

Meeting time: Opened at 05:22 PM on 01/11/2024

Meeting location: In the Conference Room at the Campus Centre of Monash University and Zoom (Hybrid)

Meeting Minutes

A. Attendance

<u>Title</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Proxy</u>
President:	Chloe Ward	Josh Chauh
Secretary:	Zareh Kozanian	
Treasurer:	Joshua Walters	
Education (Academic Affairs):	Naomi Drego	
Education (Public Affairs):	Nafiz Ibrahim	
Activities:	Fatima Iqbal	
CLA:	Anban Raj	
Welfare:	Campbell Frost	
Indigenous:	John Sopar	
Environment & Social Justice:	Sophie Allen	
Women's:	Zoe Binns	
Queer:	Madeline Curkovic	
Disabilities & Carers:	Charlotte Sutton	
People of Colour:	Anshuman Das Tooba Javed	
Residential Community:	Aylin Vahabova	
MUISS:	Vedant Gadhavi	
MAPS:	Joshua Pelach	
Clubs & Societies:	Jay Davis	
Radio Monash:	Georgie McColm	
General Representative:	Dilhan Simsek	
General Representative:	Beck Riches	Josiah Downey
General Representative:	Stella Robinson	Paul Halliday

General Representative: Diyara Jaswar

Observers: Stuart Gibson
Felix Hughes
Thomas White
Lowan Sist
Allesandro Papaleo
Tayla Husband
Nhan Nguyen
Mandy Li

B. Acknowledgment of Traditional Owners of Land

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. Office Bearer and Divisional Reports

Office Bearer and Divisional Reports	Submission Compliance
MUISS	No Submission Received
C&S	Report Submitted on time
MAPS	No Submission Received
Radio Monash	No Submission Received
President	No Submission Received
Secretary	No Submission Received
Treasurer	No Submission Received
Activities	No Submission Received
Creative Live Arts	No Submission Received

Motion #1:

This MSC accepts the report submitted by the C&S as attached at the end of this document.

Moved: ~~Joshua Walters~~ Charlotte Sutton **Seconded:** Zareh Kozanian
In Favour: 17
Against: 0
Abstentions: 3

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The mover of the motion, Charlotte Sutton, waives her right of speaking.

The seconder of the motion, Zareh Kozanian, waives his right of speaking.

Georgie McColm expresses disappointment about not being notified that a report was required, as they enjoy writing reports. Despite this, they proceed to provide an update on RadMon's achievements for the year. They highlight that RadMon has had a successful year, achieving a record number of listeners, members, and participants in events. Although the studios have closed for the year, RadMon is still accepting a few shows, particularly returning ones. Georgie concludes by noting that RadMon has accomplished most of its goals for the year and looks forward to continuing its work in the coming year.

Jay Davis passes credit to Paul for most of the accomplishments reported, as they occurred during his term as president. Jay notes they just started today, so they cannot take credit for the achievements. Jay also mentions that a revised reporting schedule was sent out last Friday, indicating that the due dates had been extended to the 29th. However, they raise concerns about the current reporting schedule, arguing that it is not fit for purpose. They suggest that having reports due at MSCs, which can be called on short notice, is not ideal. Instead, they propose setting a fixed date each month for report submissions, which would then be tabled at the next MSC meeting. Jay recommends that this change be considered as a potential amendment to the office-bearer regulations and passes the matter on to the next year's executive to address.

E. MSA Executive Divisional Representative

Each year one of the Divisional Representatives is elected to sit on the Executive. This motion will open nominations for that position. Only Divisional Representatives may nominate or vote in this election.

Motion #2:

This MSC open nominations for the election of MSA Executive Divisional Representative for 2024, pursuant to s24.1(d) of the MSA Constitution.

Moved: Zareh Kozanian **Seconded:** Dilhan Simsek
For: 17
Against: 0
Abstentions: 1

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The mover of the motion, Charlotte Sutton, waives her right of speaking.

The seconder of the motion, Zareh Kozanian, waives his right of speaking.

The chair explained the role and that only Executive Divisional Representatives can vote or nominate for the position.

The chair called for nominations for the role of Executive Divisional Representative.

Jay Davis nominated himself. Vedant Gadhavi seconded the nomination.

F. MSA Divisional Representative Election Result

This motion confirms the election of Divisional Representative to the Executive. Only Divisional Representatives may vote for this motion.

Motion #3:

This MSC confirms the election of Jay Davis as Executive Divisional Representative

Moved: Zareh Kozanian **Seconded:** Dilhan Simsek

For: 3

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

MOTION PASSED

The mover of the motion, Charlotte Sutton, waives her right of speaking.

The seconder of the motion, Zareh Kozanian, waives his right of speaking.

G. Lot's Wife Motions

Preamble:

The contracts of Lot's Wife editors will come to an end on October 31st, 2024 – as per regulation 9.5 of the Regulations for Office-Bearers and Members of MSA Bodies. Regulation 9.5.1 allows for the contracts of editors to be extended by an absolute majority of the MSC until December 31 at a reduced pay fraction for the purposes of facilitating handover to next

year's editors. As quorum was not reached at M.S.C. 12 on October 25th, the contracts must be backdated to the 1st of November for continuity purposes.

Motion #4:

This MSC nominates Samantha Hudson, Mandy Li, and Angus Duske for an extension of their contract until December 31, 2024, to be backdated from November 1, 2024, at a reduced pay fraction of 0.2, for the purpose of assuming handover responsibilities to next year's editors.

Moved: ~~Joshua Walters~~ Charlotte Sutton **Seconded:** Zareh Kozanian

In Favour: 11

Against: 0

Abstentions: 8

MOTION FAILS

The mover of the motion, Charlotte Sutton, passes her speaking rights to Angus Duske.

Angus Duske (Observer) addresses Regulation 9.5 of the office-bearer (OB) regulations, which limits the term of Lot's Wife editors to ending on October 31st. After conducting some research, they express uncertainty about the reasoning behind this rule but speculate that it may stem from the time when the magazine's layout was done manually by a group of regular contributors, a process that no longer exists. The participant points out that Lot's Wife editors are the only office-bearers whose contracts do not extend until December 31st for handover purposes. As a result, they, along with Sam and Mandy, currently lack access to MSA facilities to conduct the necessary handover unless the proposed motion passes. The participant shares their experience of the difficulties they've faced since the last meeting was held at Quora, where they had to spend much of the week contacting Monash HR to resolve the issue.

The chair clarifies that Jay was previously a general representative but was removed from that position upon taking office as CNS president. They also mention that the MSC currently has 23 members, meaning the absolute majority required for decisions is 12.

The seconder of the motion, Zareh Kozanian, waives his right of speaking.

Jay Davis seeks clarification regarding the extension of the Lot's Wife editors' contracts until December 31st. They ask whether the two editors who will be staying on will receive new contracts starting December 1st under the office-bearer regulations, and if this would result in double pay for those editors.

The chair clarifies that the two editors staying on will receive a lower fraction of pay during the handover period, which is typical when an office-bearer is transitioning to the next one.

Angus Duske (Observer) confirms the chair's earlier statement, explaining that the standard Regulation 9.5.1 allows for a continuation of reduced pay during the handover period. However, they point out that Lot's Wife editors are the only office-bearers who do not typically receive payment through to the end of December. They also mention that there are office-bearers this year who will be moving from one position to another and will be paid double in December.

Madeline Curkovic asks whether extending contracts for Lot's Wife editors to allow for an appropriate handover period has been done in previous years. They express confusion about why the contract for the editors ends earlier than those of other office-bearers, questioning if there is a set handover period that would justify the current arrangement. The participant seeks clarification on whether this is a standard practice and, if not, who would be the appropriate person to address this issue.

The chair confirms that extending the contracts for Lot's Wife editors to allow for an appropriate handover period has been done in previous years, including last year and the year before. They express uncertainty about why the contracts are currently structured differently, describing the situation as unusual.

Madeline Curkovic raises a question about the current process of extending contracts for Lot's Wife editors each year. They express concern that if this is required every year, it may be time to consider changing the rules to avoid repeating the process annually. The participant seeks clarification on whether such a change should be considered to streamline the procedure.

Angus Duske (Observer) agrees with Madeline's observation that the current process is strange and potentially outdated, describing it as "archaic." They mention that similar issues arose last year, where the contract extension was a last-minute motion, and the current challenges are not new. After speaking with SRSU, they confirm that this has been an ongoing issue during their tenure. They also mention that Lohan has expressed similar concerns. The participant acknowledges that this issue might need to be addressed in the future but states that it is not for them to decide. They suggest that the MSC should take it up at a later date next year.

Dilhan Simsek provides clarification on the pay structure for Lot's Wife editors if their contracts are extended. They explain that extending the contract would not change the total amount of money the editors are earning; instead, it would mean their fortnightly pay is decreased due to the longer payment period. The overall fraction they are paid remains the same. However, when handled through the MSC process, the editors receive more than their usual allocation. The participant suggests that while the period is shorter in the MSC process, the editors are still paid their full fraction based on the office-bearer regulations, which results in a higher total pay during the extension. They invite others to correct the record if there is a different interpretation, as their understanding is that the editors are not paid less,

but rather their payments are divided differently across the extension period. They also mention the need for clarification from Jay.

Jay Davis seeks clarification, asking if the Lot's Wife editors are being paid the same total amount as office bearers from January to December but distributed over the shorter period from January to October. They ask the chair to confirm if this is correct, based on Dylan's earlier explanation.

Dilhan Simsek clarifies that the Lot's Wife editors are paid the full amount as specified in the office-bearer regulations. However, because the payment is distributed over a shorter period (January to October), their payments per period are higher. If the contract were extended through the regulations, their payments per period would decrease but be spread out over a longer duration. Dilhan acknowledges that if the extension is done through the MSC, the editors would receive an extra bonus, which they do not have an issue with. They seek clarification on whether this is the intended process and if there is a need to extend the payment period instead of simply increasing the payment amount.

Angus Duske (Observer) explains the process outlined in Regulation 9.5.1, which allows for the Lot's Wife editors to be paid an honorary amount for the period starting December 1st until the end of the year. They clarify that the MSA can decide, by resolution, to pay the editors at a reduced pay fraction from November 1st to December 31st for the purpose of training the next year's editors. The participant reads this regulation as effectively an extension of the contract, albeit at a reduced pay rate. They point out some confusion surrounding the documentation, with some assuming contracts run through December 31st and others assuming the cutoff is October 31st. The participant suggests that the ultimate decision rests with the chair and notes that the regulation's interpretation is somewhat ambiguous.

Dilhan Simsek clarifies that, based on their understanding, the Lot's Wife editors' contracts are valid until December 31st on some documents, but the payment period ends on October 31st. They emphasize that this does not mean the editors have not been paid the correct fraction; rather, it means that whatever payment would be made for November and December has already been distributed across the period from December to October. The participant suggests that if the current arrangement is correct, the solution should not be to extend the contract each year at a reduced fraction. Instead, they propose extending the payment period with a reduced pay rate per period, rather than making yearly extensions.

Paul Halliday (Proxy for Stella) provides clarification on Regulation 9.5 and 9.5.1, explaining that Lot's Wife editors are paid an honorarium from December 1st of the year they are elected until October 31st of the following year. However, Regulation 9.5.1 allows the MSC, by resolution, to pay the editors a reduced pay fraction from November 1st to December 31st for the purpose of training the next year's editors. The participant agrees with Dilhan's interpretation, stating that the editors are paid their original honorarium at the agreed pay fraction, but because the payment period is shorter, they receive a higher amount during that time. They clarify that this clause allows for an extension of the editors' appointment at a lower pay fraction, with the work during those two months focused on training the new editors and preparing for the following year.

Angus Duske (Observer) reviews the contract, confirming that the notification of appointment specifies the position starts on December 1st and ends on October 31st, making the current situation an extension of the contracts signed at the end of the previous year. They agree that the pay rate remains unchanged but support the idea that regulations should be modified so that the payment is spread over the full year, rather than being cut off at the end of October.

The chair emphatically confirms that Dilhan is correct, and that the payment during the handover period is extra pay on top of the editors' regular pay. They mention that they will confirm the details with MSA finance and provide an update at the next MSC meeting to ensure clarity on the matter.

Dilhan Simsek questions what Lot's Wife editors who are staying on would be handing over to themselves if they are assuming the same roles. They suggest that this question be directed to the Lot's Wife team for further clarification.

Angus Duske (Observer) explains that Samantha, in particular, will need to train the new Lot's Wife editors, such as Sophie or Mandy, in using InDesign, as she is the only one with access to the software license. Due to a reduction in licenses from three to one, only Sam has been able to use it. The participant affirms that it is appropriate for Sam to stay on at a reduced rate for the handover period. They also clarify that both Mandy and themselves still have work to complete in November, including the handover tasks and finishing off the year's responsibilities. This includes tasks like camps, administrative work, and continuing to liaise with SRSU until the end of the year. The participant further points out that other office-bearers staying on in the same position next year will also be paid for both handover duties and assuming the new role.

Campbell Frost agrees with Dilhan Simsek and his previous discussion, stating that the pay arrangements for the overlap period are fair. As the welfare office-bearer now and looking to continue in the same role next year, they will also be paid for the overlap period. They note that other office-bearers will likely be in a similar situation. The participant believes the pay fractions are correct and emphasizes that this issue should not be overly controversial. They encourage the group to move forward, suggesting that they focus on more important matters rather than debating minor details.

Jay Davis thanks everyone for clarifying the points regarding the payment arrangements. They suggest that this issue should be addressed in the office-bearer (OB) regulations, potentially alongside a reporting schedule, to provide clearer guidelines moving forward.

Dilhan Simsek expresses indifference but acknowledges Jay's point, emphasizing that the issue needs to be corrected.

Campbell Frost raises a point of order regarding the election of the divisional representative, stating that it was conducted outside of the proper procedure outlined in Section 14.1 of the Constitution. They highlight that under subparagraph 2.3.1 of the Constitution, the election must occur at a meeting of the MSC. They explain the requirements for the election,

including that it must be a secret ballot in which only eligible members may vote, and the chair should act as the returning officer. Additionally, the election must pass by an absolute majority of all eligible voting members, and these members must be given a reasonable opportunity to attend the meeting. The participant emphasizes the importance of following these procedures before the MSC executive can meet.

The chair seeks clarification, asking if the issue is with the lack of a secret ballot in the election. They inquire what action the speaker would like to take, specifically asking if they want the election to be invalidated and re-run due to the improper procedure.

Jay Davis raises the point that it is common practice to forgo a confirmatory vote when there is only one candidate, even if there is a requirement for a secret ballot. They ask if this is not the case in the current election, implying that the absence of a secret ballot may not be as problematic due to the lack of multiple candidates.

The chair expresses the opinion that the resolution must be passed even if the ballot is unopposed, referencing the requirement for a resolution in the Constitution. They clarify that the point of order is to re-run the election and are willing to do so without reopening nominations. The participant instructs that ballots be passed to the people in the room and asks those on Zoom to send their votes to Josh Chua. They confirm that the vote will be re-run for motion number 3.

The chair explains that ballots for the re-run of the election were counted outside of the room, following standing orders. The results are as follows: two votes in favor, one against, and one abstention. The motion fails to meet the absolute majority required.

Dilhan Simsek alongside two other MSC Members requests a recount of the election results.

The chair adjourned the meeting for five minutes starting 6:09 PM to 6:14 PM as Georgie wanted to leave the room for a moment.

The recount results show two votes in favor, one against, and one abstention. As a result, the motion fails, and Jay's election to the executive is not confirmed.

H. General Business

Dilhan Simsek moved the council to consider the special general urgent motion.

Procedural Motion:

That Motion 5 be considered urgent and be dealt with immediately.

Moved: Dilhan Simsek

In Favour: 10
Against: 8

MOTION CARRIED

Naomi Drego questions the rationale for re-voting on the same motion after it has already been voted on twice and after multiple recounts. They ask for clarification on the reasoning behind bringing the motion up again.

This chair calls out Regulation 20.6.4, which allows the chair to rule out any motion that has already been discussed, taking the General Business Motions out.

Procedural Motion:

That this MSC Dissents the Chair and the alternative ruling of discussing the urgent motions in general business.

Moved: Dilhan Simsek

In Favour: 10
Against: 8

MOTION CARRIED

Jay Davis refers to Regulation 20.6.4, explaining that it addresses motions similar to those already discussed or resolutions passed at previous meetings. They clarify that the word "may" in the regulation is key, meaning the chair is not required to strike the motion out. Jay Davis argues that the chair's role is to facilitate debate and that, since the MSC has resolved to consider this urgency motion, it should be accepted and not ruled out, as doing so would go against the MSC's recent indication.

Naomi Drego reiterates by raising identical points of clarification, asking why a motion that has already been elected and voted on twice is being re-done, especially after multiple recounts were called, with both recounts showing the same results. They request clarification from Dilhan, the mover of the urgency motion, on the reasoning behind redoing the vote despite no contention in the recounts.

Dilhan Simsek explains that a representative informed them they were unable to cast their vote, and their previous vote was counted while a new ballot was not issued. They highlight this issue as part of the ongoing concern about the election process by the chair.

Naomi Drego raised a point of clarification expressing confusion about why Josh's offer to allow the votes to be observed during the counting process was not taken up for both the first and second votes. They apologize but suggest moving forward with the discussion.

Paul Halliday (Chair on the procedural motion) acknowledges the point of clarification, accepting the question. They note that the question was borderline and advise that, in future, clear questions must be asked to avoid confusion. The chair also mentions that if there is no clear question, they will name the speaker.

Jay Davis explains that a scrutineer was not appointed because the ballots were submitted via Zoom, and they would have been able to see the names of the people submitting their votes. This would have created difficulties in ensuring a fair and anonymous voting process.

Joshua Walters justifies their decision to strike the motion, stating that if there was an issue with someone not receiving a ballot, it should have been raised earlier. They note that two recounts were conducted and the motions had already been decided. The chair emphasizes that they have the right to strike the motion, as indicated by Jay, and they have exercised that power although it was against what the majority of the MSC Members decided.

Motion #5:

This MSC open nominations for the election of MSA Executive Divisional Representative for 2024, pursuant to s24.1(d) of the MSA Constitution.

Moved: Dilhan Simsek **Seconded:** Jay Davis

In Favour: 11

Against: 7

Abstentions: 0

MOTION CARRIED

The mover of the motion, Dilhan Simsek, waives his right of speaking.

The seconder of the motion, Jay Davis, waives his right of speaking.

The chair called for nominations for the role of Executive Divisional Representative.

Jay Davis nominated himself. Vedant Gadhavi seconded the nomination.

Procedural Motion:

That Motion 6 be considered urgent and be dealt with immediately.

Moved: Dilhan Simsek

In Favour: 10

Against: 8

MOTION CARRIED

Motion #6:

This MSC confirms the election of Jay Davis as Executive Divisional Representative

Moved: Jay Davis **Seconded:** Vedant Gadhavi

In Favour: 3

Against: 1

Abstentions: 0

MOTION CARRIED

Procedural Motion:

That Motion 7 be considered urgent and be dealt with immediately.

Moved: Paul Halliday (Proxy)

In Favour: 16

Against: 0

MOTION CARRIED

Preamble:

This motion is drafted in light of recent changes to student rights to organize and protest on campus launched by both University administrations around Australia and the government. It is incredibly important that these fundamental rights of students and the broader community are protected.

Motion #7:

This MSC condemns attacks on the right of students to organize and peacefully protest.

This MSC commits to fighting any attempts made by Monash University to restrict students rights to peacefully organise and protest on campus.

Moved: Paul Halliday (Proxy) **Seconded:** Campbell Frost

In Favour: 16

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

MOTION CARRIED

Paul Halliday (Proxy) affirmed that it is an important motion that protects students' rights and emphasised that it is the role of the student union to safeguard these rights for students.

Campbell Frost emphasizes the importance of reaffirming the union's values, stating that the MSA stands up for workers and supports students who mobilize in a legal and peaceful way. They highlight the role of the MSA in ensuring that students know the union will back them in their efforts.

Josiah Downey explains the context behind the motion, stating that it was developed in response to attacks on staff at Monash, particularly regarding the redefinition of casual employee rules and international student caps. They stress the importance of defending students' right to organize and engage in activism on campus. The participant expresses hope that the MSA will support a campaign against these attacks on staff at Monash University.

Procedural Motion:

That Motion 8 be considered urgent and be dealt with immediately.

Moved: Paul Halldiay (Proxy)

In Favour: 14

Against: 0

MOTION CARRIED

The contracts of Lot's Wife editors will come to an end on October 31st, 2024 – as per regulation 9.5 of the Regulations for Office-Bearers and Members of MSA Bodies. Regulation 9.5.1 allows for the contracts of editors to be extended by an absolute majority of the MSC until December 31 at a reduced pay fraction for the purposes of facilitating handover to next year's editors. As quorum was not reached at M.S.C. 12 on October 25th, the contracts must be backdated to the 1st of November for continuity purposes.

Motion #8:

This MSC nominates Samantha Hudson for an extension of their contract until December 31, 2024, to be backdated from November 1, 2024, at a reduced pay fraction of 0.2, for the purpose of assuming handover responsibilities to next year's editors.

Moved: Paul Halliday(Proxy)

Seconded: Jay Davis

In Favour: 13

Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

MOTION CARRIES

Charlotte Sutton speaks and request under 30.5 to be directly quoted

“For those who weren't here last week, I put a motion up for removal, I guess I'm just saying this now so it can be ministered and recorded because there is not a lot I could do. I see whoever just left. That was to remove my co-office bearer because we were inquorate and also did not reach the number of people that are required to remove that. The motion was not able to proceed, which I think in itself is really disappointing that we as an MSC did not hold up our duties to hold people accountable but that is I think it's really disappointing that we didn't have a chance to actually vote on that motion. And I'd also like to say that I was not able to put that motion up for this MSC as I'm required for any removal motions to provide the person being removed a week's notice and as notice was only provided for the MSC in less than a week.

That notice would not have been valid. I think it's really important that we follow procedure exactly, particularly when we're dealing with something as serious as removing someone from their position. So I just like all of that to be ministered and recorded, please. I think it's really disappointing that something that should be our core duty of holding people accountable and making sure those who are doing or not doing their jobs are held accountable was not able to be voted on essentially because we did not have enough people turn up. I'm not asking anyone to have voted one way or another, but we were not able to have that vote in the first place and I think that's really disappointing. But yes, I'd also like to be recorded properly. I was not able to put that motion up for this MSC due to improper notice requirements and at the next MSC, which will be the 1st of December. I don't really see that being much of a point in going through the motion again.

I'm still deciding if I will put a motion up for that. Yep, that's all for me. Thank you.”

Jay Davis addresses the events of the previous week's meeting, explaining that they had to leave early to attend their brother's birthday dinner. They mention that there were comments made about multiple people, but they feel it's not their place to speak for others. The participant emphasizes that their reason for leaving was a personal one and clarifies that they believe it was brought up by someone during the meeting.

Charlotte Sutton raises a point of clarification inquiring why Jay didn't arrange a proxy.

Jay Davis reflects on the agenda for the meeting, noting that they expected to be done within half an hour, but the meeting clearly did not start on time. They acknowledge that they didn't consider the impact of proxy votes, noting that they should have taken that into account. Jay Davis added on by responding to accusations made during the MSC that they intentionally pulled quorum in the past to avoid voting on a motion. They clarify that they

had voted to consider the motion urgently at the previous MSC and believe the accusation is unfair. The participant encourages the person who made the accusation to apply critical thinking and question why they would show up to an MSC just to pull quorum.

Thomas White clarifies that they were critical of a former member of the MSC's actions and that their comment about Jay leaving the room was merely to note that there could be an explanation for why this occurred. They state that they did not accuse Jay of intentionally pulling quorum in this instance and affirm that if such an accusation had been made, it would have been documented in the minutes. The participant acknowledges that they found Jay's previous explanation unconvincing but is open to having the notes from previous meetings reviewed to clarify any misunderstandings.

The meeting has lost quorum

Jay Davis mentions that section 30.5 does not provide a positive right to be directly quoted. They clarify that, similar to the secretary's role, individuals cannot be directly quoted unless they explicitly request it.

Meeting Closed at 06:57 PM

I. Appendices

***Key Activities**

Outline key activities completed thus far since last report

1. C&S Awards Night

In August C&S held our annual C&S Awards night in collaboration with Team Monash. The event was a success with over 300 club officer bearers from over 50 different clubs in attendance alongside C&S Executive, C&S Staff, the MSA Executive and the MSA Executive Officer. Prof. David Copolov, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Major Campuses and Student Engagement) was also in attendance at the event and gave a speech.

Thirty-one awards were handed out to various clubs & club office bearers, including the inaugural Most Outstanding Accessibility and Inclusion Program award in collaboration with MSA Disabilities and Carers. A list of awards and their recipients can be found at <https://www.monashclubs.org/About/Awards-Program>.

2. C&S AGM

The 2024 C&S Council Annual General Meeting was held on 4 September. The outgoing 2024 C&S Executive delivered their reports and elections were held for the 2025 C&S Executive. The 2025 Executive consists of 3 re-elected and 6 newly elected members.

3. Affiliation of New Clubs

After earlier in the year resolving to not to accept the affiliation of any new clubs in Semester 1 it was decided by the C&S Executive to affiliate 4 new clubs during Semester 2.

After careful consideration, applications for the following clubs were accepted: Monash Energy Club, Monash Biomedical Engineering Students' Society (MBESS), Monash University Crochet and Knitting Society (MUCKS) & Nursing Students Society, Monash Clayton (NSS).

Each new club has successfully held their Inaugural General Meeting and completed their Affiliation. New clubs will be assisted in opening their bank accounts, applying for ABNs and registering with the ACNC prior to the end of the year. Some new clubs have already begun running events.

4. Handover to 2025 C&S Executive

Following the AGM, a one month handover period took place during October, with members of the executive-elect attending executive meetings during this time. A handover day was held on 24 October to give the executive-elect an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of their roles before they took office on 1 November. Role specific handovers also took place.

Can outline work being done for upcoming events/projects

1. Grants Program

So far this year C&S has distributed over \$120,000 in grants to clubs. At the end of September C&S' non-salary expenditure was over \$35,000 higher than in 2023 demonstrating improvements made in the grants process this year.

Work is continuing to be undertaken to streamline and speed up this process to ensure clubs receive grant money as soon as possible.

Over the summer break the C&S Executive will develop and approve a Grants Manual for 2025.

2. C&S Standing Orders

C&S is currently drafting standing orders for the conduct of C&S Executive Meetings. Following this C&S will develop Standing Orders for the conduct of C&S General Meetings. It is envisaged that these will eventually serve as the basis for standard Standing Orders for use by clubs.

3. Club ACNC Registrations & Incorporation

C&S is continuing to support clubs to register with the ACNC to ensure they are not liable to pay income tax. C&S has also begun this year to support clubs in the move to becoming Incorporated Associations.

4. C&S Support Network

Started earlier this year, the C&S Support Network involves each club being assigned a 'Buddy' from the C&S Executive who the club can approach with questions about other C&S programs or issues they may be facing.

5. 2025 Planning

Planning for 2025 has also begun with dates for events being pencilled into the C&S Calendar. Further organization & planning for next year will take place over the Summer Break.

Registrations have been opened for club participation in O-Week next year.

Department Goals

Goal	Progress (complete/ongoing/incomplete)	Comments
------	---	----------

<p>Update C&S Regulations to be clearer, fit for purpose & align with current standards.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>New Finance Regulations introduced in Semester 1</p> <p>New Affiliation Regulations introduced in Semester 2</p> <p>New Grant Regulations in process</p> <p>Finance Regulations in process of moving to clearer formatting</p>
<p>Social & Non-social events for Office Bearers throughout the year</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Held various events for club OBs throughout the year including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Day • 2 OB Appreciation Days • C&S Awards Night • Trivia Night • IWD Event • WIPD Event <p>The final event for the year will be the Student Leader Conference in collaboration with the wider MSA.</p> <p>Planning has begun for events next year.</p>
<p>Streamlining and promoting use of C&S Grants Program</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>New grant forms for Social Functions & Orientation grants launched this year.</p> <p>More than 250 grants approved so far this year, up from a total of 248 across the entirety of 2023.</p> <p>Median Social Function grant processing time reduced to under a week (down from almost 2 months).</p>

		Median grant processing time for other grants reduced to approximately one month (down from over 2.5 months).
Club Incorporation & ACNC applications	Ongoing	<p>C&S has been continuing to support clubs to register with the ACNC before the deadline.</p> <p>Clubs becoming Incorporated Associations is an ongoing project that will continue over the next few years.</p>
C&S Standing Orders	Incomplete	Standing Order for C&S Executive meetings to be prioritised and completed by January.