

1) **Call to Order**

Called to order at 7:37 pm.

2) Approval of the Minutes

a. April 25, 2013

Motion to approve all minutes by VP Harris

Seconded by Councillor Southey

All minutes adopted

Councillor Lubendo: Why confidential session and not normal?

Speaker: because they are confidential minutes

b. September 26, 2013

c. October 10, 2013

d. November 7, 2013

3) Adoption of the Agenda

Motion to adopt agenda by Councillor Lubendo

Seconded by President Larson

Adopted

4) New Business

a. Equity Committee Recommendations

Justin: Equity concluded first complaints review, process for formal complaints clearly outlined strict timeline outlines scope of policy and what community members are expected to do. We present it to council for your approval. Need 2/3 to approve it. Responsibility of council to submit report (why not approved if not approved).

This complaint filed on Oct 30th: image sent out on list serv and claimant believed inappropriate: 3rd paragraph important. Leaders within SSMU have a greater responsibility in creating and fostering safer spaces. Section 3.1 of SSMU equity policy applies to this scope. First established that and made sure jurisdiction to investigate.

Important to understand that respondent didn't have malicious intent. A lot of the time it's through subtle comments or acts that reflect larger problems in society. Good example. People are of colour are marginalized and butt of jokes so images on list servs is not good. As per assessment: we propose the remedies outlined in the report.

1. More workshops to make sure you don't have to check each list serv make sure people understand greater issues. Council will be notified of remedies

President Larson: question about the recommendations first recommendation is good but 2nd and third, in sect 5.3 of equity policy possible repercussions, training of employee, HR on that matter? Appropriate?

Justin: In amendment it is policy 3.3

Councillor Bissky Diadzyk: so with regards to..

Speaker: I will explain voting procedure when questions exhausted and guest is excused

Justin: Old policy that you were looking at. I cross referenced 5.3 from old one, it's exactly the same thing.

President Larson: No but other questions can go first because I want to find the policy.

VP Hofmeister: Can the image be displayed please?

Speaker: ok

[video shown source of image]

President Larson: I found it 11.4.

Speaker: no 11.4, search term?

Larson: remedies

Justin: 9.3?

Speaker: ok

Larson: the first one is ok, the other 2 though are not here not prescribed action, talked to anybody in HR?

Justin: part of policy is that we don't want revealing information about respondents. Depending on clubs and services no money involved but in SSMU staff, at top it prescribes everything to SSMU

VP Shea: we also to protect the confidentiality of person in question

Justin: the resolution the details of applying resolution can be separate from whether or not council approves resolution. If you feel right, we can implement them.

Councillor Lubendo: looking from video, it is problematic that issue is black man, issue wouldn't have existed if it was a white woman, if public was to be given the information on the apology, you'd be focused on a negative thing. Really going to back fire, Obama is not just a black man, I understand they were hurt, but this is overboard given what intentions were.

Justin: Starting point that respondents, complaints process there to voice issues with SSMU. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This group came to express discomfort.

VP Hofmeister: clarification when received complaints multiple complaints, separately or together?

Justin: separately

Councillor Benrimoh: has respondent been informed of specifics regarding findings and remedies?

Justin: moment of received complaint, both parties get to choose whether informal or formal resolution. After each person submits what they want to say, but in policy when respondent is invited to share complaint. There is a timeline, after that they can respond but justification why late. Respondent forfeited right to respond because both deadlines were not observed.

Councillor Benrimoh: So they didn't meet with the respondent?

Justin: No. We asked after 2 weeks, multiple emails, they waived right to take part in process

Councillor Ayukawa: context of why you're here?

Justin: policy takes precedence so equity committee is separate from equity commissioner.

Speaker: To answer Councillor Bissky Dziadyk's question: Section 9.4 all recommendations have to be ratified by council if council by vote of 2/3 abstains from ratifying, the J board gets to way in and justification must be made for this.

Councillor Lubendo: what would happen if there is no j board?

Speaker: very soon!

Councillor Ibrahim: can the recommendations be on vibe

Speaker: it is

Councillor Bissky Dziadyk: 2/3 abstain = j board, 50% needed to pass, 50% needed to fail

Speaker: yes default because not specified. Inferred.

President Larson: according to new constitution unless specified it's 50/50

Councillor Southey: disagree with interpretation, 2/3 is not constitution

Speaker: not the way that's broken down. Constitution supersedes all other policies. Council retains right to pass or reject. Open floor for debate or comments.

VP Shea: note that the respondent came to the equity committee before the complaint was filed in concern over... what I'm trying to say is it was just due to time constraints that there was no response. The individual did seek guidance from equity before complaint filed.

Councillor Stewart Kanigan: equity communication is aware of that. Would like to speak in favour of upholding remedies, creating more proactive to prevent, very much in favour of that, I'm sure Shea was taken into consideration with equity.

Councillor Southey: wondering to VP Shea: what time of time constraints would prevent someone from responding?

Speaker: you don't have to answer, because not speaking for yourself

VP Shea: major event. Reason why I said that before is because it couldn't be included in report but it should have been

Councillor Ibrahim: the fact that the respondent brought it to us, we need to respond. Motion is a big deal in recommendations all in spirit encouraging safer space although one might debate whether or not complaint was valid or considered with other complaints us as a council need to respect the fact that affected person I think we need to really support this.

Councillor Benrimoh: are we allowed to amend?

Speaker: accept reject or abstain, not amendments.

Councillor Southey: rejected, it goes to J-board?

Speaker: no, back to equity. You could decide to send it back and write concerns

Councillor Benrimoh: I know we can't amend it but I was thinking that it might be helpful because issue that comes up a lot, maybe more effective if part of recommendations was that council were to have presentation on these issues, it would be useful for all of us to know about instead of one person, just benefitting all of us and more positive.

Councillor Lubendo: love to amend, I speak against it, really backwards, the problem isn't the action it's who's doing it. I kicked down the door, Katie Larson kicked door, by sending back issue, its Barack Obama no one thinks he's violent, apology for person, but this is overstepping it, singling out every black man out there, the video is just the kicking. It is wrong that black man is kicking door, the message should be kicking door is bad and race issue/gender not good.

Councillor Rioux: I agree with Lubendo, whether something is offensive to someone not for us to determine, should be apology, however, the other recommendations 2 and 3 considering incident I don't think that should be implemented, the only reason that Barack Obama is chosen for these things is same as Stephen Harper, more harm than good.

President Larson: regardless of my interpretation of validity I would like to speak that options 2 and 3 are not appropriate for situation itself, far beyond. One of the issues was that not responded to, so clearly #1 not only will help talk about it but directly part of complaint. 2 and 3 are not appropriate for this committee to enforce. Not correct or appropriate to staff member.

Councillor Baraldi: 2 and 3rd points regardless situation still feel good for council as a whole because open communication channel, generally goes with fostering safer space.

Councillor Ayukawa: in favour of motion because for me if for me the person who made this complaint could be any one of my constituents, I would feel like I should validate that. Validation is important for people and for people who may have had those thoughts, knowledge and education in this, I don't and may have laughed so we should trust them

Councillor Benrimoh: HR stuff, if passed and HR would void it?

VP Shea: Inappropriate confidentiality of respondent.

Councillor Southey: favour of this motion mainly about education also point that by apology would bring up issue, the fact that hyper aggressive black male in media and perpetuated in email and sent out in list serv, sending out an apology would be great opportunity for micro aggressions, beneficial and great opportunity for education

Councillor Giannakakis: Did the equity ask complainants what would be appropriate?

VP Shea: part of process they were interviewed I wasn't there but those questions asked

VP Shea: speak to President Larson's point about recommendations 2 and 3 not appropriate. Obviously SSMU equity complaint over SSMU member, not inappropriate to mandate training to own members. Cannot speak against education, education is positive, SSMU critiqued for being negative and policing. I think that it's a weird inverse and trying to policing of equity rather than education.

Councillor Lubendo: apology can exist, nobody saying no apology, micro aggression: most people are not going to see this as an issue, but this RAISES an issue. Barack Obama is being objectified as black male, as for education not bad just passed motion where everyone gets education, you're opening a Pandora's box because all you need is apologize, as Rioux said, looking into something not necessarily there. Overstepping ground, apologize and it'll be done. Anything beyond that is overstepping.

President Larson: to respond to what Shea said, make this recommendation back to equity specifically when and how sent so not to reveal people involved.

Councillor Benrimoh: apology: situation where you can't please everybody issue of bringing up vs addressing what happened, problem is that micro aggression exist and happen sometimes you have to bring up to address them can't pretend don't exist, still there are people who have seen it that way small negative, bigger long term. We can work towards stopping that in future

Councillor Ibrahim: emphasize speaking from privilege just because majority doesn't mean one person not valid, need to respect that and apologize to them ,above and beyond not enough, make sure understand we respect what happened, public way is necessary so that that one person doesn't feel excluded.

Councillor Lubendo: you can just sit down with person and explained what happened and enough. More and more bureaucracy, just pushing the limits to point of inefficiency. Like black face at 4floors. Who wouldn't understand that?

Councillor Stewart Kanigan: equity committees before sometimes more workshops not enough people have defensive mindset, who wouldn't get it? A lot of people, one time thing is not enough. Might not totally undo this issue, very small time commitment per month, one time intervention inadequate.

Councillor Ibrahim: idea one person vs masses doesn't cut, micro aggressions exist cannot assume only person we have to speak form that person

Motion to call to question VP Shea

Seconded by VP Hofmeister

Approved

Motion to secret ballot by Councillor Bissky Dziadyk

Motion to roll call vote Southey

Speaker: I wouldn't suggest roll call vote, up to you guys. Two things motion to secret ballot has to be voted on, even still roll call vote because opinion can be taken out of context in minutes. Unless majority feels that way.

Motion by secret ballot by Councillor Bissky Dziadyk

Parliamentarian: raise a few points – why secret ballot. Call for secret ballot is sketchy in a sense, putting anything in secret ballot brings up why? But it's because of judgment in room or public vote is problem. Issue is contentious, I think taking this into context I think you guys might want to think on why you don't feel comfortable making this public. Recognize that something in secret ballot is very rarely done, reflect on roles as councillors. Reasons to do it or not to.

6 for secret ballot

No secret ballot.

Speaker: just regular vote

All in favour of adopting equity committees recommendations = 9

5 opposed

5 abstaining

Recommendations adopted.

Councillor Lubendo: is the response is it necessary needs to happen as quickly as possible. Given that barely quorum?

Speaker: in order to do that you had to table, before voting procedure.

Councillor Lubendo: moment of silence for Nelson

5) Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Councillor Benrimoh

Seconded by VP Shea

Adjourned at 8:31 pm