



Minutes – Board of Directors

**6th Meeting of 2020-2021
Saturday, October 31st, 2020 | 1:00 PM EST**

Video Conference held via Zoom

IN ATTENDANCE

Present

Executive Committee

Muntaka Ahmed, President
Dermot O’Halloran, VP Operations
Tyler Riches, VP Public & University Affairs
Alexandra McLean, VP Equity
Paul Kaita, VP Professional Faculties

Division I Directors (Colleges, Academic Divisions,
and Transitional Year Programme)

Kayleigh McCormick, New College
Karel Peters, New College
Ramtin Taramsari, New College
Matthew Ho, St. Michael’s College
Jonathan Hsu, St. Michael’s College
Fiona Reuter, Trinity College
Pranay Prem, University College
Basmah Ramadan, University College
Jeannie Yoo, University College
Radhika Dhawan, Victoria College
Sierra Bevacqua, Woodsworth College
Miloni Mehta, Woodsworth College
Alex Erickson, Social Sciences

Division II Directors (Professional Faculties)

José Power, Architecture & Visual Studies
Tiffany Tiu, Kinesiology & Physical Education
Catherine Wang, Music
Vanshika Dhawan, Law
Andrew Chen, Applied Science & Engineering

Visitors and Other Non-Voting

Suzanne Belleau, General Manager, UTSU
Margaret de Leon, Chief Operations Assistant,
UTSU
Vibhuti Kacholia, Chief Executive Assistant, UTSU
Emmanuel Sackeyfio, EA Operations, UTSU
Joshua Bienstock, EA Research & Administration,
UTSU
Winston Chan, EA Research & Administration,
UTSU
Mackenzey Metcalfe, Chair, UCRU
Evelyn Austin, UofT Divestment & Beyond
Coalition

Absent

Zoe Chen, St. Michael’s College
Ava Harrington, Victoria College
Shaon Parial, Pharmacy
Rose Mohammad, Professional Faculties at-large

Regrets

Neeharika Hemrajani, VP Student Life
Katherine Jung, Life Sciences
Sheryl Ordonez, Woodsworth College



MINUTES

Open Session

1. Call to Order

This meeting is called to order at 1:17 PM.

2. Approval of Agenda

RESOLUTION

MOVED: AHMED

SECONDED: PREM

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be approved as presented.

DISCUSSION

2.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: AHMED

SECONDED: CHEN

BE IT RESOLVED that Item #5, Ratification of Fall 2020 Election Results, become the new Item #4 on the Agenda.

DISCUSSION

Ahmed stated that she is making this amendment to allow for the new directors to vote immediately at the meeting.

CARRIED

2.2 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: O'HALLORAN

BE IT RESOLVED that Item #6, Presentation of the Undergraduates of Canadian Research Intensive Universities, become the new Item #5 following the ratification of the Fall 2020 Election Results.

DISCUSSION

Riches stated that Mackenzy Metcalfe is here to make a presentation to the Board on behalf of the Undergraduates of Canadian Research-Intensive Universities (UCRU). They stated that they want to ensure that they respect her time as she has a meeting she has to get to.



CARRIED

2.3 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED: PREM

BE IT RESOLVED that a new Item #9 be added to the Agenda entitled "Formal Postponement of the UTSU Annual General Meeting" with the following text included.

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has extended the time for federally incorporated not-for-profit corporations to call a 2020 annual general meeting (AGM) to the shortest of the following two options: 21 months after the previous AGM and no more than 12 months after the last financial year-end, or December 31, 2020; and

WHEREAS federally incorporated not-for-profit corporations do not need to apply to Corporations Canada for the extension; and

WHEREAS Section 160(2) of the *Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act* provides federally incorporated not-for-profit corporations with a mechanism to request further extensions to the date in which a general meeting must be called;

BE IT RESOLVED that the 2020 AGM be postponed to a date no earlier than December 10th, 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU still provide appropriate notice to the members for the 2020 AGM, including a call for bylaw amendment and agenda item submissions, according to Bylaw III(h); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, if granted an extension by the Director appointed under the *Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act*, that the 2020 AGM be permitted to be further postponed to a date no later than February 28th 2020, pursuant to Section 160(2) of the Act.

DISCUSSION

O'Halloran stated that during the last meeting of the Board there was a discussion item regarding delaying the AGM with a tentative date towards the end of January. He stated that upon further review of the extension that corporations Canada gave as well as the requirement that the UTSU gives members at least 5 weeks notice before an AGM, he thought it would be in the Board's best interest to further extend the tentative date. He stated that the Board will be able to discuss this further later in the meeting.



CARRIED

CARRIED

3. Ratification of Speaker

RESOLUTION

MOVED: AHMED

SECONDED: O'HALLORAN

BE IT RESOLVED THAT _____ be appointed as Speaker for the duration of the meeting.

DISCUSSION

3.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: AHMED

SECONDED: PREM

BE IT RESOLVED that Branden Cave be appointed as Speaker for the remainder of the 2020-2021 term.

DISCUSSION

Ahmed stated that the UTSU has finally hired a speaker as the original process had slowed down due to the pandemic.

Cave introduced himself with his preferred pronouns (he/him). He thanked the board and stated that he was excited to meet everyone. He proceeded by providing the board some personal background information. He stated that he is the former President of the University of Calgary of Students' Union and was the Vice President, Operations & Finance the year prior. He then served as chair of the Union Council for the University of Nottingham during his graduate studies in the United Kingdom. He stated that currently, he is a second year law student at the University of Toronto and a member of the Students' Law Society. He further stated that he is a professionally registered parliamentarian accredited through the National Association of Parliamentarians. He stated that he has a fair amount of experience chairing meetings as a result of his time in these various institutions; adding that student meetings is where his specialty and passion lies. He asked the board to bear with him during this his first meeting as he begins to learn more about the UTSU and stated that attendees should feel free to contact him with questions or suggestions throughout. He stated that his goal is to take care of procedure so that the board can handle their mandates effectively and efficiently. He stated that he will always be a resource for board members when there are questions about parliamentary procedure and also stated that he is hopeful that by the end of the term board members will become experts on the matter.

CARRIED



CARRIED

4. Ratification of Fall 2020 By-Elections Results

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED: AHMED

WHEREAS the unofficial results of the UTSU's 2020 Fall By-Elections were published on October 21st; and

WHEREAS Article VIII(2)(b) of the Elections Procedure Code requires that the Board ratify elections results "at the subsequent meeting following the [release of] election results with the condition that there is no outstanding appeal involving [a] Candidate"; and

WHEREAS no appeals relating to the 2020 Elections or Referenda remain outstanding, NOW THEREFORE:

BE IT RESOLVED that the results of the 2020 Fall By-Elections, as presented in Appendix A, be approved as complete and accurate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Directors-elect presented in Appendix A and below be ratified as members of the Board of Directors:

Evan Kanter - Director, Computer Science

Astrid Chandler - Director, Humanities

Sidrah Rana - Director, Mathematical & Physical Sciences

Jai Kakkar - Director, Rotman Commerce

Nelson Lee - Director, Applied Sciences and Engineering

Diana Li - Director, Applied Sciences and Engineering

Nermin Piragic - Director, Dentistry

Meredith McKinnon - Director, Nursing

DISCUSSION

O'Halloran thanked all the candidates who ran in the election and stated that he is looking forward to working with these 8 new members of the Board. He stated that the remaining seats will hopefully be appointed by November.

Chen asked about the application process for the remainder of the director positions and when they are due.

O'Halloran stated that the applications are going well. He noted that there are more applicants to the remaining Board of Director seats than there have been for the Appellate Board which has been collecting applications for months. He stated that the board will have 4 new members of the Board by the November Board meeting. He stated that the deadline for the applications should be November 6th.



CARRIED

5. Presentation on the Undergraduates of Canadian Research-intensive Universities (UCRU)

DISCUSSION ITEM

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: AHMED

DISCUSSION

Metcalfe stated that she is happy to visit the University of Toronto virtually and introduced herself with her pronouns (she/her). She stated that she is the Vice President of External Affairs at the University Students' Council at Western University and the chair of the Undergraduates of Canadian Research Intensive Universities (UCRU). She stated that UCRU is an informal coalition of student associations that came together in 2015 to advocate for issues that uniquely affect students at U15 research-intensive Universities. She added that representing research-based schools is what helps set UCRU's advocacy priorities apart from other federal advocacy coalitions; UCRU collectively represents 250 000 students in this work. UCRU officially represents 10 Universities in the U15 with the new addition of the University of Ottawa Students Union. UCRU has 5 leadership roles, meaning that half of all members of the coalition will always have a leadership role in the strategic outlook of the organization in any given year. She stated that UCRU also includes the Alma Matter Society at the University of British Columbia, the University of Manitoba Students' Union, McMaster Students Union, the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union, the Alma Matter Society at Queens' University, Western University's Students' Council, Students' Society at McGill University, and the Waterloo Undergraduate Students' Association.

Metcalfe continued by describing UCRU's values, goals, organizational status. She stated that UCRU strives to develop policy that is both pragmatic and based on popular student opinions with the goal of lobbying government to make change. UCRU is an evidence-based organization and ensures that policy recommendations are supported by robust research. UCRU also strives to be collaborative and encourages its members to engage discussions about policy with one another in a critical and equitable manner. UCRU's mandate is to represent U15 Universities and as such will never be a larger organization. She stated that UCRU advocates for issues that affect Undergraduate Students in a non-partisan manner; it also strives to be an equitable organization by ensuring that its internal policy and external advocacy is rooted in supporting marginalized and racialized students. UCRU is an informal association of students' union as there is no legally binding document obligating member schools to certain responsibilities or policies, each student union that takes part in UCRU does so because they want to; she added that this is something that will continue when the organization becomes a more formal legal entity.



Metcalfe continued by describing how UCRU engages in advocacy. Each year UCRU holds a lobby week, this year taking place on the week of November 23rd, where the organization sets student leaders up with as many MPs from varying political parties as possible to discuss its policy priorities. UCRU runs national-wide campaigns in line with its policy priorities such as the upcoming Debt Free Degree Campaign that will be running on UCRU and their member unions' social media pages. UCRU prepares research briefs for attendees of their lobby week which includes their policy priorities and rationale behind each. UCRU also strives to maintain communication with staffers to ensure that it always has up to date information on the priorities of decision makers in government at any given time. It will also send letters to individual ministers when issues arise that need to be addressed. Metcalfe quickly outlined what one year looks like for UCRU, a highlight includes preparing its annual budget submission proposal where they construct their policy priorities for the fall lobby week. Although the organization operates on a yearly turnover cycle as student leaders change, UCRU also strives to address issues as they arise in the midst of more planned normal advocacy processes, such as when the COVID-19 pandemic began and policy priorities needed to be immediately addressed.

Metcalfe continued by outlining some of UCRU's policy priorities. Firstly, UCRU advocates for increases to the Post-Secondary Support Program for Indigenous Students and also advocates for indigenous languages and cultures at different University campuses. Secondly, UCRU advocates for increases in the amounts and number of Federal Student Grants as well as advocating for decreases in interest and the extending of grace periods for federal loan repayment. Thirdly, UCRU works to advocate for international students; they were very vocal in advocating for the Government to allow international students back into Canada after the pandemic began and also focuses on expanding work-integrated learning opportunities for them as well. Fourth, UCRU usually advocates for expanding Canada's summer jobs program and work-integrated learning opportunities for all students broadly. UCRU was the first student advocacy organization to put out a survey about students' concerns regarding COVID-19 and worked with the government to advocate for Canada's Emergency Student Benefit (CESB).

Metcalfe continued by describing the ways in which UCRU is learning and growing. UCRU is focusing on building its capacity for lobbying outside of the traditional budget cycles, something that has proven especially important in the constantly changing environment of the COVID-19 pandemic. They have also been working on recruiting other U15 schools, the newest being the University of Ottawa Students' Union as well as on building out their online presence which is especially important given their new focus on social media campaigns. Moreover, UCRU has been working to formalize the organization; so far, they have agreed on bylaws and hired lawyers to begin the process of registering as a non-for profit organization with the hopes of becoming one by January. The proposed bylaws will be reviewed by lawyers and each member school's student association to formally approve them in order to move towards formalization.



Metcalfe stated that UCRU currently doesn't charge a fee for its advocacy work but is intending on working towards one in the future. Currently, costs are absorbed by the member schools as they come up such as for lawyers, the UCRU website, and more. Metcalfe stated that this puts strain on the level of advocacy that UCRU can commit to and hinders institutional memory as there are no dedicated UCRU staff to help with transitioning between board terms. She also stated that the current structure makes it so that the chair of UCRU is responsible for significantly more than other members which can become a discouraging factor in member schools getting more involved in UCRU's leadership structure; this is why they are working to higher staff that can help out with day to day tasks and yearly transitioning. She also added that as UCRU looks towards formalization, it will not have a fee as that is something that it will continue to work towards in conversation with all of its member schools over the next couple of years. Metcalfe provided her contact information for further questions and thanked the Board again for their time.

Kanter thanked Metcalf for her presentation. He asked her to elaborate on where UCRU gets its funding from. He also asked if UCRU is considering advocating on the matter of tuition, citing how students such as himself and his peers in Computer Science pay disproportionately more than other Science students.

Metcalfe stated that UCRU is a federal organization and as such, it focuses on lobbying the federal government to increase funding for grants and loans programs. She stated that tuition is regulated by the provincial government which is why UCRU doesn't do direct advocacy on the issue. She also stated, in reference to UCRU's funding, that the association's costs are relatively low and reiterated that they are not funded by student fees whatsoever; smaller costs are usually covered by whoever is acting as chair for the year whereas larger costs are split between members.

Kakkar mentioned that he heard Metcalf talk about UCRU hiring full-time staff in the future and wanted to know more about how they will deal with potential biases and conflicts of interests that those potential employees may come with.

Metcalfe stated that UCRU wants to hire a full-time staff member that would also hopefully be by-lingual to help increase the organization's french-speaking capacity. She also stated that this would hopefully be a full-time position meaning that the employee would hopefully not also work in student politics in another way although they could have experience in the area. She noted that such a position would have to come when UCRU has enough funds to make it happen which will not happen until member schools agree on a fee structure.

V.Dhawan thanked Metcalfe for her presentation. She stated that when UCRU was created as an informal coalition it was done deliberately for various reasons and as such, wanted to ask what changed to warrant the organization to consider becoming a non for profit organization. She also asked if UCRU is planning on consulting members' associations more extensively in the process of creating bylaws and policies in the future.



Metcalfe stated that UCRU has been consulting with its member schools on the matter of its potential bylaws and stated that they were sent out to Executive members in September. She also stated that the process for review and revisions of the bylaws is not at all complete and that the Board of Directors' of all member schools will still have time to send in bylaw amendments and suggestions. She stated that this year the board decided it would be in their interest to become an official non-profit organization because of an overall consensus that they were lacking the ability to hold more extensive institutional memory which they deemed crucial for future years.

Riches stated that on the point of consulting the Board of Directors, it was their intention to send UCRU's potential bylaws to the Governance Committee before they were sent to the lawyers. They stated that they took responsibility for not making that happen fast enough and stated that there will be a chance for the Governance Committee and the Board as a whole to be involved in the consultation process moving forward.

Piragic thanked Metcalfe for her presentation. He asked about UCRU's plans to further cultivate undergraduate research.

Metcalfe stated that UCRU represents U15 research intensive universities and as a result, member schools have a lot in common when it comes to advocating for changes that would further support undergraduate research. She stated that they are currently looking at how they can advocate for an expansion of Undergraduate Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) grants programs into the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. She further stated that details as to how UCRU will advocate for this will be clearer once priorities are hammered down for lobby week.

V.Dhawan asked if there is a specific benefit to UCRU looking to become a non-profit organization besides the piece about institutional memory that could not be served by codifying its internal procedures.

Metcalfe stated that this change has been recommended by UCRU's Lawyers in conversations with them and stated that she could follow up on the details of those discussions for the Board at a later time. She thanked Dhawan for her question and stated that she understands the hesitancy of members' of the board to external umbrella student organizations such as UCRU due to past negative experiences with other organizations.

Piragic stated that he had navigated through the NSERC program before and asked whether UCRU has thought about the issues that arise from trying to expand the program while it remains incredibly difficult to gain funding through them due to high grade requirements.

Metcalfe stated that she hadn't yet heard that concern from students when it comes to advocating for more ways to expand Undergraduate Research opportunities to students who don't meet those grade thresholds. She thanked Piragic for the feedback and recommended that he send a message to Riches with more information so that it can be discussed in more detail when UCRU looks to finalize its lobbying priorities for this year.



Riches thanked Metcalfe for taking the time to give this presentation to the Board. They asked whether the presentation slides could be made available to the Board following the meeting.

Metcafe thanked the board, wished everyone a happy halloween, and stated that she can make the slides available to everyone.

V.Dhawan asked Riches to describe what they see the process of consultation being when it comes to the UTSU's membership in UCRU following its formalization as a non for profit; specifically, how discussions and possible referenda will be dealt with regarding a potential fee and how it could be made possible to leave UCRU if need be sometime in the future.

Riches stated that they have mentioned to the UCRU board on multiple occasions that the UTSU has a Bylaw which requires that it not join a new organization if that organization does not allow the UTSU to withdraw its membership within it by a simple vote of the Board of Directors. Riches stated that in order to make it possible to join UCRU, its bylaws need to be written in such a way that would make this possible. They stated that last time they checked the drafted bylaws, it stipulated that joining and leaving UCRU would be done by a member school's board of directors. They further stated that this bylaw could not be changed unless all member schools consented; as such, there is no way for a handful of member schools to try and change the bylaws to keep the rest in without their consent. They stated that the UTSU will not be removed as a UCRU member if it does not have a fee that students' pay for membership in the organization when it is formalized. They stated that if a referendum is run, it will be done by the UTSU to create a fee that would pay for it some time down the road. However, they stated that the specifics of a potential fee are difficult to ascertain currently but that when the time comes, potentially in another term, both the UTSU's Board of Directors and the UCRU Board will have those conversations.

6. Consent Agenda

RESOLUTION

MOVED: AHMED

SECONDED: O'HALLORAN

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following be approved as presented in the appendices:

1. **Meeting of the Board of Directors**
5th Meeting of the 2020-2021 Board of Directors, 26 September 2020
2. **Meetings of Committees**
Equity and Accessibility Committee, 28 September 2020 (3rd Meeting)
Campaigns and Outreach Committee, 30 September 2020 (4th Meeting)
Executive Committee, 9 October 2020 (6th Meeting)
Finance Committee, 11 October 2020 (6th Meeting)
First Year Council, 13 October 2020 (1st Meeting)
Campaigns and Outreach, 14 October 2020 (5th Meeting)
Services Committee, 15 October 2020 (1st Meeting)
Executive Committee, 19 October 2020 (7th Meeting)
Campaigns and Outreach Committee, 25 October 2020 (6th Meeting)
Ad-Hoc CFS Committee, 25 October 2020 (1st Meeting)
Governance Committee, 26 October 2020 (5th Meeting)



3. Executive Reports

- October 2020 Report of the President
- October 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Operations
- October 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Public & University Affairs
- October 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Equity
- October 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Student Life
- October 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Professional Faculties

6.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED: AHMED

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of the Student Aid Committee, 8 October 2020 (5th Meeting) be included in the Consent Agenda.

CARRIED

6.2 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED: AHMED

BE IT RESOLVED that the October 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Student Life be removed from the Consent Agenda.

DISCUSSION

O'Halloran stated that Hemrajani is taking a brief leave from her position to deal with personal matters. He stated that her October Executive Report will be made available to the board sometime in the next few weeks and will then be officially presented for approval once again at the next meeting of the Board of Directors.



CARRIED

DISCUSSION

Riches externalized Item #4 of the Executive Committee's 7th Meeting regarding a declaration of climate emergency, fossil fuel divestment, and commitment to a socially just climate transition at the University of Toronto.

Riches stated that they wanted to give an update to the Board as the Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario (CFS-O) Executive Committee met this past week and rendered final decisions on the motions that the UTSU wrote and advocated for. The first motion moved was NO8, a regular motion to commission a report on the possibility of creating an online voting system for certification and decertification referenda. They stated that this has been something that the UTSU has advocated for some time and has become especially prevalent this year due to COVID-19. They stated that the motion was tabled to the next meeting of the Ontario Executive Committee; the Committee argued that a similar report was commissioned in 2017 and members could take time to review that before meeting to discuss this once more.

Riches continued by describing the 2nd motion that was discussed. NO9 was a regular motion to consider online petitions in the CFS-O decertification process given that in-person petitions are impossible due to online learning and COVID-19. This motion was not seconded by any other member of the committee and as a result, it died on the floor. The next motion was N10, a bylaw amendment that would change the threshold for the amount of signatures that would be needed in a decertification petition. Some members of the Committee argued that the motion would lower standards for democracy. The motion was recommended for defeat at next year's CFS-O annual general meeting; Riches clarified that the Executive Committee cannot pass or fail motions on its own which is why it refers motions for final judgment to other bodies.

Riches continued by describing the next motion that was presented to the Executive Committee. This motion was another bylaw amendment that sought to make it possible to trigger a referendum of decertification without a petition. The amendment stipulated that students could submit a motion for decertification at their member-local's annual general meeting that could then be passed to its Board of Directors. Such a motion would have to be approved with a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority in an annual general meeting and a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority at its Board of Directors as well. This motion was also recommended for defeat by the Committee. It was suggested that because each school has different internal processes regarding annual general meetings, it would be easier to stick with the current guidelines so processes for decertification could be the same across the board. There were also concerns that the Board shouldn't have the ability to make decisions of this importance, even though Riches clarified that an annual general meeting would be the vehicle by which students could initiate the process. Moreover, members of the Committee stated that leaving and joining the federation is difficult, referenda are a waste of resources, and as such discussing them is a waste of time. Riches motivated in favor of this motion stating that many U of T students often ask questions regarding these topics and as such, it is Riches' role to move these types of motions in order to best represent their constituents. Riches pleaded to the Committee to workshop the motion instead of recommending it for defeat, although they ultimately did.



Riches continued by describing the final motion that was presented. This motion was a bylaw amendment to change the stipulation that requires signees of a decertification petition to use their proper full name, offering instead to remove the term proper from the bylaws. Riches described that this was brought forward in order to ensure that transgender students did not have to use a name that they no longer associate with and to ensure that international students could use a different name than what is written in official documents. Members of the Committee were sympathetic to the motives of this motion but argued that it was ultimately the responsibility of university administrations to ensure that their official information is accurate. Riches asked if the Committee would be open to workshopping the motion but it ended up being recommended for defeat as well. They stated that they are looking forward to next year when the UTSU's motion for the CFS to consider a report for online voting will be reviewed once again by the Executive Committee.

Reuter asked the Vice-President, Operations if he could explain why the proposed timeline for the completion of the UTSU's new website and the actual timeline ended up differing so substantially. She asked what the future maintenance of a new website will entail; if it is something that can be dealt with internally or if website developers will continue to be consulted

O'Halloran stated that the delay to the publication of the website arrived for a variety of reasons. Firstly, he stated that while getting started, obtaining a quote for the work that needed to be done was a slower process than expected from the get go. Secondly, he stated that there were occasional hiccups throughout the spring and summer due to COVID-19. And thirdly, there have been consistent issues during development. The developers have been trying to implement a specific Facebook plug-in to connect the UTSU's events calendar with its facebook events. O'Halloran stated that most student unions don't have such a calendar because of how difficult it is to develop and then maintain. He stated that Facebook has made it difficult to create a custom plug-in and as such, the developers are moving to work with the standard plug-in instead while looking at potential ways to still make the calendar as integrated as possible this coming weekend. They also noticed there were more issues with the original website than originally thought and wanted to ensure that the new website was not rushed so that it could be the best it could be right out of the gate. O'Halloran stated that his prior statements about the website were optimistic and stated that it was going to take at least a month longer than he originally described. He stated that they will be ready to publish the new website within the next couple weeks and apologized in advance if it is not. He also stated that they recently met with the Office of the Vice Provost, Students to give them access to the text site so they can suggest comments when it comes to information that pertains directly to the University.

V.Dhawan externalized the 78-90 Queens Park Development Sections of the Vice-President, Operations and Vice-President, Public and University Affairs reports.

Kanter stated that he read the health and dental section of his report which seemed to state that the UTSU is receiving \$1 Million from Studentcare that is going into a reserve fund. He asked whether he considered refunded students from this excess fund or if the UTSU is considering lowering how much students nominally pay to their Studentcare health and dental plan through their ancillary fees.



O'Halloran stated that Studentcare negotiated with Desjardins to get that credit granted to the UTSU. Desjardins was not under any obligation to provide that credit as pandemics are not considered to be cause for refunding. Therefore, that credit comes with strict requirements and restrictions on how it can be used. Dividing the total amount that the UTSU received through this credit by the number of students that it represents amounts to about \$30 per student.

O'Halloran stated that reducing the fee of the Health and Dental Plan would have been logistically impossible because it was approved at last term's final Board of Directors' meeting. He stated that previous executive reports have detailed reasons why the UTSU chose not to lower its fee for the plan in light of the pandemic mostly because the organization is borrowing from its reserve funds in order to pay for the transition into the Student Commons and cannot afford to lose any money from its current revenue streams. The credit received by the insurer stipulates that it only be placed in reserve and used only to finance the Health & Dental Plan in the future.

Kanter asked if this gives us an opportunity to reduce the Health & Dental Plan fee in the future or how it could be used to help students in general.

O'Halloran stated the Services Committee is responsible for recommending changes to the Health & Dental Plan's fee for the 2021-2022 year at some point before the end of the term. At one of the last Board of Directors Meeting of the previous term, there was a discussion to not increase the Health & Dental Plan fee by the planned 10% although the Board ended up voting in favor of the full increase. He stated that next year, the Board can consider whether or not to increase it by that amount once again; he stated that he believes an increase of some sort would be warranted given inflation although it may not be necessary to increase it to the full 10%. He further stated that mental health related expenses have made up a large portion of claims in recent years and as such, the Board had to compensate by properly increasing the fee in order to avoid bankruptcy.

Erickson asked about Ahmed's report. He stated that a large amount of the report was dedicated to outlining the various meetings she attended. He asked about the UTSU's Strategic Planning process, specifically, what stakeholders are being involved in discussions about it outside of UTSU executives and staff. He also asked about the Equity and Education campaign in the works; he stated that the Equity Studies Department has hundreds of courses listed as equity related courses and wished to learn more about what this equity campaign's goals are and how it will accentuate the resources already available.



Ahmed stated that attending meetings with members of the administration is a crucial part of her role as president which is why they make up a large part of her executive report. She stated that she thinks it is important to ensure that students know what is going on in these meetings that they are not privy to. She stated that with regards to the UTSU's Strategic Plan, it has been taken up by herself, O'Halloran and some members of full-time staff. The members of the group meet by-weekly and are currently reviewing the 2018-2019 Strategic Plan that was put together by Anne Boucher and her team at the time to look at what can be carried over from that report and what needs revising given how much has changed, especially in terms of the pandemic and how close the UTSU is to finally completing the Students' Commons project. She stated that the Strategic Plan will be a living document that is meant to act as a guide post for future Executives and Staff members as they navigate their time at the UTSU. Ahmed stated that one of her major goals is to ensure that the UTSU has every contingency and fall back option in place if and when there are events or developments that occur that they are otherwise not prepared for. She stated that the goal is to have the document complete for the next Executive team when they begin their term, adding that the strategic plan is also meant to help with the transition between Executives. She stated that the plan is still at the beginning stages and invited O'Halloran to speak more about it.

Ahmed stated that a major motivation behind the Equity and Education Campaign is to make students, especially non-equity studies students, more aware of all equity related courses that they can sign up for at U of T and thanked Erickson for bringing up the Equity Studies' Department's list of courses. This campaign came about partially in response to calls from members of the community for the University to mandate an anti-racism course. She stated that developing an entirely new course takes years of planning and social justice is an ongoing topic that does not need to wait years to be addressed. With this in mind, the goal of the Equity and Education campaign is to encourage students to go outside their own course areas and utilize the full breadth of equity related courses that the University already offers. She stated that they have already met with the President of the Arts & Science Students' Union (ASSU) who provided some information on how to go about promoting these courses. She stated that the Campaign was in its infancy when it was passed through the Campaigns & Outreach Committee as they had not yet contacted relevant stakeholders and equity seeking groups outside of the UTSU to discuss it further. She also recognized that there is a significant backlog at the UTSU in terms of campaigns but stated that that is because the UTSU is still building out its capacity for running independent campaigns at the rate that it would like to. Ahmed asked for patience as these foundations are laid to make this even more possible in future years.

Riches stated that when campaigns are presented to the Committee they are proposals that are then taken to be worked on by various Executives and staff members and discussed with various stakeholders in order to create more comprehensive plans for their implementation. They stated that this takes time and that it's not that they are on the backburner, they are being worked on constantly with the goal of launching them as fully realized campaigns.



Reuter stated that the recent by-election only saw a 1.5% turnout which was lower than the 12.7% turnout that was seen in the regular spring election and the 2.9% turnout that was seen in the spring by-election. She asked about the work that the Elections Review Committee (ERC) did leading up to the by-election to ensure that it was sufficiently promoted, what can be done to increase turnout in future elections and referenda, and what this level of turnout means for student engagement with the UTSU overall.

Ahmed stated that voter turnout was indeed very low in this election. She invited O'Halloran to speak more on the logistics surrounding this election considering that they worked closely with the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) on the matter. She attributed the election's low turnout to the fact that it was a director only election, meaning that only certain constituencies were able to vote depending on if there was a director that needed to be elected there. For example, she stated that she was unable to vote in the election as a St. Michael's College and Life Sciences student as the associated directorial positions had already been filled. She stated that even so, the 1.5% turnout was very disappointing. She stated that going into the next election season, the UTSU will have had enough experience running online only elections that the ERC will be able to better create strategies to facilitate more student involvement in the election process and higher turnout in turn.

O'Halloran stated that he was also disappointed in the turnout and reiterated Ahmed's comments surrounding the directorial only nature of the election. He stated that the union's last fall by-election had 3 Executive seats open for election and still only saw a 2.9% turnout. He noted that there has been a pattern of there being less campaigning in an uncontested race, especially when only some director seats are available. He stated that the union recently onboarded a new digital specialist and a new content advisor and that as a result, there were a few minor delays which made the planned election advertisements begin later than expected. He stated that they are already developing content and working with organizations such as the Varsity to advertise and promote the spring elections more extensively. They are also planning on making a new election video. The election will hopefully also have a longer voting period among other reforms that will hopefully be approved in committees very soon.

Ahmed stated that they have been engaging in discussions with the University administration to see if they could put a notice on the regular voting.utoronto.ca website redirecting students to the UTSU's simply voting website as students often end up not voting simply because they go to the wrong one.



Reuter stated that there she and other directors have noticed a general disconnect between the higher level daily goings on of the Executive and staff in terms of roles and staff turnover. She also stated a culture has developed where certain director are privy to more information on these matters than others depending on how connected they are to executive members. Moreover, she has seen how much of the work of the UTSU's committees has been slowly taken on by full time staff positions. She quoted directly from a meeting of the Services Committee in which O'Halloran described that the UTSU hired a staff member to work programs and services and in a meeting of the Governance Committee where O'Halloran mentioned that the Board does not know too much about the goings on of the general manager. Reuter asked O'Halloran and Ahmed how they see the role of the UTSU's Committees in light of these new developments and asked how they think the UTSU can do better in terms of being more transparent about the daily goings on of Executive and Staff operations. Moreover, she asked how the Executives can make directors more aware of staff related decision-making processes going forward.

Ahmed stated that she wanted to emphasize that the Board of Directors is the final decision-maker of anything that occurs at the UTSU, with staff acting in a supporting capacity as facilitators for the vision that the Board lays out. She stated that the programs and services team did not in any way have final say over the goings on of the services portfolio, adding that before the committee was able to meet, Executives were making final decisions when necessary. Moving forward, all decisions related to UTSU services will be approved through the Services Committee and the Board of Directors by extension; she cited the continuation of the redistribution of money from the food bank as an example. She stated that the directors having the chance to get to know staff and the inner operations of the UTSU has proven difficult for a long time given that there is a substantial amount of work that goes on behind the scenes that directors don't have a chance to witness directly. She added that the UTSU is currently onboarding a number of new staff members at the same time, adding to the work already done by the previous Executive team. This year two major additions to the staff team have been the UTSU's new human resources manager and also its newly reconstructed communications director, both of which were brought forward to the Board in some way. She acknowledged that the Board and staff should be working together more cohesively and stated that the online environment that defines the nature of this year does not help as previously many interactions were developed through the shared space of the UTSU office and through in-person board meetings. She added that executives also do not get to speak to the Full-time staff as much as they have in the past given the online nature of this year's work culture, with everyone working mostly in their designated divisions.

O'Halloran thanked Reuter for her question and asked for clarification.

Reuter clarified that her question was regarding comments that O'Halloran made in committees that made it seem like the role of the UTSU's committees would be changing given the hiring of new staff roles at the Executive level. She asked what he sees the role of committees and directors being moving forward. She also stated that the UTSU could do better in terms of being more transparent about changes taking place in upper-level management to ensure that directors are kept more informed.



In reference to his comments at the Services Committee, O'Halloran stated that he was trying to convey that in the past the Services Committee had only met to discuss changes to the Health & Dental Plan and that any projects related to that portfolio were taken on by executives. He clarified that his intentions at the Services Committee was to build up the Committee's mandate further and to build a bridge between it and the Programs & Services staff team so they can work more closely. He stated that there are more conversations to be had in terms of specific ways that the Services Committee can build up its mandate while recognizing the role that staff play. He stated that issues of transparency between the upper-level management of the UTSU and the Board has been a consistent issue. He stated that he believes that developing a Human Resources Committee, as recommended by the Chartered Professional Accountants of Canada, will help develop a more transparent culture in which directors would have the ability to directly weigh in on issues of staff compensation and hiring. He stated that he has been slowly working to figure out how to restructure the UTSU's bylaws to make that possible and mentioned that amendments to the Appellate Board, Executive Review Committee and other bylaws would be necessary. He also stated that the UTSU has a single policy manual that is relatively outdated and that the UTSU's personnel manuals have not been sufficiently updated, creating problems for staff transitioning. He stated that these elements currently exist outside of the Board's governing structure and that he has been working to incorporate them under its purview. He stated that he wants to ensure that the Board is at least aware of developments that are occurring around staff hiring and roles, such as in the process of building the staff structure for the student commons. He stated that he would be open to discussing this further with directors moving forward.

Ahmed added that specific governance changes related to human resources are on their way. She echoed O'Halloran's work on creating a Human Resources Committee. She also stated that the General Manager is intent on creating a report for the Board to let them know about the day to day goings on of full-time staff and the internal structure of the UTSU, something that has never been done before. She stated that there is more work to be done to figure out where this report would fit into the Board's governing structure to ensure it can be properly reviewed and approved. She added that staff have the opportunity to sit in on committee meetings, stating that the Communications Director has sat in on Campaigns & Outreach Meetings and the HR Manager has sat in on Equity & Accessibility Meetings. She noted that staff members, many of whom are new, are still working to understand the structure of the UTSU as both a non for profit corporation with staff members responsible for executing tasks and a union with a Board of Directors and Committees. She stated that the UTSU is building capacity which is creating new issues and exacerbating old ones as it continues to grow.

Prem stated that it is difficult to understand the role of a director in reference to the entire union when there are so many moving parts on the staff side of things that directors are not privy to seeing. He stated that it is difficult to be sitting on committees discussing ideas and plans for implementation when there is an entire staff structure involved in those conversations that directors never get to see. He asked what can be done in the near future to rectify this gap.

O'Halloran thanked Prem for his question. He stated that the UTSU will hopefully be moving towards using "HR Downloads" which will allow people to see what is going on with every staff team as they move through their tasks. He stated that alongside the UTSU's new HR manager,



they have been developing a new organizational chart to explain the staff structure and its various teams more succinctly, especially in anticipation of the new staff that will accompany the opening of the Student Commons. He stated that creating these structures to ascertain who is responsible for what at any given time is a massive priority for the staff team overall and stated that the progress being made on this front will hopefully become clearer at the next Board of Directors meeting. He stated that in terms of directors feeling confident enough to execute their duties in board and committee meetings, he has been working on a proper Governance Administration session as well as an online portal for resources for directors. He stated that staffing decisions have become clearer in recent months as the current Executives have been able to fully grasp the hiring that was done by the last Executives in order to build a better idea of what the structure has looked like and where it is going. He also stated that not receiving a proper transition in his role caused a number of issues making it difficult to have a more comprehensive understanding on this issue.

6.1 Motion to Recess

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: AHMED

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the meeting recess for 10 minutes

CARRIED

The meeting entered recess at 3:03 PM.

The meeting exited recess at 3:13 PM.

Prem asked about how the UTSU organizes and reflects on its outreach policies and results. He also asked if there were any plans to expand funding for bursaries as a part of the Student Aid Program.

Ahmed stated that this year has been very informative as to how the UTSU can make its outreach strategy more comprehensive, specifically in the realm of social media. She asked Riches to speak further on the outreach of the union as they have led the Campaigns & Outreach Committee. She stated that continuity in the scope of dealing with social media is always a challenge. She stated that in collaboration with staff members, specifically the director of communications, discussions are ongoing as to how to gauge our social media outreach as well as the kinds of questions that the UTSU is getting from its members in-person and online at its help desk. She stated that many of the possible changes that can be made in the realm of outreach are usually done by trial and error because of the task based nature of the union and its constant turnover of staff members. She stated a more comprehensive outreach strategy, which is being worked on right now, will create a more cohesive strategy that will analyse gaps in our outreach and what can be done because of it.

Riches echoed Ahmed's response about the difficulties of outreach exclusively online. They stated that right now, UTSU social media, the website, and its newsletters are the largest platforms of outreach that the organization has. They stated that in-person there are many more



opportunities for engagement. They also stated that having the Campaigns & Outreach committee be responsible for a majority of plans to do with outreach has proven difficult given how outreach is something that many stakeholders are responsible for from Executives to Staff and Directors.

O'Halloran stated that in reference to Prem's questions around the Student Aid Program and its possible expansion. He stated that there are two elements to possibly increasing the funding of the program. He noted that at the Services Committee there was a discussion around redirecting an amount of funds to the Student Aid Program. He added that the program needs the additional funding as he recently sent a message to the Finance Committee that the program will go over budget. He noted that the program has used 60% of its budget while only running for half of the year. In reference to specific bursaries, He noted that the new Student Aid Program Policy allows the Student Aid Committee to approve disbursements as they see fit. He stated that within his executive report he provided a tracker for the Student Aid Program. He noted that an updated tracker will be available within his next executive report.

Prem asked about the discussion of virtual office hours as discussed at a recent Executive Committee meeting. He asked whether there were any updates on that as it would serve as an alternative way to interact with the membership and get involved with campus.

Ahmed stated that the executive committee fully intends to use this method. She stated that scheduling is the largest problem currently. She stated that she is working with her executive assistant to work to create a space for students worldwide to meet with the UTSU executive. This event is in progress and she apologized for the delays. He noted that the UTSU picked up a series of projects at the same time and they have been dealt with in order of urgency.

6.2 Motion to Limit Speaking Time

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RAMADAN

SECONDED: PREM

BE IT RESOLVED THAT speaking time be limited to 2 minutes.

CARRIED

Ramadan asked Ahmed and McLean about the Equity campaign that they have been working on. She stated that it appears that the ASL course is currently in the air and she asked whether the campaign is feasible if the ASL course is still in development.

Ahmed stated that the campaign is not a course proposal, rather the goal is to highlight the courses that are already available. She stated that they have been reaching out to professors and faculties to collect information on these courses for the campaign. She reiterated that the campaign is not to create a new course, rather it is meant to be an education and awareness campaign to highlight the work being done already. She asked McLean to speak further on the progress of the ASL course.



McLean stated that in regards to the ASL Course there is no more work that the UTSU can do other than discussing the specifics with the Linguistics Department. It is the responsibility of the Linguistics department to hire a professor to conduct the course. She stated that she will strive to update the board when she can about the progress of the project.

Ramadan asked whether the executives could speak on their goals for the next 6 months within their portfolios. She noted that due to COVID-19 there have been major changes to each executive's roles. She stated that she isn't certain about what is currently happening within each executive's portfolio and would like to better understand their work.

Kanter asked Riches about advocating to the Provincial Government on tuition fees. He stated that the provincial government is planning on introducing a new tuition framework for the winter.

Riches stated that they will look into the issue further. They stated that public universities such as the University of Toronto do not have enough public funding to operate independent of tuition fees therefore, they have to charge students directly.

Kanter noted that he would like the UTSU commit to advocacy that is inclusive to all divisions at the University of Toronto. He noted that he would like to see tuition fees equalized so that there are not large differences in tuition within different divisions, such as within Computer Sciences.

Piragic asked for more clarification on the Student Life section of the President's Executive Report. He asked for more information on the goals of the Health & Wellness staff members at University of Toronto. He stated that his division's experience with Health & Wellness was that there were different schedules for them that made it difficult to interact with Health & Wellness, making it difficult for them to access those resources.

Ahmed stated that the student life meeting that was referenced was an introduction meeting with Jeannine Rob who stated that her focus was to digitize mental health services and create more accessible solutions. She thanked Nermit for bringing up divisional issues and Ahmed stated that she would be open to further discussion on how she can be more comprehensive with her discussion with the administration. She asked Kaita to speak on this further through the Professional Faculties perspective

Piragic asked if the administration is keeping in mind in-person safety and well-being for students who are still taking a great deal of their coursework in-person.

Ahmed stated that the administration often refers students and leaders to faculty leaders. She stated that the issue becomes when there is miscommunication between faculty leaders and leaders from central administration. She stated that the administration has not responded on the issue of keeping students in-person next semester thus far.

Peters stated that the Equity & Outreach Committee has slightly different circumstances as to how the committee runs as there is no exec in the chair or vice chair role. She asked O'Halloran



what plans were being done to create a handbook for governance and administration for her and other committee members. She asked O'Halloran about the timeline for a tangible handbook to support members.

O'Halloran stated that the internal deadline on the handbook project was pushed to the next term when committee chairs would have access to those resources right off the bat. He stated that he is happy to help committee members with governance issues if they have any. He stated that the contents of the handbook should be available after November.

Peters stated that she isn't in need of help anymore but more wanted to comment on the general issue that she's observed over the past couple months.

Reuter asked Riches about the Campus Initiatives Policy, specifically because of the large allocation that it was given by the Finance Committee. She wanted to ensure that the opportunity would be made better known to the public. She stated that the union has not held multiple campaigns concurrently in the past. Reuter asked what work has been done to ensure that the UTSU can run multiple campaigns at once given that it hasn't been able to in the past.

Riches stated that the application form for the Campus Initiatives Policy is close to being done and that it is going to go on the website when it's ready. They stated that they just recently presented a report to full time staff on how campaigns work. They also stated that they are hiring a new Executive Assistant, Research and Administration to deal with the workload.

V.Dhawan asked about the postponement of the Annual General Meeting put forth by O'Halloran. She pointed out that the UTSU bylaws don't align with the CNCA bylaws and asked if he was planning on moving changes to the Bylaw in order to rectify this.

O'Halloran stated that he thought that the union could extend the deadline in the same spirit of the CNCA extension, however he noted that it is important to codify that alliance. He added that they can introduce an amendment to the resolutions in item #8 to ensure that the UTSU rectifies this problem.

6.3 Motion to Externalize Item #4 from the Minutes of Executive Committee #7

DISCUSSION

Riches stated that they wanted to externalize it to ensure that the Divestment & Beyond Coalition as well as the board has a chance to debate this part of the committee minutes. They stated that Divestment & Beyond is advocating the University to divest from fossil fuels in its investment strategy. They stated that this is in line with the ways in which UTSU has supported advocacy for climate change and divestment in the past.

Austin stated that Divestment & Beyond asks the University of Toronto to declare a climate emergency and to divest from fossil fuels and companies that profit off of fossil fuels. She stated that the biggest motivations behind divestment are climate and



reparations, The university presents itself as being at the forefront of knowledge, however they continually invest in companies that are detrimental to the environment. She stated that Universities such as Dalhousie have been able to do away with these flawed principles known as those that are in line with “GhG standards”. She noted that the university's low carbon emergency plan has no absolute quantifier for emissions therefore, they could report decreases even while emissions rise. Austin stated that the other motivator is reconciliation. Divestment is crucial to supporting indigenous societies across Canada which have faced persecution due to energy corporation man camps who have contributed to the epidemic of missing indigenous women and girls. She noted that the final argument is that the Fossil fuel industry is a dying industry. It has been recognized by most scientists that in the near future we will have to move beyond fossil fuel usage to avoid catastrophic effects of climate change. She noted that the other goal of declaring a climate emergency is clear as the City of Toronto has already declared an emergency. She noted that these changes only occur when there is public pressure which is why they are endorsing these things, and why they are important.

Kanter asked where the goal to get the University to become carbon neutral by 2030 came from.

Austin stated that the timeline is optimistic as most would ask for the 2050 timeline. She noted that the choice of the 2030 was to push the university to move faster and sooner towards their director of net carbon neutrality.

Riches emphasized that directors can always reach out to him to discuss this moving forward.

6.4 Motion to Externalize the 78-90 Queens Park Development Sections of the VP Operations’ and VP Public & University Affairs’ Reports

DISCUSSION

V.Dhawan asked about O’Halloran and Riches deputations to the municipal committee responsible for approving this project. She asked whether there were discussions leading up to this meeting with the administration before writing the deputations or, why not. She said that many of the questions brought up in the deputation sounded like they were directed more towards the University then towards the council itself. She asked if the music directors or administration were consulted. She also asked why specifically O’Halloran felt it necessary to engage in the way that they did.

Riches stated that this consultation has been ongoing for a number of years. They stated that buildings like this can take a long time to develop which leaves communication spotty between transitions. They stated, in reference to the deputation, that usually in these matters they consult with the executive beforehand. They stated that in this case, there was some miscommunication on the executive side of things leading up to the meeting. They also stated that they met with the administration members that they had



been working with in regards to the development before the deputation to talk about the issues they brought up in the deputation to the council committee.

O'Halloran stated that he got involved because he had been working with a former member of the UTSU in the past and continued to be involved as a concerned music student and knowledgeable member of the Executive Committee. He stated that the time period that he was given to write the deputation was limited.

V.Dhawan stated that the arguments in the letter sounded like the UTSU didn't want the building to be built similar to what the Neighbourhood Organizations had been saying for many months as the development progressed. She stated that broader consultation with different members of the administration beforehand would have made more sense. She stated that she believed that O'Halloran maybe shouldn't have deputized as a member of the Executive Committee, but rather as a music student.

O'Halloran stated that he keeps regular communication with music students, including members of the music student organization there and specifically with the director of the UTSU allocated towards music. He disagreed with the characterization that the deputation was in line with the arguments that leaders form the neighbourhood association. He stated that issues such as pollution in the building of the site makes it more difficult for music students.

Erickson asked about the heritage building status of the Edward Johnson Building and the way in which O'Halloran's deputation stated that the building was in need of repairs and how to reconcile those two pieces.

O'Halloran stated that the position of the UTSU was never that it was opposed to the building's development. He stated that they did not emphasize the piece about the heritage status of the building in the deputation as they wanted to focus on supporting it. He also stated that renovations have not moved forward, noting that was a major problem and reason that the problem was referenced.

Erickson stated that in the letter prior to the deputation, the heritage status issue in reference to possible renovations that need to occur was emphasized in the letter even though it was not in the deputation.

Riches stated in discussions with members of the administration, they stated that they were aware that renovations to the building were needed and that a heritage status would not mean that renovations could not be done in the near future. They stated that in talking to the administration before the deputation, after the letter, they emphasized that the CCC building would help reduce capacity to the Edward Johnson Building to allow renovations to take place. Riches apologized that the letter and deputation were not on the same page. They stated that they plan on consulting more with stakeholders to ensure that the miscommunication doesn't affect our documentation and advocacy moving forward. They also stated that they will follow up with the appropriate members



from the administration to follow up on the specific pieces mentioned in the deputation and in this conversation. Riches also stated that the neighbourhood associations have different concerns than the UTSU does; they did not want it to be built at all saying that it would be too tall and imposing.

V.Dhawan stated that both the neighbourhood associations and the UTSU, given the content of the letter, both asked for the project to be delayed. She asked why members of the administration were consulted in the copious amount of time beforehand when O'Halloran was working with former members of the UTSU in the years prior. She specifically pointed out that the law faculty was not consulted given that they also have a stake in the area that the development is building on. She stated that she would appreciate more consultation with appropriate stakeholders moving forward.

O'Halloran stated that the concerns that were raised in the letter and amended for the purposes of the deputation were not coming from the same place as the Neighbourhood associations. He stated that his perspective was coming from being concerned for music students and conceded that it would have been beneficial to consult with members from the law faculty as well. He went on to state that when people come to the UTSU they have certain perspectives and passions that they bring to the role based on their experiences; he stated that in his case, he cares about music students, and given his experience on the matter he wanted to weigh in when the executive was discussing what to do about this development.

Reuter stated that in general advocacy in the UTSU tends to be more individualized based on those who are engaging in the steps that need to be done for any advocacy project. She stated that it would be beneficial for the Executive Committee to be more communicative about their advocacy projects to ensure that more consultation is done on these issues with stakeholders that need to be involved.

Ahmed stated that she was not completely familiar with this project prior to the last couple months. She stated that all members of the UTSU bring lived experiences that they contribute to the union and that in O'Halloran's case, he was bringing his experience and concerns as a music student to the forefront. However, she emphasized that the Executives are aware that more consultation has to be done moving forward on all advocacy initiatives.

Reuter emphasized that this could have been managed better given the miscommunication throughout and the personalized emphasis that was presented in the letter and deputation.

Peters stated that the UTSU must ensure that the material it puts out needs to be reflective of the union's stances and takes in general given that the union has a reputation on the line. She stated that it is important to emphasize that Executives are responsible for representing all students and not just personal communities.



Ahmed stated that it is important to consult with members and board members in general in reference to larger projects and plans on being more thoughtful about engaging in those necessary discussions moving forward.

Prem stated that this conversation speaks to the larger issue of communication between the Executives and the Board and thinks that there needs to be more work done to bridge this gap.

Erickson stated that are a number of issues that this example brings to light in the larger scope of discussions on advocacy initiatives.

Kanter suggested that there be more specific policy as to what stances the union is allowed to take and the process that is required to ensure that the proper stakeholders are met.

Riches stated that currently, there are Bylaws on Issues Policies surrounding this, but that usually in advocacy matters, the Executives consult amongst themselves and write and sign letters specifically from the Executive Committee itself rather than from the board. They stated that these advocacy pieces hold the weight of the entire union even though they are only signed by the Executive Committee. Riches stated that he appreciates the feedback that the Board has been providing for the Executives; they stated that transparency and communication is something they strive for and will continue to do so in the future to prevent instances such as this one from occurring again.

O'Halloran stated that the UTSU is meant to work as a team; and that the Executives are open to further discussion on creating better communication with Board members, specifically in reference to things that they think that Executives are lacking on. He stated that Peters' comments regarding the Executives' responsibility to represent all students is true; he added that his comments on the nature of the development process were coming from a place of genuine concern for music students.

6.5 Motion to Externalize Item #6 from the Minutes of Governance Committee #5

DISCUSSION

O'Halloran stated that the student commons' appointments committee was logistically challenging. In the committee, he described that they passed procedures that would make the appointments process more cohesive. He stated that the appointments committee needs to begin its work in the winter, which means that elections will happen in November alongside the other committee elections. He outlined the number of members that are responsible for being on the appointments committee as well. He also emphasized that it is important for the board to approve this today so that they can be on schedule for forming the committee in line with its development schedule on the staff side.



Kanter asked about the expected occupancy date of the Student Commons.

O'halloran stated that the expected occupancy date has changed for many years but that it should be January 2021 as to when the UTSU begins to gain occupancy of the building. He stated that at this point, the building is planning to be opened in September 2021.

CARRIED

7. Ad-hoc CFS Committee - Outstanding Vacancies

RESOLUTION

MOVED: RICHES

SECONDED: PREM

WHEREAS the UTSU Board of Directors struck an ad-hoc committee on the Canadian Federation of Students at its meeting on 26 September 2020; and

WHEREAS two vacancies remained after elections were held; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following Directors be elected to serve on the committee:

From either Division I or Division II:

- ***Firstname Lastname***
- ***Firstname Lastname***

DISCUSSION

Riches stated that in September, the UTSU struck the committee to outline the overall impact of the CFS on the UTSU and its members. They stated that the committee's responsibility is to collect as much information about the CFS as possible and make it widely publicly accessible. Riches stated that the committee has discussed what each member is responsible for contributing to the report and is looking at a preliminary deadline of February 2021 as to when it will be completed. They stated that they wanted to open the door for more directors to join the committee given the recent elections. They stated that the committee has committed to splitting up the work among committee members, executives, and executive assistants to make it less onerous for each member to deal with juggling their workloads.

Prem asked Riches to expand on the nature of the report.

Riches stated that a similar committee was struck in 2015 by the then board of directors who presented a similar report that can be found in the Ad-hoc committee's recent meeting. They stated that the report when released was found to be very helpful when presented to the public. They stated that a new report was supposed to be submitted each year after the initial one but that that hasn't happened until they presented it in the last Board of Directors meeting. They stated that there are advocacy, services, finances, and governance sections of the report that will be fleshed out in the coming months.



Riches nominated Kakkar. Kakkar accepted.

Ahmed nominated Kanter. Kanter accepted.

7.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the motion be amended to read:

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following Directors be elected to serve on the committee:

From either Division I or Division II:

- ***Jai Kakkar***
- ***Evan Kanter***

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT | CARRIED

CARRIED

8. Ratification of First Year Council Appointments

RESOLUTION

MOVED: AHMED

SECONDED: PREM

WHEREAS the First Year Council Appointment Committee evaluated applications and selected first-year students most suited to represent their class;

BE IT RESOLVED that the appointments of the 2020 First Year Council Appointment Committee, included in Appendix B, be ratified.

DISCUSSION

Ahmed stated that there are currently 18 people represented on the First year Council. She stated that the hiring committee has worked hard to represent as many constituencies as possible and that they are excited to begin their work for the year. She stated that this item is meant to ratify the members that the hiring committee chose. She also stated that members of the Board are welcome to join meetings of the FYC at any time moving forward.

Prem asked why there are now 18 members instead of 19 members.

Ahmed stated that there were some technical difficulties around the by-election process and the FYC hiring happening at the same time. She stated that she was open to hiring another member but that it would be complicated given that the FYC Executive is currently being elected at the moment.



Erickson stated that the First Year Council has a clause within its Reference Manual that codifies procedure to create a new appointment committee under the condition the council falls under a certain size. He stated that a single member leaving does not reach that threshold.

O'Halloran added that he was happy that the issue between the First Year Council and the by-election was resolved and that Nelson Lee has been able to join the board as a director.

CARRIED

9. Formal Postponement of UTSU Annual General Meeting

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED: AHMED

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has extended the time for federally incorporated not-for-profit corporations to call a 2020 annual general meeting (AGM) to the shortest of the following two options: 21 months after the previous AGM and no more than 12 months after the last financial year-end, or December 31, 2020; and

WHEREAS federally incorporated not-for-profit corporations do not need to apply to Corporations Canada for the extension; and

WHEREAS Section 160(2) of the *Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act* provides federally incorporated not-for-profit corporations with a mechanism to request further extensions to the date in which a general meeting must be called;

BE IT RESOLVED that the 2020 AGM be postponed to a date no earlier than December 10th, 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU still provide appropriate notice to the members for the 2020 AGM, including a call for bylaw amendment and agenda item submissions, according to Bylaw III(h); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, if granted an extension by the Director appointed under the *Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act*, that the 2020 AGM be permitted to be further postponed to a date no later than February 28th 2020, pursuant to Section 160(2) of the Act.

DISCUSSION

9.1 Motion to Recess

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED: RICHES

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the meeting recess for 10 minutes.

CARRIED

The meeting entered recess at 5:05 PM

The meeting left recess at 5:15 PM

O'Halloran stated that the motion would officially postpone the Annual General Meeting. He stated that it would postpone the meeting to a date no earlier than December 10th, which is set



due to the 5 week requirement for notice of the meeting. He stated that the final clause would allow the UTSU to further postpone the AGM to a later date. He noted that this motion is to ensure that the union is staying compliant.

CARRIED

9.2 Motion to Amend the Agenda

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN SECONDED: PREM

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 3 "Meetings" be approved as presented within Appendix D.

DISCUSSION

Erickson asked whether this amendment would be a one time allowance or whether it would serve as a permanent change to the union's bylaws.

O'Halloran stated that this would be a one-time allowance as Corporations Canada has not allowed extensions in the past. He stated that having a clause within the bylaw to allow the director of Corporations Canada allow for an extension is useful. Therefore, though this is a permanent change it will likely only be used in emergencies.

V.Dhawan stated that she disagrees with the procedural choice of allowing the Bylaws to be amended reactionarily. She noted that she would prefer to momentarily suspend the union's bylaws so that they are able to stay compliant.

Cave noted that the Bylaws cannot be suspended unless they expressly relate to a Rule of Order. Therefore, the suspension of the bylaws would not be possible.

O'Halloran stated that as it is October 31, he noted that V.Dhawan expressed that in order to stay in compliance with the union's bylaws. He noted that as the substance and the effect of the bylaw change would be limited, he was hoping that the board would be amenable to the change. He stated that making this amendment is within the board's ability and then could be further considered a Governance Committee meeting in November.

V.Dhawan stated that this change is reactionary in nature and stated that she did not think it would be prudent to make changes in that way. She stated that she would prefer this change to be sent to the Governance Committee for discussion before it gets brought to the Board at the next Board of Directors meeting. She stated that by her calculations we would still be within the timeline of needing to change our bylaws if we were to wait another month.

O'Halloran stated that in general he agrees with V.Dhawan's sentiment, however, given the comments at the beginning of the meeting this amendment is necessary to satisfy duty. He noted this as the union would be out of compliance with the bylaws for a



number of weeks. He stated that in regards to holding the meeting in January, the purpose of the previous motion was to clarify that it would not be possible without the permission of the Director. He noted that several members of the union misinterpreted the notice released by Corporations Canada. The notice permitted not-for-profit corporations to hold their Annual general meetings either by the end of 2020 or 12 months after the end of their fiscal year. The notice stipulated that corporations can utilize the shortest of the two options available. He stated that because of this, the UTSU would have to have an Annual General Meeting during the exam period.

V.Dhawan asked Cave about the consequences of breaking a Bylaw.

Cave stated that it is generally important not to break the bylaws.

V.Dhawan asked if there was a positive obligation to the board to avoid breaking a bylaw.

9.2.1 Motion to Refer to Governance Committee

RESOLUTION

MOVED: PREM SECONDED: ERICKSON

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this is referred to the Governance Committee of the Board of Directors.

DISCUSSION

Prem noted that if the board agrees to ratify the changes within the Bylaw 3 today, O'Halloran stated that he intends to bring the amendment to the Governance Committee for further review. He asked why the motion would not be brought to the Governance Committee first.

O'Halloran stated that the union has realized that they are no longer in compliance with their Bylaws. Under fiduciary duty they are required to make measures within reason to attempt to resolve the discrepancy with the bylaw. He noted that this bylaw amendment would ensure that the union is not breaking the bylaw while creating the extension. He noted that it is very rare that this extension would be allowed, therefore this can act as an emergency clause similar to ones that many other not-for-profit corporations have had to make.

V.Dhawan stated that she wants to speak in favour of deferring this to the Governance Committee. She noted that being mindful of the fact that the union may be in violation of the bylaws, though they have a fiduciary duty to the board they do not have a fiduciary duty to the executive. She stated that amending the bylaws in a rushed way sets a precedent that may outweigh the harm caused by violating the bylaws.

O'Halloran stated that there is no such thing as a fiduciary duty to the executive committee, only a duty to the board. He stated that if this amendment is not approved by the board. He stated that he is attempting to exercise his duty to the



board to ensure that the UTSU is within its legal constraints. He stated he strongly believes that this bylaw amendment is the best possible solution that the union can take at this time.

Prem stated that he does not understand why this would be passed at the Board before it is reviewed by the Governance Committee

O'Halloran stated that the only reason that he wanted this today is because it would be in action starting today unlike if it was passed at the Governance Committee.

Ahmed asked whether V.Dhawan's suggestion of deferment is possible.

Cave stated that Robert's Rules of Order is not able to consider this resolution. He noted that this type of amendment is not within the nature of Robert's Rules of Order. He noted that he would rule the motion in order under the requirement of the bylaw. He noted that if the assembly would like them to formally repeal his ruling.

ABSTENTION: TIU

V. Dhawan called for quorum.

It is determined that the meeting is inadequate due to an insufficient number of individuals present in the room. The Chair ruled that the meeting immediately adjourn, without outstanding business to be taken up at another time.

10. Motion to Adjourn

RESOLUTION

MOVED: V.DHAWAN

SECONDED: ERICKSON

BE IT RESOLVED that the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 5:58 PM.

10: Approval of the First Year Council Transition Team Report

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O'HALLORAN

SECONDED:

~~WHEREAS the First Year Council Transition Team was appointed to their seats by the previous council; and~~



~~WHEREAS the First Year Council Transition Policy stipulates that the FYC Transition Team must prepare a final report for board approval;~~

~~BE IT RESOLVED that the First Year Council Transition Team Report for 2020, included in Appendix C, be approved as presented by the Board of Directors.~~

~~DISCUSSION~~

~~CARRIED/FAILED~~

11. Other Business

~~DISCUSSION ITEM~~

~~MOVED:~~

~~SECONDED:~~

~~DISCUSSION~~

12. Adjournment

~~RESOLUTION~~

~~MOVED:~~

~~SECONDED:~~

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

~~CARRIED/FAILED~~

~~The meeting adjourns at ___:___ PM.~~

Appendices Listed on Following Page



APPENDICES

- **Consent Agenda**

Link: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1kY3b10TLA6V6771BHGr8ufl8lkPJJKqr?usp=sharing>

A Fall 2020 By-elections Results

Link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/18lsQK1yUEpxa8CSiPOSkbX5VNUrsNeyN/view?usp=sharing>

B First Year Council Appointments

Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kVubZpke6h_afBO_2M6bhodb4TY2LaIT/view?usp=sharing

C First Year Council Transition Team Report

Link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RPT90WGGUakf2ojvX5NL0BRV-WyTJsxk/view?usp=sharing>

D Bylaw 3 Amendment

Link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tFUeJq73qdzaxcrS85X_bzrY01IOAJZP/view?usp=sharing