

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL



Thursday 24th March, 6:30pm

University of Adelaide North Terrace Campus, Hughes 323

<https://adelaide.zoom.us/j/89097626674?pwd=MHg0dG0ybEtrNWlZY1daSnkybjlDUT09>

Passcode: 798894

AGENDA AND MEETING PAPERS

AGENDA

1. Procedural Matters

1.1. Acknowledgement of Indigenous Owners

The SRC acknowledges that we meet on the traditional country of the Kurna people. We acknowledge that the land upon which Australia has been built was and always will be an integral part of the spiritual and cultural history of Indigenous people and that this land was never ceded.

1.2. Attendance

1.3. Apologies

1.4. Adoption of Agenda

Motion: that the agenda as circulated be adopted.

1.5. Welcome

2. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Recommendation: That the SRC accept the minutes of the meeting of 10 March 2022 as a true and accurate record (Appendix 1).

Moved:

Seconded:

3. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

ACTION	PERSON	STATUS
Bank handover	Billy & Ana	Ongoing
Posting the text of the Ukraine Motion	Facebook Admins	COMPLETE
The SRC Social Justice Officer will publish a post on SRC social media that summarises Amnesty International's recent report and condemns Israel's oppression of Palestinians.	Tom Wood & FB Admin	Ongoing

4. Correspondence

5. New Members

6. Motions on Notice

7. Office Bearer Reports

7.1. President

7.2. Welfare Officer

7.3. Women's Officer

Recommendation: A response to this report is published on the SRC Facebook page after it is released that provides a summary of key issues and information.

Recommendation: The SRC hosts an event or dedicated space where students can directly contribute and provide feedback on how we can take action to improve campus safety in the wake of the NSSS report release.

7.4. Environment Officer

That the SRC:

1. Endorses and encourages students and staff attend the Adelaide Global Day of Climate Action on 25 March
2. Supports the central demand of Fridays for Future to prioritise #PeopleNotProfit.

7.5. Ethno-Cultural Officer

7.6. Rural Officer

7.7. Mature Age Officer

8. General Business

8.1. Oppose Labor's Uni Merger Plan

The SRC:

1. Calls for Labor to drop its planned establishment of a University Merger Commission.
2. Calls for Labor to commit to a tuition free and fully publicly funded university model.
3. Opposes university mergers in principle, acknowledging that they are measures intended to entrench the corporatisation of universities by giving management more scope to implement cuts and generate bigger profits through obtaining research funding.

Action points:

1. The SRC will release a statement on the SRC Facebook page opposing opposition Labor's university merger plan.
2. The SRC will write to the Premier-elect Peter Malinauskas and Labor's education spokesperson Susan Close expressing the SRC's opposition to their proposed university merger.
3. The SRC commits to supporting potential campaigns and actions to oppose the merger.

Moved: James Wood

8.2. The new state Labor government must reverse job losses at UoA in defence of our right to quality education

Motion:

- The SRC demands that the new state Labor government commit to reversing job losses at Adelaide University to prevent deterioration of our education quality
- The SRC demands the new state Labor government cap the VC's salary to the average university worker's salary.

Moved: Ana Obradovic

9. Emergent Business

Item 7.1: President's Report – Ana Obradovic

SRC President's report, meeting 24th March 2022

1. Student General Meeting, 24th March

The SGM is this week, Thursday, 12pm, on the Barr Smith Lawns. As a major initiative of the SRC, all council members should attend and bring students and clubs.

We'll need a quorum of 150 students to officially:

- 1) Express opposition to university management's proposed faculty mergers, staff sackings, and course cuts.
- 2) Pass a motion of no confidence in Vice-Chancellor Peter Høj and the University Council
- 3) Defend student democracy: demand direct funding for the democratically-elected Student Representative Council

Peter Høj and Oscar Ong have been invited to defend themselves and respond to student concerns. Thanks to the Young Greens and NOLS for volunteering to speak/introduce motions. Please let me know if you'd like to be added to the formal speaking list.

2. No Adelaide Uni Cuts organising meeting, 14th March

The organising meeting last week put the final touches on jobs to be done before the SGM. Thanks to those who attended. We have a public meeting, infographics and article in On Dit to spread the word, as well as leaflets for announcements in classes and lectures:

Public meeting: <https://fb.me/e/2x63MUZB4>

Infographic to share: <https://www.facebook.com/adelaidesrc/posts/272996528339257>

On Dit article: <https://onditmagazine.medium.com/the-src-have-called-a-student-general-meeting-to-stop-faculty-mergers-what-does-this-mean-543c79f17441>

We also need volunteers to check student IDs for the SGM, as well as man a BBQ for the SGM.

3. No Adelaide Uni Cuts hub stall, 15th March

In collaboration with the NOAC campaign, I hosted a stall in the Hub to promote the SGM. It was lively, and especially helpful to hear from students about their main concerns re: mergers and cuts. International students in particular were angry by the double insult of moving overseas to pay three times domestic fees for a lower quality of education.

We gave out the SRC's free No Cuts badges for students to wear in their classes. I encourage council members to wear them on campus too.

4. No Adelaide Uni Cuts public meeting, 22nd March

Alongside the NOAC campaign group, I organised a public meeting on the history and achievements of past SGMs. Nix Herriot and James Wood will be speaking. Please invite interested students.

Public meeting: <https://fb.me/e/2x63MUZB4>

5. No Adelaide Uni Cuts activity day, 21st March

More info can be found here: <https://fb.me/e/316iJuuVH>

Alongside the NOAC campaign group, I organised an activity day to promote the SGM. I encourage all members to be part of talking with students and building this important part of our anti-cuts fightback.

6. Student Engagement Committee meeting, 8th March

I attended the SEC meeting with other members of the council on the 8th of March. Management again confirmed plans to investigate school mergers. The DVCA discussed funding some SRC activity directly and requested the AUU change their meeting time to discuss SRC funding to a day other than the SGM (which has not happened). We requested information about air circulation audits in the university given the rising COVID case numbers on campus

7. Correspondence on Ed NDA with NUS Ed officer, April 13th

The NUS Education Officer is in correspondence with James and I about collaborating on a Free Education NDA for April 14th. We will update in the next meeting with more information about what this will look like in Adelaide.

Yours sincerely,

Ana Obradovic

Item 7.2: Welfare Officer's Report – Ulian Cox

Discussions with Welfare OB Counterparts.

Over the past several weeks, I have continued my pursuit in having discussions with my fellow Welfare Officer counterparts at both neighbouring and interstate universities. These discussions had a large focus on discovering differing approaches and skills that they have that have been implemented within their respected universities and how they improve the overall student wellbeing and welfare. Furthermore, these discussions progressed in finding ways to collaborate in improving student wellbeing. The focus on partnering with neighbouring universities can provide a tremendous benefit in achieving our collected vision of improving student wellbeing and welfare on campus.

Student Care.

During this period, I have contacted the Education and Welfare Officers at Student Care here at the university and began introducing the wide range of goals and initiatives that the SRC, and myself as Welfare Officer is seeking to implement this year. They presented their plans on how to support and navigate students, particularly with the arrival of international students this year. These discussions were cordial and productive, addressing the concerns faced by students, particularly the need improve to the wellbeing and support team at our regional University campuses. They were receptive and acknowledged that they are actively seeking to address and improve upon. I have confidence in working with Student Care to find areas of collaboration between the SRC and the University.

National Union of Students - Welfare Officer.

I have had several discussions with the National Union of Students (NUS) Welfare Officer, our very own – Billy Zimmermann, and the initiatives that he is willing to pursue for the upcoming year. A number of these initiatives is to address the crisis of student poverty that has been affecting the most vulnerable Australians in our society, and the advocating for student rights and welfare across the nation. Another initiative, formally introduced by Mr Zimmermann's predecessor is the 'Change the Age' Campaign that seeks to advocate the changing of age independence from 21 to 18. I have full confidence that many members of this Council will rightly support and commend his current and future efforts.

Amongst these discussions, I along with Mr Zimmermann discussed the importance of student welfare and the issues faced by students on campus. We shall find approaches for collaboration that can be fostered between our Council and with this national organisation in improving student wellbeing on campus.

Talk Out Loud – Mental Health Support Group.

Finally, I have more recently begun discussions with several NGOs both within and without South Australia that have a particular focus on addressing mental health at a younger level. In addition to the mental health crisis that has been sweeping across the youth of Australia, particularly, at our most vulnerable. A particular NGO, that I wish to present to you, is an organisation that has become a beacon of pushing such causes to the forefront of our mainstream discussion, Talk Out Loud Australia.

Talk Out Loud is a South Australian organisation that is a not-for-profit service, offering innovative mental wellbeing programs that seek to develop resilience and positive life choices for youth and young adults. This organisation has reached out to 300 young members since 2016 and has offered its services to over 4,000 school students. This local group is standing above giants and should be commended on the work they have achieved.

I enquired ways on how they addressed mental health issues, that are particularly affecting young adults both within and heading into university. Such positive reception led to offering ways of collaboration between that of the SRC and Talk Out Loud, to provide events and talks to address student wellbeing both within and outside the campus.

Item 7.3: Women's Officer's Report – Georgia Thomas

NSSS Report Release and NUS Women's Network Campaign

The report from the National Student Safety Survey will be released this week (prior to our meeting, but after the writing of this report). As part of the NUS's Women's Network we have met about the release of this report and how we can place pressure of universities given the findings. I'm sure there will be more to discuss in meeting following the full release but at the moment I'll discuss some key issues that have been identified ahead of this.

Some of the previews we've received of the report show that there remains a lack of knowledge of student support services and processes. This is something I will be discussing with our student support and we will examine how we can simplify SASH processes and create more visibility around the steps that are taken for SASH reporting. We also continue to see that residential colleges remain a space particularly vulnerable to SASH and do not have proper responses in place. We clearly see a disconnect between SASH in colleges and on campus - universities continue to distance themselves from colleges and fail to acknowledge that these residences have a deep connection to campus culture and student safety. This is another key point I am looking to discuss with UofA's student support and counselling.

One of the most disappointing previews of the report that we've seen is that, unlike the 2017 report, there are NO recommendations for universities. Universities Australia has said this is because they are shifting the focus onto the behaviour of perpetrators and stopping SASH from occurring in the first place. This is extremely disappointing. It's well known that most universities, including UofA, do not have appropriate, sensitive or timely responses to SASH reports and do not have adequate support systems for victim-survivors on campus. Creating a safe campus IS a responsibility of the university and I am hoping that in collaboration with students and the Women's Collective we can provide our own set of recommendations to the University of Adelaide.

I will be reaching out to the university for a copy of our specific university report so we can respond appropriately to the issues raised and hold administration accountable in creating a safe campus.

Leading on from the release of this report is the national campaign for SASH reform from the NUS. The campaign is centred around 10 priorities that promote transparency, inclusion and support from universities in their SASH responses.

Vision

Develop a university-wide action plan that is victim centred and trauma informed. This must include improved policies, processes, and practices for reporting (including anonymous reporting), investigation and adjudication, therapeutic services, alternative justice and resolution pathways, and prevention.

Priorities

1. Create a stand-alone sexual assault and harassment policy (including stalking and relationship violence), that is mandated across the university's department and affiliates, including residential colleges. This policy should be developed in conjunction with those with lived experience and subject matter experts. It should focus on reporting as a process, rather than a singular decision.
2. Move all reporting and therapeutic services, including anonymous reporting, away from university administrative premises into a stand-alone 'Health and Wellbeing Centre'. All reporting and therapeutic services should reflect the diversity of the university community.
3. Publish clear guidelines, in multiple languages, about reporting, complaint, investigation, and adjudication processes.
4. Publish clear information about the breadth and diversity of sexual and relationship harms, including LGBTQIA+ relationships, in order to promote reporting from as many groups and communities within the university as possible.
5. Publish annual figures (appropriately anonymised) for reporting, complaint and adjudication, to promote transparency in decision-making and development of a genuine 'zero tolerance' approach.
6. Develop an independent investigative process, including appropriately trained staff, available to all departments and affiliates of the university and affiliates.
7. Maintain one investigative process for all complaints, whether student or staff. This should include all graduate students and those on placement with external agencies.
8. Develop alternative justice and resolution processes, with appropriately trained and supported staff, made available across the university and affiliates.
9. Develop appropriate educational resources, with consultation from students and student representatives, to define the university's culture and expectations, and assist students in developing positive relationships.
10. Develop a liaison committee, including representatives from key community agencies and services.

We're currently seeking feedback from university collectives about the above priorities to ensure they are as inclusive and intersectional as possible - if you have any feedback please do not hesitate to send me a message or email and I will pass this on.

Part of the campaign will include myself giving the University of Adelaide a grade against a scorecard created by the NUS Women's Officer so we can see how our policies stack up against other universities across Australia and identify areas we absolutely must improve in. I've attached this scorecard as an appendix to the meeting papers for you to review. Similarly to above, if you have any feedback to provide please get in touch and I'd love to have a conversation.

The combination of the NSSS report and the national campaign give a strong foundation for real change in the University of Adelaide's SASH response. I'm hopeful that this year will see great pressure being placed on the administration to take real accountability and true action to improve campus safety.

Recommendation: A response to this report is published on the SRC Facebook page after it is released that provides a summary of key issues and information.

Recommendation: The SRC hosts an event or dedicated space where students can directly contribute and provide feedback on how we can take action to improve campus safety in the wake of the NSSS report release.

Item 7.4: Environment Officer's Report – Nix Herriot

Building the Student General Meeting (SGM) and the No Adelaide University Cuts campaign

As the most important event in the anti-cuts campaign to date, promoting the SGM has been my current priority. It was great to distribute badges and leaflets to sympathetic staff and students at an SRC stall in the Hub on 15 March. I attended an organising meeting for the campaign and volunteered to contact clubs and encourage them to endorse, promote and attend the SGM. I co-authored an article about the SGM and the situation at Adelaide Uni for On Dit. The intention of this article was to offer an accessible and informative explanation of how SGMs work, why we have called one and encourage students to get involved. Please read and share! James and I will be presenting some archival research and recent history of SGMs at a public meeting for the No Adelaide Uni Cuts campaign on Tuesday 22 March.

Defeating the faculty mergers and their worst effects is a collective responsibility and I encourage everyone to continue to share and promote the SGM. Let's cover campus in chalk, posters and leaflets.

Save our Outback

As intended in my last supplementary report, I have promoted the Save Our Outback campaign on SRC social media, distributed leaflets and will maintain communication with this important campaign. Please take extra leaflets from the SRC Office. The defeat of the Liberals at the polls last week is welcome, but environmental campaigners shouldn't rest on the assumption that Labor will consistently prioritise conservation above the interests of the pastoral industry. Let's keep up the fight to ensure that any changes to pastoral laws do not give greater power to graziers at the expense of the environment.

Our Archival collection of *On Dit*

In our previous meeting I raised my concern that SRC copies of On Dit and other student union publications are being stored in inadequate conditions. I have cross-checked our collection with issues missing from the Barr Smith Library collection and located an issue from 1985 which I will donate via Marie Larsen. There are still 12 archive boxes of issues, some of which are broken and need replacing. Ideally, paper should be kept away from natural light and water and heat sources, with larger issues stored flat. I'm happy to investigate options for acquiring some new archival boxes for the SRC Office.

Postgraduate student forum

I attended the forum hosted by our two postgraduate representatives, Jack and Eddie, on 17 March. It was interesting to discuss many of the issues facing postgrad students and particularly the results of Eddie and Jack's survey. Responses overwhelmingly rejected the staff cuts. As a postgrad student, I'm familiar with many of the student concerns regarding welfare, quality of education and specific issues such as the exploitation of casual labour and extensive cuts to University Library services. I

suggested that the SRC publish the results of this survey and continue to advocate for postgrads as the faculty merger process unfolds.

Campaigning for divestment

I'm keen to make fossil fuel and weapons divestment a key focus of my activity as Environment Officer after the Student General Meeting. I intend to discuss this issue with activists from interstate universities such as Curtin and Monash, gather signatures for this petition recently put together by Fossil Free Adelaide University and discuss how we can develop an activist strategy towards divestment on campus

Global Climate Strike

As part of the upcoming global climate strike, School Strike for Climate has called an action starting at 5pm at Victoria Square on Friday 25 March. I've been in touch with the organisers of this event who expressed their desire for future collaboration with the SRC in environmental activism. I indicated my willingness to speak at this event. I will be attending and encouraging all councillors to do so. It is worth also noting the left-wing demands of Fridays for Future, including calls for climate reparations, recognising that climate struggle is class struggle and acknowledging that the ruling class is responsible for the destruction of the planet.

Motion: The SRC Supports the 25 March Global Climate Strike

Preamble

In its major new report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued its "bleakest warning yet" on the impacts of the climate emergency. In some areas, extinction rates are set to increase tenfold if warming reaches three degrees. Almost half of the global population live in areas vulnerable to climate change, with the poorest areas of the world the most impacted.

The IPCC highlights the threat posed for Australia's environments, including irreversible coral reef loss, a loss of alpine species, the collapse of forests, rising sea levels, a drastic increase in fatal heatwaves, floods and storms, and bushfires that will be "too big, too hot, and too fierce for firefighters" to contain. Just in the last few weeks we have seen devastating floods across Queensland and New South Wales caused by the climate crisis. And to make matters worse, fossil capital is profiting handsomely from the lockout of Russian gas and oil.

The longer the delay to bringing about fundamental solutions to climate change, such as shutting down the fossil fuel industry, the worse the crisis will become. As the IPCC says, there is still a window of opportunity to act, but it is "brief and rapidly closing". This underscores the necessity of climate activism and mobilisation after the failure of the COP26 talks.

The upcoming global climate strike carries an important anti-capitalist message and is based around the slogan #PeopleNotProfit. As Fridays for Future writes, "The catastrophic climate scenario that we are living in is the result of centuries of exploitation and oppression through colonialism, extractivism and capitalism, an essentially flawed socio-economic model which urgently needs to be replaced."

As part of the Global Day of Climate Action, School Strike for Climate has called an action starting at 5pm at Victoria Square on Friday 25 March. The SRC should endorse this action and encourage students and staff to attend. We need everyone in the fight for action. It has never been more important to demand climate justice now

Motion

That the SRC:

1. Endorses and encourages students and staff attend the Adelaide Global Day of Climate Action on 25 March
2. Supports the central demand of Fridays for Future to prioritise #PeopleNotProfit.

Item 7.5: Ethno-Cultural Officer's Report – Marilee Hou

I have continued to speak with different students regarding some of the issues I outlined in my last report. I am also pleased to report that I have begun the process of speaking with the Presidents of cultural clubs and hopefully maintaining an active relationship with many clubs throughout my term.

Two issues have since emerged that I would like to look into:

A student has asked whether we have a 'lounge' for ethnocultural students, like there is a women's lounge. The University currently does not have a dedicated space on campus for ethnocultural students. I believe that a safe space will be beneficial for ethnocultural students to share their experiences with each other on campus. I am aware that in different universities across Australia, students are campaigning for a dedicated safe space. I am speaking with Akshay Jose, the NUS Ethnocultural officer, on implementing a similar campaign here at the University of Adelaide – something which I hope the SRC will get behind.

Another issue that has been raised is lecture recordings cutting off at the scheduled finish time, but the lecturer will continue lecturing, meaning that the end of lectures are not captured by the recording. This is an issue which relates to student learning more generally and will affect all students who do not attend in-person lectures (which seems to be a majority at the moment). My understanding is the recording is automatically set-up by the University and that individual lecturers do not control when the recording cuts off, and that this may be an issue across all courses. I will investigate but please let me know if you know more about this issue and/or how we can get it looked into and fixed.

Kind regards

Marilee Hou

Item 7.6: Rural Officer's Report – Liam Johns

Roseworthy Mental Health Campaign

Since my last report, Claire and I have continued our hard work on the Roseworthy Mental Health Campaign. Most importantly, we have confirmed a date and time for our BBQ Fundraiser: Tuesday 29th of March at 1pm. At this BBQ, we will be providing cheap soft drinks and alcohol (supplied by some of the clubs at Roseworthy) and snags. We have also made a petition which will be promoted at the event, with it including such demands as hiring a full-time GP and psychologist on campus, as well as making changes to the VIS form such that veterinary students are not dissuaded from seeking assistance. I would be immensely grateful if some SRC reps would volunteer to help at the fundraiser.

Motion: that the SRC makes a post on its Facebook page linking the petition and outlining its importance.

Roseworthy Orientation Night

The Roseworthy orientation night was largely a success. I had many good conversations with students regarding our mental health campaign and how little the university seems to care about the mental health crisis in the veterinary industry. Through such conversations, I managed to get about 12 petition signatures within an hour.

I also made connections with many prominent students at Roseworthy, such as former SRC Rural Officer Tobias Threadgold, many of whom offered their support for our campaign. A concern raised by these students was splitting Rural Officer into three positions: Rural Officer (focusing on students who are studying or have recently relocated from the regions), Roseworthy Officer, and Waite Officer. I will continue discussions with students on this suggestion and, in the future, seek to change the constitution to include these positions.

Item 7.7: Mature Age Officer's Report – AJ Francotirador

AJ will provide a verbal report at the meeting.

Item 8.1 – Oppose Labor’s Uni Merger Plan

Preamble:

In October 2020, the now Premier-elect and Labor leader Peter Malinauskas committed to establishing a University Merger Commission headed by the Vice Chancellors to consider a merger of Adelaide, UniSA and Flinders. Malinauskas wants to pursue this in his first term in office. Labor’s glossy brochure which makes the case for the mergers promises to create a ‘world top 100 university’ that is more attractive to private investors for research and is more competitive with the bigger eastern state universities.

It should alarm us all that Malinauskas and Labor here are on pretty much the same as the uni bosses who have been coming after our education for years now. The VCs here in SA have countenanced mergers for years now because it suits their own interests which are diametrically opposed to those of students. We have already seen how management at UofA have taken advantage of a fabricated COVID crisis to push through disastrous faculty mergers that saved money by sacking at least 96 staff. On a much bigger scale, though, squeezing together entire universities would give management a licence to go on a slashing spree to make savings everywhere possible. Management will scan the balance sheets, looking everywhere for ‘duplication’ of courses, services and staff to be slashed to pump out a bit more profit.

Any merger brokered by Labor will be a deal between the VCs deciding what best suits their common money-making interests. The former Labor Senator Chris Schacht is quite honest about the motivations behind the merger proposal. Schacht himself advocated for the Hawke Government’s neoliberal reforms that kicked off the transformation of our universities into corporate institutions. He quite frankly admits that mergers would lead to staff sackings, stating that “some of the duplication of administration (will be eliminated) and some (job losses) will be in faculties”.

Labor’s paper mentions the University of Manchester merger in 2004 as an apparent exemplar of successful mergers. Closer analysis shows a much grimmer picture. Even if the uni bosses might have a bonanza with more research dollars and institutional clout, students and staff were thrown under the staff. The mergers though plunged management into massive debt, the costs of which were paid for by sacking 400 staff. Across the globe, there are countless examples of botched mergers creating riches for those in charge but misery for staff conditions and education quality.

Labor completely accepts the cut-throat for-profit university model reliant upon private investment, the hyper-exploitation of international students as cash cows and the casualisation of an ever-shrinking workforce. It is appalling that Labor's flagship 'solution' to the dire state of higher education lays the foundations for even more corporatisation. As the progressive commentator John Menadue reminds us, it was the Labor Premier Jay Weatherill who kicked off discussions about merging SA's three universities. The Weatherill Government also introduced measures that entrenched the corporate uni model such as reducing elected student and staff representation on governing bodies and by extending partnerships with fossil fuels and weapons companies.

If Labor was serious about standing up for higher education, then they would commit to a free and fully funded university system and make universities more democratically accountable.

The SRC:

4. Calls for Labor to drop its planned establishment of a University Merger Commission.
5. Calls for Labor to commit to a tuition free and fully publicly funded university model.
6. Opposes university mergers in principle, acknowledging that they are measures intended to entrench the corporatisation of universities by giving management more scope to implement cuts and generate bigger profits through obtaining research funding.

Action points:

4. The SRC will release a statement on the SRC Facebook page opposing opposition Labor's university merger plan.
5. The SRC will write to the Premier-elect Peter Malinauskas and Labor's education spokesperson Susan Close expressing the SRC's opposition to their proposed university merger.
6. The SRC commits to supporting potential campaigns and actions to oppose the merger.

Moved: James Wood

Item 8.2 – The new state Labor government must reverse job losses at UoA in defence of our right to quality education – Ana Obradovic

The new state Labor government must reverse job losses at UoA in defence of our right to quality education

At least 264 people have lost their jobs over the pandemic at UoA. Given the high rates of casualisation at universities, and the dodgy FTE way that workers are accounted for, we can assume the true number of job losses to be far higher.

The SA Labor Party's policy on higher education includes the following as its third platform:

“The SA university sector needs to be stable and productive. Securing jobs and career pathways for academics, researchers and administrative staff will strengthen the university sector here.”

Given the crisis of profit-driven attacks in the higher education sector, it is incumbent on the new state Labor government to defend our quality of education and therefore the staff that make our university run.

Further, any cost-saving cuts should begin at the top. A recent report in the Campus Morning Mail revealed that the fastest growing costs in universities are senior executive salaries. At UoA, Peter Høj receives a salary of \$900k. The new state government should stand with students against this unreasonable financial gap between ordinary workers and senior management

Motion:

- The SRC demands that the new state Labor government commit to reversing job losses at Adelaide University to prevent deterioration of our education quality
- The SRC demands the new state Labor government cap the VC's salary to the average university worker's salary.

Appendix 1: Minutes of the Previous Meeting (10 March 2022)

Meeting in Hughes 323 Thursday 10th March 2022

1. Procedural Matters

Ana Obradovic opened the meeting at 6:33

1.1. Acknowledgement of Indigenous Owners

Ana acknowledged the owners of the land we were on as that of the Kaurna people.

1.2. Attendance

Ana Obradovic, Billy Zimmermann, James Wood, Ulian Cox, Georgia Thomas, Mat Monti, Nix Herriot, Jack Crawford, Eddie Satchell, Marilee Hou, Ramon O’Donnell, Chanel Trezise, Francesco Ciampa, Steph Madigan, Alicia Turner, Henry Southcott, James Dimas, AJ Francotirador, Wendy Yu (Joined 6:45)

1.3. Apologies

Dhuruva Padmanabhan, Tom Wood, Liam Johns

1.4. Absences

AJ Francotirador

1.5. Adoption of Agenda

Procedural Motion: That the agenda be adopted as circulated

Moved: Billy Zimmermann **Seconded:** Mat Monti **Motion carried**

2. Confirmation of Previous Minutes

Recommendation: That the SRC accept the minutes of the meeting of 10 February 2022 as a true and accurate record (Appendix 1).

Moved: Billy Zimmermann **Seconded:** Franceso Ciampa **Motion carried**

3. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

ACTION	PERSON	STATUS
Bank handover	Billy & Ana	Ongoing
The SRC Environment Officer will publish a post on SRC social media describing Adelaide University’s dirty financial investments and promoting divestment from fossil fuels.	Nix Herriot & FB Admin	COMPLETE
The SRC Social Justice Officer will publish a post on SRC social media that summarises Amnesty International’s recent report and condemns Israel’s oppression of Palestinians.	Tom Wood & FB Admin	Ongoing

The SRC will release a statement on the SRC Facebook page in complete opposition to the Religious Freedom bill.	James Wood & FB Admin	COMPLETE
---	-----------------------	-----------------

4. Correspondence

4.1. Letter from ‘Save our Outback’ Campaign – Discussed later during the Environment Officer’s Item

5. New Members

5.1. Falie Klieve

6. Motions on Notice

7. Office Bearer Reports

7.1. President

Ana handed over chair to Billy Zimmermann at 6:37

Oscar Ong tried to join the meeting, as Chair Billy Zimmermann informed Oscar that as he had not requested or received permission from the SRC President, in accordance with Section 8.g.i of the Constitution he could not be in the meeting.

8.g.i: Members may attend meetings via video link and vote via distance only when previously approved by the SRC President.

Procedural Motion proposed by Eddie Satchell:

Motion: To have as a requirement for this SRC Meeting, to attend and vote online, members must have their cameras switched on.

Moved: Eddie Satchell **Seconded:** Georgia Thomas **Procedural Motion Carried**

Bloted motions from President’s Report

Motion: The SRC council reaffirms its rejection of the funding agreement and condemns it as an attack on student rights that, amongst other things, bureaucratically undermines anti-education cuts and antifascist activism.

Motion: The SRC approve a third official order of business for the SGM condemning the AUU’s power and funding agreement as illegitimate attempts to stifle student ability to fight education cuts. It should call on university management to directly give SSAF money to the SRC in the name of preserving student democratic will on campus.

Moved: Ana Obradovic **Seconded:** Nix Herriot **Motion Carried**

Billy handed over chair to Ana Obradovic at 6:50

7.2. General Secretary

Recommendation: That William Zimmermann (SRC General Secretary) be duly authorised as a signatory to the SRC bank account and remove Patrick Stewart (former General Secretary). [Account Name: Student Representative Council (Adelaide), Inc. Account Number: 188 648 140]

Recommendation: That Ana Obradovic (SRC President) be duly authorised as a signatory to the SRC bank account and remove Ali Amin (former President). [Account Name: Student Representative Council (Adelaide), Inc. Account Number: 188 648 140]

Moved: Billy Zimmermann

Seconded: Mat Monti

Motion Carried

7.3. Education Officer

James gave his report noting particularly prep work for the SGM including the drafting of the policy which will govern the meeting. There was some discussion that under the proposed wording the President could appoint someone not on the SRC as chair of the meeting. James said that this was not the purpose of the wording and agreed to make the relevant section clearer.

Motion: The SRC adopts the proposed Policy concerning the conduct of a Student General Meeting.

Moved: James Wood

Seconded: Alicia Turner

Motion Carried

7.4. Queer Officer

Mat delivered their report mainly focusing on their motion regarding pronouns in the Uni system.

Motion:

That the SRC endorse a petition by the Queer Officer demanding the University of Adelaide:

- a) begin the process of collecting student's pronouns and listing those on class roles.
- b) fix their broken name system to ensure students are not deadnamed.
- c) commit to creating gender neutral bathrooms in every new building and begin the process of creating gender neutral bathrooms in all existing buildings.
- d) commit to a review of all course content across the university to ensure there is no queerphobic content being taught at the University

There was a lot of comment around the mandatory nature of this if it were to be introduced. Concerns were raised by Henry, Georgia and others around the concern that students may be outed in class or may not want to participate for other reasons.

There was also concern about the review process of courses and who would be conducting that hypothetically. Mat amended the motion to

Amendment:

Change point d to remove ‘commit to a review of all course content across the university’ and replace with ‘Have a student led review headed by queer students to’

Proposed by mover so no vote required.

Amendment proposed by Francesco Ciampa:

Change point d so it reads ‘commit to a review of all course content across the university to ensure that topics that have LGBTQ+ related components are taught respectfully, despite individual views regarding the subject.

Moved: Francesco Ciampa **Seconded:** Henry Southcott **Amendment failed**

Motion moved in amended form:

That the SRC endorse a petition by the Queer Officer demanding the University of Adelaide:

- a) begin the process of collecting student’s pronouns and listing those on class roles.
- b) fix their broken name system to ensure students are not deadnamed.
- c) commit to creating gender neutral bathrooms in every new building and begin the process of creating gender neutral bathrooms in all existing buildings.
- d) Have a student led review headed by queer students to ensure there is no queerphobic content being taught at the University

Moved: Mat Monti **Seconded:** Falie Klieve **Motion Carried**

7.5. Post Graduate Officer (Research) Report

Jack gave his report

7.6. Post Graduate Officer (Coursework) Report

As Mat had to leave, their motion 8.3 had to be moved forward.

Procedural Motion:

Move item 8.3 to before the Social Justice Officer’s Report.

Moved: Billy Zimmermann **Seconded:** Mat Monti **Procedural Motion Carried**

8.1 Queer Athletes Belong in Sport

Motion:

That the SRC

1. Affirms its support of Trans Athletes
2. Supports the right of Trans Athletes to compete in the competitions that best correspond with their identity.

3. Condemns any and all attempts to ban or remove trans athletes from sporting leagues, clubs and communities.

Amendment proposed by Henry Southcott:

Remove point 2 & 3 until after Adelaide University Sports have been consulted.

Moved: Henry Southcott **Seconded:** Francesco Ciampa **Amendment Failed**

Motion moved in original form.

Moved: Mat Monti **Seconded:** Falie Klieve **Motion Carried**

7.7. Social Justice Officer's Report

Tom Wood was a late apology so his report was taken as read.

7.8. Disability Officer's Report

Motion:

The SRC:

1. Acknowledges there is currently no space on campus designed for or with disabled students in mind.
2. Condemns the University of Adelaide for taking no action to provide such a space for disabled students, despite other SA universities showing the effectiveness of these spaces.
3. Supports the Disability, Illness, and Divergence Association campaign for an Access Room for disabled students.
4. Commits to sharing DIDA's soon to be released On Dit article calling for an Access Room onto the SRC Facebook page.

Amendment proposed by Francesco Ciampa:

Add point 5: The SRC implores the University to provide AUSLAN or transcript options for online and in person lectures, workshops and tutorials for students who are hard of hearing. Furthermore, the SRC suggest the University consider providing AUSLAN training to their staff, to create a more inclusive campus community

Amenable to the mover.

The SRC:

1. Acknowledges there is currently no space on campus designed for or with disabled students in mind.
2. Condemns the University of Adelaide for taking no action to provide such a space for disabled students, despite other SA universities showing the effectiveness of these spaces.
3. Supports the Disability, Illness, and Divergence Association campaign for an Access Room for disabled students.

4. Commits to sharing DIDA's soon to be released On Dit article calling for an Access Room onto the SRC Facebook page.
5. Implores the University to provide AUSLAN or transcript options for online and in person lectures, workshops and tutorials for students who are hard of hearing. Furthermore, the SRC suggest the University consider providing AUSLAN training to their staff, to create a more inclusive campus community

Moved: Falie Klieve **Seconded:** Francesco Ciampa **Motion Carried**

7.9. International Officer's Report

Dhuruva's shockingly short report was taken as read

7.10. Environment Officer's Supplementary Report

Motion

The SRC:

1. Supports activists campaigning to protect and conserve the South Australian outback
2. Opposes the Pastoral Lands Bill 2020 and attempts by any future state government to undermine environmental protections
3. Will share a post promoting the 'Save Our Outback' campaign from the SRC Facebook page
4. Will make 'Save Our Outback' campaign leaflets and posters available to students in the SRC Office

Moved: Nix Herriot **Seconded:** James Wood **Motion Carried**

8. General Business

8.1. Financial Transparency of the AUU

Motion:

The SRC expresses its deep concern at the significant cost the decision of the AUU Board under the Presidency of Oscar Ong to rebrand the AUU will impose on the student body.

The SRC also expresses its deep concern regarding the lack of any genuine consultation with the student body or AUU membership as to the youX rebranding project.

Noting the legislated name of the AUU will remain as the Adelaide University Union and that the branding of the AUU has since the time of its creation always been the AUU, the SRC also expresses its deep concern that noting the true intent of the AUU Board under the Presidency of Oscar Ong in making this decision simply seems to be to remove reference to the word 'Union' in the AUU name for political reasons.

The SRC calls upon AUU President Oscar Ong and the AUU Board to publicly provide the following:

- How much cost has the AUU incurred to date in association with the youX rebranding;
- All estimates future costs associated with the youX rebranding
- All external organisations that have provided services to the AUU in the development of the youX rebranding project;
- What consultation the AUU has undertaken with the student body and AUU membership in determining to rebrand the AUU;

The SRC will publish a request to the effect of the above on its Facebook page.

Moved: Eddie Satchell

Seconded: James Dimas

Motion Carried

8.2. Oppose the Character Test Bill

Motion:

1. The SRC stands in solidarity with all students from a refugee and/or migrant background to oppose the Strengthening the Character Test Bill and any similar bills.
2. The SRC condemns the Morrison Government for pushing discriminatory policies which negatively impact migrant students for the sole purpose of running a political scare campaign.

Moved: Marilee Hou

Seconded: Falie Klieve

Motion carried

8.3. Trans Women in Sports

Moved to before the Social Justice Officer's Report

8.4. Inclusive Activism

The SRC commits to:

1. Including marginalised groups when organising events and protests, especially when the event is relevant to said groups.
2. Centring those who have lived experience.
3. Investigating the integration of Auslan interpreters into SRC events where possible.
4. Ensuring protests and events include spaces for those with wheelchairs, mobility aids etc.
5. Ensuring the location of the protest / event is accessible to everyone

Amendment proposed by Francesco Ciampa:

Change the title from 'Inclusive Activism' to 'Inclusive University Events'

Moved: Francesco Ciampa

Seconded: Henry Southcott

Amendment Failed

Motion moved in original form:

Moved: Falie Klieve

Seconded: Georgia Thomas

Motion Carried

8.5. Stop the War in Ukraine, no escalation of war!

There was ample discussion on this motion as well as similar motion 8.6 proposed by Eddie Satchell.

Ana handed the chair to Georgia Thomas at 8:06

After much discussion it was decided to move 8.5 and 8.6 en bloc.

Procedural Motion proposed by Jack Crawford:

Bloc motion 8.5 with 8.6.

Amenable to both James Wood and Eddie Satchell so no vote required.

Bloted motion moved:

Motion:

1. The UoA SRC opposes the Russian invasion of Ukraine.
2. The UoA SRC supports the right of self-determination for Ukrainian people.
3. The UoA SRC opposes both Russian and Western imperialism. The SRC recognises that NATO is no force for peace but is an aggressive military alliance that also must be opposed. The US and NATO have killed over 6 million in wars since World War 2.
4. The UoA SRC confirms its opposition to all imperialist wars.
5. The UoA SRC opposes the increasing Australian military expenditure, and the drive towards war in the Indo-Pacific.
6. The UoA SRC stands in solidarity with the heroic anti-war protests in Russia.

Actions:

1. The UoA SRC will post the text of this motion to its Facebook page.
- The UoA SRC condemns the Russian invasion of Ukraine which is in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.
 - The Ukrainian people now face imminent threat to loss of life and dislocation from home due to the illegal actions of Vladimir Putin's regime.
 - The SRC sends its full solidarity to the struggle of the Ukrainian people and the democratically elected government of Ukraine against the aggression of the Russian state directed by Putin and his Russian oligarch cronies.
 - The SRC also recognises and sends its solidarity to those Russian citizens who have valiantly protested their government's actions knowing the direct risk they face from the corrupt Russian government. The SRC sends its solidarity to the anti-war movement across the globe protesting the aggression of the Russian state.
 - The SRC President will make a post on the SRC Facebook page in solidarity with the Ukrainian people noting the above.

Moved: James Wood

Seconded: Eddie Satchell

Motion carried

8.6 Solidarity with Ukraine

Moved en bloc with 8.5

9. Emergent business

Georgia passed the chair to Ana Obradovic at 8:16

Ana Obradovic closed the meeting at 8:16

Appendix 2 – National Student Safety Survey Scorecard

Scorecard

General – Maximum 54 Points

Has committed to annually release anonymised data - +4

- ⇒ +2 points if the university has pledged to begin sharing data publicly in the next two years, demonstrating both students' confidence to come forward and transparency on the part of universities. +2 points if the university has already released data in the last four years.

Committed to releasing the UA Report - +4

- ⇒ +2 points if the University has already released their 2016 report. +2 points if the University has pledged to release the 2022 report based on the 2021 findings.

Committed to implement all UA recommendations - +3

- ⇒ +1 if pledged +2 points if they have created a timeline for their pledge within 2 years.

Existence of a policy that covers Sexual Violence - +12

- ⇒ A significant number of points can be earned simply for having a policy that covers Sexual Assault and Harassment. While the inclusion and omission of certain criteria will add or detract points, +3 is assigned just for having a policy in place. + 6 points if the policy and procedures are contained within a single, stand-alone policy, and does not refer to the procedures outlined in another policy or disciplinary document that deals with anything other than sexual violence (i.e. a student code of conduct). +3 if policy is clearly outlined in a transparent step by step process for students, staff, and faculty.

Student effective Sexual Violence policy - +6

- ⇒ +3 if policy is co-designed by student survivors and student SASH advocates (for example, women collectives, women officers, women departments, queer collective officers). +3 if student input is ongoing for continuous improvement of the policy.

Policy is 'institution-wide', including student residencies or other affiliated services/agencies - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if some areas of the institution have separate policies.

Accessible policy - Online - +3

- ⇒ +1 Easily read and understood (available in different languages and easy English), +1 on the main university website and appears on first instance in university search +1 appears in search engine

Accessible policy - One Online Document - +2

- ⇒ +2 if you only have to refer to one document to find all policy and procedures.

Clearly defined complaint process; requires clearly outlined and defined step-by-step process - +2

- ⇒ +1 if process is clearly outlined and comprehensible; +1 if process is laid out step-by-step (who one must contact, in what order, with a timeline for the complaint process and results etc) so the reader can follow it chronologically and logically.

Existence of reporting and statistic mechanisms (including anonymous reporting) - +2

- ⇒ +2 if there are proper mechanisms in place to report, publicly, statistics on complaints received and numbers of reports made.

Ability to report externally to the criminal justice system or human rights tribunal or alternate justice pathways - +3

- ⇒ +2 if policy references the ability to report externally to police/law enforcement and a human rights tribunal/commission and/or alternate, culturally relevant justice pathways. +1 if a student is aware of other options, they are provided with resources to contact other justice bodies.

Does not include the ability to suspend complaint if the complainant also seeks recourse from criminal justice system - +2

- ⇒ +2 if internal complaint processes are not suspended if a complainant also seeks recourse from law enforcement. 0 points if policy does mention suspension of internal processes.

Renewal and review of policy - +4

- ⇒ +4 points if policy review is annual or every 2 years, OR if policy is reviewed after 1st year and then every 3 years following; +3 points if policy is reviewed every 3 years; 2 points if policy is reviewed every 4 years; +1 point if policy is reviewed every 5+ years.

Renewal and review of policy – student involvement - +5

- ⇒ +5 points if students are included in the review process.

Scope – Maximum 30 Points

Faculty and staff are processed under the same policy as students - +4

- ⇒ +4 points if the policy outlines the processes for the respondent is a staff/faculty member or if they are a student, and that they are as similar in process as the relevant collective agreements will allow.

Defines consent effectively: 1) consent cannot be assumed, 2) cannot be obtained through coercion and threats, 3) revocation of consent, 4) power relations, 5) recognizes drugs/alcohol 6) affirmative consent - +6

- ⇒ +1 for each of the 6 different definition components; 0 points if policy does not include a definition of consent.

Covers external contractors, visitors, and alumni etc. (would include any specific mention of the ability to ban external teachers, visitors and alum from campus and have no contact orders) - +2

- ⇒ +2 if policy explicitly mentions that external teachers, visitors, and alumni are included within its scope.

Policy includes research supervision relationships - +2

- ⇒ +1 points for specific mention of research supervision relationships and graduate power dynamics. +1 point if the policy states that reports or disclosures relating to a research supervision relationship will not impact one's academic outcomes.

Paid leave regarding Sexual Violence provided for Phd candidates - +1

- ⇒ +1 point if students are able to access separate paid leave to accommodate reporting and recovery from sexual misconduct.

Ensures complaints are not suspended if the respondent ends their relationship with the school (i.e. transfers or drops out) - +2

- ⇒ +2 if the policy explicitly says that complaints will not be suspended if the respondent ends their relationship with the school.

Covers off-campus activity (impacting ability to live and learn on campus) - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if off-campus activity is not covered by the policy (using the language of 'university sanctioned events' is not enough as it does not cover parties, transport, internships, university affiliated events or people's apartments).

Covers online and digital activity - +2

- ⇒ +1 point if online activity is covered by the policy. +1 point if policy is NOT restricted to university provided online platforms.

Covers broad range of sexual related abuse and harassment - +6 (Maximum 6 points)

- ⇒ +1 point for each mention of a type of sexual and related abuse. This includes but is not limited to, stalking, stealthing, image-based, injection-based, drink-spiking, suggestive comments and jokes, and unwelcome touching.

Explicitly covers placements with external agencies and/or institutions - +1

- ⇒ 0 points if external agencies or institutions are not covered by the policy.

Explicitly covers sexual misconduct as visual, verbal, physical, written, mental - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if the spectrum of sexual misconduct is not covered by the policy.

Composition of the Decision Maker(s) – Maximum 14 Points

Existence of an independent investigation process for all complaints - +4

- ⇒ +4 if the policy explicitly says the complainant has the ability to request an external investigator. Only +2 if you only have that ability in an appeal process; 0 points if only the institution can decide to use an independent investigation process, or independent investigation is not open to students.

Existence of external third party, independent member/s, on the review

Committee - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if there is no external third-party independent member on the review committee; also 0 points if there is no review committee.

Existence of student representatives on the review committee - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if there are no student representatives on the review committee; also 0 points if there is no review committee. Added points per student representative.

Explicitly mandating sexual assault and harassment sensitivity training, including queer/LGBTQIA+ sensitivity training - +6

- ⇒ +4 if policy explicitly mandates decision makers to receive sexual assault and harassment training; +2 points if decision makers also receive queer/LGBTQIA+ sensitivity training; 0 points if training is not mentioned in policy.

Formal and Informal Complaint Process - Maximum 48 Points

Existence of informal and restorative justice mechanisms - +4

- ⇒ +2 for existence of informal resolution mechanisms included in the policy; +2 for restorative justice mechanisms included in the policy. Note, all informal or restorative processes must be conducted by appropriately trained personnel. If not, 0 points.

Explicit protections for survivors from harassment by investigative bodies (e.g no questions regarding past sexual history) - +2

- ⇒ 0 points there are no explicit protections in the policy.

Existence of Face-to-Face Protections - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if protections for face-to-face encounters are not included in the policy.

Existence of specific immunity clause for drug and alcohol use - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if there is no immunity clause for drug and alcohol use included in the policy

Explicit mention that all sanctions ordered against respondent will be made known to survivor - +2

- ⇒ +2 if policy explicitly outlines that all results of the complaint, as well as sanctions if applicable, will be made known to the complainant. This is hard in many states due to restrictions in privacy law - it is important that if this is the case in your state that the institution outline this limitation in the policy as well. However, they still lose the points, even if they explain it properly.

Explicit mention that survivor will be able to access the accused's response during the complaint process - + 2

- ⇒ Transparency will encourage confidence in the complaint process and allow the survivor opportunity to respond effectively so that an investigation is not then dismissed on the basis of the accused's response.

Clearly defined timelines for complaint process - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if clear timelines are not included in the policy.

Interim Measures - +2

- ⇒ +1 for the existence of interim measures in the policy; +1 if interim measures are included in the policy with an explicitly survivor-centred stance.

Does not include a frivolous claims section - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if policy references frivolous or vexatious claims (also referred to as complaints made in “bad faith”, “malicious complaints”, etc.).

Ability to have support person present - +1

- ⇒ 0 points if the ability to have a support person present are not referenced in the policy

Existence of a conflict of interest clause - +1

- ⇒ 0 points if there is not a conflict of interest clause included in the policy.

Does not include an exception clause - +2

- ⇒ 0 points if any exceptions to the policy exist (ex. Policy can be suspended by the president/other authority, rules can be changed by the president/ other authority, etc.).

Existence of protection from retaliation - +1

- ⇒ 0 points if protection from retaliation is not referenced in the policy.

Existence of ability to submit anonymous and third party complaints - +4

- ⇒ +1 if policy includes ability to submit anonymous complaints/disclosures; +1 if policy includes the ability for third-party complaints/disclosures to be made; +2 if the anonymous reporting mechanism is supported by appropriately trained staff and has the capacity for end-to-end encrypted communication between reporter and staff.

Does not include a time limit to file a formal complaint after incident - +2

- ⇒ 1 point can be given if an existing time limit is 3 or more years in length; Full points (2) if the policy does not put any time limitation on filing formal complaints.

Does not include a gag order (confidentiality order) at any point - +2

- ⇒ +2 if nowhere in the policy does it suggest that a complainant is unable to speak about their experiences at any point. Policies will almost never use the term ‘gag order’ and so you will have to watch out for strict language in confidentiality clauses.

Appeal process - +3

- ⇒ +1 point for inclusion of the ability to appeal internal decisions; +2 points if the policy includes the ability to appeal to a non-administrative body.

Visibility of reporting procedures - + 6

- ⇒ +2 points if procedures appear in the top search page. +1 point if reporting procedures are covered in the same page as support services. +2 points if no material *needs* to be downloaded to access information. +1 point if all SASH related content has their own section on the main university website for all to see. 0 points if it takes 5 or more clicks to find procedures.

Timeliness of response - + 6

- ⇒ 0 points if no time is given to the student for when they should expect a response. Only +1 point if the response time is given as longer than one month.

Education – Maximum 29 Points

Annual compulsory consent module for all students and staff - +12

- ⇒ +2 points for a consent module that is compulsory for students and teachers. +1 point for a module that is completed annually rather than once a degree. +1 point for language inclusivity. +1 point for trauma informed language and visuals, with minimum depictions of violence. +5 points for diverse examples covering the unique experiences of people with a disability, culturally diverse people, transgender people, non-binary people, or people in LGBTQIA+ relationships, for example. +2 points for informed content explaining the extent of sexual violence.

Creates a prevention, education, and support committee - +1

- ⇒ 0 points if a prevention/education/support committee is not referenced in the policy. Note that committees can be listed with a different name, but must serve the same purposes of prevention, education, and support to receive the point.

Highlights support services available for students - +4

- ⇒ +1 point if internal support services for students are mentioned in the policy; +1 point if external support services are mentioned in the policy; +2 points if support services for students are explicitly highlighted in the policy and examples/names are given.

Committed funding to support programs - +1

⇒ 0 points if funding/resources for support programs are not committed.

Highlights prevention programs on campus - +1

⇒ 0 points if prevention programs are not mentioned in the policy (prevention programs could include committees, strategic plans, frameworks, working groups, etc.).

On campus services for victim/survivors that are appropriately located and staffed - +2

⇒ 0 points if support services are housed in institutional administration centres.

On campus services that are sexual violence specific - +1

⇒ Even if support services on campus are mentioned, 0 point unless they are specific to/specialize in sexual violence.

Inclusive support services with identified roles - + 1

⇒ Student support services that cater to marginal groups and include specific identified roles to ensure effective representation of students with diverse identities and needs.

Intersectionality recognized - +1

⇒ +2 points if intersectional impacts of sexual violence are recognized (ex. acknowledges marginalized communities on campus, recognizes the impacts of intersectionality and sexual violence, etc).

Rape culture mentioned - +1

⇒ +2 point if rape culture is mentioned.

Accommodations for survivors mentioned - +1

⇒ 0 points if accommodations for survivors are not mentioned in the policy.

Institution has a liaison committee with representatives of key local services, including sexual assault services and police - +3.

⇒ +2 if institution has regular liaison with local community services, including sexual assault services and police; +1 if the committee has student representation.