the following meeting.

1. Acceptance of minutes from meeting on 2/8/17

The minutes from the previous meeting (2/8/17) were accepted by unanimously.

2. Resolution of Committee, Faculty Relationship, and SRC nominations

a. Permission to record this section

Ellen will supply a permission form for Committee members to sign, asking their permission to record the audio from this section of the meeting solely for the purpose of typing up the minutes afterwards, as she would like to participate fully in this discussion, rather than focussing on minuting.

Everyone was happy for the discussion to be recorded, and the form was signed by all.

b. Declan's recusal letter

Declan is unfortunately absent from this meeting due to family commitments. He has submitted a letter of recusal from this topic due to his centrality to the issue. Within this letter, he has provided a timeline, indicating the meetings that have taken place with external groups/organisations, and the conditions surrounding them. His letter also includes some comments on Zane's email, as described in the letter attached as an Appendix. He describes the reasons why Phil and Khalia are nominated/running for Clubs Committee and General Secretary on the SRC respectively, as well as the plans for discussing their running at the next Committee meeting (which would've been 16/8/17). He has requested that either Emi or Michael be appointed to coordinate the Emi/Michael to facilitate repairing Faculty relations with the Learning and Teaching department. He has suggested that we should just let ScienceNetwork be, rather than working with or against them. Unfortunately, it seems that due to the depths (or heights, rather) to which Mark Pace and Brodie Scott have lurched in response to ScienceNetwork and the Faculty's actions, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible to call them off. Regardless of what has occurred, AUScA has still achieved a lot this year, and constitutionally, we are within our rights to advocate for Science students on course matters. Our resolution with the Faculty also has presented itself in a timely manner, as Amy Hardwick is soon to go on leave, there is a new Executive Dean commencing, as well as a new Vice-Chancellor for the University.

To clarify on some components of the recusal letter – Brodie Scott and Mark Pace are the Presidents of the AUU and SRC, respectively. After Declan and Khalia attended a Union meeting seeking signage for a letter addressed to the Faculty regarding the necessity of ScienceNetwork, Brodie and Mark appear to have taken it upon themselves to also question ScienceNetwork, and this was apparent in the CoP meeting with the Faculty. Unfortunately, it seems ScienceNetwork is caught in the middle of this.

Khalia and Phil running with Activate (as General Secretary of SRC and Casual Vacancy on Clubs Committee) is not intended to be seen as conflict with Brodie Scott and his party, Progress.

All reasoning explaining the engagement student politics is explained in Declan's recusal letter. In addition, the proposal (referred to as the "Modest Proposal") was composed by Arthur Yeow. Declan was under the impression that the Faculty would be dictated by a single person, who would somehow have control over us. He also wanted to put us in a position poised for stronger student advocacy, one which would allow us to have more influence over certain parts of

the University. Additionally, the distinction between the proposal and ScienceNetwork was not overly clear. All in all, this was very consuming. Whilst Declan was approached personally by Activate, he made it clear that any discussion must be had with the Executive committee, rather than just him (due to time constraints, there was insufficient time to call a whole-committee meeting).

The offer Activate proposed was that they could reserve us a place on their ticket for General Secretary in the upcoming SRC elections (Khalia was nominated as candidate), as well as endorse a candidate for a Casual Vacancy on the Clubs Committee (Phil).

AUScA was approached by Activate, as Activate had been betrayed by another party at the last minute, and needed to fill positions on the ticket. Other student societies, such as the Med Student Society, already had candidates in positions. The capacity in which AUScA would be endorsing Khalia and Phil as candidates with Activate was to be discussed with the Committee at the next meeting, as we had already moved to maintain an apolitical stance earlier in the year.

Brittany raised that the only apparent benefit to having an AUScA Committee member also on the Clubs Committee would be to increase funding for AUScA, as well as having a say in the formation of future clubs (e.g. Adelaide Uni Space Society). This would be immoral. However in future, it would be beneficial to have someone on the Clubs Committee, who has had previous experience in a more administrative role at AUScA (just not on both committees simultaneously). This is elaborated more in section 2.f.

c. Meeting 16/8/17

It is not clear the Executive requirements for quorum were met to make the meeting official – copies of the current Constitution are supplied at this meeting to cross-reference

Made it clear that the Committee is upset with the secrecy surrounding matters, re-iterate the Committee's stance of non-political alignment, and how this affects science student nominating for positions. Suggestions that the Executive Committee is afraid of competition from other clubs (ScienceNetwork, AUSS) Zane asked if anyone called for his resignation, which they did not.

Maggie – people came to the room, and found out shortly before the meeting that it was cancelled. Quite a lot of people were present. Zane was explaining the email he sent and why. Decided to take minutes, explaining everyone's thoughts and feelings on the matters at hand.

Brittany – Quorum by proxy was in place, it's not forbidden by the constitution. No motions were made.

Mostly discussed the executives and what they'd been doing. The discussion was quite heated, and ended after an hour.. Zane asked if anyone called for his resignation, but was not called.

Should note that CoCos are not executives, can not meet quorum by proxy with their presence.

d. Emails/recordings

Zane was invited to a secret meeting (10/8/17), where he recorded the audio of the meeting without the expressed consent of those present. He then proceeded to distribute this recording to an undisclosed number of people, we are currently unaware if these people are on the Committee, or non-Committee members. This will be discussed.

Zane sent the email to Maggie, Josh, Tobi, Michael, Brittany, Emi, Catherine and Arwa (Arwa was the only non-Committee member to receive the email). Tobi also forwarded the email to Khalia, for transparency.

Jack (and Zane stated that the criminal accusations of Zane do not hold, based on the following excerpt of legislation:

WhistleBlowers Protection Act (1993) and Listening and Surveillance devices Act (1973)

Where in it stipulates;

“(1) Section 4 does not apply to or in relation to the use of a listening device by a person (including a person to whom a warrant is issued under this Act) if that listening device is used

— (a) to overhear, record, monitor or listen to any private conversation to which that person is a party;

and (b) in the course of duty of that person, in the public interest or for the protection of the lawful interests of that person.”

Zane had the public interest at heart, as well as his duties as morals officer. As he was present, he was allowed to record. Accused of committing a crime, but no legislative basis for that.

Zane left the room briefly upon Brittany’s recommendation ,to allow a more neutral discussion
Zane left the room

A general consensus was observed – none of us are lawyers, so talk and interpretation of legalities would require a suitably trained individual. Michael expressed his personal moral view: he is not okay with breaching others’ privacy, as it is bad for trust, and any type of relationship.

We need to consider that while Zane felt he needed to do this (possibly pressured by his title as Morals Officer) and has suffered much emotional turmoil and duress, Declan and Khalia are also very hurt, and have asked for his resignation. There was a general consensus that he should not be kicked out from AUScA entirely, and this mistake should not be a burden to him in future.

Brittany also raised that in future, if there are disputes within the Committee, they should refer to the Dispute resolution section of the Constitution. However, we may have to amend the final clause of this section, referring to the Head of School/Faculty).

BH – in future – if there are disputes within the committee, they should refer to the Dispute resolution section of the constitution.

In this case, dispute hasn't been officially raised to a neutral party raised, so dispute resolution discourse can't be followed.

We understand that Zane chose to take the recording as a means of evidence to support his claim (of the meeting itself and the topics discussed).

There was debate as to the method chosen to distribute the information – it should not have been sent as an email to select individuals, particularly when the topic was to be brought up the following day at the meeting. However, it would not be viable to air a 30minute recording during a 1hr meeting, and force everyone to listen when they might not want to/be comfortable with it.

It has also been suggested that in future, when anyone has an AUScA-related meeting, it is made known to the rest of the Committee.

Zane returned to the room, and was asked to rebut.

Zane felt what he did was necessary, but did feel bad about how he went about it and was nervous about distributing the information.. He never wanted anyone to resign, just wanted to remove the secrecy aspect and inform others. The secret meeting was more a discussion of which candidates should go where/positions to be filled, and vote stacking/counting, less what path should be followed, but more who would follow in succession.

The email was sent to those people who had been signalled out as "anti" during the vote stacking/counting discussion (or he honestly forgot to send it).

Emi made a proposal that Zane step down as a Committee member, and be made an Associate Committee member/general member of the association. He would still be allowed to continue his work on Subcommittees (Pubcrawl and Games night), as we still want to acknowledge his hard work. He would no longer be the head of those subcommittees. Exposing the secret meetings isn't the issue, more the nature of how the information was recorded without the consent of the parties present, and how it was distributed We would also like to make clear that there's no limit on his running as a committee member in the future. The position of Second Year Rep would become vacant.

Counter-proposals

Michael proposed resign

Jason proposed that he be stripped of Morals Officer

Karl proposed that he move down to general committee member.

Constitutionally, we don't **have** to have a year rep for every year level, in previous years this has been the case.

Jason proposed that the motion be passed towards the end of the meeting, when similar matters are discussed.

Emi moved that we make a decision immediately. Seconded by Britt. All opposed. The matter will be voted on at the end of the meeting, along with similar items.

e. Faculty relationship (ScienceNetwork)

At present, AUScA's relationship with the Faculty is not ideal. During a meeting on the 24/5/17, the Faculty were quite cold towards AUScA. More recently, at a meeting held on the 4/8/17 with the Faculty and other science student clubs regarding the Community of Practice, AUScA were quite aggressive in their questioning of why ScienceNetwork currently exists, which has put us in a bad light in the Faculty's eyes. Other Academics within the Faculty are also aware of the situation, and we do not want this to impact on student's relationships with their assessors/supervisors.

AUScA and ScienceNetwork have similar aims, however we have been acting quite hostile towards them, unsure as to how their Faculty involvement would affect how the Faculty would interact with other student clubs. We would like to make clear the aims for both clubs, and how this relationship can be amended.

Emi left the room to tend to her centrifuge/research.

Michael explained the situation further.

At the meeting on May 24, we were planning to present our Peer Mentoring proposal to Bob Hill. Coincidentally, at this meeting the Faculty also presented ScienceNetwork. Our Peer Mentoring proposal was essentially waved away, to be discussed later. As previously mentioned, a letter was signed by Brodie Scott and Mark Pace with a "please explain" message about ScienceNetwork, directed to the Faculty. We are not sure what the Faculty's formal response was to this letter. AUScA and ScienceNetwork had similar events held around the same time (coincidentally), which only increased tensions. Further to the Community of Practice meeting, no agenda was provided, and it was unnecessarily messy. Representatives from several science clubs were present, as well as Amy Hardwick, Tak Kee and ScienceNetwork, as well as Mark Pace and Brodie Scott. Brodie was 15mins late to the meeting, and immediately questioned the place/existence of ScienceNetwork, which put us in a bad light with the Faculty.

It was clarified that Arthur's proposal (mentioned earlier), was embodied as the Community of Practice, and not ScienceNetwork. The proposal was meant for increasing student engagement, and not in response to our Peer Mentoring proposal. The faculty wants to help us run/improve our events.

Historically, our relationship with the faculty has not been strong. Individual members have had good (professional) relationships, which have extended to AUScA's benefit. We hope that if we attempted to reconcile with the Faculty, and presented a sincere proposal for improved events, then the relationship might be restored. We have had examples of collaboration recently too. (e.g. Peer mentoring scavenger hunt – organised by Michael and Khalia. The Faculty paid for AUScA memberships for the winners, so they could attend our BBQs and other events).

Jason highlighted that in the majority of cases, collaboration is a wonderful thing. We are in good standing to strengthen the science communities and social calendar (there are 5 science clubs). Postgrads and honours are not the intended audience for AUScA – ScienceNetwork, however, is.

“Our antagonism towards the faculty and ScienceNetwork is embarrassing. The way it has been conducted has shed a negative light on all science students. It’s reaching other non-science networks, and having the Faculty view us, their own students in this light, is extremely toxic. They’re entitled to put forward an initiative whose aim is to encourage student retention and increase engagement, and if that is embodied as ScienceNetwork, especially as it is receiving funding, we would be silly to try and stamp it down.

The engagement of student politics to fight this, especially behind people’s backs, has degenerated science student’s standing with the faculty, and could damage the relationship for years/have long-lasting effects. This is why we have “no politics” in the constitution. If you enforce politics once, the presidents of the Union and SRC are involved, and want to take down AUScA, they don’t see us as science students, but merely as students. “

Michael put forward a list of recommendations for moving forward.

Karl and Michael proposed that AUScA has a meeting with ScienceNetwork to clear the water. Just a chat to talk about our feelings and lay everything out.

f. SRC and Clubs nominations (including political involvement)

At present, but still to be voted on by the Committee, Khalia is running for General Secretary of SRC, under the ticket Activate, whilst Phil has been nominated for a position (casual vacancy) on the Clubs Committee. In the minutes from 23/3/17, the Committee moved and passed a motion that AUScA would remain apolitical, and cease from aligning ourselves with any political parties. This, and particularly how it relates to the SRC/Clubs Committee nominations will be discussed.

The General Secretary nomination issue is resolved through Khalia’s resignation, so we needn’t address the issue of political-nonalignment in this scenario. However, we need to make sure that Phil isn’t endorsed by AUScA (can still recommend him personally though, for his actions in AUScA). We are not sure how Activate will endorse Phil (i.e. whether they will use AUScA’s name or not).

From an outside perspective, someone has become a Committee member, and through that position has gotten a position on a political club, and then left the Committee. We would not like this to set a precedent, and it has been suggested that we have a clause to counteract this.

To clarify, there are no problems with individuals being involved with politics, but just shouldn’t be from representing AUScA.

Emi moved that AUScA doesn't support/authorise Phil running for Clubs committee, if he wins we ask that he resign as a committee member/not be affiliated with AUScA. We can still support him personally though.

Seconded by Michael.
12 votes, passed.

Emi moved that it Phil's resignation would be required by the point he officially takes up the position (no later than Dec 1).

Seconded by Brittany
11 votes, passed.

g. Moving forwards/recommendations (whiteboard discussions)

Michael has prepared a list of recommendations, which are attached as an appendix at the end of this agenda. We will discuss these recommendations, and work towards a common view/goal for the Club. This will include a discussion on what everyone wants AUScA to be, and what they think it represents.

Discussions against Declan/Khalia

Emi/Britt – Would like to suggest to Declan that he take a few weeks off as President, as he is not representing the ideals of the committee, and have someone step in during the meantime. Emphasised that it would be suggested, not enforced. Gives him a chance to reflect on everything that's happened, and general R&R.

Brittany provided some insight – “As president, you get tunnel vision for AUScA, it is your child. You forget about everything else and can go a little insane.”

In the meantime, one (or two) people/persons from the Committee could act as temporary President. This would be determined if Declan accepted the offer.

Maggie asked how Ellen and Phil felt about all these meetings, who replied that the Executive's decisions at these meetings were unanimous, and we were believed we were doing the best thing for the club, with no malicious intent. They did not have the impression that it was a power-grab, but rather an opportunity to increase AUScA's advocacy for science students.

Jason said that when the club was founded, the intentions of the club were purely social. Although times have changed, advocacy also works outside of AUScA (see other Faculties and their clubs). For us though, the Faculty doesn't control course content. It is important that the club is social, with Peer Mentoring and Science Alive being positive examples. Not sure what type of advocacy works in the course context though?

Advocacy works best when an individual from the club has a good relationship with the Faculty. Works best to have a voice heard in small meetings with the Faculty. However in saying this, Brittany has been trying for years to improve Microbiology, and despite having a good relationship, has not made any ground.

Michael moved that for the time being, as a club we have no action in course content until further discussed.
Seconded by Emi, passed by majority vote.

Emi moved that we recommend/suggest Declan step down as President until the end of the mid-semester break (4 weeks) Seconded by Maggie. Passed by majority vote.

Upon his return, he would give a response to the committee. Particularly, in response to the Committee's concerns.

Emi moved that upon Declan's return, he supply a response to a series of topics defined by the committee. Seconded by, passed by majority vote.

Will vote on interim president(s) if Declan accepts.

Zane announced his desire to resign as a committee member, and forwarded the email to Ellen, which is attached as an Appendix to these minutes.
He will still stay on the Pubcrawl subcommittee, until it the event has passed.

Michael would like to vote/discuss Declan's suggestion of Michael/Emi dealing with faculty relationships. Would like to meet (either simultaneously or not) with the Faculty and ScienceNetwork, and it is open for any committee member who wants to attend. We should reach out to the Faculty first, saying that we are open. We could invite them to one of our meetings or hold a separate meeting. For this meeting, we as a Committee are all to be on the same page as well. We need to reset and recognise that our goals are the same.

The general notion is that we're going to move ahead to work with the Faculty/ScienceNetwork. We don't have to promote one another, but just nothing negative.

Ellen moved that a Google doc is created, (and a Slack channel is created) as a whole committee effort that pertains the issues to be addressed in Declan's response is created. Public link to be put on the Slack channel. Seconded by Emi. Passed by majority vote.

Brittany will make the Google Doc and publish it in due course.

3. Acceptance of Khalia's resignation

Attached as an appendix is Khalia's resignation as Vice-President.
Effective from 19/08/2017

Accepted.

4. AUScA Institutional Response to Sexual Harassment and Assault Forum

AUScA has successfully submitted an open letter for publication in On Dit in response to the Sexual Harassment and Assault Forum. This response is attached at the end of this document.

5. First Year Representative Nominations & New Vice-President

At present, we have received three nominations for First Year Representative (FYR). We would like to ratify the process for choosing the suitable FYR shortlisted candidates during this meeting, and at the following AUScA meeting the shortlist will be revealed. In addition, the newly-vacated position of Vice-President will also be discussed.

One of these nominations came from the Faculty, who approached a student. Waiting for a suitable time to interview the first year delegate, don't want to introduce them into a turbulent committee. Tobi is looking after this at the moment.

First Year reps are important – if they're engaged in first year, that's a really good sign!

6. Sub-committee reports

- a. Watson, Crick and Morty Pub-Crawl (Provided by Zane)**
- b. Networking events (to be provided at the following meeting due to Khalia's resignation)**
- c. Quiz night (provided by Emi)**
- d. Games night (provided by Zane)**

7. Gratuity Letter Nominations

Madeline Noble (Science Alive! Contact) was very pleased with AUScA's volunteers during the event:

"I had a few that were unable to make it, but they were able to let me know well in advance so there were no issues, and those that did attend were exemplary volunteers. I was very impressed to see that they were all hard-working, autonomous, and enthusiastic about their tasks."

She highlighted one of our volunteers, Imogen Winsborough, who went above and beyond her duties over the three days she volunteered at Science Alive. Ellen has proposed that we consider her for a gratuity letter.

Additionally, we had several exemplary volunteers at the BBQ on Friday, who willingly gave up large parts of their day. These people are: Natasha Bradley (who also helped out with pubcrawl shirt sales), Steph Eglinton, Jacqueline Barsby, Lucy Carpenter and Furdosa Ababor. Declan proposes that we should consider these people for gratuity letters.

Meanwhile, are there any other nominations for gratuity letters?

8. BBQ Reflection

We held our annual Semester 2 BBQ on Friday, August 11. How did it go, what were our thoughts? We did have to order more food halfway through, which is a good sign for outreach to members!

9. Battle of the Sciences Reflection

On Wednesday August 16, our long-awaited event, Battle of the Sciences was held. How did it go and what did we learn from this event?

10. Magazine

The Faculty has asked if AUScA is planning to print another Magazine this year for incoming students. This will be discussed.

11. Questions Without Notice

As an aside:

Jason: "As a committee, you guys need to do something fun. Don't always sit around a table, don't get burnt out!"

Meeting closed 8:33pm.

Appendix : Declan's recusal letter

I know that this document is lengthy and at times will be poorly written, I encourage you to read all of it.

Before I begin to speak about things more generally I want to speak briefly about my own life. This past months has been horrible for a number of reasons, not least of which has been an escalation of threats made against me by someone with a poor grasp on reality. These threats have lead me to fear for my life, I have taken to sleeping fully clothed. In addition, events at my work have escalated in preparation for next year's LGA elections. All in all I have been exhausted. I do not mention these by way of excuse but rather to give context to y state of mind over the past little while.

By way of yet briefer prelude I wish to note my own inability to recall when things happened in relation to other things, any inconsistencies in terms of timelines is simply due to this irritating failing of mine and not any intentional obfuscation.

I wish to first speak of the nature of my/the executive's relationship with the faculty and the SRC/Union. Not long into us all taking office I had a meeting with Bob Hill, we had what felt like at the time a deeply productive conversation about establishing closer ties between us and the faculty, and in exchange for our assistance and input he offered for several things to help us better work with members of staff. A few weeks later, upon the conclusion of the preparation of the peer mentoring proposal I set up another this time with Khalia also present, in order to present it. By this point none of the things Bob offered had been delivered, however I was still hopeful and optimistic. He looked briefly at the proposal and sounded broadly in favour of the idea, stating he would talk it through with the relevant people. This was the last direct communication I had from Bob. Later through the grapevine we heard about the ScienceNetwork, at that moment, whilst disappointed this had happened without any consultation and was a little peeved about it, I took no action.

We later attempted to set up a meeting with Amy Hardwick in an attempt to both ask what was happening with the Peer Mentoring proposal. Rather than give us the simple curtesy of a meeting, she asked us to attend a group meeting with ScienceNetwork and other interested parties. Initially I intended not to attend, having another engagement and feeling it was best if AUScA seemed like the organisation it is, and not just me. However as the meeting approached it became clear that something was amiss and I decided to attend. This is the meeting dated 24/5/2017 in Michaels letter, a Wednesday in a week that we didn't have a committee meeting. I was right when I thought something was amiss, in this meeting after immediately brushing off our peer mentoring proposal, though without giving it a clear no. Then the meeting proceeded to a hastily printed out PowerPoint presentation which was discussed at great lengths, this Powerpoint presentation contained what we came to call 'the modest proposal' (an esoteric reference to a satirical essay by Johnathon Swift). This proposal outlined a new structure for Faculty student relations in which a committee of students appointed by the faculty would have oversight over all student influenced matters, including AUScA. This proposal scared the bejesus out of me, and the

rest of the executive, and we immediately went to unibar to start to think of a path forward.

Upon arriving at unibar, and after a not insignificant amount of complaining about how we had been treated we resolved that this proposal had to be defeated. We were of the view that Once Bob made up his mind on the proposal the matter would be closed, one way or another. To put it differently time was of the essence. I made contact with the clubs committee through Patrick Imosay (whose name is undoubtedly spelt wrong), contact with the SRC president via Patrick Stewart, and contact with Brittany through messenger. I spoke first to Patrick Imosay who came to unibar he was shocked and appalled by the proposal and offered to bring the matter before the clubs committee. Khalia and I then spoke to Brittany, who after some discussion was equally concerned and offered to have a meeting with Pauline Oswald and Amy Hardwick. Whilst we were at the UniBar Tobi came past and we briefly told of the modest proposal, I assured him that I would go into more detail at the next committee meeting.

Conveniently the clubs committee was meeting on the Monday immediately following. Khalia and I attended said meeting, whilst our biggest concern was with the proposal itself theirs was with ScienceNetwork as an abstract concept. Not being the biggest fans of ScienceNetwork and feeling in desperate need of allies, we were willing to let the lines between the two blur. This was an error, we ought to have made clearer that we only wished for their assistance in halting the modest proposal, in the end the lines between the two would blur in our own heads too. This committee then wrote a letter to Bob Hill asking him for an explanation, Mark Pace SRC president also signed on.

At some point during this period, I think it may have been the same Monday, Brittany had her meeting with Amy and Pauline. I shall let her speak to the contents of said meeting. However after the meeting Brit conveyed to me that they were unsure of whether they were going to go ahead with it and that if they did AUScA would get a seat on it by default, this uncertainty combined with the knowledge of the Union's incoming letter had me satisfied that we had the situation in hand.

Here is where I made my gravest error, I had up until this point always intended to inform the full committee of what was going on, Britt advised me not to. At this time I was still uncertain of my own leadership abilities and thus inclined to listen to advice, and wanting the committee's experiences of AUScA to be as positive as possible, I decided to not properly or fully inform the committee. Exams were fast looming and I didn't want to stress the full committee unnecessarily, and certainly not with a matter the exec thought was under control. Regardless of how the decision was made, and with what in mind, it was mine and thus wholly my responsibility. It was a mistake, and for it I am sorry. Over the next week it became clear that nothing further would be happening with the modest proposal. At this stage we thought the matter was done, and little further happened until after exams. During the break Brodie Scott asked me personally for a meeting, in this meeting he conveyed that he had been assured a Community of Practice would form, with the newly minted Associate Dean Tak Kee at the head. The meeting was broadly productive and we spoke about a great many things. As the meeting progressed I realized that the proposal was merely an excuse for a meeting, what he actually wanted to talk about was the Unions relationship/support for clubs more generally and eventually try and convince

me to run in the student elections with his party Progress (an offer which received a swift 'absolutely not').

During Sem 1 Swat Vac I received a message from Arthur asking for a meeting, we set it up and he gave little indication what it was about. I asked Josh if he had any idea what it could be about, and he indicated that there had been a major falling out between Arthur and the rest of ScienceNetwork. I arrived at our meeting only to receive a message from Arthur stating he had been held up and wouldn't be able to make it. We agreed to reschedule after exams. After exams I had no success contacting Arthur. It was not until a few (I think four, but I could be wrong) that I finally had any success in setting up a meeting, on the condition of secrecy. I still respect that request and as such will only mention that he showed me an unlaunched version of the website that would later be the student ambassador page, stating it would launch sometime late this year early next year. In follow up he sent me a copy of the files contained on that website. The Student ambassador programs for marketing and the equivalent for research seemed fine and in line with what most faculties do, and I was prepared to actively support them should that be necessary, however the one for learning and teaching bore a striking resemblance to the modest proposal. Given how far away the launch was, we chalked it up as something that could be dealt with much later.

It was shortly after this meeting with Arthur that I received an email from Amy about the Community of Practise meeting. Given Amy's clear attachment to the idea of the modest proposal, the exec were deeply suspicious that the CoP itself would try and act as that committee mentioned in the modest proposal. We decided to once again contact Mark and Brodie and invite them to this meeting, under the accurate view that the faculty didn't listen to us, but may listen to a more powerful body.

The meeting was an utter disaster, I disagree with Michaels assessment that they were attempting to extend an olive branch. They were insulting and rude towards Brodie, at one point laughing when he attempted to raise a point. We were under the impression that we were there to discuss the nature of the faculties relationship with student groups, when we attempted to do so we were told that we weren't to question the faculty. It was at this point that I concluded that our relationship with the Amy Hardwicks component of the faculty (learning and teaching) was utterly ruined.

It is at this point that I wish to have a brief aside, we often talk about all this as our relationship with the faculty, it is not, it is our relationship with one part of the faculty. Our relationship with other parts of the faculty remains incredibly strong, such as our bond with the Marketing department, or directly with academics. Our relationship with the faculty leadership is effectively non-existent simply because the leadership just resigned.

Now a few days after this meeting we discovered that the Student ambassador page was live, what Arthur had said about the launch was untrue. We spoke to Brodie and Mark about the page, and made a plan to hold off until the Interim ED Liebolt was in place and then make a caretaker argument the project should be delayed until the new ED was in place. In the mean time they would raise the matter with the acting VC and DVCA, they did. Both the acting VC and the DVCA where very much annoyed by the faculties efforts. We were tired and frustrated and it felt like anytime we had a plan in place the ground shifted beneath our

feet. That the ideas of the modest proposal would keep coming and coming and coming until we lost. In short we were feeling desperate and defeated.

There was a lull at this stage, until late on Wednesday the 9th, Mark messaged me desperate and asked for a meeting the next day. He elaborated little, However I made clear that the meeting couldn't simply be with me it would have to be with the exec. We assembled at 10am the next day in the Braggs meeting room. I stated immediately that I intended to abstain from any decision as it was impossible for me to appear impartial due to my relationship with Patrick Stewart. Mark's faction had been screwed by another faction at the 11th hour and as such was willing to give the house away for candidates, he spoke with the exec for a good half hour. It was impressed on us the importance of the secrecy of this deal, which had nothing to do with the committee and everything to do with their political opponents. The deal was fairly simple, we provided them with a GenSec candidate and they would get us a seat on the clubs committee and give us seats on whatever committees we wanted. It was the final component of the deal that was most appealing, that would give us direct access to people above and beyond the faculty who could help us.

Mark left, with us having only a few hours to make the decision, the exec talked for another 30mins. I stated that we would only move forward if (other than my abstention) we were unanimous. The exec was unanimous on the first vote. We set about picking candidates, which involved a great deal of decision making involving who would be doing what next year, I made clear that I had no intention to run for a second term as president. In order to work out who would run for what we also had to work out what AUScA would look like next year. Our committee is an especially old one, and if you are of the view that the president ought to come from within the committee, that you can't do honours and the presidency at the same time, and that you need to be based on North terrace to be president, there are few options. In fact there was only one, Zane. Not wanting to leave the club in a lurch, and wanting to ensure that the club continued to go from strength to strength had decided that whilst I didn't want to be president, I did want to stay involved and thought that the Ben model, of becoming treasurer post-presidency made the most sense for me. At no point did I intend to control the club through proxy, If I wanted to remain in control of the club I would seek a second term.

It is at this point that I must make another aside to comment on Zane. Zane committed a crime that can carry a custodial sentence, over a student club. I cannot express how absurd that is, how over the top and stupid that is. If Zane had issues with how the exec were handling things he could have told us, he could have told the committee. Instead he walked into the meeting room and recorded a private conversation without people's consent. I have lost all confidence and trust in Zane. Quite frankly he is lucky the police aren't involved. His criminal actions, were they to become public, would bring the club into utter disrepute and could lead to us being disaffiliated, effectively ending AUScA. I fear that his continued involvement in AUScA's management is utterly untenable. By the conclusion of that meeting, we had decided to run me for GenSec and Phil for clubs committee. Later that night I recalled that I had deferred (a fact I had forgotten what with having been in at uni literally every week day since then) and was thus ineligible, I spoke to Khalia, Phil, and Zane about running for the position, Khalia said yes at 7am the next morning.

Given the sheer quantity of information to convey, we wanted to talk to the full committee at the next available opportunity, we had always intended on explain everything at the next committee meeting and seek the committee's permission to dissolve the statement of neutrality. From there I think you are all aware of events.

I have lost confidence in my capacity to judge the committee's desires on this matter, for that reason I intend to recuse myself from all decision directly pertaining to our relationship with Amy Hardwicks component of the faculty, I would ask the committee to appoint either Emi or Michael to act in my stead on those matters.

I do however wish to suggest a course of action regarding ScienceNetwork, we gain nothing from working with them, better to simply live and let live, we leave them alone and they leave us alone too.

I also wish to note, that involvement in faculty decision making, especially in regard to course structure and student support, is a perfectly normal thing for a faculty club to do. Med, Law, and Arts all do it as do others. I believe we should too, it was what I meant when I spoke about advocacy in my speech at the AGM. We are the students representatives, and for us to confine ourselves to purely social stuff would be neglectful, and not what I ran on. We are also bound to partake in such activities by section 2.d and 2.e.

As I conclude I want this club to remember that this whilst this matter is serious (Khalia's resignation makes that utterly clear) we cannot allow it to detract from our astounding achievements, the clubs membership has grown by more than 100 compared to the end of last year, we are taking the leading in responding to sexual harassment and assault, we are running more events, and existing events have increased in success. We are fundamentally strong and well placed, but we must resolve the ideological question of what the nature of our relationship with the faculty should be. The good news is that if we do resolve it we will soon get a clean slate to enact it, Amy is going on leave and we get a new ED and a pro science VC, but we must be ready to seize that chance.

Appendix - Khalia's resignation letter

19/08/2017

To the Adelaide University Sciences Association Committee,

Let this statement serve as written notice of my resignation as Vice President of the Adelaide University Sciences Association, effective immediately.

I would like to ensure that the committee is aware that under the Listening and Surveillance Devices Act Of 1972, to record video or audio of a private conversation without the express or implied consent of the participants is illegal. Conviction of this crime can result in up to 2 years imprisonment or a fine of \$10,000. I'm sure it is well understood how serious it is that Zane Marks committed a crime, and that the committee will take the appropriate action, which I believe to be his expulsion or resignation from the club.

Signed,
Khalia Primer

Appendix - Zane's resignation letter

Resignation Statement Zane Marks 23/08/2017;
This is my formal resignation from the Science Association.

Zane Marks.

Appendix – Michael’s suggestions for moving forward (17/8/17)

The next meeting someone other than a member of the executive committee should chair the discussion. I would suggest Brit or Emi as they have a long history with the club.

- I know I'm not the only one here who does not have much experience with law terminology so I would appreciate it if people's responses could avoid legal jargon, technicalities or loopholes wherever possible. I would personally prefer a sincere response to a polished one.
- Hold a meeting within a week. The longer this is put off the harder it will be to trust each other and it also delays any other AUScA business that needs to be attended to.
- A timeline is made of the various meetings that have been had between the executives and other parties (this sounds pretty extreme and would be a lot of work but I know that myself and others would appreciate the ability to find out when exactly certain events happened).
- The discussion of the next meeting NOT being held in camera -not everyone is going to be able to attend and it's also important that the AUScA members be able to see what's actually happening in the club especially when they are making their decisions for next year's election.
- Anyone who has a meeting regarding AUScA makes a post on the slack beforehand/shortly afterwards to let everyone else know that it happened (details can be discussed at meetings)
- I think we should try to follow Tobi's footsteps and make clear declarations of Conflict of Interest in situations where they could be important. e.g. I think I could have done a better job of making it obvious my affiliation with ACAD when suggesting Alan for various events and promoting ACADs Open Day.
- Improve relations with the faculty, it's my opinion I think it's also the committee's opinion that the relations with the faculty have been unnecessarily hostile - I want representatives from the committee (not necessarily the executives) to meet with the faculty to fix this. It is unacceptable for this to have happened and for the committee as a whole to have been kept in the dark about it.
- Improve relations with ScienceNetwork, fear of the ScienceNetwork and precedents that may or may not have been set is extremely unhealthy and more toxic to the committee than ScienceNetwork itself. We need to have a meeting with ScienceNetwork to make it clear what our plans for events are and find out theirs.
- With relation to the SRC and political debacle, from my understanding wrongdoings have already occurred however this is an extremely complicated matter. I'd rather the execs wait until next meeting before making any changes e.g. removing nominations/making official announcements
- Cancel some of our upcoming events. The mixture of committee unease and fatigue is going to lead to half-baked events and negative experiences for members. While this should be decided by the various sub committees I think the Games night and Science at the Unibar events may need to be cancelled or postponed (very much up to discussion).
- Can we please get all the minutes on the website this is actually ridiculous

•Be friends :D I've made a lot of friends from AUScA and would hate for relationships to be ruined because of club politics. I hope that we can try to keep our personal and club identities separate.