



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

DECEMBER 1ST, 2016

Attendance:

Observers:

Absence:

1. Call to Order

Speaker calls the meeting to order at 6:29.

2. Land Acknowledgement

Speaker gives land acknowledgement: "SSMU would like to recognize that it is located on the traditional unceded territorial land of the Kanien'keha:ka, which has long served as meeting grounds for indigenous peoples."

3. Approval of the Minutes

Councilor Century motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Councilor Douglas. Motion passes.

4. Adoption of the Agenda

Chin: Motion to omnibus items B through H.

Motion passes.

VP Carolan: Motion to table Finance committee and FERC Committee until next legislative council.

Councilor Sadikov: May I ask why?

VP Carolan: For the Finance Committee presentation: that was just going to be a review of the midterm budget, which I was scheduled to do this evening, but then the numbers for all of our



operations were changed this afternoon, so I just didn't have time to update that, but I'll give you the correct numbers more thoroughly and accurately next time. And for FERC, I'm on the way for approval of a FERC commissioner, which would be helping me write the presentation, so I need to do that.

Councilor Cleveland motions to adopt the agenda, seconded by Councilor Century. Motion Passes.

5. Guest Speakers

No guest speakers at this meeting.

6. Question Period (5)

Councilor Templer: Is there a member of the chess club in attendance? Okay, for context, apparently someone from the chess club has been attending our meetings.

Councilor Sadikov: This is a question for the VP Finance. I just noticed that the policy regarding the five-year ethical investment plan is expiring in a few weeks. I was wondering if there are any plans to renew it?

VP Carolan: That I can renew first thing in the winter, that's what I'll have to do. I honestly don't have a solid answer for you right now, so if it's okay I'll follow up in email. But I'll make a note of that for sure.

7. Report of the Steering Committee (2)

VP Sobat: The committee met and there was a bunch of motions for senators. That's it.

8. Announcements (5)

VP Magder: One of the things we started this week was a Facebook event to document any construction barriers to accessibility taking place on campus. I just want to remind everyone to please keep posting on that, every single time you see a lip on the sidewalk, a mat that's not filled to create a ramp, anything at all, because I was just a working group meeting this past week and campus security have actually started monitoring this Facebook page as well, as well as some of the admin. Now that it's starting to pick up traction, it's a fantastic way to have regular students document anything at all. The more people post, the more traction we're going to get. Anytime you see something, snap a picture and put it on the page.



Councilor Madwar: What's the Facebook event called?

VP Magder: Campus construction campaign call for submissions

Councilor Chin: To add on to that, one very effective way to enact change is to take a picture or a selfie of what's wrong, preferably with a measuring tape, and post it on that page. Because that works really well for making admin make changes.

VP Patterson: As you all know Gert's usually has a lot of events, but I'd just like to draw everyone's attention to one specific event that's happening next week entitled: Sad Girl Takeover of Gerts. It's happening on Decemeber 8th, please join me and a bunch of other sad girls as we were all black or torn wedding dresses and challenge the hyper-masculine culture bro culture of our university pub.

Councilor Zhou: Right now, our first year council is having an event at Gerts tonight, if we finish in time there is free beer.

Speaker: As many of you may have noticed, we lost a councilor, if you have any questions or concerns for the reasons behind this, please come speak to me or Ben Ger, who is not here, so come talk to me. Ben is at Board of Governors.

Councilor Cleveland: The University Affairs committee in conjunction with Erin (VP Sobat), are doing a volunteer call out for the Know Your Rights Campaign in January. You can go on the website and sign up to volunteer, on getting in touch with student to let them know what their rights are.

VP Aird: Do we know which councilor left?

Speaker: Ashby Gangaram, our science councilor. They'll be having, I believe, either a by-election or they'll be appointing someone for the new year. They'll be appointing someone.

10.Old Business

No old business.

11.New Business

a. Motion Regarding Global Access Medicine



Councilor Sadikov: This only concerns the first resolve clause in this motion, since we passed the second clause last time. This was just due to procedure, we couldn't pass it last time but it is the same motion as last time. I encourage you to pass it.

VP Sobat: Just wanted to mention that since last council, there has been moves towards changing the McGill mandate towards this end so passing this motion would only further support that.

Councilor Cleveland calls the motion to question. This motion passes.

VP Madger: Motion to suspend Robert's Rules to give one more announcement.

Motion passes.

VP Madger: Sorry I just wanted to give one more quick announcement before everyone tunes out. I went through the building booking software and strung together extra space during peak library hours tomorrow, Saturday, Monday and Tuesday of next week. Rooms will be booked for pretty much the entirety of these days. These space are going to be opened especially for studying, so if you guys are in the library and you can't find anywhere to study, definitely come check out the SSMU building. There is going to be an announcement posted on the SSMU page with the specific rooms and hours.

b. Motion Regarding Provision of Bridge Funding for Savoy Society

VP Carolan: This motion is to enable the Savoy Society to put on their yearly production. They were previously a SSMU service but lost their service status, as per the service review committee in winter of last year. They perform a Gilbert and Sullivan play every year, it's a very large production, and it brings in a lot of ticket revenue. However right now they don't have the money basically to be able to absorb all of those costs up front so they're requested bridge funding in the form of a zero-interest loan from now, that will be paid by the end of this fiscal year. There's an attachment to this that was put up on vibe that details their budget and also details the balances that are left in the funds. They've requested \$25,000 in bridge funding. It highlights their expenses there, total expenses are \$39,000, the largest of which is a one time payment to McGill for the rental of Moyse Hall, which is the nice rentable theatre in the arts building. I think it's ridiculous that a student group has to pay that, but anyways. The rest of it is being taken up by costume, make up, sets and props. Theatrical stuff.

Myself, the president and their VP Finance can reasonable assure that these expenses will be reimbursed based on historical ticket sales, and also the nature of the show, and the amount of tickets that they're selling. In their budget they've conservatively estimated \$27,000 in ticket sales alone. However, that's conservative amount, it could range up to \$35,000. They also secure money in sponsorship and other streams like that. I'm happy to answer any questions about this.



Let me speak a little bit about the fund balances, we will be removing this from the campus life fund, the amount is \$25,000, currently there is a surplus of \$51,000 in the Campus Life Fund and that is for this semester alone, there will be \$38,000 added to fund at the beginning of winter, once the new student fee money comes around. There's just a very large surplus in a lot of the funds because some of them have been under applied to. So it doesn't negatively affect our cash flow at all, or the cash flow in the funds because we would never see \$25,000 worth of applications in one week, because the funds close on December 7th, so we're near enough to the point when the funds are closed. In the budget breakdown, I detailed the amount outstanding in check recs for the Campus Life Fund, which I believe is \$13,250.

Councilor Douglas: So looking at what they project for their budget, it looks like they're expecting to have an extra \$2700 by the end of the year, like after all of the sales and stuff that they bring in, realistically for so next year there is no way they would be able to operate unless they again got another loan from us.

VP Carolan: That is an issue. Ideally we would absorb this through the operating budget, if we could I wouldn't even come to council with this, but currently that is not possible. Next year, that might be possible, based on the surplus that the society will post, but right now that's not possible. So right now this really is a year-to-year solution, and I acknowledge that. However they're really keen on throwing the event and I'm very keen on throwing the event and supporting them in whatever way we can. If we could set them up in a more sustainable way, I would, but really that just amounts to giving them more money, which is hard. Hopefully they'll post a larger surplus, and then they're also looking into new avenues of funding.

Councilor Cleveland: Are you or someone else capable of speaking as to why they lost their SSMU service designation and did it have anything to do with financial mismanagement or something else that we should know about before we vote?

VP Patterson: I can speak to that, but disclaimer: I did not sit on this committee last year. So basically last year services were reviewed based on whether they provided resources, education and support to members of the student society. What was found was that a few services such as the Savoy Society and Players Theatre for example, because they were performing arts services, they didn't necessarily provide those specific things for students that a lot of our other do provide. That was one of the main reasons. Those criteria came from the internal regulations of the Clubs and Services portfolio. So that is how they were looked at and because they didn't provide those things, that's why their service status was revoked. Does that answer your question?

Councilor Cleveland: Yeah, I just wanted to know that they didn't mismanage funds.



VP Patterson: As far as I can tell, last year, I don't know how much of a role funding played in the actual review of all the services. I think it really was based on what was outlined in the internal regulations.

Councilor Douglas: For the Savoy Society specifically, doesn't have a bad financial record historically, but last year I think they did run a small profit, but its no where near enough for them to like finance all of their expenses. What happened is they put a lot of money into their play and then they get all that back in revenue. I know that last year finances were not a major thing that was considered, but because there was a large amount of money being handed out, that was something that was discussed.

Councilor Chin: First of all I want to reiterate Councilor Cleveland's question, but let me rephrase it: If the Savoy Society was still a service, would they have access to this \$25,000?

VP Carolan: Yes. If they were a service, it would be internal to the department, so we would be responsible for all surpluses and deficits.

Councilor Chin: My second question is: what happens in the event that this loan becomes overdue? What actions would be taken?

VP Carolan: I suppose that if they can't pay it, we're not going to go to collections or something, but like I said, I don't believe that's going to happen. It won't negative effect our cash flows if they couldn't pay it back within the fiscal year. That wouldn't damage anything, because the funds in that period would be replenished, like twice. But it will be repaid, they've assured me. I don't know anything about Gilbert and Sullivan, but they're doing *The Pirates of Penzance*, which is like the top-flight premiere Gilbert and Sullivan performance. It attracts a lot of attention, especially from the McGill Alumni community, it's generally for adults. The Savoy Society right now, they're heralded as the number one Gilbert and Sullivan production theatre in the world, the orchestra conductor, the head producer, is an ex or retired New York Met guy. So he knows his stuff. So I'm very confident and they're very confident this will be a best-selling performance that they've ever done. I wouldn't bring this motion to council otherwise.

Councilor Chin: Okay my third question – but just to add on to what you were saying, I did go to one of their performances, it's very good! They do it really well. My last question is that in the event that this motion does not pass, what changes in the short term and long term for the Savoy Society?

VP Carolan: If the motion doesn't pass, the Savoy Society won't get the secure funding and they won't be able to do their production. They already have some outstanding liabilities, no large ones because of Moyse Hall, and I wouldn't feel comfortable leaving that down to personal



repayment, so I would probably find some way of repaying as much as I can with the operating budget. But we can't really afford that right now.

VP Sobat: I was wanted to mention that this funding structure is used with other groups on campus that use Moyses Hall, such as the Arts Undergraduate Theatre Society, every year AUS has to give them a loan, basically in advance, so that they can pay those costs upfront, and they have a student fee of a few cents per term per student. So it's not uncommon just because of how expensive the upfront overhead cost is.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: My one issue about this motion is that if we enable this \$25,000, maybe other small groups would reach out to SSMU for money, so I don't know if this is something that you want to consistently do.

VP Carolan: So I have no interest in giving out loans to anybody, especially zero interest loans. This is a very exceptional circumstance, it's a blend of different situational stuff: them losing their service status, them not being in the best financial state I suppose themselves. I wouldn't extend this to other student groups, however they do have a very longstanding relationship with us; I think they were the very first student group on campus and they have a very longstanding relationship and I would like to help them out the best that we can, and I think we have a mandate to support student groups probably somewhere.

VP Carolan motions to extend debate by five minute. Motion passes.

Councilor Sadikov: I guess I'm still a bit confused. Because looking at the motion from last year, where the service status was revoked, it says that the Savoy Society will remain a programming department under the Student Life portfolio, in which case this motion is basically just a transfer from their restrictive fund to a different department, or are they like independently incorporated? What are they working under?

VP Carolan: So they don't have a subaccount under Elaine's portfolio. They used to be a department before they were a service. Within SSMU's finances, there is a series of departments, we have governance departments like our ministry portfolio, you have general admin, you have building, and then there was Savoy Society, much like the SACOMS department. So now that they've lost their service status, they effectively have to have a SSMU club bank account, which is just a community bank account with ScotiaBank that they have formal provision over. It's not a SSMU department, we have been unable to transfer funds out of that department for any reason, and so they're not a sub-account.

Councilor Douglas, Councilor Century, VP Aird, Councilor Zhou are all added to the motion. This motion passes.



- c. Motion Regarding the Election of Student Senators from the Faculty of Education
- d. Motion Regarding the Election of Student Senators from the Faculty of Science
- e. Motion Regarding the Election of Student Senators from the Faculty of Management
- f. Motion to Pass Management Senator Elections
- g. Motion Regarding the Election of Student Senators from the Faculty of Law
- h. Motion Regarding the Election of Student Senators from the School of Music

VP Sobat: Just for the record, I emailed faculty associations about this option like two months ago, but these are all coming now, which is fine. Just to say, going forward, there's been a desire expressed to look at the internal regulations on this about maybe always doing it this way. At minimum I would propose, for my successor that they should put this forward at motion like this in September with every faculty listed so we don't go through all this again. But happy that all the faculties have done this and hopefully that will improve turn out to the senator elections and raises the profile, also help folks will maybe understand a little bit more what their role is and what it's relationship to other forms of student governance on campus. Also we're going to do an information session next month about being running for senator, so if anyone know anybody interested in, they should look for that event.

All of these motions were omnibus into one motion. Councilor Chin speaks in favor. All motions pass.

VP Sobat: One thing I didn't mention, I will be emailing all of your associations with something outlining what the McGill requirements are for this role and some of provisions just so that you can include it in your posts, I know some people start early with January on issues, so I'll email that over the break.

12. Reports by Committees

- a. **Indigenous Affairs Committee**

VP Sobat gives the report.

- b. **Environment Committee**

VP Magder gives the report.

VP Magder motions to recess. Councilor Century seconds. Motion fails.



c. Building and Operations Management Committee (BOMCOM)

Councilor Madwar and VP Magder give the report.

Councilor Chin: Regarding the tenants in the building, I know this might not be the most appropriate medium here in a public forum to discuss it, but are there going to be any short term changes to the six ongoing subleases that SSMU has in this building.

VP Magder: Short term as in what, two years? No.

d. Equitable Governance Reform Committee

Councilor Cleveland gives the report. 1:11:45

Councilor Sadikov: Basically there's a committee of the board that has councilor seats that needs to be allocated and we forgot to do that in business, so I'm wondering if it's possible to move to add a point to do that after the reports by committees and before the councilor reports, would that be in order?

Speaker: That is in order. How many seats is it?

Councilor Sadikov: Two councilor seats on the committee to review the judicial board. I can talk about it more when we get there.

Moves to add the vote for two councilors who will sit on the committee to review the judicial board onto the agenda. Motion passes.

e. Accountability Committee

The Speaker (Udita Samuel) gives the report.

VP Sobat: I'm not in the position to question the accountability committee but I was wonder if you could a bit speak to your methodology, and if there were any discussions around that? I personally did not fill out the councilor evaluation form, because I did not feel comfortable or really in a place to rank councilors on a one to ten scale on those areas. Maybe Councilors have suggestions as to how that should happen in the future and also talk about that.

Speaker: We needed to start somewhere, and this is where we started. Obviously our system was not perfect at all, it was also done very last minute so we do apologize. We wanted to start somewhere in understanding perceptions of executives to councilors and councilors to executives, and this is where our starting point is. We will be taking into consideration these



grading schemes, but also the comments that were given for each councilor and each executive for the future, but this is just our starting baseline. I do think that if you have any specific concerns, you can definitely meet with Victor and I and we can bring that to accountability committee for January.

Councilor Chin: It's very clear what three metrics are given for the executives, what are the three values we see here for the councilors?

Speaker: They're the same: approachability, accountability and fulfilling their mandate.

Councilor Cleveland: I don't know how the executive staff received theirs, but for councilors we also received, like at the end of our form there were suggestions to fill out for ways to change, things like that. Will the councilors be receiving information from the executives for us? I find that this grading scheme is nice to know how you do compared to others, but doesn't have any way of showing how you can improve?

Speaker: One thing that we can do is...some people did fill out specific feedback for each councilor and that we can bring that to you, so if there was specific feedback for you we can bring that to your attention. But some councilors didn't get any comments on them, so I can't really tell you what you're doing wrong, because I didn't fill out the survey. But I can definitely get direct feedback to you if applicable.

Councilor Mehrotra: For the councilors, was it just the executives that filled out the survey?

Speaker: Only four. We thought it wouldn't be fair to allow other councilors to evaluate councilors.

Councilor Mehrotra: No, I do agree with that, but if only four executives filled it out, that's not like really a huge sample size.

Speaker: Yeah, we recognize that. Only eighteen people did it for the executives, that's not a very good sample size in all of legislative council, and same with the executives as well. So we recognize that.

Councilor Segal: In terms of seeing everyone's letter grade, I think that should be done in a different manner, because I don't think that's appropriate. I personally don't care, but some people may. I don't think it's fair to see how everyone ranks against everyone.

Speaker: That's fair. Victor and I personally do disagree with you when it comes to that, but we're not the only people in accountability committee so we can bring it to the members at large. But we do think that accountability is not just holding yourself accountable to your work or the



executives holding you accountable or your constituents, but it's each other. I think that all of you should be holding each other accountable, because we are a legislative council and we're all equal here, so I think that everyone should see how everyone else is doing. But I can bring your concerns to council.

Councilor Segal: I get that you want everyone to be aware of how everyone is doing, but I don't see how a letter grade would make that much of a difference.

Councilor Thomas: If someone said something specific to me, would that be made available? And also, I totally understand that you guys had to come from a starting point; may I suggest like even everyone brain storming like various methods as to how they would approach this. AUS just had our survey regarding accountability and certain councilors in the department brought up how they liked certain parts of the survey – I just want everyone to be able to voice their accountability concerns.

Speaker: One hundred percent. I think that we definitely will be sending out a follow-up email before meeting in January; respond to that email if you have points to make and we can bring your concerns to accountability committee to bring that forward and see where we can go with this.

Councilor Mehrotra: Regarding what Jasmine was saying about making the results public; I feel like in this instance especially because only four executives filled it out – I really do not feel like the grades are representative of how everyone is actually doing. Like those four executives to fill it out could have been people that you don't work with. If you're going to publish results, it should be results that are representative of how you're actually doing. Four people is not a sample size for a survey in any way.

Parliamentarian: Just to address that, I totally agree with the points you made, but at the same time, it's very hard to evaluate how one is fulfilling their mandate within the whole scope of your work in SSMU and that obviously goes outside of legislative council. Unfortunately executives for the most part will only see your work in legislative council as well as the committees that they sit on with you, so those are basically the perceptions they use when answering these questions, so the amount of reports you bring in, the amount of work you put into that, involvement within caucus, the speeches, the moving of certain motions, etc. So basically that's the focus we had, as well as attendance obviously, which is super important, especially in this semester.

Councilor Mehrotra: My point is that maybe publish the result until all the executives have filled it out, because that's only like half the executive team. Maybe publish it when all of them have filled it out to make it slightly more representative of the actual work that has been done by the councilors.



Parliamentarian: Unfortunately we had to post it because it's the last legislative council of the semester, so we wanted to then follow with at least some statistics and hopefully next semester it's dispatched earlier and thus executives and councilors have a lot of time to fill out the survey.

VP Patterson: I think it might be a good idea if maybe the accountability committee could assign each councilor a number and then the numbers with the corresponding grades could be posted. Every single councilor would be told what their number is and then they could look at the number that they correspond with to see their personal grade, and everybody could still see the grades as marked against one another, so they could still know that there are things to improve on or things that they've been doing well, so they can still rate themselves and see how other councilors are doing without knowing exactly what each member got rated, if that makes sense.

Councilor Chen: Could you explain a bit more the idea behind having all the executives rank councilors on a scale against other councilors? It almost seems like pitting people against each other.

Parliamentarian: By in large that's one very interesting point, we spoke about having more impartiality by bringing in accountability committee members who are not affiliated either with the councilors or with the executives to have a very neutral observatory role within legislative council, to each have a councilor assigned and really research what their mandate entails and thus evaluate how well they're completing their responsibilities, but for now since we don't have that service, we're basically avoiding councilors evaluating each other as well as executives evaluating each other, so the only option we had now is to have executives evaluate how much councilors are involved, how much they attend and all those other matters that were brought up and vice versa. But this is very much subject to change and those points will be brought up in committee.

Councilor Douglas: I understand wanting to avoid having people evaluate each other, but would it be possible to have some kind of system in place where the councilors aren't evaluating other councilors, but if they have specific comments, because they are working closely with other councilors and they had things that they've noticed, they are able to put that forward just for consideration, not necessarily in an evaluating way.

Speaker: Yeah definitely, that is a great suggestion that we can bring back to accountability committee. If there are specific concerns or points or information that you think that other councilors need to be aware of, as another councilor, we can definitely provide another form for next semester as well.

Councilor Magdar: I appreciate that in the feedback process that we can write comments, I'd just like to see incorporated some kind of a more thorough feedback process, I just don't think it's enough to write small comments like that if people who are willing to follow up on their ratings



can approach the accountability committee, I don't know if that's something that they can do or something you can propose.

Speaker: If there are specific councilors, we will put together all the comments and just email you individually your comments that we received, based on your grade. Obviously we can't really tell you what the person was thinking while they did it, but if they did have significant comments or even just a comment like "great", we can let you know as well. In the future, if you want there to be more specific feedback, we can incorporate that to hold each other accountable.

VP Sobat: First of all, I don't know that I agree that the executives should be evaluating the councilors at all. You're not accountable to us, you're accountable to your constituencies and not one of these surveys have been passed back to your constituencies in terms of your faculty councils for example. So I would recommend that instead, as those people are more important and probably have more insight than we do. I also think that a qualitative approach would be more useful. Or if there is going to be a ranking, ten is too wide a scale, maybe five because it's something that is relative anyways. Like strongly agree or strongly disagree, I think that sort of thing would be useful. Also, I'm wondering if for next term will there be plans to provide feedback throughout the term or only at the end of the term, because by the time we get to the end I think that wouldn't be helpful.

Speaker: Our goal is to have at least two to three reports for next semester. Hopefully a report before the mid February, like we said we're definitely going to be looking at attendance, how many motions you've moved in, how you voted. We definitely want to hold councilors accountable to that as well. But I do understand your concern that it is more important to hold councilors accountable to their constituents, and we will be taking that into consideration for next semester. I do think there is something to be said about holding each other accountable in this room, because legislative council is really important. It happens once every two weeks and I think the basic grade of this does indicate your approachability, accountability and your mandate in council, which is possibly like speaking in council, how much you participate, might have been one of the reasons you got the grade that you did. How you interact in this room is also as important as how you interact with your constituents.

Councilor Renondin: I just want to further air this point about getting feedback from constituents and just wanted to pitch this idea: maybe the way of doing that would be to send out that survey to the different councils. Because we report to the EUS council for example, and so just getting their feedback could be good.

Speaker: Definitely, thank you Councilor Renondin.

Councilor Douglas: I just have a question, you mentioned how you looked at how councilors voted? What does that mean?



Speaker: It's basically about your mandate. Every week, we publish exactly how you voted on the website for motions. There was a concern in accountability committee that every single motion that has been brought up so far in council, there has been an overwhelming majority in favor compared to opposed and abstained. So we have a lot of people on accountability committee that really want to look into how your mandate and how you're elected falls into how these motions were actually voted upon. Honestly, it was very complicated; there was someone who used regression models. But we can definitely get you specifics about how you want to take that into concern.

Councilor Douglas: I'm just wondering whether councilors will be penalized for how they voted?

Speaker: No, no one is going to be penalized for voting in favor for a specific motion, that's not going to be in the report, but it's going to be an overall perspective of how we're passing motions in council, because that's important.

Councilor Shi: In order to be accountable, it's also important to not forget any councilors.

Speaker: Yeah we forgot you, sorry. We do have a grade for you, apparently. We'll send that along.

VP Aird: I think there were two very relevant points that were brought up, one by VP Sobat and one by Councilor Douglas. First off, I did complete the survey but I felt very weird doing it because I don't ever work with some of the councilors and I don't know what they do outside council. That's part of your job too, talking to constituents, making sure you're representing them. There's a lot of work done outside of council, I only see what they do here. In terms of a mechanism not to punish you for voting, but some sort of accountability mechanism in terms of voting records, I think this underpins a conversation that should have happened a really long time ago actually, and it's not on you guys this year for the accountability committee but I think there should have been a process instigated towards actual accountability, to actually ensure that if people elect you, you're not just coming to council and voting for whatever you want, and that your vote does reflect in some measure the desires of your constituents and what it means to be in contact with them. People say sometimes, "I consulted my constituents," like what does that even mean? Did you talk to two people? Three people? Your friends? There is no real process in place, so that is a very relevant point that the committee should consider.

Councilor Sadikov: Regarding the councilors being held accountable to their constituencies, I don't think it's not the SSMU accountability committee's responsibility to ensure that accountability, I think that the faculty associations can take that on, if they wish to do so and can take steps to make sure that their representatives are following their mandates, I think all the information to do that is available to them. I believe there is some value in peer accountability, in



that train of thought I have a question for the accountability committee: do you feel that it might be helpful to have one or two councilors on the accountability committee, obviously not involved in discussion that concerns them personally, but to provide that perspective, because I feel like a lot of the things that have been brought up would have been brought up at the committee and would have made the evaluations better.

Speaker: There is a lot of concern in the accountability committee about how... I can tell you right not that the accountability committee did not want to do this survey. They were like, we don't think that its fair for executives to be evaluating councilors because a lot of executives are friends with some of the people in this room, there's conflict of interest obviously, and it was a very vague survey, like I put accountability in the survey, what does accountability even mean was a conversation we had. But we needed a baseline to start. To answer your question, I don't think that it would fair to have councilors sit on the accountability committee, but I do think it would be fair to have possibly a meeting where we bring the accountability committee and people that wish to come speak to the committee can do so and bring their suggestions, so kind of a middle ground.

Councilor Templer: I just want to respond to a few points, the first being the question of the accountability investigating whether councilors are upholding their mandate. There's a perception that many councilors are voting almost uniformly, and if I could just speak from experience of being on council last year, I think it's just because there have been a significantly fewer number of controversial motions that being put forward. A large number are either administrative or have been well crafted and well thought out, and those have garnered a great deal of support versus last year there were a number of motions that were a bit more controversial that provoked far more abstentions.

My other point that I wanted to respond to was regarding councilors on the accountability committee. Having been a councilor who was on that committee last year, I found I basically had to recuse myself from sort of all involvement when it came time to reviewing the performance of executives because for the exact same reasons that were mentioned: conflict of interest, I knew them too well, I was friends with them. So I believe having a meeting with councilors and the accountability committee, I think that would work better as a way to get councilor's thoughts on certain things that the committee is working on, as opposed to having councilors as members on the committee.

President Ger: I don't know if you can write down everything that everyone is saying, I guess to help facilitate the information that is being collected, you could just send out a form for feedback and suggestions.

Councilor Sadikov moves for a ten-minute recess. Motion passes 1:43:25



f. Services Review

Councilor Douglas gives the report.

g. Funding Committee (10)

VP Carolan gives the report.

Councilor Cleveland: How were these amounts determined and how did you decide whether or not they deserved the full amount, etc?

VP Carolan: So the criteria for all of the funds available are put into different groups. Each fund has a different mandate, so it really it depends on the fund, whether the applications are numerous, opposed to an operational expense for a student group. So generally the event will fall in line with one of the mandates of the funds, the most applied fund is the club fund, with the real only mandate being that you need to be a SSMU club and put on your events as a SSMU club. We generally will try, and especially this semester, to be as generous as possible with the dispersals. We can kind of see that for the most part we are giving out the full amount where available, because we have so many surpluses in most of the funds. If you want me to go through the mandates of each of the funds I can.

Councilor Cleveland: I noticed in the presentation you gave earlier regarding the Savoy Society, you also mentioned how much money is left in all these funds, are clubs aware of just how much money is being left on the table for them?

VP Carolan: Yeah, so all the funds are publicized through the website, however I do recognize we could do a better job at making these public, and we actually spoke about that in our last funding meeting, when we realized just how much money is available and under-applied for. So we want to publicize this more frequently through listserv and faculty councils, so I hope that will more strongly publicize the amounts.

h. Club Committee (5)

VP Patterson gives the report.

Councilor Sadikov: I'm just wondering about the clubs that collect membership fees, what's the process for that? Does it go through SSMU or do they just collect themselves?

VP Patterson: A lot of clubs actually have a membership fee of \$5 or less. Some tend to be more, for clubs like the Boxing Club, their membership fee was a lot more because they do purchase equipment that club members are invited to use, that would otherwise be extremely expensive



for members of the club to use. They do vary, but for the most part they are \$5 or under and they collected by the clubs, all SSMU clubs have a sub-bank account under our general bank account at ScotiaBank, so they usually collect as cash and then deposit it or something. They are audited then by the club auditor at the end of each semester.

i. Executive Committee (5)

16:23 President Ger: There really isn't too much. Prior to the meeting, there was an approval that was done on vibe for the creation of harmful military technology researcher, there was some questions about this so I'm happy to answer those now. We approved another position for a "students from care" researcher that arose out of the presentation that was give to us a few council's back, about the lack of resources that McGill current has. Hopefully that researcher can compile some kind of additional report with recommendations and that can be used for advocacy mandates for SSMU to push. Also there was a building auditor researcher that was approved.

Councilor Cleveland: How did you decided upon this creation of a harmful military technology researcher and also the hours that they're mandated?

President Ger: The name specifically as well as the mandate come from a policy that we do have for campaigning against harmful military technology. As well, the researcher will be sifting through a lot of documents received through the Access to Information Request made by Dean Mill specifically about the research that is going on at McGill. In terms of the 80 hours, there is quite a number of documents that are available, however that is merely a cap, if the researcher ends up not filling the entire 80 hours, then the money wouldn't be still allocated to that person.

Addition to discuss adding councilors to the committee regard judicial reform

President Ger: As was approved by the board of directors earlier this year, there will be a judicial board review committee that is going to be reviewing some of their internal procedures, which are slightly different from our internal regulations. There needs to be a lot of update and revamp, especially since we've on our own updated our own constitution and internal regulations and now there are some things that maybe are contradictory between the two. As well, there seems to be some confusion as to what exactly the judicial board does, how its procedures work. So we're hoping to clarify that a bit further. As well there are positions that are currently being held by the judicial board that we'd like to flush out more, for example the role of chief justice and things like that. It's mainly a regulatory review, but we do need councilors on that as well.

Councilor Anderson nominates herself. Councilor Sur nominates herself. Councilor Sgro nominates himself.



13. Councillor Reports

a. Councillor Madwar (2)

Councillor Madwar gives the report.

b. Councillor Sgro (2)

Councillor Sgro gives the report.

c. Councillor Zhou (2)

Councillor Zhou gives his report.

d. Councillor Jiang (2)

Councillor Jiang gives the report.

14. Executive Reports

a. VP Operations (5)

VP Magder gives the report.

Councillor Sur: A few weeks ago we had three men who were harassing women leaving the law library at night and there were a few incidents and so we contacted security so I just wanted to find out if security has any leads or if anything has happened after that.

VP Magder: Thank you so much for bringing that up. In response to that, the first thing that happened was that we called campus security ourselves, campus security apparently had received some formal complaints so they increased security in the area. Elaine was working with me as well. We spoke about this campus security, we spoke about this with SSMU security, so they took the actions they needed to increase security in the area. Apparently there were formal reports made to the police as well and what I've heard through the grapevine, it sounds like there was an investigation that was somewhat successful. In that sense at least, it was positive that there was more security done. Also trying to figure out if there's a way that we can get some floodlight put on the Doctor Penfield area to make that whole area more secure. As it stands right now, there's not a whole lot more that we can do, we're just going to have to hope that campus security and Montréal police do everything they can to patrol those areas and to follow up on those incidents. But if there are any other concerns that people know of that they would



like to bring to our attention, we absolutely like to help you guys make sure that they're addressed, we know that it can be difficult for people to find the right avenues to bring these things forward and if they feel like they are struggling to get momentum on these sorts of things, we would absolutely love to help push them forward.

Councilor Sur: Specifically the areas of Drummond and de la Montagne, those have been places where, not just a person walking, but someone who is in a car and yelling profanities to the women who are walking there. We have a group for all women in law, and a lot of women are walking home together or not staying in the library too long, which is not something that should be happening. So if you could create better avenues as well, maybe with WalkSafe and DriveSafe, that could be very helpful.

VP Magder: Absolutely and we're definitely taking that seriously, and if there's more that you think we could be doing, honestly I'd love to talk about it because that's something that is really awful to hear, I don't think it can underplay how disappoint it is that this is even a problem. I want to publically confirm, if there is anything we can do to help you or make it easier to address, I'd love to talk about it.

Councilor Templer: Just on the resolve from the Building Operations Management committee, it's really encouraging to see how quickly work is being done to institute those projects and that underway and try to get that done as quickly as possible, that's really encouraging. So thank you.

Councilor Cleveland: I was wondering if you might take a moment to discuss how you prioritize the projects that bomcom is doing, and whether that money and time might be better spent elsewhere.

VP Magder: I'll speak about the grading process briefly. I'll post the document that we have of the ratings that we did, but I'll explain briefly. So each project was rated on a set of criteria that was decided before we started evaluating any projects. So I can even pull this up for you right now, but some of the criteria were, for example, does this address any mandates that we currently have; will this project enhance accessibility or service those with restricted mobility; will this project fulfill legal or policy mandate; will this project create a student space or enhance existing student spaces; will this project improve sustainable practices at SSMU; will this project reduce building utility and material costs; will this project improve safety and security; will this project decrease administrative work for SSMU employees or departments; will this project generate revenue for SSMU; and will this project be effected by current or future construction.

Each criterion was given a certain percentage, three, two or one point weight. Each person on the committee, there were seven people who rated the projects and the totals were added up and the projects were ranked based on the average total of what every single person ranked them, and to make it more fair I took out the top and the bottom rating and cut them out, so I took the average of the middle. So anybody who is biased or heavily pushing on project, their



rating wouldn't be effective on the average. Once those ratings were taken, then we discussed each project individually. So for example, the mirrors were the highest rated project, so that was an easy approval, but then when it came down to the ballroom projector versus the student lounge space, we discussed as a committee which one reflected more accurately the mandate of the space fee.

Councilor Cleveland: Were all the people sitting on this committee aware of what the eventual cost of these projects would be, was it taken into consideration the fact that like adding wheelchair accessible mirror is like \$500, which seems like pretty tiny in comparison to the \$22,000 you are spending on this mounted projector?

VP Magder: We approved the highest rated projects first, so the projects of the bathroom mirrors and the door renovation were the top two rated projects, so we approved those projects before any of the other projects. After those initial approvals, the others were all in the \$5000-\$6000 range, so we decided to look at the bigger picture and then came back to it. That came into it as well; so if we had approved the student lounge space over the ballroom projector, a number of those higher rated projects that weren't worth as much would not have been allowed to be approved as well, because we wouldn't have had the funding. So other than the top couple projects, which were pretty unanimous, the remaining projects we had to think of as a package deal, because you either pick one big project or a number of smaller projects that are collectively less popular, and that's where the decision becomes controversial. But in the end we decided on the ballroom projector, which was actually rated higher than the student lounge.

b. President (5)

President Ger motions to push his report until the end of the executive reports, seconded by Councilor Templer. Motion passes

c. VP External Affairs (5)

VP Aird gives his report.

Councilor Douglas: When you mean getting in contact with floor fellows about possible retroactive pay, do you mean to get them on board with fighting for retroactive pay or do you mean to actually get that pay?

VP Aird: Both.

Councilor Douglas: So when I reach out to past floor fellows, what should I say?



VP Aird: You should say that there is an initiative going on to make that happen and it does require some people, so if they are able to help that would be great, but otherwise they should at the very least be made aware that this is something that is happening.

VP Sobat: I don't think they need anyone to campaign, but it's a possibility of pay coming out of the pay equity exercise that the government mandated in the last cabinet of 2010. So it goes back to 2010 now, so most floor fellows from 2010 won't know what you're talking about otherwise.

Councilor Chin: Related to the floor fellow issue, is that part of this tentative agreement or is this an issue that is separate from that?

VP Aird: No, it's separate.

Councilor Chin: Couronnement, la soiree de francophone, est-que ca va etre?

VP Aird: Oui.

Councilor Sadikov: Regarding the accessible education policy, what is the timeline that I can anticipate on that? I'm asking because maybe it would be cool to bring to the GA.

VP Aird: That's a definite possibility, yeah. December is not that busy and I was planning on working on it in the coming weeks, but there is some research required to actually come up with the good policy we want, something resembling the type of work for instance the climate change policy last semester. Yeah, some consultation work, some research work and some drafting work, all of which can be certainly done before the next GA.

President Ger: I was wondering if you wanted to elaborate on some of the MCC stuff – who they are, who sits around that table, maybe some the projects that they're doing, they're priorities as intersecting with SSMU?

VP Aird: MCC is a group that kind of overlaps with the inter-union council, so there are a lot of unions on it that come together to deal with problems that effect the whole McGill community, these are typically governance issues, problems with the administration. Basically this is a group of people that first came together, if I'm not mistaken, after what happened in 2012, that was called "Six Floors", which was a huge problematic event that happened with students that was a big deal. After that, unions and students came together to form the McGill Communities Council to try to avoid this in the future. Typically we just meet alone, but once a year we meet with the principal and once a year we meet with the provost.



Councilor Cleveland: I was wondering if previously SSMU council has shown solidarity and support for this campaign for the deregulation of international fees?

VP Aird: We get that mandate out of our accessible education policy, we get a lot of stuff out of that policy, which is the reason I'm working so hard to make it more comprehensive. It is typically one of the things we work against in our anti-austerity effects, we're typically opposed to the deregulation to the international student fees in order to just make money for the university, that's problematic in several ways. We think that having lots of international students on this campus is a privilege and we don't want to see it eroded and we don't want to make it accessible to only the people who can afford to pay, say, \$25,000.

Councilor Cleveland: Would it make sense, during this campaign, to put forward a document showing our support for this? I don't know if that would be appropriate for a motion going forward?

VP Aird: There's no absolute rush, this is an ongoing annual campaign, or at least one that will be ongoing for a while. We could come forward with a motion of explicit support by probably by next council in January.

President Ger: I'm pretty sure last year there was a motion to have SSMU take a stance against deregulated tuition. I'm not sure if at this point the motion would have expired, but we can follow up and check.

d. VP University Affairs (5)

VP Sobat gives the report.

e. VP Internal (5)

VP Lawrie gives the report.

Councilor Douglas: I was just wondering if you know how many people filled out the survey? Because you said these were the best stats for Frosh.

VP Lawrie: They had a total of 1,166 people fill out this survey.

Councilor Cleveland: When you say best stats for frosh, does that mean the number of students doing frosh or how well they received frosh?

VP Lawrie: When I say best stats for frosh, it's like a general in all respects. For example, for leader feedback, 91% of people thought that they were included in their groups, included by their



leaders, which is the highest its ever been. The whole reason I'm saying this is the best its ever been, the point is that we're comparing back to 2012, when everyone was unhappy with frosh, just a horrible experience for everyone. We've improved so much, even just compared to last year, how people are feeling as far as frosh. It could be that we're surveying more effectively, or it could be that frosh has improved.

Councilor Templer: As someone who came in and did Frosh in 2012, I can definitely agree with that, Frosh has gotten a lot better. Regarding the consent video, there was a lot of positive feedback but was there any comments on how to improve or anything like that?

VP Lawrie: That will be address next semester in our internal meetings, when all the VP internals from the faculties come together to discuss how things went during frosh and as we start planning for frosh 2017, that is something that will be addressed. I know certain faculties did have problems with how it was mandatory, but those will be discussed later as we approach the next Frosh.

Councilor Sur: I think would be really helpful, because there were quite a few students in the law faculty that are involved in drafting policies for sexual assault and they had quite a lot of things to say about the video, so I think that feedback would be really helpful for you.

f. VP Student Life (5)

VP Patterson gives the report.

Councilor Templer: My question is regarding the role of the Mental Health Commissioner; I was wondering if they either have done or were looking into any way to raise awareness about the mental health coverage, part of the SSMU fund, and how that's available to students?

VP Patterson: That honestly hadn't even crossed my mind and I don't think it's crossed their mind either, so I'll bring that back to them.

g. VP Finance (5)

VP Carolan gives the report.

Councilor Cleveland: What was the \$31,000 deficit you were expecting?

VP Carolan: Over Q1, the reason why our deficit will always be unfortunately like this, is because our first quarter only runs from June 1st to August 31st, so we only have five days of sales to recapture two or three months worth of overhead that we're paying our SLC manager, the kitchen manager, they use salary. And they do a lot of work like menu creation and stuff over the



summer that's like valuable, but we only have those five days to recapture that, which is why we'll see a deficit, but it's considerably less of a deficit than there was last year and we've been managing to chip away at that as well.

h. President (5)

President Ger gives the report.

Councilor Chin: It's regarding the conflict of interest policy, I realize that there is mention for changed to reflect a more pragmatic procedures and to reflect conceptual and ideological mandates, can you give more concrete examples of that and how do you see it changing from the current practice?

President Ger: It was actually moving away from these conceptual ideas of what conflict of interest means and more into this procedural document. The reason why this was decided was, a little bit of back story, the conflict of interest policy arose out of a situation in which an executive took some actions that were considered to be a conflict of interest, there wasn't a policy that anyone could point to at that time and as such the executive, although there were some terrible team dynamics that arose, stayed in office, so a policy was passed to fix that situation. However, there was a misunderstanding by the executives at the time, as the policy was written poorly; additionally conflict of interest are already defined in the company's act, so there's no need to have a second document internally defining conflict of interest. What's more important is that we have a procedural document defining how people can actually declare conflict of interest, how those forms work, how developing those forms so that people can actually submit if they have a conflict of interest or feel that someone else does, actually developing the practice itself. A lot of the policy right now is devoted to listing the examples of what conflict of interest could look like. That is not really within the scope of a policy to list example, it's more supposed to be a conceptual document, but it's just repeating efforts that were already mandated to not act in areas by which we have conflict according to the company's act.

15. Confidential session

The Council moved into confidential session.



Students' Society of McGill University
Tel: (514) 398-6300 Fax: (514) 398-7490 | ssmu.ca
3606 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G2
Établi et enregistré, sous le statut de corporation sans but lucratif

16. Adjournment

Council adjourned.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Muna Tojiboeva". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-08-09

APPROVED