The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

### **Meeting Minutes**

Special General Meeting 24<sup>th</sup> September, 5:37pm ANU Bar, Canberra

Present: Tara Shenoy (Chair), Ross Caldwell (Secretary), Alex Catalán-

Flores, Polly Mitton, Abigail Widijanto, Josh Bolitho, Tom Nock, Ben Kremel, Mark Rowe, Jack Foulds, Lachlan Chislett, James Downie, Giordi Bouzuola, Annika Humpherys, Anna Kaufmann, Mitchell Scott, Cam Wilson, Vincent Chiang, Nick Barry, Em Roberts, Hugo Branley, Gus McCubbing, Megan Lane, Charlotte Barclay, Josh Orchard, Eben Leifer, Paul Dickson, Tom Chen, Ben Gill, Sam Guthrie, Alex Lawson, Camilla Patini, Eric Mandel, Arthur

Bi, Sophie Yates, Louise Liu, Tara Mulholland

Apologies: Janis Lejins, Jacob Ingram, Beatrice Smith

Tara Shenoy opened the meeting at 5:37pm

ITEM 1: Acknowledgement of Country

Tara Shenoy acknowledged the Ngunnawal & Ngambr peoples, the traditional custodians of the Canberra and paid respect to the elders, past & present, of all Australia's Indigenous peoples.

ITEM 2: Standing Orders

Tara Shenoy explained the Standing Orders and outlined how the voting would occur for the Special Resolution, that is by endorsements of individual changes to the constitution before voting on the special resolution. She also outlined how the discussion of the amendments would occur in light of the standing orders.



ITEM 3: Accepting Minutes from 2014 AGM

**MOTION:** That the Association accepts the minutes from the 2014 AGM.

Moved: Tara Shenoy Seconded: Ross Caldwell

For: 29 Against: 2

Abstain: 6 - Lachlan Chislett, Tom Chen, Vincent Chiang, James Downey

Motion passed.

ITEM 4: Editor-in-Chief's Report

Tara Shenoy read out her Editor-in-Chief's Report (APPENDIX ONE).

**MOTION:** That the Association accepts the Editor-in-Chief's Report.

Moved: Ross Caldwell Seconded: Polly Mitton

For: 30 Against: 1

Abstain: 6 - Sam Guthrie, Lachlan Chislett, Tom Chen, Hugo Branley,

Motion passed.

#### ITEM 5: Special Resolution to Amend the ANUSM Constitution

Tara Shenoy outlined that she will be moving motions to endorse each separate amendment to the constitution. For each motion she will talk to the motion, anyone can speak for or against the motion for a minute, then she will talk in response for a minute.

Tara Shenoy passed the chair to Alex Catalán-Flores.

Tara Shenoy outlines the first change to the ANUSM constitution as per the Summary of Constitutional Amendments (APPENDIX TWO).



**MOTION:** That the Association endorses Change #1 in the Summary of

Constitutional Amendments document released alongside the

online notice of the SGM.

Moved: Tara Shenoy

Tara Shenoy: All I want to say is, the reason why we're putting forward this

motion is because there has been a danger in the past where one member of the board has made a contractual arrangement without necessarily knowledge of all other members of the board. If this arrangement is made, we have to adhere it. It's dangerous, that's

why we should make that change.

Seconded: Polly Mitton

For: 27 Against: 0

**Abstain:** 6 - Lachlan Chislett, Tom Chen, Hugo Branley

Motion passed.

Tara Shenoy outlines the second change to the ANUSM constitution as per the Summary of Constitutional Amendments (APPENDIX TWO).

**MOTION:** That the Association endorses Change #2 in the Summary of

the Constitutional Amendments document released alongside

the online notice of the SGM.

Moved: Tara Shenoy

Tara Shenoy: I think it's pretty self-explanatory, do you need an explanation?

Yeah? Oh you would? Sorry, okay. To explain, really the officers, currently as it stands every member of the board is an officer. We're really just demarcating the difference between an officer and an executive officer. The previous motion passed was about contractual arrangements, it's kinda like a follow on almost. Yep.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Anyone else, any queries? Gus, you have the floor.



#### **Gus McCubbing:**

What are the implications of this change and is there anything actually concrete that goes along with it? Or is it really just a name change?

Tara Shenoy: I'm just gonna clarify for again for Gus...

**Gus McCubbing:** 

I guess my problem is having a top tier of editors, and then a

secondary rung.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Is that it?

**Gus McCubbing:** 

Yeah.

Tara Shenoy: At the moment, I guess legally, only the editor-in-chief can enter

into contracts outside of the association. However, as I said previously in the past members of the Association have entered into contracts without knowledge of the other members of the board. This is definitely an issue, because it means that if a member of the board enter into a contract, the other members of the board have to abide by that contract, whether or not they have knowledge that that contract is made. The executive officers of the Association were extended to the Deputy Editor and the Managing Editor because the Managing Editor will enter into contracts often, because the Managing Editor does advertising. Therefore 'Executive Officers' is accurately named, as the Deputy Editor, Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor are the executive of the

Association.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara.

**Ross Caldwell Seconded:** 

For: 22 **Against:** 

Abstain: 6 - Hugo Branley, Lachlan Chislett, Tom Chen

**Motion passes** 

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

Tara Shenoy outlines the third change to the ANUSM constitution as per the Summary of Constitutional Amendments (APPENDIX TWO).

**MOTION:** That the Association endorses Change #3 in the Summary of

Constitutional Amendments document released alongside the

online notice of the SGM.

Moved: Tara Shenoy

Tara Shenoy: Our rationale for changing this section of the Constitution is that this isn't Woroni protecting itself, it's about Woroni trying to protect students. So if the change isn't welcomed by you, it won't be welcomed by us.

I know there's a lot of controversy surrounding this section, but essential as per section 22 the Deputy Editor-in-Chief has the ultimate discretion over interpretation of the Constitution. General practice for this section has always been that it is interpreted to mean published contributions, however many students don't know that.

Last semester there were many students running for Election that submitted pitches that were one sentence each at the last day of nomination, because they expected that to suffice. A pitch or an idea isn't a contribution, and unfortunately, general practice will mean that it will always be interpreted as such, whether or not this changes today. It meant that we went from 12 nominations to 6 nominations, I don't want that, I want more nominations for Woroni. Therefore, by making this amendment we will be making the election process more transparent. The board approves the nominations, I want it to be clear to the people who wish to nominate, that that's how the reasoning will go.

The question then is, how do then prevent conflicts of interest and bias? How to prevent the Board from stacking the Board? Well, that's a long standing issue. Whether or not we make this change today, it's going to continue. Because to reiterate, the Deputy Editor-in-Chief, I guarantee, will always interpret it to mean Published Contributions. However, we have established a conflict of interest policy to ensure that bias has to be declared, we also make sure the election process is independent and every member that's elected to the board is independent. We also have directors duties that mean that we have to act in the best interest of the students.

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

Furthermore, if someone does submit often and does not get published for whatever reason, you can always apply to the grievance & dispute panel to ensure that transparency and accountability has been met. The Deputy Editor-in-Chief is also writing an interpretive guideline to expand the scope of the constitution to mean photo, video, print, radio & online. Thank you.

#### Lachlan Chislett:

I'd like to ask a question against the motion. Tara, I know from this board that editorial bias won't be an issue, but I'm still quite concerned about the whole idea of the Editorial Board getting to decide whether or not to publish an article whether it's from a different political or philosophical point of view and they may not want to go through the grievance tribunal as they might feel embarrassed, and then they don't get to go up there. What safety checks are you going to put in place to ensure that people who believe in the Woroni process and student media are allowed to be put onto the board, even if it's not consistent, and the editorial board is honest and isn't of a high enough standard to, open the board?

Tara Shenoy: So this is what I was trying to say earlier, every editorial board has the discretion to approve and disapprove. They don't even have to say why. They can just say "Nope, we don't like this article and we're not publishing it." So whether or not we change the section that's always going to be an issue. So therefore we've established a conflict of interest policy and the deputy editor is writing interpretive guidelines to make sure the scope of contribution is clear, to include photo, video, print, radio and online. Unfortunately, whether or not we change that section today to be published, or to read as published, it's always going to be the case that the board will decide whether or not to publish something. Whether or not we change that section, the only avenue you've got for accountability will be the Grievance & Dispute panel, or to call upon those policies. Does that make sense? The only reason we're changing this is to ensure that when people try and nominate later, they know how to nominate clearly. Cause it's always going to be interpreted to mean published, by the board, behind the scenes.

#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara, anybody else? Cam? Oh, Alex, you were first.

Alex Lawson: As somebody who has previously been published in Woroni, but never under my own name, or it's under a pseudonym, would that



content be published or would the fact that it's not under my name mean that I was not eligible because it has not been published.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you, Tara, one minute.

Tara Shenoy: Umm, if you've been published under a pseudonym, and if you've published three articles under that pseudonym, you still wouldn't qualify unless that pseudonym was registered as a student of ANU because all members of the Association are students of the ANU.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara, anyone else? Cam? Uh who was first, Sam? You have one minute

Sam Guthrie: My main point would be that a strong Woroni would be a Woroni that has many contributions. Ideally Woroni would have more contributions that it can publish, therefore they would be able to pick the best contributions to publish for students. Uh, this motion should not be passed because I believe that in an ideal world it would restrict students who continue to submit work to Woroni, who might not make it, but would not acknowledge their hard work. I would also be highly concerned over whether the Editorial Board in certain circumstances, had issues which they were not disclosing against individual who were contributing.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Sam, Tara?

Tara Shenoy: I agree with you Sam, completely. But I just want to make clear, whether or not we change the section, it'll always be interpreted that way, I just wanna be clear. Furthermore, in terms of actual publishing of contributions, most articles or content that doesn't get published in the paper generally gets published online. Almost everything we've been sent this semester has been published online. And online contributions suffice as a contribution to Woroni, as per the interpretive guidelines that are being written right now.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara.

Cam Wilson: Point of Order.

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Cam.

Cam Wilson: Tara doesn't get a right of reply to every thing said, she gets a right

of reply to questions. Just to clarify...

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Sorry?

Cam Wilson: Just in the Standing Orders, Tara gets a right of reply at the end,

she doesn't get a right of reply after every comment.

Tara Shenoy: I'm not sure, as per the standing orders we've written.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

As per my interpretation of the standing orders, as the chair, it's 3 minutes after the motion, a minute after every person speaks, and then a minute for Tara to have a right of reply, and those two

minutes can be repeated for every individual.

Megan Lane: Sorry, sorry, so every time someone speaks Tara gets a right of

reply?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Yes

Q: When were these passed?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Today.

Megan Lane: When?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Previous boards haven't passed standing orders, these were written up today and in fact, as the chair, I can tell you that these

are the same as the ones from the ANUSA constitution.

Q: If that's the case, then you guys don't get a right of reply after

every person.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

That's the facts that I can tell you, and they were passed by the Board hours ago.

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

Tara Shenoy: Sorry, one second. Section 14.7 of our constitution "A general meeting must be run in accordance with standing orders determined by the Board." I'm going to ask that if anyone has any more questions, specifically Cam Wilson, you can either follow the procedure or keep them to yourself.

#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you. But yet, that is my interpretation of the standing order as the chair of this meeting. But thank you Cam for your point of order. Would anyone else like to speak to, for or against the motion.

Q: Well I want to make some comments, not either way, because I'm not so sure about the motion. Just want to ask, what's the definition of ANUSM? Does that extend to Peppercorn or other publications or just Woroni?

Tara Shenoy: ANUSM is ANU Student Media, and it only extends to everything published under the name ANUSM or Woroni. It doesn't include peppercorn.

#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara, anybody else like to speak for or against the motion? Or about the motion? Yes, you have the floor.

Tom Nock:

I have to say, the issue with that it's always going to be interpreted as published contributions is quite disturbing. It's written in the constitution as "all submissions, whether published or otherwise," to interpret that as only publications that we publish is actually quite shocking and I would hope that Deputy Editors in the future would not follow the interpretation that you've said. I think that the motion as it stands is inherently undemocratic. I think that ANU students are the appropriate people to determine who gets to sit on the Woroni Board. I think that this motion, it politicizes, it has the potential to politicize the Woroni Board by determining who gets published and who doesn't. I understand your assertion Tara, that the Deputy Editors in the future may interpret the constitution as you have today, but as I said...



Alex Catalán-Flores:

Ten seconds.

Tom Nock: But um, I hope that the um, yeah that's basically it.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you. Tara?

Tara Shenoy: I would like that too Tom Nock, but unfortunately I really think

that we need to do the best that we can in terms of allowing more people to be on the board, or to nominate to be on the board, or as many as possible. Particularly in terms of the situation that I described earlier, most of the students that didn't end up getting to nominate were postgraduate students. This situation will always reoccur and, yeah, you might get lucky. But unfortunately Submission itself is a contentious term, submission could include just an idea, it could include just one sentence, or a pitch that is never met. A submission could be just a simple conversation with an individual saying "Yeah I'd like to write, and this is what I'd like to write about." Submission is contentious, and even documentation of the submission is difficult considering most submissions are made to different members of the Board at

different times to different emails. Yeah, maybe you're right, but if you want to take that princ...

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara.

Tom Nock: I don't think there should be a submission requirement to join the

Woroni Editorial Board.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you.

Polly Mitton: Perhaps you should put forward a motion to eradicate that.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Would anyb-..

Polly Mitton: Do you want to change the constitution to reflect that?

Tom Nock: Yeah sure.

Tara Shenoy: What?



Alex Catalán-Flores:

Uh, thank you guys.

Tara Shenoy: Stop. Stop.

Sam Guthrie: Can I move a clarification point of order?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Please move your point of order.

Sam Guthrie: So am I asking a question?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

You're making a point of order as to my interpretation of the

**Standing Orders** 

Sam Guthrie: Uh so, I'm sorry I'm speaking from not knowing entirely how to

make the point of order, but I'm making a point of order... I'm speaking to section 2.02(b) in the Standing Orders, which reads that "the right of reply made be exercised immediately before the motion is put or before any one amendment is put, but only be exercised once" and my point is that Tara is replying multiple

times having not put forward a motion.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Sam, I take your point. Um, As the chair my response to that is that if the standing orders stipulated that the right of reply can only be exercised once altogether then yes, Tara or the speaker would only get to exercise his or her reply once, but because there are several points of clarification, there are several points being raised for or against the motion, Tara as the mover of the motion

gets a right of reply after every single point is raised.

Megan Lane: Only if it's a question.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

They are all questions.

Megan Lane: No some of them are just statements against the motion, they're

not questions.

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

Alex Catalán-Flores:

They have all... As the Chair I can tell you that they've all been questions. Would anybody like to speak further for or against the

motion? Cam?

Sam Guthrie: Can I challenge the point of order? ANUSA lets you challenge a

point of order. ANUSA standing orders let you challenge a point of

order, do you?

Cam Wilson: Yeah. It's a dissent to the chair.

Sam Guthrie: Can I do that now?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Okay. I will now replace myself as chair as per the standing orders, and the motion has already been spoken for and against, and we need a two-thirds majority to confirm either or Sam's or my interpretation of the Standing Orders. Okay I will now replace

myself with Polly.

Alex Catalán-Flores moves the position of Chairperson to Polly

Polly Mitton: Thanks. Would anyone like to move a motion?

Sam Guthrie: I would like to move a motion that the chair's interpretation be

overruled.

Polly Mitton: Would anyone like to move a motion to challenge Alex's

interpretation?

**MOTION:** To challenge Alex's Interpretation of the Standing Orders

Moved: Sam Guthrie Seconded: Alex Lawson

Polly Mitton: Who's for it?

Megan Lane: For this to be legit, the motion has to be that the chair's ruling be

upheld, and then you vote for or against it.

Polly Mitton: Alright, we'll have to redo this. Abby, we're redoing it. So the

motion that's being... that has to be put forward is that the Chair's ruling be upheld. Would anyone like to move that motion? Would anyone like to put forward the motion that the Chair's ruling be

upheld?



#### Motion abandoned.

**MOTION:** That the Chair's ruling be upheld

Moved: **Ross Caldwell Tara Shenoy** Seconded:

For: 5 **Against:** 23

Abstain: 1 - Hugo Branley

Motion fails.

Polly Mitton: The Chair's ruling was not upheld. Now just to clarify, from now on

Tara's just going to speak at the end of it, unless a question is

asked. I'll now hand the chair back.

Polly Mitton moves the position of Chairperson to Alex Catalán-

Flores.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you, we'll resume. Anyone to speak for or against the motion? Gus, I believe you were first. Oh Hugo, I apologise. Hugo

hasn't spoken, Hugo has been... Hugo, please.

**Hugo Branley:** 

Okay, so like Socrates himself I have a suggestion in the form of a question. Do have we have any way of distinguishing between submissions, do we have any way of distinguishing between submissions rejected due to their lack of quality and any submissions that have rejected due to lack of space or other

concerns, or philosophically?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Perfect, that's a question yes?

**Hugo Branley:** 

Yes, it's a question in the form of a suggestion in the form of a

question.

Tara Shenoy: So most articles go through our subeditors, and our subeditors have ultimate discretion about whether or not they find that the article meets the quality threshold. Most articles aren't chosen at the discretion of the editorial board in the first place, once the sub-



editor has decided that the article meets the quality threshold, the article is then sent forward to the editorial board, and the editorial board then decides whether or not to put it in the Paper or online. Yeah, so most of the time it's not up the sub-editors, it's not up to the editors whether or not an article meets the quality threshold. But if an article sent straight to the editorial board, then yeah, we'll probably edit and decide, based on that. I guess, I'm not really a print editor.

#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

Any questions? I will give the floor to Gus.

#### **Gus McCubbing:**

I think there's something slightly insidious about the fact that the editors get the right to decide who runs for election. For instance, I don't particularly agree with everything that John Passant has to say, well very little, but he has the fuckin' right to run and whether people just vote him out, that's their prerogative, and they probably will. And that's a question.

#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

Was that a question? It didn't sound like a question.

#### **Gus McCubbing:**

Um, so what preventative measures are you putting in place to stop yourselves from deciding who can run?

Tara Shenoy: That's what I've been trying to say the whole time, I don't think the editorial board should ever, ever have the right to decide who gets to run, and every semester, no, every semester the Deputy Editorin-Chief has the right to decide how to interpret what submissions mean, and submissions by itself is a subjective construct. And, as has been my experience, it has always been interpreted to mean published, and people don't know that. So the preventative measures that I've tried to put in place is the conflict of interest policy, the electo- and um essentially to ensure the grievance and dispute panel is as independent as possible. But the interpretive guidelines won't necessarily be binding, but the interpretive guidelines will try to elaborate on exactly what submissions, I suppose if it's not passed, or contributions, public contributions mean.



Alex Catalán-Flores:

Ten seconds.

Tara Shenoy: I'll probably finish there, thank you Gus.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara. I'd like to, as the chair, apologies to Cam as I didn't see you before. You can have the floor.

Cam Wilson: Look, I don't have any ill will, I appreciate what you guys are doing, this just isn't necessarily the right way to do it. I agree that the constitution is not clear about submission or contribution, so rather than giving the board the ability to choose who can or cant run, I'd suggest putting in a definition of what a published submission is, it's a suggestion I gave last time which you said you wouldn't answer until today, and there's a few other things. In the past, as an editor for a year, we allowed anyone who submitted pieces regardless of whether it was published or not to run for election, and so I don't think what you're saying is necessarily true. Just finally, it's just a tiny thing, I'd still probably recommend having a record of all the things that were submitted, published or not, because you'll still receive them, as you've seen last year, sorry first semester this year with certain incidents if things aren't published it's good to have a record, so I oppose these changes.

#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Cam. Would anybody else, Vincent? You have the floor for one minute.

#### **Vincent Chiang:**

So, obviously I'm sympathetic to you guys and I think you guys have been doing a great job all year, but I do also question the purpose behind not only this amendment, but this entire section 9 of the constitution. As part of the Board that did strengthen this to some extent, in retrospect I do wonder, Woroni is a publication for the students, by the students, if that's the case why shouldn't it be the students choice as to who becomes editor as opposed to some arbitrary decision by the editors themselves. Secondly, if everyone in the floor thinks that we should just make it published or unpublished submissions, why not just get rid of this clause all together? To that reason, I wonder if everyone wants to move a motion to abolish this clause from the constitution, oh really? Apparently I can't move that, but I think that's something that everyone should consider here.



Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Vincent. Was that a question?

Vincent Chiang:

Perfect.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

I would like to give the floor to Megan.

Megan Lane: Can I move a motion that the motion be put?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Yep, perfect. I'd like to put it to a vo-

Megan Lane:

No you've gotta put a motion whether it should be put or not.

**MOTION:** That the motion should be put

Proposed: Megan Lane Seconded: Gus McCubbing

For: 27 Against: 0

Motion passes.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

I would like to put the motion proposed by Tara to a vote, any seconders for the motion?

Seconded: Polly Mitton

For: 3 Against: 22

**Abstain:** 2 - Hugo Branley

Motion fails.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Next item of business.

Tara Shenoy outlines the fourth change to the ANUSM constitution as per the Summary of Constitutional Amendments (APPENDIX

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

TWO).

**MOTION:** That the association endorses Change #4 in the Summary of

Constitutional Amendments document released alongside the

online notice of the SGM.

Moved: Tara Shenoy

Tara Shenoy: All I want to do is to clarify that a secret ballot does not mean a

secret meeting, any member that asks for a secret ballot will do so under the understanding that the outcome will not be secret.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you, any questions?

Tom Nock: This motion is a bit concerning. In, especially in terms of a student

editorial publication, I don't think there should be any secret ballots whatsoever. You will be publishing things that contain people's names, that contain details, that contain things that people have done, and I think that to have that publication voted on secretly is very concerning. I think that if you're looking for accountability and transparency, every editor should be prepared to put their name forward to any motion amongst the board. I think that lowering the threshold for secret ballots might

compromise that.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you, was that a question?

Tom Nock: Yes.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

What was the question? You have ten seconds.

Tom Nock: What is your response to that?

Tara Shenoy: Okay, I just want to clarify. So a secret ballot itself is just a secret

vote, but that does not mean that the person who puts forward that they want the vote on whatever this is will not be put in the minutes and made public. So if the person says I want to vote on whether or not this article gets published, which never happens. In Board Meetings we only vote on policy, procedure and we never vote on articles. It's just policy and procedure and action items...

Megan Lane: Why are we debating this?

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

Tara Shenoy: Yeah I don't really understand, A secret ballot is just that if someone says "Hey, I'd like to vote on this but I want every vote to be secret, so that every one member can vote however they want without anyone judging them for the way they voted" They can vote in secret, then they count the votes and oh, cool.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Fifteen seconds.

Tara Shenoy: I'm gonna emphasise, any single member of the association, so any student, can come to any ANUSM meeting ever and Board Meetings are 12pm on Sunday.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara, Vincent?

**Vincent Chiang:** 

I'd actually just like to speak in response to what Tom said, I actually wholeheartedly agree with this motion. I think that from my own editorial experience there were times when the public votes meant that individual board members were picked out and antagonized, and actually I think it leads to incredibly uncomfortable situations and more of an unprofessional working environment. It's worth bearing in mind, that while this is perhaps something that ideally would not happen in the organization, we are a student organization at the end of the day, and sometimes these kinds of unprofessional behaviours may very well happen, as like in my situation, not speaking on this particular board at all. I also think it's worth bearing in mind that the ANU Student Media Board does operate as a board as a whole, I think what should be held accountable should be...

Alex Catalán-Flores:

10 seconds.

**Vincent Chiang:** 

...and not the decisions of the individual members of that board once those decisions have been made.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Vincent. Megan you have the floor.

Megan Lane: So I was just wondering, and this could be a stupid question, if editors have a conflict of interest and then you're allowed to vote in a secret ballot, how do you go about adjudicating a way that a

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

conflict of interest works. So say for example, we're talking about the fact that, say if you had passed that thing about having to have three published submissions and those three had gone through a secret ballot, and there was someone, say, like Labor or Liberal who was running and it had come down to something political on the board. How do you expect people to own their behavior? If you're going to publish something then you've gotta own that.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you. Tara or Polly? Tara?

Tara Shenoy: I'm just gonna allow Polly to reply to that.

Polly Mitton: As part of the conflict of interest policy, anyone has to declare their

conflict of interest and then withdraw themselves from the vote.

So they can't vote, regardless of whether it's secret or not.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you, anybody else? I believe Alex Lawson, up the back, you

have the floor.

Alex Lawson: As the student body, surely you should be accountable to the

student body. So therefore, disguising, just hiding behind ambiguity is not in the students interest if they can not hold...

Alex Catalán-Flores:

This is a question?

Megan Lane: It doesn't have to be.

Alex Lawson: Okay it's a question, is secret ballots in the students' interest if

then it stops the members from seeing who represents their

interest?

Tara Shenoy: To be perfectly honest, the way that we write minutes, we don't

necessarily write who voted for, who voted against. So unless you attended the meeting, you wouldn't know who voted for and who voted against. The only reason why we are putting forward this amendment is to ensure if any one member of the board, if they feel harassed or intimidated or want to put forward, to allow for a secret ballot, they can. As to the actual content of what they're voting on, that will always be in the minutes. So if we're voting on the article, which will never happen, but if we were to vote on an article that will be in the minutes. But how people vote, whether or

The Australian National University Student Newspaper since 1950

not there's a secret ballot, will probably not be in the minutes regardless.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tara, Guthrie I believe you have the floor.

Sam Guthrie: So, two points to my question. My points are that as a... there's a lot of funding that goes into, from SSAF into Woroni, so I understand why people would not want to be accountable given the circumstances, I also am concerned that unlike student colleges might have secret ballots because those affect pastoral care issues, this is also a core organization that is accountable to students and receives students money, and I wanted to ask a question based on, in what circumstance since you guys don't vote on articles, would you actually require a secret ballot.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Tara, Ross, Polly? Tara, you have a minute.

Tara Shenoy: Uh, to be perfectly honest I think Vincent could probably answer this question better than I could. But there are very few circumstances where a secret ballot would be necessary, but a secret ballot might be necessary if a member of the editorial board feels like they are harassed, victimized or being discriminated against for putting forward a motion. That should never happen, and so far, in my time in Woroni, has never happened. But, I think we need to protect the students of the editorial board, because they're students too and if they put forward a motion and they're putting forward that motion because they believe in that motion, then I think that motion should be put forward regardless. What's going to happen is if we don't allow kids to put forward a secret ballot, it's just not gonna happen the motion isn't going to be put forward and voted on in the first place. So I'd prefer a secret ballot to be in place for one member of the board, to be clear, the option for a secret ballot is in existence of the constitution, and will occur regardless, it just needs two members.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Anybody else?

Josh Orchard: I just wanna say that pretty much every other student organization has open ballots for pretty much everything except for the union's commercial in confidence and replacing outgoing members, same as ANUSA. I'm just slightly troubled by the fact that there is a



secret ballot, because then we don't know who voted on policy ideas, I'm not sure what you guys are...

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Is there a question?

Megan Lane: There doesn't have to be.

Josh Orchard: I'm just talking to the motion.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Perfect.

Josh Orchard: I'm allowed to talk to the motion.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

I know, I know you're able to talk to the motion.

Megan Lane: Then don't interrupt him.

Josh Orchard: It's alright, it's alright.

Alex Lawson: My question is to Tara, if there's never been an issue before, why is

there an issue now? And why is this motion necessary?

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Perfect, Polly or Tara?

Polly Mitton: Well, we're not trying to introduce a secret ballot, they already

exist in our constitution.

Alex Lawson:

The question's not to Polly...

Tara Shenoy: Don't interrupt, let her finish Alex Lawson.

Polly Mitton: All we're saying, just to read this again to clarify a secret ballot

does not mean a secret meeting. So what we're, so all we're putting forward... the secret ballot already exists, we're not debating the

fact whether or not we should have them.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Megan, we have 22 people in the room. Thank you, anybody else?

**Vincent Chiang:** 

So ju-...



Megan Lane: You can only speak once.

**Vincent Chiang:** 

Uh.

Megan Lane: You can only speak once, he's already spoken once, under the

standing orders.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Oh really? Megan is correct. Anyone?

Lachlan Chislet:

I would like to speak in favour of this motion, I think that given how secret votes are basic tenement of fundamental democracy as it is in our western society, it's only fair to entrust the responsibility in the Woroni editors and if they let us down in this responsibility, then we have all we need to vote them down at the

next election if they want to recontest.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you. Anyone else?

Tom Nock:

I guess, I think broadly the issue is really one of accountability, one of accountability within the board, and I feel like to whatever extent you think about it, it can address negative pressures that certain students have from other students on the board maybe also on contentious issues, it seems like at the end of the day everyone outside the board, I don't really affects the rest that

much.

Alex Catalán-Flores:

Thank you Tom. Polly, do you have something to say?

Polly Mitton: Can I put this forward to a vote?

**MOTION:** To put the motion to the vote.

Proposed: Polly Mitton Seconded: Vincent Chiang

For: 16 Against: 5

**Abstain:** 1 - Hugo Branley

Motion passed.



#### Alex Catalán-Flores:

We will now proceed to vote for the motion for the proposed changes.

Seconded: Vincent Chiang

For: 14 Against: 5

**Abstain:** 5 - Hugo Branley

Motion passes.

Quorum was lost.

Meeting adjourned to a future time and date to be advised.



#### **Appendix One**

**Editor-in-Chief's Report** 

### Editor-in-Chief's Report

Tara Shenoy Special General Meeting 24<sup>th</sup> September 2014

#### INTRODUCTION

This semester has been quite a roller-coaster ride. In my time this year, Woroni has opened its arms to diversity, accountability and transparency and the team has embraced its role as the fourth estate at ANU. My report will present the transformation of the Association over the past few months on behalf of the Woroni Editorial Board.

#### **PRINT**

**Policies**: To address criticism that Woroni Newspaper is unnecessarily provocative without heed to the harm we have established stronger policies for the newspaper. This extends to a Publishing Policy, which enshrines *duty of care* and *duty to avoid harm* alongside the quality threshold.

Since the start of this semester, we also now have a Corrections Policy, Advertising Policy, Facebook Publishing Policy, and Online Policy. The impetus behind the creation of these procedures is to ensure that we can be trusted to respond in an appropriate and adapted manner that is unilateral in approach.

**News:** The news team this semester has been carnivorous. ANUSA and PARSA have both been held to a greater deal of scrutiny. University policy, particularly in terms of sexual assault, has been challenged. Woroni takes note that the ANU Union still has not brought Brodburger to campus.

**Editions:** The lift-outs for this semester have taken an abstract turn, extending to drugs and alcohol, disabilities, mental health, power-play, relationships, and violence.

**Design:** The paper has undergone a significant re-design, with a template that has been inspired by the style of *Broadsheet*. We have decided to narrow our use of imagery to art and photography by ANU students predominantly.

**Archiving:** Woroni is still in the process of archiving and are in negotiations with the National Library of Australia. In regards to the digitization project so far, you can find editions of Woroni since its naissance in 1949 up until 2007 on the Trove website.

Thanks to the Print Team: Abigail: <u>Abigail@woroni.com.au</u>, Janis: <u>janis@woroni.com.au</u>, Beatrice: <u>Beatrice@woroni.com.au</u>, Jacob: <u>Jacob@woroni.com.au</u>. Special thanks to the contributions of Elena Tjandra.

#### **RADIO**

Radio has moved away from 2xxfm to focus on in-house training. It has a revitalized spirit and has introduced shows that more accurately represent the diversity of the ANU demographic, including shows in other languages, for example a successful Bollywood show. We are still trying to get Radio at ANUBar.

**Live Broadcasts:** Frequency of live presenter talk shows has increased from once to twice a week.

**Podcasting:** We have amped up our podcasting, which are pre-recorded shows on a range of issues, from student politics to autism in women.

**24/hr radio station:** There is 24 hr radio consisting mostly of music.

The 24-hr radio, podcasts and live shows can all be accessed online on our website: Woroni.com.au. If you want to get involved or contribute your ideas, you can email Polly at polly@woroni.com.au.

#### PHOTOGRAPHY & VIDEO

This semester the focus has been on moving away from the image of Woroni as only providing coverage of domestic undergraduate student events. Events covered this semester through photography and video, include: Mid-Autumn Festival, ISA Hunger Games, Pakistan Independence Day, French Collective Soiree, Bust the Budget Rally, Eid, AFEC Ball and Queer Department's 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. If you would like Woroni to cover your event, email us at <a href="mailto:photos@woroni.com.au">photos@woroni.com.au</a>.

#### FINANCES

**Policies:** In light of events over the last few years, Woroni has instated stronger financial policies, including an Expenses and Reimbursement Policy, Financial and Oversight Reporting, Fraud Prevention Policy, Payments to Individuals for Work, Purchases/Debit Card Policy, Gifts and Entertainment Policy, and Inventory Policy.

The essence of these policies is to ensure that every decision that Woroni makes is to the wider benefit of the student community.

**Auditing:** We recently completed an internal audit successfully with our independent auditor, Adrian Bray. Currently Ernst and Young are also conducting an external financial governance review of ANUSM upon request by the Australian National University. Any further recommendations that arise from this will be made public.

**SSAF**: We are still waiting to receive two installments of SSAF funding from the ANU, totaling \$81,198.23.

Any questions can be directed to Alex, our Managing Editor, at alex@woroni.com.au.

#### **EVENTS**

Following in the success of the Woroni Garden Party, AGM and Deregulation Forum, Semester 2 has been jam-packed with events.

**Woroni Training and Team-Building Retreat**: To address the casual vacancies that seem to arise every semester and the fact that we have never had comprehensive policies that determine decision-making, Woroni had an Editors' retreat at the start of this semester. There was much debate, tears were shed, but the end result was strong policies that have been put up online on the Woroni website in the form of a draft Board manual.

**Roundtables**: Woroni held two roundtables this semester to get in touch with groups that felt alienated from our coverage.

- (1) Student Organisations (ANUSA, PARSA, ANU Sport, ANU Union)
- (2) International Student Clubs and Societies

**Great Presidential Debate**: Woroni held a Great Presidential Debate this semester to challenge the policies and activities of the 9 individuals running for Presidency. Things may have gotten a bit out of hand but everyone emerged unscathed, for the most part.

**Woroni Talks I:** Our first talk of the semester was one on "How to Get Published" by Jo Walker, Editor in Chief of Frankie Magazine. It was well-attended and Jo is an inspiring speaker.

**ANUSA/Woroni goes to Palace Electric:** Woroni and ANUSA held hands gingerly, somewhat tentatively, but ultimately with love at Palace Electric cinemas. The ANU students enjoyed free wine and popcorn and the scruffy jaw of Mark Ruffalo.

**Woroni Special General Meeting:** We have also decided to hold an SGM to clean up our act and our Constitution.

Events envisaged or are in the process of being set up include: A Radio Launch Party on October 9, Woroni Weekend on October 11 which will involve talks and workshops by prominent journalists in Australia, a forum on the terrorist group ISIS, a talk by Margaret Zhang, blogger, student and international model on Branding, and an end of year Awards Night to celebrate the valuable contributions of our subeditors and contributors.

**Woroni Internship**: We are planning to have a \$5000 scholarship alongside a placement at a reputable news agency. Currently, we are engaging in consultation with the Chancellery.

We have also had and will continue to have regular information sessions for subeditors and contributors at the Woroni offices in Shop 15, Lena Karmel Building, 26 Barry Drive, Canberra, 2601. If you have any issues or grievances that you would like addressed, I'm happy to address them at tara@woroni.com.au.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Throughout 2014 we have been trying to strengthen Woroni as an accountability framework, in regards to itself and the University. To this end, we have established a Conflict of Interest Policy to ensure that no member of the Board will transgress their role without full disclosure

This Board is also proposing significant Constitutional amendments that will influence the way our organisation operates in the long-term. This Board feels that the amendments are necessary, for the sake of clarity, to ensure that students are aware of general practices of interpretation. The ambiguity of the current wording of the Constitution creates misunderstanding and exclusion.

We respect the fact that the Woroni Editorial Board consists of elected members. No decisions of this immensity should ever be made by the Board without consultation. We have a long-standing commitment to transparency, as the only editorially and financially independent student media organisation in Australia.

Interpreting the Constitution is at the discretion of the Deputy Editor-in-Chief. Any questions about interpretation, electoral regulations or our policies and procedures can be directed towards Ross at ross@woroni.com.au.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Thank you to the ANU students for providing the SSAF that oils the wheels that keep us in motion, but also for providing contributions that amaze and provoke our sensibilities. Thank you to the Subeditors and their hard work in print, radio, photography and video for fulfilling thankless and time-consuming tasks that are always met with diligence and enthusiasm.

To our staff – We are indebted to Olivia Kelly (Administrative Assistant) who has pivoted our direction away from administrative oblivion to protect our institutional memory through proper archiving. Thank you to Dallas Proctor (Bookkeeper) who has dragged us from the pit of financial confusion to stabilize and consolidate upon our strengths to keep us afloat. We also greatly appreciate our distributors, Tegan Cawley and Alice Hoeng for distributing papers far and wide across campus.

We have lost and gained members of our team throughout this year and it has been a grueling process. I have found myself awed and inspired and consistently humbled by the Herculean efforts of the Woroni team. It appears that criticism has only spurred them to develop their skills, while positive feedback only encourages them to strive to surpass each achievement.

I am grateful to have been a part of this process. I have learnt many lessons from the strength, bravery and integrity of the leaders that I have worked with.

For general enquiries or submissions email us at <u>contact@woroni.com.au</u>. Like our Woroni Facebook page and join Woroni Contributors for regular updates.



#### **Appendix Two**

**Summary of Constitutional Amendments** 



# Summary of Constitutional Amendments

#### Change #1:

#### Circumstances of Entering into a Contractual Arrangement

Throughout 2014 it was recognised that procedure was ad hoc surrounding the circumstances where an editor can enter into a contractual arrangement. This change would specify clearly under what circumstances an Editor can enter into a contractual arrangement and would strengthen good financial governance within ANUSM.

#### Section 7.1.2

This section is created in order to stipulate under what circumstances an Editor can enter into a contractual agreement. The new section is a subsection of section 7.1 which details the "Powers of the Board of Editors."

The amended section reads:

7.1.2 Contractual Arrangements

The power to enter into contractual arrangements rests solely with any one Executive Officer of the Association. General Editors may only enter into contractual arrangements when authorized & put in the minutes of a board meeting or when recorded and approved via email. The Board must define the scope of the authorization and the authorized Editor must adhere to that scope.

### Change #2 Creation of Executive Officer

#### Section 7.3.2

This section is amended to specify the role of "Executive Officer"

The section currently reads:

7.3.2 The Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor are Officers of the Association.

The amended section would read:



7.3.2 The Editor-in-Chief, Deputy Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor are Executive Officers of the Association.

#### **Section 7.4.1(d)**

This section is amended to reflect the creation of the role of "Executive Officer" and how the Editor-in-Chief will work with other Executive Officers to manage and supervise ANUSM employees.

The section currently reads:

(d) be primarily responsible for the management and supervision of the Association's employees, in conjunction with the other Officers of the Association.

The amended section would read:

(d) be primarily responsible for the management and supervision of the Association's employees, in conjunction with the other Executive Officers of the Association.

#### Section 7.5(b)

This section is amended to reflect the creation of the role of "Executive Officer" and how general editors will assist Executive Officers in the performance of their duties as requested by the Board.

The section currently reads:

(b) provide assistance to the Officers of the Association in the performance of their duties as requested by the Board; and

The amended section would read:

(b) provide assistance to the Executive Officers of the Association in the performance of their duties as requested by the Board; and

#### Section 16.2

This section is amended to reflect the creation of the role of "Executive Officer" and how they contribute to quorum at a meeting of the Board.

The section currently reads:

16.2 The quorum at a meeting of the Board is five (5) members of the Board and must include at least two (2) Officers of the Association.

The amended section would read:

16.2 The quorum at a meeting of the Board is five (5) members of the Board and must include at least two (2) Executive Officers of the Association.



#### Change #3

#### Nomination to run for Election to the Board of Editors

In recent ANUSM elections it was recognised that the current wording of the Constitution provided a loophole for people who wished to run for election to the Board of Editors but had not demonstrated the commitment and dedication required to become an Editor.

This loophole was that under the current wording people would have to have a least three contributions made over a period greater than two weeks. As these could be published or unpublished contributions, it would be possible for people to submit work that was not of an adequate standard and then claim eligibility to stand for election. People could also be eligible if they have only submitted one piece of content at the beginning of semester, and then submit two others once applications opened.

By specifying that the three contributions must be published, this means that the people who have shown the commitment and dedication to consistently contribute work of an adequate standard to Woroni will be the only people eligible to lead ANUSM.

#### Section 7.6.7

This section is amended to specify that the three contributions that a person must make over a period greater than two weeks must be published by ANUSM.

The section currently reads:

7.6.7 A nomination is only valid where the nominee has previously made at least three (3) contributions over a period greater than two weeks duly recorded by the Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

The amended section would read:

7.6.7 A nomination is only valid where the nominee has previously made at least three (3) published contributions over a period greater than two weeks duly recorded by the Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

#### **Section 7.4.2(d)**

This section is amended to reflect that keeping a record of unpublished contributions is no longer necessary given that unpublished contributions have no standing on someone's eligibility for election.

The section currently reads:

(d) create and maintain an accurate record of the published and unpublished contributions made to publications of the Association, and

The amended section would read:



(d) create and maintain an accurate record of the published contributions made to publications of the Association, and

#### Section 19(f)

This section is amended to reflect that the record of contributions made to publications will no longer include unpublished contributions, and hence a record of unpublished contributions can not be supplied.

The section currently reads:

(f) the most up-to-date version of the record of the published and unpublished contributions made to publications of the Association maintained by the Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

The amended section would read:

(f) the most up-to-date version of the record of the published contributions made to publications of the Association maintained by the Deputy Editor-in-Chief.

#### Change #4

#### Initiating a Secret Ballot at Board Meetings

We would like to lower the required requests needed to initiate a secret ballot at a Board Meeting. If any one member of the board would like a secret ballot, that should be sufficient to hold one.

#### Section 16.4

This section is amended to change how many members must request a secret ballot for it to be held.

The section currently reads:

Decisions at a Board meeting shall be by a majority vote of members present. In the event of a tie, the chairperson shall have a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote. At the request of any two (2) members present at the Board meeting, a secret ballot shall be held. Voting by proxy shall not be permitted at any Board meeting.

The amended section would read:

Decisions at a Board meeting shall be by a majority vote of members present. In the event of a tie, the chairperson shall have a casting vote as well as a deliberative vote. At the request of any member present at the Board meeting, a secret ballot shall be held. Voting by proxy shall not be permitted at any Board meeting.



#### Change #5

#### Changing how the Grievance and Dispute Panel is Elected

Regrettably events in 2014 have lead to a Grievance and Dispute Panel needing to be called.

As it currently stands, the Grievance and Dispute Panel consists of a board appointed ordinary member, a staff member of the University appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, and an ordinary member elected at the Annual General Meeting of the Association.

Due to oversights made by previous Editors, an ordinary member was not elected at the Annual General Meeting of the Association in 2014. As such, amendments must be made to the Constitution to allow greater flexibility surrounding the timing of electing the student member of the Board.

In addition, as it currently stands, any general meeting can remove a Panel member, but only an Annual General Meeting can appoint the second ordinary member. This could potentially create a vacuum where the panel is unable to be held if a general meeting removes a member from the panel following an Annual General Meeting.

In the future, this change would allow for the ordinary member of the Panel to be elected at any general meeting, but would still make this an annual appointment.

#### Section 27.1(b)

This amendment would allow for an ordinary general member of the Association to be elected to the Panel at any General Meeting, not just an Annual General Meeting.

The section currently reads:

(b) one (1) ordinary member of the Association elected at the Annual General Meeting of the Association who must not be a member of the Board or a co-opted member; and

The amended section would read:

(b) one (1) ordinary member of the Association elected at any General Meeting of the Association who must not be a member of the Board or a co-opted member; and

#### Section 27.1 – Final Paragraph

This amendment would reflect the changes in section 27.1(b) and would simplify the wording of the Constitution to aid interpretation and legibility.

The section currently reads:

The ordinary members of the Panel appointed by the Board and the Annual General Meeting must be appointed annually. A general meeting may remove a Panel member.



The amended section would read:

The ordinary members of the Panel must be appointed annually. A general meeting may remove a Panel member.

#### Change #6

#### **Increasing Autonomy in Employee Arrangements**

As it currently stands, ANUSM must pay employees of the Association under the same conditions and entitlements as employees of the University.

The ANU is a multi-million dollar organisation, while ANUSM has very limited funding and does not have the capacity to award its employees the same conditions and entitlements.

ANU pay rates are set at levels for professional office staff, while ANUSM occasionally employs people as distributors, bar staff, event staff, and more.

Removing the section of the constitution that requires us to employ people under the same conditions and entitlements of the University would allow ANUSM to tailor its employment conditions to suit its financial environment and the unique circumstances that it employs people under.

ANUSM must be careful with its finances, and the award rates approved by Fair Work Australia are fair and reasonable to employees, while also being reflective of the Australian job market.

#### Section 13

This amendment would remove our obligation to award our employees the same conditions and entitlements as employees of the University.

This section currently reads:

13 The Board may appoint employees of the Association from time to time in accordance with relevant laws of the Australian Capital Territory and the Commonwealth, and any applicable industrial relations award or enterprise agreement. Employees of the Association must enjoy the same conditions and entitlements as employees of the University.

The amended section would read:

13 The Board may appoint employees of the Association from time to time in accordance with relevant laws of the Australian Capital Territory and the Commonwealth, and any applicable industrial relations award or enterprise agreement.