

Minutes of the 2017 Annual General Meeting

Monday October 30 2017 | 18:00
MC 102

1. Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at 18:23.

The Chair informs the assembly that all printed copies of the bylaw amendments available in the room are outdated, and that accurate, up-to-date versions are accessible online. The Chair provides time for attendees to access the accurate versions of the bylaw amendments.

C. Alao, Vice-President Equity, reads the Land Acknowledgement and the Equity Statement. Alao identifies Tka Pinnock, Executive Director of the UTSU, as the Anti-Harassment Officer of the meeting. Alao notes that the “Lady Godiva Memorial Bnad” will make an appearance early in the meeting.

The Chair declares that the meeting operates under the University of Toronto *Policy on the Disruption of Meetings*.

The “Lady Godiva Memorial Bnad” interrupts the meeting at 18:27.

The meeting resumes at 18:32.

The Chair explains to the assembly that each speaker is limited to three minutes’ speaking time, and that speakers are permitted to speak a maximum of two times per agenda item. The Chair reminds the assembly that in managing and adding to the speaker’s list, priority will be afforded to attendees who have not yet spoken. The Chair reminds the assembly of the rules of parliamentary procedure.

D. Singh, Vice-President Internal, states that members attending on behalf of a club to satisfy club funding requirements should email vpinternal@utsu.ca to ensure record is made of their attendance.

2. Approval of Agenda (10 MINUTES)

MOTION

MOVED: M. MEMMEL

SECONDED: D. SINGH

Be it resolved that the Agenda be approved as presented.

DISCUSSION

The Chair notes that amendments to the agenda are limited to the removal or reorder of extant items on the agenda. The Chair notes that, in accordance with provisions set out in the UTSU Bylaws and the CNCA, additions to the agenda may not be made at this time. The Chair further indicates that this also holds especially true for prospective items pertaining to the UTSU Bylaws.

CARRIED

3. Approval of Minutes (20 MINUTES)

MOTION

MOVED: M. MEMMEL

SECONDED: D. SINGH

Be it resolved that the minutes for the 2016 Annual General Meeting be approved as presented.

DISCUSSION

M. Memmel, President, yields their speaking time to Singh.

Singh states that the minutes of the previous year's AGM were, in their opinion, an accurate report of the meeting. Singh urges members that note any issues, omissions, or errors in the minutes to put forward according amendments.

CARRIED

4. Presidential Address and Executive Question Period (45 MINUTES)

DISCUSSION

Mommel welcomes members to the meeting and delivers the Presidential Address. Mommel details the UTSU's activities, victories, and concerns from the past year. Mommel asserts that solidarity is built through trust, which is earned and not owed. Mommel states that, moving forward, the UTSU will endeavour to foster and earn students' trust.

Julia DaSilva presents a petition with 1,200 signatures in support of reinstating the Health and Dental Plan Coordinator, the Clubs and Service Groups Coordinator, and the Financial Coordinator positions to the UTSU. DaSilva asks how the Executive can justify removing the positions.

Memmel states that to their knowledge, the petition includes many signatures by persons who are not UTSU members. Memmel states that they would be happy to receive the petition regardless. Memmel notes that the UTSU has been fully compliant with the Collective Agreement between it and the affiliated union local, CUPE 1281. Memmel states that the staff changes were in large part due to long-term fiscal considerations, with particular regard to the UTSU's structural deficit. Memmel states that the UTSU Executive stands by its decision to remove the positions.

Salma Fakry, President of UTMSU, voices concern that proxies were collected during the reading week of members at the U of T Mississauga campus, and that consequently insufficient time was provided for these students to submit proxies. Fakry affirms the importance of recognizing UTM students' membership within the UTSU.

Memmel states that proxy collection is administered as an online process to accommodate and facilitate students' accessibility needs, with particular regard to those that would otherwise be unable to complete in-person proxy forms. Memmel notes that the meeting was advertised in several newspapers and in multiple e-newsletters. Memmel notes that various AGMs in previous years have seen high attendance from UTM students, and that a similar system and method of communication as in those years was implemented for this meeting. Memmel states that the UTSU Executive will nonetheless review communication methods used to disseminate information surrounding its general meetings.

Michelle Mabira states that the UTSU continues to enact and practice policies that exclude UTM students and discourage their involvement. Mabira cites this as the reason for decreased attendance from UTM students. Mabira asks if Memmel may provide information on how the UTSU is providing services previously provided by staff members in the eliminated positions.

Memmel notes that the Collective Agreement bars the UTSU from commenting on the necessity of staff positions. Memmel notes that the Collective Agreement also prevents the UTSU from asking members or clubs about the quality of services provided by staff members. Memmel states that while the UTSU Executive can reconsider the removal of the subject staff positions, the UTSU Executive stands by its decision. Memmel notes that clubs have expressed satisfaction with the service provided this year.

Mabira states that some clubs have not been satisfied with the current level of service in areas previously served by the Health and Dental Coordinator and the Clubs Coordinator. Mabira expresses concern that the UTSU is disregarding the needs and desires of its membership.

Memmel states that, to their knowledge, no members have reported being adversely affected by any specific service deficit. Memmel states encouragement for clubs and individuals to approach the UTSU with any concerns around service deficits if and when identified.

5. Receipt of Audited Financial Statements *(45 MINUTES)*

MOTION

MOVED: D. SINGH

SECONDED: M. MEMMEL

Be it resolved that the audited financial statements for the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year be approved as presented.

DISCUSSION

Singh notes that the largest change in the financial statements as compared to the previous year concerns the Health and Dental Plan premium. Singh explains that the change is a result of the UTSU having conducted a “request for proposal” (RFP) process with the assistance of a reputable insurance broker, allowing the UTSU to select an insurance policy that best served the needs of its membership. Singh remarks that the financial statements are considered drafts until the assembly approves them.

Ali Raj Asrani asks how uncollected levies are managed, and particularly those restricted for specific groups or services. Asrani further inquires about the attending process for the Wheelchair Accessibility Projects levy.

Singh explains that levy-receiving groups are subject to certain compliance conditions in order to receive funds, of which examples are an audit or a Memorandum of Agreement. Singh further explains that the Wheelchair Accessibility Projects levy is administered to accumulate funds over time to finance capital expenditures on major accessibility improvements. Singh cites a historical example, where renovations establishing an accessibility ramp for the UTSU building drew from the levy’s deferred funds.

Memmel notes that no policies exist for governing access to restricted funds built up by the Wheelchair Accessibility Projects levy, and that the use of said funds is usually left to the discretion of the Executive and the Board. Memmel states that the Student Aid Committee, chaired by General Equity Director Adrian Huntelar, may work on this during the upcoming year.

CARRIED

6. Appointment of Auditors (20 MINUTES)

MOTION

MOVED: D. SINGH SECONDED: M. MEMMEL

Be it resolved that _____ be appointed as the external auditors for the University of Toronto Students' Union for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2018.

DISCUSSION

MOTION TO AMEND

MOVED: D. SINGH SECONDED: J. JONES

Be it resolved that Sloan & Partners LLP be appointed as the external auditors for the University of Toronto Students' Union for the fiscal year ending April 30, 2018.

DISCUSSION

Singh notes that it is good practice for corporations to change auditing firms from time to time. Singh states that for the last nine years, audits have been completed by Yale & Partners LLP. Singh explains that Sloan & Partners LLP were selected after an extensive RFP process and that the firm was priced competitively with only a small increase in cost over the previous year.

CARRIED

CARRIED

7. Bylaw Amendments (60 MINUTES)

MOTION

MOVED: D. SINGH SECONDED: M. MEMMEL

Be it resolved that all Bylaw Amendments approved by the Board of Directors since the 2016 Annual General Meeting be approved as presented in Appendix A.

DISCUSSION

The Chair states that, owing to a logistical error whereby outdated versions of the Bylaws were printed, the subject amendments will be displayed on a projection screen and presented by Memmel and Singh.

Mommel states that an amendment was introduced to limit the number of terms any member may serve as an executive of the UTSU to 2 years. Memmel explains that this amendment was introduced to discourage career student politicians.

Mommel explains that the Annual Ratification Meeting (ARM) is facilitated by the UTSU as a way to meet compliance standards it is subject to under the Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act. Memmel states that the amendments around the ARM were

introduced to ensure that questions put to the ARM faithfully reflect the results of the UTSU's spring elections. Memmel expands, noting that the amendments addressed the possibility of severing some subset of the election results to block their ratification.

Memmel states that an amendment approved at the most recent Board meeting removed the Vice-President External and Vice-President University Affairs executive positions and instated a new Vice-President Advocacy executive position in their place. Memmel notes that some responsibilities of the removed positions will be absorbed into the President's portfolio.

Memmel notes a number of amendments concerning a redistribution of work in the Vice-President University Affairs and Vice-President External portfolios to a new executive position, the Vice-President Advocacy.

Memmel states that an amendment was passed to append "or their designate" to instances of "President of the UTMSU" in the UTSU's governing documents. Memmel explains that these changes were technical in nature, bringing affected language to compliance with existing contractual obligations of the UTSU to the UTMSU.

Memmel outlines amendments implementing changes arising as a consequence of changes to the UTSU's Executive structure. Memmel notes the transfer of a number of responsibilities to other executive roles, and further, changes to the organizational structure of commissions and committees of the UTSU.

Memmel states that the capacities of committees were expanded to vest greater powers in the Board. Memmel notes that the Finance Committee has been charged with approving financial statements and budgets, as well as empowered to request credit card expenditures and day-to-day expenses. Memmel states that the Services Committee mandate has been amended to clarify its role as an oversight as versus an administrative body in respect to the Health and Dental plan. Memmel explains that the Services Committee had previously been mandated to administer the Health and Dental Plan, though in practice had never done so. Memmel states that the Outreach Committee and Campaigns and Advocacy Committee were introduced to empower Board Directors and increase engagement with members. Memmel notes that the time for striking committees in the Fall semester was moved to accommodate for directors elected in the fall semester.

The Chair notes that the bylaw amendments have been moved in omnibus. The Chair notes that individual amendments may be externalized for specific discussion. The Chair states that individual externalized amendments will be considered after discussion on the remaining amendments has elapsed.

A. Huntelar, General Equity Director, moves to externalize the Vice-President Advocacy amendments (Bylaws V.1, VIII, and XI.2).

José Wilson, UTMSU Representative, moves to externalize the Equity Collective amendments (Bylaws V.1.e, V.1.f.ix, VI.2.a.i, VII.6, and XI.5).

Andrew Sweeney moves to externalize the Removal from Office amendments (Bylaws X.2.c).

DISCUSSION ON REMAINING AMENDMENTS

Albert Hoang asks to whom the duties of Interim Chair and Interim President fall in the event that the President is unable to perform their duties.

Singh states that the Vice-President Internal takes up those roles in that case, and that an order of succession extending through various members of the Executive Committee is provided in the bylaws. Singh notes that this is a historical provision and is not a crucial policy to the operation of the UTSU.

Memmel clarifies further, noting that the specific powers afforded to the President as a signing authority of the UTSU cannot be delegated to other executives in the event of incapacitation.

Hoang asks for clarification on processes surrounding Board Directors' removal from office or abandonment of office. Hoang asks if the preceding bylaws regarding removal were enforced in past.

The Chair explains that in past, the removal of a Board Director from office required a motion moved by another Director. The Chair notes that as a result of this requirement, any such removal was not automatic. The Chair states that Directors had previously been removed from office in 2015 via the same bylaws.

J. Jones, Victoria College Director, asks about Directors' removal from office due to absences from committee meetings.

Singh states that the UTSU's governance structure is designed to empower Directors through their participation in committees over their participation at the general Board level. Singh states that knowing this, the committee attendance trigger for removal from office emphasizes that attendance at committee meetings is extremely important to the accountability and operation of the UTSU.

Jones raises a point of parliamentary inquiry and asks if amendment to bylaws are permissible.

The Chair responds that amendments of a smaller, procedural, and/or non-controversial nature will be entertained in the broader discussion, but affirms that amendments exceeding this limited scope will require an externalization.

MOTION TO AMEND

MOVED: J. JONES

SECONDED: Y. EL-SANYOURA

Be it resolved that Bylaw X.2.c be amended from:

“The director has failed to attend any three (3) meetings of a committee they sit on.”

to:

“The director has failed to attend any two (2) meetings without regrets of a committee they sit on.

DISCUSSION

Christina Badiola dissents from the proposed amendment. Badiola states that the original amendment, while harsh, was more appropriate because it held Directors accountable to the responsibilities of their offices.

Sweeney states that the amendment’s intention is fair. Sweeny additionally cautions that the amendment may weaken accountability measures.

Memmel notes that, due to the requirement that Directors place resignations onto the agenda, Directors have been reticent to tender fellow Directors’ resignations.

Huntelar declares support for the amendment. He reasons that some Directors may have legitimate reasons preventing their attendance at all meetings despite their intention to do so.

Carol Yeung, Professional Faculties at-large Director, states that as a student whose degree requirements include work obligations, this amendment is welcome because it would allow members in similar circumstances to continue their participation in balance against competing obligations.

CARRIED

Abstentions noted: C. Badiola

Mescon Sethi asks how many copies of the outdated bylaws were printed.

Singh states that 75 copies were printed.

REMAINING AMENDMENTS CARRIED

Externalized Bylaw Amendments

7.1. Amendments Pertaining to Vice-President Advocacy (Bylaws V.1, VIII, and XI.2)

DISCUSSION

Huntelar expresses concern that there was insufficient discussion had when the bylaws regarding the Vice-President Advocacy position were introduced to the Board. Huntelar asserts that the financial argument for removing an executive position is unsound because various other efficiencies may be sought to better distribute funds. Huntelar delivers examples: the “Miscellaneous Internal Expenses” line item alone is allocated \$30,000, and additionally, various dispensable expenses over other several line items collectively exceed the salary of an executive.

A. Boucher, Vice-President External, states that the amendments to remove the executive positions would harm students. Boucher asserts that the Vice-President External portfolio is expansive and notes that effective advocacy work requires close familiarity with the provincial and municipal governments. Boucher states that supplementing the portfolio with the responsibilities of the Vice-President University Affairs portfolio would overload the Vice-President Advocacy position.

Singh states that the UTSU Executive is currently the lowest paid student union Executive Committee in the country while also being the largest in number. Singh states that there is insufficient work to justify the number of executives in the UTSU. Singh states that downsizing the UTSU is necessary given the UTSU’s current and forecasted financial positions.

Kassandra Neranjan, Humanities Director, states that the Vice-President University Affairs portfolio has important aspects to it that may no longer be recognized with the elimination of the position.

Wilson states that Vice-Presidents are required to work between a minimum of 25 hours and a maximum of 40 hours per week. Wilson notes that the extent of the current Vice-President External portfolio causes it to regularly meet or exceed the maximum hours allotment. Wilson states that it is therefore likely that the proposed Vice-President Advocacy position will exceed the stipulated maximum hours allotment.

Mommel explains that introducing the Vice-President Advocacy in lieu of the Vice-President External and Vice-President University Affairs positions was part of an effort to balance the UTSU’s structural deficit while providing more opportunity to students. Mommel outlines a concern that the current executive structure, which prescribes the direct responsibility of executing advocacy work, is ineffective. Mommel envisions executives in roles where they instead fill a

managerial capacity, supervising and empowering associates and other hired students to pursue advocacy work.

Emmanuela Alimlim states that part of the rationale to downsize the UTSU is based on an incorrect assumption that student enrolment at the University of Toronto will be capped in the future. Alimlim emphasizes the importance of having a Vice-President University Affairs to advocate on issues such as tuition caps and international students' rights and support.

Spencer Robertson voices their opposition to the amendment based on the fact that the university's bureaucracy is difficult to manage. Robertson suggests that merging redundant clubs might be an effective way to find sought efficiencies.

Mabira states that the Vice-President University Affairs position is important to handle issues that affect the University's broad and diverse student body. Mabira states the importance of having a full-time advocate to work on such issues.

Fakry questions the necessity of continuously cutting services, especially since the UTSU's growth has stagnated. Fakry voices support for retaining the Vice-President University Affairs position due to the considerable extent of the portfolio.

Norton speaks in favor of the amendment. Norton asserts that the extreme financial situation of the UTSU requires budget cuts. Norton states that advocacy can only be effectively pursued when the UTSU functions on an operational basis. Norton notes that much critique of the UTSU has included concerns surrounding the duplication of services and other issues of redundancy, and that addressing these concerns demands measures like these.

Sonali Patel states that the change in executive structure would expand the scope of possible work for associates to include more advocacy initiatives. Patel notes that allowing more associates to participate in the UTSU's advocacy would be a valuable opportunity to increase engagement with the organization.

Alimlim asks clarification on the UTSU's hierarchy of priorities in the following areas: students, advocacy, and filling obligations such as the Student Commons.

Memmel asserts the necessary requirement that the UTSU exist in the first place, before it can pursue advocacy. Memmel notes that, taking into account both maintenance and operational costs, the Student Commons will incur a \$300,000 deficit in each year of its operation. Memmel asserts that the UTSU's financial forecast did not take account of the University of Toronto's "Towards 2030" plan, and that if the plan was enacted, the UTSU would become financially insolvent.

Huntelar relates some of the specifics of the Vice-President University Affairs and Vice-President External portfolios. Huntelar notes the exceptional present importance of having a dedicated government-focused advocate for the upcoming provincial election.

Wilson asserts that, given a trend of campus-based advocacy groups being pushed out of the conversation by the UTSU, it is unlikely that collaboration with or empowerment of these groups would be a feasible path to take in offsetting the inevitable impact of the proposed changes on the advocacy work of the

UTSU. Wilson states that as such, the proposed restructure of the Executive would result in a deficit in advocacy work outputted by the UTSU.

Mabira states that the previous four years of the UTSU's progress have followed a trend of downsizing. Mabira speculates that the UTSU has not been in a prosperous position in this period, and that therefore the output of the subject portfolios may have been underappreciated. Mabira adds that associates may have been delegated an insufficient workload.

Yeung asks if there is a contingency plan should this amendment fail.

Memmel states that failing the amendment will result in a deficit that the UTSU will have to bear forward. Memmel states that to offset it, additional revenue moving may need to be sought from operations in the Student Commons.

Aidan Swirsky speculates that new associates might be able to resolve some of the concerns with the new executive portfolio. Swirsky asks how associates compare to a fully-fledged VP position.

Memmel explains that associates can be hired on the basis of better particularized portfolios which clearly assign them to specific areas of advocacy. Memmel states that the cost of associates would be approximately half that of an executive.

Nish Chankar asks if the Vice-President University Affairs and Vice-President External portfolios could be demoted to part-time positions.

Memmel states that the Executive had previously considered this course, and that resulting consensus introduced a 25-hour-per-week minimum for all executives save the President and Vice-President Internal.

Alimlim objects that the present changes to the executive structure were not broached at a recent Accountability Café. Alimlim asks why the amendments were not raised at that time.

Singh states that the executive structure changes have been public for some time in previously released financial projections. Singh explains that Accountability Cafés are designed to accommodate operational questions arising from members, and that they are not used as a broadcasting medium to disseminate information widely.

Tamim Mansour states that the University of Toronto's "Towards 2030" plan is about changing the proportion of undergraduate versus graduate students, and not about changing the absolute number of students. Mansour asserts that the plan does not propose to cut undergraduate enrolment. Mansour notes that the plan includes a small increase to St. George campus enrolment.

Memmel states that the University has communicated its intention to increase undergraduate enrolment at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses to balance negative changes to enrolment at the St. George campus.

Hoang voices their support for the amendment. Hoang cites their experience as a serving divisional society president, and from that resource affirms that executive

positions are better structured as managerial in nature. Hoang asserts that the proposed amendments would help make the Vice-President Advocacy position more managerial where the Vice-President University Affairs and Vice-President External positions were not.

Singh attests to the incredible work delivered by the former Vice-President University Affairs and current Vice-President External in the present term and asserts that critique of the executives as ineffective is unfair. Singh confirms that, nevertheless, they continue to support the proposed amendments.

The Chair clarifies the consequences of the possible vote outcomes. The Chair notes that an affirmative vote will see the amendments enacted, and that a negative vote will preserve the bylaws in their unamended form, retaining the Vice-President University Affairs and Vice-President External Affairs positions.

FAILED

7.2. Motion to Extend Time

MOTION

MOVED: D. SINGH

SECONDED: A. ISMAIL-LADAK

Be it resolved that debate is extended for 30 minutes.

CARRIED

7.3. Amendments Pertaining to Equity Collectives (Bylaws V.1.e, V.1.f.ix, VI.a.i, VII.6, and XI.5)

DISCUSSION

Alimlim asks if Equity Collective Coordinators will have voting rights on the Board.

Alao states that the coordinators will not have voting rights. Alao notes that the General Equity Directors (GEDs), who fill similar a similar role at present, are not compensated for their work. Alao states that the new coordinator positions will be fairly compensated for their work.

Alimlim enumerates each of the GED positions. Alimlim asserts that removing these positions would contribute to the continued marginalization of students represented by the GEDs. Emmanuela emphasizes that the populations represented by the GEDs will lose representation in the UTSU.

Alao notes that the GEDs are currently hired by the Board. Alao asserts that replacing the GEDs with Equity Collective Coordinators would aid in ensuring that the respective communities can act in a coordinated and cooperative manner. Alao further asserts that the Collectives are structured to emphasize

tangible community and advocacy outcomes outside of the UTSU rather than circumscribe them to representation at the Board level.

Wilson indicates provisions within Bylaw I and Bylaw IV regarding advocacy on the behalf of marginalized populations. Wilson speculates that the proposed Collective structure might risk tokenizing its subject communities. Wilson states that the agency of affected marginalized populations would be reduced by the proposed amendments.

Jones speaks in favor of the amendments. Jones commends members on their tough questions and critical engagement. Jones explains that Alao consulted extensively with students and previous GEDs who indicated that these changes were well warranted. Jones notes that previous criticisms from GEDs pertaining to their positions emphasized insufficient compensation for their work. Jones highlights the importance of recognizing their work appropriately and motivating coordinators to act in a collective fashion.

The Chair notes that the Letters Patent of the UTSU explicitly forbid remuneration for Board Directors, hence the lack of compensation for GEDs and their work.

Nathoo revisits the particulars of Alao's consultation process. Nathoo emphasizes the tokenizing and exhausting nature of GED positions. Nathoo asserts that the emotional labour entailed in a GED's portfolio should warrant remuneration. Nathoo states that the Collective model allows for a more comprehensive and substantive voice to be heard, avoiding the difficulties that GEDs face in accurately representing the whole of their constituency.

Huntelar cites their current role as a GED and speaks in favor of the amendments. Huntelar states that GEDs are seldom capable of addressing all the needs of their respective marginalized populations, and much less so the even greater complexity of intersectional issues. Huntelar emphasizes that the Collectives will empower members to select amongst themselves a coordinator to drive their work.

Mabira inquires as to the process of hiring coordinators and how that process would encourage diversity amongst them.

Alao explains that coordinators are to be selected internally within the collective by virtue of an elections process. Alao states that the structure is bottom-up rather than top-down.

Mabira voices optimism for the Collective model but also lingering concern that refusing coordinators votes on the Board removes their representative populations' power.

Alao states that the Collectives will be able to address the Board by placing items on its meeting agendas. Alao notes that coordinators will additionally sit on the Equity Committee, allowing them access to the Board via resolutions passed at the committee level.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME

MOVED: J. Wilson

SECONDED: A. Ismail-Ladak

Be it resolved that debate is extended for 15 minutes.

CARRIED

Wilson states that even if GEDs do not have sufficient numbers to sway Board decisions, their voices are nonetheless valuable on the Board. Wilson asserts that seven voices on the Board are better than none.

Huntelar asks for clarification regarding the Letters Patent.

The Chair states that the Letters Patent are part of the UTSU incorporating documents that detail the corporation's purpose. The Chair states that the Letters Patent take precedence over all internal governing documents, including all bylaws and policies, but do not supersede the Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act nor other provincial or federal legislation.

G. Marshall, General Equity Director, voices their support for the amendments. Marshall notes that the current model makes it difficult to uphold the role fully and fails to ensure the accountability of GEDs. Marshall notes that the current hiring process limits the ability of interested members to deliver contributions. Marshall states that in a Collective model, the GED-equivalents would be more able to consult with their designated and intersecting communities. Marshall notes that GEDs currently vote at the Board according to how they intuitively feel, rather than according to any kind of consultation process.

Singh speaks in favor of the amendments. Singh notes that they contributed to the GED structure in 2015. Singh admits that the position has not manifested in the manner that was intended.

Amanda Sanchez Harvey states that a potential solution could be to allow the coordinators to vote on the Board.

Aiao states that providing coordinators voting rights is precluded by the Letters Patent, which forbid remuneration for Directors aside from the Executive.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME

MOVED: S. NATHOO

SECONDED: A. ISMAIL LADAK

Be it resolved that debate is extended for 10 minutes, with speaking time limited to one minute.

FAILED

CARRIED

7.4. Amendments Pertaining to Abandonment of Office (Bylaw X.2.c)

DISCUSSION

The Chair states that, due to time constraints, they will be calling the question on this item immediately. The Chair clarifies the consequences of the item's passage or failure.

CARRIED

8. Motions Submitted by Members

8.1. Motion on Autonomy

MOTION

MOVED: M. MEMMEL

SECONDED: D. SINGH

Be it resolved that the following be adopted as Bylaw XIX:

Bylaw XIX – Autonomy

1. The UTSU shall not become a member of any organization from which the UTSU would not be able to withdraw via a vote of the Board of Directors.
2. The UTSU shall not enter into any perpetual agreement that cannot be terminated by a vote of the Board of Directors.
3. Bylaw XIX shall not apply to actions taken prior to 30 October 2017.
4. No part of Bylaw XIX may be amended other than by a three-quarters majority (3/4) of members voting at a general meeting at which at least 10% of members are present, either in person or by proxy.

DISCUSSION

Memmel explains that the Bylaw amendment aims to ensure that principles of democratic and responsible governance are upheld by the Board.

Salma Fakhry asks if the amendment would affect any current services or service groups' Memoranda of Agreement.

Memmel states that the bylaw would not affect any services of the UTSU.

Mansour speaks in favour of the motion. Mansour expresses concern with subsection (4), citing the ten percent threshold as being potentially too onerous.

MOTION TO AMEND

MOVED: MANSOUR

SECONDED: CHENGYE

Be it resolved that the proposed Bylaw XIX.4 is amended from:

“No part of Bylaw XIX may be amended other than by a three-quarters majority (3/4) of members voting at a general meeting at which at least 10% of members are present, either in person or by proxy.”

to:

“No part of Bylaw XIX may be amended other than by a three-quarters majority (3/4) of members voting at a general meeting either in person or by proxy.”

DISCUSSION

Due to time constraints, the question is called by the Chair.

FAILED

CARRIED

9. Other Business (15 MINUTES)

No other business is brought.

10. Adjournment

MOTION

MOVED: D. SINGH

SECONDED: M. MEMMEL

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

DISCUSSION

CARRIED

The meeting adjourns at 10:02.