



# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

OCTOBER 20, 2016

Attendance:

Observers:

Absence:

## 1. Call to Order

Speaker calls the meeting to order.

## 2. Land Acknowledgement

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

## 4. Approval of the Minutes

No minutes to approve at this time.

## 5. Adoption of the Agenda

VP Patterson motions to add a Motion Regarding Radio CKUT Existence Referendum Question. Motion passes.

VP Carolan motions to add a Motion to Approve the Audited 2015-2016 Financial Statements. Motion passes

VP Sobat motions to add a presentation. Motion passes

VP Patterson motions to move a Mental Health presentation down to the committee reports. Motion passes.



Motion to adopt the agenda by Councilor Zhou, seconded by Councilor Junejo. Motion passes.

## 6. Guest Speakers

### a. Malcolm McClintock, Library Improvement Fund Commissioner

Malcolm: Hi, I'm Malcolm McClintock, I go by he or they, I used to be on SSMU Councilor last year, so I'll try to keep this quick. I'm here to talk about the libraries in general, I'm the Library Improvement Fund Commissioner, which means that I sit on the Library Improvement Fund, which is a fund hosted by SSMU that is about \$700,000 per year that goes towards student projects. I'd also like to talk to you about the Fiat Lux, which is a new library project that the libraries at McGill are going towards to replace Redpath and McLennan. About me: I sit on three different committees, one is the Library Improvement Fund committee I also sit on the Library senate, I have a direct voice with them. We talk about ongoing projects, different consultations, and things to that degree. I also sit on the Friends of the Library Committee, who support the library through fundraising.

So first about Fiat Lux, it's a huge project that McGill is going to pursue, it's around a lump sum of 200 million dollars. The funds still need to be raised, there are a lot of things in motion, but you should have this on your radar because this is a project that they are putting into effect over the next ten years. It affects all of us and it solves quite a few problems, because it allows us to rebuild from the ground up and solve quite a few issues. There's some rendering they have out: they're focusing primarily on space and group study, transforming space, as was brought up in the last meeting by the deputy provost, space is an issue across campus right now and one of the goals is to make lots of different spaces available for all interest groups of all faculties, transforming databases into more of a learning commons. The difference between a library and learning commons is that libraries are more of a space to study, while learning commons are more group oriented. Another big aspect of the library proposed is a robotic storage center, which would be housed under lower field. So that means moving a lot of the collections underground in order to make these spaces, the space doesn't exist yet, it would require moving quite a lot of collections.

Just some quick facts: there's some statistics about why people use the library space in general, as well as on the left hand, there's space allocation. About 51% is collections, which is a lot considering most of you probably don't take books out that often. There's a lot of statistics that say that like 30% of the books haven't been checked out in over 20 years. So there's a lot that needs to be updated and revised, and that's what this project is leaning towards.

Proposed changes: just some digits on the current allocation of space and what it will be. As you can see, the space nearly doubles for students and more specifics about user seating nearly doubles. There's a lot of documentation online, which I highly recommend for you to look into. It might not be for our generation of students and it might not be for the next generation of students, but if we put it our voice about what we want to see in our libraries, it can be heard. There's so much going on right now in terms of planning, and it's so important for students to be heard.



More specifically I'm here to talk about the Library Improvement Fund, which is near and dear to my heart and position. I'm going to go over briefly what the fund is, how you can get involved, and why it is so important. As you may or may not know, working with McGill can be slow. With this fund, again \$700,000, which is \$8.50 per student per term, matched by alumni, so we actually only put in \$350,000. It happens every year, and every year we allocate it to stuff like extended hours and student employment, and new projects like the new phone charging machine in Redpath. It was just an idea that was had and now we're going to put them on every floor.

We do a lot of consultation. A big part of the library improvement fund committee is reaching out to students and getting ideas for what they want to see in the libraries. If you have even the slightest inkling of an idea, please let us know. We're also going to be submitting a campus wide survey to find out why students use the library, why they don't use the library, what they'd like to see, different resources that they know or don't know are available to them, and things to that degree. Just so that we can better put this money forward.

Something that the committee does struggle with once in a while is why students are putting their money forward for things that the library should be providing for us, and we do have these negotiations consistently with the Dean of Libraries to try and make that point heard. Last year, we didn't allocate any more money towards student employment because it wasn't clear as to where this money would be going, how many positions, and things to that degree. That was remedied, we put the excess of the fund towards it this summer, but there is a little bit of politics in that regard.

These are the questions that we ended up funding last year, I believe they're available on the SSMU website, but some things that are very important: I don't know if you've been on the fourth or fifth floor of Schulich, but there is a lot more space now and that is because of this fund. 24 hour access right now is because of this fund: our money is going towards making sure we have this space available to us, where McGill might not otherwise be able to afford it. So when we get proposals, we evaluate them on certain criteria to make sure they cover all the bases and make sure that they are available to everyone, making sure that everything gets taken into consideration. Yes, it is a large fund but that doesn't mean we can just throw it around, so I just wanted to reiterate it is very thorough, the way that we evaluate these proposals. We do take into consideration the technological relevance, whether or not it meets all criteria, whether or not it's relevant to all students or just a small sector. We're going to be evaluating two times during this semester, one mid-November and once again in March. So if you have proposals, get them in soon.

Things that we're focusing on this year: last year we funded the position of the open educational resource researcher, whose job is to try to find more resources available to everyone over the web, because that is a general trend of educational resources right now. That is external to the committee itself, but was provided by the Library Improvement Fund. We also provide amenities so when you're spending all that time in the library it's enjoyable; the chargers, vending machines, things like that. We are looking into specifically more space diversity, making sure the libraries are relevant to everyone. On our timeline, we're halfway through our gathering ideas period.

That's all I have today. Feel free to ask me questions about the libraries and the fund!



Councilor Mansdoerfer: I saw something about cutting down on security cameras, what's the reasoning for that?

Malcolm: There are a lot of studies that show security cameras don't actually keep people safer. There's also an idea that when you're in the library, privacy is rather important and we don't want to encourage a policing presence. And we decided that the actual benefit of the one person who may be in view of the camera, not to mention that security wasn't really on board – it didn't really line up.

Councilor Century: You said that the library improvement fund helps the libraries stay open 24 hours, I was just wondering how long would they be open without the fund, how much does the fund add to it? Specifically in regards to the music library.

Malcolm: with the music library, I believe we only fund the weekend hours right now, so you can access it on Saturdays. I would estimate that on an annual basis we probably do about 10,000 hours across campus, maybe 20,000. I can't speak to the music library off the top of my head but I do have those numbers written down and can get them to you.

VP Carolan: Wanted to know if you could provide some more information about the struggle in terms of financial transparency when working with the libraries, because I understand that there isn't a great deal of information that they provide for you, especially in terms of their general operation budget. I understand that maybe they provide you a small snapshot of what pertains specifically to the library improvement fund, but obviously it's important to get an idea of the bigger picture in terms of what you're funding and what they're making us spend our money on.

Malcolm: Certainly. So a lot of the way it operates right now or in the years past, is when we have a proposal idea we ask different librarians, "Is this feasible? How can we do these things?" But you're right: in large scale we don't get a general idea of what the library is putting forward in terms of services already. We don't know how much we're adding on or how much they already have. However Erin and I have been working towards getting more concrete numbers through Colleen, she's the Dean of Libraries, to try and get a better idea of how much we as students are contributing to things that should be facilitated by the libraries themselves. But right now we don't have any data whatsoever; we have guesstimates, I believe there's like 16 million in collections and 16 million in staff, and 4 million in other. That's pretty much all we know, and those are round numbers.

VP Carolan: So is there anything that we as student representatives or even just as general students, that we can do to urge McGill or the admin on the importance of this? Because I understand that there's a lot of work that gets done through the Library Improvement Fund, but if there's any support that we can provide outside of that, I'd like to know.



Malcolm: Specifically about budget transparency, I don't know if there's much that students can do. In terms of the Library Improvement Fund and our negotiations with the libraries, the more fact, the numbers, the more understanding we have of what students need. That's how we're going to fully negotiate; if we can back saying "student aren't supported by this, they don't feel that they have a proper nutrition" or so on and so forth, that's when we can actually provide this to the librarian to prove that we need things.

Councilor Chin: In terms of student involvement, what kinds of appointments or positions are available with the Library Improvement Fund?

Malcolm: A lot of the positions that we fund go through the work-study program through the library. It's positions like collections moving from library to library, storage and research projects. Really just support across the libraries.

Councilor Segal: So you said security cameras don't help with theft, so what are you doing to help with theft because I know it goes on a lot in the libraries?

Malcolm: I don't have any data on that right now. I mean, there's posters everywhere, there's signs everywhere; we have had a proposal made and not fully developed about potentially having computer safety locks that you can put in, having that available tied to desk to that when you go to the washroom or something like that, you can have your laptop safe without someone there. That's just a proposal; in terms of actual library security, in terms of McGill security, that would be a bit more administrative. However if you have any suggestions, I could push that forward.

VP Sobat: We haven't had a recent conversation with McGill security about the libraries, but certainly in past years we have raised the concern because a lot of students bring it up. McGill security does monitor the situation in the libraries and they have in the past put more resources and agents towards problem area, and if there have been reoccurring thefts they will be able to catch people. So if there are thefts, you should report them. Something the fund was able to implement last year was barcode scanners for afterhours access to cut down on signing people in at the door, and spending more time patrolling. But if you have specific issues, please let us know.

Councilor Chen: I'm wondering if you can clarify for us, on the proposals how much do you expect students to provide? For example, we hear sometimes, "Oh it would be great to have this," but do they need to go find out exact costs or give you an implementation plan?

Malcolm: So there's two basic ways you can submit an idea; one, on the website, is a basic just two line "what do you think would be cool to have or could improve the library"? But there's also a full fledged



evaluation proposal form in which you can fill out more details about monetary values, if you happen to have the statistics and you really want it to happen, here's the numbers for it, if you happen to have those kind of details. In general, this year we're encouraging committee members to pick up an idea that's been prevalent or something that they're passionate about, and turn it into a proposal. So maybe, like I suggested, standing desks. We do have committee members who can turn that into actionable, "we're going to get twelve standing desks on the third floor of Schulich" or something to that degree.

Councilor Prillo: My question is, the Library Improvement Fund, you guys do have jurisdiction and try to spearhead projects for – because I come from the faculty of medicine, so like smaller libraries within our building? Could our students submit proposals to you guys?

Malcolm: So like I said, one of the things we do evaluate is how many students it will affect; specifically something like that might be a little bit too nuanced. It really depends on the cost-benefit analysis, like what you guys are actually asking for. In general when it comes to like departmental specific, it's a little bit harder for us to put the funds towards that, but I suppose it's possible depended what you're thinking about.

Erin: Specifically it's only libraries under the McGill Library system, so there are a couple that are like department administered that don't qualify. I think the only medicine library that would qualify would be the Osler space.

## 7. Question Period (5)

Councilor Sadikov: I have a question for the President; it pertains to the Board of Directors. It's my understanding that the Board of Directors has started a committee to review the structure and function of the judicial board. To me, that's a governance issue and not so much a governance issue, so I'm wondering why this was not brought to council.

President Ger: The committee was just struck last week so I didn't want to throw it on the agenda right away, but there actually are councilor seats on the committee, just so that we do have that link. However it is the feeling that considering that the judicial board is also a quasi-legal body, that this would be something that fits underneath the Board of the Directors.

Councilor Century: So last week we all heard AMUSE come by and say that there might be a strike vote and I found out yesterday that tonight, they're having a strike vote. I just wanted to know if anyone else was aware of this. Yes? Okay, good.



VP Aird: Yeah, they're having their general assembly right now; it's not open to non-members. Last I heard, they were either very close or at quorum. I'll contact their president to find out if their strike vote passed. And if it did, in any case, I'll be trying to support them in their negotiations with the administration in any capacity I can, but I can let people know.

Councilor Century: Also what the consequences of the strike vote are, please.

Councilor Chin: I just have a follow-up to Councilor Sadikov's question. With regards to the j-board, will that ever be brought up to council for discussion and ratification?

President Ger: There currently is no double approval included in the committee. However, if that is something that is of interest to council; that certainly can be mandated and explored.

## 8. Report of the Steering Committee (5)

President: There were changes that were made in terms of wording of some of the motions, as well as a reduction that was made in regards to the amount of the fee that was going to be made forwards to the student body for the bulk purchasing of menstrual hygiene products to be dispersed throughout campus. We went back and changed the amount to accommodate for how council was feeling. We can go into that a little bit later on. Mostly just wording changes.

## 9. Announcements (5)

Councilor Lawrie: Four Floors is coming! Buy tickets.

VP Aird: AVEQ mobilization camp is this weekend! Should be very interesting and useful to you as councilors.

## 11. New Business

### a. Motion Regarding Support for the Radio CKUT Existence Referendum Question

Tamara (Arts and Culture Coordinator at CKUT): Hi, I'm Tamara, I'm the Arts and Culture Coordinator at CKUT, I'm also the chair of the Yes committee for our existence referendum that's ongoing right now. The vote starts tomorrow. An existence referendum is not a new fee, it's not a new fee increase, it's something that most fee-based services at McGill have to do every five years to reaffirm the existing funding that they're getting from students. We do it even though our funding is opt-outable; every student has the



chance to opt-out in the beginning of the semester. So we need SSMU's support for the Yes vote, because what's on the line is not just more than half of our operating funding, it's also the lease on the building we occupy and it's also the type of our license. So our license with CRTC as a campus community radio station, so if a no vote happens then we will lose the campus part and we will have to go off the fm dial, which is damn scary because we have existed as a student-initiated and student-run organization for over thirty years and losing this one would be a huge loss for McGill campus and also for Montreal as a whole. Because the SSMU mandate is very similar to the CKUT mandate, we thought it made sense to present this motion, to ask SSMU to endorse a yes vote in our current existence referendum. We definitely need your support in winning this.

Councilor Sadikov, VP Aird and Councilor Thomas become movers on this motion.

Councilor Chin: Are the services provided by CKUT also available to graduate students? Are you also asking the PGSS?

Tamara: Yes, absolutely. We're doing this at the same time right now, I was just at their general meeting yesterday, trying to do the same thing. Any student who is on downtown campus and not continuing education or postdoc is members with us.

Tamara: Can I add one thing? So there is a precedent with this kind of motion with SSMU, they voted in support of a yes vote in 2012 and I just wanted to mention that. Thanks so much.

Councilor Chin motions to move to question, seconded by VP Patterson. This motion carries.

## **b. Motion Regarding Midnight Kitchen Existence Referendum Question**

Anastasia (Staffer at Midnight Kitchen): So this is sort of the same thing as CKUT, we need to run an existence referendum so we're doing that. You all know what Midnight Kitchen does, we give out lunch from Monday through Thursday. There's nothing particularly new about the referendum, we have to include a clause about our discretionary funding, which we were doing in the past but we had it suspended because it wasn't explicitly written in our referendum. So we're adding a little clause about discretionary funding, basically we get \$500 a month that sort of give out to people who apply for who need funding for various reasons for projects around campus. We're also making sure that we remain indexed to inflation as we have been in the past three years, because most of the fee goes to paying wages as well as buying food, both of which change drastically due to inflation, so we need to make sure that we can continue affording them. That's pretty much it; it's just a standard existence referendum.



Kaim (Member of Midnight Kitchen): Just to clarify, we're not asking for any type of support, we're just asking to be put on the ballot to let SSMU members decide if we still need to exist.

Councilor Junejo: So I just pulled up your budget, Index A, and it shows that you've been getting a lot of surplus over the past years. There was \$1084 in 2014, going up to \$17,923, and going on to 2016 it became \$30,007. So if you guys are getting so much surplus, why would you want a fee increase?

Anastasia: This isn't a fee increase. It's an existence referendum; we're going to maintain the same fee.

Kaim: I'm just going to say that while we are prepared to answer financial questions, at the same time we don't want to devote that much time to do so because if you have concerns as SSMU members, you can take that out if we do get put on the ballot as a question. There will be a campaign period for which there can be a no committee formed, and all of that. So I don't know if the answers to any of this should or would effect whether or not we get put forward as a question.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: So based off the budget, there's \$23,000 increase in fee revenue; I see a \$19,000 increase for salaries, \$15,000 come from a stipend that isn't included in this year's budget, can you guys explain why there is a 4 or 5 thousand dollar increase in salaries and a two thousand dollar increase in benefits?

Kaim: I've been volunteering with MK for four years, not as a paid position, and I haven't seen when we were less adequately staffed in the past. There is more likely to have concerns about hygiene or safety. Now in terms of having a single fulltime coordinator on in every hour that the kitchen is open as really increased the safety and desirability of our service, as well as made us run much more efficiently. At the same time, the only people that we can really get to be in the kitchen for 8 or 9 hours in a single day are paid people, so we haven't been able to get volunteers interested in doing that, so we've had to increase the number of hours worked by staff as opposed to volunteers simply because there was no one volunteering to do these jobs. But we need to keep expanding our service and we've done that, we now do three additional servings per week.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: That's for that answer. Just in regards to the motion itself, the be-it-resolved clause, which says that 20% of your fee be dedicated to discretionary funding, there's an issue with discretionary funding in that it is discretionary and that creates an issue. Students aren't really aware of what exactly their money is going to, it could change year by year depending on who is running Midnight Kitchen and what their desires are with it. So as a student I think it's hard to say, hey 20%, you're going to 20 thousand dollars towards whatever that executive team wants per year, which is kind of an issue. And based off of that, 20% of your fee budget is discretionary funding, how is that accounted for right now in your budget? You have currently budgeted all the allotted money for this current year, so I don't know where you're pulling that 20 thousand dollars from that you would get for discretionary funding.



Anastasia: So Midnight Kitchen as a political mandate and that mandate has always been available online and it's always been a part of how we decide how we're going to be doing solidarity servings for, as well as how we operate our day to day. Our discretionary funding falls under that same political mandate, and all that discretionary funding is also approved by SSMU, which also has a yearly exec turnover and changes year to year based on how you want to interpret things.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: Where do you pull that \$20,000 from? You've already decided your budget for next year and have 20 thousand for discretionary funding, what do you pull from your budget?

Kaim: There's a line in the budget for discretionary funding. Procedurally, \$500 per month, which is almost always split between two different groups, each of them getting \$250 if that's what they ask for, are getting the opportunity to be funded by us per month. I can tell you there are really no secrets behind that, as well as our meetings are open and collected. It's open to anyone who wants to get involved and a single member of our collective has veto power over any decision made for the entire organization, whether or not it's tied to any sort of funding. So anyone who has an concerns about what we're funding is free to use that power to veto any of our decisions just by coming.

Councilor Chin: I'd like to go back in time and remember two years ago VP Stephan Fong, who was one who initiated restrictions on discretionary funding. I'd like to quote from him, he says the purpose of restricting discretionary funding is, quote, "the money that is raised by students for service fees should be given back to students through the provision of services. If the service would like to donate money towards a project, that does not directly benefit students, they are welcome to fundraising towards that goal and donate the money raised off their efforts." My question is, since then you've had to operate under that by-law; how has that changed the way you've managed discretionary funding and if part 2 were to pass, which additional projects and initiatives do you envision further supporting through discretionary funding?

Kaim: I'll respond to part 2 first, which is that we don't see any real expansion of our discretionary funding expenditures at all. There's nothing in the works for that. The purpose of putting this in isn't so that we have expanded capability to shuttle money to other groups, it's simply so that we're able to continue providing this \$500 a month to a variety of groups, as we have been doing for several years in the past which has now changed because of by-law change.

Anastasia: And again, SSMU has to approve our discretionary funding and it goes into community oriented things that we believe benefit the McGill community.

Kaim: We have, as our application for discretionary funding, one of the questions is "what is your organization, can you give us the mandate of your organization," and the third question asked is, "how



does the service or event or project that you're asking for funding for, benefit specifically the McGill undergraduate community", and if we don't receive a satisfactory answer to that question, we can't fund the group because of the by-law that you were specifying. So we're very much concerned the actual practice of and the appearance of us taking student money and moving it off campus, and in terms of our practical discretionary funding that's definitely not the case. It tends to be McGill undergrads who haven't found a parent or umbrella for their project which we see as very necessary to be happening on campus.

Councilor Junejo: Can you tell us who all is taking the salaries and the benefits and everything categorically so that we know where that money is going?

Anastasia: Yeah, well there's five staff. We kind of have different rates of how many hours the different staffs work. SSMU decides our pay rates and I imagine SSMU and various legal and tax things decide what type of benefits we get and things like that, it's not really something we have any control over whatsoever.

Councilor Sadikov: A question about the discretionary funding again; so it says up to 20% there, so 20% is the maximum payout by internal regulations and the percentage has to be in the question, which we added in during steering. That said, if your actual usage of discretionary funding is much less than 20%, would you be open to us amending this to a much lower number to reflect your actual usage if you don't foresee changes, to kind of present a more accurate picture to the students voting? From my calculations, if it's \$500 a month, which would be about 5% so we can set it to maybe 8% or something like that.

Anastasia: Yeah, well we decide everything based out of a collective decision, so Kaim and I can't speak to that and say absolutely yes, but given that we do normally give way less than 20%, that's totally something we could talk to our collective about, if you would be more comfortable with that being more accurate wording.

Councilor Zhou: Looking at your budget, I see that you have a reoccurring budgetary surplus, just a point of inquiry: as you are a non-for-profit organization underneath SSMU, you should be running at break-even or a profit.

Kaim: An explanation for the surplus, since I've been involved for so many years consecutively, as much as it kind of pains me to say it, was less than adequate administration, really. There's big kitchen purchases that were working with a semi broken oven, missing carts that we need honestly, purchases are getting made very quickly now to outfit our kitchen well, but that surplus wasn't so much a surplus as much as people neglecting to use it for things that it needed to be used for, which we're catching up with quickly now.

Councilor Zhou: So the money now is going towards capital improvements or efficiency improvements?



Kaim: In terms of the spending decisions that the collective has made in the past two weeks, yes. It's been stuff like kitchen carts or whatever, which incidentally is usable and is used by any McGill or SSMU group, who books the kitchen which is a bookable room in SSMU. So anything that comes out of our budget – like we paid for five plus appliances that are in that kitchen, which are sort of the public property of McGill even though it came out of our budget line, in terms of their usage. So it's very important that we do use our large budget to pay for these sorts of things, so we can have a safe kitchen.

President Ger changes some of the wording of the motion.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: Part one makes sense with the be it resolved clause, part 2 – I still don't think that discretionary funding is always the best answer when you're getting a service. Like Councilor Chine said, the expectation is that you pay for what the service provides; I don't think it makes sense to have discretionary funding for any SSMU service.

Councilor Zhou: Just to further question I had previously, I'm a little bit concerned about the rollover capital from the previous years, as they do get to carry that money forward. Seeing as they are using it for infrastructure improvements, that makes me a little bit more comfortable now, however I would like to see a more detailed breakdown of how they're using that money, considering that they should be running at a break even rate, not a for-profit rate.

Councilor Renondin: I just want to follow up on what Tre was saying concretely, but if we were to change that 20%, would that change be able to be done within the by-laws? Would we send that change to the Midnight Kitchen, and then they approve it, and then move directly to the referendum question? Or is it plausible to actually implement a change so close to the referendum period?

President Ger: Theoretically, if someone brings a motion to amend the question, council votes it in and then that change is made.

VP Aird: To speak in regards to the rollover fund and that concern; I think there's a different to be drawn between profit and a rollover fund. A lot of organizations function that way, including SSMU, so we do have funds that yes, we move money to a fund so as to not label it as a profit and it does mean that we're a nonprofit and I think that the presenters that there are things like capital projects that they can't accommodate on a yearly budget that needs to be built up to over the years that costs a lot of money. So it doesn't function as a profit, they're not a money-making enterprise, they are still a service, it's just that sometimes within the budget you have to accommodate these things.

VP Sobat: I just wanted to clarify that we're really just voting on whether or not this question should be posed to students, so if you personally have a concern about discretionary funding, I think it's even better if we post that to students at large. Again, the 20% really comes from the internal regulations and I will



note that the change to the internal regulations last year was really made without, at least in my eyes, very much consultation with the services, so I take some issue with how that happened, but I think that they are now basically being forced by SSMU to put this back as a question, posing this to members, so I would support allowing them to do that, procedurally.

Councilor Chin motions to extend debate by one minute. Motion carries.

Councilor Chin: Just a quick question, because I want to clarify things for myself: currently under the existing rules, what's the percentage allotted for discretionary funding? Given that, we have a motion here asking for 20%.

Councilor Sadikov: It's up to 20%.

Councilor Renondin: I want to motions to reduce the discretionary fee from 20% down to 10%, considering the fact that those Midnight Kitchen delegate were telling us that they don't even use all those 20%, I think a 10% figure would be a middle ground in that case, so I'm motioning for that to happen.

VP Magder: I think this is an interesting motion, mainly because although it does limit the capability of Midnight Kitchen to allocate discretionary funding, on the other hand, this is an existence referendum and by reducing the discretionary funding, if they don't actually use it, this makes the motion much more likely to pass, in my mind, and I feel like this reduces the risk of anyone voting no on this motion, which would result in the loss of Midnight Kitchen. So personally, I feel like this is a responsible decision to make this change even though we don't have clarification from Midnight Kitchen and it is unfortunate that the timing does not permit that, but I do feel that this is the responsible decision to be made.

VP Patterson: It was my understanding that at our last council meeting, we decided that this question would actually be split into two parts, so there would be a vote on the existence of MK and then there would be a supplementary question that was a vote on the discretionary funding of MK, so while I think that Councilor Magder makes an excellent point, I do want people to remember that these are two separate questions that will be presented on the referendum as I understand.

Motion carries; discretionary funding is changed to 10%. Moving into a vote; motion carries.

#### **a. Motion Regarding the Free Menstrual Hygiene Products Policy**

President Ger: People heard about this last meeting, when we brought forward the notice, there was just a couple wording changes that were made, but it's basically the exact same thing. Largely, the policy is focused on advocacy, to the university and different levels of government, I think there was a missing



municipal and we added that in. But it's the exact same thing, but if you need further reminder of what's in there I stand for questions.

Councilor Century: I brought this up at MUSA, and they were all on board but the only question they had was where all the menstrual hygiene products would be installed? Do we have an answer for that?

VP Patterson: Products are going to be distributed at the Healthy McGill kiosks that exist on campus already. Those kiosk have different things like condoms, chapstick, etc. So these products are going to be distributed there along with other products that are already existing at those. You can take a look at where all of those are currently located on campus online. They do have it listed. From there, they will be provided in washrooms throughout this building, in our gender neutral washrooms on the fourth floor and in our gendered washrooms in the third and fourth floors and basement.

Councilor Century: The main concern was whether there would be ease of access for music students, so whether they would be in the music building? Is there a Healthy McGill kiosk in the music building?

VP Patterson: Off the top of my head, I don't know. That being said, part of this policy does include a clause where we as the SSMU have to speak to the administration in order to make sure that these products are distributed more widely across campus, in different campus restrooms and things like that, so they will make their way to the music building.

VP Carolan: I wanted to speak in support of this policy, I worked with Ben and Elaine quite a lot this week, revising the budget, it's a great policy.

Councilor Thomas: I really want to speak in favor of this policy, I think have all these availabilities on campus will really help with the stigma associated with having a period, it's really difficult as a girl sometimes, it's considered taboo, that being said, if we're very open about it and create a caring environment on our campus, it will help girls or anyone who identifies as female feel more comfortable with their gender as well as their period.

VP Madger: I want to speak strongly in support of this motion. I was shocked, first of all as a man, when a lady told me how much women typically spend on these products throughout the year, it just couldn't believe that. So for every man out there, you want to consider the fact that you might have to buy one less pair of shoes per year if you had to pay for the same expenses as they do. I strongly thing we should support this and I would like to commend the work of Elaine and everyone else on this team for making this happen.

Councilor Zhou motions to put to question, seconded by VP Carolan. Motion carries.



## b. Motion Regarding Free Menstrual Hygiene Products Fee and Health and Hygiene Products Fund Referenda Question

President Ger: I will quickly say that, in terms of things that were changed in between, there was concern about the price of the fee so we went back and reduced it by quite a lot; the reasoning behind this is because we took the average of the number of products that were used per person, the average is from an article that was also sourced, and that number was 20. The previous fee accounted for 20 tampons as well as 20 pads per cycle, which is a total of 40, which was more than actually needed, so instead we reduced it to 10 and 10, and though that is not in line with the average of individual product, we can then start to gauge after the first year to see which product was used more and reduce the amount we purchase of one or the other. Any surplus would be going towards a separate fund to be reserved until there was enough money to purchase alternative products such as diva cups.

Councilor Chin: I support this motion, but I have three questions. You mentioned before that these calculations were based on a percentage of 56% of undergrad students, however it seems like the calculations used account for exactly half or 50% of undergrad students, is this discrepancy used? Secondly, I realize that there is an individual criterion in number of tampons or pads used; some individuals need more than others, has that been taken into account? And my last question is it seems like the calculation will envisage purchasing a million tampons and a million pads, are there storage solutions for this amount of products?

President Ger: In terms of storage, there is room in the sub-basement, as well as I suggested that we throw them all in Councilor Sobat's office. The way that we tried to counteract any flaw in our percentages was through the wording in the policy to make sure that it was addressing folks who specifically experience menstruation and would require the products or like to use the products. Although the numbers themselves may be flawed, hopefully after we see the demand, post using the numbers that are available to use through McGill, although there are flaws in their numbers and we're pushing them to do better in surveys. Using the numbers that we do have available to us is the best we can do, and hopefully we will be able to readjust it.

VP Carolan: I want to answer Councilor Chin's question about why 50% was used; that was like a generality that I used through the budget. To qualify that, there are a number of things that we have no way of predicting through this budget. So, for instance, the uptake of SSMU members who use this service, that's an unknown at this point, so there will be variance there; also when you purchase this scale of feminine hygiene products, it's almost dealt on a commodity basis, so depending on the time of the year and who you purchase from, the prices can fluctuate very slightly but still, when you're purchasing on this scale it can have an impact, so to be perfectly upfront and honest, we'll never be able to get the budget 100% accurate, I will always envision like a 10-20% variance in any of the numbers, especially because it's the



first year. That's really what I came up with, and then I did find out later that the number 56%, so I apologize for not using that. However, I doubt that having any serious impact on the fee itself and the purpose of the fee, and I'm very committed to reevaluating the budget after the first year, and I think that's what is most necessary. We make a commitment on SSMU's end to reevaluate where that money is being spent and making sure that it's being spent in an efficient manner.

Councilor Junejo: Just want to strongly support this motion and I hope I see 100% there this time.

Councilor Chen: I have a question in terms of management of this fee. I imagine it is quite a lot of money and quite a lot of logistics, managing what I imagine is a pretty complex operation, so what are the preparations for that and whether we should put that into the referendum?

VP Carolan: So there's always an administrative cost associated with these fees, and those costs, generally as the society increases in scope and it's provisions, those costs can sometimes add up, but that only happens over a number of years and generally things like base fee increases will go to offsetting that. In the immediate, in terms of setting up a fund, that's very straightforward, we have at least eight funds within our operating budget and many more through capital expenditure reserve funds, so in terms of our capacity to house that much money, that's really not an issue. We have funds that are considerable larger than this. And again, there would be no cost incurred to place the funds under any kind of management, so this isn't going to be given to a portfolio director or investor to play around with it; it would likely just sit in an account or a GIC or term deposit, so that we could get a little bit of interest, but in terms of the costs associated with that, that's an overhead that is absorbed by the society.

Councilor Chen: If I could clarify, what I meant by management is who is buying the products and deciding which brands to buy and monitoring which ones are being used and adjusting?

President Ger: In terms of the specific brand, that's not necessarily something that is highlighted although there are specific restrictions on it; I believe they have to be organic, non-allergenic, unscented and use a plastic applicator. But there's not brand associated.

VP Carolan: I'm sure that the administration of the fee, as it is a new kind of project endeavor, that would be funneled under one of the executive portfolios, and speaking for myself, I would take responsibility for reviewing the financial impact of the policy and how we can best renegotiate with suppliers or redistribute our purchasing on an as needed basis that would be reviewed once or twice a year.

Councilor Gangaram: What is the reasoning behind the fee being non-opt-outable?

VP Carolan: While we have a generally rough idea of what percentage of students will be opting out of fees, we don't have that down to a science, and it can fluctuate year over year. When we're making



purchases on this scale, these purchases need to be planned well in advance, especially if the supplier is generally in another country, so having the stability of knowing how much money year over year will be available greatly eases our purchasing plan and makes the fund much more manageable than if we would constantly have to be recalculating, reevaluating how much we're able to purchase per year.

VP Sobat: The social side of that question, because we just passed a policy that mandates us to fight things like price discrimination, there's a lot of people on campus that wouldn't use this and might think that they don't want to pay for it, part of this is suggesting that men should bear some of the cost that women or people who use these products currently bear. Sorry dudes.

Councilor Chin motions to vote on the question, seconded by Councilor Junejo. Motion carries unanimously.

### **c. Unpaid Internship at McGill Policy Presentation**

VP Sobat: I'm just going to give you some background information on this issue and SSMU's role in particular with this policy as it will be coming forward for consultation, so I wanted to contextualize this issue for you and give you a sense of where we'll be moving forward with this, and hopefully puts you in a better position to help students.

So relevant background info is that we do already have an existing mandate against unpaid internship, we had a general assembly motion passed in winter 2015 that mandated us to take this stance as well as develop a policy. Ideally that would have come forward last year, but because of various resource constraints and logistical problems, that didn't happen. Specifically, we're talking about internships on campus, offered by McGill units, but that's less of the issue, it's more of the internship offering through McGill, either as educational programs, part of courses, or just promoted out of the university. In terms of fulfilling this mandate, over the summer we hired a researcher to do a whole bunch of the background research, to look at what the legal and regulatory frameworks are, to what other institutions are doing, and then look internally at the university programs that exist, like CAPS and the Arts Internship Office, for example.

Just in terms of what the mandate from the GA involves, which is pretty comprehensive, it involves reviewing the existing internship availabilities on campus to pressure the university to stop posting and circulating internship positions that are illegal under existing laws, and I'll talk about why a lot of those laws aren't followed, to develop a SSMU policy that clearly follows the criteria that we are using to define unpaid internship or when internship shouldn't be provided, and how that criteria follows the legal definition. To end the course fees associated with some of the internship courses, so where students are paying to do unpaid labor, notwithstanding supervisor fees, the motion allows for those. To really focus on more paid opportunities, and finally to advocate outside of the university, so to use the



external portfolio to advocate to the government through student federations to publically advance SSMU's position on this.

Some of the issues with unpaid internships: almost 1 in 4 youths in Canada are unemployed, underemployed or have been looking for work. The motivation specifically for taking a stance against unpaid internships is because of the role they play in exacerbating existing inequalities, because particularly those who cannot afford to work for free, to get these positions. There are existing laws against unpaid labor, and specifically against unpaid internships in Canada, but the enforcement of those is quite lax. There also has been research that shows that internships are a motivation for employers to replace entry-level jobs, so there's this myth of getting your foot in the door, but these opportunities are actually just replacing those kinds of entry-level positions. Other research shows that there is not necessarily an advantage, having researched starting salaries for undergraduates with unpaid internship positions versus paid internship experience, for example. Also, definitely a lot of companies have a motivation to offer unpaid opportunities and then get as much work as possibly out of it – for example, a 2014 Ontario study found that 42% of companies were actually breaking the provincial laws around unpaid internships. We also have examples of companies that pay interns from certain disciplines like engineering, but not from others like arts or even science.

What are some of the regulations is what our researcher has been working on in Quebec. There the Act of Labor standards, which states that internships are legal except for when part of a course, so for example an educational practicum for an education students, where it's for a non-profit organization, but of course there is some grey area in terms of what that involves. Like, I've done unpaid internship for a museum. Does that qualify? And also when they're part of a vocational program, such as an apprenticeship. The regulations in Ontario, which we looked at because they are probably the best in Canada, they're stronger than the Quebec ones; internships are regulated expect for this category of trainee, where they are legal, and that's a lot more fleshed out in terms of the requirements. So, for example, it needs to be for the benefit of the individual, not provide really any benefit to the organization or company, and it can't displace existing employees of that organization, like they can't be doing the work that an employee should be doing, and there needs to be some sort of learning outcome. And a note on Canada wide, because some positions are regulated on that level like within the federal government, also federally regulated organizations like bank, broadcasters and airlines. There's really no regulations in the labor code per se, although there are some changes coming forwards by the new liberal government, with some more restrictions, so it's quite a grey area, but anybody doing work, broadly defined, in these sectors is entitled to minimum wage of the province they're working in. That includes some of these training opportunities. In terms of some more in depth criteria that we may look at, the Canadian association for educators and employers has a pretty good list, just to include some more data on what that trade needs to look like, and most of this is similar to the Ontario code. Most internship offices and career offices on campus seem to endorse this, but not necessarily formalize them or put any effort towards ensuring that all postings meet these.

What are some of the issues: I just talked about one, which is that there is no clear screening process, there is nothing undertaken by these career and internship offices, so anything could go up on a



database website. We have particular problems in particular faculties like Arts, no surprising, but also in management a lot of start-up companies and media companies are offering these. A lot of databases just have a disclaimer but then it remains up to the students to figure out what's wrong, which speaks to the second point which is awareness of your rights as a student and as an employee, so more communication about what those protections are. Specifically practicum programs, so like in Education but also Nursing, any professional degrees, there are concerns. There is external advocacy at the provincial level, but there are still concerns. Internship courses, particularly within Arts, so paying for a course after you do an internship to then get credit for it. Certainly there are some student groups that offer internships or unpaid opportunities that might fall into this category, like voluntourism or internships that you are paying to do. There's a question about whether volunteer research positions should fall into this category, and that's something I would love your feedback on. Also a shortage of opportunities in general and issues with the quality, so whether they actually have a clear learning plan as a training opportunity.

A note on what else is happening in the province: there's a lot of momentum around some of those professional programs. So there's a campaign, PRES, on education practicums in particular, they've been working for a few years to try and get compensation from the government for those opportunities for around \$330 per week, which is roughly minimum wage for the hours that they put in. What has been more successful recently is FEDEP's campaign for psychology PHD students. This year, a number of those students are boycotting their opportunities, and then also AVEQ is involved right now.

What can SSMU do in terms of a policy? It's clear that there does need to be more education and awareness built, so we could work with different student groups and career offices to distribute this kind of info at career fairs or other locations where these kind of positions may be advertised. We can advocate within McGill for better screening; in fact, we did submit a senate question about this for the October senate and when it came to the steering committee, the provost offered to go and do a scan of all of the existing opportunities, which surprised me. So that's happening and we'll have that information for November, which really sets us up in terms of our research for policy development. Also looking particularly at increasing paid opportunities and looking at some of the fees for those internship courses. I was also in a meeting today talking about ways to improve the plans for accessible fieldwork opportunities, which is not in this category but is a similar situation. Trying to strengthen some of these criteria as well, making sure that there is a real learning and development element involved. Concordia actually has a table for rates of pay for co-op opportunities for students that is broken down by major, so we could have something like that done. Possibility of most strictly regulated student groups; we do have a policy on travel-based and charity-based clubs, which is relevant, but it could be part of the club application process and we could review the existing clubs on campus to see if they're promoting these kinds of opportunities. We could bar third party groups that promote paid-for internship opportunities, we could prevent them from booking space in our building; alternatively they could book space and we could like show up at their event with flyers. And provincial-level advocacy through the VP External. But this is definitely what we mean by student consultation, so I will now open it up to questions on any of these categories, as well as issues that may be a concern for your constituencies.



Councilor Segal: I'm curious, because for the school of social work, we have a placement where it's 400 hours a year, so we're having a big issue because students aren't able to get a part time job with the hours that we have to do, because we have to take five courses on top of the 400 hours. So would you say that this is part of the idea of unpaid internships, or is this separate because it's credited?

VP Sobat: Definitely, that should absolutely be covered. In terms of the professional programs, it does probably require from provincial level effort, where government factors in, but there is stuff we can look at in the McGill side and also the external.

Councilor Carolan: I wanted to ask, what is the most efficient way for you to gain feedback for this?

VP Sobat: At this stage, I would mostly be interested, if you bring this up with your councils, to hear some general feedback on what the issues may be. I don't think in Engineering that it's an issue of unpaid opportunities as much as the quality of opportunities. We are going to be bringing forward an actual policy, and at that point it will be a lot easier to go back and consult on specific provisions, and we'll try to flag some locations where we have specific questions, but right now this is just to give you something to think about and talk about.

Councilor Sur: In our faculty, we have this issue of having internships where you have to pay for the credit, but then you're sent to places where part of everything is subsidized, so you're still paying out of your pocket to go overseas or whatnot. So I think our faculty would be very interested in this campaign to advocate for a better process for this.

Councilor Chin: I wanted to ask about the nature of this policy; is it something to define our relationship with McGill or students? It seems like this is really a systemic problem that affects all universities, if this is something we can really pressure our university in changing, that might not necessarily benefit the students, because those opportunities could simply arise elsewhere at other universities where there is less regulation. Should there maybe be more assertive action at a provincial level?

VP Sobat: I think these need to happen together. For example, we could bar some of these external groups from our building, but they're going to go do presentations elsewhere. So I joked about ambushing them with flyers, but doing that would probably be a better way of educating students who are already there. In terms of scope, I think at least provincial level, in terms of what we are capable of at SSMU; taking on the UN might not be the first place we want to start. Definitely provincial level efforts on strengthening the Quebec regulations would be great, so make them in line with the Ontario ones; part of the problem is the enforcement side of it, but the other side is the promotion so I think we can target that. I will say that some of the issues are a little bit more McGill specific than other Quebec schools, just because we do have a higher population of international students that are more likely to go take



opportunities outside of Quebec, and that issue really arises for Arts students with a non-professional opportunity, and I think we have a lot more of that going on than other schools.

#### **d. Motion Regarding Creation of Musicians Collective Fee**

VP Patterson: There is not much to motivate other than the fact that an appendix was added to include the budget of the musicians collective, so hopefully everybody got the chance to look at that.

VP Carolan: I'm just going to in general speak in favor of this motion, if anyone has specific questions about the finances, I can answer that. I uploaded the past three years to show the increasing subsidies that has been provided to the musician's collective; while it's not a discrete line item, in terms of the subsidy, you can find that out between the difference in their deficit versus surplus of the next year. So when you find in one year they are posting a deficit, and then magically the next year they have a surplus from the previous year in their account, that is the invisible hand of SSMU.

Councilor Century: I also just wanted to speak in favor of this motion because music is good, music is healthy. So if anyone has any questions in that regard, you can ask me.

VP Carolan: I'd also just like to say, this is a very modest fee and this isn't in any way going to pay for salaries or overhead otherwise associated with running this space, it's just going to be purely volunteer and student run, so I think that's important to know. And really the money is going to be used to sustain the activities of the club and also to make up for the lack of opportunities they have to gain revenue based on them being a service and not being able to charge students for the use of that service.

VP Patterson motions to call to question, Councilor Anderson seconds. This motion carries.

#### **e. Motion to Approve the Audited 2015-2016 Financial Statements**

VP Carolan: They're the exact same statements as last week, we can feel free to pull them up and I can answer any questions that the councilors have, but there's no changes, we just really need this to be approved tonight so I can send it off to Jonathan Morgan and McGill, because we need to do that. As soon as it gets approved through council, it'll get signed off and sent over.

Councilor Chin calls the motion to question. Motion carries.

## **12. Reports by Committees**



#### **a. Clubs Committee (5)**

VP Patterson gives the report.

Councillor Sadikov: Just a procedural question; do these recommendations need to be approved by council?

VP Patterson: Yeah, so the reason why the club committee reports to council is because these are, like you said, recommendations that we make, but it does need to be ratified by council before we can tell clubs that these are the decisions that we've made.

Councillor Sadikov: For the constitutional amendments, the last one in particular, would it be possible to get some more context on those changes or maybe share the constitution with us?

VP Patterson: Yeah, absolutely. I can try to speak to it now, since it would take me a while to find the constitution to show you, so I don't know if you want to wait on voting on this for when I can show you the constitution or not. But next time for other things, I can definitely make sure that I have those on hand. But basically, there were concerns from the club committee that in the mandate of Israel on Campus, that they had words such as "conflict" and "delegitimization" in their constitution, it had a very negative connotation to the constitution and we do want clubs to feel empowered on campus, especially regarding religious and cultural clubs in particular, so these suggestions were made to Israel on Campus and were approved by the group, they were friendly to those amendments that we suggested. That's why we changed it; we just want mandates of clubs to be empowering, to make them inviting to people to join.

#### **b. Executive Committee (5)**

President Ger gives the report.

#### **c. Mental Health Committee**

VP Patterson gives the report.

### **13. Councillor Reports**

#### **a. Councillor Medvedev (2)**

Councillor Medvedev gives their report.



**b. Councillor Mansdoerfer (2)**

Councilor Mansdoerfer gives their report.

**c. Councillor Prillo (2)**

Councilor Prillo gives their report.

**d. Councillor Century (2)**

Councilor Century gives their report.

**e. Councillor Gangaram (2)**

Councilor Gangaram gives their report.

**14. Executive Reports**

**a. VP (Student Life) (5)**

VP Patterson gives their report.

Councilor Gingrich-Hadley: Just wondering if you have any thoughts on the things that students services chooses to consult students on? As in like floor plans versus the actual way that student services is set up, like is there anything you can do to increase that?

VP Patterson: I'm glad that you asked that because honestly I'm not satisfied with the amount of consultation that's been done for students, based on what's happening in student services. I think that this is a process that has been happening since November, according to conversations that I've been having with directors of certain services, I know that these conversations have been going on and that means that there have been many opportunities for students to be consulted since a year ago. That hasn't happened and that's disappointing to me. Erin and I have tried reaching out to the interim director of student services, in order to create things like focus groups or working groups for students with experience of trying to access these services to no avail. Now they are consulting us on space that we use for a model that they've created on their own with hardly any student consultation. So thank you for asking that, I'm extremely disappointed with the way this came about, I do hope that with some concrete work with the new incoming executive director of student services in January – I do think it's good that



Mental health and Counseling are combined to a certain extent, the way in which it was done just doesn't impress me.

**b. VP (Finance) (5)**

VP Carolan gives their report.

**c. VP (Operations) (5)**

VP Magder gives their report.

**d. President (5)**

President Ger gives their report.

**e. VP (External Affairs) (5)**

VP Aird gives their report.

Councilor Century: So AMUSE just voted to have a strike, do we know yet when that will be and what the consequences will be?

VP Aird: Nope. We don't have a lot of information at this time, I just wrote to the president, Claire, and she said that she'll get back shortly with comment. When I get that information, I'll present that and the consequences of that decision to all of you.

VP Sobat: It's not an immediate strike, it's a strike with a mandate so it's part of their bargaining with McGill and I believe they do have more bargaining scheduled next week, so it wouldn't be before the week of October 30<sup>th</sup> or first week of November.

**f. VP (University Affairs) (5)**

VP Sobat gives their report.

**g. VP (Internal) (5)**

VP Lawrie gives their report.

Councilor Zhou: How much are tickets for 4Floors?



Students' Society of McGill University  
Tel: (514) 398-6880 Fax: (514) 398-7490 | samulca  
3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montreal, QC, H3A 0G2  
*Uwite kwan uwite, hanes' abibika ur burund burundi*

VP Lawrie: It's \$26 online.

#### 14. Adjournment

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

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-08-09

APPROVED