



# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

**NOVEMBER 17, 2016**

**Attendance:**

**Observers:**

**Absence:**

## **1. Call to Order**

President Ger (acting as speaker) calls meeting to order.

## **2. Land Acknowledgement**

President Ger: We've got the 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. Cool!

## **3. Approval of the Minutes**

President Ger: Approval of minutes, I will make a note that we have just hired our recording secretary, there are not minutes up for approval as there is a bit of backlog that we're starting to work through, but by next council hopefully we're going to have this one and we'll be working our way back. Does anyone have any questions about that right now? Cool.

## **4. Adoption of the Agenda**

Buland motions to adopt the agenda, seconded by Councilor Cleveland. Motion carries.



## **5. Question Period (5)**

President Ger: Any questions at this time? Seeing none, we'll move right into the report of the steering committee, which I will be giving.

## **6. Report of the Steering Committee (2)**

President Ger: I can say even before the report is pulled up, the only two items on there with the motion regarding Global Access policy and cost free birth control coverage, support for, and neither of those were edited as both of those went to the GA prior, which was then later turned into a consultative forum, there was a question sent to the movers of both of those motions to see if they would like to move it to the following GA or to this legislative council. Both requested that it go to this legislative council so we did not make edits. There was one amendment that I'm not sure is included, I remember reading but I'm not sure if I actually saw that from VP Sobat, but if you would not mind sending those to the parliamentarian so we could have them in. Any questions at this time? Seeing none, we will move on.

## **7. Announcements (5)**

Presentation by Arisha, the Funding Commissioner and Ben Ger, SSMU President.

Arisha (Funding Commissioner, Kids in Care Presenter): Today we're going to give you a presentation on improving the situation at McGill for students from care. What is care? You've probably heard the terms child welfare or foster care, if you're from the states probably child protective services, but they're all essentially names for situations that arise where you are taken into custody by usually a state or government authority as your parents can no longer provided for you

President Ger: There are a number of reasons for entering care some of them are listed up on the board and I can go through them. There's abuse, numerous categories of that like mental and sexual, neglect, issues associated with immigration, food and housing insecurity, systemic discrimination, there's unfortunately a disproportionate amount of kids who end up in care who are BIPOC, and policy changes leading to some of the above.

Some of the issues arising within care that do overlap with each other: identity, racism, labels and stigma, family and parenting, mental health, resources or lack thereof, secure isolation,



psychotropic abuse, effects of trauma, suppression, and we'll go into details in a second about how these things come up as well as some statistics.

Arisha: To give some context for that stuff as well, so these have just been highlighted as common themes when children grow up care and have spent a lot of time in either group care or foster care. For example identity: members of the lgbtq community often aren't able to voice or find themselves because these situations are such that you would get bounced around from house to house, you don't really have a comforting home environment.

So it depends on the province or the state or if it's the federal government, there's different legislation that governs ages of protection. So ages that the authorities can apprehend, so take in a child and when they technically age out of care. So right now all though there is inconsistent numbers, the last census that was in 2011 was actually the first time where they counted the amount of children that were in care; there was an estimated 62 thousand children in care in 2013 and although aging-out varies according to legislation, the reality is that approximately half of those people between the ages of 14 and 18 are left homeless or without shelter as they no longer a place to stay, because of situations such as trafficking and drug abuse. This is in stark contrast to the general population, which stays at home, almost half of the young population under 29, almost 60% receive some sort of identity support.

President Ger: Again, numbers may vary, Ontario and BC stats Canada are mostly consistent, however less than half (around 44% in some provinces) graduate from secondary school, and the overall population ranges from 89% graduation rate, so it's a pretty large difference. Less than 13% enroll in any sort of post secondary program accompanies by less than 2% actually graduating from those institutions. We'll go into a bit more detail of why in upcoming slides, but largely due to lack of supports.

When it comes to homelessness, half of the homeless young adult population is in care, a third of the overall homeless population, 32 thousand end up in drug trafficking, 60% of females under 24 in care are pregnant, it comes with a lot of different issues, trying to juggle jobs while attending secondary, post secondary schools can lead to external effects on how grades are in those institutions as well as the likelihood of someone actually moving through secondary to post.

Arisha: There's been quite a lot studies done in the States, not so much in Canada, obviously issues are similar, show that kids in care are more likely to get suffer a host of physical and mental issues moreso than their peers; learning issues, development disabilities. This is because if you aren't properly care for either before you're apprehended or you just don't have consistency in care and service, you're just not going to get the developmental support that children need; and again this is due to situations that arise from care they are more likely to suffer from mental health issues such as depression, anxiety. Then there's also the second piece because there aren't supportive and nurturing foster homes or group home or residential placement, there's been systemic abuse of psychotropic drugs, so for example if they're having troubles taking care of the child, the child will just be placed on psychotropic drugs to



subdue behavior. This is also one of the pipelines to homelessness. When they're under the influence of a lot of prescription medications while they're in care, when they're phased out or cut off they're not able to afford that, so that leads to usage of other forms of drugs.

Because of this as well, children who do make it out and are in post secondary institutions, a very small population, probably still likely to suffer with a lot of the issues that they have, just because they developed a distrust of the mental health system.

There have been quite a few reports on children having a much higher representation if they are from marginalized populations; this year the Human Rights Tribunal had a landmark ruling where they said that child welfare services in Canada are actually a perpetuation of the residential school system. The specific ruling was that they have to cease the discriminatory practices that they've had against indigenous children and it's been nine months now or eleven months and the tribunal has had to issue two other standing orders because the government hasn't actually made any changes. This comes about because provincial welfare agencies are provincially legislated, but indigenous children are under the order of federal government, there is a perverse financial incentive there because the provinces get reimbursed money if they take in indigenous children. And also when they were shutting down residential schools, when the government took over from the churches, instead of sending all the kids home they actually just changed their mandate, so instead of educating children they were now taking in the majority of children who could not be care for in their home or what they described as neglect and abuse, therefore it was just a perpetuation with a name change.

As well, black youth are almost 3 times as likely to end up in care rather than white children or other children of color in Toronto. This is from this year as well, the Toronto CDS. Even though 8.2% of the population is black, 41% of the child raising care population is black in Toronto. Property as well; so if you're food or housing insecure, you're also more likely to end up in care and this is again because of a systemic policy issue. When the Conservatives came in, they cut off social welfare supports, as well as giving children to the authorities, neglect by omission is what they called it, to be able to apprehend children; so financial incentives are at works.

President Ger: We're going to break these down a little bit more in the upcoming slides, and give specific examples of universities that are addressing these areas and looking into different supports that can be given and programs that are built that encompass all of them, or perhaps some intersecting key pieces of the areas that need improving in our education: emotional, health and financial. There are not a lot of supports, especially at McGill for kids coming from care, students who were previously in care, especially in those areas. Specific resources, though some currently do exist, are not sufficient.

So aligning McGill and SSMU initiatives: there are quite a few things that McGill can do and SSMU can help advocate for, or have an active part in assisting. Research and advocacy around indigenous issues that are already happening, the provost's taskforce in indigenous education can definitely be an area in which more discussion surrounding indigenous youth coming from care can happen, talking about supports specifically for them as well as active outreach. Diversity inclusive enrollment strategies; recently enrollment services just went under cyclical review so maybe we'll see



some recommendations from there. More research into first generation students, research that is currently already happening in terms of the society, and looking into how immigrations firsts into that larger issue association with ending up disproportionately in care. And some CEDE initiative, specifically focused on community engagement, this kind of relates into doing active outreach, making sure that there in recruitment going on, as well as a desire from McGill to improve on the community itself, to be able to increase rates of application as well as enrollment.

Improving support for racialized students specifically, there have been conversations already happening surrounding counseling, mental health services, some things like identity specific rap groups, as well as some identity specific counselors, and then employment equity so mentorship and role modeling.

Arisha: So why do we want to make these changes? What gain to we have in this? Well sticking to the cycle means that we're perpetuating a cycle where thousands of young people aren't given the opportunity to actually move on to adulthood. Most don't really have the opportunity to pursue a secondary education so without the educational supports, but more generally the social supports needed to thrive, their ability to contribute to society as an adult, economically as well as in other areas, is thwarted; and there's pipelines to homelessness and sex trafficking. The congress board of Canada came out with their report, in line with the United Nation Commission on the rights of the child, that said that children in care over the course of their lifespan earn 126 thousand dollars less than their counterparts and failing to react to the systemic policy defects that we have will have an 8 billion dollar loss in ten years.

There's an international impact as well. The UN and the CRC have continuously ranked Canada at the bottom of the barrel in regards to our counterpart countries as far as economic prosperity. They provided a list in their last review for several recommendations for areas in which Canada has to improve, but we don't make any changes. Because of the failure of government, there's a more collective impact approach that could be taken. Because child welfare authorities are often privatized as well, as a public institution we do have economic stake, but cross-sectorial is one of the main reasons why there is such poor outcomes for children in care, so collaboration would be a key to solving this problem.

President Ger: Recommended approach: we'll dive a little bit deeper into these as well, things that we can do now, we need to look into enhancing and implementing programming surrounding those four areas, different support systems that we can implement to address them. Hopefully that will lead to retention and then recruitment. Having a higher retention rate will show that these students are entering McGill and that we're not only actively looking to have more kids from care or having students from care at this university, but when this university is also having those kids who come from care graduate, that will be more of an incentive for people to actually come here.



Targeted programming: some specific areas. Financial supports, things like tuitions waivers, room and board, designated scholarships and bursaries, living stipends, etc. There are programs that currently exist that could be expanded upon, things like the access bursary fund that SSMU currently has, could be expanded to include a program specifically earmarked for kids in care; alternatively we could look into seeing whether any of the money that is currently collected could be enough to support, though obviously in the future it would be ideal if that could be expanded.

Mental health supports; so peer groups, anti-oppressive outreach, etc. There is a piece around kids traditionally coming from care maybe not wanting to actively engage in mental health supports, so making sure that you are recognizing the desire to withhold that information and trying to reach out in ways that maybe don't require disclosure or alternatively would be identity specific.

Academic support: additional advising programming, academic mentorship; having peer supports in that area are very helpful, making sure that you could potentially pairing up students in upper years and lower years to be able to give that sort of support; people with similar experiences or not. And fostering communities, like mentorship programs, making sure that kids who come from care know that there are other kids from care here, that those sorts of communities can be linked up; there can be supports there as well as connecting kids from care with the general student population as there is a divide in lived experiences that could lead to a difficult time adjusting. Designated programming like living and learning programs.

Arisha: We have conducted studies about targeted programming at post secondary institutions in the US and Canada. Canada sucks, but the States has almost sixty institutions that have targeted programming where the supports encompass such that they are specific to kids coming from child welfare backgrounds.

So just three examples here are Seattle University; they call their program "Fostering Scholars", so what they offer is a tuition waiver, year round housing, meal plan (and housing needs is especially important there because again you don't have anywhere to go home to on the holidays, so that's very nice). They appoint two staff members to serve as their mentors, counseling that is both personal and academic, as well as peer supports. Their program has been so successful that they have an 80% retention rate, which when you contrast that to the regular retention rate which is only 2%, so obviously these supports are working to improve those outcomes.

Another example is the University of Michigan. Getting your own housing, emergency funds and tuition support; then they have a mentorship support where the student paired with someone who is privy to issues that they face and the various things that come with university and life skills. As well as social gatherings, peer networks, to engage in things that they are learning together.

The University of California as well, so all the UCs all have a program called "Guardian Scholars", the University of Colorado also adopted this. So it's kind of unique, some schools in Canada and UBC have a program called "Jumpstart", where you come on campus two week before to help you integrate into the school environment, so they offer a similar kind of model for kids from care. Programming, life



support, and they're paired with a mentor who is also an academic advisor to help guide the student throughout their university career, as well as financial supports.

President Ger: Next step: so in the short term there is definitely stuff that can be done to help improve. Start with outreach, see what kind of statistics, how many kids in care are actually at McGill right now, outreach surveys, potentially focus groups, keeping in mind trouble disclosing, making sure that these approaches are as inclusive and welcoming to students who potentially come from that sort of background. Eventually hopefully a report, outlining the kind of problems those kids here face, the types of supports that are there at present, as well as some of the more statistical breakdown of how much active outreach we are doing and what that is resulting in. Well no active outreach, but how much outreach is happening and are we ending up with a certain percentage of students.

And in the long term, looking to coordinate some sort of program with enrollment services, student aid, mental health and counseling to build something that encompasses all those difference supports to hopefully start to address some of the large problems that are present here on campus. That's it! Thank you.

President Ger: I'll now open up the floor to questions; does anyone have any questions for Arisha at this time? Or in general for how SSMU can act.

Councilor Okome: I was wondering with the virtue program that McGill currently has, does McGill currently take into account the struggles of marginalized students, and does it take that into account when it decides who it gives the entrance bursaries to?

Arisha: As far as I know, there are no designated supports, specifically for this population and that is something we would hope that there would be specific designations of support. They just do that by financial allocation and it's usually based on numbers rather than systemic history.

President Ger: Any more questions at this time?

Councilor Mansdoerfer: Awesome presentation; how many students does this impact at McGill? How many kids from foster programs are here?

Arisha: We don't have that number, which is kind of the problem, I'm one but as far as I know there's nobody else. So hopefully this survey will help with that, so we can gauge what the scope of this is. Most



people don't disclose, which is why there's like a lower graduation rate when you don't have supports to go off.

Councilor Cleveland: Awesome presentation, great stats that were really astounding. My question was for this school research that have good programs to support students – were those initiatives started by students or were they more top down? And if they were from students initially, like more grassroots, what sorts of ways did they use to convince the university to apply these services?

Arisha: Well to be frank, to do anything you need money; so as much as there could be the social support provided by students, all the programming does come from the administration. Canada, with their public institutions, we don't do as much; in BC they are starting to implement specific designated additional support. A lot of provinces, they provide some sort of tuition reimbursement, but usually it's very vague because of legislation, so most aren't actually eligible for those supports. Most of it has to be from the administration, and part of what lobbying would be that we as a public institution we should be caring, and there is that additional economic case of if we are producing productive members of society as a public institution, why not increase that by having more people involved.

President Ger: Are there any questions at this time? Seeing none, thank you Arisha for your presentation. Moving on, we have our motion regarding verbal access to medicine policy, does anyone like to propose the motion... never mind, small miscommunication from steering. We do have a presentation from SPF, the sustainable projects fund.

Kim McGrath from the Sustainability Projects Fund gives a presentation.

Kim Magrath (Sustainability Projects Fund): Hi everyone, how are you doing. My name is Kim Magrath, and I am here to give you some SPF information. SPF is Sustainability Projects Fund. Does everyone here know about it? Okay, I'll skip a few slides then. I'm here to present the result of fiscal year 2016, which goes from May 2015 until April 2016, so we're now in fiscal year 2017 already.

So basically the point of the SPF is to built a culture of sustainability at McGill through supporting the development and the seed funding of interdisciplinary projects. So we see the fund as an empowering tool for sustainability motivated individuals who work together, collaborate their efforts for making McGill more sustainable.

Just to let you know, there were some changes in the application process this fiscal year (2017), we included a under \$5000 process for project teams that have small projects, to the SPF form. Just to let you know.



Starting with the highlights: so 2016 was a year of pilot, because I don't know if any of you were here when I presented for fiscal year 2015 report, but one of the key highlights was that we had worked on revamping lots of things under the SPF, so the application process, the tools for project teams, many tools for working with group members. That was then, and really resource intensive that year and time consuming, but which did not allow us to do as much outreach as we would have usually.

So fiscal year 2016 focused first on piloting and second doing more focus on outreach. We did that through various things; for piloting material and processing went really well, we don't have many changes to bring so far, except the new process I mentioned before. We did provide a lot of support for project teams, introducing the SPF Tuesday, which are 20 minute sessions every two weeks for allowing project teams to bring their key questions. So it's a much shorter time investment than what we did in the past, but much more efficient and more much constructive because people now come ready with their key questions and make the conversation less general and really focused on helping project teams, so this is working really well.

We also introduced project orientation for approved projects. So this is basically to introduce the tools we developed in fiscal year 2015 to let project teams know how to manage their projects to help them about along the way. We also have a Facebook page for ongoing projects so that people can communicate together more easily.

We have a reporting plan to track indicators for the SPF and those indicators we benchmark for the end of fiscal year 2016; and now from there we are able to contrast with last year, which is new for SPF at that level. This is really good.

Outreach, we reached out to 1300 stakeholders on campus, among others for a new SPF ambassadors program, which we piloted last year. It was so-so; this year we re-launched it again and it was excellent, we have six undergrads on the team and one graduate student and they're amazing. Out of the 1300 stakeholders that we reached out to: 89% were students, more than 76% were undergrads, and 70% were U0/U1. We want people to know about SPF earlier on when they get into McGill so that they can get settled in, get used to their courses and then once they're ready they can apply not in their last year of school. So we'll see if this pays out.

Part of the outreach was a big sustainability projects showcase last year that we held here in the SSMU ballroom. There were above 100 people attending and the outcomes were really helpful from this event.

Applications and project we've had in the past fiscal year; the last outreach was in 2015 and the result of applications we received last year was 19. So this is lower than what we get usually, but we aren't worried because we knew we would pay a little for working more on the processes than on outreach, but it was really worth it. And now we had a deadline last June and we received sixteen applications in just one day, so that was a good sign. We're now at above nineteen. Out of the 19 applications we received, 5 projects were approved, plus 2 from the previous year, 7 withdrew, which is something we'll pay attention to this year because we have no reasons being showcased. We track why people withdraw and most of the time, like 4 out of 7, were just unreachable anymore. So that's something we'll look at.



Key project impacts: here I organized the impacts and relations of the 20/20 category, One of the projects reached 35 volunteers engaged and in operations we had over 1000 meals served with the eggs produced in chicken coops at MAC, students in rez were education about food waste management, we had some ASR projects being conducted under SPF, etc.

Finances: the result of having received last application is that for the second time in our lifespan we have extra money. So we carry over to this year, fiscal year 2017, the extra money. We're not really sure how to perceive that, we know it was because we had less applications, but we're thinking that it's for the best because we foresee bigger projects coming on in the coming months. Because of the Vision 20/20 action plan, which is being developed for 2017-2020. I'm pretty sure some applications will come to the SPF because of that. So far we've allocated 200 thousand already this year.

Coming up: I mentioned already the big Vision 20/20 projects probably coming, we're going to build a lot of first year rapport, we're expanding outreach, we have more SPF ambassadors than last year and they've done so much already. Many class presentations. One thing that is good, there's always been good collaboration between student societies and SPF but when we clarified our process in fiscal year 2015, we clarified how recruitment few the working group members would be done, so now we have a really closer collaboration with SSMU in terms of recruiting the working group representatives, and that's really helped financially. The students we get on board get to know SSMU better as well, so that's really good and we hope to continue that way.

We're going to manage how the under \$5000 application process it going. Two big things: we're about to start a SPF cyclical review, for the years 2013 to 2015, it's an independent one, like was done for 2010-2013 just before the other referendum, which was put in place to asses how SPF was doing. When I came in, in 2014, I used that report to update and make changes to the SPF. Also the next referendum, which is coming next year 2017-2018, so I'm about to get in touch with Nihow, all the people I need to get in touch with for organizing this. It's going to be my first time doing this, so I'm excited.

Key takeaways: I think I shared more of the things already, but the work done in fiscal year 2015 paid off really well, we deal with so much less issues now than a few months ago. The next deadline is January 9<sup>th</sup>, so apply or tell your friends to apply! Do you have questions? 45:03

President Ger: Questions?

VP Sobat: Could you give a few examples of SPF projects?

Kim: Because last year we had only a few, I can tell you all of them: one of them was a co-rad collective, a network of students that came working on food projects, that decided to get organized, collaborate better – for instance it's most MacDonaldd ecological garden, and some other groups, collaborating with farmers market, coming together to better coordinate and maximize their process and themselves their



projects and themselves. Another project at MAC “at connect” which connected students with facilities and with farming. We had the vision 20/20 action teams, which helped hire a coordinator for helping that process. We had “sidewalk hands”, series of workshops held by the Redpath Museum. Spin bike gardens, one that really merges well the three dimension of sustainability. It is led by a nurse who is a staff members at McGill; she want to develop five sites with spin bikes surrounded by plants and art, where people can just go for five minutes and they want to make it very welcoming area. It’s to raise awareness about how physically health is good for mental health, but it doesn’t have to be record breaking marathon or anything, just 5 minutes can really make a difference in your life and giving people the location for a break. I suspect that this project will be too popular; I suspect that people will want these sites everywhere on campus. SPF is here to start projects, but we hope it can grow. It’s unique in how it’s being conducted: involving students from all over campus, all spheres; it’s a very excellent collaboration, collaborating with building directors to make sure they have access to space, etc. Two projects have recently been approved: the SSMU courtyard garden and the leading operations and maintenance project, which is a project that buys facilities where the sustainability construction officer is going to help the project managers construction projects on campus integrate lead standards into their day-to-day maintenance of the campus. We have some more coming, hopefully. Is that it? Thank you very much!

President Ger: Thank you!

#### **10.Old Business**

No old business.

#### **11.New Business**

##### **a. Motion Regarding Global Access to Medicines Policy**

Moved by Councilor Sadikov, seconded by Councilor Junejo.

Councilor Sadikov: I’d like to cede my time to someone in the gallery.



Sonya (Co-president of Universities Allied for Essential Medicines McGill): I don't have presentation, but I can speak briefly about what the motion is about and the answer questions. This motion was brought to GA, which didn't meet quorum, so now we're here. This motion is basically the result of me being involved in this club called Universities Allied for Essential Medicines. Recently the club is kind of motivated and has a long-term goal of seeing what called a global access-licensing framework be implemented at McGill University in the research areas, but the club also does things like bring awareness to disease and generally the burden of disease that's being felt by the developing world versus the amount of research and funding that goes to bringing the medicines for those diseases. So this is one of many things that the club does, just for context.

This motion basically is asking SSMU to put into your SSMU, and specifically the senate representatives, put onto their agenda as a policy for the next five years, to go after McGill University as an institution to implement this access-licensing framework.

To give some background on what that is, it's specific to the way that innovations that are invented at McGill are patented through McGill. It's a pretty dense topic, but so if someone is working at a lab, they invent something, and it doesn't necessarily have to be a new drug, it can be a new concept to make a new drug, it could be like a molecule combination, things like that. They have the option either to patent it themselves as an individual or they can patent it through the university. Already there's a choice. This motion speaks specifically to patents done through university, because at the end of the day, we can't regulate individuals as a club or as an institution. So this would be, for those who choose to patent through McGill University – and there are a decent amount who choose to do that, we have statistics that say there are around 25 or patents every couple years that are put through McGill University.

When someone goes to write up the patent, the patent itself can have different things in it, it can be how much money they get from it, it can be how long the patent last for, it can be how much control they will be taking over naming, that the patent will be sold to private sector, stuff like that. It's basically done in a concessionary way, so you would have a conversation between you as the researcher or McGill University on your behalf, and then you would come to some sort of agreement with the company that is going to buy your patent.

So what Universities Allied for Essential Medicines has found is that universities have a unique leveraging position within this conversation, due to the fact that this particular innovation only being done at this university at this time and in this way; so they actually have a ton of leverage, in terms of what they can ask for from the pharmaceutical company, especially if it's something unique or lucrative. And also in general, if you look at research and development for pharmaceuticals, over ¾ is done in university research labs and then they're sold off to pharmaceuticals; pharmaceuticals barely do any in house research, they spend the majority of their budget on advertising. They spend on advertising products for the developing world specifically.

So universities have a huge leverage point in this agreement situation with patents. Our club wants to take advantage of that and add in what's called a humanitarian cause, or a global access-licensing framework. It's going to be in the form of one paragraph and all it's going to say is: in the event that this drug or this innovation is ever implicated in an humanitarian crisis. So for example, during the HIV/AIDS



of the 90s, when there was a huge upsurge of the illness, the drug that was the first round of drugs that basically cured the disease and allowed people to have a really good quality of life, and this was in the 90s, so obviously the drugs have improved since then, but the first very drug was actually invented at Young University, and Young University patented it. So that would be an example of the drug that was patented at a university that was implicated in an humanitarian crisis, specifically in the developing world. And so the humanitarian clause would say that if situation occurs, this innovation that is in this patent would be able to be available either at a cost, so either the pharmaceutical company that is producing it wouldn't charge anything over the fixed cost of manufacturing the drug, so if that's a pill they're usually like five to ten cents, if it's a vaccine then they're usually around \$100, so they wouldn't mark it up. So if anyone knows how pharmaceuticals price their products, they have full licensing on pricing because of the patent system that they're using, so they can basically set whatever price they want above the fixed cost of creating the drug, and as we probably all have heard, that can be extremely expensive and extremely unaffordable for people.

So the humanitarian clause would say that in the event of a humanitarian crisis, the product would either be priced at cost or they would allow the intellectual property of the patent, so the way in which the medicine is made or the medicine itself, they would allow that intellectual property to transfer to a generic distributor. Which is basically kind of going against what patents are all about, because patents are about being able to have full monopoly rights over your intellectual property, being able to sue anyone who takes that intellectual property from you. But allowing it to be transferred to generic distributors allows generic distribution and production of the drug in places like Brazil, India, Thailand; countries that have booming generic industries and have the ability to produce medicines, the exact same way that the developed countries do, but because of prices and things like that, when they do produce it, it would be much cheaper than if a developed country produces it.

So that would increase access a lot, what we're seeing now is that the current structure, especially through different trade agreements, it makes it so that a lot of generic distributions in other countries who are maybe low or middle income or emerging markets, they aren't allowed to produce drugs that they are capable of producing and being bottlenecked through the developed world, they're extremely unaffordable, they're like quadruple the price. And if you look at the amount of income people have, like the average person has in a developing country, it's much less than developed countries and that kind of just shows you like how inaccessible medicine are.

This is one small way that McGill University could possibly allow for an increased access to a drug in the future. There's a big chance that if this goes through that literally nothing will ever happen, but personally and as a representative of the club, it's an extremely principled stance to take: that if we have a system that currently allows for access in theory it would help, we should do it. If you look at the texts of the motion, there is a lot of information in there about how, first of all pharmaceuticals agree that this is a good thing to do; this is not something that they oppose. GlaxoSmithKline and Eli Lilly have both come out with statements saying they support this way of releasing drugs. Which is important because a big argument against something like this would be to say that well pharmaceutical companies are going to choose not to patent if there is this clause; that is fundamentally untrue, I've spoken to lawyers that are in the room for these agreements with universities that have these humanitarian clauses this is never the deal breaker. A deal breaker for a pharmaceutical company would be like patenting in



Quebec. Like they would basically avoid the entire province all together. So the fact that they're in the room, already agreeing to patent something is a good sign

Also universities or pharmaceuticals do not lose any profit from this kind of agreement because, if you look at the text of the motion, I think it says or if not in the article that's cited, that 97% of profits for pharmaceuticals are in the developed world. The entire developing world, which is literally anywhere that is besides Europe and America, is 3% of their market. So it's like negligible that money that they would lose, and this is also a very specific case. I don't know if you need any more information than that, but yeah.

President Ger: Thank you. Any questions at this time?

Councilor Chin: I wanted to ask if you've approached PGSS with something similar to this proposal, given that they probably also have a statement on this?

Sonya: We have not approach PGSS, but we might.

Councilor Chen: I was wondering if you would mind clarifying exactly what you are saying in terms of a humanitarian cause, because if you understand that when you have a patent, you can't specify what you will be using the patent for; a patent is a legal way of saying that you are now legally own this method and its use. So when you're saying to McGill to add a humanitarian clause, do you mean in the contract of negotiation of McGill, who already hold the patent, with the manufacturer and then that, if that's the case could you expand?

Sonya: Basically the humanitarian clause would be directly in the text of the patent, which would mean that you get full monopoly rights of this intellectual property, except in this specific situation. This is what 65 other universities or research institutions are already doing, including Harvard and Oxford, it's been around since the 90's, since the AIDS epidemic. To further clarify, so McGill University is head of the arbiter of this situation, like with McGill, your decision to patent something, they're selling it to a pharmaceutical company or a research institution. The patent is transferred from McGill to that other entity, and it is that other entity that is then either responsible for following the exemption or it is the country, question or the people in question who are responsible for reminding or informing that entity that in the case of a humanitarian crisis, this is literally in the text of their patent. Unfortunately, there are not very many examples of a humanitarian clause being put into action, but the fact that 65 other universities have already put humanitarian clauses into all their patents in a comprehensive way, means that in the future if this is to happen, realistically it would probably be lawyers from whatever contexts



that is being implicated that would then either contact the entity that holds the patent or perhaps that them to court if they're being difficult about doing the plan. That's how they would get it done.

VP Sobat: I just wanted to add the other place to include this would be McGill's intellectual property policy, which is coming under review and will come to senate for approval in the middle of February, so this is really timely actually, and I'd say you should look at having a meeting with the Association for global research and innovation.

Sonya: Just to respond to that, we've actually been in formal talks with that person, we wanted to bring a motion like this specifically through SSMU because we wanted to institutionalize it for as long as we can, which is five years, because as co-president of this club, I don't know how long this club is going to be around and in case that no one is around to continue this fight in this capacity, I would like it to be officially the policy of SSMU. So this is one of many avenues and we're definitely going to reach out to others.

Councilor Chin: I'm curious as to the timeline surrounding this motion; there have been plenty of opportunities to pursue this in the past. I'm also aware that UAEM McGill is a branch of the larger UAEM organization. Is there a greater policy move or plan in place towards this by the parent organization? Why do this now?

Sonya: To answer your first question, we've been trying to figure out the best way to go about this for the past three years; McGill bureaucracy is really hard to mobilize around, so it's actually the timing of the fact that UAEM is being overhauled and that particular committee which we've been eyeing for the past year seems to be wrapping things up more or less, so we wanted to get in on that. We've also been coalition building with different professors on the McGill senate for past three years, we have key professors who are willing to support us already and we've been working on informing more who may not necessarily be against something like this. So we've been doing a lot of background work.

Specifically to this kind of motion at a legislative council, I personally have become aware of this avenue and how to go about doing something like this in the past year, so the reason why someone didn't do it last year is because we didn't know how. In terms of our parent organization and what their plans are, UAEM National is actually moving to go upstream to places that fund university research, basically the Canadian equivalent of the NIH would be here, the national organization is going to target that and trying to inform them about the situation and see if they can't make it some sort of contingent for grants and things like that.

This is something universities did this voluntarily in the 90s when people were dying because they didn't have access to life saving treatment that existed and they weren't able to use it because it was too expensive. It's kind of abhorrent but also typical that McGill University did nothing and continues to



do nothing on it own, that students have to motivate things like this, because literally the institutions that I list in the motion adopted this stuff in the late 90s, early 2000's.

Councilor Cleveland: My question is in relation to when you talked a few times about a humanitarian crisis; and yet the term crisis does not appear any time in this motion, the only time I really see like humanitarian used is in the third point of this very long where-as clause, where it says, "other appropriate crises on a humanitarian basis, for example subsidized, at-cost or no-cost." I was wondering if the argument could be made that like a humanitarian case could really be made for any time anyone has no access to essential medicines. Because I saw that, I then looked at the advocacy for the implementation of humanitarian global access licensing framework and I went to your parent organization, the large chapter of UAEM and that also said nothing to do with humanitarian crises or humanitarian issues in general at all. I was wondering, because you've spoken about these humanitarian crises, in what way do you see this being incorporated to actually show that in this policy?

Sonya: The were-as clause that you're referring to is basically the text of what's called the SPS or the Statement of Principles and Strategies for the Equitable Dissemination of Medical Technologies that was adopted by Harvard, Brown, Oxford and I believe 22 other institutions, which is wrote into the motion. Yes, it doesn't specifically refer to crises, that was actually put in there as an example of what could possibly be adopted by McGill. Harvard, Oxford, Brown and others decided not to do a contingent on a crisis. Yes, that means that humanitarian crisis could possible apply to something a little less acute, but I ask why is that such a bad thing. But if McGill wants to focus on that, and it seems to be kind of a point where they need that to be there for it to go through, maybe me and McGill and the senators have the flexibility to put that in there. And that wouldn't necessarily go against anything that the club stands for, you're right to point out that this document is a bit more broad, so obviously that means that 22 universities are fine it being a bit more broad and maybe that's something McGill should consider. It's ultimately up for debate.

Councilor Cleveland: Follow up question? While I see that it is more broad, and I have no issue with more broad policy in general, it also more verbose and I think more descriptive than the be it resolved clause where most of what you're suggesting is just a couple sentences; while then also calling for a framework to be enacted. I was wondering what kind of framework you have in mind, or what is going to be adopted? I feel like its odd for us to fully pass this without actually knowing what framework you would want to be adopted by the university.

Sonya: Like I said before, the framework is ultimately up to discretion of the senate, the university and the people who are actually going to be making that decision, but the reason why I decided to put in the text of the SPS that was adopted by all these other universities is because that's an example of what they did and what ours would be based off of. That goes into a lot more detail about exactly what they



say and how they set up their agreement, which is currently being, that particular one was adopted in 2007, so that's the one that currently active and its also reviewed every two years and so that would be an example that you could look towards for this.

President Ger: Thank you so much.

Move into debate.

Councilor Igor: There's a procedural issue that's been pointed out, [explains the issue, missed something so they can't vote to change policy] so I would suggest that we split this motion into two questions and vote on the second resolve clause today so it doesn't affect our policy so that SSMU has this mandate and is able to begin work with university and senate committees and then pass the policy section next council.

Councilor Chin: Is legislative council the final body of approval for this motion or will it need to be ratified?

President Ger: This motion was brought to the GA but the GA was turned into an advisory body. The movers of the motion had the option of sending it directly to the legislative council or to postpone to the following GA. So it will not have to go to referendum, this will be the final place.

Councilor Igor: Does policy not have to go through the board?

President Ger: Yes, but not to referendum.

Motion to split the where-as clauses and only vote on the second where-as clauses at this council, and then vote on the first where-as clause at next council. Seconded by VP Sobat. Passed. Request to vote by Councilor Renondin. Motion carries.

## **b. Motion Regarding Support for Cost Free Birth Control Coverage**



Motion moved by Councilor Okome, seconded by Councilor Cleveland. Councilor Cleveland cedes his time to a member of the gallery, Julian from NDP McGill.

Julian (Policy Director for NDP McGill): Hi I'm Julian; I'm the policy director for NDP McGill. So as you all know birth control is the most effective form of pregnancy protection, it's 99.9% effective where as condoms when used correctly are only 97% effective and in normal usage are only 82% effective. A whole bunch of countries, for example Australia and a whole bunch of other countries in Europe, who have birth control covered in their health plans. Unfortunately Canada has not yet covered it, however it is covered for Québec residents here at McGill and we want to expand that beyond Quebec to Canadian residents and also ask McGill to see if they can do the same for international students.

This policy would affect approximately 3500 students here. Apparently the cost is only covered for 80%, we want to increase to 100%. It would be a modest increase in coverage but it would have a great benefit because we feel that unfortunately cost is a giant barrier to health care. For example with birth control we want to eliminate those barriers and we feel that this would be great for all individuals in a relationship where pregnancy might occur, whether they be female or male.

Councilor Chin: I have a question regarding the study reported in the motion; I read through it carefully, and it seems that at least here in Quebec, the main barrier to access to contraception is not the cost but rather access to a family physician in order to get prescription for birth control. Have you explored this route in order to facilitate access to contraceptives; mainly trying to find ways to reduce that wait time someone has to go through, that whole process of getting a prescription?

Julian: I have not personally; there are other members of NDP McGill who are looking, we don't have any answers currently as it is for you, but we are looking.

VP Sobat: I think that's an important thing that was brought up to me in the context of this motion, I do know that after speaking with student health services that requests for birth control prescriptions are one of the highest demands for appointments and also they are looking to provide better access to physician appointments.

Councilor Templer: My question is not so much to the movers; I was wondering if the VP Internal is here to talk about the [something] review committee, because it has not met yet there have been no emails about it. I can't see if they are present, but I wanted to ask.



President Ger: Niles is away on vacation for this week, but definitely need follow up. Any more questions? Thanks so much.

No Debate. Motion carries.

## 12. Reports by Committees

### a. Equity Committee

VP Sobat presents the Equity Committee report (Equity Commissioners are absent).

VP Sobat: Unfortunately our equity commissioners can't be here tonight. We've been largely focused on networking this term; a lot of stuff is being taken over by the equity commissioners. In terms of events, we have our campus conservation series, which are just sessions throughout the term on different topics, we did a post-election solidarity event two weeks ago, we're also doing an event discussion next Thursday for student of race about the experience of race in the academy. We just confirmed another event on November 8<sup>th</sup>, which will be focused on strategies for engagement in political discussion with friends and family.

Other advocacy stuff: specifically we're revising the equity policy, that's a little bit delayed and will probably come out around December 1<sup>st</sup> or at the start of January.

Other reps on campus who are involved in different campus accessibility projects, initiatives like discussing lack of accessibility during construction, possibility of creating better university design standards to capitalize accessibility on campus for space and purpose. The need for a more centralized complaint process issues; we're going to tackle those things by creating an accessibility page on the website as a starting point.

Other initiatives: there's an initiative for the joint board of equity subcommittees to introduce a tutorial like the academic integrity tutorial on Minerva. Talking with Mental health services for better support for racialized students, as well as the possibility for formalizing a racialized student mentorship network (there's a loose network already).

Next term the committee will be doing more events, currently there are some tentative campus conversations, discussing mixed race on campus, decolonizing love for valentine's day, and the



intersection of poverty. Looking at different groups on campus involved in accessibility programming in order to collaborate or how SSMU can give support around advocacy.

Annual speak event, bigger name speaker into the ballroom, still nailing down who that might be this year. Always open to other ideas and initiatives, a lot of the projects this year are really focusing around race this year, due to the interests of the committee members.

Councilor Bunejo motions to recess for five minutes. Motion carries.

#### **b. Financial Ethics Research Committee**

VP Internal is absent, will do next council.

#### **c. Funding Committee(10)**

Arisha, Funding Commissioner, presents the report.

Arisha: Funding has been moving along quite well in the past weeks since the last report, as you know we did make quite a few changes to the funding application process, specifically being limiting second installments for any club applications under \$2000 and for everyone else under \$1000. Since we've started the application process we've caught up two months up applications in two weeks. We currently have 57 applications and of those 54 have been processed.

Plan going forward is to start implementing new software, more holistic CRM (customer relationship management software) with a database, which would allow us to migrate from the current software, which doesn't really allow for data analysis. By doing this we would have relationship management and also a good view of patterns that we see in our current funding applications. That would allow us to improve or ameliorate some of the barriers that we've been seeing. Such as changing funding applications, so if there is an increase in clubs applying to one fund over another. Just to give you context of where we were last year, so because we streamlined the application process, last year we had around 500 first term, so we're doing quite well with that.

We will be starting the report back period once we've done the administrative piece of acquiring the software. That would just entail clubs to have a portal to log into, so that their post-funding reports and their auditing reports would be fewer reports for clubs to fill out and we would have historical tracking and historical data analysis of this information.



#### **d. Club Committee(5)**

VP Patterson presents the Club Committee report.

VP Patterson: I'm going to talk about some interim club applications and some McGill status applications and just a bunch of different constitutional amendments that come up in the McGill Club Committee these past two weeks. We'll start off with the full-status applications: the McGill Yoga Student Club applied for full status after having interim status starting last year, they are recommended their approval based on our full status approval rubric, so we recommend their approval, they are a great club and provide something great for the McGill community, we also recommend the approval of the BJJ and MMA Club, again they bring something very different to the Student Society of McGill, so we thought that it would great to include that.

Additionally, we have one interim status application so as you all remember there is currently a club moratorium on new club applications, but the Afghan's Student Association actually applied for club status last spring before the moratorium was in place, for whatever reason the club committee didn't see this application or never reviewed it, so we found it and we decided to review it, so it was submitted before the moratorium was in place, however we did decide to table it because there was information that we wanted more clarification about. So the club commissioner is getting in touch with the Afghan's Student Association and they're going to provide more information about financial sustainability and other details.

In terms of constitutional amendments: you can see all the different clubs that have amended their constitutions, if you'd like to take a look at the appendix to see what the previous constitution was, and see what their amendments were, you do so. A lot of the amendments we received, we did end up tabling. One of the major concerns within Club Committee wants to address is the appointment of the executive committee for clubs. Some of them want to have interview processes and we are weary of doing that simply because we don't want people appointing their friends to executive positions. So we're working with different clubs to work towards a more democratic way of appointing their representatives on to the executive team.

At our meeting this past Monday on the 14<sup>th</sup>, we had a presentation from Tim Wilfong, who is the person working on the co-curricular record. We talked about how we can extend the curriculum record and involvement on that record to general members of clubs. So we have a lot of different ideas about swirling around and looking forward to working on that more and more in these coming weeks. You can see more constitutional amendments that we approved and review at our meeting on Monday.



Councilor Chin: My question is regarding the electoral processes for clubs. Is there any general policies for SSMU with regards to this sort of thing or do clubs just make up their own rules with regarding this sort of thing, is there any direction towards where there should be rules as to the general election process?

VP Patterson: There is no policy in place, so really every club can do what they want within their club's constitution, but the club committee does strive to make sure that clubs use the most democratic way possible when selecting an electoral system. So that's why we make recommendations to clubs.

Councilor Douglas: What does BJJ and MMA stand for, the clubs that were approved?

VP Patterson: BJJ stands for Brazilian Jujitsu and MMA is Mixed Martial Arts.

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

President Ger gives the Executive Committee report.

President Ger: Nothing on here really needed for approval, I believe it was just the hiring on the accounting technician whose name is Marcela.

Councilor Chin motions for ratification, seconded by Councilor Sadikov. Motion carries.

#### **a. Community Engagement & Francophone Affairs**

VP Aird gives the Community Engagement & Francophone Affairs report.

VP Aird: This is not a report so much as a task list. Things we're doing, which is ever better if you ask me. So it's a list of 26 tasks that we're undertaking as a committee, within four different projects.



Awareness campaigns: so we're looking at two different ones, actually maybe three. Residence rights campaign, to do with rent and all that, so when you move into a place, what rights do you have as a tenant. A lot of these can be meshed together, so it's generally around the peoples living in Milton-Parc. So residents rights, student living, how to deal with common household problems, how to live more sustainably in student households, and what it means to be a good neighbor, stuff like that. We are working with the Milton-Parc citizens committee to do some awareness raising around garbage and waste disposal in the neighborhood, what days it gets picked up on, where to put your trash. Also resisting the name "McGill Ghetto". So we're looking to actively reach out to first years and like avoid them being socialized into using the name "McGill Ghetto" for a few reasons; creating posters, we already have a draft of the poster.

Second project is garbage and waste disposal. So we're actively working with the Milton-Parc citizens committee on this. And also with Christopher Buddle, Dean of students, and Alex Morris, who is the CEDE councilor for the neighborhood. Looking to see how we can potentially collaborate, going as far as to see how this could fit into the Sustainable Projects Fund.

Milton-Parc website, looking at what would be on it. Looking at maybe concentrating some source of apartment listings, there's some all over the place. There's the McGill website, there's social media groups, there's Montreal websites, looking at what type of events we can organize in the neighborhood, looking at what opportunities there are for volunteering in the neighborhood.

And finally, the French conversation circles, which the VP Communications of AUS is very interested in collaborating on those and so it is the Milton-Parc citizens committee, so that's going well.

Councilor Sutter: I was just wondering if you had a name in mind over McGill Ghetto?

VP Aird: Yeah, just Milton-Parc because that's the actual name of the place. So we're looking to have people call it Milton-Parc instead of the McGill Ghetto.

### **13. Councillor Reports**

#### **a. Councillor Junejo, Clubs Representative (2)**

Councilor Junejo presents the report.



Councilor Junejo: Last week I attended the funding committee on Wednesday, which went great. At the steering committee, nothing could happen on Thursday, because we were doing motions from the GA. The club committee is also doing great, had a great discussion today about the democratic selection of club execs. Every couple of weeks I have some interaction with some of my constituents, last week I met the Egyptian students association (ESA) president and asked if he was having any problems etc. Usually they come to me with any problems, and ask whoever to resolve those issues, and end up emailing that person and usually it all works out.

Working on my project, which is my main goal for this year. What I want to do is go to all the copy and print stores, the ones that sell banners, since clubs use them to market their events. I want to figure out which store has the best deal for large orders and whoever gives best we will probably sign a contract with them and that will make it cheaper for clubs to get banners, posters, when they need it.

#### **b. Councillor Okome, Environment representative (2)**

Councilor Okome presents the report.

Councilor Okome: McGill School of environment council had a holiday party for faculty and students on December 1<sup>st</sup>. We also have the GIS day to learn from professionals what you can do with your GIS experience, there will be food and geography related games, any and all are invited. Peer tutoring and mentoring program all planned out to focus on the core environment classes that environment students have to take.

For events, we have SASS/MUGS/MESS movie night November 13 at ECOLE, all are welcome. MUGS/MESS Ski trip January 6-8, 2 nights, it costs money, don't worry about it. MESS clothing is happening for all who love the school of environment and want some clothing to prove it. We also have more Prof talks, still deciding on which profs and what dates. For the SSMU Environment committee, I'm busy on the day that we meet, which is okay because we can still talk about it. We have an event called Green Life Hacks: DIY Holiday starting Sunday and lasts all week. We're also in the midst of planning the garden so we'll be doing some research on what kinds of fruits and vegetables we can grow depending on the year, and in the midst of collecting some data from the garden the McGill School of Environment does.

Sustainable tip of the week: Swing by a McGill cafeteria to participate in the celebration of local food. This month's local food day will focus on cheese! You can purchase local cheeses or meals that feature local cheeses from participating cafeterias.

#### **14. Executive Reports**



### **a. VP (Operations) (5)**

VP Magder presents the report.

VP Magder: Alright, I'm going to start with campus space planning: so thankfully as of this week, the door to the brown building will be open from 6 until 10:30, so that extension should help continue that accessibility route. So that's one example of why all of you should give me any accessibility issues you see on campus so I can bring it to the next construction update meeting on Wednesday. That's happening on Thursday so if any of you see any issues on campus related to construction, please let me know by latest Wednesday night.

To continue with building affairs: I've just booked a number of spaces in the building for exam time to help to increase the amount of study space on campus around exam period because I know the library's always packed, I'm trying to find funding to open up the building on Sunday December 4th, which is usually the busiest time in the library around exams. Hopefully I can secure some funding so that we can open up some more study space.

Building operations committee has been a big part of my work recently; we just finalized a collection of projects that we're going to be evaluating. Our evaluation scheme is basically each member of the committee evaluates based on set criteria that we've already set; at which point the highest and the lowest scores are removed and we have the remaining scores to take into account. So next Tuesday we should be allocating our first round of projects, which is very exciting.

Food and beverage: I've had time to analyze all the data from September. So a good points I've elected to bring up are that we have had double the amount of sale in this year in September than we had last year, which is fantastic. Likely due to simple increase the number of transactions, and the fact that we've tweaked our margins helps the profitability as well. Now the task going to be, now that we've increased sales, I'm going to look at margins and see if I can improve them to see if we can increase profitability, so that's the next task, to go to the inventory list and see what I can trim out of that. Drink sales were 30% higher this year than last year, which is fantastic. One of the biggest regrets that I have from this past year is that I did not have a lot of time to go help organize programming for Gerts, but what's going to happen is that this year is SPIN will be organizing to help plan events at Gerts, which should help to keep it fresh and keep people interested and hold the momentum that we have in this earl year. We're very excited to look at October sales data, so that's coming soon.

Mini courses: we've locked up some exciting new courses. We've locked up Adobe photoshop, programming we're going to offer a whole bunch of new courses: java 1, java 2, etc. American sign language and Spanish are also new mini-courses we're offering this semester. So as you can see, we're a lot more invested in mini-courses this semester now that CSRC is up and running. We're looking into the creation of a brochure, there's also now a refund policy to improve the image of professionalism.



Sustainability is a big part of my portfolio as well; we've been working on info graphic, the recent management working group, and SSMU environment committee, all really exciting and really positive.

## **b. President (5)**

President Ger presents the report.

President Ger: GA happened on Monday, as some people might know, GA did not meet quorum. So we're currently in online ratification in these two motions that were brought up to council. That's just a normal procedure; anything that's required for the company still needs to go to online ratification, as well as the auditor.

Committees: ad-hoc equitable governance reform committee, before I even say anything about what's going on, I'll also mention that there was a question last time about when they were going to report: we'll be reporting it next council. It's talking about equity training and for staff preps, as well as doing training for just general student governance and McGill governance. WE meet every Friday from 1:30-2:30 if anyone wants to come.

Academic Amnesty: we're just waiting on a few different people to get back to us, about any feedback that was given. Chris Buddle is going back to see if there's anything, any positive or negative feedback. I've just started putting together some whole docs to show how the GA does struggle with quorum unless there's something specifically controversial. There's one particularly shocking one, which was Josh Redel's quote in the Trib article.

President's Roundtable: we're meeting once every two weeks instead. We've been talking about the post-election support letter that went out, Mental Health 101 and individualized faculty-level mental health faculty training initiatives. Menstrual Hygiene products fee, as well as Centraide campaign.

Ethical Expenditures policy: so we have a draft, but if anyone from council would like to give input on that, it's more than welcome. We're probably going to try and do some outreach to see if there's people who are also interested in giving feedback, there's also some conversations about whether or not the SSMU policy in the period that is discusses that includes organization that supports political institutions or people with large platforms like politicians who support values that are in line with our mandates.

Conflict of interest policy, as said before, we're going to be taking that out, hopefully making it into more of a procedural document that looks into the set up of how you would declare that internally. There has been, out of that conversations, other conversations coming up about whether or not we should be formalizing procedures within the policy handbook and maybe there should be a part of the document that includes procedures and puts emphasis on the difference between those ideological policy level additions as well, as more procedural documents, maybe clarify internally as well as externally how SSMU works. Specifically myself and the general manager have been talking about that,



potentially that could be useful especially with some of the stuff that's coming out regarding sustainability checklist for events, as well as procurement procedures and things like that.

Equitable hiring practices up for consultation. Boards reform: Leslie Anne has submitted what we have decided to call our final rough draft, after a lot of back and forth, to come back with something that's kind of near completion. There are probably like one or two things that we need to change, but we're hoping to have it done in the next week. NGE, which is the nominating governance and ethics committee, is meeting on November 29<sup>th</sup>, although I'm not a member I will be going to talk to them about the report that the board has agreed to write for that committee. That report is the one that is looking into the making of a report, as well as different procedural practices and consultative practices, and that will be taken in addition to the report that we're writing.

Executive shadowing is being pushed back a second semester just due to some of the logistical, administrative stuff that came up during this semester, however it is ready to go now, although considering we're going into exam period, it's probably best to put out the form for request later on.

When it comes to MOA stuff, Jonathan taking his time to get back to us, he's from the office of the DPSLL; this conversation is ongoing. There has been talk of removing McGill regulations, some of the regulations surrounding not being able to advertise on campus.

Post-election support: Erin and I have been meeting with Ollivier and Manfredi, the DPSLL and the Provost, to talk about our bipartisan support focus letter that we put out, to see if they would sign on to it, unfortunately we were pretty disappointed; they had no interest in signing on, they maintained this long-held idea that McGill is separate from the outside world and that things that happen out there do not affect students on campus, despite the fact that we have such a large international population. This led to a few different things: there was that article that came out just the other day with the Gazette that I was quoted on where they were talking about the issues associated with McGill refusing to support students, as well as faculty and staff that might be affected.

MOOS, as mentioned before in the SPF, there are these Vision 20/20 action teams and I'm on the governance and administration one, we had our second meeting today and we were talking about the addition of a positions book for McGill, specifically to build accountability, usability, transparency, around any actions taken by the McGill VP communications and external. Also a conversation happening around a taskforce on climate change, carbon neutral campus, fossil fuels was a conversation that happened at the table, as well as equitable governance reforms similar to what we're doing here.

The CEDE office; I'm sitting on the fundraising committee and we met. There's that article that I was referring to; environmental sustainability advisory council met, it's still unclear exactly what that body is going to be doing, considering it's under the VP Administration and Finance, as well as only being an advisory body. There are definitely a lot of external experts on environmental sustainability around the table, but a lack of internal university members that would probably be important: there's nobody from the McGill school of the environment, no one from Divest, no one from MCSS or MCGSS, only myself and Victor for the time being.

In terms of executive stuff, we're working on indigenous affairs; make sure you go to the event from the provost's taskforce. There is a solidarity rally that tomorrow right before the end of year vigil.



Everyone should go to that. And make sure to vote yes in the referendum, go to the Facebook event and actually vote at simply voting during the ratification period.

Councilor Sadikov: I have a question about the MOA and stuff; in terms of the concessions that you're foreseeing on the McGill team, is there nothing for you to suspect that we would be obligated to other groups that would have similar structures like this.

President Ger: When it comes to the McGill name stuff, and we talked a little bit about why they were doing that, I can see it definitely moving into some of those ways. They were talking about how legal has had a change of opinion, about how it opens up liability, where they're having a change of opinion of realizing that there is no distinction, like external parties will look at that and see the exact same thing, like everyone will still think its McGill.

Councilor Renondin: You brought up sustainability at McGill; can you talk a little bit more about that, more specifically about how to get a carbon neutral campus? Is it realistic to see that happen in the near future? Is McGill taking this seriously?

President Ger: There have been a lot of conversations happening about that, I doubt we'll be able to see it in the near future, it's a pretty massive undertaking, there haven't really been that many steps towards being carbon neutral. It's definitely possible in the late future? A lot of the conversations that we've having at my meeting, one of the votes was specifically talking about a carbon neutral campus and taking step towards that. Like should there be a climate change officer implemented, should there be a taskforce, we're still looking into early stages of being able to develop in the next 8 to 10 years, I would say.

### **c. VP (External Affairs) (5)**

VP Aird presents the report.

VP Aird: Things at external affairs have been pretty quiet. We've had a pretty spontaneous anti-trump rally on November 9<sup>th</sup>; that was cool. We walked on St Catherine's, the Montreal police were very happy to see us.



In terms of committees, provincial representation met on Tuesday, we revisited the Accessible Education Policy and drafted several additions to it. For now the policy we have is just one page, with all the additions included we're expecting it to be several pages long, some of which will require some research.

Met with my Political Campaigns Coordinator to come up with specific research questions to be undertaken in the political committee following the research interests expressed by members of the committee.

As for Community Engagement and Francophone Affairs committee, you just heard the report, so that was that. Francophone Affairs, the VP Communications of AUS is very interested in collaborating over conversation circles.

Indigenous Affairs: the statement regarding "Support for the Women Titleholders of the Land" was read at the GA. It went well. We will be reviewing the Indigenous Solidarity Policy tomorrow within the Indigenous Affairs Committee.

Community Affairs: I met with Helene Brisson and Community Affairs Coordinator today to talk about potential collaboration between SSMU/McGill/Milton-Parc/Montreal collaboration around garbage collection and waste disposal, we also talked about the awareness campaigns. We will be coming back together on Monday morning with a draft of posters for one of them. Walking tour happening tomorrow of Milton-Parc.

McGill Council Against Austerity: started planning Anti-Austerity Week; reaching out to people about workshops. We reached to about 5 different groups now, all of which we're expecting to be interested in participating. We talked about the possibility for a "mentorship" program to initiative new members to the campaign, especially people who haven't done any sort of flyering or awareness-raising before.

Divest McGill: we had a general meeting on Monday, I work within the external working group of Divest, which is one of several groups that they have. We're currently looking to have the admin published the report that was drafted on the Open Forum on Sustainability. The report was due end of October, and it still hasn't been published yet and we're basically being stonewalled by the administration right now, but we're trying to find a way to get it made public.

Pretty quiet in terms of union affairs. Independent student campaigns: so the event that I'm organizing with one of my political campaign coordinators is under way, that will be sort of an activist/student organizations on campus networking evening on the 29<sup>th</sup>, five workshops are confirmed, dinner will be served, it should be pretty cool.

#### **d. VP (University Affairs) (5)**

VP Sobat presents the report.



VP Sobat: I've been feeling the November slowdown of the term, so some things have unfortunately slowed down, particularly the policy writing stuff that is happening; some like losing our unpaid internship researcher, however for that I've reached out to councilors and a few of you have volunteered to help with that, so I'll send out information soon.

The policy against sexual violence is coming to next Wednesday's McGill senate meeting. This is the revised draft and a lot of our recommendations are reflected in that so tentatively that is looking forward.

Less encouragingly, last council we talked about mental health policies at student services and the issues associated with that. Since I had the chance to meet with student services to discuss the problems involved with those issues, hopefully there will be some short-term improvements with the categories of departments relating to these issues in emergent departments, but it doesn't solve the issue for students right now who are still wanting application for incidental mental health issues, for which they're going to counseling at mental health services. So if you have concerns, feel free to reach out. The mental health committee is looking ahead to create more advocacies around short term.

Library Improvement Fund Committee is meeting next Wednesday to figure out allocations for the fall term. Recently we were talking to CEDE about ways in which we could make libraries more accessible and friendlier to student parents.

Also finishing up the charter of student right case, should be submitted by end of month. Student Rights website is coming along well.

**e. VP (Internal) (5)**

VP Lawrie is not present to give report.

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

VP Patterson presents the report.

VP Patterson: So this week in terms of club things, we're doing the second round of club workshops this week. The first one took place in October but there were some groups who hadn't gotten that information yet, so I'm giving those workshops again. There will be more in the winter semester as well for groups that didn't know they were happening this semester.

The Club Administrative assistant is working on emailing building directors of other buildings on campus to talk about room booking policy in those buildings, we can maybe offer or put together a kind



of agreement between SSMU and other buildings on campus to provide more space for student groups within SSMU.

I met the graphic designer and the club commissioner to discuss putting out a layout for the Club Workshop Handbook, which will be completed next week. So we can send that pdf to club executives for the rest of the year. Club committee is discussing different ways to integrate club members on the co-curricular record. Also, as a note, Winters Activities night is happening in the second week of January, registration for that is going out soon.

Met with BSN on Friday; please vote yes for Musician's Collective and Midnight Kitchen's fee; Service review committee is still in the process of being audited.

Missed CKUT board meeting, due to conflict. As a note, CKUT general assembly is happening November 30<sup>th</sup>. Met with general manager and VP operations today to discuss independent student group leases.

In terms of mental health, feel free to rent a happy light from our happy light lending program at the SSMU front desk. The mental health roundtable also took place on Tuesday the 15<sup>th</sup> of November. Peer support groups were able to discuss how they contribute to mental health initiatives and how they are a resource to students. Representatives from Mental Health and from Counselling were there to talk to those groups about how they can refer clients to their services. We're hoping to do many more roundtables throughout the year. Next week is mental health movie night.

Student services committee met last Wednesday. Approved funding for CAPS, offering presentation for students in peer support networks about the changes that are happening in Mental Health and Counselling. I also addressed concerns about the website integration, hoping to have one site come January. Family care Study Saturday is coming up. Met with CEDE Family Care coordinator, going to discuss ideas of how to make libraries more friendly to families.

Councilor Douglas: You were talking about mental health and counseling having a unified website by January hopefully, in the meantime are they amenable to making a change to one of their website pages, because I feel like it's a little bit misleading and incomplete? I brought it up at the mental health roundtable, but they have their own peer support tab but they only have one peer support service on there of the SSMU services and I know that there are at least two others that should be on there. I was wondering if that's a small change that they could make before the websites merge.

VP Patterson: Yeah, that's absolutely possible, I think the best people to contact would be the mental health and education coordinators. You can contact them at [wellness.ssmuservices@mcgill.ca](mailto:wellness.ssmuservices@mcgill.ca). They are Tamara and Chloe. So you can go ahead and get in touch with them. As I understand Chloe and Tamara have been doing a lot in terms of creating content that makes sense to students for those website, so



they would probably take that into consideration if they haven't already. They can update that, I would imagine.

## **15. Adjournment**

VP Patterson motions to adjourn. Motion carries.

APPROVED