



---

## Minutes of the 2019 Annual General Meeting

Wednesday, October 30, 2019 | 6:00PM  
Innis Town Hall, 2 Sussex Ave, Toronto, ON, M5S 1J5

---

### Open Session

#### Ordinary Business

##### 1. Call to Order

*This meeting is called to order at 6:20 PM. .*

The Chair, M. Sethi, 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.

S. Ma, the Anti-Harassment Officer, reads the land acknowledgement and the equity statements. Ma identifies herself as the Anti-Harassment Officer for the duration of the meeting.

##### 2. Approval of Agenda

###### RESOLUTION

MOVED: KAUL

SECONDED: CURRIE

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be approved as presented.**

###### DISCUSSION

A. Kaul, the Vice President Operations, introduces that the agenda includes housekeeping items that are necessary to keep the Union running, in addition to a number of procedural and logistical updates that the UTSU has made in the wake of the Student Choice Initiative. Kaul concludes that he looks forward to feedback on their work.

###### CARRIED

##### 3. Approval of the Minutes of the 2018 Annual General Meeting

###### RESOLUTION

MOVED: KAUL

SECONDED: MA

**BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of the 2018 Annual General Meeting be approved as presented.**

###### DISCUSSION

J. Bowman, the President, explains that it is normal protocol for the minutes of the previous AGM are approved in the succeeding AGM. The document includes all of the business that was conducted,



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

including all of the motions that were passed, the audited statements, and approval of the auditor. Those items reappear in this agenda, as it is protocol. Bowman encourages that if members wish to externalize anything in the 2018 AGM Minutes, this would be the time to do so.

**CARRIED**

## **4. Presidential Address and Executive Question Period**

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: CHAN

**DISCUSSION**

Bowman begins to read his speech.

*"Good evening, and welcome to the UTSU's 2019 Annual General Meeting. I hope these samosas found you well. My name is Joshua Bowman, and I am the President of the UTSU for the 2019-2020 term. Before I get into it I'd like to take the opportunity to cede five minutes to Alex Erickson, the President of the UTSU's First Year Council."*

Erickson begins to read his speech.

*"Good evening everyone,*

*My name is Alex Erickson, and I'm the President of the First Year Council.*

*Josh has graciously offered up some of his speaking time this evening to allow me to introduce us, and talk about some next steps for the newly minted FYC.*

*The First Year Council is composed of 19 first year students from a wide variety of colleges, faculties, and fields of study. Tonight we're here in strong numbers... (WHERE MY FYC's AT???) We are the inaugural council of our type within the UTSU, and the first and only student group on campus that is dedicated to representing first year students. While some other campuses, such as McGill and McMaster, have had First Year Councils in their student governance for years, this is a new endeavour for U of T, one we're proud and excited to be apart of.*

*So far in the year, we've elected two executives: both myself as President, and our wonderful, extraordinary Vice President Emmanuel Sackeyfio, there he is waving for us. We've also elected three full committees. They are dedicated one to each of finance, advocacy, and events. These are the three elements of our operations we see most clearly as starting points, ones outlined for us in our constitution. They'll be establishing their year long work plans in short order. This may not sound exciting, but to me it's actually super exciting, because "work plan" means things happening, and there is just so, so much we can do.*



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

---

*On that note, at present, we're doing our best to engage campus partners to help us set goals. As much as the vision and mission statements of the FYC will come from its members, it's also important that we serve and accommodate to the values and needs of the broader students' union and U of T campus. Therefore, within the next week or so, I'll be reaching out to leadership representatives of a wide variety of college and faculty student associations, hoping especially to connect with the first year representatives at that level. We want to speak with them about what kinds of things they see us doing for them, - with them, and gaps that we may be able to help fill. As a brand new organization, listening and engaging with representatives at all levels is a trajectory we think wise.*

*Ideas mentioned so far by councillors are wide ranging in scope, and have tonnes of potential. I speak of things like producing resources and guides to help future first year students navigate the transition to university, with information on PoST, residence, and college selection. Things like time management support. Things like earmarking a portion of writing centre appointments for first year students in the month of September. Things like action on breadth requirements, community building and information sharing, have been brought forth. Now, I want to be extremely clear here: none of these items are actually official council positions at all. We are only at the very beginning of our year. I mention these only to provide context and a bit of insight into what advocacy from our council may end up looking like.*

*Now, you may be wondering, how can you, the elderly, get involved? Well, one way is to help us get our message out there. We're hoping to engage with as many different campus student groups as we can. We've had guests from LGBTQOUT, ASSU and the Muslim Students' Association so far, but we're hoping to reach out to as many other groups as are willing to. Our meetings are also open to attend, and any first year students at this campus have automatic speaking rights at them. Our next meeting will be especially important, as we'll be approving committee work plans, deadlines and deliverables. Essentially, what will be our first tangible look at the output of the first, first year council. We would love for many of you to join us. Having a diversity of voices in the room for such a discussion would be a great thing to see.*

*This opportunity that we've been given, as councillors, is incredibly unique. We, in our first few months on campus, have been offered a platform and resources to help us represent our peers in campus dialogue. This year, and long into the future, I look forward to seeing a first year council that is able to address the needs of a group previously unspoken for. That is, a group undergoing a major transition, and with unique perspectives and needs to bring forth.*

*The possibilities are numerous, the energy is high and the future is exciting. I am tremendously looking forward to working with the FYC this year, and collaborating with the UTSU Board and Executive team.*

*If you have any questions, ideas, would like to get in touch, or know of a student group that may be interested in us, please don't hesitate to reach out. We now have both an Instagram and Facebook presence at UTSU FYC, as well as my email is [president@utsufyc.ca](mailto:president@utsufyc.ca) which is also available on both of those platforms.*



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

---

*That's it from me, UTSU."*

Bowman resumes his speech.

*"Thank you, Alex, I am so happy you could be here to introduce the first ever First Year Council, and I'd like to thank you all for coming. The First Year Council is just one new initiative that has been created to better reflect the needs of our membership, and the students that we represent.*

*For our student union to operate at its highest capacity, we need the feedback of as many students as possible. To the students that are actively sacrificing their time to motivate for the change that they want to see -- a lot of you are in the room right now -- I thank you all for that. The rest of the Executives and myself are excited to hear from you. Let's have a conversation.*

*As of right now, the UTSU is performing stronger than ever. We're midway through our terms, and we've already delivered on several of our key campaign promises. We established the First Year Council, a representative body consisting entirely of first years. Our VP Ops, Arjun, overhauled our Student Aid program, reallocating funds to better suit the needs of our membership by creating an Emergency Bursary, an accessibility bursary, a transit bursary, and a Health and Wellness bursary. And throughout all of it, he made sure to consult low-income students and those who would depend on these new programs most. Our VP Equity, Michael has been working with the Arts and Science Students' Union to advocate for the creation of the first American Sign Language and Deaf Culture course at the University of Toronto St. George. Our VP Profac, Dermot, has put in the work to ensure professional faculties, including second-entry programs, are represented in UTSU initiatives, like orientation and the ChooseUofT campaign. Our VP University Affairs, Avani, building on the foundations laid last year, created a microtransactions access bursary, helping to make studying at UofT more financially accessible for our members. Our VP External, Lucas, brought candidates from major political parties to our campus for a student-focused debate during the federal election. Our VP Student Life, Ameera, reformed the clubs policy to ensure clubs are supported according to their needs and to foster the growth of new clubs on campus.*

*We have also been privileged to work with so many amazing students who have taken the step to get involved with their student union as Executive Assistants, front-desk staff, and Orientation team members. Devon Wilton, Aidan Cole Currie, Padraic Berting, Tharsiga Gunasageron, Cheryl Quan, Justin Patrick, Aidan Swirsky, Margie de Leon, Tajwar Arnab, Muntaka Ahmed, Sharon Ma; Zubie Taupan and Victoria Barclay -- they have dedicated so much of their time to ensuring that the UTSU serves its students, and we wouldn't be where we are without them.*

*The UTSU's Ad Hoc Mental Health committee hosted the first in a series of mental health town halls as a way to incorporate more student voices in the work of addressing the mental health crisis on our campus. This work is ongoing in cooperation with student groups across UofT.*

*In all of our efforts, we are building and maintaining healthy dialogues and relationships with our campus partners, including student societies and members of the university administration that are actually willing to listen to students. I made it a priority from day one to hold introductory meetings with student society leaders, because I know that many students see themselves better represented in those organizations than in the work of the UTSU. I am proud to see the leaders of many of those communities in this room tonight.*



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

*All that being said, this year has brought its fair share of difficulties to the union. The Student Choice Initiative has changed the landscape of student life on campus. Mitigating its effects on our programming and services has proven to be a challenge.*

Opt-out numbers:

## **Fee on ACORN Invoice**

	<b># of Opt-Outs</b>	<b>Total # of Students</b>	<b>Opt-Out Rate</b>
UTSU Advocacy, Training & Dev	8121	37137	21.9%
UTSU Bike Chain	9446	37137	25.4%
UTSU Blue Sky Solar Racing Car	10073	37137	27.1%
UTSU Canadian Federation of Students (CFS)	9884	37137	26.6%
UTSU Centre for Women & Trans People	9296	37137	25.0%
UTSU Cinema Studies Student Union (CINSSU)	10239	37137	27.6%
UTSU Day Care Subsidy	9416	37137	25.4%
UTSU Downtown Legal Services	7195	37137	19.4%
UTSU Foster Children Program	9053	37137	24.4%
UTSU Health Initiative in Developing Countries	8420	37137	22.7%
UTSU LGBTOUT			



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

	9570 37137 25.8%
UTSU Ontario Public Interest Research Group (OPIRG)	8799 37137 23.7%
UTSU Orientation	8429 37137 22.7%
UTSU Radical Roots (Food Bank)	7888 37137 21.2%
UTSU Scholarships & Bursaries	5870 37137 15.8%
UTSU Sexual Education & Peer Counselling Centre (SEC)	8592 37137 23.1%
UTSU Student Life: Club Funding & Resource Bank	7764 37137 20.9%
UTSU Students for Barrier Free Access (SBA)	8819 37137 23.7%
UTSU UofT Aerospace Team (UTAT)	10077 37137 27.1%
UTSU UofT Environmental Resource Network (UTERN)	8607 37137 23.2%
UTSU World University Services of Canada (WUSC) Levy	8710 37137 23.5%

The UTSU, with service groups, college, faculty and divisional student societies created the ChooseUofT campaign to fight for the important services that are funded by our student fees. Additionally, the Ford government's cuts to OHIP+ risked overwhelming the capacity of our health and dental plan, and necessitated the reductions in coverage which we are now working to remedy. And, while our relationship with administration has been positive on the whole, we are holding members of the administration who would discount student voices to account. Recent remarks made by the University Ombudsperson in support of University Mandated Leave of Absence policy, detracting from the work



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

---

*of students, reminds us that the University doesn't always act with our best interests at heart, and strengthens our resolve to stand up for students..*

*Our union is strongest when we work together, and the best way for us to overcome the challenges we face is with your experiences, student experiences, at the heart of everything we do. So, once again, thank you for taking time out of your Wednesday evening to eat samosas and participate directly in your student democracy. The executive, staff, and directors of the UTSU, have been hard at work, benching 250 day in and day out, but at the end of the day we report to you, our membership. Thank you all for being here."*

The Chair opens the floor to questions.

B. Licalde asks if suggestions may also count as questions.

The Chair allows for comments to be provided in the Q&A period.

Licalde directs his question towards any member of the executive committee, but particularly interested in Bowman's and Kaul's answers. Licalde acknowledges that they were present at the Governing Council's meeting, where the University Ombudsperson made comments about the UMLAP. Licalde goes on to suggest that, since there is a mental health task force in place to try to determine the cause of the suicides, that the UTSU establish a sub-committee that will hold the taskforce accountable. This taskforce may include eight undergraduates and eight graduates, of which there are sixteen members, to establish a system to ensure the taskforce is doing their job.

Bowman thanks Licalde for his question and suggestion. Bowman states that the UTSU established the Ad-Hoc Mental Health Committee this year, which has met fairly regularly to review a lot of the work that is being done on campus, including that of the Presidential and Provostial taskforce. Bowman, on behalf of the Executive Committee, speaks to his comparative disappointment with the work of the taskforce, especially because - in all of their consultations - none of the student members of the taskforce were actually present. Bowman continues that the UTSU Ad-Hoc Mental Health Committee can serve a similar role to what Licalde is suggesting. Bowman cedes time to Kaul, as he is the chair of the committee, and encourages any members of the Ad-Hoc Mental Health Committee to speak to the work that is being done.

Kaul elaborates that the committee will begin consulting campus groups in preparation for some of their future initiatives. Kaul states that the Mental Health Taskforce has been, thus far, very uncooperative, according to Kaul, not just in terms of the work that they do, but also in terms of their engagement with students. He notes that the taskforce has only reached out one time, despite numerous attempts on the committee's part to reach out. Kaul states that the extremely small amount of representation on the task force means that they believe students' resources are being used to try and create a better alternative, rather than try to question an initiative that was set to fail from the beginning.

T. Yun directs his question to both the President and Vice President Student Life. Yun describes a club on campus that is being overseen by, and run by an authoritarian regime that he believes crushed pro-democracy protesters and run concentration camps detaining an ethnic minority. He names the Chinese Students and Scholars Association (CSSA), which he claims is a UTSU-recognized and funded club. Yun continues that experts have declared it a potential national security threat. He concludes by asking if the UTSU is willing to follow the lead of the McMaster Students Union, and refuse this club funding..



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

A. Karim, the Vice-President, Student Life, clarifies that CSSA has not been recognized by the UTSU for this year, as they have not applied. She explains that because of the Student Choice Initiative, clubs are deemed non-essential, and she has had to reform the clubs policy to ensure that clubs that actually require funding, more than other clubs, are a priority. In order to combat this, Karim explains that they will not fund clubs that are already receiving external funding.

Yun asks a follow-up question if the denial of this club's funding is purely on the basis of the changes in the Student Choice Initiative, and the fact that they didn't apply. He continues, asking hypothetically if these things had not happened, would that club have still gotten funding despite the fact that it is connected to an authoritarian regime.

Karim answers that the UTSU believes that all clubs that cause harm to other clubs are not being good to the University of Toronto community. In order to make changes to that, Karim says that there would need to be consultation with that club to ensure that they are not causing harm to other clubs on campus, and other groups, and making other people feel unsafe on campus.

T. Riches directs his question to the Executive Committee. He reminds them that, at the September 22nd Board of Directors Meeting, the Executive Committee committed to releasing a statement in the UTSU's Listserv newsletter regarding changes to the mental health coverage. Riches states that although the UTSU made a post to this regard on social media on September 23rd, it is almost November and there has not yet been any information listed in the newsletter. He states that, since these changes were made on September 1st, the timing is still less than ideal. Riches states that it is important that members are made aware of the changes that were made, since not every student under the Health & Dental plan follows the UTSU on social media, and may not have seen the post that was made. He asks why an update was never provided in the UTSU's newsletter.

Bowman agrees with Riches' account that this was a conversation that was had at the board meeting. Bowman apologizes, saying that there is no reasonable excuse as to why the statement wasn't posted on alternative platforms. Bowman agrees with Riches that there are a lot of students that do not frequent the UTSU's social media, and that they could be more likely to look at the UTSU's newsletter. Bowman states that the UTSU is currently in the process of overhauling its newsletter, as although the executives don't necessarily think that it conveys all of the information it needs to, they believe it is of great utility to students. Bowman relates that the UTSU has received criticism that meaningful work being done by the UTSU is not being conveyed in the newsletter, and that the UTSU is in the process of ensuring that the newsletter is doing what it needs to do. Bowman states that the next newsletter is going to be out on November 12th, to the best of his knowledge. Bowman commits to the statement being included in the next newsletter. He acknowledges that, seeing as there was a blackout period, hopefully the lack of a statement in prior newsletters wouldn't have affected too many students that were looking for essential services.

T. Pender asks if there is any update on the UTSU Student Commons. Pender states that it has been quite some time since he has heard anything about it. Pender also asks a question regarding the First Year Council. Pender states that it is a great idea, and expresses gladness to see a motivated group of first years who are doing great work. Pender questions why the First Year Council is appointed rather than elected. Pender states that he doesn't understand who is making the decisions on who gets to be on the First Year Council. Pender states that he doesn't understand how it, by definition, represents first years if it is not chosen by first years.

Bowman states that he was not expecting to go through the AGM without talking about the Student Commons. Bowman states that there has been a practice of the UTSU being given a date by its contractors, and then the executives just immediately peddling it to the board and conveying that as



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

the date. Bowman asks Pender to take the new given date, April 2020, with a grain of salt. Bowman acknowledges that the UTSU is assuming that there will be a soft launch by the end of this year, in April, and a hard launch of all operations in September 2020. Bowman asks Pender to bear in mind that this is what the UTSU's contractors have told them, and they have also been the ones who have told them those dates in the past. Bowman begins to answer the second question, stating that the UTSU made the decision to make the First Year Council appointment-based because of the poor turnout of the most recent UTSU elections. Bowman states that the UTSU also knows that for many first years on campus, there are so many things coming at them at once, and they didn't want to have first-years be posed with the questions of whether they should run in an election, and whether they have the courage to put themselves out there. Bowman acknowledges that, as someone who has run in two election cycles now, it's a very daunting process. Bowman states that, to ensure the First Year Council had the representation it needed, the UTSU created an appointments committee, that was composed of directors from Division 1, meaning Arts and Science, and Division 2, meaning Professional Faculties, so that they could have representation from both. Bowman states that the committee was majority directors, and the hope was that they would skew a little bit earlier in their undergraduate tenures, so that they could better understand the needs of first-year students. Bowman states that out of the 143 applications that the UTSU received, 19 were chosen. Bowman acknowledges that the First-Year Council policy allows for a switch to elections, and that there is a possible hope to switch to elections in the following year. Bowman expresses hope that if there is enough traction around the First Year Council, the UTSU can announce that early on to students who want to get involved. Bowman states that in the First Year Council's first year, the UTSU wanted to ensure there were more students filling those seats, rather than less.

A. McLean directs her question to the Vice-President, External Affairs, L. Granger. McLean asks Granger what he has done regarding the topical issue of mental health, and how, as VP External, he can advocate for students' mental health by establishing connections with important people, organizations, and politicians outside of the University. McLean states that the lack of mental health resources isn't just a massive UofT problem – it's a province-wide problem, one that is especially apparent in places with high population density, such as Toronto. McLean states that the UTSU needs to contact local representatives who actually have the power to allocate funds and improve the currently inadequate system. McLean states that thinking and caring about the people around you, and being educated on these issues, is a very good start, but one has to be politically involved to make systemic change. McLean acknowledges that the call that was made on World Mental Health Day, by UofT, for federal parties to commit to increase investment into Mental Health resources, is an excellent start. McLean expresses encouragement that UofT will become politically involved in advocating for these crucial mental health resources. McLean asks how the UofT community can continue to further the mental health resources initiative outside of the university-wide spectrum, in order to gain more resources that are critical to UofT students.

Granger states, on the question of reaching out to public officials, campus groups, and outside, external groups, that the UTSU has slowly been making its way to who is within that conversation, and who should be in that conversation. Granger states that the UTSU's biggest push, in the beginning, was with the World Mental Health Day conversation that it had with Councillor Kristyn Wong-Tam, Ward 13, Toronto Centre. Granger states that the executive has also talked with various political officials, such as MPP Chris Glover (Spadina-Fort York) and Councillor Mike Layton, among others. Granger states that the UTSU is currently in the process of working on various outside institutional projects, including working with Residential Associations that surround the university on how they can benefit the UTSU and speak on its behalf. Granger states that the UTSU has had a close relationship with the University of Toronto's Government Relations Office (GRO) this year, and as a result, they have released a letter that went to city council today, supporting the aforementioned mental health push. Granger states that



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

everyone at the UTSU realizes that mental health encompasses more than what's on campus – it's everywhere. Granger states that the UTSU is pushing towards that and going to the future.

E. Sackeyfio echoes Bowman by acknowledging problems with access to certain websites that UofT uses in certain classes, as ways of giving out marks and homework. He acknowledges the importance of the UTSU's Microtransaction Access Bursary, but asks why there is no advocacy against teachers using these systems, when Quercus can supersede most of these programs.

A. Singh, Vice-President, University Affairs, states that she was the lead on the creation of this access program. Singh acknowledges that there was a lot of talk on Reddit about kickbacks from TopHat and other benefits that the UTSU was speculated to have received, but she confirms that the UTSU hasn't received any of those things. She states that the UTSU only received a set number of codes, which are disbursed to students through a bursary application process overseen by Services Committee. Singh states that this is the same process as all of the other bursary applications. Singh acknowledges that this access program was created as a short-term measure for students who might not be able to pay for courses, and might have to make that trade-off between dropping a course required for their program or not eating food that day. Singh states that as a long-term measure, the UTSU has been working on microtransactions for almost two or three years. Singh states that the UTSU has created a report, talked to university administration, and given them recommendations that they want them to undertake to remove this whole problem, so that students don't have to pay for third-party services. Singh states that especially since the advent of Quercus, the UTSU has actively been trying to take steps, with long-term solutions to solve this issue.

Bowman elaborates on Singh's comments regarding the Microtransaction Access Bursary being a short-term measure. Bowman states that the UTSU has been floating around this item in all of its meetings with the Office of the Vice Provost Students (OVPS). Bowman states that it has gotten to the point where, instead of bringing it to that setting, the UTSU has requested a meeting with the Office of Innovation, as this is within their purview. Bowman states that the meeting is supposed to occur in November, and expresses hope that the UTSU can communicate what happens in that portfolio, either through its newsletter or the Executive Highlights that it publishes every month.

D. Singh directs his first question to Kaul. Singh states that he was involved with the UTSU in the past, and speculates that this year, there is a remarkable amount of the Associate Vice Presidents who seem to come from the same friend group, namely the friend group already very close to the executives. Singh asks Kaul what efforts he has made, or will be made, to ensure that the hiring process that the UTSU uses for student staff is fair, and isn't biased toward friends of the executives or human resources manager. Singh asks Karim if she would or would not recognize CSSA if they applied for recognition, and asks the same question about University of Toronto Students for Life.

Kaul states that applications at the UTSU are redacted from the beginning. Kaul states that, as he has done at least twice, executives recuse themselves from hiring committees when they believe they are too close to the person in question. Kaul states that he doesn't believe the UTSU has made an error thus far, or that many of these executive assistants come from the same friend group. Kaul states that in the future, the UTSU is going to keep its hiring committees as stringent and impartial as they've always been.

Karim states that in terms of clubs recognition, all clubs are under the same rules and regulations under the UTSU's Clubs Policy. Karim affirms that all clubs in the UofT community that cause harm to the public or to students, or cause different issues that make other people uncomfortable or unsafe, do not



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

get recognized. Karim affirms that if these clubs, in their constitution, do not comply with these regulations, then the UTSU would not recognize these clubs.

Bowman, acknowledging that the McMaster Students Union has been referenced, states that he is acquainted with the MSU President. Bowman states that the MSU President called him after everything had transpired, and in that specific circumstance, the clubs in question were violating similar policies to those outlined by Karim. Bowman states that even this year, executives at Street Fest did everything they could to ensure that students were protected, even if that meant that conflicting club tables had to be moved around. Bowman states that as the UTSU, their number one stance is ensuring student safety, and that if there are similar circumstances to those that took place at McMaster, and a student brought that to our attention, the UTSU certainly wouldn't file them away and just ignore them. Bowman states that the UTSU wants to make sure that the UofT campus community is a safe space.

Kaul states that he wants to add to his previous point, by offering an alternative explanation for the supposed friend group bias raised by D. Singh. Kaul states that when hiring, the UTSU actively pursues experience in campus initiatives and leadership positions, and that right now, the UTSU has executive assistants who have been prominent in, for example, the Muslim Students' Association, the Trinity College activities, and even the UTSU previously. Kaul states that if it seems like, from the outside, that the people in question are a part of a friend group, the perception might stem from the reality that people in campus leadership positions talk a lot anyway – they confer with each other to try and build campus initiatives.

D. Singh states that he still hasn't received a yes or no answer to his question to Karim. Singh states that the types of activities that Students for Life engages in are widely known. Singh states that Karim's answer, that decisions will be made based on whether a group causes harm to another group, is so broad that it just serves to please the room, but it doesn't give a substantive answer to the question. Singh asks what constitutes harm to another group, and asks if the UofT Campus Conservatives harm other groups by proposing what he views as harmful policies for the country. Singh asks if the UTSU should remove recognition for the UofT Campus Conservatives, and states that he doesn't think so. Singh states that UofT Students for Life should not be given recognition. He asks whose power it is to decide what constitutes harm to another group, and asks if the UTSU is just arbitrarily deciding what this harm is. Singh requests a yes or no answer. He asks, if the UofT Students for Life applies for recognition, if he can be confident that his students' union will not provide that recognition.

Bowman affirms that the UTSU will not recognize Students for Life.

Riches directs his question to Bowman, and begins by acknowledging that pursuant to the UTSU's Sustainability Policy, the UTSU has an obligation to encourage environmental sustainability on campus by working with various student groups. Riches states that, especially given the most recent Global Climate Strike, he thinks this is a very important thing to do. Riches asks Bowman what work has been done so far this year to reach out to and work with, student environmental groups on this front.

Bowman agrees with Riches in that if there was ever a time to start getting involved in climate issues, it is definitely now. Bowman states that this is a part of a bigger approach that the UTSU has taken this year, which is getting involved without taking up space. Bowman explains this approach, stating that if students or organizations have already been doing relevant work throughout the entire of their undergraduate degree, the UTSU is not going to come into that process just when they're hitting the finish line and ask to smack a logo on their materials. Bowman relates that with the Global Climate Strike, which was organized by Fridays for Future with a lot of help from LEAP, the UTSU just asked very politely if there's anything the groups needed from them. Bowman relates that the groups asked the UTSU to publicly declare support for a strike, which they did, and for megaphones, which they provided.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Bowman states that the UTSU is also in communications with Fridays for Futures to support their next strike, which is happening in November. Bowman states that while meetings have been had with groups, the whole point is that the UTSU wants to support them on their terms, and not on the UTSU's terms. Bowman states that whatever the groups want to see from the UTSU, the UTSU is here to listen. Bowman states that he himself is not someone who studies sustainability, or has working expertise in the area, but he knows that there are a lot of really hard working groups on campus that have been doing that work, and will continue to do that work, and he feels like the UTSU should just do what it can to support instead of trying to take up space or slap its name on something.

M. Ryeda asks Karim if she can elaborate on the updated Clubs Policy, and state how it will affect clubs funding this year.

Karim states that the clubs policy is something that is very important for clubs on campus, as clubs are the foundation of student life here at UofT. Karim states that the reality of the Student Choice Initiative is that clubs are deemed non-essential, and following that, the UTSU had to reorganize and reform its clubs policy. Karim states that she introduced two new funding regimes which include semester based funding (fall semester and winter semester). Karim gives the reason for this as being so that smaller clubs, or not necessarily smaller but clubs that don't have a concrete idea of the programming that they would like to host for the whole year, are still able to apply for funding for the fall semester or the winter semester. Karim states that this also helps the UTSU to keep its finances in check, to ensure that clubs are still receiving their funding, in order to host programming throughout the whole year, or at least for a semester, so that they don't lose their programming and their outreach. Karim states that the UTSU also included the year-long clubs funding, which is a holdover from last year. Karim states that one main thing that was also eliminated was the automatic clubs funding, and the reason why is that it caused an excessive amount of funds to go out to clubs that might also be on a hiatus year, meaning that that funding would go into a bank account for a club that wasn't hosting any active programs. Kareem states the reality, which is that the UTSU used to budget \$200,000 for clubs, and this year that budget has been sliced in half, due to the Student Choice Initiative. Karim repeats a point made by Bowman that the UTSU has had a 20 percent opt-out rate for clubs for this semester. Karim states that the UTSU is dealing with quite a lot, and that's basically how she reformed the clubs policy.

P. Berting asks Bowman and Kaul what the consultation process with administration has been regarding the mental health crisis. Berting asks if they can still see a conducive dialogue occurring going forward, in the wake of recent exchanges.

Bowman says he will start off, and encourages A. Singh to chime in afterwards. Bowman states that the UTSU does hold monthly meetings with the Office of the Vice Provost, Students (OVPS), and that the UTSU has been very vocal about its concerns around the mental health crisis. Bowman states that the UTSU also held a meeting with the OVPS and President Meric Gertler, in which Kaul actually brought it to Gertler's attention that a big foundation of the mental health crisis on campus is the academic culture at UofT, and the fact that UofT doesn't necessarily cultivate a culture of academic forgiveness. Bowman states that the UTSU has also been holding meetings with David Newman, from the Office of Student Life, and Janine Robb from Health & Wellness, and is trying to work on solutions there. Bowman states that the communication lines have been comparatively open, so he is somewhat optimistic. Bowman states that one of the things about which the UTSU is specifically talking to Newman and Robb is that when students have a tendency to talk about the Mental Health Crisis, they don't necessarily emphasize the wait times for chaplaincies, and just tend to think about wait times at Health & Wellness. Bowman states that this is a really huge issue, and that the UTSU has taken it upon



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

itself to get in touch with those groups that might be reliant on those chaplaincies, and looking at the steps that we can take forward. Bowman states that the comments made by Uoft's Ombudsperson, Dr. Ellen Hodnett, were extremely disrespectful to student groups and students that have been doing the work to remedy the mental health crisis that administrators are hired to remedy. Bowman states that there has been a comparatively open line of communication, and that the Ombudsperson never spoke to the UTSU prior to this, anyway.

A. Singh states that the UTSU has had all these conversations with all the administrative figures that Bowman mentioned. Singh states that other than that, the UTSU also trying to get more student support, which includes her personally working with student governors on Governing Council and its various boards, to see if a change can be made this way. Singh states that, especially since these students have a voting seat and more impact, if the UTSU can collaborate with them to get its point across, or even propose a motion that binds the council to acknowledge the mental health crisis and resolve to take steps to resolve it, would be good.

Riches explains that the comments in question were made by Dr. Hodnett at the October 24th Governing Council meeting. Riches states that these comments were inflammatory and insulting towards student mental health activism on campus, and relates that immediately after the meeting, the UTSU issued a statement calling for Dr. Hodnett to apologize. Riches relates that, in a recent Varsity article from this week, Hodnett had doubled down on her statements, despite how insulting they are. Riches inquires as to the UTSU's response, and what they will be doing going forward.

Bowman states that Hodnett actually tripled down, because the UTSU did send her e-mails as well, asking her to make an apology. Bowman relates that her initial response was, "I stand by my comments." Bowman states that a lot of the arguments that Hodnett is making revolve around the idea that her judgement is fact-based. Bowman argues that, by assuming that the student groups who have been mobilizing around this issue aren't arguing with facts, this inherently dismisses the lived experiences of these students, because he guesses that to administration, those aren't considered "fact-based." Bowman gives an example that Kaul brought up at a meeting, whereby at the Same-Day Counselling sessions, there's only three to four open spots, and if you're not one of those three to four students who happen to wake up at 8:30 AM, then you have to try again next week. Bowman argues that to Hodnett, this must not be a fact-based judgement. Bowman states that the UTSU is still going to ask her to make the apology, and it is sticking by this ask. Bowman acknowledges that a lot of students actually called for Hodnett's resignation, to which he responds that if she resigns, she won't be able to apologize, so Bowman expresses hope that that will come first.

A. Boucher states that she has a two-part question in regard to the budget. She first refers to the fact that the budget is not yet online. She states that she understands that the current executive's term started in May, so the year is halfway done and the budget is still not there. Boucher asks why there is a delay. Boucher states that she understands that with the Student Choice Initiative, she is sure that that has played a part, but the fall semester is two months from ending. Boucher asks when the budget will be online. She states that she has heard a little bit about how the budget has been changed significantly since the Student Choice Initiative (SCI), and asks if Kaul could give an overview of the most substantial changes that the room might want to know, that were made to the budget in response to the SCI.

Bowman states that the SCI has made it extremely difficult when it comes to financial planning at the UTSU. Bowman states that, as Boucher should know, being the former President, the UTSU does have bylaws that mandate that certain financial processes are published online by a certain date, or that it



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

approves its operating budget by a certain date. Bowman states that all of this has been thrown out of whack by the SCI, and states that he is sure Boucher can appreciate that it is hard to adjust governance documents based on one initiative sent forward by the provincial government. Bowman states that the Finance Committee has been meeting, and did approve a preliminary budget and a Spending Authorization Resolution, which is the novel process. Bowman states that the UTSU did not feel comfortable fully committing to publishing an operating budget until it knew what the opt-out numbers were. Bowman states that the UTSU received its opt-out numbers on September 27th, and the Finance Committee has met three times since then. Bowman states that the committee is going to be holding a meeting on November 1, to approve the Operating Budget, which will then be sent to the next meeting of the Board of Directors. Bowman states that once it is approved by the board, the Operating Budget will be fully accessible to the UTSU's membership, so they can see what the UTSU's finances look like this year. Bowman states that, overall, the SCI was really hard to plan around, and that there is no real precedent for it, so the UTSU is just doing the best that it can.

Kaul states that with regard to the second question, in a minute, he will cede some time to Bowman, as he is the Chair of the Finance Committee. Kaul states that, in terms of cuts that were made to specific areas, as Bowman said, the UTSU planned around several scenarios for what the budget would look like, throughout the summer and until it had its opt-out numbers. Kaul states that, using those, one of the largest areas that the UTSU cut from was Orientation. Kaul states that the UTSU didn't have any large arena-based events, such as a Blue Jays game. Kaul states that this was one of the largest cuts from Orientation, and in general. Kaul states that clubs funding did receive a large cut as well, but based on opt-out numbers, it looks like the UTSU may be able to get a decent amount of that back.

Bowman states that, to put it into context, around 87% of the UTSU's budget is actually essential. Bowman states that it was that 13% that is non-essential that the UTSU needed to budget for. Bowman states that that 13% is very people-facing, and that the ancillary fee framework is incredibly insulting because it shows that the provincial government doesn't really understand what student life on campus is really all about. Bowman acknowledges that the reductions made to Orientation, clubs funding and WUSC (World University Services Canada) have had adverse effects on the UTSU's programming. Bowman states that with clubs, the UTSU had to change its whole funding formula, and that was a task in and of itself, which the Clubs Committee, under Karim's leadership, did complete. Bowman states that with Orientation, the reduction was around \$100,000. Bowman states that the UTSU is looking to analyze the landscape around WUSC with other student societies that currently support refugee students under this program, and thinks this is going to be a team effort going forward. Bowman reiterates that with the SCI, there isn't really a lot of precedent for this sort of organizing that the UTSU can do. Bowman states that the UTSU is still really dealing with the shock from it, but that the biggest affected areas are Clubs, Orientation and WUSC. Bowman states that with Student Aid, there has also been a reduction there, but that the UTSU is doing its best to cope with those changes, so that the students who rely on and need that funding the most are not affected by the opt-outs.

Licalde asks Bowman who exactly is part of the UTSU's Ad-Hoc Committee on Mental Health.

Kaul states that the Ad-Hoc Mental Health Committee, like all other UTSU committees, is composed of members of the Board of Directors. Kaul states that he won't name anyone specific, out of respect for privacy, but their names are in the minutes online. Kaul states that there are four members of the executive, three Division I directors, and two Division II directors. Kaul states that, in terms of how this relates to the student population more generally, he knows that the directors in the committee have been doing their job quite well, and reaching out to their constituents very actively.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Licalalde speculates that these are all UTSU-employed people.

Kaul states that they're members of the Board of Directors.

Licalalde asks to clarify why the UTSU doesn't expand this Ad-Hoc Committee to people who do not serve on the Board of Directors or as an Executive. Licalalde speculates that if the UTSU was to include people from outside those two groups, then there would perhaps be a diversity of thought as to how the Committee will proceed. Licalalde states that the Committee can have, for example, a person who studies Psychology, or a person who studies Sociology, with no background in mental health. Licalalde asks why the UTSU does not encourage a diversity of thought when pursuing the Ad-Hoc Committee's objectives.

Kaul states that reaching out to other people, in terms of where to take the Ad-Hoc Mental Health Committee, is why the UTSU had the first Town Hall Meeting, and why they are having another Town Hall Meeting soon – likely right after Reading Week. Kaul states that the reason they have not had more, is that one of the biggest criticisms of the first one is that they did not reach out to enough groups, or the right groups. Kaul states that the committee is taking their time with this one, and ensuring that they are reaching out to the right people. Kaul states that, in the time since the first town hall, even more campus activism groups have sprung up, so the committee is looking to reach out to them as much as they can, including existing groups on campus. Kaul states that, in terms of why the committee doesn't include more external actors, it's a committee of the Board of Directors, so only UTSU directors would have voting power on the committee. Kaul states that they plan to invite more people to have speaking time on the committee, and assures Licalalde that, due to the actions of certain directors on the committee who have been prominent in outreach, other people's thoughts are adequately represented on the committee. Kaul cedes his time to T. Siddall, the Victoria College Director, who is on the committee..

T. Siddall states that the Ad Hoc Mental Health Committee was struck at the May Board of Directors meeting, and that meeting determined to expand that committee from its original size. Siddall states that there is a diverse background of people that are on the committee. Siddall states that, in terms of expertise of people on the committee, all committee members have taken the time to educate themselves on issues they haven't understood, and states that this committee is extremely proactive. Siddall states that the committee had actually resolved the last month that it would meet at least once a month, which would put it on the same level of importance as the Finance Committee. Siddall states that the importance of the committee itself is such that the mental health crisis on campus is addressed. Siddall states that if one looks at the minutes of the previous Ad Hoc Mental Health Committee meeting, they can see that there will be a Town Hall Meeting coming up shortly. Siddall states that the committee has also resolved to address not just the mental health crisis on campus, but also factors such as the culture on campus, as well as numerous other structural and psychological barriers to access to education. Siddall states that if anyone does have any questions, they can email Kaul or the Deputy Chair of the Committee at any time. Siddall states that they, for one, as a member of the committee, are quite receptive to listening to these things and ensuring that the committee is actively engaged in the process. Siddall states that the committee is committed to working with UTSU executives to ensure that their meetings with the Administration are succinct, express students' views successfully, and take student voices seriously.

I. Bañares asks Bowman and Granger what exactly the plans are, if any, with regard to a referendum on the UTSU's membership in the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS).

Granger states that the room should be aware that the CFS makes it virtually impossible for schools like UofT to leave. Granger states that he is also not really allowed to use union resources and time to



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

advocate for leaving. Granger states that he has spoken to stakeholder groups and interested students on campus. Granger states that things are in the process, but notably, it really depends on how somebody external to the UTSU would like to approach the referendum. Granger reminds the room that both the national organization and the Ontario organization have different rules for referenda. Granger states that CFS-Ontario requires the exact dates of the referendum to be noted on a petition, while CFS-National does not. Granger states that both require 15% of UTSU members, at least, using their legal name—not their chosen name—their student number, and their signature. Granger states that the realistic number of signatures that a UofT petition would have to collect would be 8000-9000, due to the likely invalidation of signatures. Granger states that the CFS makes leaving impossible, as the organization itself sees UofT as a cash cow, which they can use to collect money. Granger states that the CFS doesn't value UofT's voice, because they don't have to. Granger states that the UTSU is but one vote in a membership of more than 60 unions, and that the CFS continues recruiting more, mainly from smaller schools. Granger states that if students are interested, they should come talk to him, but that the UTSU is really looking to keep moving forward on this.

Bañares states that Granger didn't necessarily answer his question. He asks if there are any plans, right now, on a referendum, and asks if Granger's answer means that there aren't any plans right now.

Granger states that there can always be plans, but the question is whether or not the CFS will accept signatures that will be collected.

D. Singh directs his first question to either Bowman or A. Singh. D. Singh states that he knows that the UTSU disagrees with the University Mandated Leave of Absence Policy (UMLAP), the way that it's been presented and the governance process that it went through. D. Singh states that he sits as a voting student member of University Affairs Board (UAB), the board that is ultimately responsible for the approval of policies like the Mandated Leave Policy. D. Singh states that he hasn't heard from the UTSU yet about any action that student members could take at UAB. D. Singh states that his question is a policy question, and a question about beliefs to either Bowman or A. Singh. D. Singh asks if it is the UTSU's position that there is no situation in which the university should involuntarily remove a student from their studies because of mental health reasons. D. Singh directs his next question to Kaul, regarding the UTSU's budget policies. D. Singh refers to the discussion about the budget, the approval process and the difficulties in releasing a budget on time due to the SCI. Singh states that one of the budget policies mandates that profit/loss statements be submitted to the Board of Directors, and by virtue to the public, once a month. D. Singh states that to his knowledge, they have not been provided to the public this year. D. Singh asks how he is to know what the financial health of the UTSU is this year, when what is an important transparency policy has not been followed. D. Singh also asks about what information the Board has, if they're not receiving these profit/loss statements. Singh states that if they are, he's sorry, but he just hasn't seen them.

Bowman states that personally, he is extremely uncomfortable with the University taking the mental health of a student into its own hands, and that he thinks a culture of fear has been created by a lot of the UMLAP and the language that surrounds it. Bowman refers to Dr. Ellen Hodnett having accused student groups are stoking the fear, despite the fact that it was members of the Governing Council, particularly administrators, who were giving such examples of behaviours that could be covered by the UMLAP, as wearing a parka in the summer. Bowman states that he doesn't see a lot of the examples coming from the University that could create these situations, where you ask, is there any situation where a student should be removed from the university? Bowman states that, comparatively, the Student Code of Conduct wasn't good either, which has been the argument made several times over.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Bowman states that, however, with the Mandated Leave of Absence Policy, he believes it should've been a policy that was informed by consultation with students, and states that he just doesn't understand or know how many students have to come outside Simcoe Hall and sacrifice time their time studying or attending class to tell administration that they don't like the Mandated Leave of Absence Policy. Bowman relates that when people in this room, or in the UTSU's membership, said that they didn't like the UTSU's Remuneration Policy, it was changed. Bowman states that it was as simple as that, because the UTSU knows who its members are, and states that he thinks that UofT administration needs to start realizing who their students are as well.

D. Singh states that he knows Bowman doesn't agree with the policy, and can see why he doesn't agree with the policy, but that this was not his question. Singh asks whether or not, regardless of the situation that the administration has proposed, Bowman can imagine a situation in which it would be in the student's best interest to be involuntarily removed from their studies because of mental health reasons.

Kaul states that his belief is that there are situations in which it would be a student's best interest to be removed from their studies. Kaul states that those situations are when the student poses a harm to another student. Kaul states that to couple those instances with mental health is implicitly in the argument. Kaul states that this is an argument that is not only irresponsible, but not remotely data-driven, nor does it come out of consultation with anyone in particular. Kaul states that it's a question that is inherently devoid of logic to pair with mental health. In response to D. Singh's second question, Kaul states that there was one profit/loss statement that was presented to the Board as soon as the executives became aware of the policy, which was two board meetings prior to the AGM date. Kaul states that one was presented to the Board last meeting. Kaul states that at the same meeting, an amendment was moved, stating that instead of presenting profit/loss statements at every meeting, they would be presented quarterly. Kaul states that the next one would be due in the coming quarter. Kaul states that to the current UTSU's knowledge, the UTSU has not followed this practice in a long while, so he would consider it alright that they have started as of now. Kaul states that although there has been one provided to the Board, he's not sure if it has been provided to the public.

A.C. Currie states that he is a UTSU member, and that he also works at the UTSU as the Chief Operations Assistant. He states that it is his aim to clarify some points. Currie states that last year, during the 2018/2019 year, only one profit/loss statement was presented to the Board of Directors and to the public, and that was at the February Board of Directors Meeting. Currie states that one can find that at [utsu.ca/governance](https://utsu.ca/governance). Currie states that, to the point of reporting to the public, all of the UTSU's Board Packages and meeting minutes are available in [utsu.ca/governance](https://utsu.ca/governance), in the meeting packages section, so if anybody has any questions about that, that's where they can go.

V. Kacholia states that at the last Board of Directors meeting, in October, two executive members failed to have their reports approved in the agenda. Kacholia states that, furthermore, the reports that have been coming in for this year from the executive have varied greatly in length and quality. Kacholia states that they do appreciate the Instagram updates every month, showing what the executive is doing. Kacholia asks what steps the executive is putting in to keep themselves accountable to not only the Board, but also to their membership.

The Chair states that, just before she lets the executives speak, pursuant of the truth and the actual facts, one executive report was not added to the agenda, whereas one was failed. The Chair clarifies that one of the reports that Kacholia is mentioning was added to the agenda, but the Board decided not to approve it, and not accept it as the official report of the position.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

A. Singh states that she was one of the executives whose Board Report was not added to the agenda. Singh states that she knows that Board Reports are very important, because they keep the executives accountable to the Board, as well as the membership. Singh states that she is really, really sorry that she was not able to get hers in, in the last period. Singh states that she was just undergoing some personal issues, and that there was a very short duration between the two Board Meetings that the UTSU had. Singh states that, as for the length, she knows that the length varies, but though she can only speak for herself right now, she tried to include all the important information that happened. She states that as the UTSU executive, there are a lot of things that happen on a day-to-day basis that are very administrative, and might not have a larger impact to the membership. Singh states that she can see how the reports varied, because some roles are more administrative-based, and some have meetings that are important that they need to highlight, or projects that are taking place in that particular month that are being highlighted.

Bowman states that he will speak more generally to Executive Reports. Bowman prefaces this by saying that, as a Director on the Board last year, he was very critical of Executive Reports not being submitted on time, and that he thinks Boucher can agree that he was pretty annoying about it. Bowman states that he is definitely a huge proponent of Executive Reports, as they are the number one way that anyone can find out what the executives are doing in any given month. Bowman states that Kacholia is right in that that they do vary in length. Bowman states that the reality is that every single executive is empowered to submit their own, and that he would never say, "You need to include more to hit a certain threshold." Bowman states that it's on them to communicate what they'd like to, but states that Kacholia is correct in that there should never be a circumstance where students are not kept in the loop as to what their executive is doing. Bowman states that one Executive Report not being in the Board Package is one too many, and that the UTSU will do its part to make sure they can do better in the future. Bowman reminds the room that all Executive Reports are available online. Bowman states that Executive Highlights, which are on Instagram and Facebook, are more of a snapshot, but the Executive Reports are more detailed, depending on who is submitting them. Bowman states that the reports also include the hours that executives completed in between the two Board Meetings. Bowman states that if students are interested in what their executives are working on in any given week, he would greatly implore them to look at the Board Reports.

Kacholia asks, in terms of reports being failed, what Bowman is doing internally, as an executive, to ensure that this isn't happening regularly.

Bowman states that it really is on those individual executives to learn from that experience and do better the next time. Bowman states that this is the only time it has happened this year, which is not necessarily the case, historically speaking, across several years of the UTSU. Bowman states that the UTSU is doing its part to ensure that the Executive Reports will be submitted, and that this also extends to the UTSU setting internal deadlines for them being submitted, well before the actual deadline to include them in the Board Report. Bowman states that he would never rush an executive to submit an Executive Report that isn't necessarily comprehensive. He states that having a one-page explainer, for example, "I went to work this week; it was great," won't necessarily satisfy the questioning that the Board has. Bowman states that it's important that these reports are comprehensive. Bowman states that when the Board fails a report, it speaks volumes to how they feel about that executive and the work they have been doing, so the executives are going to do their best to improve, because they are an Executive Committee and a group of seven, and any criticism is not just criticism of any one or two individuals.

Riches states that a number of students, who couldn't be there tonight, demanded that he ask this question to Bowman on their behalf, but that it's lighthearted, so don't worry. Riches relates that during



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Bowman's presidential campaign, he had made repeated commitments to demonstrate to students that he can bench 250 pounds. Riches wonders when students can expect this to happen.

Bowman states that he hasn't seen any of the students in question in Goldring when he has been there. Bowman states that he thinks this is on Riches for not going to Goldring when he is there.

E. Kanter states that, given that opt-out numbers were released today in the meeting, he would be curious to find out why they weren't released online in advance of this meeting. Kanter also asks Granger to clarify if CFS referendum signatures are being collected by members, and if there is a timeline for submitting those signatures to the CFS. Kanter also asks, in light of earlier questions about defunding various student groups, how the University's free speech policy will be factored into those decisions.

Bowman states that, as for the first question about the opt-outs, there was nothing preventing the UTSU from throwing together a graphic and putting it on their social media, so that folks were made aware, so this is definitely on the UTSU, and they should've done it sooner. Bowman states that the reality of the situation is that the UTSU website has been through so many years of coding in the backend of it is really difficult to navigate. Bowman states that the UTSU actually just went through the process of hiring two new website developers just to help them navigate the page, so the UTSU can actually include new things on it. He states that the UTSU literally could not navigate the page themselves, so they had to bring in web developers to do it. He states that the UTSU is working with that process, and that he does want to make sure that they are made available online. He states that there is no excuse for not putting the numbers out as soon as the UTSU received it, because it is public information. He states that once the UTSU figures its stuff out with the web developers, they will be sure to include the opt-outs because the UTSU really has nothing to hide there.

Granger reiterates that union time or resources cannot be used towards defederation, and that no member of the UTSU team is able to do so. He states that, however, members of the UTSU can collect signatures. He states that there is a formula in the CFS bylaws that restricts the UTSU from collecting signatures. He states that the deadline for any signatures would be six months before any referendum, and furthermore, the deadline for CFS Ontario would be six months before the submitted date, while the deadline to leave CFS National would be six months after the submitted date.

Kanter asks for clarification that the UTSU will take no action to stop its affiliation with the Canadian Federation of Students. .

Granger states that he has done as much as he could, in his power, including submitting 106 pages of motions to the next CFS National General Meeting.

Kanter asks, with regard to the near \$1 million UofT contribution to the CFS, what the UTSU has done to reduce the amount contributed from student fees.

Bowman states that, because it is a collected levy, there is not much that the UTSU can do to change the actual number figure that they collect for the CFS, and that this has been the case for several years. Bowman reiterates that UofT does contribute the largest amount of money to the CFS per year, but that work on a CFS referendum would be a way to alleviate the amount of money granted to the CFS. He repeats that no member of the Executive Committee is able to start the referendum themselves, in that they cannot go out and print papers from the UTSU office and collect signatures. He states that it needs to come from a member who is not a part of the Executive Committee.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Kanter asks if it is possible to discourage students from opting-in to this particular fee.

Bowman answers that the ChooseUofT campaign surrounded the understanding that the UofT campus is a community of communities. He states that many students can't see themselves reflected in different student societies, and that there are probably students on campus who see themselves reflected in the Canadian Federation of Students as well. He states that, with the language around ChooseUofT, it would not be wise to say, "Choose everything, except that one group." He states that the UTSU wanted to encourage students not to opt-out of student life, more generally speaking, so that is why there hasn't been any language that would encourage students to do otherwise. He states that, with ChooseUofT, and everything with the opt-outs, the UTSU is more in disagreement with the Student Choice Initiative than with the Canadian Federation of Students.

The Chair limits Kanter's follow-ups, and moves on to Kanter's third question regarding the relationship between the UofT Free Speech Policy and Clubs.

Bowman states that he believes free speech, as a concept, is more often utilized as a guise to mask speech towards certain identifiable groups that could border on hate. Bowman acknowledges that some student groups identify free speech as their right, and he respects this. He states, however, that as mentioned previously, the UTSU would never encourage any group that has proven to do actions or promote language that is hurtful to a community. Bowman cedes his time to Karim.

Karim refers to the Clubs Recognition Criteria, and how the UTSU follows it. She states that the Clubs Policy states that recognized groups cannot discriminate on the basis of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual education, gender identity, gender expression, age, marital status and/or disability. She states that the UTSU would just like to ensure that all clubs are aware of this policy, that students who cause other students to feel unsafe are not allowed in the UTSU Recognition Criteria for clubs and student groups.

Kanter clarifies that his question was specific to the University of Toronto Free Speech Policy. Kanter asks how the Free Speech Policy is considered in the UTSU Clubs Recognition Criteria.

Bowman states that the UTSU can consult this policy further, but stands by his first statement that free-speech is often used as justification for certain actions or words towards other groups. Bowman reiterates Karim's point that this is the UTSU's policy. Bowman believes that the UTSU needs to do its best to follow governance documents, and those that have been set by precedent. He states, however, that the UTSU will do its best to ensure that it is consistent with the UofT Free Speech Policy.

Kanter asks for clarification that Bowman's position is that Students for Life is one of those hate-propagated groups.

Bowman states that he does not believe it is his place to speak about this, and he cedes time to any woman who feels comfortable speaking about this.

Karim states that a group that causes a woman to feel uncomfortable and unsafe is not representative of the University of Toronto community. She states that the UTSU has taken many measures to ensure that people who attend UTSU events are not faced with these issues are not feeling uncomfortable and feel safe to attend a public space in UofT. She states that, for instance, Street Festival, Clubs Carnival, and Parade are available for all students to attend and feel safe and welcome.

S. diNicolo states that she is a student head for the Non-Resident Affairs at the TCM. She states that a common problem across the colleges is engagement with its commuter students. diNicolo



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

acknowledges that the UTSU has been trying to increase member engagement this year through various means such as the First Year Council. She asks what else the UTSU has been doing to help engage commuter students beyond the transit bursary.

Bowman answers that the reality for many commuter students, is that events typically happen in the evenings or on a Friday, when they would rather spend time at home or with friends after a long week instead of coming to a UTSU-organized event. Bowman recognizes that there is a great deal of work already done by commuter-based positions on campus. He states that, more often than not, these do manifest in Pancake Breakfasts, because many commuter students miss breakfast in order to catch their next train. Bowman concedes that the UTSU can do a lot better to figure out how it can help commuter students specifically. He states that there have been partnerships with different groups who do breakfast events, but the UTSU is more than open to any member-recommendations as to how it can change events and programming so that it is open to all students, and not just those who live on residence.

T. Shafiq states that the last full UTSU election had a voter turnout of only 4.9%. He states that many positions went unfilled, and the By-election that followed still had a very low voter-turnout rate. Shafiq asks what the executive team is doing to build more student engagement with the UTSU's voting process.

Bowman concedes that what happened in the elections is not acceptable. Bowman states that his number one priority, since the very beginning, has been student engagement, and that the first thing that he did when he got elected was message all student society leaders in order to meet with them. He states that many students do not see themselves reflected in the UTSU, which accounts for the low voter turnout. He states that, for example, if there are students at Victoria College that feel more represented by VUSAC, it is the responsibility of the UTSU to have a meeting with VUSAC on how the UTSU can help. He states that the reality is that the UTSU does not have to be the one leading if groups are already doing the work, and the UTSU can just support. He states that the UTSU has tried to maintain as much of a presence by connecting with stakeholder groups on campus, and this also extends to clubs. Bowman specifies their collaboration with the Muslim Students' Association, whether through Community Iftars or Stress Relief Events. He states that the reality is that the UTSU does not just live in the tower with the painted dome in the middle of campus. He states that the UTSU wants to be involved at the events that students are frequenting on campus. Bowman further explains that another thing that the UTSU has done is holding Community Office Hours, where normally every Monday and Friday, barring any booking difficulties, the UTSU is tabling across campus. Bowman states that the UTSU Executive have been at Kelly Library, Vic, Woodsworth, and trying their best to go to Professional Faculties, and explains that the booking system is a bit different. Bowman states that the UTSU can't just expect students to come to us, they need to do their part to go to the students. Bowman also states that the last thing he will point out is that the UTSU's communication style has been completely changed. He states that they have tried their best to tweet as much as possible, and actually communicate to students their opinions on matters. Bowman states he would like to give big kudos to Padraic Berting, who is in the back of the room. Bowman explains that the UTSU just wants to communicate with students where the students frequent. He re-iterates that it shouldn't be enough to just expect students to come to them, and then be disappointed with the results of voter turnout. Bowman explains that this is why they're doing their best to reach out to students, rather than expect them to come to the UTSU.

D. O'Halloran, Vice-President, Professional Faculties, explains that in reference to the question of election turnout, he did run in that by-election and it was only because he read in the Varsity, and thought "oh these three seats are vacant". He states that It is unacceptable for a student union to have vacancies in their executive after a general election and promises to not have that happen again this



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO **STUDENTS' UNION**

year. O'Halloran further states that as for the Professional Faculties, he has been trying to work with all the student associations of the faculties to get UTSU services conveyed to students so that students know what the UTSU is doing, how to access its services, and how to get involved with the UTSU. He states that he has been showing up to the Community Office Hours every Friday, and that executives are always there and able to talk. He states that members can check that out on the UTSU Facebook page. He states that the UTSU also worked with all of the other student societies on campus to put on Choose UofT, to inform students what services are available to them and what their student associations do. He states that he did run on that particular issue, and that he cares about it a lot. He states that the Campaigns Committee, which he chairs, and the Outreach Committee have also been doing diligent work to ensure that the UTSU is as available to its membership as possible. He states that he is very confident that come the election period, the UTSU is going to see some very improved turnout.

Ma raises a Point of Order, to state that this agenda item has been discussed for more than forty minutes.

The Chair states that the time limit specified on the agenda isn't indicative of an actual motion brought to the meeting to limit discussion on this item. She states that this was a projection of how long the individual that was creating this document thought it would take, but it's not representative of what is happening. She states that she therefore cannot ask members to stop continuing to discuss items, because there has been a motion brought to the assembly to limit this discussion.

Shafiq states that he has a follow-up, and states that even if the UTSU collaborates with clubs, it is still limited to the audience they already have. He asks how the UTSU is going to try and approach students who might not have much engagement with any kind of clubs at all, or very infrequently attend clubs, of whom there are many.

Bowman states that this is a really great question. He states that the UTSU should not necessarily rely on students to take the first step to interact with it, and that Shafiq is completely right. He states that the executives are always open to suggestions about how they can change the UTSU's programming so that it's open to more students. He states that a really great way to do that is with a variety of programming, and not just doing the same formula over and over again. He states that basically what the UTSU has been doing right now is to reach out to as many groups as possible because, again that is the easiest way because they already do have an audience, and the UTSU really just wants to support the work that they're doing. He states that the executives are trying to ensure that the UTSU's programming is consistent with what students want to see. He states that there are ways that the UTSU can solicit those answers, whether that be with a survey, or something like that. He states that if that would be of interest to Shafiq, that would be of interest to himself because he wants to engage as many students as he can. He states that if the UTSU is not doing that right now, then it has to change for the better.

Maragha states that she would like to move the motion out of the discussion items and into the next order of business.



#### **4.1 Motion to Limit Debate**

##### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: MARAGHA

SECONDED: MORRIS

**BE IT RESOLVED that debate be ended on this motion.**

##### **DISCUSSION**

D. Singh raises a Point of Order, to state that a motion to call the question is not debatable.

The Chair states that technically, it is being moved to leave the discussion items, and she doesn't need to vote to leave a discussion item.

D. Singh states if there are people on the Speaker's List, and there is a motion to end discussion on an item early, it is a motion to call the question.

The Chair states that it's not a motion, but rather, just a discussion item.

#### **4.1.1 Motion to Challenge the Chair**

##### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: SIDDALL

SECONDED: BRYANT

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Chair's ruling be challenged.**

##### **DISCUSSION**

The Chair states that she gets an opportunity to explain the ruling. She states that, furthermore, there will be a discussion on the appeal, followed by moving into voting procedure on whether or not to uphold the chair's ruling.

D. Singh raises a Point of Order, in that the Chair needs a motion to uphold her ruling.

The Chair states that she does not not require a motion to uphold the ruling.

D. Singh states that she does require such a motion. D. Singh states he would like to challenge the Chair on that. D. Singh insists that the Chair does require a motion to uphold their ruling.

The Chair explains that because there is no requirement to have a Motion to Uphold the Chair's ruling, because an appeal of the Chair requires a vote in negative for the appeal. The Chair states that, hereby, she appeals her ruling, and allows the Motion to happen with that Discussion, regarding the Motion to end the Discussion Item.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

D. Singh states that he thinks it's important that the meeting follow procedure closely. D. Singh states that the Chair has Robert's Rules in front of them and that he believes that if someone challenges the Chair, as a member just did, that they need a motion to uphold, otherwise the challenge carries.

The Chair states that she is looking at Robert's Rules of Order and states that Appeal in a General Case is in order whenever someone has the floor and it needs to be seconded. The Chair states it is debatable and it does not require a Motion to Uphold the Chair's Ruling.

D. Singh states that the Appeal is the Motion to Uphold the Ruling.

The Chair states that there was a seconder for that appeal. The Chair explains the ruling that discussion would be allowed when it comes to ending the time of discussion item and exiting. The Chair further states that on the motion of appealing the Chair's ruling, there can either be discussion on it, or this discussion item can be left.

The Chair states that if there's no other points available, she will move into the Appeal of the Chair's Ruling, so that there will be discussion to end the discussion item. The Chair explains that she has the first opportunity to speak on why she made the ruling. Chair explains that it is allowed to have discussion on a motion to end discussion item, because there are still speakers on the discussion that wished to speak. She states that she feels that if rights are being taken away rights from individuals who wish to speak on a motion, it makes sense for the motion to end that discussion, and is also debatable so those individuals get an opportunity to speak on whether that should be allowed. She states that this is not actual motion, it's a discussion item. She states that there's no call to the question, because there is no vote to leave the discussion item, or there's no vote to be had. She states that this time she will open the floor to any discussion on her ruling, and from there the meeting will go into voting procedure.

D. Singh states that any motion to end any item, regardless of whether there was a vote on that item, is a Call to Question. He states that this is important for two reasons: that it is important that motions are labeled correctly, and that a motion cannot be renamed if the new name accomplishes the same goal. He states that this is primarily because a Motion to Call the Question would require  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the vote, but a reframed motion that requires the same thing, one could argue, only requires  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the vote, which would be a significant substantive difference in how this motion is handled. He states that, regardless of what it is called, folks can say whatever words they want. He states that this is a Motion to Call the Question, and it should be treated as a Motion to Call the Question.



The Chair asks if there are any other individuals that would like to speak on this motion, or this appeal.

Riches asks if he may raise a Motion to Recess for 10 minutes and return to this issue later.

The Chair states that a Motion to Recess does take precedence over a Motion to Appeal.

Siddall asks to make a Friendly Amendment, to thirty minutes.

The Chair states that a Motion to Recess is not an amendable motion.

Riches asks if he can change his motion.

The Chair states that she did not receive a seconder, so Riches may do so.

#### **4.1.1 Motion to Recess**

##### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: D. WILTON

**BE IT RESOLVED that the meeting be recessed for 15 minutes.**

##### **DISCUSSION**

##### **CARRIED**

*The meeting resumes at 8:32 PM.*

The Chair states that the motion at hand was the appeal of the turn, whether the discussion would be allowed on a motion to end discussion on the executive Q&A. She asks if there is anyone that would like to speak on this appeal.

#### **4.1.2 Motion to Call the Question on the Appeal of the Chair**

##### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: SIDDALL

SECONDED: SINGH

**BE IT RESOLVED that the question be called.**

##### **DISCUSSION**

Bowman states a Point of Information to confirm what a vote in favour would indicate and what a vote of opposition would indicate.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

The Chair states that a vote in favour of Calling the Question would indicate a limit on discussion on the Appeal of the Chair, moving into voting procedure immediately. She states that a vote against calling the question would indicate furthering discussion until it exhausts or another Motion to Call to Question is raised before a vote on the appeal of the Chair's ruling.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTION: O'HALLORAN, GRANGER, KARIM, MA, A. SINGH, ERICKSON, HANSRA, BOWMAN, RISSEL, KAUL**

Currie asks for clarification on what a vote in favour a vote against would indicate.

The Chair states that a Vote in Favour would support the Chair's ruling such that a motion to end discussion on a discussion item is debatable. She states that this would require a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote at the end if the meeting wants to move out of the discussion item. She states that a vote to not uphold the chair's ruling would indicate that a motion is not debatable and still requires a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority in order to leave the discussion item. She asks if this satisfies the Point of Information.

**CARRIED**

## 5. Receipt of Audited Financial Statements

### RESOLUTION

MOVED: KAUL

SECONDED: STOJANOVIC

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Audited Financial Statements of the 2018-19 fiscal year be approved as presented.**

### DISCUSSION

Bowman states that the pizza's on the way. He states that he would just like to draw everyone's attention to the UTSU Financial Statements. He states that there were physical handouts right outside, and that they're also available in the meeting package. He states that, in the first section, pages 1-2, this is a report-back on the Audit Process and any general findings. He states that this would normally outline any ethical requirements and standards of a not-for-profit audit such as the UTSU. He states that it is noteworthy that there was no management letter submitted. He states that normally, a management letter, provided by an auditor, would convey to the management of the UTSU and to its membership that there are some internally controlled deficiencies, but the UTSU did not receive a management letter. He states that the balance sheet can be found on page 3. He states that this is not the same as a profit/loss statement, as that is money in and out over time. He states that the balance sheet is a snapshot of the entirety of the UTSU's assets and liabilities, until April 30th of 2019. He states that that's just an important thing to note when asking questions. He states that assets are resources that the UTSU can use to create goods or provide services and generate revenues. He states that the UTSU's current assets include cash, accounts receivable (which is money that is owed to the UTSU), and its inventory, such as tickets. He states that these resources are typically consumed within the next 12 months of the year. He states that some of the highlights that he is going to note, as far as the money in



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

the bank that we have, is that it is \$3 million. He states that that is cash that supports the UTSU's annual cash flow, and that is earmarked for ongoing and future investments, specifically in the Student Commons. He states that this is currently being maintained in an interest-bearing investment account. He states that going forward, for Accounts Receivable, money owed to the UTSU is \$20,000. He states that, for the UTSU's assets, the non-current assets include resources that are useful beyond the typical life of 12 months. He states that for this, the UTSU normally uses a deferral method that restricts any money not spent to the same purpose the following year. He states that some of the highlights from this are the Toronto Transit Commission Term Deposit, which is \$500,000. He states that it is noteworthy that the TTC no longer requires that the UTSU hold this deposit, as the program is ending. He states that the funds remain in the interest-bearing term account in the meantime. He states that, furthermore, there is restricted cash in deferred student fees, which is \$1.15 million. He states that these are the cumulative levies that are collected, and that it looks high mainly because the Wheelchair Accessibility Fund is included in it. He states that one can clearly see that the UTSU reserves and restricts levies to their intended purpose, and that they don't get absorbed into the UTSU's general operating budget. He states that this also does include some money that could be owed to certain levied groups, but that is largely due to accounting practices and things that the UTSU is working out with them right now. He clarifies that these are not just levied groups at UofT St. George, but also at UTM. He states that, furthermore, in terms of restricted cash, there is \$1.7 million of it allocated to Health and Dental, which are deferred Health and Dental fees. He states that the most significant thing to note here, for those that followed the UTSU-UTMSU separation, is that there was a transfer of 30 percent of all previous reserves, which is \$600,000, to the UTMSU because of the split. He states that an increase in the administration and general expenses was related to the cancellation of OHIP+, the Ontario Health Insurance Program, which cost the Health and Dental plan about \$800,000. He states that this cost actually means that \$0 went into the Health and Dental Reserve this year. He states that the UTSU is very fortunate that it did have a healthy reserve last year prior to this, to weather the storm of the Student Choice Initiative and cuts to OHIP+. He states that, furthermore, there is restricted cash for an HR Legal Contingency of around \$50,000, and that's because the UTSU expects to go into Collective Bargaining in January 2020. He states that, as far as liabilities go, these are debt obligations that the UTSU owes other companies, individuals, or institutions, and liabilities match assets for an ending balance of \$0. He states that the UTSU's Accounts Payable is \$996,000, and this just includes the \$800,000 the UTSU paid out to its Health Insurer, and a lot of this is being worked out with UTM right now. He states that the statement of changes and net assets is on page 4. He states that the UTSU's total assets have increased by a 2018/19 surplus of \$221,000, and that its total net assets are around \$2.6 million. He states that the statement of operations is on page 5, and that it can be perceived to be a profit and loss, if that helps folks understand it a bit better. He states that this is the statement of earnings from the reported period from May 1, 2018 to April 30, 2019. He restates that the UTSU's revenue is as projected. He states that the UTSU's fees will come in from student fees; money raised through sponsorship and advertising related to the Student Handbook (the lovely agenda that the UTSU handed out at Orientation and in Orientation Kits); office ticket sales; and interest off of the UTSU's investment accounts. He states that this comes out to about \$2.4 million. He states that for the UTSU's expenses, folks can go into salaries and employee benefits, of which there was a small increase, and a lot of that is because there was a 2.5 percent cost-of-living adjustment on all staff and any



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

payouts that were there. He states that, for the office in general, there is a decrease because there was a large Docudavit in the year that preceded it, and that's not reflected in that figure, comparatively speaking. He states that for Orientation, there was an increase in spending from the previous year, but that it is noteworthy that there has been a reduction of \$100,000 in this current year, comparatively. He states that for Clubs and Subsidies, there was an increase in clubs funding. He states that for TTC and other tickets, there was a decrease, most likely because the TTC Metropass program is ending. He states that for Elections, there was a decrease, but this was because previously, the UTSU had attributed the cost of the Elections Staff to the Elections Item, and in that year, it did not do so. He states that for Campaigns, there was a small decrease in Campaigns and Committee Spending. He states that for the Handbook, there was a decrease, but that was intentional, as the UTSU prints a lot of them, and it wanted to make sure that money is being spent wisely and that students are actually benefiting from the Student Handbook. He states that for Meetings and Conventions, there was a decrease. He states that for Equipment Expenses, there was a small increase, but it was just because the UTSU was adding things to its resource bank, like physical items. He states that for those who are a part of clubs and access the Resource Bank, the UTSU does need to restock it from time to time, and that this was reflected here. He states that for Interests and Bank Charges, that's just the cost of banking and for amortization, which is the cost of equipment over time. He gives the example that if one buys a computer, it might have a lifetime of five years, and while there is not a subsequent expense for it, it is amortized over time, so that's reflected in that item. He states that for the Restricted Fees Recognized, there is a surplus, and for Revenue that is over expenses, not-for-profits typically reinvest their surplus. He states that that UTSU has reinvested our future growth, which is the Student Commons. He states that the Statement of Cash Flows is on page 6, and that this acts as a bridge between the Statement of Operations, which is like the Profit/Loss Report, and the Statement of Financial Position, which is the UTSU's balance sheet, and shows how much money has moved in and out of the UTSU. He states that because there is a positive cash flow, and actually a comparatively higher positive cash flow, this puts the UTSU in a better position to make investments. He states that this is due to a lot of organization and planning to get the UTSU in a position where it has enough cash flow to operate the Student Commons. He states that he is very thankful to my predecessors, two of whom are in the room. He states that the UTSU has maintained enough money in its unrestricted accounts, so it never has to borrow money from a restricted account. He states that the UTSU always has enough upfront money, meaning cash in the bank, to apply for things like Orientation and Renovations. He states that with regard to the Notes to the Financial Statements, which are on pages 7-17, these are footnotes. He apologizes for talking about footnotes, but acknowledges that many attendees are trying to escape class. He states that these footnotes provide additional information pertaining to the UTSU's operations and financial position, and that they are a very integral part of the financial statements. He states that on page 7 is just a background on accounting principles, not specific to UTSU. He states that page 8 details Equipment Amortization, which just spreads the cost of an intangible asset over time. He states that Deferral Accounting and Revenue Recognition indicates that the UTSU is in accordance with all generally accepted accounting principles, and that it restricts its money for its intended purpose, which can be the Health and Dental Reserve or the Student Refugee Program. He states that page 9 describes Capital Management, which states that the UTSU understands how to maintain its operations, and that it is putting aside money for future projects, most specifically the Student Commons. He states that



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

there's also a Restricted TTC Deposit, as the UTSU used to buy Metropasses in the thousands, and thus it had to put aside money as a credit deposit. He states that as this program is going to fully cease on December 31st of this year, this money will be reinvested. He states that for Equipment, it is currently valued at \$33,000. He states that for Inventory, it's just the amount of tickets the UTSU brings in each year. He states that page 10 centers around Accounts Receivable, which are just the people that owe the UTSU money. He states that the UTSU was very aggressive in ensuring that there was no bad debt. He states that a lot of the bad debt was from Orientation sponsors, so the UTSU also made the decision to remove a lot of the Accounts Payable that it deemed as bad debt because it over-inflates its assets in its balance sheet. He states that page 10-14 discusses Restricted Student Fees, which are all the levies that are collected and dispersed. He states that not all of these are fully dispersed at the time, because a lot of them are restricted for future spending, like the Student Refugee Program or Health and Dental. He states that in the case of levied groups, some of them haven't met all of the financial requirements to have their levies dispersed at the time that they asked. He states that page 15 notes that there was a UTMSU split and allocation in payout of 30% of all Health and Dental and Wheelchair Accessibility Funds ever collected, and that this was dispersed for a total of \$1.2 million. He states that what is most notable here is that the cuts to OHIP+ didn't really help the matter. He states that the UTSU started the year with more money in the Health and Dental reserve than it ended with, because 30% of the Health and Dental reserve and the Wheelchair Accessibility Fund was designated for the UTMSU. He states that the UTSU's health and dental reserve has been terribly impacted by the \$800,000 that was owed to the Health and Dental provider. He states that, for context, the Health and Dental plan existed to complement the OHIP+ plan, but that with the reductions to the OHIP+ plan, a lot of this has affected the Health and Dental plan, and the UTSU's ability to put money into its reserves. He states that this has had consequences on things like the payout to the UTMSU, and on the amount of money the UTSU plans on putting in reserves in any given year. He states that page 16 discusses an increase in Wages and Benefits, which was just because there was an increase in executive hours in the Associate Vice President structure compared to the previous year. He states that in the previous year, there was a bit of a difference of executives coming off of salary positions, so he thinks that there was a bit of a difference that was reflected there. He states that for Restricted HR and Legal, it was put aside in 2018 for costs and expenses surrounding Collective Bargaining in 2019/2020. He states that for the UTSU's Commitments, it does owe \$800,000 for Health and Dental, due to the government's OHIP+ costs. He states that a lot of the money that the UTSU would be putting into the reserve this year would be put aside to ensure that it can pay off what it owes.

Kanter asks who is going into Collective Bargaining, and about what.

Bowman states that this could be better answered by the staff. He cedes his speaking time to either T. Nikolaevsky, the UTSU's Services Coordinator, or S. Belleau, the General Manager of the UTSU.

S. Belleau states that the UTSU goes into Collective Bargaining on the regular, about every three years. She states that because of an assumption that the UTSU would have to go into Collective Bargaining again, any changes to the organizational structure, whether it be on the management or the staff side, including things like job descriptions, all have to go through the Collective Bargaining process. She



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

states that this is dictated by Labour Laws in the Province of Ontario, and that the UTSU is a unionized environment. She states that the UTSU assumed, likely correctly, that it would have to go into Collective Bargaining sooner than three years. She states that the UTSU was in Collective Bargaining last year. She states that the UTSU's agreement was only set up for one year rather than the usual three years, because the UTSU is expecting so many changes related to both the Student Commons, and to infrastructure that is required. She states that the UTSU wasn't able to conceptualize ahead of time what the job descriptions would be, thus it has agreed to go into Collective Bargaining, and that in the past, the legal costs associated with that have really dragged on. She states that, just as a contingency measure, the UTSU put a fair bit of money into that in the previous two years, when it knew it was going into Collective Bargaining two years in a row.

Kanter asks if Belleau is referring to the union that represents the staff of the UTSU.

Belleau confirms.

Kanter asks what union that is.

Belleau states that it is CUPE.

Shafiq asks a question regarding page 16 of the audit, which says that the UTSU would be moving to 250 College Street, which he believes is the Student Commons. He notes that Bowman has mentioned that's probably not going to happen within this academic year. He asks what the plan is for the current Observatory Building, if the UTSU moves, and whether it reverts back to common student usage. He notes that this audit is for the previous fiscal year, up until April. He asks if Bowman can give something of a sense, even without an audit, of what the UTSU expects its finances to be for this year, especially in light of the Student Choice Initiative. He asks if there are any new expenses or significant cuts to revenue.

Bowman states that to the best of his knowledge, the university will be taking the Observatory back and it will be converted into some sort of student space. He states that Belleau has been privy to whatever the plans are for that building, so he will cede my time to her and then he will answer Shafiq's second question.

Belleau states that within the Student Commons Agreement, which is something that the UTSU should be paying attention to over time, it does say that for any space that is taken back from students by the student groups moving into the Student Commons, the costs associated with those student spaces should be removed from student fees. She states that she doesn't know how the university intends to articulate the cost of all the specifics. She states that there are at least 8 student groups that will be moving into the Student Commons, relieving that space on campus. She states that if the university doesn't use the Observatory for student-led, student-serving activities, it is supposed to take those costs off of student fees somewhere. She states that this is just something for the UTSU to pay attention to



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO **STUDENTS' UNION**

over time, to ensure that the university isn't taking advantage of the space that the UTSU is offering and that students are paying for.

Bowman, in response to Shafiq's second question, states that the first thing he would do is to encourage Shafiq to look at the UTSU's November Operating Budget when it is released. He states that there was a Profit/Loss statement offered at the September 22nd meeting of the Board of Directors. He states that if one is curious as to what the UTSU's finances look like over the summer, he would encourage them to look there. He states that as far as the Student Choice Initiative goes, and how it has impacted the UTSU's funding, it has been very proactive in ensuring that the cuts don't necessarily immediately affect all the services and programming that the UTSU offers students. He states that, that being said, the Student Choice Initiative compelled the university – at least according to the Office of the Vice Provost, Students (OVPS) – to commit to the most sound financial practices as possible. He states that when levied groups collect fees, they'd need to be allocated to what they were designated for. He states that this has really placed the onus on the UTSU, as a student union, to be as extremely financially accountable as possible. He states that the OVPS is very nervous that if any group necessarily contravenes the ancillary fee framework, it could have massive consequences on UofT campus. He states that the UTSU's budgeting process has been very strict, and again encourages members to look at the Profit/Loss statement that was offered in September. He states that because the UTSU did commit to doing this on a quarterly basis, he would stay up-to-date with those to get a better picture about what the UTSU's finances look like going into the year.

N. Ferreira states that he is one of the Heads of Trinity College, here with the Trinity College Meeting tonight. He states that he has one question, as it pertains to the Salary and Employee Benefits Line of expenses. He states that he was just hoping that either Bowman or someone else could provide some clarity as to the specifics of why the increase was as much as it was. He states that he knows Bowman spoke of the planned 2.5% increase for adjustment of cost-of-living, in addition to a few other factors. He states that, to his calculations, it was about a 16% increase from the previous year. He states that if it has anything to do with new hires, that's absolutely fine, but that he was just wondering if that played a role as well, and if so, why those hires were made. He states that he is sure there's justification, but that he is just wondering.

Bowman states that he will first answer a bit of that, and then he will encourage other members of the executive, or Boucher or Belleau, to touch on this point. He states that to Ferreira's inquiry if there were new members of staff brought on, there were. He states that one of those new members of staff is the UTSU's Strategic Partnerships Coordinator, A. Lashley, whose function is to bring sponsorships and additional revenue into the UTSU. He states that Lashley is an entirely new staff person, and was one of the additions that were made. He states that this was an extremely necessary addition, as Lashley was extremely instrumental in the funding of Orientation this year, and that she's just a really great person overall. He encourages either members of the executive committee, Boucher or Belleau to speak.

Boucher states that basically, Bowman just hit the nail on the head. She states that, at one point last year, the UTSU had four full-time staff, and by the end of that year, it had eight. She states that the UTSU



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

has been essentially increasing staff to meet the demands of the new Student Commons that will be opening.

The Chair clarifies that Boucher was the previous president of the UTSU, which is why it made sense to allow Boucher to speak on the changes on the budget from last year.

**CARRIED**

## **6. Appointment of Auditors**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: KAUL

SECONDED: CURRIE

**BE IT RESOLVED that \_\_\_\_\_ be appointed as the external auditors of the University of Toronto Students' Union for the 2019-2020 fiscal year.**

### **DISCUSSION**

### **6.1 Motion to Amend**

#### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: KARIM

**BE IT RESOLVED that the motion be amended to read:**

***BE IT RESOLVED that Sloane and Partners LLP be appointed as the external auditors of the University of Toronto Students' Union for the 2019-2020 fiscal year.***

### **DISCUSSION**

Bowman states that they were the UTSU's auditors previously, and that they do a good job. He states that he was very satisfied with the report that they issued for this AGM.

**CARRIED**

D. Singh states that Sloane and Partners were the auditors who did both this audit and the previous audit. He states that he was the Vice President, Operations the year that the UTSU did its Request for Proposal (RFP) and solicited Sloane among others, and picked Sloane. He states that this is going to be the third year that Sloane is doing the audit, and asks if there is any interest from the executive in doing another RFP process and soliciting new auditors moving forward, or if that is something they are leaving to future executives, or if there is a lack of interest.

Bowman states that he is satisfied with the work of Sloane and Partners. He states that while there could be interest in doing an RFP in the future, he thinks that is something that the UTSU can think about as an executive, and possibly make a recommendation to its successors in its transition report as to whether or not that is something they should look into pursuing. He states that right now, the UTSU



has a lot of things to look at, whether that be the Student Choice Initiative or the split with the UTMSU and the impacts of those on the UTSU's finances, so he doesn't really think that going through the process of an RFP and getting a new auditor is necessarily the most productive exercise. He states that the UTSU should just select Sloane because they are a safe bet, and then, in the Transition Report, the UTSU can recommend that its successors look into an RFP.

**CARRIED**

## **7. Bylaw and Elections Procedure Code Changes**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: KAUL

SECONDED: GRANGER

**BE IT RESOLVED that the amendments to the UTSU's Bylaws and Elections Procedure Code approved by the Board of Directors since the 2018 Annual General Meeting be approved as presented in the appendices.**

### **DISCUSSION**

Kaul states that there are a number of policies and bylaw changes that the UTSU has had to make in the wake of both the SCI and the Student Commons. He states that he believes these will be discussed individually. He states that he will cede some time to Granger, if he wants to speak to any of the motions that he proposed specifically.

Granger states that he will keep it short. He states that, in general, the Bylaw changes that can be seen are necessary changes that the UTSU has to make, both proactively and reactively, to the Student Choice Initiative, depending on which policy. He states that the UTSU has produced some more user-friendly amendments, such as merging the Elections and Referenda bylaws under one umbrella, but that among others, this is the general sense of the term. He states that many of the UTSU's bylaws have really been policies, and that the UTSU needs to reflect this. He states that, as such, the UTSU is moving towards a structure that more accurately reflects what the bylaws are and what the policies are supposed to be.

Ferreira states that he is seeking clarity on Amendments to Bylaw 4, under policies, which strikes the ability of members at an AGM to either vote to adopt, rescind, or amend procedural or operational policies. He asks if anyone could give some clarification as to why this is being struck, and if this is going to alter the way that this may be conducted at an AGM. He asks if this is being taken out because it is redundant in some way, and if members would still be able to do this at an AGM.

Granger states that, as the person who moved this motion at the Governance Committee, he will clarify the points that are being made. He states that, as members can see, this was a change that was also implemented last year at the Annual General Meeting. He states that it was done for various reasons, but ultimately, the reality is that the Operational and Procedural policies of the UTSU are documents that have had many things thrown into it for a long time, and that the UTSU needs to restructure how



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

its policies look in general. He states that, as members can see, the UTSU added a new section for Governance Policies. He states that within that policy bylaw, the intention, from his end, over the course of the next however many months of the year, is to add the ability for students to implement governance policies at the AGM. He states that the reason is that the governance policies are those that would impact the governance and the structure of the UTSU, which is what most people are interested in anyways regarding the bylaws. He states that the difference between the operational and governance policies will essentially be that operational policies deal with that of HR staff, which ultimately the membership should be able to see, but not necessarily, on a dime, move around. He states that these include Health and Safety policies, and financial practices. He states that in terms of procedural policies, there is only currently one procedural policy in the UTSU's Policy Binder, and that is the Policy on the Submission and Adoption of Policy. He states that the UTSU is in the process of reworking its entire Policies and Bylaws, and as such is looking at ways for members to continue to be involved. He states that this is one of those ways, going into the future.

Ferreira states that he will follow up. He states that, from what he can gather, the UTSU would be removing the ability of members to vote on operational or procedural policies at an AGM. He asks if this is correct. He states that he assumes all of these amendments to the bylaws are going to be passed in omnibus. He states that he would like to move to externalize this portion of this, because it is quite significant, seeing as the UTSU is limiting the scope of what members can vote at the AGM. He states that there should be a thorough discussion on it, and a separate vote.

## **7.1 Motion to Divide the Question**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: FERREIRA

SECONDED: CURRIE

**BE IT RESOLVED that the changes to Bylaw 4 be externalized.**

### **DISCUSSION**

Riches raises a Point of Information, to ask if this is a Division of the Question and not an Externalization. He states that this is just because last year, he did externalize something that was in the Bylaw and EPC changes, and it was considered an externalization. He states that, to the best of his knowledge, this is not debatable and not votable, and is just done.

The Chair states that this is true for the UTSU's consent agenda at the Board of Directors meetings.

Riches states that he is talking about last year, at the Annual General Meeting.

The Chair states that she is going to explain her thought process. The chair states that Externalizations only exist for the Consent Agenda that only appears at the Board of Directors meetings of the UTSU. She states that that is not applicable here, because it is in the policy for the Board of Directors meetings, in the Consent Agenda and Externalizations bit. She states



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

---

that she would have to treat this as a Division of the Question, which would do the same thing but would just have to be voted upon, whether the assembly thinks that this portion is worth dividing from the other amendments and the appendix, and discussing in its own merits.

## **CARRIED**

D. Singh states that he has questions relating to the Bylaw changes, and then possibly motions to divide. He states that, first, the vast majority of bylaw changes includes the removal of responsibilities from the bylaws and shifts to moving those responsibilities to mandate policies. He states that, for example, the Bylaw 8 mandate of the Board of Directors has been considerably reduced and there is a little add-on that says the UTSU will talk about it in the policies. He states that that seems to be the large narrative of these changes, and if anyone is trying to follow along, there is a reduction of responsibilities in the bylaws and a move of those to the policies. He states that this motion in itself is just approved policy changes. He asks if those policies are available, and states that these are being moved somewhere, presumably. He states that Granger is adding a clause that says that it will be talked about in the policy. He states that the membership, as a body, has no control over the policy, so, presumably all of the power of this mandate, if this is approved, is going to the Board of Directors. He asks if those policies have been written, and if there is something the membership can see. He states that right now, they are just voting without being able to see what the actual changes are. He states that the UTSU is just removing a bunch of stuff from the bylaws and then saying they will talk about it in another document, which isn't written, or isn't present.

Granger states that he is the one who moved this amendment, as well. He states that in his reading of the policies and bylaws in the past year, as a Director and as an Executive, he noticed that a lot of the bylaws were replicated in the policies regardless. He states that, for example, in the Mandate of the Executive Committee, the job descriptions are replicated in both places. He states that one of the consequences of this is that one description was out-of-date, and one was a more accurate reflection of the current practice of the current UTSU, and future practices the UTSU intended on keeping. He states that when these changes were made in the bylaws, there was no change that was made without a policy change as well. He states that everything that has been taken out has been in some form been replicated within that policy. He states that, for example, there is a mandate of the Board of Directors policy, which has removed sections in there as well. He states that on top of that, the Executive Responsibilities Policy has also seen increases, but no removals, to job descriptions. He states that ultimately, yes there have been removals from the bylaws, but the reality is that the UTSU was following the policy more accurately, and the bylaws should ideally make it more user-friendly for the reader and the Union to follow.



## **7.2 Motion to Divide the Question**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BOUCHER

SECONDED: D. SINGH

**BE IT RESOLVED that the question is divided to externalize Bylaw 7 after the Bylaw 4 changes.**

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: O'HALLORAN, GRANGER, KARIM, MA, PREM, FAROOQ, REUTER, OGBONNA, MCCORMICK, ROBSON, SACKKEYFIO, RISELLI, DESIBIENS, RICHES, PATEL, KOOMSON, KAUL**

Erickson states that he would like to draw attention to Bylaw 11, wherein the actual mandates of every committee of the UTSU is removed and put directly into policy. Policy is what the Board of Directors have jurisdiction over, rather than the membership. Erickson states concern, especially with the Elections and Referenda Committee, whereby the membership may have no ability to even talk about amendments to that. It would only sit within a policy that is at the jurisdiction of the elected officials. Erickson additionally asks about an incomplete sentence at the beginning of the document, and asks for clarification on this.

Granger states that committee bylaws, similar to the mandate of the Board of Directors and Executive Responsibilities Bylaws, were replicated and sometimes out of date with what the committee had actually done. He states that, in a push to rework the UTSU's committees and ensure that they are more responsible to themselves and to the members, the UTSU has greatly expanded upon what the committees actually do. He states that the bylaw itself now outlines what a committee should be, and a grander idea of what a committee is; so, instead of dictating exactly what the committee will do, because that's not always the case – especially if the committees don't meet – they are now outlined in the general guidelines of the policy. He states that committees have more power to do as they see going forward. He states that, on the note of the Elections and Referenda Committee, it is dealt with in its own separate Bylaw as well. The committee shall exist and shall have jurisdiction over certain things, in the Elections bylaw.

Kaul states a Point of Information, asking for the specific sentence in Bylaw 11 that Erickson is referring to.

Erickson states that he is referring to Bylaw 11, item 1, sentence 2.

Kaul states that it is a complete sentence on the online copy. He states that it says, "The Committees of the UTSU shall conduct all decisions made by the Board and seek approval on all matters."

Erickson states that this is not available on his copy, and reiterates his first point to the relevancy of the policy in the bylaws, which is to question why, rather than delete it from the authority of the membership, the UTSU does not simply amend the text so that it's more accurate, instead of totally removing it as a separate part of policy that only the Board of Directors can ever amend.



### **7.3 Motion to Limit Speaking Time**

#### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: MA

**BE IT RESOLVED that speaking time be limited to two minutes per speaker, with the exception of those that are motivating for items.**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Bowman states that individuals should only speak three times per motion.

D. Singh states that there is already a rule in Robert's Rules of Order that limits speaking to two.

Bowman motivates for the motion stating that it is shortly past 9:30PM, and on the meeting schedule, it does say that it is only supposed to go until 10:00PM. He states that it is the UTSU, so the meeting will likely go for a bit longer, but encourages everyone to be aware of the time so that the meeting can proceed on the business on the agenda.

#### **CARRIED**

Granger states that the idea, of course, was not to remove it from the membership. He states that that is never the intention, but essentially, when there are replications in both the bylaw and the policy, every time one of those gets amended, the other must reflect that. He states that, for instance, the policy reflects fewer committees because of some have recently merged and this would have to be reflected in the Bylaw as well. He states that, in the past, and most notably in the Executive Responsibilities Policy, some of the changes just weren't ever made. He states that this is a similar project: to move them into a place where they are more easily accessible, and where they refer to each other less so that people can read them more easily.

### **7.4 Motion to Recess**

#### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: SACKKEYFIO

**BE IT RESOLVED that the meeting recess for five minutes.**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Bowman states that pizza has arrived in the lobby

#### **CARRIED**



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

---

*The meeting resumes at 9:50 PM.*

Sackeyfio asks whether, if a certain part of the bylaws move to the policy, the membership still has jurisdiction over the policy, or whether that is completely removed from the membership.

The Chair asks what Sackeyfio means by jurisdiction.

Sackeyfio asks if the membership still has the ability to make edits or make suggestions on the policy, as well as the bylaw.

The Chair states that the Governance Committee Meeting minutes are open to all members of the UTSU, in which members can propose amendments or make changes to any of the bylaws and policies within the UTSU. She states that the general membership does not lose jurisdiction, and they still have the opportunity to engage with the policies and bylaws and propose amendments and changes.

Bowman asks if Sackeyfio is referring to this in the context of the AGM specifically.

Sackeyfio states that he is referring to this in the context of the changes with the bylaws.

Bowman states that the UTSU's structure is inherently meant to be a place to contribute thoughts and attend meetings. He states that all of the committees do meet in open session, unless they go "In-Camera." He states that the Governance Committee does meet in open session, and anyone can come and work with the Executive and the Directors to move an amendment on something. He states that it's just that those members of committees have to be members of the Board, as those are the people who have the voting rights. Bowman states that there has been this confusion that moving things to certain areas makes it inaccessible to the membership, and Bowman states that he does not necessarily agree with this.

The Chair states that, if bylaws are moved to policies, and there are proposed changes, those changes may not come to the General Meeting to be approved by the general membership. She states that this doesn't mean that the general membership doesn't have the opportunity to come to the Board of Directors' meeting or the Governance Committee meeting to discuss their thoughts and opinions on the proposed changes.

Sackeyfio expresses thanks for the clarification.

D. Singh states that the answers have so far been misleading. He states that the idea is that right now, if something is in the bylaws, it is an absolute requirement that members vote on it for approval. He states that if it is removed from the bylaws and moved to the policy, not only do members at no point get a vote on it, but they only get a right to discuss it. He repeats that members do not get the ability to vote, and states that there is also no requirement for it to be approved by the members. He states that the idea that it is not a removal of jurisdiction is almost patently false, as it is a shift of jurisdiction to the



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Board of Directors, and members do not get votes at the Board of Directors or the Governance Committee. He states that right now, there is a requirement that changes be approved by this body, and that's why there is a discussion on it. He states that if the membership approves the changes, that requirement will no longer be present, and while he believes that this Board of Directors acts in good faith, there could be another Board of Directors that does not act in good faith, and that Board of Directors would have ultimate authority to make changes as they want, and there is no requirement whatsoever if these changes are approved for the membership to approve the changes.

O'Halloran states that the issue at hand is moving bylaws that affect internal management issues to the policies. He states that there are only about four of the UTSU's bylaws that are required to be bylaws by the Canadian Not-for-Profit Corporations Act, and that the rest of these do not, by law, have to be bylaws. He states that everything that the Executive is moving to the policies right now are simply for the streamlining of internal operations, and it is also to make sure that things cannot be changed on a whim, and also, that there isn't any overlap. He states that every time the UTSU is not in accordance with the bylaws, which, he states that D. Singh's executive as well as the previous administration executive were not in accordance with the bylaws, it weakens the legal argument that the UTSU is in accordance with the bylaws.

The Chair interjects and asks members to not speak on previous administrations without actual proof that can be brought to the Annual General Meeting about possible infractions. Chair reminds individuals to be mindful of their language.

O'Halloran states that he would like to clarify that he is not making accusations but that when committees change, the UTSU is technically not in accordance. He states that that it affects the integrity and security of the organization to remain in compliance with the CNCA. He states that the only reason to move these to the policies is so that there is less overlap, and so that the bylaws are clear and accessible to the membership.

## 7.5 Motion to Divide the Question

### RESOLUTION

MOVED: D. SINGH

SECONDED: CURRIE

**BE IT RESOLVED that the question is divided to externalize Bylaw 8, Subsection 2 and 4; Bylaw 11; and Bylaw 6, Section 1, Subsection B.**

### DISCUSSION

The Chair asks D. Singh if he is referring to Subsections 2 through 4.

D. Singh states that he wants to externalize Subsections 2 and 4, but not 3, but also 4. He states that he also wants to externalize all of the changes in Bylaw 11, as well as the changes in the Elections Bylaw that talks about the Committee structure, though he states that he can't find



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

the actual number on that. He states that he wants to externalize any changes where the jurisdiction is being moved from the bylaws to the policies.

The Chair asks D. Singh if he is looking to externalize the entirety of those changes, since he can't recall which section the Elections Bylaw is.

Currie raises a Point of Information, to state that D. Singh is referring to Bylaw 6, section 1, subsection B.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: O'HALLORAN, GRANGER, KARIM, AHMED, MA, A. SINGH, PREM RATNA, FAROOQ, REUTER, OGBONNA, MCCORMICK, ROBSON, SACKEYFIO, RISELLI, DESIBIENS, RICHES, PATEL, KOOMSON, KAUL, BASU, SHAFIQ, VROLIJK, CURRIE, ANGAROSO, TIU**

The Chair states that this is in order, and those sections have been divided from the overall appendix. The Chair moves back to the main motion of the Bylaw and Election Procedure Code Changes, and asks if there is any further discussion on it.

Liceralde raises a Point of Information regarding Bylaw 6, Item 1, Section B. He asks for clarification on what this bylaw means, and why it is all crossed out.

Currie raises a Point of Order, to state that this has been externalized, and that he thinks it should be discussed during the externalization.

The Chair states that she agrees with Currie, and rules Liceralde's Point of Information out of order. She states that it will be discussed when the meeting comes to the relevant section, because it no longer remains in the main motion.

Erickson raises a Point of Information, to ask if Bylaw 4 has been externalized.

The Chair confirms. She asks if there is any further discussion on the overall changes, and seeing none, moves the meeting into voting procedure. She clarifies that the vote is on approving the changes to the document provided in the AGM package, except for the changes in Bylaw 4, Bylaw 7, Bylaw 8 Subsection 2 & 4, Bylaw 11, and Bylaw 6 Section 1 Subsection B. She states that if members vote in favour, they are voting in favour of adopting those changes to the bylaws and the constitution.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTION: BAÑARES**

Bowman asks if it is in order to motion to have Items 8 and 9 on the agenda considered before the externalizations on the agenda.



The Chair states that this is in order, because the question is being divided, making each of them separate motions, with separate Be it Resolved clauses. She asks for a seconder to amend the agendas such that the current motions 8 and 9 come before the Division of the Questions.

## **7.6 Motion to Amend the Agenda**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: BASU

**BE IT RESOLVED that Items 8 and 9 be considered before the externalizations on the agenda.**

### **DISCUSSION**

Bowman states that he would like for those who are motivating for the member-submitted motions to have the opportunity to do so, and have enough time to do so.

The Chair states that this motion would require unanimous consent, meaning that everyone needs to be on board except for those who choose to abstain, in order for these motions to move prior to the Division of the Question.

### **CARRIED**



## **Special Business**

### **8. Changes to Equity Collectives and Creation of Equity Initiatives Fund**

#### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: MARAGHA

SECONDED: RICHES

**WHEREAS Equity Collectives were established at the 2017 Annual General Meeting; and**

**WHEREAS the mandate of the Equity Collectives served to uphold equity values, advise the Board of Directors on equity issues, and actively work on equity initiatives throughout their term; and**

**WHEREAS in the years succeeding the establishment of the Equity Collectives the aforementioned mandate has not been fulfilled; and**

**WHEREAS the University of Toronto Students' Union should commit itself to empowering the already existing equity seeking communities and service groups which exist at the University of Toronto St. George campus; NOW THEREFORE**

**BE IT RESOLVED that the Equity Collectives be de-established, and the Equity Collectives Policy alongside mentions of the Equity Collectives be stricken from the UTSU's Bylaws and Policies; and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that three (3) community members be added to the Equity and Accessibility Committee to allow for community consultations to occur at the committee level; and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University of Toronto Students' Union establishes an Equity Initiatives Fund in the interest of empowering already existing equity seeking and service groups on campus; and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Vice-President, Equity, in conjunction with the Equity and Accessibility Committee, be mandated to reach out and be accessible to equity seeking groups on campus to ensure the promotion and utilization of the equity initiatives fund.**

#### **DISCUSSION**

### **8.1 Motion to Amend**

#### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: SIDDALL

SECONDED: RICHES

**BE IT RESOLVED that the motion be amended to read:**



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

***BE IT RESOLVED that the Vice President, Equity, immediately begin to work with equity seeking groups on campus to revise the Equity Collectives Policy; and***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU Bylaws and Policies be amended to ensure that these Equity Collective leaders sit on the Board of Directors in addition to the Equity and Accessibility Committee; and***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Equity and Accessibility Committee hold at least one town hall style meeting per semester to allow for community consultations to occur at the committee level; and***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University of Toronto Students' Union establishes an accessible Equity Initiatives Fund for the purposes of ensuring the strong presence equity seeking and service groups on campus that prioritize justice advocacy; and***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Vice-President, Equity be mandated to inform equity seeking groups on campus of the equity initiatives fund.***

## DISCUSSION

### CARRIED

L. Maragha states that she is a third-year student at the University of Toronto, and wanted to speak to this motion on reforming or reanalyzing equity when observing the Equity Collectives. She states that this motion deals with the Equity Collectives, which had been implemented in 2017 to hire students on campus to actively work in conjunction with the Vice President, Equity on equity initiatives throughout the year. She states that from her experiences as a University College Director on the Equity and Accessibility Committee concurrently, and years prior, she can attest to the inefficient structure of the Equity Collectives, which has largely inhibited the delivery of their intended mandate. She states that the concept of an Equity Collective is inherently flawed, as it stems from selecting students from the University of Toronto to wholly represent the act on behalf of entire equity-seeking communities. She states that although the concept of ensuring that all communities are represented on a committee is essential, this method of organization restricts the potential of the Equity and Accessibility Committee, rather than enhances it, because they lack a system which ensures that these individuals will come from the already existing equity and service groups on campus, which work to empower their communities on a day-to-day basis. She states that, on the contrary, these individuals are hired seemingly randomly, almost resembling a symbolic effort to seek their involvement and seek involvement from underrepresented groups on campus. She states that, in response to this, she hopes that through proposing this motion, a systematic flaw in how equity initiatives are conducted through the UTSU is addressed. She states that she hopes to strengthen the UTSU's ability to aid in the empowerment of existing equity-seeking groups on campus. She states that this will help place the onus on the UTSU to empower and provide, rather than on-brand select an individual from the community. She states that, furthermore, this motion includes a mandate that states that the



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Vice-President, Equity of the UTSU would reach out and make groups on campus fully aware of funding that they could be eligible for. She states that this is because, in exchange for the Equity Collectives, the UTSU would establish the Equity Initiatives Fund. She states that, as it currently stands, the UTSU has Coordinator of the Indigenous Students Collective, Queer Students Collective, Racialized Students Collective, Disabilities Collective, Trans-Students Collective, Anti-Poverty, Women's and Black Students Collective. She states that, rather than asking for those specific demographics to be represented, which is seemingly tokenistic, the UTSU would have community members, which is similar to the way the Clubs Committee works. Maragha states that she is in favour of this motion because the already existing groups on campus make the University of Toronto home to the diverse communities which already exist. She states that rather than occupying space, the UTSU should work to empower the already existing communities on campus.

## 8.1 Motion to Amend

### RESOLUTION

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: SHAFIQ

**BE IT RESOLVED that the resolution be amended to read:**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that six (6) community members be added to the Equity and Accessibility Committee to allow for community consultations to occur at the committee level.**

### DISCUSSION

Riches expresses full support of the motion, and states that he wants there to be opportunities for representation of equity-seeking groups and diverse communities on campus, on the Equity Committee.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: B. LICERALDE**

P. Berting concurs with the motion to essentially change the Equity Collectives because they are innately tokenistic. Berting asks what the consultation process was with the equity-seeking groups on campus to ensure that all those impacted are being included in the conversation.

Maragha states that this motion is completely member-submitted, so in her own individual capacity it was her responsibility to reach out and consult with equity-seeking groups on campus. She states that, unfortunately, she was not able to complete this in a timely manner, and could only reach out to equity-groups the night before. She states that, however, she can speak to her experiences on the Hiring Committee of the Equity Committee. In her capacity, as the University College Director, she had the chance to look through the individuals that had submitted to become- or to be hired potentially as Equity Collectives Coordinators. Maragha further states that she does not want to speak on behalf of any communities, but if they have felt represented in this capacity, then they would have applied. She states that in the past two years, Equity Collectives have not fulfilled their mandate, and this is because



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO **STUDENTS' UNION**

equity groups on campus have not seen themselves reflected in this capacity. She states that this motion would bridge the gap between the UTSU and the already existing equity-groups on campus.

M. Ahmed states that she is an executive for the Muslim Students' Association. She states that students know the best about what representation on campus looks like, and that they know what they want to see in terms of representation. She states that student groups historically rooted in advocating for marginalized students already exist, and should be consulted on matters of equity. She states that the MSA is an example of that, standing as an organization that represents and directly interacts with Muslim students on campus since 1965. She states that the MSA has been hearing the needs of students and advocating for equity, safety, and community on campus since its conception. She states that it does not make sense that groups such as the MSA are not considered when issues pertaining to equity are discussed at the union level, even though these groups have so much knowledge and lived experience within its teams. She states that to have fair and equal representation throughout time, requires diverse voices from students within communities who are working with other students, and other marginalized communities that can speak to what is really needed on campus.

E. Kanter asks whether or not there has been any thought to how this money will be distributed, and who will make the decisions on its allocation. Kanter further asks how those three, now six, community members on the Equity and Accessibility Committee will be selected.

Maragha states that the onus is on the Vice President, Equity to establish the specifics on how the Equity Initiatives Fund would be conducted. She states that a good parallel would be how clubs funding, to an extent, is distributed. She states that the Vice President, Equity would be mandated to reach out to those communities on campus. Maragha states that her intention behind this would to make that money as accessible to all those equity groups on campus, should they need it. Maragha cedes time to Karim, Vice President, Student Life, to speak on how members are selected for Clubs Committee, to answer Kanter's second question.

Karim states that Clubs Committee community members are appointed through an application process with submitted resumes and cover-letters for open positions. She states that they are posted on the UTSU website, as well as on social media, to suggest that they are available, as well as the Clubs Bulletin. She states that a similar approach would be taken for the Equity Committee as well.

Maragha states that the idea of having community members is to take away from the performative aspect of having certain seats dedicated to certain demographics, which is performative in nature and does not help in enhancing equity work on campus. She states that, on the contrary, it just seems that these seats are symbolic, instead of actually empowering the work of the already existing groups on campus.

N. Ogbonna states appreciation of the labour to bring this issue to the forefront. Ogbonna states that there is a need to reframe what the Equity Portfolio looks like, and further states that there it needs to



be codified in the bylaws or the policies about what the compensation of labour is going to look like for students, due to varying budgets year-to-year.

## **8.2 Motion to Refer**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: D. WILTON

SECONDED: MORRIS

**WHEREAS there is general support among the membership of the UTSU to disestablish the Equity Collectives and institute an Equity Initiatives Fund;**

**WHEREAS more consultation and refinement of the policy-proposal is needed;**

**BE IT RESOLVED that the motion be referred to the next meeting of the Equity Committee.**

### **DISCUSSION**

D. Singh raises a Point of Order that this motion contains bylaw changes that can only be approved by the membership.

The Chair states that the motion would go to the Equity Committee, and they would have to vote on whether they approve it or not, go to the Board of Directors, and the subsequent changes would be approved in the next AGM. She states that if this goes to the Equity Committee, these amendments won't be effective until they are brought to the next AGM.

D. Wilton expresses support and appreciation for the member that submitted the motion, and states that Maragha articulated the issues with the Equity Collectives and her proposed solutions. Wilton further expresses appreciation of the words that M. Ahmed on behalf of the MSA and others who expressed support for this idea and those who expressed concerns of how much consultation was done before tonight and the wording of the policy. Wilton states his concern about the wording of the policy, in that it does not seem to represent an amendment of policy. He states that there have been questions of who would be managing the fund, but the language isn't in the motion about how these community members are appointed even though it has been mentioned today that it would be adopting the method of appointment of the Clubs Committee. Wilton states that he supports the motion overall, but believes that it must be refined, with consultation and that role is taken on by the Executive in collaboration with Maragha, and that it moves through the Equity and Governance Committees to eventually be affected at the policy level.

T. Riches raises a Point of Information. He asks, if this does not get referred to the Equity Committee, and should it pass, and pass through the Board of Directors, given that the bylaws and policies that it would change, if the motion would take effect immediately or after the next AGM.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

The Chair states that, if this is approved at all stages of Governance, including the Equity Committee and along with the Board of Directors, it would be effective at that point, but will still be brought to the next AGM.

Maragha states that she is also in favour of tabling this motion to the Equity Committee. She states that she understands the shortcomings of this motion come from the lack of consultation, and that is essential because this will affect equity-seeking groups on campus to the greatest extent.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: BOWMAN**

## 9. Endorsement of Fridays for Future Climate Strikes

### RESOLUTION

MOVED: FREEDBERG

SECONDED: McLEAN

**BE IT RESOLVED that the UTSU endorse all upcoming Fridays for Future Toronto Climate Strikes.**

### DISCUSSION

The Chair notes that the mover of this motion is not present, but a discussion can still occur and asks if members would like to be added to the Speakers' List.

Attar introduces herself as a Fridays for Future Climate Strike organizer in Toronto, and a student at the University of Toronto. She states that this motion was originally moved by Freedberg, and Attar thanks them for supporting the movement. Attar moves to make two amendments to the motion.

### 9.1 Motion to Amend

#### RESOLUTION

MOVED: ATTAR

SECONDED: RICHES

**BE IT RESOLVED that the motion be amended to read:**

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that UTSU commit to actively promoting Friday Climate Strikes, including the fridays that precede and follow the larger global climate strikes***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that UTSU support for university closure on November 29th for the next Global Climate Strike.***

### DISCUSSION

Attar notes that an endorsement from the UTSU carries a lot of weight, and it is important for attending those strikes and mobilization be accessible for UofT students.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

Bowman speaks to the point about supporting the call to close the university. He states that, similar in principle, there was a motion moved at last year's AGM about endorsing a movement, and it called on the UTSU to ask the administration to compel action. Bowman notes, as one member of the executive committee, he supports this motion but is not optimistic that the university would comply. He states that the UTSU had asked UofT President Meric Gertler if there would be a university closure for the first half of the day for the first Fridays for Future Climate Strike, but the question was not acknowledged. Bowman concludes that he does agree with the amendment, however it may not necessarily come to pass.

Licalalde raises a Point of Information, and asks if the Fridays for Future is an annual occurrence.

Attar clarifies that the strikes depend on how the political climate progresses, but the Global Climate Strikes occur, thus far, about three to four days in the year. Attar reinforces that it is a new movement, and carries on further to say that an endorsement from the UTSU for university closure is necessary, and it should also include UTSU advertisements of upcoming climate strikes.

The Chair provides further clarification on the two BIRT clauses. She states that the UTSU would be held accountable to the entirety of the first motion's existence, once approved by the AGM, until this motion is rescinded or another motion is added to remove the endorsement, or to no longer endorse future climate strikes, whereas the second amendment would only hold the UTSU accountable until November 29th, 2019.

Licalalde raises a Point of Personal Privilege, that while he supports this movement, he concurs with Bowman.

The Chair responds that it Licalalde is not stating a Point of Personal Privilege, as he is not describing something that is negatively impacting his participation. She states that Licalalde is simply stating an opinion.

Licalalde states that the likelihood that the university is going to close for this movement is low.

Bowman raises a Point of Information, and asks if the member who moved the amendment could restate the exact language of the BIRT clauses.

Attar restates the exact language of the BIRT clauses.



# UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

## 9.2 Motion to Amend

### RESOLUTION

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: GRANGER

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the motion be amended to read:

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that UTSU commit to actively promoting Friday Climate Strikes, including the fridays that precede and follow the larger global climate strikes, at the discretion of both the UTSU Executive Committee and Fridays for Future.***

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that UTSU support for university closure on November 29th for the next Global Climate Strike.***

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: KANTER, LICERALDE**

## 9.3 Motion to Amend

### RESOLUTION

MOVED: ATTAR

SECONDED: TIU

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the motion be amended to read:

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that UTSU commit to actively promoting Friday Climate Strikes, including the fridays that precede and follow the larger global climate strikes at the discretion of the Executive Committee and Fridays for Future.***

### DISCUSSION

Bowman motivates briefly that he believes it is important for the UTSU to commit to working with Fridays for Future, and not just randomly supporting the event and throwing up ads without their consent. This would also be a way to ensure that there is a solidified partnership and communication strategy moving forward.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: KANTER, SHAFIQ, RISELLI**



#### **9.4 Motion to Call the Question**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BOWMAN

SECONDED: BRYANT

**BE IT RESOLVED that the question be called.**

**CARRIED**

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENTIONS: BRYANT, RISELLI**

Bowman calls for quorum.

*It is determined that the meeting is inquorate due to an insufficient number of individuals present in the room. The Chair rules that the meeting immediately adjourn, with outstanding business to be taken up at another time.*

#### **10. Other Business**

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

MOVED:

SECONDED:

**DISCUSSION**

#### **11. Adjournment**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED:

SECONDED:

**BE IT RESOLVED that the meeting be adjourned.**

**CARRIED/FAILED**

*The meeting adjourns at \_\_:\_\_.*