



Minutes of the
**University of Toronto Students' Union's
2018 Annual General Meeting**

**Tuesday, 30 October 2018 | 18:00
Walter Hall, 80 Queen's Park, Toronto M5S 2C5**

MINUTES

The Speaker explains the history and purpose of the Annual General Meeting, the basics of Robert's Rules, and the general order of the meeting including the location of accessible and gender neutral washrooms and the presence of photographers.

A Wasim, VP Equity, reads the land acknowledgement and the equity statement. Wasim identifies herself as the Anti-Harassment Officer for the duration of the meeting.

1. Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at 18:29.

2. Approval of Agenda (5 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: SINGH

BE IT RESOLVED that the agenda be approved as presented.

DISCUSSION

RESOLUTION TO AMEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RISING

SECONDED: ROBERTS

BE IT RESOLVED that item 10 be moved after item 4.

DISCUSSION

J. Rising states that the AGM is one of the few times throughout the year where students have a direct influence and democratic say in the direction of the UTSU. Member submitted resolutions are currently one of the last items on the agenda. Many students cannot stay for the duration of the meeting and often we cannot get to the end of the agenda. It is detrimental to the democracy of the UTSU if we do not get to these resolutions, especially considering that this year Rob Ford has attacked our democratic right to protest on campus. Rising states that there could be serious repercussions for democracy on campus if the meeting does not get to this resolution

D. Singh speaks against this motion, states that the motion to approve the audited financial statements and appoint the auditors for the next year are important. Singh states that he appreciates that some students cannot stay for the duration of the meeting, however this is the last day to approve the audit. Singh clarifies that the Canadian Not-for-profit Corporations Act



requires organizations to approve their audited financial statements within 6 months of the end of the fiscal year. Singh states that If we move these discussion items before the auditor items, the UTSU would be in violation of its own bylaws and the law, namely the Canadian Not-for-profit Corporations Act that governs the UTSU's existence. Singh states that it is prudent that members have an opportunity to discuss submitted items, but it is also prudent members at least have the opportunity to look at the financial statements, look at the financial health of the UTSU, and to abide by the law and bylaws.

S. Robertson calls a point of order, clarifying that Rob Ford is a corpse, and that Rising likely meant Doug Ford when referencing Item 10.1.

A. Abdullah, UTMSU Vice President, External speaks against the motion, because the motion after pertains to UTMSU-UTSU separation. UTMSU brought a delegation, and this could potentially be the last UTSU AGM that these members attend. Abdullah adds that UTMSU students cannot stay late, and if the agenda is amended then they may not be able to stay until the motion which is important to UTM students.

T. Biswurm, Vice President, Operations notes that this is the first AGM where students can register any time during the event rather than mandating attendance for the entire duration. Special efforts have been made for members for the latter half of the AGM, should members deem some items to be more important than others.

FAILED

CARRIED

3. Approval of the 2017 AGM Minutes (10 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

MOVED: GRANGER

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes for the 2017 Annual General Meeting be approved as presented in the appendices.

No discussion.

CARRIED

4. Presidential Address and Executive Question Period (40 mins)

DISCUSSION

MOVED: BOUCHER

SECONDED: GRANGER

A. Boucher, President, welcomes members to the meeting and delivers the presidential address:

"Good evening, and welcome to the UTSU's annual general meeting. My name is Anne Boucher, and I am the President for the remainder of the 2018-19 term.

First off, thank you all for coming. This is going to be a long meeting, so I appreciate the time you've all set aside to be here. Now I'm not going to talk for the sake of hearing my voice. I know some of you may be keen on asking our executives some questions, and all seven of us are here today and happy to answer them. I do, however, have a few words and thoughts I would like to share.

I think today, for the first time in a while, I can report that the UTSU is not putting out any fires. We're financially on track, we're maintaining good, healthy relationships with campus partners, and we've been successful in pursuing the needs that our students face through both our advocacy work, and services.



Now, we're in a state of growth. Thanks to the dedicated effort of the last couple of years, we have the foundation necessary to grow as an organization to better serve our members. That's not to say that we're now in a perfect state--there's still some work to be done, but we're almost there. We're able, finally, to move the organization in a new direction, and we are committed to doing so.

Now I know for a lot of you, this is your first AGM. Your first interaction with us might have been as early as September, maybe it was the year prior, or maybe you're in your fourth year. But whether you're in your first year or your last, everyone shares one commonality: what we know about the UTSU is limited to the time we've spent along it.

From year to year, bits and pieces get lost. Executives switch over, new ones take over, and first thing you know you have no idea why certain changes were made, or that any changes were made to begin with. Your baseline is set according to what you experience. And your baseline, four years from now, will be forgotten.

I'm in my sixth year now on this campus. Even then there are many things about this organization I don't know about, or of which I only know the broad strokes. It's unfortunately an inherent problem with these types of organizations, who see a yearly turnover.

Surely, you know about the U-Pass proposal, and maybe some staff layoffs. These are all relatively recent. So I want to tell, or remind you of the times when the UTSU wasn't always there to work in your best interest.

You probably don't know about a time, just around 3-4 years ago, when non-UTSU members, students who didn't even go to U of T were bussed to the St. George campus to campaign for incumbent candidates, leaving fresh faces at a huge disadvantage. It was at a time when voting was by paper ballots, and these campaigners would be seen coercing passersby to vote for specific, incumbent candidates, using intimidation tactics.

You probably don't know about a time when the bylaws, the policies, the UTMSU agreement, the collective agreement, the Student Commons agreement, and even meeting minutes were all "confidential" and not accessible by members. The UTSU said that, if meeting minutes were publicly available, the university would be able to "spy" on the UTSU. Some of these documents weren't published until 2016.

You probably don't know about a time when directors were told that they weren't legally allowed to criticize or disagree with the UTSU or the executives. This only goes back a few years.

You probably don't know about a time, in just 2013, when college and faculty student societies were so fed up with the UTSU that they ran referendums to decertify from the UTSU, and--get this--the referendums passed. Overwhelmingly. 95% of engineer students, to name one, voted in favour of leaving.

Behind us are years of the UTSU not listening to its constituents, years of financial mismanagement, years of UTSU playing politics, and years of UTSU playing as a mouthpiece to one of the most vile advocacy organizations in the country.

The point is, I don't want these facts to be forgotten, carried with those who graduate. It might seem strange that I'm speaking ill of some of the actions of the organization I'm sitting here representing, but the reality is: these things can happen again. Organizations that get built up can always be brought down. Keeping the UTSU's--and your--best interest in mind, I owe it to the membership, the board, and the Executive to remind you of what once was, and what could always be.

I want to clarify--I'm not trying to make us out to look like we're "so much better in comparison". The UTSU should never compare itself to bad examples. We should strive to be the best UTSU possible in absolute terms, rather than relative ones. The UTSU now still isn't perfect--we still make mistakes, we sometimes don't navigate new situations as smoothly as we could, and-- meeting minutes have at times been posted late. But, the UTSU now is finally caring about the right things.

We've proven this past year that the UTSU can be effective in its advocacy work, and can be a voice for its students without external assistance. We've proven that we can be effective. And, we're working to



prove now that the UTSU is not just looking out for its own self-interest, but for its membership..that we are students, who are working because we genuinely care about you. While there are times when the UTSU will need to look internally--you might see some of this tonight--know that this will always be done in order to promote an organization that is able to serve its members as well it possibly can.

The UTSU will constantly be learning, and constantly improving--so long as my successors abide by our core principles and values.

If there is one takeaway I want to leave you with, it is the reminder that the UTSU is, like everyone in this room, a living, breathing body that is not just capable of change, but constantly undergoing it. The vehicle of change for the UTSU is you - your actions and advocacy, your continual demands that the organization stay true to its core value of helping students, and your ability, like the UTSU's, to learn, adapt, and grow."

The Speaker calls for questions to be asked to any executives.

T. Riches states that many of the proposed changes to the Bylaws get rid of commissions. The roles of the commissions are to be carried out by equity collectives and board groups. Asks how this decision was made and how students will be able to get involved with commissions gone.

Boucher responds that the rationale behind getting rid of commissions is that they don't work. Commission meetings every month with only a few people showing up. On paper they looked good but in practice it did not work.

J. Bowman states that when running for the UTSU a lot of executives ran on the promise of holding a referendum on the membership with CFS. In the past years there have not been enough signatures. Pay around \$700,000 to the organization and do not take advantage of services. Asks if there are efforts to collect signatures and if they are willing to fix from the inside.

Boucher responds that the efforts to fix the CFS from the inside has been underway. Boucher attended all meetings and pushed for changes, was consistently shut down and it was made clear there was no intention to change. CFS is trying to prevent them from attending the next AGM. Collection for You Decide signatures is currently active, there is still an effort to decertify.

Biswurm adds that \$842,089.00 is the exact amount of money of student fees paid to CFS.

Bowman asks Boucher to elaborate on what she means with efforts not being as visible. He asks if there people on campus right now collecting signatures?

Boucher defers to Y. Liu. Says there are students on campus collecting signatures, whether or not the UTSU is active in collecting signatures, which has not been the case, there are signatures being collected by the membership.

Granger states that he is an Innis College Director. He asks about dumpster fires and the Student Commons.

Biswurm states that Student Commons is a new six-floor student centre being opened in 2019. Delays mean the initial opening date was 2 months ago. The first delay was up until January 2019. The additional update is that the university and contractor that the delay has been pushed to April 2019. Firstly, from the UTSU perspective a lot of this is out of the UTSU's hands, it is a lease from the University - we occupy and manage it but the University owns it. In terms of direct ownership of the renovation project the UTSU has none. To explain why delays have happened, the student commons is in a building that is over 100 years old. The delays have been covered in *The Varsity*. Old buildings bring a number of challenges, documents are lost, unexpected challenges come up. To lend some security to the new open date April 2019, for the first time the UTSU have contacted a separate consultant to verify the open date and they confirmed it is a reasonable open date.

M. Hönig is here on behalf of New College Student Council. Hönig says one concern consistently brought up is the lack of preparedness for the tri-campus parade in orientation. Many students experienced heat exhaustion due to inadequate supply of water. There were water stations promised



along the route that were not present. Anne sent an apology. Hönig asks how this happened and how safety of students can be ensured at UTSU orientation events. The lack of water was unacceptable.

Y. Alfaro, VP Student Life, is responsible for supervising orientation along with the President and VP Operations. She agrees they were not prepared for the heat on parade day. She did confirm with OCs of each division the allocation of emergency water bottles which each division confirmed. The UTSU will ensure in the future there are specific contingency plans laid out for events in the future, this is in the transition report for next year.

Hönig adds on behalf of the New College OC team, New College was not given enough water and New College is the largest college. New students had to pay personally for water in Shoppers for students' safety. She hopes the UTSU understands the impression this leaves on incoming students, that the safety and wellbeing of students was not accounted for.

Biswurm adds that concrete action moving forward is considering a temporary and specific lift on the ban of disposable water bottles on campus for the parade. U of T is proud of having a ban on disposable water bottles. The UTSU provide thousands of reusable water bottles, this year was unexpectedly hot. The UTSU are exploring speaking to the office of the Vice-Provost, Students to purchase disposable water bottles which are the only efficient means of providing large amounts of water.

S. Ma, New College Director, asks about the Student Commons. She asks, which service groups have been promised a space and if they been updated about delays.

Boucher let all levy groups know about delays, even those without a space in the Commons. U Turn, SEC, Students for Barrier-Free Access, LGBTQOut and perhaps another. All of them were made aware. The UTSU has negotiated with the University to make sure levy groups still have a space until it opens.

T. Yun states that The Newspaper has reported that they were guaranteed a space in the Commons which was taken away by the union. Their home on McCaul is closed, they are homeless, he asks the President to speak about that.

Boucher defers to former President M. Memmel.

M. Memmel replies that The Newspaper was initially promised space, after consideration of the financial status of the building and the Newspaper's status as a student group, which they are not and never have been. The UTSU decided to prioritize student groups, not those who claim affiliation. The newspaper did not publish terribly many issues last year, he is not sure if they are operating or not.

J. Moore asks if following the UPass referendum, more efforts have been pursued to improve access to public transit at U of T..

Boucher states that UPass specifically is not being pursued, it is clear students want something cheaper. Any future negotiations would need to find a price students are happy with.

Y. Liu, VP External Affairs, states that UPass is controversial. Students are concerned about the city's transit system. She has engaged in working with government to look at new plans for the city. Would like to take the opportunity to invite those interested to meet every Thursday or email her.

Moore follows up, clarifying that current efforts are in consultation phase with no tangible plans.

Liu responds she is working with groups related to transit system to find a better system in large scale. She believes this needs to be addressed alongside housing concerns.

Bowman returns to YouDecide. He recalls he used to see them everywhere on campus and now does not. He asks if Blue Crew is involved or if the UTSU is paying anyone to collect signatures.

Boucher responds Blue Crew is not being used, UTSU members have been collecting signatures but are not being paid.



C. Yang, Division III UTMSU board member, asks the President where the UTSU stands on the Mandated Leave of Absence Policy. Almost all members were opposed at the board meeting, she asks why the UTSU did not show up to the protest.

Boucher defers to J. Grondin, she states the UTSU did have a presence at the protest and at Governing Council. There has been an active effort made.

J. Grondin, VP University Affairs, states that he has been part of discussions around the Leave policy since last year. The UTSU did not have a strong presence at the rally, they decided to take a role at the UA Board and Academic Board and Governing Council and speak at meetings. They found a lot was already decided by the administration. They turned instead to long term strategy, aiming to make sure students were not put in review situations in the first place, and to provide support. They put together student guide provided to divisions to keep students aware of policy and how it would affect them. They were not able to influence the policy.

Yang follows up asking if the UTSU is taking a stance against the MLAP or if it is remaining neutral..

Boucher states UTSU is against the policy, there are statements available on the website and social media. She wants the UTSU to be proactive, regardless of whether policy passes or not they want members to be in the best position possible and to provide resources for members.

H. Hassaan, President of the Arts and Science Student's Union asks about the termination of the contract of the former General Manager. He adds the GM is the adult in the room, signing cheques, approving hours and making sure things get done. He asks who is taking on this role since the post has been vacant since June.

Boucher responds that the UTSU has not had a GM since mid-July. They are currently in the process of hiring one. In terms of day-to-day there are some gaps observed, a lot of the role is absorbed by Tyler and herself. She is looking forward to having GM to fill the role. The UTSU has contracted an individual to do day-to-day finances and make sure people get paid.

Hassaan asks who is making financial decisions, what company has been contracted..

Boucher says the person filling the role is Mathias Memmel. He is incorporated. She wants to give rationale and to discourage conspiracies. Memmel has had 3 years of experience with the organization, beyond her own and Biswurm's experience. Memmel is a good resource and is important to the sustainability for the organization. She sees no problem with that. Memmel keeps a respectful distance from the operations of the organization and its direction and politics. He works exclusively in the day-to-day and she feels it is unfair to presume the presence of a past executive is worth discussing.

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: GRANGER

SECONDED: MEMMEL

BE IT RESOLVED that the debate/discussion/item/meeting be extended by 15 minutes to a total of 55 minutes.

No discussion.

CARRIED

Abdullah, UTMSU, discusses the Mandated Leave of Absence Policy. He thanks Grondin for his work and support in the campus response. He states there was no active participation from UTSU. All student unions across UofT had a committee which the UTSU declined to show up to. At Governing Council Grondin did speak up, but other than that there was no UTSU support.

Boucher responds that she appreciates the work done by other unions including UTMSU, APUS, SCSU. She states that the UTSU approached the issue differently. Issues depend on an executive's portfolio,



this was delegated to Grondin who did a great job. The entire exec wasn't there but there was a UTSU presence. It is the way they do things at the UTSU.

Granger prefaces by thanking the executives for tolerating him this year. Granger asks if the CFS is forcefully icing the UTSU out and, regarding Memmel, he asks if it is appropriate to for the President to hire her former boss in a vacancy she created.

Boucher asks Granger to clarify his second question.

Granger states Memmel is contracted out as financial coordinator. The UTSU used to have a financial coordinator. Is it appropriate given you worked under him.

Boucher states he is not fulfilling the role of the financial coordinator. He is doing basic day-to-day payment and making sure the Union does not go broke. In terms of dynamic, given the role he has in the organization, doing day-to-day finances and overseeing the Student Commons project, he is very removed from the President's and the executive's day to day work. There is no overlap or problem with the dynamic.

Granger asks Boucher to address his first question.

Boucher states that in terms of the CFS icing us out, they do it every year. They do not send the proper notices to the proper people. This year they sent notice to the wrong executives. It is very clear they do not want the UTSU present at the meetings, the UTSU delegates are the ones who ask the hard questions and criticise them. We are kept out of the mail list.

M. Taylor states that in the Facebook group U of T Memes for True Blue Teens, Moderator Arjun Kaul has posted the true blue bracket. Currently Victoria College is against The Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering in the semi-finals. Would the execs care to endorse a college, after the UTSU was defeated by University College in the first round?

Boucher states that this is a divisive issue within the Executive. There is not an official UTSU take on the war. Her heart is in engineering, but perhaps other Executives could speak to their positions.

S. Robertson asks if the UTSU executives will endorse podiums because they are a product you can stand behind.

Boucher says they will have to discuss this as a team.

S. Roberston is disappointed.

The Speaker calls for decorum.

D. Ramanujam asks who handles Human Resources concerns in the absence of a General Manager.

Biswurm states that the responsibility falls to the VP Operations and President, the other members of the management committee.

D. Ramanujam asks, if an employee has a concern about payment for example, if it is not a conflict of interest.

Biswurm says this is the default arrangement in any employment. The boss telling you how to do your job is the one signing the paychecks.

Ramanujam states if there are concerns about an unfair or unsafe working environment, employees might not feel comfortable bringing it up to the executives in the absence of a dedicated manager.

Biswurm admits this is one of the gaps felt with a vacancy in the General Manager position. This aspect of the role has suffered. There is a rigorous process to hire a new GM.

What is the earliest date a GM can be hired.



Biswurm states they are aiming for mid-November

5. Receipt of Audited Financial Statements (30 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: SINGH

BE IT RESOLVED that the audited financial statements for the 2017-2018 fiscal year be approved as presented in the appendices.

DISCUSSION

Biswurm asks members to look at the financial statements. Notes they are prepared by management and conducted by Sloane & Partners LLP. Biswurm states that previously, Yale & Partners LLP had audited the UTSU for nearly a decade. States that over time auditors become familiar with finances and it was good practice to switch auditors to Sloane. Biswurm states that the UTSU is running a surplus of \$492,887. Attributes this to layoffs of the Clubs & Services and Health & Dental Plan coordinators. And to prepare for Student COMmons, largest financial undertaking the UTSU has had ever. Notes repatriation of restricted fees to UTSU operational revenues. States that on page 13, fees that went to Hot Yam something was repatriated to the UTSU as the levy group is now defunct. They are now used by the UTSU for similar programming to Hot Yam. The UTSU is also now investing \$80,000.

T. Yun asks for clarification the investment policy, is there ethical investments?

Biswurm responds that the UTSU banks with Alterna. All investments the UTSU has pursued have been through Alterna called GIC, which are very safe investment portfolios with admittedly low returns that pad the UTSU surplus a little.

Yun asks about the VP Advocacy position proposal that failed at the last AGM. Memmel stated last year if this position didn't pass the UTSU would be looking at a deficit, is this still the projection given it did not pass?

Biswurm yields the floor to D. Singh.

Singh, former VP Internal, answers that the membership voted down the merger for the VP Advocacy position, and that they made cuts in other places where they were necessary.

Biswurm notes that members interested in examining the surpluses or deficits can consult financial documents.

The Speaker calls for a vote on the reception of the audited financial statements.

CARRIED

6. Appointment of Auditors (10 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: MA

BE IT RESOLVED that _____ be appointed as the external auditors for the University of Toronto Students' Union for the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

DISCUSSION

RESOLUTION To AMEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: BOUCHER



BE IT RESOLVED that Sloane & Partners LLP be appointed as the external auditors for the University of Toronto Students' Union for the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

DISCUSSION

Biswurm states that it is common practice to keep the same auditors for some years and change them on a rolling basis.

CARRIED

CARRIED

7. Bylaw and Elections Procedure Code Changes (60 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: MA

BE IT RESOLVED that all changes to the Bylaws and Elections Procedure Code approved by the Board of Directors since the 2017 Annual General Meeting be approved as presented in the appendices.

DISCUSSION

Biswurm states that a number of these changes were forwarded by last years executives. Biswurm states that the current executives are familiar with them and can explain rationale.

The Speaker says if you wish to debate a particular amendment move to externalize it, discussed after the discussion on the motions presented in omnibus.

Riches asks to externalize 6.1.r and 6.1.v2 in the Elections Procedures Code regarding slates.

RESOLUTION To AMEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: GRANGER

BE IT RESOLVED that the following items be externalized: Elections and Procedures Code Article 6.1.r and 6.1.v2.

CARRIED

CARRIED

7.2 Elections and Procedures Code Sections 6.1.R and 6.1.V2

DISCUSSION

Granger asks regarding future elections. Considering student commons is opening in April, that leaves the next Board and executive the moving process. On top of that there are some concerns what an arms length campaigner is. Granger asks in the event that someone's friend campaigns for two people if they will be considered arms length campaigners.

The Speaker clarifies Appellate Board rulings 20 and 22.

Singh provides background. UTSU elections have in the past allowed teams of campaigns to run in a slate. The motion is not allowing these teams to run as teams in elections. Singh states that they found last year and the year prior that students dislike the toxic nature of UTSU elections. In addition, the same lineage of people for the past five or so years have run and been elected. Last years executive voted to remove it, following suit with universities such as SSMU at McGill and the UBC AMS, who have more substantive debates and better turn out. There is a



ton of precedent, the UTSU has a 'supreme court' of law and students called the Appellate Board with a ton of precedence. Singh states this is not the time to hash it out, it is a discussion for the people leading the organization.

Memmel states that when the slate ban was introduced one of the goals was that the slates were one of the most popular topics to hate among students. Students year after year are frustrated because the culture around slates is very insular around circles of friends who recruit their buddies. Some might say the problem is not slates in general its the slates that involve exec and board but exec only slate isn't bad. He believes all-executive slates are worse, when the board is involved the executives have to be representative of diverse backgrounds of students. When you take away this reality you allow friends to co-opt the UTSU as a personal toy. This happened at UBC and McGill before they banned slates. This is good for the university and health of the campus.

Boucher states that she ran as an independent once and on a slate once, experienced both. There are pros and cons to both. Pros of slates is that it simplifies the process, you know these people will work well together. The cons are that while an executive might work together well a campaign is very different from day to day operations. Looking back a few years there has been infighting among people who ran on the same slate. The clear and simplified set of ideas are easy to digest but do not offer the voter the opportunity to get thorough answers. If you ask a slate candidate a question you will always get a slate answer that is prepared in advance. People will not fully tell you why they want to run and what they want to do in order to give the slate answer. No slates allows the voter to discern who is reasonable and has good ideas. Another issue is that independents are very intimidated by slates, their chances are much lower than slates, this makes elections less accessible.

Robertson states that he ran elections last year. Says slates are not the greatest. The reality is not being on a slate you do not have to speak for the team, can be an individual and not tiptoe around things to appear the slate has a solid foundation.

Eaton states that as someone new to U of T, slates make voting easy because if you like the ideas of a slate you don't need to know everyone's names. Will this impact voter turnout and how will the decrease in voter turnout be mitigated? Yields remainder of time to Boucher

Boucher says easy voting is not necessarily the best way to go if it means voters are not informed and cannot know the true stances of candidates. Boucher believes removing slates will increase voter turnout, slates make people feel disenfranchised. Removing slates might reinvigorate UTSU elections.

Biswurm states that this question is very theoretical. This will be the first year without slates, we have no evidence right now other than the experiences of other campuses and the negatives of slates. Changing things with the hope of making them better is better than leaving things the way they are when you know they are bad.

Singh clarifies a vote in favour is a vote in favour of banning slates, a vote against the item is a vote in favour of retaining slates.

T Mackenzie asks what granular things will be done to boost turnout in acknowledgement that this might have an impact on turnout.

Boucher responds that tangible ideas are not available, as this is still in the planning stages. The intention going back to last year when things were uncontested, the strategy used in the past to promote elections has not worked well.

CARRIED

8. Endorsement of the Separation of the UTSU and UTMSU (30 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: MA



WHEREAS the University of Toronto Students' Union (the "UTSU") and the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (the "UTMSU") entered into an Associate Membership Agreement (the "AMA") on the 30th of April, 2018; and

WHEREAS the respective Boards and Executive Committees of each union have exercised due diligence in considering, and have commenced the execution of the necessary legal, governance, and operational procedures to effect a smooth separation of the UTSU and UTMSU; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED that the severance of legal relations between the University of Toronto Students' Union and the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, as carried out thus far and as planned henceforth, be endorsed.

DISCUSSION

Biswurm cedes his time to Boucher.

Boucher explains the the UTSU and UTMSU signed the AMA in 2008, which is available at utsu.ca/financials. It means that the UTSU represents both St. George and Mississauga students, the Health and Dental plan includes both, advocacy work is on behalf of both campuses. Essentially while the UTMSU is an independent organization, the AMA states that the UTMSU functions almost as a subsidiary of the UTSU. The UTSU remits student fees to the UTMSU. Boucher says there are issues with the agreement. Boucher says the UTMSU should have the right to represent its membership fully, and that the UTSU has been doing its due diligence, but UTMSU offers being there on UTM campus. Boucher uses the SCSU-UTSU relationship as an example. The SCSU and UTSU separated in 2004. Boucher states that another issue is that the AMA was signed on April 30, and that this essentially means that two people on their last days of work decided to bind the organizations together with no student consultations. Boucher further states that the AMA does not work because the organizations are much different than they were 10 years ago.

The Speaker notes a typo in the resolution, noting that the AMA was signed on 30th of April, 2008, not 2018.

Granger states that the negotiations committee has worked with the UTMSU to finally terminate the agreement. Notes that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the membership need to vote in favour of the motion for it to pass, and notes that both the UTSU and UTMSU want this.

Abdullah states that the UTSU does not represent UTM students as an essential body. At its highest point, the AMA was a great way for students to come together to run health and dental plan because there is strength in numbers. Notes that it has become a begrudging relationship. UTM students do not stand to benefit from a partnership with the AMA. Ever since the termination of the Health and Dental coordinator, UTM students service quality has dropped. Notes that there is division in politics on campus, but some issues bring students together. Notes that the MLAP was ill-received on campus, across all campuses. Abdullah thanks Grondin for helping with the UTMSU fighting the MLAP. Abdullah says the UTSU did not meet with the UTMSU. Urges members to vote in favour of the motion.

Robertson speaks in favour of the motion. Says that "mom and dad want to get out of the relationship" and that the membership should vote in favour. States this is not a complicated matter because both parties want it.

Singh notes that since this motion is an endorsement, it requires a simple majority to pass and asks for a ruling from the Speaker. The Speaker rules that a $\frac{3}{4}$ in favour vote is required.

RESOLUTION TO CHALLENGE THE SPEAKER

RESOLUTION

MOVED: SINGH

SINGH CHALLENGES THE SPEAKER'S RULING IN FAVOUR OF A $\frac{3}{4}$ VOTE THRESHOLD.

DISCUSSION



Moore asks whether the outcome of the motion has any affect on the separation itself.

The Speaker answers that it would be preferable to have the vote pass.

Moore asks whether the motion is binding.

Boucher states that it is binding. Boucher encourages going with the $\frac{3}{4}$ majority.

Mommel states that when an agreement is made between parties, such as the AMA, the parties could change the termination procedures themselves. Mommel asks for clarification on the process of termination, as this vote is not to terminate the agreement but to endorse the termination which will be carried out by the two organizations by amending the agreement.

Boucher states that the language of the AMA was checked by legal council, and that the language is in line with the separation between the two organizations.

The Speaker states that the exact text of the AMA is that by a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote in favour of terminating the agreement, one of which is a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote in favour at a meeting between the UTSU and UTMSU board.

Granger is confused. Asks for clarification on the amendment of the AMA whether it can be amended and in the same breath be terminated. Yields time to Boucher.

Boucher states that the AMA has not been changed at all.

Rehman, from The Varsity, asks what the consequences of terminating the agreement are. Asks what happens to UTM students and the Health and Dental Plan.

Biswurm states that most of the burden of arranging the course of action following termination lies with the UTMSU. The idea would be to have the termination agreement say that UTM students stay in the same Health and Dental Plan until 30 August 2019.

Rehman asks whether the original resolution is simply an endorsement of the separation or the actual termination.

The Speaker clarifies that they are currently in the motion to overrule the Speaker, but the original motion is an endorsement.

Bowman calls the question.

FAILED

The Speaker clarifies the voting threshold will remain at $\frac{3}{4}$. Returns debate the the main motion.

Shafiq asks the UTMSU executive what will happen to services that were previously the UTSU's to translate to the UTMSU if the motion passes, what does the UTMSU foresee the relationship with the UTSU being after termination, especially with regards to the MLAP.

Abdullah states that the only services the UTSU provides to UTM students is the Health and Dental Plan. The UTMSU would move forward with its own Health and Dental plan. Do not need a contract to work together, mentions that APUS, GSU, and UTMSU made a partnership to fight the MLAP. It is very possible to work together without an AMA.

CARRIED

9. Meeting Recess *(10 mins)*

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BOUCHER

SECONDED: BISWURM



BE IT RESOLVED that the assembly enter recess for ten (10) minutes.

CARRIED

The meeting recess begins at 20:26.

The meeting is called to order at 20:44.

10. Items Submitted by Members (50 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BISWURM

SECONDED: MA

BE IT RESOLVED that the following items of special business, as submitted by members of the University of Toronto Students' Union, be each and severally considered at the union's 2018 Annual General Meeting:

1. a resolution titled "Resolution to Reject Ford's Attack on Free Speech",
2. a resolution titled "Policy Proposals at the UTSU Annual General Meeting",
3. a discussion item titled "Amending Article VI(1)(r) of the Elections Procedure Code",
4. a discussion item titled "Review of Certain Orientation and Executive Committee Policies",
5. a discussion item titled "Updating the UTSU Conflict of Interest Policy – 2018 Review",
6. a discussion item titled "Schedule B of Charter of Referenda – 2018 Review", and
7. a discussion item titled "Affiliated Student Societies and Service Groups Policy".

The Speaker explains why there are discussion items that look like policy amendments, will be addressed further in 10.2 but in general the UTSU bylaws and rules say policy amendments cannot be proposed at an AGM however this time we are providing an opportunity to debate policy amendments. Once debate concludes the policies will go to UTSU Governance Committee. Results of discussions are not binding, no substantive votes on those policies.

CARRIED

10.1 Resolution to Reject Ford's Attack on Free Speech (10 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RISING

SECONDED: MA

WHEREAS Doug Ford has directed Ontario universities and colleges to adopt an Orwellian "free speech" policy or face funding cuts; and

WHEREAS this policy is based on the University of Chicago statement which prohibits "ongoing disruptive protesting". But such vague criteria leaves the road open to prohibit all protests. Who decides what period is too long? Who decides how big a protest can become before it becomes "disruptive"?; and

WHEREAS this policy would require schools to police protests on campus and potentially threaten students and student groups with disciplinary measures; and

WHEREAS this policy will provide a police-protected "safe space" to anti-abortionists holding obscene displays, alt-right racists, and those denying the Holocaust; and

WHEREAS this policy is a direct attack on the time-honoured tradition of civil disobedience on campus; **NOW, THEREFORE,**



BE IT RESOLVED that the UTSU go on record as opposing the Ontario government's anti-democratic "free speech on campus" mandate, and refuse to participate in its implementation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU demand that the U of T administration also refuse to implement any policy that may restrict the right to protest, especially those referencing the University of Chicago statement, which itself violates free speech rights.

DISCUSSION

Rising states that the resolution is self explanatory. Doug Ford has directed Ontario universities and colleges to adopt a 'free speech' policy that infringes on the right to protest. Freedom of speech excludes state repression, not anger of people. Rising states that this infringes on the democratic right to assemble, wants to pressure university to do the same.

Boucher offers a point of clarification. University has had a free speech policy since 1992. Getting in touch with university to double check, the University would not be required to make substantive amendments to what is in place. The university has a clause about disruption in protest, it is a right owed to students and a right that cannot be lost.

Granger if endorsing the resolution would put the union in legal jeopardy since University has a policy that conforms to this law since it says we "must oppose" the policy, potentially conflicting with the law and the university. This is a strong statement that could put the UTSU in another lawsuit.

D. Roberts, Co-President of Anthropology Students Association and a member of Socialist Fight Back on campus states that on 30 August 2018, Premier Ford said he would enforce a free speech policy on all universities and colleges. This means Ford is defending free speech of right wing friends, stripping it away from students and workers. If universities do not comply their funding will be cut. Ford is criminalizing the right to protest, this will remove funding and recognition from student unions, result in clubs that are hateful, and discipline or expel individual students. Freedom of speech doesn't equate freedom from consequences. We do not want to hear hateful rhetoric. Countless examples of hate acts. Some of the most memorable events in Canadian history won the rights we take for granted. Winnipeg strike that helped women get the vote. 1970 women from all over the country marched on Ottawa winning reproductive rights. Protests are disruptive, we must defend this constitutional right.

Rising states this is not a law in parliament, there would be no legal repercussions in voting for this, but we could be defunded for not supporting or complying with it. University has a free speech policy, haven't had clear communication from University if they will change it to comply with Ford.

Shafiq thinks this is an important topic to be discussed. Adds that when thinking about this issue must consider the consequences of adopting this position. Strong moral reason to do so but given the possibility of defunding we should be well equipped and ready for any opposition from the ford government if the motion passed.

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: MOORE

SECONDED: RICHES

BE IT RESOLVED that the debate/discussion/item/meeting be extended by ten minutes.

CARRIED

Memmel speaks in favour. There are times when political organizations like the UTSU have a responsibility in these circumstances to say no to things that oppress members. In this case what the Tory government in Ontario is doing going with the intention of silencing



marginalized voices. UTSU openly encourages and allows dissent at meetings and it is important we say no to bigotry and it is better the organization fights this through a human rights complaint rather than be on the wrong side of history.

Moore questions the wording of the motion, asks for clarification regarding the term "Orwellian".

Rising says Orwellian says it is a free speech policy when in reality it bars free speech. It is not free speech to bar the right to assemble.

Moore suggests switching the word "Orwellian" for contradictory or hypocritical. Further, the second paragraph phrases the whereas statement are distracting. Fourth paragraph lists three different types of hate speech groups, would add an 'etc.'

Bowman speaks in response to fear of legal jeopardy. States he is on the ASSU and they put out a statement.

RESOLUTION To AMEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: SADIQ

BE IT RESOLVED that the resolution be amended to strike the second operative clause "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU demand that the U of T administration also refuse to implement any policy that may restrict the right to protest, especially those referencing the University of Chicago statement, which itself violates free speech rights."

DISCUSSION

Biswurm states this is conjecture, we do not know what the law will become. Ford often makes statements with nothing to back it up. Not to say he opposes it but wants discussion to be cognisant of the reality that we do not know what it will look like. Perhaps more prudent to condition action on certain things (if the law does this we will do this)

Rising does not see the point of it, why not pressure the University to not obey this anti-democratic policy.

Biswurm states that in his view the consequences of legal jeopardy is that this is an assessment of values. Is this issue of ideals important enough to put the organization at risk of being defunded. Part of the rejection of this policy is that Doug Ford is holding universities hostage by promising or withholding fees. If it is the case that our action contributes to withholding fees we have taken a moral position that robs students of material benefits they otherwise would have access to.

Bowman states that working hard does not compel admin to act in accordance. As a utsu member would rather they put something out than nothing.

J. Kao, The Varsity's News Editor, asks whether putting out a statement would mean the UTSU is going against the university's existing free speech policy.

Boucher asks the mover to clarify the intention of the motion.

Rising states that the idea that any new policy that is in line of Ford's description of the policy which outlines Chicago disruptive process should be opposed.

CARRIED

RESOLUTION To EXTEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: SADIQ

SECONDED: SADIQ



BE IT RESOLVED that the debate/discussion/item/meeting be extended by 7 minutes.

FAILED

CARRIED | Abstention: A. Wasim

10.2 Policy Proposals at the UTSU Annual General Meeting (10 mins)

RESOLUTION

MOVED: GRONDIN

SECONDED: GRANGER

WHEREAS Bylaw III.1.a.iii indicates that the Annual General Meeting shall include amendments, if any, to the Bylaws unless previously approved; and

WHEREAS the Annual General Meeting allows members to directly engage in, and vote on, matters of the Union; and

WHEREAS currently, bylaw submissions by general members for the AGM must be approved by the Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS members currently do not have a chance to submit policy proposals for the Annual General Meeting; and

WHEREAS members should have the right to move their own policy ideas; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that Bylaw XI.5.d.iv be removed from the Union's bylaws; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following line be added to Bylaw IV.1.a:

A two-thirds (2/3) majority of members present at an AGM may vote to adopt, rescind, or amend Procedural Policies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following line be added to Bylaw IV.1.b:

A simple majority of members present at an AGM may vote to adopt, rescind, or amend Operational Policies; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following line be added as Bylaw III.1.a.viii:

amendments and additions, if any, to the Policies & Procedures unless previously approved and ruled in order by The Board.

DISCUSSION

Grondin says it was initially advertised that members could submit bylaws or policy amendments for consideration. Once policies were submitted, they found out that was not allowed and that only bylaws were allowed to be submitted at an AGM. Grondin sees the AGM as an opportunity for students to see how they want their union to act. An opportunity to bring things directly to a referendum where they might be controversial among the BoD. Grondin believes that it is unfair to students to submit policies at governance committee meetings where they cannot have speaking rights. Grondin references that he tried to submit accessibility policy. Long delay in bringing things to light when they could go to AGM, students can bring ideas to governance committee but this would speed it up.

Boucher speaks against the motion. Moving policy changes is not a right. Member rights outlined in Bylaw 2.4. Policies are operational, have direct input into what the day to day is and this is a procedure that has been delegated to elected officials. Bylaws dictate high-level rules



and values of the organization. Members should have a say on what happens in bylaws and policies should have the input of those who are well versed (board) and those who will be held liable by these policies. States that students have good sound ideas, that the UTSU can benefit from hearing members' policies but does not believe the AGM is the place for that. Believes board should have oversight and say over what the policy is. References anti-harassment policy, code of ethics, which make a huge difference over what the utsu stands for. Changes proposed would not be detrimental to the organization, and believes people have good intentions in mind when they come to AGMs. Boucher can see people abusing this opportunity to the detriment of the UTSU.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: SINGH

SECONDED: MA

BE IT RESOLVED that the resolution be amended to remove first 'be it resolved' clause

DISCUSSION

Singh motivates. Grondin's amendment, in principle, was for members to submit policy proposals to the AGM. The UTSU's Board of Directors has a legal obligation to protect the union's legal interests. Singh states that AGM's usually end up being a group of people who are involved in the UTSU but recognizes faces in the room of people who are members of students societies familiar with the UTSU. If you want to add a policy to the UTSU but you are not elected, you submit it to the Governance Committee and if they or the Board believe it is not in the best interests of the members they can reject it. A portion of the CNCA says that there is a list of things that are not allowed to be included in the agenda that are in personal interest of members and believes those principles can be applied here.

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: GRANGER

SECONDED: MA

BE IT RESOLVED that the debate/discussion/item/meeting be extended by 15 minutes

CARRIED

Grondin responds saying that if someone puts forward a policy not in the best interest of the organization it can be shot down at the AGM. Grondin sees a group like the one present that is affected by what the UTSU does, says they should have a say in it not just seven people on Governance Committee.

Granger says he believes Boucher said that some people come to the AGM with ideas not in the best interest of the UTSU, however they still have the ability to affect the Bylaws which have an impact on the organization. Asks why the concern is with policies but not bylaws.

Biswurm believes a number of false assumptions have been made. Does not believe that non-board members have less expertise, but believe Executives and then the board has more operational expertise. It is the responsibility of the board to listen. It is not the case that the people in the room are more representative than the seven on Governance Committee. All of the people in the room are insiders and do not speak for the normal person. Not empowering normal people, empowering the insiders who know what goes on at the AGM. Say somebody submits a policy in January, that student may have graduated or



cannot attend the AGM, or it was time sensitive and is no longer relevant. Going to Governance Committee first allows for real and immediate change.

Memmel speaks in favour of the amendment. Bylaws are a way of encoding the rights of the majority, policies ensure protections of minorities. References policy around accommodation, accessibility, staff rights. These issues should not be left to the will of the majority. Policies themselves are documents that are amended more frequently than bylaws. Nothing stops a policy from being adopted at AGM and then repealed at the following board meeting. Memmel states that in Singh's wording it requires the Governance Committee to debate policies and they will be on record and the campus press can keep the union accountable.

Bowman says he is not sure if everybody is an insider in the room. Bowman states that people may not know what Governance Committee is or who sits on it. The AGM used to be the place for normal students to bring their bylaw revisions and participate in the governance process. The Governance Committee is people on the inside, not against the motion, but bringing policies to a group of seven people is not as true as they have been making it out to be.

Ramanujam states that if it is only insiders who come to AGMs then it is only insiders who submit things to Governance Committee. Addresses the mover of the amendment, asks if the people who submit these policy reviews will be granted speaking rights or if they will have to be given speaking rights, and whether that poses an accessibility issue.

Singh says it would not give automatic speaking rights but is open to an amendment to include that. Does not think it is an accessibility concern. Will vote against such an amendment because there is no guiding principle that says they should have speaking rights.

Rising states the UTSU is not generally known by the student body, and the UTSU is not representative of the student population. Criticizes UTSU AGM advertisement.

Forgay states that he is an outsider of the UTSU. This AGM isn't necessarily the most accessible but it is more accessible than submitting a policy to a board he didn't know existed. As someone who hasn't come in the past it might be because people don't think they have influence.

RESOLUTION TO EXTEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: MEMMEL

SECONDED: MOHAMED

BE IT RESOLVED that the debate/discussion/item/meeting be extended by 10 minutes.

CARRIED

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT

RESOLUTION

MOVED:

SECONDED: MA

BE IT RESOLVED that the amendment be amended to read: "*BE IT RESOLVED that Bylaw VI(5)(d)(iii) be amended to read: "members submitting motions shall be granted speaking rights at all levels of governance where the motion or its outcome is being considered."*



CARRIED

Granger asks for clarification on referring to coming to the AGM, passing to the board, or passing to governance committee. If someone submits a policy where would it go, essentially.

Singh states that the process would be a member can submit a motion to governance committee which would then go to the AGM.

Biswurm states that he believes there are two priorities in the discussion. Which version will promote greater engagement. Which one will function better? On the first point, Biswurm sympathizes with the sentiment that we should offer students a place to come as opposed to intimidating them at Governance Committee. now we have to decide if we prefer Grondin's version which is more direct or Singh's which leans more toward representative democracy. The basis for this did have engagement as one of its principal outcomes. References instances in the United States of direct democracy. California votes on policy directly and only the people who can read 600 pages of amendments.

Singh calls for quorum.

The Speaker determines we are below quorum. Kidd references CNCA 164(3). The Speaker Rules that given quorum was present at the beginning of the meeting, it may continue.

RESOLUTION To EXTEND

RESOLUTION

MOVED: KIDD

SECONDED: LEONG

BE IT RESOLVED that the debate/discussion/item/meeting be extended by 10 minutes.

FAILED

FAILED

Granger reminds members that they can submit motions to the UTSU and it will be considered anyways. It gives the chance for more turnout at these events.

Singh states that there are not enough people in the room to make a democratic decision and the bylaws state that they cannot make these decisions without quorum.

CARRIED

~~10.3 Amending Article VI(1)(r) of the Elections Procedure Code (10 mins)~~

DISCUSSION

MOVED: EATON

SECONDED:

Eaton withdraws the motion.

10.4 Review of Certain Orientation and Executive Committee Policies (10 mins)

DISCUSSION

MOVED: RAMANUJAM

SECONDED: MA



Ramanujam states the remuneration policy for orientation. People working on orientation think these amendments need to take place for healthy working environment. Orientation policy needs to be more extensive in terms of fair hiring, compensation, and One of the key clauses to be added is the following "Orientation executives should be entitled to five days of paid leave in personal emergency" it is imperative that people are working in an environment that prioritizes mental and physical health. Should be entitled to overtime exceeding 44 hours, many people worked hard and got capped on pay, some people worked upwards of 60 hours with no option for overtime pay. Amending remuneration policy for UTSU execs. 1.5 hourly rate in excess of 44 hours. Currently UTSU bylaw 8 2b says overtime work shall have no monetary value. Part of the problem is remuneration says honorarium get hourly honorarium. Honorarium are usually one time or non-routine, not substitute as wage or salary and should not be used to circumvent rules. Should be changed to hourly wage of \$16 up to 40 hours a week.

Boucher clarifies why adding President and Vice President pay change in orientation policy changes, asks how they fit together.

Ramanujam said it was orientation and other proposals. Separate proposals. Wanted to ensure executives were entitled to overtime pay, which Ramanujam claims is a basic working right.

Singh as previous executive who routinely works 60-70 hours states that executives are management and are therefore not entitled to the same overtime criteria as staff.

10.5 Updating the UTSU Conflict of Interest Policy – 2018 Review (10 mins)

DISCUSSION

MOVED: ROBERTSON

SECONDED: MA

Robertson states he sits on clubs committee for UTSU, conflict of interest policy does not apply to him (only Board Members). No oversight over his conflicts of interest. Wants policy extended to include community and staff members. Increases transparency. Update policy to get rid of loopholes to allow voting on friend's or significant other's club's funding.

Biswurm states that as Chair of the Governance Committee he will be moving all the discussion items during the next Governance Committee meeting.

10.6 Schedule B of Charter of Referenda – 2018 Review (10 mins)

DISCUSSION

MOVED: GRONDIN

SECONDED: MA

Grondin states that a decision from the Governance Committee decreased the number of signatures required to defund service groups. Believes it was previously 2000-3000 and reduced to 3000. As a result OPIRG was brought to referendum. Original proposal was to increase to 1000 people, which included a clause that stated service groups could only be brought to referendum once every 3 years.

Biswurm notes the original submission asked for increase from 250 to 1000.

10.7 Affiliated Student Societies and Service Groups Policy (10 mins)

DISCUSSION

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: MA

Bowman notes he has the "dubious pleasure" of being the last person to speak on the agenda. The Affiliated Student Societies Policy gives certain groups speaking rights at meetings, but there is no mechanism to notify them when a meeting is happening. Two other groups should be given ex-officio status, the G.S.U and KPEUA. Other groups who should get ex-officio status are service groups on campus, based on the fact that the UTSU remits fees to them.



11. Other Business (10 mins)

No other business brought.

12. Adjournment

RESOLUTION

MOVED: SADIQ

SECONDED: GRANGER

Be it resolved that the meeting be adjourned.

The meeting is adjourned at 22:20.