



# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

JANUARY 26, 2017

## 1. Call to Order

Speaker calls the meeting to order at 6:12pm.

## 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'kehà:ka, which has long served as meeting grounds for indigenous peoples."

## 3. Attendance

Quorum was met:

Kia Kouyoumjian

Igor Sadikov

Isabella Anderson

Maria Thomas

Jerry Jiang

Olivia Anne Sutter

Adam Templer

Buland Junejo

Richard (Tre) Mansdoerfer

Tristan Renondin

Ellen Chen

Jake Prillo

Marco Sgro

Noah Century

Mckenzie Gingrich-Hadley

Rachel Medvedev

Olivia Fiona Borgia

Anoosh Poorian

Caitlin Mehrotra



Joshua Chin  
Kahli-Ann Douglas  
Olivia Shi  
Erin Sobat  
Elaine Patterson  
David Aird  
Daniel Lawrie  
Niall Carolan

#### 4. Approval of the Minutes

Motion to approve by Councilor Chen, seconded by Councilor Junejo. Agenda is approved.

#### 5. Adoption of the Agenda

Councilor Sgro motions to adopt the agenda, seconded by Councilor Anderson. Motion is adopted.

#### 6. Guest Speakers

No guest speakers.

#### 7. Question Period (5)

Councilor Douglas: I remember last semester at the beginning of the year, we were talking about holding council in various locations around campus, and I'm not sure if that's being done, but I saw on the council page today that it looks like the rest of our meetings will be held in Lev Bukhman for this year?

VP Sobat: President Ger can speak in more detail to that, but as far as I'm aware that wouldn't be happening this term due to some municipal issues unfortunately, I don't know the details, but we are scheduled to be in Lev Bukhman.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: I was wondering if we could sing happy birthday for a few of the councilors, Councilor Thomas and Councilor Anoosh?

Councilor Thomas: Yes, it is their birthdays.

VP Lawrie: Motion to sing happy birthday.



Happy birthday is sung by council.

## 8. Report of the Steering Committee (2)

VP Sobat: Nothing substantial, we don't have the clicker system set up because there is no official vote on the agenda; as Councilor Sadikov pointed out, we just have a Notice of Motion Regarding the Amendment of the Internal Regulations of Governance.

## 9. Announcements (5)

Councilor Gingrich-Hadley: Healthy McGill Self care challenge is coming up! Everyone should be getting emails from Healthy McGill about how you or your faculties can get involved.

VP Lawrie: Two quick announcements, tonight and tomorrow night are the last few night of B-week at Gerts, I highly recommend that you check it out. My second announcement is that I have an event for Life Aid this coming February 6<sup>th</sup>, it's going to be an interview seminar and a LinkedIn headshot photo.

VP Patterson: Just a reminder that this week is mental health awareness week! We still have events going on for you to attend.

VP Aird: So the principal of the university is up for reappointment by the Board of Governors, so there's a committee dedicated to that, and they're taking input from students, basically on their opinion on her. So I have drafted something up that I'll be posting shortly, I encourage everyone to suggest edits or to actually send their own input to the chair of the committee. Stay aware of that!

VP Sobat: If you don't already know, we're going to have an info session next Thursday in this room about becoming an executive and we've also launched our "day in the life" shadowing program.

## 10. New Business

### a. Notice of Motion Regarding the Amendment of the Internal Regulations of Governance

Councilor Sadikov: So this motion primarily consists of a set of suggested internal regulations for the Board of Directors, as I've mentioned a few times already. This is what the democratic governance review committee is working on. So those proposed internal regulations are in the appendix, they concern things like procedure and also the relationship between the Board and Council, so just clarifying some things on that. So as you might know, currently the process is that the Board ratifies all Council decisions; so this would retain that process, however Council decisions would basically come into effect immediately and the Board would have the choice of ratifying to overturn them, and if it's overturned it would come back



to the Legislative Council and basically the internal regulations would recommend that the Board only exercise this power very sparingly. Also some further clarifications regarding the power of the Board, such as the power to recommend a referendum question to the Legislative Council; so that's actually a power that the Board has according to the constitution, to actually recommend a question, but it's not clear what the process is, so this provides a process to do so. It also, in Article 1.6, provides a way for the board to adopt an interim provision in an exceptional case, but such provision would have to be ratified by the Legislative Council subsequently. And then the other changes that are outside of the appendix are mostly there to kind of manage the changes made in the appendix, however some of the more substantive things are in terms of dealing with j-board decisions. So there's two main changes, that's article 5.3, so the two main changes are that the Board has the option to refer an opinion of the j-board to the Legislative Council, and the other change is that returning the opinion of the j-board no longer requires a 4/5 majority, and this is because ratifying a j-board decision requires a simple majority so if you don't have a majority to ratify, in effect, your opinion is not being ratified, so it's not in effect, so this is just a way to make that explicit and not have this limbo state where it has not been ratified or returned. So those are the main changes, if people have any questions or any feedback, please share them.

Councilor: Mansdoerfer: I'm going to talk about 5.3, the removal of the super majority. Obviously I understand your logic on it, to trying to make it universal and make a simple majority whether to ratify or overturning, but I feel like the j-board should be held to a higher standard and that they shouldn't be so easy to overturn. J-boards can make decisions on things such as SSMU elections, and the Board of Directors being able to easily overturn a j-board decision on that, and it's done through protocol, I don't feel comfortable just having the Board of Directors being able to overturn a j-board decision with a simple majority, in something they put lots of extended thought into? So that's an issue I have there. And I would like to see a super majority added to the Legislative Council portion, in terms of overturning j-board decisions. I think j-board should be respected and it shouldn't be easy to overturn any decision they made; they're an impartial group and they spend a lot of time on their process, and they're outside of SSMU. So that's my opinion on the matter. I'd love to hear any other comments on this.

Councilor Chen: I agree with the point about the super majority as well, and my point about these changes is that these are rather substantial changes in particular to the Board of Directors' powers, so I'm wondering if the boundaries and the degree of consultation that the current Board should be given, as to these changes?

Councilor Sadikov: So the Board of Directors has not met yet this semester, but I expect that they will be before the next Legislative Council meeting, so it will be brought up there.

Councilor Templer: My first question is regarding the inserting of article 1.2 to the internal regulations of governance document 5; given that is in practice this is already done, is it necessary to add it into there as an actual clause in the internal regulations? Because in practice that's what happens already. My next



question regarding is the insertion of article 6.2 into the in internal regulations of governance document 7; it says two readings shall be required, as detailed in the standing rules, however, as far as I can tell the standing rules aren't mentioned anywhere else in this document, and unless standing rules are brought forward in addition to this, then that's not going to take effect if this passes. So I think that should be brought forward with standing rules, in addition to being there so it just goes into effect right away. Regarding appendix A, article 1.3.1, I think there are a number of situations in which the Board of Directors might have, or might consider itself in a position where it needs to exercise power to overturn the solutions of Council beyond just legal, financial, and operational situations; there may be instances beyond merely legal, financial, and operational matters, that might make certain Directors feel that they should step in, given the Board of Directors is meant to be the ultimate governing body, especially when this section only says "should", I feel like that is weak wording and should be removed.

Councilor Sadikov: I'll respond to each of those in order. So regarding the amendment of article 1.2 to article 5, it's definitely the case that the decisions of council take effect immediately, however this is an ambiguity in the internal regulations, and I guess a case where that would be of concern is if the resolution would be implemented and then overturned by the Board, this would help clarify in the interim period that this resolution was valid, and the action taken validly, so that's the intent here. In terms of the article that mentions the standing rules, I think yes, that's a valid concern that the standing rules are not mentioned elsewhere; this refers to the standing rules of the Legislative Council, which are in effect for the required two readings, so there is no need to adopt them additionally. That said, the reason why I thought that it is not necessary to have the full procedure in the internal regulations is because this Legislative Council should be able to set that procedure for itself and also should be able to suspend such rules if it finds that this is necessary; like I don't think that passing on policy or a plan, that the procedure for doing so necessarily needs to be in the internal regulations but that's debatable I guess. And finally, regarding 1.3.1 in the Appendix, as you know it uses the word "should" precisely for the possibility that there might be other reasons to do so. The reason I still think it's important to do this is to kind of give guidance to the Board of Directors as to what it should be thinking about when considering overturning a resolution of Council, and that's the well-being of the Society, so that's why it is there. But yes, with the word "should", it has less regulatory power than it would with a word like "shall".

## 11. Reports by Committees

### a. Funding Committee (10)

VP Carolan gives the report.

### b. Club Committee (5)



Club committee has not met, no report to give.

**c. Executive Committee (5)**

VP Sobat gives the report.

Councilor Chin: Is it possible to explain the context behind the letter of appreciation to the Board of Governors?

VP Sobat: Sure. So as you may know, through the presidential portfolio as well as my own, one of our advocacy projects for the year has been to see some changes to the McGill Board of Governors in terms of its composition and its nomination procedure and internal regulations; there was a research report released near the end of last term, and a report gave to Council about some of the changes we would like to see. Through the process of advocacy through the Board as well as at Senate, we have been very loud about some of our thoughts and we wanted to recognize some of the changes that have been made at the Board level, specifically at the December meeting, they voted to create new community sessions – two meetings a year where students or anybody in the McGill community can submit questions for response and also attend to ask follow up questions, so similar to what is done at Senate but for anybody. We wanted to acknowledge that was a good first step, as well as express our interest in continuing on to improvements, which outlines a number of other steps.

**12. Councillor Reports**

**a. Councilor Mehrotra (2)**

Councilor Mehrotra gives their report.

**b. Councilor Okome (2)**

Councilor Okome was not present to give the report.

**c. Councilor Jiao (2)**

Councilor Jiao gives their report.

VP Sobat: I was wondering if you had any more details about the administration's increase of the athletics and recreation ancillary fee, providing budget information or explaining exactly where that will be going or just vocation for increasing that fee, etc.



Councilor Jiao: There is a meeting with the associate director next week regarding the details about the actual budget increase.

**d. Councilor Mansdoerfer (2)**

Councilor Mansdoerfer gives their report.

Councilor Anderson: I was wondering about the mental health initiatives, just clarification: will you be working with existing service for the purpose of providing that extra support?

Councilor Mansdoerfer: Yes, it will be getting all the different mental health services involved.

Councilor Anderson: In regards to the blacklist committee, is that run under your VP Social? Because I know that for events like Frosh, Science Games, things like that, their committees do say that they have the power to blacklist individuals who violate rules or committee some kind of harmful act during events. So is this something that the EUS would recommend being under the Social portfolio to deal with? Or does the faculty as a whole need a separate committee?

Councilor Mansdoerfer: It's not under any portfolio currently, it was originally formed as an ad-hoc committee. I would suggest putting it under the Social portfolio, but we haven't decided upon that.

Councilor Prillo: What is a blacklist committee?

Councilor Mansdoerfer: If anyone does anything that is harmful or destructive at events or anything like that, they would get blacklisted from being able to attend events. But it's only under pretty extreme circumstances.

Councilor Douglas: So my question is also regarding the blacklist committee; you said this is the first year that it's been instituted, does that mean that the EUS did not have a blacklist prior to this year? Or that they just did not have a full committee?

Councilor Mansdoerfer: It just didn't have a committee to review the list and make appeals afterwards. I'm pretty sure blacklist is a relatively new thing.

VP Sobat: I was going to mention this during my report but it seems relevant now. I don't think there's any management I think here today, but something new this year at the MUS Carnival was that MUS actually signed a letter standing with McGill for the student code of conduct to apply to Carnival. This was based on a number of criteria and conditions surrounding the production, safety and regulations, etc. We'll be



working very closely with the team of students who established this, and all the reports that we've had so far have said that it was really successful, and this is something that they are going to be in touch with other faculties about the prospects for, such as Frosh. Again, this is very preliminary, but just to let you know in terms of the question of how to address issues that arise at events, particularly around violations of policies, assault, other things like that. We'll probably be in touch with the faculty associations in the next few weeks to talk about what that could look like moving forward.

### 13. Executive Reports

#### a. VP (External Affairs) (5)

VP Aird gives their report.

Councilor Sadikov: One question that I just want to ask about AVEQ, I know you said that you'd do a report at next council, but this is something that is important to us and our constituents, I guess there is some frustration about the lack of information, so I was wondering if you could say a few words about that things that were discussed, the kind of mandates, things like that.

VP Aird: So there were two commissions, I personally attended the Social and Political Affairs Commission, and the Mobilization and Social Development Commission; VP Sobat attended the Research Commission. So I can talk about those. Basically we talked about some internal policies of the federation and also, in terms of social and political affairs, there's a consultation coming up by the provincial government on sexual violence policies in universities, so the idea behind that is to mobilize support and get student input on what that would look like, so that would involve the Minister of Education getting people's input on what, if anything, a sort of law could look like that would mandate universities to have their policies. And also what we're trying to do is to make sure that there's a higher body responsible like above the university administrations that you could complain to if the university fails to follow through on its policy or it's not serving student's needs.

The Mobilization and Social Development Commission, we talked about ongoing association campaigns, so it does look like it would like to re-ask the question this year during our referendum period to McGill students; the feeling is that seeing as there were so many abstentions last year that people aren't really aware of what a federation is. And so that would involve, in my report, some tabling by the External Affairs portfolio, either my staff or myself, to interact with students at that level, letting them know what the federation is and what it does for people. There's also collaboration over anti-fossil fuel divestment campaigns, so there's a big action coming up in Rimouski that we'd like to take part in and so we're potentially coordinating a huge action across the province that would involve all the universities who are currently sitting around the table. As well, we passed Community Fund, so you can now apply to a specific fund that AVEQ has for community development, basically any group of student or even





external organization that does work that seeks to fulfill the policies and methods of the federation can apply for this fund, it works kind of like a SSMU fund: you apply to it, you get a grant, there's an application process, so we hashed out the details of the application process, the approval process, and the policy itself. That's about it for working groups.

Councilor Sadikov: My other question is about the little feedback banner that you included above your last report. We had asked that you posted that online, and I see that's not there, so my question is what was the intent of putting that in and how can we keep you accountable to that?

VP Aird: The reason I didn't include that on my report last time is because I was told everyone did it, but no one did expect me, so that was weird. If you want to get everyone to do it, that would be great.

Councilor Thomas: I know at the last meeting when we brought this up, you did say that you would put it up on vibe but you didn't, and I think that speak to a certain level of accountability because that is something that we look back at.

VP Aird: Yeah sorry, I just forgot.

#### b. VP (University Affairs) (5)

VP Sobat gives their report.

Councilor Sadikov: You mentioned at the last senate meeting that the next senate meeting has proposed amendments to the regulations on research, could you speak to the nature of these revisions taking place?

VP Sobat: Yeah so that policy has been undergoing revisions since 2013-14, at which point it was already supposed to have a review the year previously, so it's hugely delayed. We do have a policy against harmful research technology on campus, which does have some mandates for the VP University Affairs for the criteria of social responsibility in research, so that has been what myself as well as the last two University Affairs VPs have worked on in regards to that regulation, if you don't know, the last time that it was revised was in 2011, they actually removed a step in the research ethics approval process whereby researchers have to let it be known if their research might have potentially harmful applications, that is being reintroduced as well as some additional criteria as a lens for how to address situations in which that may come up, and how to look at that. This has been raised previously by different SSMU members so we're skeptical that it will be substantiated by the administration, but it does present another avenue for folks to bring their concerns because the nature has always been that there's been no meetings to evaluate this because they all just say it's on a case by case basis, based on the research and the application, etc.



So I don't actually have the final document yet, I'll get it by the end of next week for the Senate steering committee, and I'll have more information.

**c. VP (Internal) (5)**

VP Lawrie gives their report.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: How much is the cash prize for Faculty Olympics and where did you get the money?

VP Lawrie: So we're trying to have most the money for this event coming from participants paying for it and through sponsorship. So the cash prize as of right now, we're aiming for \$1000-\$1500 for the winners, so that will be an event aimed at McGill student but we're going to try to open it up to the Montreal community, so we'll have a pretty competitive sports competition.

Councilor Gingrich-Hadley: I'm wondering how you're choosing to prioritize which items go on the list-serv?

VP Lawrie: So each week I have a submission form; a lot of the time I do it based on who submitted it first, then from there based on how much I feel personally that they should be in the listserv, so it is very personal opinion. I try to determine which events I think are most important for students. This week's listserv was a lot of SSMU item, because I felt those were important, so unfortunately because of limitation of how many actual events I can put in, I was unable to have a lot of student groups' events in the listserv, but there are many mediums for students to get their events out to their constitutions, individual clubs and faculties have their own listservs as well. But if you think there is something that should really be in the listserv, for sure send me a message or in your listserv submission explain it to me in full, and I will do my best to include it.

Councilor Junejo: I just wanted to ask about the listserv, how many people read it?

VP Lawrie: When you send out a mail-ship email, I get all the statistics, but I know who in this room actually looks at my listserv. If you've ever seen any Facebook analytics or anything like that, all that information is available to me, nothing is secret.

Councilor Shi: I wanting to ask, can anyone apply to put their events in the listserv, and does it have to apply to the entire student body?

VP Lawrie: Basically to be on the listserv, I have some criteria like how applicable it is to every student, if it's trying to target a certain demographic of students that I feel does not apply to everyone, or I see an



event that doesn't cater to as many people as possible then I won't put it in the listserv. But if it's applicable to as many people as possible and I feel like it is beneficial for students, then I will include it.

Councilor Anderson: I have a suggestion for events that don't get included in the listserv, could you

VP Lawrie: Something I forgot to include in the listserv; the McGill app is starting to have find niche of providing a platform for events to circulate and become available to students. So basically this week they're starting to launch a pilot program for having all the events and all the clubs will be able to have their own page and post their events on the McGill app. Now, if you update your McGill app, you'll be able to see the clubs and they'll be able to post their events there; every event that is happening at McGill will be on that medium. You can sign up for particular clubs that you're interested in and you'll be able to see exactly what you want to see, and be able to push notifications directly to your phone for those events. You'll be able to get the most relevant information that you want.

Councilor Anderson: Are you advertising that enough to the student groups so that they're aware that they can do that, and are you advertising the McGill app as much as possible to make sure people are actually using it?

VP Lawrie: We actually had a webinar this week where they walked through all of the features that are currently in the McGill app and how we can use them to the best of our ability. Her and I are going to go see Mitchell Miller and go to the OohLaLa development to see a first person, hands on approach to use this, so we'll be able to give you better insight on how to use it next council.

#### **d. VP (Student Life) (5)**

VP Patterson gives their report.

Councilor Sadikov: I'm just wondering about the legal status of our student groups – do you mean incorporating them as non-profits?

VP Patterson: So regarding independent student groups, as per the internal regulations of student groups, it's stated that an independent student group has to be legally separate from the SSMU. It's recommended that it be an incorporated non-profit organization; I'm probably going to be bring forward an amendment to those internal regulations because there is a step between being a nonprofit organization that's a little bit lower, which is called being a legal entity, having a separate legal status. Basically that means that they would still be considered legally separate from the SSMU but won't have to pay the fees or incur the charges of being a separate nonprofit organization. So I'm looking into that more and more, but it is something that is new to the SSMU.



VP Carolan: I can provide more clarification for your question also; any club fun or SSMU funding is available to any McGill student, so they'll always be able to apply to any of the funds to help with those increased costs.

**e. VP (Finance) (5)**

VP Carolan gives their report.

Councilor Douglas: Given the success of the grilled cheese week, will grilled cheese be added to the official menu of Sadie's?

VP Carolan: Yes.

**f. President (5)**

VP Sobat gives President Ger's report in the President's absence.

Councilor Anderson: With regards to the Menstrual Hygiene Products Policy, do you have a timeline for when you're going to be order and distributing products? Because I noticed that the fee was instituted this term.

VP Patterson: So we ordered the dispensers that will be put into washrooms. We had to order new dispensers because the dispensers we currently have are firstly only in female-gendered washrooms and we wanted to put them in all washrooms, gender and non-gender conforming, and the other reason is because the current ones that we have are coin ones, so we're getting dispensers that don't need to be coin operated because they'll be free! We're waiting for those to come in, and the other thing is that we're also ordering a specific brand of pads and tampons from a company called Albad, and those should be coming in soon. I'm not really sure when we will start installation, but I also know that the fees, in terms of being able to collect them from the office of the registrar, it takes a little while to get them, they'll probably come in mid-February, because they need to account for people who are still adding and dropping during the add-drop period, etc. So we'll actually see that money by mid-February.

Councilor Anderson: Will you be partnering with Healthy McGill?

VP Patterson: Yes we are!



Students' Society of McGill University

Tel: (514) 398-6900 Fax: (514) 398-7490 | ssmu.ca

3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

*Écrivez-nous à l'adresse: ssmu@ssmu.ca ou 514-398-6900*

#### 14. Adjournment

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Muna Tojiboeva". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-08-09

APPROVED