Minutes – Board of Directors

7th Meeting of 2020-2021
Monday, November 30th, 2020 | 5:00 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 Taramsiri, New College
Fiona Reuter, Trinity College
Pranay Prem, University College
Basmah Ramadan, University College
Jeannie Yoo, University College
Radhika Dhawan, Victoria College
Ava Harrington, Victoria College
Sierra Bevacqua, Woodsworth College
Sheryl Ordonez, Woodsworth College
Katherine Jung, Life Sciences
Alex Erickson, Social Sciences
Evan Kanter, Computer Science
Astrid Chandler, Humanities
Sidrah Rana, Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Jai Kakkar, Rotman Commerce Director

Division II Directors (Professional Faculties)
José Power, Architecture & Visual Studies
Tiffany Tiu, Kinesiology & Physical Education
Vanshika Dhawan, Law
Shaon Parial, Pharmacy
Rose Mohammad, Professional Faculties at-large
Andrew Chen, Applied Science & Engineering
Nelson Lee, Applied Sciences & Engineering
Diana Li, Applied Sciences & Engineering
Meredith McKinnon, Nursing

Visitors and Other Non-Voting
Brandon Cave, Speaker of the Board of Directors, UTSU
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
Maria Lin, EA Student Life, UTSU
Winston Chan, EA Research & Administration, UTSU
Sophia DiNicolo, EA Research & Administration, UTSU
Micaela Consens, EA Student Life, UTSU
Andrew Monkhouse, Monkhouse Law
Anusha Madhusudanan, President FYC
Maggie Kou, Vice-President, FYC
Danielle Lewis, Medical Society Representative
Marta Anielska, The Varsity
Victoria Liu

Absent
Zoe Chen, St. Michael’s College
Miloni Mehta, Woodsworth College
Nermin Piragic, Dentistry

Regrets
Matthew Ho, St. Michael’s College
Jonathan Hsu, St. Michael’s College
Catherine Wang, Music
MINUTES

Open Session

1. Call to Order

This meeting is called to order at 5:10 PM.

2. Approval of Agenda

RESOLUTION
MOVED: AHMED SECONDED: Prem

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be approved as presented.

DISCUSSION

O’Halloran stated that the ‘Discussion with Monkhouse Law’ would set some context regarding the AGM Motion to be voted upon later in the meeting. Monkhouse is an external member, thus he will be speaking at the beginning of the meeting.

CARRIED

3. Approval of the First Year Council Transition Team Report

RESOLUTION
MOVED: O’HALLORAN SECONDED: Prem

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 A, be approved as presented by the Board of Directors.

DISCUSSION

Erickson stated that this is a summary report of the work done by the Transition Team of the First Year Council. It includes projects completed including the Handbook Website and other promotional work for the incoming council. He thanked Fiona Reuter, Rose Zhang, Emmanuel Sackeyfio, and Pranay Prem for their contributions. He stated that this report has to pass through the board because Zhang would be receiving an honorarium.

CARRIED
4. Discussion with Monkhouse Law

O’Halloran introduced Andrew Monkhouse of Monkhouse law. He had been working with Monkhouse about the AGM to ensure that the UTSU’s work surrounding the 2020 AGM were appropriate.

Monkhouse stated that he is a lawyer, counsel to the UTSU, and partner at Monkhouse Law. At his firm, they focus on civil litigation and employment law. He stated that the management was looking to announce the notice for the AGM this year, and hold the meeting next year. There was some confusion regarding what “call” and “hold” would mean according to the CNCA. Most likely, given the pandemic, holding the meeting in the next year would be fine. Many corporations have received extensions. However, it was his recommendation after evaluating the regulation, that the UTSU hold the AGM by the end of the year to be in strict compliance with the law as it exists. Non-compliance could have a theoretical implication for the individuals who choose to do that. He stated that he did not believe that there would be any punishment from the government for the UTSU if the AGM were to be held in January, but that if the UTSU could assure that an AGM would be held in a safe way, that it would be best to hold it in December. Based on this, that is what Monkhouse had recommended to the management of the UTSU. Insofar as it is possible to attempt to hold the AGM, the UTSU must give action to the letter and the spirit of the CNCA.

Erickson asked, if the meeting is held on December 22nd, what would happen if the UTSU does not meet quorum requirements?

O’Halloran stated that he is working with the communications staff of the UTSU to prevent a loss in quorum at the AGM. It is possible to hold a Special General Meeting if the AGM loses quorum to conduct remaining business.

Monkhouse stated that the requirement is that the UTSU at least attempt to hold a meeting in case something goes wrong. People have the opportunity before the end of the fiscal year to have their voices heard. If the AGM does not have quorum, the UTSU would still be in compliance with the law, and it can deal with other matters afterwards.

Kanter asked when the fiscal year end is, and how is this interpreted in the CNCA and the UTSU bylaws.

O’Halloran stated that the fiscal year end for the UTSU is April 30th.

Monkhouse stated that, in this case, the law is that the meeting must be held no more than twelve months after the end of the previous fiscal year, or December 31st, whichever is shortest. They have interpreted past legislation as being compliant, given the outstanding circumstances, to take into account the safety of everyone involved. In the current circumstance, references to in-person would include zoom meetings, unless somehow stated otherwise.
Kanter asked about which law Monkhouse was referring to.

Monkhouse stated that he was referring to the Canada Not-For-Profit Corporations Act (CNCA).

Dhawan asked about the application for extension being approved, and if it has been confirmed that the AGM would be happening on December 22nd.

O’Halloran stated that they had not heard anything about the extension submitted by the UTSU. Thus, it would be safer to hold the meeting in December.

5. Consent Agenda

RESOLUTION
MOVED: AHMED
SECONDED: PREM

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

1. Meeting of the Board of Directors
   6th Meeting of the 2020-2021 Board of Directors, 31 October 2020

2. Meetings of Committees
   Student Aid Committee, 29 October 2020 (6th Meeting)
   Finance Committee, 9 November 2020 (7th Meeting)
   Student Aid Committee, 9 November 2020 (7th Meeting)
   First Year Council, 13 November 2020 (2nd Meeting)
   Student Aid Committee, 19 November 2020 (8th Meeting)
   Governance Committee, 20 November 2020 (6th Meeting)
   Campaigns and Outreach, 21 November 2020 (7th Meeting)
   Executive Committee, 23 November 2020 (8th Meeting)
   Finance Committee, 25 November 2020 (8th Meeting)
   Governance Committee, 26 November 2020 (7th Meeting)

3. Executive Reports
   November 2020 Report of the President
   November 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Operations
   November 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Public & University Affairs
   November 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Equity
   October & November 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Student Life
   November 2020 Report of the Vice-President, Professional Faculties

DISCUSSION

Riches stated that all motions provided by the UTSU have been sent to the National Executive Committee of the Canadian Federation of Students. Furthermore, they went over the events of the UCRU Lobby Week, where Ahmed and Riches spent five days in lobby training and meetings with MPs and Cabinet Ministers. In addition, Riches stated that UCRU is working on a press release that would be sent out later that night regarding an investment of $575 million to the YES program and the removal of interest on all Canada Student Loans from the 2020-2021 school year. They noted that the budgets for KPE, Hart House and Student Life are worked on independently and noted that they sit on all of those bodies. They added that those budgets will be brought to the Council of Student Services before being reviewed by the University Affairs Board and
presented in the new year. They stated that in terms of progress on Divestment, at the October Board meeting the Board passed a resolution to advocate for the university to divest from fossil fuels. They stated that they have been in contact with LEAP at the university of Toronto to promote that resolution.

Dhawan asked why there was a decision made to replace the VP, Student Life seat on the Campaigns and Outreach Committee with the VP, Equity without a vote at the Governance Committee because this violates UTSU policy.

Riches stated that they were aware of the policy. However, they found that the VP Equity has made a lot of meaningful contributions to the committee, and agreed for the next term that it would be worthwhile to include MacLean instead of Hemrajani.

Hemrajani stated that she fully supported this decision because, as the portfolio of the VPSL has been progressing, its main focus would be on programming and clubs. Her presence on the Campaigns and Outreach Committee has not been as useful as MacLean’s presence.

MacLean stated that there is much overlap between her and Riches’ portfolios, and it is easier this way to break down communication barriers and to work on campaigns with one another.

Dhawan stated that policies only need to be amended through the Board of Directors, she wanted to know why the policy wasn’t changed. She stated that breaking policy and dealing with it after the fact is bad governance.

O’Halloran stated, as Riches mentioned, the decision was made by the Executive Committee because it would not be a permanent change. There are times that the Board knowingly makes an exception to policy, and he does not believe that makes it bad governance. This decision was made at the Executive Committee, and if the Board would like to reject this change for the semester because it does not align with the policy, then they have the power to do that. However, he strongly believed that it is not necessary.

Reuter asked Riches about their joint statement with University Divisions, and what they are doing to ensure that the administration is aware about action items in the statement.

Riches stated that student societies and organizers did a lot to ensure that everything was covered. They stated that the concerns were raised but the administration addressed concerns they were prepared to address.

Erickson asked what the UTSU’s priorities were on consulting stakeholder groups for Lobby Week.

Riches stated that UCRU lobby recommendations include feedback from Members of Parliament, from previous Lobby Weeks, and issues that are brought forward by each member school. The Lobby Brief is consensus based, and all schools must come into agreement and sign off on it.
Erickson externalized Item #3 of the 7th Executive Committee meeting.

Erickson asked where the priorities of UofT came from, and if there was consultation from other student groups.

Ahmed stated that federal advocacy is collected from every university, and must be succinct. Their main focus was on issues that pertain to all campuses. It is difficult to go from a fragmented UofT campus and UofT-specific issues. This type of advocacy is different from university advocacy, where the UTSU can reach out to stakeholders. Briefs are meant to encapsulate the entire federal landscape for university students.

O’Halloran recognized that members may not have had time to read his Executive Report because it was submitted a few hours before the meeting. He stated that the main aspects were the updates to the Health and Dental Plan. Studentcare has taken initiatives in light of COVID-19, including doubling trip cancellation coverage, trip interruption and delay coverage, quarantine costs, and expanded medical expense coverage. Further, the Finance Committee approved an additional $45000 to the Student Aid program. He concluded that the website has not yet been released because the developers have been delayed.

Hemrajani stated that her portfolio has been progressing with administrative changes, with an addition of a full-time staff member and a new Executive Assistant, Student Life. Further, she highlighted her collaboration with the UTWA. For the next semester, Frost Week would be pushed back by one week because of the semester delay.

Ahmed thanked everyone for their patience with the Executive Committee. This month, her report is shorter than normal, but her month has been more packed than usual. She apologized for submitting her Executive Report late. She worked on mental health conversations and initiatives for this month. Mental health brought up during UCREW lobbying week as well.

McLean stated that she would be combining the campaigns she was working on into one campaign. These campaigns include Equity 101, Advancing Equity in Education, and Advancing Equity in our Community and Beyond. She stated that she would be working on making these campaigns sustainable so that her successors may carry it on if they choose. Further, she is working with the Communications team to develop content for these initiatives.

R. Dhawan stated that the agenda and the board package went out four days prior, and the Executive Reports from the VP, Operations and the President were included earlier this morning. When executives are late, the Board would motion to include them. She asked why their reports are already included in the Consent Agenda.

O’Halloran stated that R. Dhawan is referring to the process that was conducted last year. Last year, the team set out punitive internal deadlines that don’t seem necessary in light of the circumstances posed by COVID-19. He stated that both he and Ahmed anticipated to submit their reports shortly after the package went out, but there were other pressing matters that needed to be dealt with at the time.
R. Dhawan stated that she understood that it would be late in advance, but receiving the report the morning of the meeting would be difficult to consider.

O’Halloran apologized for the delay.

Rana asked the VPPUA and the President regarding their meetings with the administration on mental health. She wanted them to clarify what they meant by pushing the administration, as well what the VPPUA is specifically doing to address University Mandated Leave of Absence Policy (UMLAP).

Ahmed stated that they believe that the administration is using stopgap solutions instead of acknowledging the greater problems around mental health at the university. She noted that they are overlooking one of the most important aspects of student mental health, which is a forgiving and compassionate atmosphere to academics. She added that this negligence is especially bad as due to COVID-19 there are a number of new issues that are affecting student’s mental health. This being an additional layer of stressors on top of academic, financial and other pressures. She stated that ensuring the university understands that their momentary solutions can be seen through.

Riches stated that the UTSU has consistently advocated against the UMLAP. This has been a problematic policy since 2017, and it is reviewed every three years. Riches ran on a platform to get student consultations on this specific issue. The administration would be carrying out its consultation structure this year, but did not specify exactly to Riches. Riches stated that they would craft the UTSU’s own consultations for a report from students about revising the policy.

Rana asked if they were consulting with faculties and discussing this advocacy work, and asked if the UTSU was in support when UMLAP was put into place.

Riches stated that the Executive Committee of 2017-2018 was in favour of the UMLAP on the basis that it would be better than the Student Code of Conduct.

Jung asked the VPSL what is happening with Clubs Funding. She stated there are no links to funding applications or information on how to apply for funding, but the VPSL assured that the UTSU is taking funding applications.

Hemrajani stated that she does not have any control over the website. All communications are done through the mailing list, and any recognized clubs would have received notification that the UTSU is receiving funding applications at this time through email.

Reuter asked the VP Operations about the Strategic Plan in his report. Given the cycling of directors and executives, how will the VP Operations ensure that this plan is adaptable and the mandate for future executives and directors.
O’Halloran stated that this process is being undertaken by himself, Ahmed, the Manager of Strategic Projects and the Learning and Development Coordinator. There has been some information gathering and organizing to consider adapting the Strategic Plan to include the Student Commons. As well, Working Groups will be established in January to contribute to the plan.

Peters asked about last year’s UCRU briefing, and stated that there were many gaps, specifically towards Indigenous students’ asks, the cut to the tuition tax credit, and the cut to undergraduate research funding.

Riches stated that these recommendations were made from the input of different board members of UCRU, and in relation to the federal political climate. Further, regarding research awards, this is in relation to the doubling of positions available for students. They stated that they would be going over the press release when the meeting is over.

Peters stated that the Members of Parliament did not support tuition tax credit and noted that the MP for the area surrounding UTSG is the Minister of Finance. She asked whether Riches received his information from that department or from the minister.

Riches stated that the previous UCRU Board provided the information based on what they received from Members of Parliament. They stated that they are unsure where the feedback originated.

Prem asked the VP Operations about the quarantine program released by UofT, and stated that students would be charged an $2000. He asked if students would be able to use the Student Aid bursaries to cover quarantine costs.

O’Halloran stated that the recent increase to the Student Aid budget would allow the UTSU to accommodate these costs.

CARRIED

5.1 Externalization of Item #3 from the Governance Committee #7

5.1.1 Motion to Amend

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Annual General Meeting of the UTSU shall be held at a time not prejudicial to the members every year, as per s. 160 of the CNCA.

CARRIED

V. Dhawan asked about the word prejudicial in the spirit of the Government of Canada’s language. Her understanding is that “at a time not prejudicial” is determined by the Minister and not the Board. Adding this clause will clarify this so
that anyone going forward will understand that this is in the control of those external to the organization.

O’Halloran stated that this amendment was brought forward at the Governance Committee. Initial language was not the important part. The reason for the amendment was to clarify the interpretation when holding online meetings.

CARRIED

5.2 Externalization of Item #3 from the Executive Committee #8

RESOLUTION

Erickson stated that there is an issue when a decision has taken place knowing that it goes against the policies of the UTSU. He suggested that the Executive Committee views the policies as optional.

5.2.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: ERICKSON       SECONDED: V. DHAWAN

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the second paragraph of the resolution in Item #3 be removed.

DISCUSSION

Kanter stated that there were good intentions of the exchange in seats, and asked if there is a good way of making this substitution.

O’Halloran stated that the board may introduce a policy amendment to find an immediate solution. The board may appoint the person prescribed in the policy, then they would go to the Governance Committee to make a change, and then wait until the next Board Meeting. The Executive Committee could meet again, or change the policy to include the VP Equity, to be voted upon in the next Board of Directors. He stated that the goal of policy is to set the board in a positive direction regarding governance. Sometimes the UTSU Policy Manual does not stand to be relevant.

Dhawan echoed Erickson’s statement, and stated that this may not seem like a big deal, and she is sympathetic that this is an exceptional year. However, the Executive has been using the excuse of COVID to ask for leeway since the term has started. She stated disdain for setting a precedent that bylaws and policies are guidelines instead of governing documents. Though it is the board’s discretion to provide them the leeway, she did not believe that they should be providing it any longer. There have been instances of not following bylaws and policies, and it is the job of the VP Operations to amend them to move in a positive direction. There is no reason why this could not have been brought to the Governance Committee to amend because it met after the Executive Committee had met to make this change.
Riches stated they are uncomfortable with the notion that the executive sees the bylaws and policies as optional. It was mentioned that the board has given a lot of leeway to the executive, however the pandemic is not yet over. They are still doing their best to navigate one of the most difficult crises that this union has had to deal with. This appointment of the VP Equity to the Campaigns and Outreach Committee rather than the VPSL was done with the best intentions, and it is within the board’s right to say that they should be following the policy to amend.

O’Halloran stated that he had been working hard to oversee the UTSU’s governance, and that this year’s team had undertaken the most substantial governance reform in five years. In terms of this change, he disagreed that this sets a precedent. The leniency that has been referred to goes both ways. He stated that the UTSU has not enforced Bylaw X, for example, because it would be unfair and punitive for members who have been struggling to attend meetings due to COVID-19.

Dhawan stated that she would not like to set the precedent to give leeway for changing substantive bylaws and policies. Further, Dhawan stated that she did not appreciate what she viewed to be a threat to the Board that when it holds the executive accountable, then they will retaliate. Directors are volunteers, and the Executives are paid.

**5.2.1 Motion to Call the Question**

**resolution**

MOVED: Kanter

SECONDED: Prem

FAILED | NOTED ABSTENTION: Hemrajani

Reuter stated that this is not an issue of intention or motivation, she believed that everyone is acting in the best interest of the UTSU. However, it could easily have been taken to the Governance Committee, and this was handled by slipping it into the Consent Agenda without Board consideration. Consultation was skipped, and committee membership directly affects directors.

Ramadan concurred, however, the VPSL had stated that she was not providing to the committee as much as the VP Equity, thus the board shouldn’t be against it.

McCormick stated that the Executive must be held to a different standard because they are paid members, and stated it is important to focus on these things because of accountability.

Erickson stated that there is no need for guilt on any party, and this is not anything against one person. Erickson is only opposed to this decision. He stated that policies are amenable, and must go through the proper channels.

Kanter stated that they have spent thirty minutes on a minor procedural point, and the board can talk about more substantive issues at this time.
Prem echoed Kanter’s statement, and reiterated that any policy changes done should be communicated to the Board.

Ahmed stated that though she appreciates the discussion raised by the board, she is uncomfortable with the suggestion that any decisions have been made in bad faith.

Board entered recess at 7:52 PM

Board exited recess at 8:05 PM.

McLean stated that everyone should be cognizant of comments to ensure that this remains a safe and comfortable environment.

Cave stated that the board must not assume motives and remain on the question at hand.

Peters stated that Executives have a responsibility to the Board, and acknowledged that there is a learning curve, but it is December. Executives need to follow policy, and that does not need to be learned.

Cave called certain comments made by Peters out of order, those comments were not recorded.

FAILED | NOTED ABSTENTION: RICHES, HARRINGTON, HEMRAJANI

Dhawan stated that there are calls for better communication, but that is why the policy exists so that the Executives may communicate. The Board is asking for the Executive to communicate in a way that follows procedure. It is not about intent or motive, it is about procedure and policy, specifically this motion to replace the VP Student Life, which would have been a simple thing to do properly. It is possible that the board would not be opposed, but procedure was not followed.

Cave called certain comments made by Dhawan out of order, those comments were not recorded.

O’Halloran apologized for the statements made earlier, and that he and Ahmed had been working extremely hard, and any personal attack against her was very inappropriate. In terms of governance, it is very common practice for policies to not be followed and addressed afterwards. The board has an opportunity to make this decision and see how it works. The Executive did not try to slip anything under the rug, as they saw it as a non-issue. If people would like to fail this externalization, they can do that.

Cave called certain comments made by O’Halloran out of order, those comments were not recorded.
Lee stated that they are new to the board, and as one of the only first year students at the meeting. Believes that when the executives make a decision, they don't think there's any reason to believe the decision is being made in bad faith, we should move on.

**CARRIED | NOTED ABSTENSIONS: REUTER, LI, JUNG**

### 5.3 Motion to Amend

**RESOLUTION**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Resolution item #7 “Approval of the Annual General Meeting Package” be considered before item #6 “Ratification of Committee Elections”.

**CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

Cave recommended suspending the order of business to move to resolution 7, as it is of importance.

Kanter asked a point of inquiry. How long would item 6 take that we need to change the order?

O’Halloran answered that it could take a little bit because they have vacancies that need to be filled. In person committee elections can take forever.

### 7. Approval of Annual General Meeting Package

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: O’HALLORAN           SECONDED: RICHES

WHEREAS Bylaw III(a) describes the items to be distributed at the UTSU’s Annual General Meeting; and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors call the 2020 Annual General Meeting to be held on ___December_______ 22nd_______ 2020___; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors approve the Annual General Meeting Package as presented in Appendix C.

**DISCUSSION**

O’Halloran stated that for the AGM, he, the staff, and the UTSU's auditors had misread the extension, and believed that the UTSU could hold the meeting in January without issues. The UTSU hadn't noticed the caveat of "the shortest of the two extensions" granted by Corporations Canada. As a result, the UTSU should hold the AGM in December if they want to be in compliance, despite quorum concerns. O’Halloran motivated for December 22nd to be the date of the AGM, and spoke to the AGM meeting package. O’Halloran asked if directors had any concerns.

V. Dhawan asked whether the bylaw and policy changes passed during the consent agenda are included in the AGM package, and whether there is a procedure for including them.
O’Halloran replied that they would need to move to amend the item to update the appendices and EPC.

7.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION
MOVED: O’HALLORAN SECONDED: RICHES

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the motion be amended to have an additional clause which states:

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Annual General Meeting package be updated to reflect bylaw amendments that have been approved in this meeting through the consent agenda and any externalizations. “

CARRIED

Kanter asked whether there were any member submissions for AGM from members?

O’Halloran stated that he did not receive any submissions. When they move to call for a SGM, they will put out another call if people have submissions.

CARRIED

6. Ratification of Committee Elections

RESOLUTION
MOVED: O’HALLORAN SECONDED: RICHES

WHEREAS nominations and elections for the standing committees of the UTSU Board of Directors took place from November 14th to 29th; and

WHEREAS those elections have concluded prior to the consideration of this motion, and Directors have been elected to those committees; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the committee election results be ratified as presented in Appendix B.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that vacant positions be filled immediately following the decision on this resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any elections for vacant seats be conducted by secret ballot.

DISCUSSION

O’Halloran stated that the responses to the election form have been tabulated in the background.
6.1 **Motion to Amend**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: O’HALLORAN  
SECONDED: RICHES

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the last “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED” clause be struck; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the motion that the following clause be added to the motion:

“BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

______ be appointed to the Clubs Committee,

______, ______, ______ be appointed to the Elections and Referenda Committee,

______, ______, ______, ______ be appointed to the Executive Review Committee,

______, be appointed to the Finance Committee,

______, ______ be appointed to the Governance Committee,

______, ______, ______, ______, ______, and ______ be appointed to the Student Commons Appointment Committee.”

**DISCUSSION**

Board recesses at 8:45 PM

Board returns from recess at 8:55 PM.

**CARRIED**

6.2 **Motion to Amend**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: O’HALLORAN  
SECONDED: PREM

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the new Executive Review Committee, not be struck until after the December Board of Directors meeting.

**CARRIED**

*Nominations are opened for the Clubs Committee.*

Li nominated themself.

Kaita nominated Mohammad. Mohammad accepted.

Li stated that they are in chemical engineering and currently on their Professional Experience Year. They are a very involved member of the engineering community, and have served as Mental
Health and Wellness Director and the First Year Mentorship Director with the Chemical Engineering Council. Currently, they are also the Alumni Outreach Director with EngSoc and VP Academics with the Sustainable Engineers Association. They want to bring their experience to the Clubs Committee.

Mohammad stated that they would love to be part of the club committee because of their past involvement as orientation coordinator at Daniel’s faculty and ASSU member as Vice President of Academic Affairs, and want to bring past experience to this committee.

6.2 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blank in “____ be appointed to the Clubs Committee” be filled with Diana Li.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Nominations are opened for the Elections and Referenda Committee.

Parial nominated themself.

Lee nominated themself.

O’Halloran stated that if you serve on this committee in the second term, you can’t run for UTSU at that time, otherwise you will have to resign. Keeping that in mind if you plan on running in future elections, it is not advisable to sit on the ERC during the second semester.

Lee withdrew their nomination.

Kakkar nominated himself.

McLean nominated Ordonez. Ordonez did not accept

Kaita nominated Power. Power accepted

O’Halloran nominated Jung. Jung did not accept.

6.3 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blank in “____ be appointed to the Elections and Referenda Committee” be filled with Shaon Parial, Jai Kakkar, and Jose Power.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Nominations are opened for the Executive Review Committee.
Ramadan nominates Prem. Prem accepted.

Ho nominated themself.

Chandler nominated themself.

Ordonez nominated themself.

Jung nominated themself.

Prem stated that they sat on XRC right now, currently the chair. They want to sit on it next semester because as the policy stands it is not as coherent as it needs to be. Want to be part of that change, and to continue on the committee.

Ho stated that they are serving on the XRC this semester. They aim to continue working with the Executive Review Committee in investigating and maintaining the integrity of the UTSU. They will remain impartial and only use evidence in forming committee decisions. Their hope is to reform the complaint and review system within the UTSU to allow for an equitable and uncomplicated process.

Chandler stated that unlike the two other people, they are new to the board. Interested in making impartial decisions needed on the XRC. They think new perspectives from someone not on the board previously could be useful.

Ordonez stated they would appreciate the position as they have realized that keeping the executives accountable is very important. Important for how UTSU functions and how they go forward with board of director meetings. Also with current positions on executive positions at woodsworth.

Jung stated that they were also on XRC this semester. They learned a lot, and want to bring back this knowledge. Found changes need to be done, want to be part of that. Enjoyed time holding execs accountable, most important thing members on the board can do. Want to be part of that.

Prem, Ho, Chandler, and Ordonez elected to XRC

6.4 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blanks in “_____ be appointed to the Executive Review Committee” be filled with Pranay Prem, Astrid Chandler, and Sheryl Ordonez.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Nominations are opened for the Finance Committee.
Rana nominated themself.

Reuter nominated Kakkar. Kakkar accepted.

Reuter nominated Kanter. Kanter not present to accept.

Reuter nominated Chandler. Chandler accepted.

O’Halloran nominated Harrington. Harrington did not accept.

O’Halloran nominated Mohammad. Mohammad accepted.

Rana stated that they are the Mathematical and Physical Sciences Director. Even though they don’t have experience on the finance committee, they want to try it out. Want to bring a fresh perspective. Want to advocate for equitable causes and bring more funding for that.

Kakkar stated they are also new Director, Director Rotman Commerce. They are happy to be nominated for this. They can bring in their studies. They attended the previous meeting for the finance committee, and really liked it. Scope to look at where budget needs to be spent, where it doesn’t. More deserving areas should be funded better.

Chandler stated they are a humanities director, maybe that is a unique perspective to bring to the finance committee. They are also new to the UTSU and excited to get involved in any way possible.

Mohammad stated that although they are an architecture student, they are happy to be nominated for the finance committee. Experience budgeting, and finances from orientation coordinator for Architecture Faculty.

6.5 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blanks in “_____ be appointed to the Finance Committee” be filled with Sidrah Rana, Jai Kakkar, and Astrid Chandler.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Nominations are opened for the Governance Committee.

R. Dhawan nominated themself.

Prem nominated Ho. Ho accepted.

McCormick nominated themself.
Kaita nominated Power. Power accepted.

R. Dhawan stated that they have gained a lot of experience with policy writing and governance. Sit on Caffeine’s exec at Victoria College working on their constitution and policies. Also student employee and work study student. She stated that it is important to have an advocate for student employees on the governance committee.

McCormick stated they are a second term director and they think there are a lot of governance changes left to do here, still, especially if we are going to be holding an SGM next term. They believe their perspectives having been in and around the UTSU for years will be insightful and important contributions.

Power stated that never been on this committee before, and has experience with other student organizations, such as AVSSU. Experience on campaigns and outreach committees. Provide a fresh outlook on this specific committee.

R. Dhawan, and Ho elected to the Governance Committee.

6.6 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blanks in “_____ be appointed to the Governance Committee” be filled with Radhika Dhawan and Matthew Ho.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Nominations are opened for the Student Commons Committee.

Tiffany Tiu nominated themself.

Riches nominated Power. Power accepted.

Kaita nominated Mohammad. Mohammad accepted.

O’Halloran nominated Harrington. Harrington accepted.

Kaita nominated Parial. Parial did not accept.

Riches nominated A Chen. A. Chen accepted.

Board entered recess at 9:44 PM

Board exited recess at 9:50 PM
Kaita nominated Lewis. Lewis accepted.

Ahmed nominated Basmah. Basmah did not accept.

McLean nominated Yoo. Yoo did not accept.

6.7 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blanks in “_____ be appointed to the Student Commons Appointment Committee” be filled with Tiffany Tiu, Jose Power, Rose Mohammad, Ava Harrington, Andrew Chen, and Danielle Lewis.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

CARRIED

8. Striking of Board Vacancies Appointment Committee

RESOLUTION

MOVED: O’HALLORAN    SECONDED: RICHES

BE IT RESOLVED that a Board Vacancies Appointment Committee be struck to fill the vacant seats at the Board of Directors; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT __________, __________, and __________ be appointed to the Board Vacancies Appointment Committee.

DISCUSSION

O’Halloran stated that this is to hire people for the vacant seats for the board itself. Transitional Year Program, Toronto School of Theology, Innis College Director, second professional faculty at large director. Executives could have hired them, but thought it would be important that directors are on this committee for the hiring of new directors. Need to strike this committee, then hire these people, then they will be on the board for the final 5 months of the term.

Ahmed nominated Power. Power accepted

Riches nominated Prem. Prem accepted

Kaita nominated A. Chen. A. Chen accepted.

O’Halloran nominated Kakkar. Kakkar accepted.

Power stated they have never been on this committee, but has a lot of experience on other student organizations. Think this is something that is very important to be done quickly. With their experience they know what to look for and expedite that process.
Prem stated that they have never been on this committee. Been around the UTSU for 1.5 years. Fair judge of who should be on the Board of Directors

A. Chen stated that they were one of the earlier directors for engineering. Qualify by being on this board for the past couple months, and want to hire the right people.

7.1 Motion to Amend to fill the blank

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the blanks in “_____ be appointed to the Board Vacancies Appointment Committee” be filled with Jose Power, Pranay Prem, and Andrew Chen.

CARRIED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT
CARRIED

9. Other Business

DISCUSSION ITEM
MOVED: SECONDED:

DISCUSSION

Chandler stated that one thing that has not been raised, but they think is important. Given the lengthening of the winter break, at least in arts and science, but not lengthen the semester. Issue regarding value for money because paying the same fees, less time. Wondering if that’s being addressed.

Riches stated that this is an important point. Immediate concern with the petition was whether course content would become condensed, as we saw on the report of online learning, this is already a problem where it is difficult for students to handle course work right now. Tricky because per faculty basis issue, not university wide approach that the UTSU can take. In communication with the administration. Will raise this concern. Keeping an eye on this in each individual faculty. Talked to Arts and Science Student Union, and the intention is that the final assessment period will be shorter. Same time for instruction, so course content won’t be condensed. Any specific, in any other faculties, either they or Paul could look into.

Ahmed stated that this was a very long and strenuous meeting. We talk about mental health, when we talk about mental health for ourselves we can fall short. Please take care of yourself as we roll into exam seasons. Can speak for the entire executive team, if anything we said caused harm or not appropriate, we sincerely apologize, their intentions are always to serve you, to be held accountable by you, and serve our membership for you, and through you. You’re our first line of communication into so many constituencies. Play a valuable role to bring that leadership to the forefront. Thank you for spending 5 hours of Monday with us. Not easy, but appreciated. Everyone here with the best intentions. Go back and take care of ourselves as best as we can.
Cave stated that this was the most difficult meeting chaired in 4 years. Never had to call people out of order before. His job is to balance letting people speak while at the same time making sure people feel safe and don’t feel attached in the meetings. He never wants people to feel unsafe or intimidated in meetings. He apologizes if he contributed to that. Not his intention, will be reflecting on this meeting moving forward. Want to end on a positive note. Two board meetings he’s been part of, see potential to improve in efficiency and effectiveness, and to move forward. Thank you for bearing with him and for your patience. If anyway he can help, feel free to reach out.

10. Adjournment

RESOLUTION
MOVED: Riches SECOND: Ahmed

BE IT RESOLVED that the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourns at 10:06 PM.
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