

MSC 4/26 CONFIRMED MINUTES

A. Attendance

Title	Name	Proxy	Attendee
President:	Leroy Van Schellebeck		Present ▾
Secretary:	Nick Fallaw		Present ▾
Treasurer:	Lana Abdelhalim		Present ▾
Education (Academic Affairs):	Ruby Paul		Present ▾
Education (Public Affairs):	Madi Curkovic		Present ▾
Activities:	John Lavanya		Present ▾
Creative & Live Arts:	Eowyn Judge		Present ▾
Welfare:	Carla Hunaidi		Present ▾
Indigenous:	Nanjera Pender		Absent ▾
Environment & Social Justice:	Anushka Sharma		Present ▾
Women's:	Esha Serai		Present ▾
Queer:	Tyler Hollis		Present ▾
Disabilities & Carers:	Mehfooz Khan		Present ▾
People of Colour:	Rofida Arnaout		Present ▾
Residential Community:	Ashley Rosewall		Present ▾
MUISS:	Ishaan Puri		Present ▾
MAPS:	Alex Self		Present ▾
Clubs & Societies:	Jay Davis		Present ▾
Radio Monash:	Noah Martin		Present ▾
General Representative:	Monty Richardson		Present ▾
General Representative:	Dominique Amad-Corson	Malak Ababneh	Proxy ▾
General Representative:	Jorgie Rainbird		Present ▾
General Representative:	Quinney Brownfield		Absent ▾
General Representative:	Diyara Jaswar		Absent ▾

Observers

Alejandro Mariona, Angus Duske, Alessandro Papaleo, Nhan Nguyen, Penelope Scacciante

Quorum is met and Leroy Van Schellenbeck (Leroy) assumes the chair.

Meeting declared open at 11:17AM

B. Acknowledgment of Country

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

C. Confirmation of Agenda Order

Confirmed

D. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Motion #1:

This MSC confirms the minutes of [MSC 3/26](#) to be the true and accurate recording of the proceedings.

Moved: Nick Fallaw

Seconded: Jay Davis

For: 13

Against: 0

Abstain: 5

MOTION PASSED

Nick Fallaw (Nick) speaks to the minutes as they accurately reflect the events of MSC 3/26. Jay Davis (Jay) waives speaking rights. Alessandro Papaleo (Alessandro) raises a correction that he and Angus Duske (Angus) were both not present at MSC 3/26 though had been listed as observers. Nick notes that this will be amended. Anushka Sharma (Anushka) enters the meeting room at 11:22AM

E. Reports

Department	Names	Report Type	Submission Compliance
Education (Public Affairs)	Madeline Curkovic & Harleen Singh	Regular report	Due 14 May 2026
Environment and Social Justice	Penelope Scacciante & Anushka Sharma	Regular report	Submitted on time
Women's	Mehreen Khan & Esha Serai	Regular report	Submitted on time
Queer	Tyler Hollis & Ethan Imbriano	Regular report	Due 14 May 2026
Indigenous	Nanjera Pender	Regular report	Due 14 May 2026
Disabilities and Carers	Mehfooz Khan & Olivia Reid	Regular report	Submitted on time
People of Colour	Rofida Arnaout	Regular report	Submitted on time

Residential Community	Lily Rose & Ashley Rosewall	Regular report	Due 14 May 2026
MUISS	Ishaan Puri	Regular report	Submitted on time
MAPS	Alex Self	Regular report	Due 14 May 2026

Nick clarifies the due dates of regular reports where a due date is after the scheduled date of the MSC but within the MSC month. Nick conveys that any reports submitted prior to the MSC will be accepted, and that any other received up to and including the May 14 will be tabled and considered on time at MSC 4/26.

Jay waives speaking rights.

Motion #2:			
This MSC accepts all submitted Office-Bearer & Division May Reports en bloc.			
Moved:	Nick Fallaw	Seconded:	Jay Davis
For:	20	Against:	0
		Abstain:	1
MOTION PASSED			

Mehreen Khan (Mehreen) enters the meeting room at 11:25AM

F. March Financial Statement Summary

Motion #3:			
This MSC accepts the Financial Statement Summary for March 2026 .			
Moved:	Lana Abdelhalim	Seconded:	Nick Fallaw
For:	21	Against:	0
		Abstain:	1
MOTION PASSED			

Lana Abdelhalim (Lana) waives speaking rights.

Nick waives speaking rights.

G. Adoption of Administration Regulations

Motion #4:			
This MSC adopts the proposed MSA Administration Regulations .			
Moved:	Nick Fallaw	Seconded:	Jay Davis
For:	21	Against:	0
		Abstain:	0
MOTION PASSED			

Nick speaks to the substance of the motion, thanking those who have been contributing to update MSA Regulations for their work - especially which Jay has contributed, in refining outdated regulatory frameworks to match best practice and ensure compliance within the organisation.

Nick highlights the importance of a more transparent and mutually accountable set of prescribed responsibilities under the regulations with regard to Executive and Lot's Wife engagement and thanks both parties for their willingness to participate in the necessary reforms.

Jay speaks to the motion and explains the substance of the amended regulations in compartmentalised fashion. Jay expands that Part 2 is intended to clarify: - who and who is not a student, the applicability of clear days notice, weekend and holiday due dates (excluding MSC notice/standing orders to avoid delays), strict compliance with prescribed forms, accidental invalidity and savings provisions. Part 3 relates to Providing clarity to processes under the constitution. Part 4. was included in response to legal advice the life members list must be formalised in regulation.

Allessandro speaks to the motion and to the fact that there exists a genuine nexus between Lot's Wife's desire to publish as accurately as possible the voices of students and the Executives need to protect the MSA from legal risk. Allessandro notes that these regulatory changes are a good step towards clarifying due process and ensuring potential risks are not able to go unnoticed. Allessandro makes particular mention of the requirement for the executive to seek legal advice and that this be communicated to Lot's Wife editors in a timely manner.

Allessandro further notes that this has been convention over the last few years but that it is his opinion that codification is a necessary safeguard. Allessandro concludes by seconding Nicks earlier thanks as to good will which underlies the mutually agreed arrangement now in place.

Jay thanks Alex Self (Alex) for his contributions by way of corrections to an earlier circulation of the proposed regulatory amendments and notes that these changes have been accepted in part and included in this draft.

H. Monash University Governance - Student and Staff Representation

Leroy notes that, in the interests of time, he will not read the preamble for all motions.

Preamble:

In its submission to the Victorian Parliament's University Governance Inquiry, the University has rejected any need to increase student and staff representation on Monash's governing Council.

The submission falsely claims that there is "no correlation" between having elected student and staff representatives and better governance, and that increasing elected representation does not ensure diversity of perspectives.

Monash University Council currently features just one elected staff member and one student representative. While at the same time, no fewer than five members are appointed internally, by the Council itself, none of whom are staff or students.

Students and staff are not a governance inconvenience. We are the university community. The University's submission argues that student representation does not strengthen governance.

The letter raises a very serious question: why does university leadership not want students and staff involved in decisions that directly affect them? What exactly is the concern with students and staff being part of decision-making spaces? What is University management trying to hide? When leadership argues against elected representation, it does not sound like a commitment to good governance. It sounds like a commitment to avoiding accountability.

The suggestion that diversity of perspectives exists without elected student or staff voices is simply incorrect. We already know what best practice is from the Australian Senate's inquiry and Expert Panel report. Students and staff bring lived experience of the very policies being decided. Removing or minimising those voices does

not make governance stronger. It makes it narrower, more insulated, and more disconnected from reality on campus.

Universities cannot claim to value diversity, while arguing against democratic representation from the very communities they are established to serve. We have seen exactly where that leads on our own campus. It is a fallacy to suggest that everything works perfectly when students and staff are not properly consulted about safety, inclusion, and the environments they are expected to be in and it is dishonest to argue that the University is well governed, when it has admitted to unlawfully underpaying more than 10,000 staff members more than \$20 million in stolen wages.

At a time when universities are increasingly being run like businesses, student and staff representatives are often the only people in governance spaces whose priority is education. Without strong student and staff voices at the table, decisions risk being driven by optics, revenue, and administrative convenience - instead of the best interests of the university community.

Jay speaks to the motion and condemns the university's submission, in particular in that it refutes the notion that student and/or staff representation on council is of benefit to the institution. Jay highlights the importance of the inquiry itself and its capacity to ensure reform that requires universities mandate such representation in future. Jay contends that it is important that MSA advocates for not only legislative change but also change that is cultural, seeing as the University is at present not just debating how much student and/or staff representation there should be, but whether or not the representation is valid even at its current level.

Nick waives speaking rights.

Penelope Scacciante (Penelope) raises a concern that the structural and governance reforms within the University as they relate to representation on the council level will not broadly affect a larger issue which is purported to be that of Universities being subordinate to a capitalist system. Penelope goes on to express cynicism as to whether or not greater staff and/or student representation at the university's peak decision making body would have any worthwhile impact on university decision making.

Jay replies contending that while governance reform does not represent the only method by which change should be affected at university, it does play an outsized role. Jay notes that should the peak decision making body of an institution be filled with business minded individuals, the institution will be run in such a way that business is prioritised, whereas if this representation is broader and comprises staff and students, the educational needs of this broader constituency are accommodated and given weight also. Jay notes that this rationale is supported in all of its principles by the NTEU, and that while there are multiple issues running at the same time in terms of university governance and a disconnect from the business interests of the university institutionally with what staff and students seek to attain educationally and otherwise, this is a positive first step.

Alex speaks to the submission made to the enquiry by MGA where a minimum of three student representatives was requested (one undergraduate and two postgraduate). Alex seeks to clarify whether the MSA has had any involvement with the MGA submission and whether the MSA has a position on it.

Jay replies that the position of the MSA is firmly that more student representation is better, and that three students is the preference regardless of any specifically assigned proportionality between student representative groups. Jay discloses his providing of assistance to the submission of the National Union of Students submission which outlines a preferred approach to include at least 3 staff, two students and the president of a relevant student union. Jay concludes to say that while the exact principle proposed by MGA is not necessarily agreed upon by MSA and there was no explicit involvement with the MGA submission, the latter is not completely unaligned with the position of the MSA.

Madi Curkovic (Madi) replies to Jay expressing disagreement with the premise that the proposed extra student and staff representation does not change who controls the university.

Angus Duske (Angus) enquires as to whether the MSA submitted an enquiry, took a stance or was involved in any joint position. Jay replies to confirm that the MSA contributed to the NUS position and joint NTEU NUS position that outlines at least 3 staff making up not less than 20% of council and at least two students making up not less than 13% of council.

Jay responds to Madi contending that the University would ideally like to make student involvement in real decision making purely consultative and that accordingly, meaningful proportions of the University's peak decision making body being assigned to student and staff representatives is a substantial and meaningful win for their representation in practical terms, citing the work of Demitri Kaminis on University Council and recent appointees to the Academic Board as prime examples of students able to affect change in a manner that can be bolstered by greater representation.

Malak Ababneh contends that issues like universal submission times are irrelevant to a broader picture of staff and resource mismanagement and that the influence of random student appointees is being overstated. Malak contends that a strategy of consultation with the university is ineffective.

Jay replies to Malak and underscored the manner in which student and staff representation has in fact been slashed at Monash Council, with 7 staff and 3 students being the high water mark in the past. Jay notes that the position being taken by some members of the MSC to invalidate and condemn the usefulness or appropriateness of student and staff appointees to University Council is a right wing approach that undermines student and staff voices. Madi replies to Jay and contends that a broader activist approach is missing, and that the success of previous monash councils in harbouring greater student and staff representation was on account of decision making occurring within an activist environment that had placed a critical amount of pressure on the universities governing bodies beforehand.

Madi encourages the MSA to become more combative with the University's administration.

Motion #5:

This MSC:

1. Condemns Monash University's submission to the Victorian Parliament's University Governance Inquiry.
2. Calls for the University to retract and apologise to students and staff for statements made in the submission.
3. Commits the MSA to continuing to advocate for student representation at all levels of University governance.
4. Commits the MSA to working together with the NTEU to achieve its equally important goal of greater staff representation.

Moved: Jay Davis

Seconded: Nick Fallaw

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

MOTION PASSED

I. Extending Misogyny Review

Preamble:

Since the beginning of 2026, a new external HR company has been engaged as part of an ongoing effort to strengthen governance, compliance, and internal processes. At the time of this transition, it was identified that a number of MSA policies, procedures, and practices were outdated and no longer aligned with current best practice.

In response, the MSA has commenced an organisation-wide HR audit. This is a formal 12-month process designed to systematically review, update, and restructure the organisation's policies, procedures, and workplace structures. This includes key areas relating to conduct, reporting processes, and organisational standards.

As part of this process, many existing policies are under active review and are being rewritten or replaced. The MSA is therefore operating within a transitional policy environment, where frameworks are not yet finalised and are subject to ongoing change.

In this context, finalising the Misogyny Review in this environment would result in an assessment of systems and policies that are incomplete or in flux. Any findings or recommendations produced would be based on a framework that is actively changing, risking a report that is outdated on arrival.

It is incredibly important that all of us take action to address any and all misogyny within the MSA. However, for the review to be effective, it must assess a stable and finalised set of policies and practices. To provide informed and relevant recommendations for the MSA, the report must evaluate the organisation's policy environment after changes have been completed, rather than while they are still in progress.

Extending the review until the HR audit concludes will ensure that its findings are grounded in a clear and consistent policy framework. This will allow the review to produce recommendations that are practical, implementable, and that inform long-term institutional change.

The 2025 Women's Department has submitted a guide to the incoming working group on the review's direction and priorities. Building on this work, the proposed working group will be formally established as the HR audit process concludes, ensuring that the review is both informed by prior advocacy and positioned to deliver meaningful outcomes.

Esha Serai (Esha) speaks to the motion, first highlighting the direct correlation between the delay of the review and a desire to undertake it in a non-rushed, comprehensive manner that reflects the MSA's stance of zero-tolerance toward misogyny. Esha outlines that the MSA Women's department is intending to extend the time period, citing that the department feels as though the initial deadline is too onerous. Esha expands upon this to reiterate that the intention is to honour the spirit and substance of the review as proposed and that the seeking of further time to complete the review only reflects that the ongoing and broader work of the Women's Department has consumed the majority of active office hours to date.

Esha goes on to highlight that there exists a significant amount of potentially outdated policies that must be reviewed prior to the reviews tabling so as to avoid a double-up in work should the review be based upon policies which are discovered to be incompatible and/or outdated. Lana speaks to the motion and thanks the Women's Department for the work and consultation that has been communicated extensively with the executive.

Lana reiterates that the issue of misogyny is not one to be responded to in a way that is rushed or anything less than comprehensive and lends support to the extension as requested by the Women's Department. Lana highlights that the MSA's engagement of external Human Resources counsel intends to provide built-in and preventative measures against misogyny as much as reactive assessments and that until this informs updated policy frameworks, the Women's Department has determined it valuable to seek the extension as requested in the motion. Lana concludes by reiterating the importance of a deadline which reflects and respects the capacity of the Women's Department and the work it seeks to achieve, while highlighting the many administrative and procedural steps being taken by the MSA in lockstep which seek to provide the framework for a robust and future-ready review.

Mehreen Khan (Mehreen) thanks all the women involved in MSA for the assistance and interest in the review process. Anushka commends Esha and Mehreen for their work on the review and other matters, highlighting again the importance of facilitating the review in such a way that does not unfairly burden the Women's Department and commends the motion.

Leroy asks for and receives clarification that Esha Serai holds the vote for the Women's department.

Motion #6:

This MSC extends the MSA Misogyny Review to the end of the 2026 calendar year, to ensure the review is conducted following the completion of the organisation-wide HR audit and reflects the MSA's updated and finalised policy framework.

Moved: Esha Serai

Seconded: Lana Abdelhalim

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

MOTION PASSED

J. Headspace Work and Study Online Support

Preamble:

Access to meaningful work and study support is essential for students navigating university life. Many students face ongoing pressure as they balance academic commitments, employment opportunities, and their mental wellbeing. These competing demands can contribute to burnout, disengagement, reduced academic performance, and lower confidence in future career prospects.

Headspace Work & Study Online Support is a free, accessible service for young people aged 15–25, providing tailored guidance to help them plan, pursue, and achieve their work and study goals. Delivered online, the program offers flexibility and accessibility for all young people. Participants are matched with a Work and Study Specialist who engages regularly with them over a structured period, typically weekly/fortnightly for up to three months. The duration of the program is flexible and can be adjusted based on individual needs and requests.

The program also provides access to mental health clinicians where appropriate, helping address barriers that may impact a student's ability to engage in work or study. Students do not need to be experiencing a specific issue to benefit from the program, and can reach out if they are seeking to build skills, confidence, or direction. Key areas of support addressed by the program include job readiness, career planning, further education pathways, and balancing wellbeing alongside work or study commitments.

With the support of the National Union of Students (NUS), increased awareness of the service available across universities in Australia would enable students to access alternative, targeted support for managing work and study pressures. A trial implementation of the program within universities, beginning with Monash as the first participating institution, would increase student access to support and help guide future rollout to other universities.

Carla Hunaidi (Carla) outlines the Welfare Department's work with the NUS and Headspace to introduce the Work and Study Online Support Program at Monash. The program provides students aged 15–25 with access to a Work and Study Specialist who offers ongoing support relating to work, study and wellbeing. Carla noted that the Welfare Department would be engaging with University Health Services to explore opportunities to embed the program within existing support services and strengthen referral pathways for students.

Lana commends the Welfare Department's work on the initiative and welcomes efforts to improve access to support services for students. Lana personally commends Carla and Rafiad Jewel (Rafiad) for their work and embodiment of the MSA Welfare portfolio across many fronts.

Motion #7:

This MSC:

1. Supports the introduction of the Headspace “Work and Study” online program
2. Calls for collaboration with Monash University’s Health Services to embed the program into long-term student support service

Moved: Carla Hunaidi

Seconded: Lana Abdelhalim

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

MOTION PASSED

K. Free Parking Extensions

Preamble:

Affordable parking has been a key priority for Monash students in recent times, particularly in the context of the ongoing fuel and cost-of-living crisis. Many students rely on driving to campus due to limited, impractical, or time-consuming public transport options.

Rising fuel prices and increasing parking costs place further financial pressure on students who are already managing the costs of study, work, and living. Earlier this year, the MSA successfully advocated for the temporary introduction of free parking on Mondays. This initiative was introduced as an emergency cost-of-living measure, with the University initially stating that it would only remain in place for a short period. Following continued advocacy from the MSA, Monash University extended free parking on Mondays until the end of Semester One.

This is in addition to the ongoing Free Parking Friday’s initiative, which will continue permanently. The MSA has also secured free parking throughout SWOTVAC and the exam period, from the 1st to 26th of June. This is an important win for students during one of the most stressful and financially difficult periods of the semester.

While these outcomes represent meaningful progress, parking affordability remains an ongoing issue for students. The MSA must continue to advocate for long-term, affordable parking initiatives that will continue to help students through the cost-of-living crisis.

Monty Richardson (Monty) speaks to the motion and highlights that parking-centric provisions are not a long term goal of the MSA, and that whilst an ultimate objective is to reduce reliance on car parking, the cost of living crisis in Australia necessitates immediate alleviating action.

Nick thanks Monty for his work in compiling the motion and recounts his experience in recent times of many students raising issues about parking pricing and availability especially in exam periods.

Motion #9:

This MSC:

1. Commends the Monash Student Association on its successful advocacy in securing free parking during exams and the extension of free parking on Mondays until the end of Semester One.
2. Calls on Monash University to extend free parking to all future exam periods, as well as establishing free parking on Mondays as a permanent initiative.
3. Directs the MSA Executive to bring further free parking proposals to the University, including proposals for expanded free parking during high-stress academic periods and broader cost-of-living relief for students.

Moved: Monty Richardson

Seconded: Nick Fallaw

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

MOTION PASSED

L. Hidden Disabilities Awareness Week

Preamble:

Many students at Monash live with hidden disabilities that are not immediately visible, including chronic illnesses, mental health conditions, neurodivergence, and other health conditions. Because these disabilities are not always visible, students may experience misunderstanding, stigma, and barriers when seeking support or navigating university life.

Awareness initiatives, including collaboration with the Hidden Disabilities Sunflower program, play an important role in building understanding and creating a more inclusive campus environment. Establishing a dedicated awareness week would provide a consistent opportunity to promote these initiatives, highlight available support services, and strengthen a culture of accessibility and inclusion at Monash Clayton.

Mehfooz Khan (Mehfooz) shares his finding that most students are not aware of the meaning behind the sunflower campaign, and shares with the room the intention behind the motion.

Nick commends Disabilities and Carers Office Bearers Mehfooz and Olivia Ried (Olivia) for their work in the department and commends the motion. Nick encourages the MSC to participate where practicable in the sunflower campaign, highlighting the significance of invisible illnesses and hidden disabilities and the importance of their recognition.

Motion #10:

This MSC:

1. resolves to recognise Week 9 of Semester 1 as Hidden Disabilities Awareness Week (the week) at Monash University Clayton campus.
2. resolves that the Disabilities and Carers Department will lead the week annually, in collaboration with the Hidden Disabilities Sunflower organisation.
3. resolves that the week should aim to raise awareness of hidden disabilities, promote the Hidden Disabilities Sunflower initiative, and improve understanding of the support available to students.
4. endorses activities that may include awareness stalls, digital campaigns, sunflower distribution, lanyard promotion, staff/student education, and other initiatives determined by the elected Disabilities and Carers Officer.

Moved: Mehfooz Khan

Seconded: Nick Fallaw

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

MOTION PASSED

M. Opposing NDIS Cuts and Protecting Disabled Students' Support

Preamble:

Many disabled students and student carers rely on the NDIS for support that helps them study, travel, communicate, manage daily living needs, access therapy, and participate in campus and community life. According to the Australian Government Department of Health, Disability and Ageing, in material released by Minister Mark Butler on 22 April 2026, the Government's NDIS reform plan would mean the scheme grows every year, but projected spending in 2030 would reduce from more than \$70 billion to around \$55 billion. The

same government material also outlines changes including tighter criteria for unscheduled reassessments, resetting participant budgets for social and community participation, and introducing standardised evidence-based assessments for access to the scheme ([Health, Disability and Ageing Australia](#)).

While scheme sustainability, fraud prevention, and service quality are important, reforms must not reduce disabled students' access to necessary supports without clear, accessible, and properly funded alternatives already in place. For students, reduced or restricted support may create further barriers to attending university, using transport, managing disability-related needs, participating in campus life, and maintaining social connection. There is an acute need to advocate for disabled students and student carers to be properly considered in any NDIS reform process.

Mehfooz speaks to the motion and begins by highlighting the critical nature of NDIS support, and that this reality can coexist with a need to ensure proper management and oversight of the program into the future.

Mehfooz criticises the recent prescribed forward cuts to the NDIS program and its servicing where no alternative has been adequately provided by the state or otherwise. Mehfooz highlights that the motion seeks to maintain the relevance of NDIS beneficiaries in a process of review that may treat those same people as an afterthought. Nick waives his speaking rights.

Procedural Motion		
That this MSC proceeds with discussion of motion #11 under formal debate.		
Moved: Nick Fallaw	Seconded: NA	
For: 18	Against: 0	Abstain: NA
MOTION PASSED		

Malak raises concerns with action points "2", "7" and "8". Malak raises a neoliberal praxis, which involves the procurement or retention of funds allocated in past to the NDIS at the expense of Australia's most vulnerable people. Malak notes that this approach will see up to 300,000 people removed from the NDIS over the coming decade. Malak raises further concerns that it is women and frontline workers who will bear the consequences of a system put under more strain by defunding. Malak pivots to discuss the broader structural inadequacies of the NDIS in its current form, citing that it is unable to meet the needs of the approximately five million Australians living with disability and that it serves private business interests primarily.

Nick speaks to the motion, reiterating the contention that the NDIS system is broken and invites exploitation by design, going on to say he believes it requires reform in ways that prioritise the needs of Australia's disabled people. Nick clarifies for the sake of total transparency that the earlier assertion that 300,000 would be removed from the NDIS may be misleading. Nick clarifies that the figure stems from a reality where some future applicants who might previously have entered the NDIS will not enter, as well as situations where some existing participants are expected to lose eligibility or transition out during reassessment.

Penelope speaks and raises that a minority of MSC members had requested to amend action point 8 to read as "condemns the Federal Labor government for proposing these cuts..." and critiques the approved amendment to action point 8, alleging that it obfuscates the responsibility of the sitting Labor government to ensure a fair process and accountability over the issues raised. Penelope frames the proposed changes to the NDIS as an attack upon the working class, and a reform to a system that is in fact irreparably and by nature flawed in its prioritisation of profiteering over genuine care provision.

Leroy seeks to clarify with Penelope as to whether an amendment is being proposed. Penelope clarifies that there is not.

Mehfooz speaks to the matter of amending action point 8 and reiterates that any proposed amendment to include party-specific referencing is undesirable as he wishes for the substance of the motion to apply more

broadly. Madi replies and characterises such an argument as relatively weak, while pivoting to a broader critique of an extant NDIS model that allows for private businesses to price services with such freedom that the cost of maintaining the NDIS continues to blow out.

Madi alleges that these cuts see vulnerable Australians bear the brunt of reforming a system that will never work for them.

Motion #11:

This MSC:

1. Recognises the importance of the NDIS in supporting disabled students and student carers to access education, transport, daily living support, social participation, and independence.
2. Condemns NDIS reforms or funding changes that may reduce access to necessary disability supports for students.
3. Opposes any reduction to essential NDIS supports unless clear, accessible, and properly funded alternative supports are already in place.
4. Demands the Federal Government ensure that disabled people, carers, disability advocates, and student representatives are genuinely consulted before major NDIS changes are implemented.
5. Demands the Federal Government protect supports that allow disabled students to participate in university life, including transport, support work, therapy, daily living support, and social and community participation.
6. Supports the Disabilities & Carers Department in sharing relevant information with students about major NDIS changes and available support pathways.
7. Calls for the neoliberal NDIS system to be replaced with a fully funded public healthcare system.
8. Condemns the Federal Government for proposing spending cuts and austere reforms to the NDIS.

Moved: Mehfooz Khan

Seconded: Nick Fallaw

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

MOTION PASSED

N. General Business

Jay notes that France has announced that every University student can purchase meals at university for 1 Euro, with fees that are equivalent to between \$300 and \$500 AUD annually. Jay notes that in a fourth year of a progressive Labor government it is time for a far greater focus to be put upon higher education policy, where instead flawed programs like the Job Ready Graduates scheme continue to raise prices and price-out ordinary Australians. Jay commends the recent initiatives of the MSA executive to slash food prices at MSA-run venues on campus.

O. Next Meeting

The next regular MSC, 5/26 will be held on 03/06/2026 at 11:00AM in the Conference Room Floor 1, Campus Centre, Clayton.

Meeting declared closed at 12:25PM

Appendices:

1. March 2026 Financial Statement Summary
2. MSA Administration Regulations
3. Office Bearer Reports

Closed meeting 12.28