



---

**Minutes - Board of Directors**

**3rd Meeting of 2021-2022  
Sunday 27 June 2021 | 2:00 PM EST**

**Video Conference held via Zoom**

---

**IN ATTENDANCE**

**Present**

Executive Committee

Alexa Ballis, President  
Fiona Reuter, VP Operations  
Catherine Lai, VP Public & University Affairs  
Maria Lin, VP Student Life  
Reva Aggarwal, VP Equity  
Ruoheng Wang, VP Professional Faculties

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

Easha Khan, University College Director  
Muskan Nagra, University College Director  
Rayan Alim, St. Michael's College Director  
David D'Aversa, St. Michael's College Director  
Caroline Tolton, Trinity College Director  
Stuti Roy, Victoria College Director  
Halit Erdogan, Victoria College Director  
Jenny Shen, Woodsworth College Director  
Ramtin Taramsari, New College Director  
Elad Dekel, Innis College Director  
Katherine Jung, Life Sciences Director  
Victoria Liu, Social Sciences Director  
Jessie Wu, Humanities Director

Division II Directors (Professional Faculties)

Nelson Lee, Engineering Director  
Neo Lou, Engineering Director  
Sheral Kumar, Engineering Director  
Sydney Munro, KPE Director  
Catherine Tan, Music Director  
Vicdan (Chill) Okman, Architecture & Visual  
Studies Director  
Maria Ebeid, Professional Faculties-at-Large  
Director  
Sterling Mancuso, Law Director  
Hailey Goldberg, Nursing Director  
Oluwadamilola (Dami) Sogbesan,  
Pharmacy Director  
Dariya Darvin, Medicine Director

**Visitors and Other Non-Voting**

Guests

Maggie Kou, Vice-President, FYC  
Ivana Jovicic, Interim Woodsworth Director  
Marta Anielska, Deputy News Editor, Varsity  
Evan Kanter  
Lauren Alexander

Executive Assistants, UTSU

Emmanuel Sackeyfio, Chief Operations Assistant  
Tran Thai, Chief Executive Assistant  
Rebecca Wan, EA Operations  
Leila Tjiang, EA RA, President  
Foti Vito, EA RA, Public & University Affairs  
Nicole Giebler, EA RA, Public & University Affairs  
Emiri Katakawa, EA RA, Equity  
Maddie Kalda, EA RA, Professional Faculties  
Yasmine Nasereddin, EA Student Life  
Chelsea Song, EA Student Life

UTSU Staff Members

Suzanne Belleau, General Manager, UTSU  
Ankit Sharma, Director of Operations, UTSU  
Nicole Johnson, Executive Coordinator, UTSU  
Brian Stock, Director of Communications, UTSU  
Yara Kodersah, People & Culture Manager, UTSU  
Tasia Richards, Digital Specialist, UTSU  
Kate MacMillan, Events Coordinator, UTSU  
Arlene Williams, Learning & Development, UTSU  
Terri Nikolaevsky, Programs Manager, UTSU  
Marco Hernandez, Services Coordinator, UTSU  
Louis-Charles Girard, Speaker of the Board

**Absent**

**Regrets**

Gianna Choo, St. Michael's College Director  
Roshawn Jamasi, Rotman Commerce Director



## MINUTES

### Open Session

#### 1. Call to Order

This meeting is called to order at 2:20 PM.

#### 2. Approval of Agenda

##### RESOLUTION

MOVED: REUTER

SECONDED: D'AVERSA

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

##### DISCUSSION

#### 2.1 Motion to Amend

##### RESOLUTION

MOVED: BALLIS

SECONDED: NAGRA

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT a discussion item named " The University of Toronto's plan for the Fall Semester" be added to the agenda as item #7**

##### DISCUSSION

Ballis stated that this discussion item stems from a conversation that she had with Munro about how each faculty has different approaches to this upcoming semester. She noted that she wants to hear from members of the board on their thoughts on their faculty's plans. This will help the UTSU know how best to advocate for students. She noted that the discussion will be brought to the Campaigns and Outreach Committee later.

##### CARRIED

#### 2.2 Motion to Amend

##### RESOLUTION

MOVED: DEKEL

SECONDED: REUTER

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the consent agenda be amended to include the minutes of the 2nd Executive Committee and the 1st Student Aid Committee.**

##### DISCUSSION

Dekel noted that these minutes were not a part of the consent agenda and stated that they are relevant as they are within the Board Package.

Reuter thanked Dekel. She noted that those items were intended to be added, however they were accidentally forgotten as they occurred very close to the date when the Board Package was published.



CARRIED

### 3. Consent Agenda

#### 3.1 Meetings of the Board of Directors and Committees

RESOLUTION

MOVED: REUTER

SECONDED: Wu

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

1. **Meeting of the Board of Directors**  
2nd Meeting of the 2020-2021 Board of Directors, 30 May 2021
2. **Meetings of Committees**  
Finance Committee, 13 June 2021 (1st Meeting)  
Finance Committee, 17 June 2021 (2nd Meeting)  
Governance Committee, 20 June 2021 (1st Meeting)  
Executive Committee, 20 June 2021 (2nd Meeting)  
Student Aid Committee, 21 June 2021 (1st Meeting)
3. **Meetings of First Year Council**  
FYC Summer Commission, 29 May 2021 (3rd Meeting)

DISCUSSION

Dekel externalized motion #3 of the 2nd Executive Committee.

##### 3.3.1 Externalization of resolution #3 of the Executive Committee, 20 June 2021

DISCUSSION

Dekel stated that they are bringing up this motion as they feel that the decision to sign onto the MSA's letter is antisemitic. They stated that they believe the letter implies double standards and utilises false definitions and by signing onto the letter, the UTSU is condoning this narrative and alienating its Jewish and Israeli populations. He stated that he wanted to note three things about the signing of the letter, those being the definitions used, the calls to actions and the UTSU's stance. Dekel stated that the letter utilises words such as ethnic cleansing, apartheid and genocide. They stated that ethnic cleansing is defined as the intent to create an ethnically homogeneous area by forcefully and violently removing people from their land, including actions of rape, murder, torture and severe injury to civilians. Apartheid is defined as inhumane acts in attempt to establish or maintain dominance of one racial group over another. They stated that these definitions do not apply as there are over 2 million Arabic peoples living in Israel with full rights. They stated that the utilization of these terms alienates the Jewish and Israeli populations. They added that the letter itself has the topic of the Palestinian genocide, while the definition of genocide is the systemic killing of people of a certain group with intent to stop that group



from existing. Dekel stated that the meeting minutes only discuss the call to action about the decision to hire the law professor and the topic of genocide and condemnation of Israel is not discussed by the executive. They added that they wanted to speak on the letter's calls to action including that of the discontinuation of the Munk School's participation in the Middle East study abroad program. He stated that the letter claims that it is an illegal trip, however, this suggests that those who have family who live in eastern Jerusalem are illegitimate to the land. They noted that themselves and other Israeli students are angered by the union signing this letter and worried about returning to campus. He stated that he feels that the UTSU is not treating other countries that are doing the same or worse similarly. The UTSU's originally published statement was succinct and bipartisan as it acknowledged the suffering of the Palestinian people while not perpetuating antisemitic tropes. They stated that by signing onto this letter, they are doing the opposite and making students feel unsafe on campus. They ask that the UTSU rescind their support of the letter as the union's current statement is succinct enough.

Jovicic stated that genocide is not just killing. According to the UN, genocide is defined as causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of a certain group; and deliberately inflicting on that group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part. They noted that they wanted to clarify that definition as it is not just a matter of killing. Hence, it could still be deemed genocide.

Ballis thanked Dekel for raising their concerns and apologized that the union's signing of the letter made them feel that way. She stated that she would like to hear the thoughts of other board members on the signing of the letter. She added that it is very difficult to represent all 38,000 students.

Dekel stated that the UTSU has been doing an amazing job in responding to this issue, in terms of reaching out to both groups. They stated that is why they felt it necessary to bring up this motion as the union has been on the right track. He stated that it is not anyone's fault as it is a very complicated topic. They stated that they think education is important, however, this issue is more complex and it is the union's job to represent all students. This includes being there for students mentally. The signing alienates students and takes a step further away from the union's focus on students' needs for the sake of a global political topic. They added that they feel that the union can discuss these topics like in the UTSU's statement, without alienating people.

Lai stated that the signing of the letter was a decision that merited a lot of discussion from the executive. She stated that the UTSU released a letter backing a censure that was the result of affairs within the IHRP. She stated that they felt that the initial statement was not responded to as there was not a lot of action by the university administration; this being one of the mandates of the



MSA's letter. She noted that the UTSU advocates for the teaching bodies of the university to have academic freedom and express their views when it comes to education on this topic as it is very nuanced. She added that the objective of the union was never to alienate any student and she stated that she wants to hear from the board about how this decision could have been taken in a different direction. She noted that the executive is welcome to feedback from the board and apologized if they have made any students feel unsupported.

Mancuso stated that they are opposed to the union's signing onto the letter. They stated that they decided to speak up because of the discussion around the university's censure in relation to the IHRP Faculty of Law hiring scandal. They stated that it is fair to say that law students overwhelmingly think what happened in the hiring situation was wrong and inappropriate. However, they are more divided on whether the censure was an appropriate response and whether it is appropriate for students to bear the brunt of the downsides of the censure existing. They added that they do not think it is coincidence that this topic is only being discussed now when the hiring scandal broke over a year ago. When the scandal first came out it was not of much interest to non-law students but with the recent discussions of Israel and Palestine there is an influx of individuals who want to speak on the topic. Mancuso stated that they find the MSA's letter to be intentionally provocative and though there is nothing wrong with being provocative, however if the union's goal is to represent the entire student body being intentionally provocative doesn't make sense. They stated that they do not think that it is the UTSU's role to speak on these events as the governments of Israel and Palestine do not care about the union's stance on the issue. The motion is of a provocative moral stance which does not make sense if we are trying to represent the whole student body.

Aggarwal stated that they wanted to speak to what Mancuso stated about the situation. They stated that there are two issues being discussed simultaneously; those being the events in Israel and Palestine and the issues around the censure. These events happening at the same time is what is causing momentum behind the situation. In terms of the first letter, they were trying to make a safe environment and avoid alienating any students. The union then received several concerns from students stating that their voices weren't supported. She noted that though the MSA's letter is provocative, the union signing onto the letter shows their support. There are parts of that statement that they agree with, in particular the sections on censure. She noted that the information around the censure has been more publicized due to the Israel bombings and as the situation in Israel and Palestine is amplified along with the issues of the censure. She stated that the executive is in support of the censure. She added that the main thing is to make students feel safe and heard and they genuinely believe that with the letter, they were making students heard.



Dekel stated that both of the UTSU's statements were great. They noted that the discussion around the censure and the Law Society affects our students. However, signing a provocative letter alienates parts of the student population. He added that the fact that the minutes only focused on the call to action and did not mention its other calls to action or usage of certain language is an issue. They added that the union mentioned in their letter that they are calling the Law school to action. He added that signing this letter is solely a provocative act because we have already made our calls to action.

Aggarwal noted that the purpose of signing the letter was to make sure that students' voices were heard.

Ballis clarified that it is standard practice that when the Executive Committee is signing onto a statement the decision is approved through the Executive committee and signed as the Executive Committee. They emphasized that the UTSU did not have a lot of time to decide whether to sign onto the letter as they were initially told the day the statement was to be published before it was pushed back.

Nagra stated that they wanted to speak against retracting the union's support for the letter. The letter is not anti-semitic and provocative language is required to spark outrage and raise awareness for what is going on. She states that although the UTSU does not have authority over what is happening in Israel and Palestine, the union's job is to represent the students and if a student-led body is requesting we support them, it is important that we look into this. It is clear that there is a human rights violation going on and that is what supporting the letter is about. This issue is about one group oppressing another. They added that the involvement of religion further complicates this issue and it is horrible that Jewish students do not feel safe on campus. They stated that she would like to suggest there be a letter written by the Jewish Students Union in opposition of issues that are making students feel unsafe on campus. However, this letter is condemning the human rights violations that are going on and that is why they are against rescinding the union's support.

Jung noted that this is very difficult to speak about especially with all of the information that has been talked about in a short amount of time. They agreed with a lot of the things that Nagra stated and supported the idea of contacting either the Israeli or Jewish Student Union on campus to see how the UTSU can support Jewish students as well. They noted that the views of Dekel are valid and that the UTSU should address Jewish students feeling unsafe. But she notes that the goal of this specific letter discussed the human rights violations occurring in Palestine was to prompt a statement from the president of the university, recognizing that there is violence going on and how it affects the mental health of students on campus. For this reason, Jung thought that the motion is an order and that is something that the UTSU should support.



D'Aversa asked about the union's options. They noted that this is a sensitive and heated discussion, and that it is important to review the current options to make a good decision. They state that currently the discussion was either to ratify to sign the letter or revert the signing. They asked if there were any additional options, such as editing the letter and changing some contested language such as the word "apartheid".

Mancuso wanted to clarify one of the things they previously said regarding neither the government of Palestine or Israel caring about this letter. They stated that this point was important because the UTSU needed to recognize its motivation for signing this letter. They noted that by signing the letter, the UTSU endorses what the letter says. They rejected the position that the UTSU should support this letter simply because it is from a student union that should support students. They note that the UTSU cannot blindly support every letter any student union drafts because the organization needs to reflect on the letter and what can be achieved. They then asked what it is the UTSU hopes to achieve. They stated that this letter will not change the course of events in the Middle East. They noted the other stance of supporting students by signing the letter however, they note that there are students feeling alienated or the letter being inaccurate. With that in mind, they claimed that the letter is then self-defeating. They then asked if the purpose of the UTSU letter was because the union supports the contents of this letter so much that they are willing to alienate students for the sake of it? They note that it is not the role of the UTSU to decide whether there is genocide or apartheid occurring in this situation and no one is an expert here in this subject with using these highly contested terms. They state they do not understand what the UTSU is trying to achieve and they further noted that what should have been achieved with the signing of the letter was not achieved. They stated that the goals of condemning human rights abuses and supporting students could be achieved by much more effective methods without causing division. Hence, they concluded that this is the reason why the UTSU should oppose signing this letter.

Liu recognized the concerns on both sides and inquired whether it's possible to reach out to the MSA and share the UTSU's concerns with the letter in order to work together to revise it. She noted that this way the union could condemn the current human rights abuses happening in Palestine and also voice that this is not a personal attack against Jewish students. She noted that this distinction is important to clarify in the letter. She noted that the letter should also state its impact of helping students in having the university address the Munk School program and the hiring of the IHRP Faculty of Law while respecting Jewish students.

Jovicic reiterates that this is an incredibly sensitive topic and that everyone's feelings, opinions and interpretations are entirely valid. They stated that no one



is in any way denying or rejecting another students' interpretation. They clarified that the letter was specifically discussing the actions of the Israeli government and the government alone. Additionally, they agreed with the suggestion to revise the letter to make the distinction that this letter has nothing to do with Jewish or Israeli people. They closed by agreeing that it's important to address human rights violations

Ballis spoke to the motivation aspect that was brought up. The Executive thought that they were making the right decision by signing the letter based on student feedback and what has been said by human rights watch and the United Nations. Nothing changed with the law school despite student push back, and the UTSU signed to continue the push for that, as well as to have President Gertler acknowledge what is going on. Ballis was open to meeting with the MSA to bring up the concerns voiced during this discussion. They restated that they were sorry that this action alienated Jewish students and made them feel unsafe on campus and this was not the intention when signing the letter

Goldberg wanted to say that this is more complicated than simply saying that the union is going to support this letter but Jewish students on campus should not feel harmed by this. There is a deep connection between the state of Israel and the Jewish people as a whole. It is not easy to make that disconnect for Jewish students on campus. They stated that this is far more complicated than some people speaking on it may understand.

Dekel clarified that there is no Jewish student union or Israeli student union and stated that if there was, the UTSU cannot expect them to speak up. It is the UTSU's responsibility to represent and listen to all students, which is something that the UTSU has failed at in the past, and something that is being strengthened this year. They did not want to insinuate that, in suggesting this, other members were suggesting that the UTSU hide behind student unions. They also did not mean to insinuate that the executives' intentions were to target these groups-the executives are doing their best job. They stated that, on the topic of the Munk School, there are no legal grounds for opposing that. Additionally, Dekel made the point that when discussing human rights issues, the UTSU does not have letters on Hamas or China. When reviewing this call to action and why the UTSU agreed with it, it is because the action is against the law school. However, it is important to consider what signing this reflects and if this action represents all students, including Jewish and Israeli students who have close ties. The union cannot edit the MSA letter, but did the next option in drafting its own. After the initial letter was edited both parties were happy with it, Dekel questions why the UTSU got embroiled with this.

Ebeid referred to Dekel's previous statement regarding the lack of a letter for many human rights issues, and suggested that the UTSU should advocate





more on these conflicts and work to make people feel more included. They returned to the letter and stated that it never said that Israeli people were not supported, just the government. This validates and supports Palestinian constituents and members of the UTSU on their feelings and experiences with the violence. They do not think that Israeli people should feel alienated by the letter but closed by stating that the UTSU should voice their support on more issues in the future because student voices need to be heard.

Erdogan recognized that this is a very sensitive topic for Israeli students on campus and returned to the conversation for the union's motivation in signing the letter. To their understanding, the letter condemned the Israeli government's military aggression towards Palestine and addresses the human rights issue. The issue is made more complicated by making underlying assumptions about the letter.

Dekel noted that people have been saying that Jewish and Israeli students should not feel alienated by this letter, and stated that this is not a point up for debate. These students do feel alienated. Dekel shared that they feel alienated by this letter and that students that they have communicated with feel the same. They reiterated Ebeid's point that students should and need to be heard. The letter does not say the Israeli government, it says Israel. Dekel agreed that assumptions should not be considered, just facts and effects. With this in mind, the content letter has affected Jewish and Israeli students and has made them feel alienated.

Girard stated that there were no motions currently on the table and that if there are no motions proposed the item will be approved as presented.<sup>1</sup>

Dekel stated that they would like to resend the signing of the letter and asked that the union release a subsequent statement supporting both Palestinian and Israeli students. They noted that it is incredibly important to support Palestinians who are going through an incredibly difficult time right now, however it is necessary that the union rescind their support.

Aggarwal stated that they are against rescinding the signing. She added that she would like to work with the MSA and Jewish students to release another letter clarifying some of the points that Dekel raised that may alienate Jewish students on campus. It is important that they consider the effects of the letter.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Disclaimer:** For the purposes of the Board of Directors, an Externalization is considered equivalent to a motion to reconsider. Because of this, the motions raised after this statement are not germane to the discussion (apart from the motion to rescind). Hence, these proposals are not noted as motions in the agenda.



Jung stated that they are not confident in voting either way for these motions and asked that the decision be delayed to allow members to do their own research. She added that she would like to see this decision tabled to a meeting sooner than the next Board of Directors meeting.

Ballis stated that there could be an Emergency Board meeting held earlier than the July Board meeting to discuss this item.

### **3.3.1.1 Motion to Table**

#### **RESOLUTION**

**MOVED: Jung**

**SECONDED: Darwin**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT this resolution be tabled to an emergency meeting of the Board of Directors.**

#### **DISCUSSION**

D'Aversa stated that based on the discussion that the board has had, they think that the union should rescind their support and then draft their own letter. They stated that the board has been discussing this item a great deal and while more time may not be helpful.

Dekel stated that they agree with D'Aversa and noted that if they decide to push the decision, rescinding would be integral until they decide whether to sign the letter or not. They think that the most neutral action is to suspend the signature.

Ballis stated that the union is working on creating internal policies on how the union will write and publish statements moving forward. They intend to bring this to the board. This is a practice that has not been done historically however, they are committed to this in the future.

Darwin asked whether suspending the letter would remove the union's signature.

Girard stated that this would be up to the decision of the Board. This would be a matter of jurisdiction.

Jung asked whether the Board could decide to keep the signature there until the next meeting.

Aggarwal stated that they wanted to clarify that if they do rescind the signature it will affect the UTSU's relationship with the MSA and in the future when they are trying to have a clarification letter, it will decrease their chances of starting that conversation. If the union releases their



own letter it may be perceived as more conflict and they suggested that the union talk to the MSA.

Dekel stated that it is important that the UTSU should put its dedication to students above their relationships and their second statement is sufficient. Dekel asked whether this motion would withdraw the UTSU's signature.

Girard stated that the question to remove is outside the question to table, however, this would be as if the UTSU Executive has not signed the motion.

**CARRIED**

### **3.3.1.2 Motion to Rescind**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: DEKEL

SECONDED: D'AVERSA

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UTSU rescind their support for the MSA's letter**

**FAILED**

### **3.1.1 Motion to recess**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: BALLIS

SECONDED: DARVIN

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the meeting recess for 10 minutes.**

**CARRIED**

**CARRIED**

*Meeting entered recess at 3:44 PM*

*Meeting left recess at 3:54 PM*



## **3.2 Executive Reports**

### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

#### **1. Executive Reports**

June 2021 Report of the President

June 2021 Report of the Vice-President, Operations

June 2021 Report of the Vice-President, Public & University Affairs

June 2021 Report of the Vice-President, Equity

June 2021 Report of the Vice-President, Student Life

June 2021 Report of the Vice-President, Professional Faculties

### **DISCUSSION**

Ballis stated that a big part of the past month has been executive assistant (EA) hiring. She stated that herself and Reuter sat on each hiring committee and every executive assistant has been hired apart from the Executive Assistant, Public Relations, who will be hired soon. They have been working on a second open letter to the University administration regarding the allegations made within the Faculty of Music in discussion with Tan. She stated that since she released her report she has met with Nagra to discuss the anonymous feedback form and received suggestions. She added that the form should be published on the website towards the end of the month. She noted that the UTSU held a Town Hall which focused on equity, mental health, and the Fall semester. She also received good feedback on how to improve the Town Hall sessions and they may try to make the Q&A sessions more interactive. She also noted that she and Reuter had one-on-ones with each member of the Student Commons Management Committee to hear about their ideas for the Student Commons. She added that the UTSU has officially moved into the new building as of May 30th, and are no longer at 12 Hart House Circle. She noted that the Executive has yet to receive the keys. Furthermore, Ballis stated that along with Wang and Lin, she has been meeting one-on-one with all the orientation coordinators. She is also in the process of figuring out how to have a 30 minute to an hour-long info session at each orientation where the Executive can talk about the UTSU and its services. Finally, she noted that she met with the ASSU to discuss how the UTSU can advocate for CR/NCR options and how the organization can advocate for the professional faculties in particular. The rest of my updates are in my report.

Reuter noted that she has been doing financial work. She thanked the Finance Committee for all their contributions to the preliminary budget and notes that the next step is to approve the budget. We had our first student aid committee meeting, where we disbursed a bunch of applications. She noted that they have been doing governance



work. She added that been doing student commons tours, and noted that if members would like a tour, they should keep their eye out for an email on that. She stated that she was responsible for the coordination of all Executive Assistant hiring. She introduced the Executive Assistant team. She stated that coordinating that has been the biggest part of her month.

Lai noted that since her report was released they have on-boarded their executive assistants and intend to start putting a number of projects in motion soon. She noted that she will be focusing on Mental Health, UMLAP and academic policies over the next month. Over the last month they attended the Community Liaison Committee where they discussed the university's plans for returning students to campus and commitment to sustainability. She met with the ASSU president along with Ballis and Wang to discuss broadening academic forgiveness policies to professional faculty students. She noted that during the June Townhall she led a discussion on the current mental health climate and what existing support is available in preparation for UMLAP consultations.

#### **Trigger Warning: Sexual Violence**

Aggarwal noted that since the release of the report she has updated the Advancing Equity in education campaign and started discussing marketing strategies with the communications team. For the open letter, she noted that the UTSU will be writing a second open letter in regards to what is happening at the Faculty of Music and addressing the UTSU's plan of action moving forward. She added that she is also supporting the Student-Faculty relationship report started 2 years ago by the Vice-President, Professional Faculties. She stated that they have been finalizing the content for equity training and has met with the Student Refugee team in preparation for the new refugee student that is arriving in August.

Lin stated that the three main areas she has focused on are: orientation, clubs, and website maintenance. She noted that she has hired her Executive Assistant and they have started work with orientation planning. For orientation, they have held their first orientation round table and have been holding one-on-ones with all orientation leads with Ballis. She has started outreach to various groups. She is looking into hiring a videographer and visual animator for the video they want to film for orientation. For clubs, they are finalizing the club funding training module and they have conducted club committee training this past month. She held director one-on-ones with those on the Clubs Committee. With regards to the website, she has been updating the club recognition and funding section to make sure they're accessible and easy to navigate. Other projects include events calendar, clubs job board, and revamping the clubs gallery.

*Wang's audio was very unclear and we are unable to discern what she was stating. A description of Wang's work over the past month is available within her executive report.*



### **3.3 Question Period**

#### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

Jung asked Ballis for more details on what was discussed at the SMART meeting.

Ballis stated that at the meeting, they discussed areas of collaboration and research around mental health on campus. She noted that SMART does not have easy access to the university administration and they are currently working on creating a website which would review mental health services available to students.

Aggarwal noted that SMART is working to create training plans for other executive teams across campus. She noted that part of their discussion around collaboration focused on getting feedback from the union's equity training so that it can be improved for other teams.

Lai noted that there is more information on the meeting within her executive report. She noted that other areas of collaboration focused heavily on relationship building especially with administration. As Aggarwal mentioned both SMART and the UTSU are developing equity training. She added that they are also helping them inform their direction.

Jung asked about the feedback from the May Town Hall around the upcoming Fall semester. She noted that there were points surrounding hybrid learning and asked what the UTSU's plan to address those points were.

Ballis stated that from the Town Hall, they are planning to promote a hybrid model for international students as well as any student who may not feel comfortable returning. They are currently collecting feedback around what each faculty is planning for the upcoming semester and intend to meet with faculties to discuss using a hybrid model. She added that this will be a major focus in the upcoming month especially.

Lai added that in addition to meeting with each faculty, the UTSU will be refocusing how they approach the university. The goal is to make standardized guidelines for instructors with recommendations like recording lectures and having accessible note taking. This proposal can be applied across all faculties regardless of their current fall learning plans. She noted that there have been worries about the hybrid model. To address those worries, they are also advocating for greater flexibility and leniency for assignments. The Fall semester will be a huge lifestyle change for many people and they are dedicated to making sure it is as accommodating as possible. She added that they are focused on accessibility of international students who experience a great deal of inaccessibility in terms of online learning.

#### **Trigger Warning: Sexual Violence**



Tan wanted to clarify what Aggarwal spoke about in terms of the FMUA and the Faculty of Music and noted that there is work being done faculty-wide. She thanked the executive for signing onto the open letter. She clarified that the reason that they are asking the UTSU to write a second open letter is because this discussion has brought attention to issues that are prevalent across campus. The second letter would be addressed to the university administration. She noted that the work that the UTSU is doing means a lot to the faculty.

Ballis thanked Tan. She noted that the second letter will be directed to the university administration about its university-wide policies and improving resources for victims of sexual violence. The letter will have two parts. The first focusing on the university administration and its policies and the second focusing on the UTSU's role as a union and what it is doing to support students.

Jung asked about other statements of the UTSU moving forward and developing a process for the board to review statements before they are published.

Ballis noted that they are hoping to create a framework for that review process. She stated that they want more input from the board on their statements. The framework has not been developed yet however, it is important for them moving forward.

#### **4. Approval of Preliminary Budget**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: REUTER

SECONDED: SHEN

**WHEREAS OFF-001: UTSU's Budgets & Finances states in section 4.b that "The Finance Committee shall then present the Preliminary Budget to the Board at the June Meeting"; and**

**WHEREAS the Finance Committee has met and approved the preliminary budget for recommendation to the Board; NOW THEREFORE,**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UTSU Preliminary Budget be approved as presented in Appendix A.**

**DISCUSSION**

Reuter stated that there is information within the Finance Committee's minutes as they discussed the preliminary budget in greater detail than will be presented. Reuter presented the preliminary budget and highlighted the increases in the Student Aid Budget due to the increase in the union's Student Aid levy and the increases in lines 51 through 54 as the UTSU has been expanding their staff complement in preparation for the Student Commons. Additionally, she noted that Line 138 will be directed to the reopening of the Foodbank, UTSU's Got You and fighting food insecurity.

Jung asked about lines 77 and 110.



Reuter noted that she is not entirely certain of the difference between director and officer insurance and stated that she would bring that information to the Finance Committee.. She added that the costs related to facilities are related to the operations of the new Student Commons building.

Jung asked about the Events line and noted that the union spent 108k last year. She asked whether the amount allocated this year is reasonable as there may be in-person events.

Reuter stated that there are intentions to hold in-person events this year when it is safe to do so. She noted that last year there was a level of uncertainty in regards to how much the union would spend. She noted that the actuals and the budget amount were very different because of this uncertainty.

Lin added that last year a large amount of the Events budget was spent on orientation and they are expecting to spend less this year.

Reuter explained the union's budgeting process stating that in November, the preliminary budget is reviewed and revisited so the operating budget is reflective of the union's spending. She added that if during November, the Finance Committee notices a deficiency, they can shift money into different areas to ensure spending aligns with the UTSU's priorities. She added that they want to make sure that every item goes back to students and stated that there is a big focus on student facing spending.

Jung thanked Reuter and noted that they agree with the union's approach. She asked about line 119 on website hosting costs. She noted that the amount allocated is very large for website hosting.

Reuter noted that the website is still in development and the allocation is a decision made by the previous executive. She stated that the 25k allocated is there to maintain the website, writing support and hiring additional members to create new content.

D'Aversa noted that they discussed this item during Finance and stated that the cost is high as the UTSU is a large organization and had additional costs. These include things such as copyrights, security and ensuring that editing is simple and accessible for future students. He added that the website is crucial to the union's and university's image as it is many people's first impression.

Ballis noted that the decisions around the allocation were made last year and they are a one time investment by the union. She stated that they will not have to pay that much in the upcoming years for the website. She noted that there is the possibility of developing an app.

Reuter noted that some of these hosting and development costs are related to the Student Commons. She added that this cost is a one time investment to ensure that the website is





functioning as in the past they could not edit the front page. She added that the website is incredibly important as the union needs to be well represented.

Jung noted that her main concern was the size of the allocation and stated that she assumed the majority of the cost would have been part of last year's budget.

D'Aversa noted that the union signed a contract with a company which created the website which lasts for a year after its finalization.

Reuter added that the union has a working relationship with Eggs Media who built the website. She noted that they support the maintenance of the site and update aspects of the website as necessary.

CARRIED

## 5. Approval of First Year Council Honoraria

RESOLUTION

MOVED: REUTER

SECONDED: SHEN

**WHEREAS FYC-002: Composition and Jurisdiction states in section 14 that "Each Executive Member [of the council] shall receive an honorarium of \$500, which shall be contingent upon the Board of Directors' assessment of their attendance and fulfilment of duties"; and,**

**WHEREAS the final report of the FYC Executive was passed by the 2020-2021 Board, but there was no formal motion to approve their honoraria; and,**

**WHEREAS there is also no formally outlined procedure for approving the FYC Executive honoraria; NOW THEREFORE,**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the honoraria for the First Year Council Executive totalling \$1,000 be approved.**

DISCUSSION

Reuter introduced the previous Vice President and President of the FYC, Maggie and Anusha. The FYC VP and President both receive an honorarium of \$500 for the year. Their report was approved by the board but there was no formal motion to approve their honoraria. Currently, there is no standard procedure for approving the honoraria.

### 5.1 Motion to Amend

RESOLUTION

MOVED: REUTER SECONDED: LIU

**Be it resolved that the Governance Committee discuss the FYC honorarium approval procedure at their next meeting**

CARRIED

Jung asked whether there are current requirements for attaining the honoraria.



Reuter stated that it is up to the board to assess whether the President and Vice President receive their honoraria based on their attendance and fulfillment of their respective role. Reuter noted that this is quite vague and stressed the importance of developing standardized procedure.

**CARRIED**

## **5.2 Motion to Recess**

**RESOLUTION**

MOVED: TOLTON

SECONDED: WU

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT the meeting enter recess for 10 minutes.**

**CARRIED**

*Meeting entered recess at 4:49 PM*

*Meeting exited recess at 4:59 PM*

## **6. Board of Directors Equity Training Dates**

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

PRESENTED: AGGARWAL

Aggarwal stated as everyone knows there will be equity training for the board. This is required for CCR credit. The training session will remain between 2 and 2 hours and 30 minutes, though the time, this will depend on how much discussion there is. The training will take place in 3 groups for a greater chance for discussion. The three days are the 17th of July from 2-4:30pm, 18th of July 10-12:30pm, 21st of July 5:30-8pm EDT. These are dates and times that are proposed to accommodate different time zones. Since there is a limit of 10 directors, including the speaker, please select a first and second choice for session availability.

Vicdan asked if there could be an additional weekday session. They are only available for 1 of the times listed due to time difference. If that session was full they would not be able to attend.

Ballis noted that they can definitely add a timeslot. She added that they will release a form to gather this data after the meeting. Noted that this was a public announcement.

Aggarwal restated that this is a public announcement and invited members to communicate after the meeting if there are any issues with availability.

## **7. The University of Toronto's plan for the Fall Semester**

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

PRESENTED: BALLIS

Ballis noted that she wanted to hear about divisional differences in planning for the Fall term. For the Faculty of Arts & Science, the first 2 weeks will have an online option and the rest of the



semester will be in-person. She noted that all faculties have different plans for the Fall semester. Asked about what different professional faculties are planning and thoughts on how UofT is handling course delivery for the fall.

Okman stated that they are the Architecture and Visual Studies Director. Within the Daniels Faculty, plans for Fall will be announced on June 30th and students have not heard any new information since May 31st. They were fairly unclear but they were hoping for classes to be in-person. Their studies are an applied science, so they would need to access facilities in-person.

Munro stated that they have met with Ballis to discuss KPE's Fall semester. They note that the timing of the announcement was odd, because this was announced the day after first-year commitments were due. They noted that other faculties are not making a decision until late June. They stated that the current plan of KPE is that first and second years are entirely online and third and fourth years will receive some sort of hybrid model. Courses are already released, so KPE students can see what courses will be in-person versus online.

Dekel noted that someone has found access to the timetable for any FAS course. From what they have seen, it is mostly in-person for arts and science classes that are up to 100-200 people.

Darvin noted that they are from the Faculty of Medicine. They were told that they will be returning to Toronto starting in mid-August. It is not all in-person, there will be a lot of hybrid classes as well. People can book spots and go into lectures, but there will be the option to watch online. But most classes are small groups, so they are hoping to have those sections in-person. We'll be receiving another update in July. The faculty and students are all hoping for an in-person year.

Mancuso stated that the Law Faculty has given a similar announcement. They hope to be as in-person as possible, but there may be some in-person components for larger classes. This was the same position as last year.

Tan stated that similar things are being proposed for Music. Larger, mandatory classes for first and second years are most likely going to be held online, and they also have a two week extension for international students. Something that has not been addressed, for people that are returning to in-person, is that it is unclear what the vaccine requirements will be. They are hoping that the university will release something about that soon.

Goldberg stated that the Faculty of Nursing is doing a hybrid model with smaller seminars being held in-person and larger lectures should be held online. Clinical will be the full schedule while last year, it was cut in half.

Lou stated that the plans for engineering are uncertain and there are several plans right now,, but students were told to plan for an in-person return.

Sogbesan stated that Pharmacy is planning for an in-person return, but that was in the information shared in May, so they will have to see how things go.



Ballis thanked members for sharing. She stated that many faculties stated that they will be in-person and asked how members are feeling about the return.

Darvin stated that in their faculty, most students want to be in-person. They note that due to the nature of how their education works, they missed out on a lot when online. They add on that students have been calling for and are continuing to push for more of an in-person component. Generally, the student body was very happy with the in-person announcement.

Shen stated that on behalf of their international friends, there are big concerns because of flight cancellations and the ability to enter the country. However, most are content as it is better to be in-person. Moving to in-person is a positive sign and they are confident that a return will be safe.

Dekel stated that from what they have gathered, most people are excited about coming back in-person. But many are also worried from a mental health perspective, because they have been away for a year and a half now, and they are worried about the transition back. Some people want the transition to be more phased. Two week grace period is nice, but there should be a more emphasis on online alternatives. Especially for people who are immunocompromised, and especially because they are not mandating that people come to campus be fully vaccinated.

Liu stated that most people are optimistic with the vaccine rollout. They know that in order to stay in residence, students must receive their first does. But for international students, it will be important that the online option remains available in case visa and travel problems arise.

Jung stated that they agree. They are also optimistic about being in person however they acknowledge that international students may face logistical issues and need to be supported. Even for domestic students, that change from online aback to in-person academically can be jarring. Having any kind of supports and leniency is beneficial for everyone.

Ballis thanked everyone for sharing and that it is in line with what they have been talking about. This information will be useful when talking to the university administration.

## **8. Other Business**

### **DISCUSSION ITEM**

PRESENTED: JUNG

Jung asked to discuss the policy around receiving the package 4 days before the meeting. They thought it was not enough time to review the package given that many of the documents are over 5 pages.

Reuter noted the Ops team is prioritizing releasing the packages on time this year. They are in favour of making this as accessible as possible for everyone, because this is a lot to read. They promised to release packages at least four days in advance. If board members would like packages to be submitted earlier, the risk is that the details will not fully encompass the entire



month. Executive reports are due a week before the deadline, and then there is an internal deadline to collect items. So, if there is a policy shift to release packages earlier, that is something they can do, but then the package would only encompass about two weeks of work. She noted that there is a lot of back-end work to put this together. She is open to more discussion on how this can be made more accessible.

Jung stated that they think that as we progress, committee meetings will increase and everyone will move to be full-time students again. She noted that four days might not be enough to review. They wanted to hear what other members thought. She noted it would also be beneficial for the reports themselves to be in bullet points to make them easier to skim.

Reuter noted that this is something to bring up at the governance committee, since it would be a policy change. They noted that the reports are not only for the board's use, but that they are public records which is why they are so extensive. They tried to make reports as detailed as possible this year, because it makes the information accessible to those who cannot attend board meetings. If the board package is due much earlier, that cuts off half of the month for the UTSU to do stuff and it would impact what comes to the board and the flow of governance. Also, they noted that the executive summaries which are used to explain all the work they have been doing in short-form. She also sends out updates every two weeks in bullet point form. She understands where board members are coming from.

D'Aversa asked the executive committee how long it takes to write executive reports. They wondered if it would be more worth it to have bimonthly reports, in order to give the board more time to review the executive activities.

Ballis noted that it depends on the executive. President and VP Ops are more extensive. They noted that for them, it took about 8-10 hours to write up their report. For some of the other portfolios, that time may be closer to 3-4 hours.

D'Aversa asked if that time adds up to about 2-3 days of the work week.

Ballis noted that executives work 40 hours a week.

Reuter stated that the President, VP Ops, and VP PUA work a minimum of 40 hours a week, and that has gone up to 50 hours a week. She explained that executive reports serve as a way for executives to explain their work to the student body, given that everyone pays fees to us so they should have a full summary of what they are doing. To provide clarification on the package timeline, there is a lot of time that goes into this from the Ops team, and requires about 12-14 hours of processing, or a week's worth of work for an EA. It is a lot of work to finalize and get every item together. They noted that they are trying to stay away from last minute committee meetings this year. Minute-taking for EAs also takes a really long time. They added they are also trying to lessen the workload that goes into writing minutes. They wanted to provide this context for the board, and reiterated that they want this process to be as accessible as possible. They reminded members that they can reach out with accessibility concerns. They stated that



they could do committee highlights in addition to the reports, but that will take more time on the EA end.

Jung agreed that the detail in executive reports should not be cut down. They suggested that bullet points may convey the same information and would be easier to read than a block of text. They noted that this might not work well for committee meeting minutes, however it is worth exploring. They suggested that even a single day would be helpful in terms of giving board members more time to read it.

D'Aversa responded that they agree with Jung's point. They noted that the executive highlights section could be helpful. They were not sure if bullet points would help because details are still useful to read over.

Ballis thanked Jung and D'Aversa for speaking on this topic. They recommend that they can talk about this more and noted that this is a conversation that has occurred internally in the past.

Tan asked the Executive who they would reach out to regarding different board business.

Reuter clarified that board members should reach out to herself or Alexa. They noted that one of the roles of the VP Operations is to support the board, so they can direct board directors to the correct executive. She also noted that Alexa works with all executives and would be a good support. They added on that they are working on setting up different channels of communication.

Jung noted that after reading the report for finance, making the budgets more accessible to students by creating graphics is a good idea because it will help the UTSU be more transparent. They also thought it would be helpful to have guides on financial procedures at the university and student rights.

Reuter thanked Jung. They noted that financial transparency is an executive priority for this year. They thanked the finance committee for their thoughts on this. They noted that this is an important topic for making finances more accessible.

## 9. **Adjournment**

### **RESOLUTION**

MOVED: JUNG

SECONDED: SOGBESAN

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

### **CARRIED**

*The meeting adjourned at 5:39 PM.*

---

## **Appendices Listed on Following Page**



---

## APPENDICES

- **Consent Agenda**

Link: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1m07-F-eirdZgwZxvpHcn7fbmYGClvPBp?usp=sharing>

**A Preliminary Budget**

Link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1GS3WtOSXf6Rj6OfepArqCmTb0oo-w6NZ/view?usp=sharing>

**B Final Report of the FYC Executive**

Link: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1s-N\\_TaetzTxvmHTu2AID\\_E36mKmCwTJ\\_/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1s-N_TaetzTxvmHTu2AID_E36mKmCwTJ_/view?usp=sharing)