

University of Melbourne Student Union
Meeting of the Students' Council
Minutes



Friday 25 July 2025, 10am
Special Meeting 4(25)

Location: Room 202, Building 168 and Zoom (by request).

Meeting opened at 10: 09 am

1. Procedural Matters

1.1. Election of Chair

Motion 1: That Luv Golecha be elected as Chair.

Moved: Luv Golecha Seconded: Joshua Stagg

CWD

1.2. Acknowledgement of Indigenous Custodians

So acknowledged.

1.3. Attendance

Councillors

Representatives on Students' Council	Full name	Attended?
Students of Colour Representative on Students' Council	Bingchan Zhou	No
Students' Council Indigenous Representative	Oskar Martin	Yes
Students with Disabilities Representative on Students' Council	Cornellius Salim	Yes
Queer Representative on Students' Council	Semin (Sam) Park	Yes
International Student Representative on Students' Council	Junaid Mohd Qamar	No
Graduate Student Representative on Students' Council	Om Deshpande	Yes
Southbank Student Representative on Students' Council	Zoriana Stephanie Krupa	No
Students' Council (General Representative)	Wasif Rahman	No
Students' Council (General Representative)	Joseph Z Y Li-Sculli	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Kerry Sun	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Stefan Gavrilov	No
Students' Council (General Representative)	Enzhe (Kevin) Li	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Yasmeen Atieh	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Rachael Hynds	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Daniel Motika	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Amaya Castro Williams	No
Students' Council (General Representative)	Lottie Jenkins	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Anndrya Chua	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Niya Chopra	Yes
Students' Council (General Representative)	Yashesvi Verma	No
Students' Council (General Representative)	Bella Beiraghi	Yes

Students' Council (General Representative)	Zeinab Jishi	Yes
---	--------------	-----

Office Bearers

Department	Full name	Attended?
President	Joshua Stagg	Yes
General Secretary	Luv Golecha	Yes
Activities Officer	Amy Peters	No
Creative Arts Officer	Tianyi Yu	No
Creative Arts Officer	Riya Gupta	No
Clubs & Societies Officer	Esther Luk	Yes
Clubs & Societies Officer	Ewan Bezzobs	Yes
Disabilities Officer	Denzil Minnaar	No
Disabilities Officer	Nabia Rauf	No
Education (Academic Affairs) Officer	Harrishman Shobanan	<i>Apology</i>
Education (Academic Affairs) Officer	Rhea Sankar	No
Education (Public Affairs) Officer	Viraj Patel	Yes
Education (Public Affairs) Officer	Sonika Agarwal	Yes
Environment Officer	Jayde East	No
Environment Officer	Helena Muecke	No
Indigenous Officer	Noah Kellett	No
Media Officer	Mathilda Stewart	Yes
Media Officer	Sophie He	No
Media Officer	Ibrahim Muan Abdulla	No
Media Officer	Marcie Di Bartolomeo	No
People of Colour Officer	Wenhao (Clement) Wu	No
People of Colour Officer	Divyanshi Sati	No
Queer Officer	Ivy Pierlot	No
Welfare Officer	Filia Cahyadi	No
Welfare Officer	Kunal Dewani	Yes
Women's Officer	Eya Takrouni	No
Women's Officer	Khwaish Jadeja	No
Burnley Campus Coordinator	Ian Adams	No
Southbank Campus Co-ordinator	Caleb William Jarcevic	No
Southbank Campus Co-ordinator	Tirion Luff-White	No
Southbank Activities Officer	Justine Light De Guzman	No
Southbank Education Officer	Joobon Kim	No

Other: Lauren Luchs (minute taker), Sara Pheasant (CEO), Pheobe Churches (Head of Advocacy and Legal), Marli Haddeill (observer), Elli Paulding (observer), Ethan McNeil (observer).

1.4. Apologies

Office Bearers: Harrishman Shobanan

1.5. Proxies

1.5.1. Lachlan Eliau for Stefan Gavrilov

1.5.2. Catherine Duong for Yashesvi Verma

1.5.3. Emma Dynes for Amaya Castro-Williams

1.5.4. Abhie Gupta for Bingchan Zhou

1.5.5. Saaisha Vohra for Junaid Qamar

Motion 2: To accept the Proxies as presented.

Moved: Chair Seconded:

CWD

1.6. Leave of Absence Requests

1.7. Membership

1.7.1. Lola Bowers has resigned from the Students' Council

1.7.2. Maria Carolina Lourenco Quartel has been terminated from Students' Council.

1.7.3. Zeinab Jishi has been appointed to the Students' Council by ticket appointment.

1.7.4. Bella Beiraghi has been appointed to the Students' Council by ticket appointment.

Ewan raised concerned about the tracking of Councillors' attendance at Student Council. Luv assured Ewan that the attendance sheet will be checked to make sure that there are no outstanding terminations.

1.8. Adoption of Agenda

Motion 3: To adopt the Agenda as presented.

Moved: Chair Seconded: Kunal Dewani

CWD

2. Conflicts of Interest Declaration

No conflicts of interest declared.

3. Operational Business

9.1 To pass \$12,000 Printing – External (03-70-700-3713) for Edition 3 Printing

Moved: Ibrahim Muan Abdulla Seconded: Sophie He

9.2 To pass \$12,000 Printing – External (03-70-700-3713) for Edition 4 Printing

Moved: Ibrahim Muan Abdulla Seconded: Sophie He

9.3 To refinance \$1250 passed from (Stu. Council 3(25) Motion (9.7) 14) for Federal Budget Trip from Travel on UMSU Business (03-70-700-3656) towards EdCon Trip finances covering tickets, transportation, and accommodation.

Moved: Ibrahim Muan Abdulla Seconded: Sophie He

9.4 To pass \$1000 from Programs (03-70-700-3839) to pay speaker fees including 11.5% Superannuation for Speakers for workshops hosted in semester two. (A total of three workshops with an expected cost of \$400 per speaker and \$44.5 in superannuation per speaker.)

Moved: Ibrahim Muan Abdulla Seconded: Sophie He

Chair invited Mathilda to speak on the motions. She waived speaking rights.

Motion 4: To move Motion 9.1 to 9.4 en bloc.

Moved: Chair Seconder:

Carried

Motion 5: To accept Motions 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 (en bloc)

Moved: Mathilda Stewart Seconder: Zeinab Jishi

CWD

4. Motions on Notice

4.1 UMSU Supports Improved Consultation Procedure

Preamble

Meaningful student engagement is central to UMSU's representative role. Motions that impact, affect or relate to identity-based or structurally marginalised groups, such as students with disabilities, Indigenous students, people of colour, queer students and international students and students from socio-economic, ethnic or

cultural groups ('Autonomous Student Communities'), should reflect the perspectives of those communities. This includes geo-political matters that may relate to social, ethnic or cultural groups. The 2024 Ethnocultural Conference demonstrated the value of bringing lived experience into policy discussions. Thus, we should commit to enhancing our student consultation processes, to seek to adopt the principle of "nothing about us without us".

Platform

UMSU commits to ensuring that any motion that may relate to an autonomous student community is grounded in meaningful input from that community before it reaches Students' Council. This is to ensure UMSU provides a democratic and transparent forum in which Students' affairs and interests can be governed in an effective and accountable manner.

Action

1. The Student Council will only consider motions that relate to Autonomous Student Communities if there is an appropriate amount of consultation.
2. To achieve this, Students Council will develop an amendment to the Standing Orders through student consultation via the Constitution, Regulations & Policy Work Group (CRPWG).
3. The CRPWG will review and discuss the proposed changes and prepare a recommended amendment for Council endorsement.
4. In the interim, the Students' Council may refuse or defer a motion that could fall within the scope of the intended consultation requirements, but the President may commence consultation on any matter relating to the interests of Students at the University, in accordance with the UMSU Constitution at C 7.3(a)(iii).

Luv ceded Chair to Kunal.

Question was raised as to whether a vote was needed on the change of chair. Vote was deemed not necessary.

Luv spoke to the motion and reiterated the preamble and purpose of the motion.

Joshua spoke to the motion and stated the purpose and value of having of autonomous student bodies that relate to ethno-culturalism present on campus. He cited the lack of representation for ethnic and religious communities, and the importance of amplifying these voices in Students' Council. Joshua mentioned the involvement with Advocacy and Legal in creating

this motion. He specified that the term “consultation” does not inherently refer to “agreement”.

Chair invited members of Council to speak on the motion.

Bella exercised speaking rights. She opposed the motion, stating her concern that these consultations with members of identity groups may promote political biases that act against students’ free speech. She cited the recent appointment of Jillian Segal to the Labor Government, and how her position on identifying and combatting antisemitism in public spaces could infringe on UMSU’s and Student Council’s discussions surrounding the war in Gaza.

She cited Segal’s pro-Israel alignments as a deterrent for students to speak against the Israeli Government’s actions on campus. Bella also argued that consultation is not a good framework for addressing political issues within UMSU, and reaffirmed her opposition to the motion.

Luv responded to Bella’s concerns, stating that the motion was an idea that he obtained from the 2024 Ethnocultural Conference. He noted that no other member of Students’ Council was present at the conference. Luv mentioned that he and Joshua consulted multiple student groups, and assured Students’ Council that the motion’s wording had been deliberated. He also noted the need for bipartisan support to pass motions in future, and thus passing Motion 4.1 would not infringe on students’ free speech.

Ewan spoke to the motion and questioned the meanings of the term “consultation”. He expressed that the motion is too broad, and that greater clarity is needed as to what consultation might entail. He urged for Action Point 4 to be removed, stating it does not act in “good faith” to Students’ Council.

Luv responded to Ewan. Aidan wished to speak before Luv, citing the speaking order. Luv continued, assuring that these consultations are open, and if there is a proposed amendment, then the motions in question will be deferred.

Viraj spoke in agreement to the motion. He claimed that Students’ Council needed to provide greater representation to the University of Melbourne student body. He noted that UMSU already has existing consultation policies, and that UMSU exists to represent all students. Viraj also noted the need for better consultation of students, as student surveying is overused and ineffective. He mentioned that this motion could be a more effective method of communication between UMSU and the student body.

Aidan responded to Luv's earlier statements. He expressed that the motion would result in the restriction of students' free speech and suggested that the motion views minority groups as a monolith. He noted that one individual cannot represent the voice of a multifaceted community, and stated that the motion effectively hands over veto power as to what is discussed during Students' Council. He also noted that Students' Council cannot decide what constitutes as an appropriate amount of consultation, and suggested the motion reflects the restriction of students' voices. Aidan further noted that this motion would give undue power arbitrarily to certain student groups and urged the motion to be rejected.

Luv specified the details of "consultation" mentioned within the motion, reiterating that it is Students' Council's decision to determine how these consultations are carried out in practice. He also noted that these consultations exist to promote discussion in Students' Council and are therefore not a restriction on free speech.

Several members of Students' Council spoke in opposition to Luv's claim, resulting in a brief dispute within the room.

Luv urged the opposing members to join in the process of these consultations, as to learn more about the importance of the procedure and rectify any inadequacies they identify in its execution.

Elli requested to speak to the motion but was disrupted by another brief dispute within the room.

Elli resumed, suggesting that represented student groups may have far-right political ideologies underpinning their motives during consultations. They expressed particular concern regarding students' freedom to engage in pro-Palestinian content, and claimed this motion would become a tax on students' free speech. They also cited the university's weaponisation of antisemitism to infringe on students' free expression of Pro-Palestinian beliefs in the past, reaffirming support for Bella's previous argument.

Elli urged that political decisions within student unionism should be made on political alignment, not based on "tokenistic" representation as suggested by the motion. They stated this policy would result in tokenistic use of students to put through motions.

Kunal invited Josh to speak. The speaking list order was contested briefly by members in the room.

Josh spoke in acknowledgment of these concerns. He rejected the notion of tokenism, mentioning his ongoing consultations with Indigenous Department OB Noah Kellett in the past. He stated UMSU's responsibility to have ethnic and religious groups heard on matters that pertain to their communities.

Marli spoke to the motion. They cited that members of the trans community hold differences in beliefs, and these differences also extend to many other minority groups. They therefore believed the motion was xenophobic, as it paints these identity groups as monolithic. They labelled the motion as "disgraceful".

Lottie spoke, affirming the importance of representing student voices. However, she questioned the consultation procedures and the circumstances that warrant consultations. She deemed Action Point 4 as concerning and called for further debate into its inclusion within the motion.

Luv spoke to these concerns. He reaffirmed the "nothing about us, without us" rhetoric, stating that it is Students' Council's responsibility to determine the best course of action moving forward. He noted the options for deferral within Council and reassured that the motion was a method of undertaking due diligence to ensuring student voices are heard.

Josh spoke in agreement with Luv. He discussed the possibilities of both good and bad consultations and ultimately stated that the motion exists to have identity groups fairly heard by UMSU.

Ewan spoke, stating that Student Council already holds these consultations in their operations, as students are regularly encouraged to voice their opinions within Council sessions. He affirmed his trust in the current Students' Council to act in good faith when voting on motions but found Luv's comment on voting deferrals concerning. He argued that constant deferring of motions could prevent the opportunity for debate during Students' Council.

Marli spoke to the notion of "bad consultation", suggesting that it could leverage biased viewpoints to make harmful arguments within Students' Council. They affirmed their opposition and cited Modi's Governance over India and the war in Gaza as reasons for opposition. They stated that giving power to small groups to shut down dissent within democratic arguments should be opposed by student unionism, as it closes the democratic space that should be made available.

Luv stated his openness to proposing amendments to the motion. He also noted the ability for the General Secretary to defer already exists in the Standing Orders, and that all members are entitled to have their voices heard in Students' Council.

Bella contested this notion and rejected the framework that consultation is an important part of political process. She cited various geo-political issues that bring differing political views, such as the Jewish student body's differing beliefs on the war in Gaza. She urged UMSU to reaffirm its left-wing political stance. Bella further asserted that some identity groups will be upset by this motion, and the impracticability of consultations as being reflective of these groups' views. She mentioned the previous lawsuit against UMSU by a pro-Israeli student and stated her concern that the motion could bring about incidents of a similar nature. She suggested that there is in fact disagreement on consultation as a framework.

Rachael spoke to the motion, adding that she trusts the current Students' Council to bring this motion in good faith, but expressed concern into future Students' Council's intentions should it be passed.

Aidan debated Luv's previous arguments. Luv implored him to revise the Standing Orders. Aidan agreed that UMSU should be aware of the political views they endorse in student unionism and that it would be more democratic to have active debates in Students' Council, instead of the proposed consultations.

Emma suggested the motion would dampen democratic discussion. She stated that UMSU should take issue when students speak against the union's previous left-wing political leaning. She agreed that there are political differences on campus, but that it is a democratic right for UMSU to take a particular political position. She mentioned Modi's governance as example again and spoke in opposition towards those who push his fascist agenda on campus. She stated the importance of UMSU in speaking to these geopolitical issues but suggested that ultimately UMSU must reaffirm its left-wing political position. Emma claimed that the motion would give veto power to the General Secretary in future, which would infringe on democratic debates within Students' Council. She urged this motion to be rejected in whole.

Viraj emphasised that UMSU already has consultation policies. He reaffirmed that it was important for opposing views to be heard in Students' Council regardless of political alignment.

Xing spoke to the motion. He stated that the origins of UMSU's political views should come from active debate within Student Council. He urged UMSU to support those who are subjected to oppression and not amplify the views of its supporters, citing the Hong Kong democracy movement as an example. He also stated his strong care for the people of Palestine, and his concern about this motion's potential to infringe on free speech.

Joshua spoke to these issues, agreeing that political differences are bound to exist and reiterated the importance of respect within Students' Council.

Emma spoke again to the motion. She mentioned her opposition to the Modi Government and its support from members of the student body, as well as the weaponisation of antisemitism on campus to prevent pro-Palestinian support. Emma also noted that UMSU regularly passes motions that disrupt the beliefs and practices of many political parties on campus, such as liberal party groups.

Bella spoke again. She affirmed UMSU's progressive political stances, and their commitment to advocacy and solidarity with marginalised groups. She cited previous union efforts regarding Australia's Same Sex marriage referendum that included consultations with the Catholic Church. She reaffirmed the previous arguments for opposition and urged members of Students' Council to oppose the motion.

Chi spoke to the motion. He questioned if there was a way to dissolve the motion if it was not executed in the same good faith that the mover intended.

Luv suggested this motion was a progressive measure for Students' Council, and there was possibility for motions to be differed if necessary.

Sonika moved a procedural motion to move to a vote. Luv cited the Standing Order 14.4 that procedural motions must be voted on right away. At Chair's discretion (and advised by Pheobe), Oskar was recognised by the chair to speak.

Oskar spoke in opposition to the motion. He cited his involvement as an Indigenous representative on campus and raised concerns about political differences within minority groups. He noted the dangers of consulting those who are in oppressive powers, referencing the Northern Territory Police Force's involvement in the death of Kumanjayi Walker as an example. He also noted that individuals outside of certain identity groups should still feel inclined to express their beliefs on their issues, as it promotes the ongoing democratic debate within Students' Council. He urged Council to reject the motion.

Kunal moved to a vote. Luv cited Standing Orders 14.4.

There were questions into amending the motion. Luv recited the Standing Orders, that this must be moved to a vote.

Kunal moved again to vote in favour of the procedure. There was debate as to whether Abhie wished to speak.

Kunal resumed.

A procedural motion was moved, to move to a vote on Motion 4.1. It was carried with dissent, with 8 to 6 votes against.

Kunal ceded Chair to Luv.

Chair, as directed by the passed procedural motion, moved Council to vote.

Motion 6: Students' Council Endorses UMSU's Support for Improved Consultation Procedure.

Moved: Chair Seconded: Joshua Stagg

Carried with Dissent

Ewan asked for clarification of proxy. Luv stated the motion had already passed.

Ewan called for a recount, as votes were counted 8 to 7 against. Luv assured him that the motion had passed. There was lively debate into the need for a recount. Mathilda argued there were 9 votes against the motion.

On the advice of 1/3 of voting members, Luv called for a recount.

Motion 7: Students' Council Endorses UMSU's Support for Improved Consultation Procedure.

Moved: Luv Golecha Seconded: Joshua Stagg

Carried with Dissent

Vote counted 10 to 9 against.

5. Next meeting

Next Students' Council will be held on the 15th of August.

6. Close

Meeting closed at 11:40 AM