

Winter General Meeting
Wednesday, March 21, 2019

President Richard Wu calls the meeting to order.

CALL TO ORDER 5:23PM

1. Opening Remarks from the Chair (information)

President acknowledges that the University of Waterloo is on the traditional territory of the Neutral, Anishnaabeg, and Haudenosaunee peoples. The University of Waterloo is situated on the Haldimand Tract, land promised to the Six Nations, which includes six miles on each side of the Grand River

President thanks the assembly for attending the General Meeting. President goes over Robert's Rules to ensure the meeting is run fairly. President discusses moving and seconding motions, the number of votes required to adopt a motion, point of clarification, point of order, calling the questions, etc. The President continues to reassure the assembly that the Board of Directors and Student Councilors are available for students who require assistance with Robert's Rules jargon.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Moved by Seneca Velling, Alexander Eyre.

Savannah Richardson would like to note that 2 director's candidates have withdrawn: Fayza Ibrahim and Michelle Teplitshki.

Motion adopted.

3. Approval of the Fall 2018 General Meeting Minutes

Moved by Connor Plante, Benjamin Easton.

Batool Suleman: For the October minutes, they didn't include anything discussed after we checked quorum...I wanted to point this out because it wasn't mentioned in the agenda.

President: Last meeting we lost quorum about 4 items in, and none of the conversations and discussion afterwards was included.

Motion adopted.

Abstentions noted: Michael Beauchemin.

4. Notice of Appointment of the Auditor by the Board of Directors (information)

Seneca Velling: Due to failure of the last General Meeting to maintain quorum, the Board of Directors under the Corporations Act had to reappoint last year's auditor. This is just a notice that we reappointed MMP LLP as the auditor for the Federation of Students for the remainder of this year until the Annual General Meeting in the Fall of this year...

5. Increases to the Federation of Students Fee

President: There are 3 motions to this one. We've boiled down what's within each of these motions to make it easier to understand... Within the agenda, there are links to the main motions... For other motions that have supporting documents are highlighted in blue.

a. Increase due to CPI

President reads the full motion.

Moved by Rebecca George, Bilal Akhtar.

Bilal Akhtar: These fee increases for people that are new here are pretty standards. These are here to keep operating the baseline of services that we've always been doing. CPI stands for inflation (increased imagined inflation).

Point of clarification: Jillian: Is the current student fee \$50/student, and does the student fee apply to Feds services or is it going to the Feds services and the clubs?

Kurt MacMillan: Right now ours Feds fee is \$6.64 per student. How it works is the 2.3% would only be added to that fee, which is about \$1.40 for the fee to keep all of the services at the same level. It's for everything that falls under Feds umbrella.

Seneca Velling: The Board recommends you vote in favour of this item. It's keeping up for general inflation.

Batool Suleman: Will this be affected by OSAP changes from the provincial government by the 10% decrease that's coming? Is it for Feds fee as well or is it just for tuition?

Kurt MacMillan: It'll be to Feds fee itself. The OSAP is on its own government loan.

Motion adopted.

b. Increase to Cover Staff Salary

President reads the full motion.

Moved by John Hunte, Seneca Velling.

Seneca Velling: In recent years, Feds has seen a decline in same level of service provision because we have to cut other aspects of the budgets in order to continue to meet

the contractual requirements we have for staff salary increases. Feds doesn't set staff salary levels. That is set with UW's Memorandum of Understanding with the Staff Association, so those are going to go up no matter what. The only way we can accommodate them is by increasing the fee. The Board again recommends that we adopt this motion.

Motion adopted.

c. Increase to Support Feds Advocacy

President reads the full motion.

Moved by Matthew Gerrits, Deon Hua.

Matthew Gerrits: I'm the current VP Education. I'm the one bringing forth this proposal. What's happened with the Feds budget over the last number of years, with regards to the VP Education portfolio is that the cost and services cuts, with regards to staff increases and us having to fund other parts of the organization, we have seen reductions in amount of money within the (VP Education) portfolio, even while we've seen part-time wages rising. This increase would allow us to do more with provincial and federal advocacy. We used to have a provincial and federal advocacy commissioner who was a part-time student working on these issues. That's something I'd like to see brought back, and I would like to raise the number of part-time hours have been working... which was 15 before...

Deon Hua: I am the MathSoc Vice-President Academic. I do a similar role to what Matt does for Feds on a student society level. Advocacy is something that is more hidden behind the scenes but it is essential work of student societies or student unions. Feds in previous years, and this year as well, has lobbied for students in many ways...I would also like to recommend adopting this motion.

Kanan Sharma: Just a question for the increase in part-time salaries, will it be only for people under VP Education portfolio or for all of Feds?

Richard reiterates Kanan's questions to the assembly.

Matthew Gerrits: Good question. This applies to only VP Ed portfolio. There are current 4 part-staff under portfolio...it doesn't apply to people in other portfolios.

Jillian: This question is more for VP Education. I was wondering what exactly are we advocating for and to whom are we advocating to? The second question is would Feds fee be 'opt-outable'?

Matthew Gerrits: Advocacy in my portfolio generally falls into two categories: one is on-campus academic advocacy (advocating to university senate, academic relations, co-op) and second big umbrella is government relations (municipal advocacy in terms of

housing, bylaws, St. Patrick's Day). Provincial advocacy is the second big thing that falls under that umbrella. There are a number of things I do under the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance advocating on their policies as well as Feds' own policies pertaining to the provincial government. And on the federal government, we advocate for international students, Indigenous students, and some of the things that fall under more of their purview. When it comes to the student choice initiative from the provincial government, the way that I read the government announcement is that this fee would be something that would fall as 'non-essential' so yes, it's opt-outable.

Lenny Cheng: Just to clarify, since this is adding almost 80 cents to students' fees, are these changes related to CPI or are these on top of the CPI changes?

Matthew Gerrits: These changes are separate from the CPI motion. Feds bylaws require that if we're raising something due to inflation, it has to be a separate item on the meeting agenda, so it's there as a separate motion and items b and c now are completely separate and it's not included in the amount...

Megan Town: What is the reason we're approving this year's increase as well as the increase in September 2020 at the same time? Would it not be better practice to approve the 2020 increase at a future GM?

Matthew Gerrits: Good questions. I came with a plan to the Feds Board of Directors as to how this would be spent and what activities it would support. The reason that it's split is because we don't want to grow the portfolio too fast. The reason I included both was because I tried to take a holistic view of the department and what needed to increase. The major part of the 17 cent increase in 2020 would go to a student researcher position. But that's not the kind of staff I want to on board at the same time I would bring in another commissioner for federal and provincial affairs. If the assembly wants...you can split the motion and vote differently on one or the other. The reason I put it in there is because it supports a strong department that has research components as well...I tried to make a plan that accounted for both.

Seneca Velling: The department has seen a decrease in real dollar value over the years because we had to compensate for other expenses elsewhere and, typically, the advocacy portfolios where those cuts come from. Once again, the Board recommends the adoption of this motion.

Kanan Sharma: Just a follow-up question regarding the part-time wage increases – is it because we're increasing the wage per hour or number hours they're working?

Matthew Gerrits: Great question. The hourly rate is currently \$15/hour, so it's an increase in the number of hours worked and the addition of a new position out of the revival of an old position.

Ben: We've cut money from the advocacy portfolio in the past, is there any chance that money from this fee increase will cover any other expenses?

Matthew Gerrits: I would say off the bat, no, not during the first year. Feds Council has ability to determine where money is spent so ultimately it's their decision. But Council tends to take into account the General Meeting intent rather strongly.

Seneca Velling: Students' Council and the Board of Directors accepted the report of Budget and Appropriations Committee this year which noted specifically the decline in real dollars of the VP Education's portfolio and advocacy generally. One of the recommendation issued in that report that was accepted was to increase funding over time for that, so it would be in contravention to our Board so we would have to overturn our previous decision to, in the future, increase funding in order to reduce funding going forward. So I don't see that happening.

Lenny Cheng: I totally support first BIRT clause...however the second clause "adding money for September 2020", that's in one year from now, so maybe it is better that we add those changes not today but in March 2020 as we get closer to the date. Can I move to split the motion?

Motion to split the question.
Moved by Lenny Cheng, Katie Arnold.

Richard Wu: This means the first part and second part will be considered separately. Anyone debate on dividing the question?

Savannah Richardson: I would like to speak against splitting the question only from the idea that this is a proposal in its entirety, so one part happens and another part happens that supports the first. This was actually a discussion that we had in the Board room whether or not to split the question and the discussion was it didn't necessarily make the most sense to split it because the plan to increase the fee over two sessions was the plan outlined that Matt put together. I'm against splitting the question for that reason.

Motion to divide question.
43 in favour to divide the question
113 oppose dividing the question.
Motion fails.

Abstention: Matthew Gerrits.
In favour: Lenny Cheng.
In opposition: Seneca Velling, Michael Beauchemin, Savannah Richardson, Tomson Tran, John Hunte.

Motion to vote for original motion.
Motion adopted.
In favour: Seneca Velling, Michael Beauchamin.

Kurt MacMillan: I wanted to update everyone: With those fees that got passed, it would be an additional \$2.43 for the Feds fee next year...

6. Ratification of the 2019 Elections & Referenda

a. 2019/2020 Councillors, Senators, and Executive

Richard Wu reads the main motion.

Moved by Kanan Sharma, Joshua Mbandi.

Batool Suleman: Have the numbers been released, in terms of votes or points, to each candidate so we can confirm ourselves?

Richard Wu: Yes, it was released the day after and it is on the Feds website.

Katie Arnold: I am the Engineering Society President and I regretfully feel I must speak against this. Addressing the elections issue this term: first, due to technical issues, on-term Engineering students couldn't vote in the referenda, and while this issue was resolved, no communication was given to students who may not have noticed that they missed these ballots. Second, due to the data set employed by the Federation of Students, students who were not fees arranged or dealing with certain failing criteria were not able to vote in the online platform. And this appeared to be shrugged off by the Federation of Students where the solution was just 'vote in person at the polling stations' which was not helped by the snow day during the voting period nor did this help any of the co-op students who could not travel to Waterloo. The purpose of ratifying the result of an election is to make sure it was run fairly and according to procedure and I cannot in good faith say that I believe that.

Joshua Mbandi: Can I just speak in favour of this. I'm sure some of you know that we ran and ended up losing, so one might assume that I have a vested interest in not seeing this pass but I don't believe that's the case. This should be passed because this was the decision of the Federation of Students and despite the outcomes, Feds tried its best to make sure this election was run as effectively as it should have. For those reasons I would like to vote in favour.

Richard Wu: The issues that you've outlined are astute and timely, they are issues I continue to acknowledge and they're issues that I've been working with both full-time staff and members of Council to fix. With respect to your current inquiries. As noted, this was quickly brought up and addressed by members of the IT department. In addition to what was said during a meeting of Students' Council, I've copied IT to this email to ensure that they are able to adequately respond to all of your inquiries, should they so choose. Historically, the Federation has requested the list of eligible voters for both the General Meeting and any elections and referenda hosted by the Federation from the Office of the Registrar. Additionally, debrief and transition documentation, particularly from the previous governing year, coming from the Office of the President has been historically weak, and the concern that you've cited was never made known in the past. In addition to working to develop more robust procedures governing the conduct of

Elections & Referenda, I hope to be able to produce more informative transition documentation to avoid this issue in the future. Currently, Institutional Analysis & Planning (IAP) does not provide a registered list of voters to the Federation. I intend to work with IT to determine the feasibility of requesting a list of voters produced by IAP, or to determine a more elegant, efficient solution to the problem. In the case that it is not, I intend to work with IT to ensure the set of registered voters includes not only those who are fees arranged in the present academic term, but also those who were fees arranged in the previous term to ensure that we are in compliance with the bylaws.

Point of information

Mike Cimetta: Richard, do you know many people formally complained they couldn't vote?

Richard Wu: In the single digits to my email, but I understand there were more. Katie did you want to explain?

Katie Arnold: No.

Bilal Akhtar: I'm a councillor for Math students. One thing I would like to point out is that this motion is for the ratification for Exec, Council and Senator elections. The concern that has been brought up by Katie seems to be concerning referenda results, not Exec or Council results. I believe Engineering students, and I'm in engineering student myself, was unable to vote for referendum for 1.5 hours. This was early in the morning from 10-1130. We were all here discussing it and it seems like IT was running around and trying to fix it as soon as possible...as Chair of the referendum committee, I was unhappy to see that half of my faculty was unable to vote, but I think the election was fair enough...most people who wanted to vote were able to vote.

Richard Wu: IT would like to directly respond.

Point of Information:

Pratik Patel: I am the current IT manager. The system was developed in-house years ago. The intent of the system was to run the Federation's elections. We have incorporated every society and hold multiple elections. From January 1st to right now, we have 18 elections that we've run for societies...We get list form registrars for all students that are fees arranged or who they consider full-time students for the last year. With Engineering, we an Engineering list from the Engineering Society explicitly (this is a list of people that can vote). It was an oversight on our part, as we were running 10-12 different society elections. Because the system is built as one voter's list, we have to override every single list for multiple elections. There were 4000 Engineering students that were not able to vote for the first hour and a half because we had to override that list. We fixed it at 11:30... And by September, were hoping to a system that incorporates a master list and an override list...

Point of Information:

Jerry Chen: Last term, I was fees arranged and off-term and was unable to use the system. This is a problem that has been going on longer than this term and I wanted to point this out so in the future we don't have same problem again for off-term students. I will be abstaining from this vote, as I'm not sure if voting platforms were affected.

Megan: Richard in your response to Katie, you listed number of things you intend to do in the future. Can you speak to what you've already done to remedy this issue or given that this term is almost over, will you be transitioning it on to Michael?

Richard Wu: As soon as those items were brought to my attention, I very quickly spoke to IT in all instances to figure out what the problem was so that they would be able to come up with a solution. They are things I intend to incorporate into procedures and guidelines so we don't have this happen in the future. With the month and couple weeks left, I do intend to finish them for you and in the case, this doesn't happen, I'll be sure to have President take this on for next year.

John Hunte: I'm in favour of ratification, but these issues have been going on for long. I can reiterate what the gentleman said earlier. When I ran in the by-election in November, all of the people who nominated me were on the registered list except for myself. I wasn't registered as a voter even though on I was term and fees arranged.

Batool Suleman: I wanted to clarify that the Engineering Society President who had the point that the referendum was the issue... but this is ratifying the Exec positions which were not affected by the same issue, if I'm correct on that. I also want to point out that its less than 30% turn out...

Katie Arnold: The issues that affected Engineering students did include the referendum... I know 4 people at the top of my head – that I don't want to identify as having financial issues – that were not able to vote who should have been able to vote. They happen to be engineering students whom I represent. This problem isn't limited to Engineering students. My comments do not reflect the opinion of the results of this election, but solely on the fact that every member of Federation should be able to vote in the Federation's elections... Voter turnout, with it not being approved, would go to Students' Council. It wouldn't be another general election; it would be a decision held at Council.

Elizabeth O'Sullivan: We're getting a little bit off topic here. While yes, people not able to vote will affect whether or not these elections are representative to what students wanted, discussing particular instances we've had, I don't believe is relevant.

Call to question

Moved by Kristen Boonhath, Connor Plante.

Assembly in favour of calling question: motion adopted.

Original motion voted on:

Motion adopted.

Abstentions: Michael Beachamin, Rachel, Seneca Velling, Megan Town, Deon Hua, Alex Lee, Tomson Tran, Jerry Chen.

In favour: Joshua Mbandi, Simran Parmar, Amanda Fitzpatrick.

In opposition: Katie Arnold

b. Feds Legal Service Referendum

Moved by Seneca Velling, Michael Beauchemin.

Seneca Velling: I believe we've addressed the referendum concerns ad nauseam at this point but I will say that the legal service will do a lot of good for a lot of students and I encourage the assembly to ratify it.

Michael Beauchemin: Seneca is eloquent.

Bilal Akhtar: Seneca was very eloquent as well. However, as chair of the yes campaign for legal service, I would like to thank anyone who helped bring legal service to this point and for supporting this. It's a great initiative and will really empower UW students who unfortunately face a lot of legal troubles be it with employers or housing disputes, or whatever. I will personally abstain from this because as Chair of that campaign, however, this vote speaks for itself. Seneca was very eloquent.

Point of Information:

Batool Suleman: This is a referendum introduction legal service to Feds, correct?

Richard: Yes.

Voting on motion:

Motion adopted.

In abstention: Bilal Akhtar.

In favour: Seneca Velling, Tomson Tran, Joshua Mbandi, Fayza Ibrahim, Alexander Eyre, Abigail Tait, Simran Parmar, Amanda Fitzpatrick.

In opposition: Katie Arnold.

c. Feds UPASS Referendum

Moved by John Hunte, Alexander Eyre.

Batool Suleman: Sorry, I just want to make sure everything's clear, because I will be looking back on these minutes and make sure everything's clear. This is the referendum regarding what exactly? What was this specific referendum?

Richards read the UPASS referendum question and results.

John Hunte: We're not actually voting for the referendum; we're voting to ratify the results of the referendum. If you think the referendum was done fairly, the you vote in favour of it, whether or not you were favour of the content of the referendum itself.

Ben Beelan: I would just like to clarify if this fee can be refunded, and if this question says that we're forcing students who are taking less than 3 courses to pay the UPASS Fee as well?

Kurt MacMillan: In the question, we have it to be accessible for students that have at least 1 on campus course so it would be an opt-in option.

Richard Wu reads the original motion.

Voting on motion:

Motion adopted.

In favour: Seneca Velling.

In opposition: Katie Arnold.

7. Election of the Board of Directors

Moved by Savannah Richardson, Rachel Lee.

Savannah: I'm going to talk to it just because we did a new process this time. I was Chair of the Director Screening Panel Committee which is a join committee between Board of Director and Student's Council. This year, we conducted an online interview for people to outline to talk about themselves and their qualifications and we ran in-person one that expanded on some of those questions. We put it together in that report. I will say there was something missing from that report and it was John Hunte is the MathSoc councilor in Winter and Spring term...I forgot to include this in that report. That was brought to my attention...

Point of Information:

Kanan Sharma: I'm running for Board of Directors and there's been a change in commitment. I'm no longer running for Senate.

Student: I am candidate for the Board of Directors and I never got an email to come here. I don't know if any other Board candidates got an email to come to this meeting?

Savannah: No. There was no email for candidates to come to this meeting. On my part, I just assumed that since the ratification would occur at the meeting, it was an expectation. So I apologize...

Richard: Additionally, there were also 2 notices sent out to the entire student body. One was the first notice of this meeting and second was the agenda...if that addresses your concerns.

Seneca Velling: Just a couple of notes before people actually write anything on their ballots. If you're a councillor and voting for the councilor-director seats, you must note that you voted, not what you voted, but that you did cast a ballot. If you're a councillor holding a proxy, or a member holding a proxy for a councillor, you need to also note that the proxy casts a ballot. That's to comply with procedure. I'd also like to note that if you're holding proxies, you're entitled to a second ballot for the proxy you're holding. So if you have a proxy in your hand, you should have 2 ballots in your hand, not 1...just to clarify, incoming Councillors do not need to declare that they've voted. Current Councillors need to declare that they voted. To clarify why that is: The Act was amended two years ago such that members from the Board of Directors coming from a class of Directors, so Councillors, must be elected by that class of Directors. So if you're a current Councillor, you will be filling out both at-large section of the ballot and the councillor part of the ballot. If you're an at-large student, you will be filling out the at-large section of the ballot. Just to clarify for the record and it needs to be stated in the minutes, so whoever is taking the minutes, Aisha, all of the candidates have been confirmed to be above the age of 18, found not to be mentally incapable, and not bankrupt, and they're all members of the Corporation.

Richard Wu: To clarify, the Act refers to the Corporations Act. This is the law that governs who we are as a Corporation and just to clarify, if you are a current councillor, fill out the councillor-director at the bottom. And those who are not councilors, please leave that blank.

Jillian Shaw: Is there a voting session that happened last week for Senate? Or is this the only voting that's available?

Seneca Velling: So the questions is "was there vote for the Senate last week?" The answer is yes. But this isn't on the agenda because there's timeline for the agenda. And that was a Senate by-election so it will be ratified by Students' Council because it wasn't completed in time. It wraps up today. It wasn't completed in time for this meeting to ratify it.

Point of Order:

Jacob Siemons: I don't think that these ballots are set up to comply with the ranked voting system in our bylaws (BC-STV). I think that system invites you to rank all of the candidates, regardless of how many seats are available, not just the top 5.

Richard Wu: In that case, because there are more candidates than there are number of seats available, if you wouldn't mind turning it over...

Seneca Velling: BC-STV only applies to the elections of Executives and Council. It's just ranked ballots of your top 5 preferential choices in this ballot. Please only rank 5 candidates. Thank you.

Savannah Richardson: We've had a request from a member here – if all candidate directors can come on stage please, both including at-large and councillor directors.

Director applicants state their names.

At-Large Director Candidates:

- Rayyan Ahmed Quraishi
- Alexandria De Sousa
- Jessica Lewitzky
- Connor Plante
- Kanan Sharma
- Benjamin Easton
- Alexander Eyre
- Katherine Sebben
- Colin Parkyn
- Derek Brockhaven
- Stephanie Jeon
- Simran Parmar

Councilor-Director Candidates:

- John Hunte
- Megan Town
- Navya Jayesh Mehta
- June (Huiqin) Xui

Point of Order

Jerry Chen: I would like to object this current procedure because essentially it's become a popularity or beauty contest that we just have candidates stand up there and state their names and there was cheering as well, and I believe this will influence the results. I think we should look at what these people have put for their profiles rather than relying on a visual of who these people look like.

Richard Wu reiterates Jerry Chen's statement for the assembly.

Rebecca George: Just to speak again that point, I think it's a fair point to ask director candidates to stand up there and introduce themselves for people who've seen them and the work they've done around their student societies or in their student community to identify with them. Sometimes you know people by face more than by name. I'd like to believe the student population that's our here for the General Meeting is more mature to choose who they want to vote for on Board of Directors based on popularity contest.

Joshua Mbandi: To add to that, we've all had access to the agenda for some amount of time now, and that included information on the director applicants. I don't think that people will come here with the intention for voting for one person, see people cheering, and decide not to vote for that person. I don't think that's how people vote and I don't think substantive enough to warrant this legitimate. I think this is a very legitimate

process considering their applications were online in advance, as well as the fact that we were given access to this. I think Richard sent out an email.

Student: Aren't point of orders not debatable?

Seneca Velling: Just to be clear, the chair can refer any matter of ruling back to the assembly for opinion. This is a non-binding opinion to the chair.

Savannah Richardson: I think Josh summarized what I was thinking very well. This was provided in advance. I can speak to the spirit of this process and that was to give people adequate time to do their own research, where in the past, people stand up and give their speech...the idea of having this available beforehand and having it out with the agenda which was sent out in the email and available on the Fed's website, it was shared over social media, so people can make an educated and informed decision on who sits on the Board of Directors.

Richard Wu: I would like to make a ruling on this first. A member requested my ruling and hearing that generally people are in favour of what's going on right now, I'm in favour of this as well.

Point of information:

Kanan Sharma: This is in regard to the Student Councillors. For the people are going to vote for certain councillor-directors, are they going to be incoming student Councillors or current Councillors?

Seneca Velling: The current student's Councillors that are here will be casting ballots for incoming Councillor-Directors. So the incoming Councillors will not be voting on council-directors.

Savannah Richardson: Can we have councilor-directors on one side of the stage?

Point of Order

Seneca Velling: The chair amends the agenda as an assumed motion and proceed with the agenda until the ballots are cast until which point we return and ratify the results.

Richard Wu calls recess.

Moved by Kanan Sharma, Deon Hua.

Motion adopted.

*Current Student Councillors casting a ballot for the Councillor-Director seats:

- Deon Hua
- Alex Lee
- Bilal Akhtar
- Seneca Velling
- Katherine Arnold
- Matthew Gerrits

- Carly Mirrlees
- Lenny Chen
- Junru Chen
- Jason Small
- Ethan Candler

Batool Sulemain would like to apologize to the Research and Policy Officer “for the constant interruptions.”

Call to order from recess at 7:12pm.

Results of the 2019-2020 At-Large Director seats:

- Connor Plante
- Benjamin Easton
- Alexandria De Sousa
- Alexander Eyre
- Simran Parmar

Results of the 2019-2020 Councillor-Director seats:

- Megan Town
- John Hunte

Move by Seneca Velling, Michael Beauchemin.

Motion adopted.

In abstention: John Hunte, Megan Town, Connor Plante.

In favour: Amanda Fitzpatrick, Fayza Ibrahim, Joshua Mbandi, Seneca Velling, Michael Beauchemin, Kanan Sharma, Derek Brockhoven.

Richard Wu: Need to motion to shred ballots.

Moved by Seneca Velling, Katie Arnold.

8. By-law Amendments

Seneca Velling: I move that we amend the agenda to consider first the item regarding the swapping of Executive Portfolio responsibilities as there is an MoU being considered dependent on this item being passed.

Richard Wu: I will hold off because I do realize that we do need a motion to destroy the ballots to maintain secrecy.

Motion to destroy Director and Councillor-Director paper ballots

Moved by Seneca Velling, Katie Arnold.

Motion adopted.

Richard Wu: I have another motion brought by a member to amend the agenda to move 8.c “[Article 9] Resolution to Adjust Responsibilities of Executive Portfolios” to move ahead of 8.a. Can I get a second?

Moved by Seneca Velling, Katie Arnold.

Richard Wu: Is there any debate on the motion?

Seneca Velling: Like I said guys, this is just swapping orientation to the VP Student Life’s role where it fits more naturally and swapping societies who have a role in governance to the President’s role who oversees the governance portfolio. Kind of a natural swap.

Richard Wu: Any discussion on amending the agenda to move 8.c above 8.a? Seeing none, all those in favour?

Motion adopted.

8.c is now 8.a

8.a “[Article 9] Resolution to Adjust Responsibilities of Executive Portfolios”

Moved by Seneca Velling, Ellen Mcgee

Savannah Richardson: I know the information is in here but I want to provide a little larger of a background in terms of why this was considered. I was volunteering for societies and with the Executive a number of year ago, as a societies relations commissioner last year. And this year in my role, I can see that Feds can do better job in supporting societies and being accountable to societies. The general oversight of the societies under the President’s portfolio will allow a direct connection with the President of Feds, while opening up other opportunities for other executives such as VP student life or internal to connect with Feds...I think this a great opportunity to enhance support between Feds and student societies as well as enhance accountability between the two groups.

Point of information

Batool Suleman: What’s the current system?

Savannah Richardson: Currently, the general oversight of student societies falls under VPSL, and currently new student transitions falls under the president’s portfolio. This is requesting shift that new student transition under VPSL and societies under President.

Richard Wu: I would like to speak in favour of this because I’ve been in this role for 10-11 months, and it makes a lot more sense from a responsibilities perspective and also from a governance and operational perspective to move them and just to make it more efficient. Is there anyone that wishes to speak to the motion?

No further debate.

Motion called to a vote.

Motion adopted.

In abstentions: Michael Beauchemin.

In favour: Amanda Fitzpatrick, Katie Arnold, Joshua Mbandi, Kanan Sharma.

8.b. Recommendations Proposed by the Task force for General Meeting Engagement

Richard Wu: I hear a motion to bundle 8.b.i ([Articles 5 & 7] Resolution to Enable Proxy Voting for and Ensure Legal Compliance of the Board) and 8.b.ii ([Article 5] Resolution for Electronic Voting and Proxying at General Meetings). This is an amendment to the agenda.

Moved by Seneca Velling, Bilal Akhtar.

Seneca Velling: They are very, very minor changes. The first is a legal compliance change because the Act was updated, we have to amend the Bylaws to reflect the changes to the Act. The second one is to allow electronic proxy submission. If going forward from this General Meeting, you want to submit your proxy by email, that motion has surpassed.

Motion to called to a vote (for both 8.b.i and 8.b.ii to be passed together).

Motion passes.

Seneca Velling moves the question. Seconded by Michael Beauchemin.

Richard discusses what both motions means and discusses major changes as outlined in the PowerPoint slide.

Kanan Sharma: Just wondering the reason behind why the election for the directors are held online?

Seneca Velling: Just to speak to that quickly, directors need to be elected at a General Meeting. That being said, proxy votes cannot be used to vote for directors unless they're screened in advance, which is what we did this year, but in order to make sure that we can continue doing it going forward, this change would allow all proxy votes to be used to cast ballots for directors. Otherwise, we're disenfranchising a huge chunk of our membership.

Motion to call to the question by Seneca Velling.

Batool Suleman: What exactly is being clarified in terms of the rules for vacancies? I don't understand.

Seneca Velling: Currently, the Board can fill its own vacancies. And if the vacancy is filled before the Fall General Meeting, then the director serves until the Fall General Meeting. If they served after, the person just fills the seat forever, or until the end of the governing year. This is to say, at least in the meantime, if a GM is held, they will be ratified by student's council. So council can refuse to ratify, in which case, a new director would have to be selected. It's to prevent board from stacking a board of directors by forcing the resignation of directors.

Motion to call to question.

Motion adopted.

In favour: Michael Beauchemin.

8. [Articles 1, 3, 8, 9 & 11] Resolution to Improve the Role of Council Decision & Executives

Motion to move this motion by Seneca Velling, Tomson Tran.

Seneca Velling: This makes the President of the Federation of Students the default speaker of Students' Council. The President can choose not to serve in this role or Students' Council can choose a new speaker under Robert's Rules, as always. It provides some continuity; it makes the Secretary of the Corporation the default Secretary for Students' Council (often times, we find it difficult finding someone who wants to be Secretary because it means giving up participating in conversation); it increases some of the responsibility to Students' Council; it provides general oversight for societies, which is codified in the MoU already; it's the committee of president's procedure, it's not an additional procedural rules; commissions, which fall under the Executive; it also adds an additional seat on Students' Council for the Engineering Society B seat, which is incredibly important. Right now, some constituencies have more than one society, and the society presidents get a voting seat but it's unclear currently to whom that voting seat goes. This clarifies, in Engineering's case, that they have an additional seat, but it comes at the cost of one of the elected seats, so that both (engineering) president's may serve on Students' Council.

Batool Suleman: ...What's the current system?

Richard Wu: Currently, when Students' Council convenes, the first thing that Council needs to do is to decide on a speaker. It's usually up in the air, but this basically makes it so that the President becomes default but council can say 'we don't want this guy'.

Seneca Velling: This also helps with planning organizational transition since we turn over once a year. It just means someone's responsible for planning council transition.

Edward Yang: In the Bylaw amendments, it says non-voting members shall be determined by Students' Council. Can you give an example why that's needed?

Seneca Velling: That's a great question. Thank you very much for asking it. Two points to this one quickly: Council's been looking to add additional seats, like one of the things we were exploring this year was forming a select committee for Indigenous students, but if we can add a representative on Council for those needs, we head off the need to create a more bureaucratic structure. That was one example. Inviting persons to participate that may not ordinarily be there, this was something that was a part of a previous set of bylaws, that was omitted when a new set was passed and it is fairly useful if we want to add someone in an advisory capacity to Council from time to time, as may be needed.

June Xu: I was wondering if after these changes, if its passed, if there's going to be any kind of follow up discussions or any kind of validation on whether or not these changes have actually benefited Council and the rest of the Executives, as well as their constituents?

Richard Wu: I think on behalf of Councillors, that would be a really good idea.

Seneca Velling: We currently have a task force that's been putting this stuff together and reviewing our organizational efficiency here and how well we represent students. One of the motions on here later is to make it easier is to recall Councillors that you don't like. That's not this motion, but it's a future motion. That is something that's actively under review. One thing we're looking to do currently is that the task force is a regular standing committee that reviews governance, but we kind of wrapped that role into the committee of president's already.

Lenny Cheng: So hopefully this doesn't piss off everyone off at EngSOC, which is a quarter of the people here. But I think it's a dangerous precedent that we're allowing EngSoc to have two seats at the expense of an at-large member to be a member of Council. As a member of Council, I would urge that against the part about having dual representation.

Katie Arnold: So, I'll speak to this a little bit. Seeing as we currently and perpetually have an Engineering vacancy in Feds Councillors, I don't see this as damaging the Feds Councillor caucus too much, seeing as we're filling an empty seat. Right now, both of the Engineering society presidents are voting members of the Federation of Students Council because we are filling a vacancy right now. This is just making that the default, instead of us just having us vote on it every time we have a vacancy, which is pretty constantly. I appreciate that you may not see the value in the Engineering Society as you do not attend our meetings, but I do encourage Feds Councillors in Engineering to attend our meetings in the future.

Richard Wu: I will also add that there is a current set of amendments in the Bylaws that says for the off-term Engineering seat...the number of Engineering seats will be the same and at the consent of Council.

Pat Duong: I just also wanted to point out that the EngSoc Presidents are elected by their constituents as well; this is the same constituent that Councillors are elected by, so in that sense, they do still represent the same people.

Lenny Cheng: Thank you for your response. If the question is why do we not have another Engineering seat and why's there a vacancy. Then the solution is not to be a default in to how EngSoc can fill that. The issue should be how do we create by-elections for Engineering which, currently as the case, almost never happens when there are vacancies. My proposal would be creating those by-elections rather than fill those seats and find a Band-Aid solution.

Richard Wu: I don't want to stray too far from the scope of this question, so I will entertain one more [question]...

Seneca Velling: Lenny, thank you very much for your concerns. This is something that we thought long and hard about when we made this amendment. I will note that it was unanimously consented to by all executives, directors, councilors, and at-large directors. I will also note that with respect to the off-term society president, it isn't so much how do we solve by-election...that is a problem that we're addressing, and I think we've worked very hard to address it this year. If you look, this year almost every election was competitive. We held 5 by-elections this year. We had a lot of by-elections this year that were competitive races. So that is becoming less of a problem. The thing though is that we recognize both engineering societies in our memorandum of understanding. Legally we recognize them, but they aren't both recognized on council to speak with different voices, which disproportionately hurts the off-term society, which is 4000 students on co-op. The point of this amendment is to make sure those students are getting represented. So I hope you can find it in yourself to support this measure.

Motion adopted.

In favour: Seneca Velling, Simon Gregg, Ben Beelan, Derek Brockhaven, Roxanne Frutier, Mark, Allen McGee, Jason Small, Katie Arnold, Michael Beauchemin,
In Opposition: Lenny Cheng.

8. [Article 14] Resolution to Improve the By-law Amendment

Moved by Seneca Velling, Edward Yang.

Seneca Velling: Council passed a policy regarding Bylaw amendments. Right now, the board of directors has really, really liberal bylaw amendment powers. If we amend the bylaws, it can go into effect immediately, and it only comes out of effect is the General Meeting doesn't approve of it. The current Board and current Council thought that it was a little bit too liberal and it's a great way for abuse. So a policy was passed that says the Board has to consult students on policy; it has to bring policy for approval for majority of Council before the board can vote on it; and Board has to vote by 2/3 to implement a bylaw amendment, and the board needs 10-day notice to consider the bylaw amendment.

There's some exemptions to this, like *Article 2 Home Office*, which says the location of the home office of the organization, is not a crucial bylaw, so that was excluded but this was originally to be included with the bylaws but was omitted when it was voted on by mistake and I would encourage the assembly to vote on this as the board of directors unanimously voted to adopt this provision.

Richard Wu: As a way to simplify it, currently, the bylaws are the fundamental rules on how we operate, and currently, they are very liberal...essentially this looks to tighten it up and makes it a little bit more difficult to just pass bylaw amendments.

Motion adopted.

In favour: Seneca Velling, Michael Beauchemin.

In abstention: John Hunte, Joshua Mbandi.

8. [Articles 1, 7, 8, 9 & 11] Resolution for Impeachment and Recall Decision Process

Moved by Seneca Velling, Austin Richard.

Seneca Velling: Last Fall, October 24 2018, at the last AGM, we introduced some motions on impeachment and recall, and people were in opposition to the process that was proposed. We implemented some suggestions from Joshua Mbandi. One of those suggestions was that the recall referendum for Councillors and Executives should be very different. The recall referendum threshold to initiate a recall referendum for a councillor should be lower than that of an Executive because an Executive is elected by all students and Councillors are elected by smaller constituencies. So we split those up to reflect that change. We also added an impeachment mechanism which is different than a recall. Recall is a political process by which the students say 'we no longer want this person in this role'. Impeachment, on the other hand, is a process to cleanse the office. That is if an executive or a councillor commits a crime, how do you get rid of them if the populace isn't in favour of getting rid of them, but it's necessary to remove them from office for the good conduct and operations of the organization? It's a very high threshold. Council has to recommend impeachment to the Board of Directors with a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote, with notice provided to all of the membership. Then the board of directors has to vote by $\frac{2}{3}$ with notice provided to all directors to remove them. All directors need to be in attendance.

Lenny Cheng: Should an executive become impeached or recalled, will they continue to be provided compensation until the end of the fiscal year?

Seneca Velling: As ordered by Students' Council, the board is investigating that. We currently have to explore the executive contract. The answer to that question is I don't know yet. If I knew the answer, I'd tell you. The aim is that we wouldn't be paying someone who is no longer employed. Obviously.

Richard Wu: The reasoning as to why this is such an investigation is because currently, the executives, once they are elected, are employed by the University. So the executives have

to follow the HR rules that the University sets, and that includes the provision of the contract that they sign as well.

Batool Suleman: What's the current process for recalling?

Richard Wu: I will speak on behalf of the Executive...the executives can be removed through a recall referendum, which needs to be initiated by a petition with 2900 signatures, and that will trigger a recall referendum with a specific question...

Seneca Velling: With regards to Councillors, and also executives, since they're bundled, but in the new system we're proposing that be separated.

June Xu: if there's any timeline requirements for petitions – before term is over?

Seneca Velling: elections procedures separated from bylaws ...

Motion adopted.

In favour: Pat Duong, Batool Suleman, Jacob Siemons, Michael Beauchemin, Connor Plante, Seneca Velling, Tomson Tran,

8. [Article 4] Resolution for the Accountable Adjustment of Member Dues

Moved by Seneca Velling, Connor Plante.

Seneca: allows large fee increases to go to referendum. GM doesn't have best attendance; and allows for staff salary adjustment by Council.

Point of information: what defines large amount? What amount can council vote on?

Wu: threshold is CPI

Call motion to question (requires 2/3 vote)

Motion adopted.

Oppositor: Chen Chi, Lenny Chen

Calling to question carries.

Voting on motion.

Motion adopted.

Favour: Seneca, Batool Suleman,

Opposition: Lenny,

Seneca wants to amend resolution to refer [Article 11.1(6)] Resolution to Refer Contents of 11.1(6) to Board to **next item** as it is essential to electons

Moved by Seneca, Katie Arnold.
Motion passed.

Moved by Seneca, Richard.

Seneca: last winter passed amendment to have acclamation votes, but way is written is burden on organization. Had 5 by-elections – referring item to procedure due to edge cases

Richard: byelections are fundamental rules and having it in procedures gives us flexibility – organizational drainage and reason it out with students council.

Batool: what defines an edge case?

Richard: what if there are 10 by-elections? If you're running alone, you should be subject to yes/no vote. But what if there's 5 byelections for 5 different seats? Gov portfolio needs to ensure byelections are running smoothly, need ERO, etc. having this in procedure to mitigate drain on organization.

Call to vote:

Motion adopted.

Abstention: Jason Small

Amend agenda to have **b.** [Article 3.1(2)] Resolution to Allow for Membership during Expulsion Appeals for decision

Moved by Seneca Velling,

Motion passes to amend agenda.

Article 3.1(2)] Resolution to Allow for Membership during Expulsion Appeals for decision

Moved by Seneca Velling, Richard Wu

Seneca explains resolution.

Motion adopted.

Savannah calls quorum check.

Does not meet quorum

All items of business are now for information only*

Connor calls for agenda to be adjourned.

Moved by Connor, Kanan.

Motion passes.

Opposition: Lenny Chen, Jason Small, Chen Chi

10. Adjournment 8:09pm