

CONFIRMED MINUTES

BOARD MEETING #19



At the **Board Meeting #20** on **3 Oct 2025** these minutes were **confirmed as presented**.

Name:	Te Tira Ahu Pae
Date:	Tuesday, 30 September 2025
Time:	11:00 am to 1:00 pm (NZDT)
Location:	Online, via Microsoft Teams
Board Members:	Caroline Ryan, Chiavanni Le'Mon, Mary Ieremia-Allan, Mathew Rope, Peyton Joe, Ripeka Paapu, Takunda Mabonga
Attendees:	Caitlin Payne, GM Email, James Collings

1. Opening Meeting

1.1 Confirm Minutes

Mary to chair today's meeting.

1.2 Interest Register

2. Major Decisions and Discussions

2.1 Business for SGM

Alhanis from Working Group (WG):

WG are asking that both models be submitted to the SGM for students to vote on a preference. It is not to pass the model; it is just getting feedback to pass at an SGM or AGM early 2026.

Mary wanted to confirm that these two models are just as is, to present at the SGM. Alhanis confirmed and noted that Model One has the option for student feedback on external voting or non-voting positions or that can be voted on today by the Board.

Model One - Student Rep Council

- Māori Students' Association is unsure how their final participation will look in the structure.
- The Board will have 5 student reps and 2 external experts.
- There will be 21 reps total, General and Pasifika President, one rep for each campus, an additional rep for Distance, International and Postrgrad, 4 Rainbow reps, 4 Distance reps, 4 Pasifika reps. The community reps have additional responsibilities to realign the deliverables for an equitable workload. Boards and Committees will sit separately under this model.

- Restructures the Presidents' appointment processes and would include a screening process, before an election goes out to students.
- The Council will be elected and appointed and they will appoint a Board. The Board will be paid a \$3000 honorarium payment.
- Reps will choose to help Clubs and Events out of goodwill as this will not be included in their roles.
- MOUs Disability, International, to facilitate.
- The Rep Manager will oversee the reps as a whole, with the council meeting monthly. Each rep will provide an update on their month's work, for transparency, and identify support needed.
- This structure allows a set budget for reps and allows for some autonomy, and would remove barriers to get projects off the ground.
- There will be an academic sub-committee, so the 76 Boards and Committees seats are separate from reps and open to all who are interested and wider student voice. This was identified as a gap in the current structure.
- 2 external advisors on the Board will be either voting or non-voting. Alhanis believes it would be best to go to the wider student body to vote on. Peyton asked if there is a branch or company that we would reach out to. Alhanis advised that there would be two appointed experts, e.g., Massey alumni or a finance and risk advisor, and they would apply for this role. They will be paid the same as the rest of the Board.
- This falls within financial restrictions and ensures there are enough funds to give to student reps and hear student voices.
- Māori Students' Association will build participation into their wages.
- If we are reducing costs, they will need to explore either in-person or online rep training and what this may look like, as well as reviewing the Boards and Committees' payment based on hours needed.
- This Model reduces Distance reps, so WG wants to ensure there is support staff, e.g., Distance advocate, more support for Distance events, to maintain Distance at Massey.
- Alhanis questions if 20 hours of rep and honorarium for Board obligations is fair remuneration for the Presidents, and recognised this is difficult to determine until we are in the structure, or until roles are filled.
- Mary confirmed that hours for representation have been cut down due to not running in a financially viable way, and to have a buffer.
- Brooke asked if the Distance Advocate would come out of rep budget. Alhanis advised that this is a suggestion for the team to take on board, but this is under operations, and the WG cannot ask operations to do this. Brooke asked what happens with Living Wage Accreditation. Alhanis confirmed that we would lose the accreditation, and the accreditation is generally targeted towards bigger organisations that can take on these costs. Taking on Living Wage Accreditation would reduce reps each year. Brooke asked if it would continue to have the same percentage above minimum wage. Alhanis advised that they cannot advise, as this will be a yearly decision. James confirmed the Living Wage has been increasing more than CPI, and minimum wage has always been closer to CPI.

Eloise from WG:

Model Two - Student Executive and Advisory Sub-committee

- One of the main differences is that independent experts will be on an advisory sub-committee rather than on the Board, but a TTAP member will be elected to the Board.
- Advisory sub-committee (SC) will have 3 independent experts and 6 students, who will meet about 5 times a year and be there as needed.

- This model also includes the Māori Students' Association.
- There is a mix of academic engagement reps and engagement reps. Engagement reps will be on the ground and help with events, and welcome to attend Boards and Committees, but this is not within their time. Academic reps spend their time in the Boards and Committees space and meet directly with the University.
- This Model retains more International and PG reps and has higher hours for some reps. The biggest limitation is the reduced number of weeks in a year. Distance and Disability often work into Summer School. There is potentially room in the budget to extend the reps on the Board.
- Advisory SC will see the Board reporting to them, and the SC will provide a wider perspective.
- Experts are likely paid kōha, but this is not currently in the budget.
- This Board only has one spare seat, and the Board payments are included in their wages, displayed in a slight increase in some hours.
- This Model does allow for a wider voluntary academic SC to enhance student voice.
- RĀTĀ Rainbow would see an increase in hours but runs on the same wage recommendations as the first Model.
- There were a lot of mixed perspectives from students about external experts on the Board, so this would see them as an SC.
- On-campus and Distance reps would have the same hours.
- Removing VP is potentially a big loss, so they would need to look at more enticing voluntary positions.
- Peyton asked via chat if the external experts would have voting rights. Eloise noted that only a TTAP staff member would be on the Board and would lean towards them having voting rights. If this staff member doesn't, it may lean towards tied votes. The Board would need to decide this.
- This Model has a little bit of budget remaining, so all Board members may be paid for the full term, but also a higher number of reps with a shorter term.
- Peyton asked about the Presidents' roles and if there was an option like Model One to have Pasifika and General. Eloise confirmed that either way, there will be General and Pasifika, but Model Two allows for a co-President structure. However, these are already part-time roles, but fewer hours allow Presidents to take on a part-time study load.
- Mary asked, with the current Tripartite structure, would it operate similarly, where most are under General? Eloise advised that the General President is currently doing a lot of the Rep Manager role, so this would allow more time for the General President to do their Presidential duties. Pasifika would likely still report to their President. Disability and Rainbow may be on a Terms of Reference (ToR) where TTAP would negotiate how they are elected or appointed, what their duties are, if they're involved in events, and if alumni are allowed in. The ToR would also include who they are reporting to, and could regularly be updated in agreement with TTAP.

Mary asked Ripeka about the context about the Māori Students' Association. Ripeka advised that no decisions have been made as they are still in the consultation process. They have called a cross-campus hui for next Wednesday to discuss this. External and internal recommendations have been made on this. The conversations have been in person at 3 different noho, and Ana has had initial conversations with students from different campuses. Mary clarified that this is by Māori students, for Māori students. Sammy asked via the chat why the Māori cohort would like to be independent. Ripeka confirmed that Māori representation has not been safe for Māori students within TTAP.

Comparison between the Models:

- Differences with the Board makeup

- Board pay
- Board external voting rights
- Total reps
- Total paid hours
- Total weeks covered
- Ripeka asked if there could be one external and one staff member on the Board. Alhanis advised that they are very different structures. Model One would be difficult for a TTAP staff member, and the external advisors would help with the governance for the Board. Model Two is by students, for students, and would provide support and expertise.
- Brooke asked that, as both Models have a decrease in reps, will we see a decrease in responsibilities and less representation in job descriptions? Alhanis said that the number of reps is decreased at the executive structure, but they will have a reduction in responsibilities, including responsibilities to assist operational staff, and Boards and Committees. This will be a distinct definition of what reps do, and they can opt in for other duties. There is a reduction in responsibilities but an increase in representation as more students can get involved, rather than limiting it to the same reps that the current students have. Ripeka asked if this is the same for Presidents. Alhanis confirmed that it will, and they are looking to get SLT positions filled so that roles and responsibilities are clarified and placed in the correct places under TTAP. A clear separation between representation hours and Board responsibilities in Model One allows for separation of responsibilities. A GM and HR Manager ensures that complaints go to them, rather than needing to be ratified by the Board. This doesn't extend to the Māori Association, as this will be self-determined. Eloise confirmed that there is a lot of room for change until the constitution is done. A lot of this can be put into policies and procedures and modified if they don't work correctly.
- They will take the recommendations from the students at the SGM on the preferred model and make constitutional changes as needed. The decision will need to be passed at an SGM or an AGM in future.
- Additional recommendations include some 2026 role-over, as all reps end in November 2025, and this means there would be no formal handover and no representation in Semester One. Recommendation includes that SLT positions are filled over the summer break, so they have time to learn their roles, extending funding opportunities to not rely on SLA, and consideration for the experts on the Board. Takunda asked if reps are rolled over, would this require them to work and be paid over the summer? Alhanis advised that this would be up to the Board, and the role over may be starting next year, in the interim until elections, and may be one rep per campus.
- Caroline would like to thank Alhanis and Eloise for presenting to the Board and recognises the hours and deliberation that have gone into this.
- Mary wants to take both to the SGM for students to see a comparison and slight tweaks that could be available. Chiavanni and Caroline agree with presenting both. All Board members are in agreement that both Models are going to the SGM.
- James advised that there wasn't a motion, as we weren't sure what the Board would decide, and would like there to be an official motion passed. Alhanis advised that if we are going to motion, both Models, with or without voting rights for Model One.
- Ripeka would like students to decide on voting rights. Takunda advised via chat that he is leaning towards no voting rights. Chiavanni agreed with no voting rights, as it is for students, by students. Alhanis would like to provide the pros and cons in a Part Two discussion.



Motion to endorse the presentation of both Model One and Model Two at the Special General Meeting

Mary moved to endorse both Model One and Model Two, as developed by the Working Group, for presentation at the Special General Meeting (SGM).

It was noted that if students choose to adopt Model One, they will retain the authority to decide whether external experts on the Board will have voting rights.

The motion was unanimously approved, with all Board members indicating agreement by raising their hands in the Teams meeting.

Decision Date: 30 Sept 2025
Mover: Mary Ieremia-Allan
Outcome: Approved

3. Close Meeting

3.1 Close the meeting

Next meeting: No date for the next meeting has been set.

Signature:_____

Date:_____