



BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES

FEBRUARY 18, 2017

Held in Suite 1200 of the University Center at 3600 McTavish Street in Montreal, Quebec, H3A 0G3.

Attendance: Ben Ger (President), Niall Carolan Vice-President (Finance), Kahli-Ann Douglas (Member at Large), Ryan Hughes (General Manager) (non-voting), Adam Templer (Member at Large), Igor Sadikov (Member at Large), Ellen Chen (Member at Large), Sean Taylor (Member at Large), Jonathan Glustein (Member at Large), David Aird Vice-President (External).

Regrets: Erin Sobat Vice-President (University Affairs), Murtaza Umar (Member at Large) (non-voting).

1. Call to Order: 3:27 PM
2. Adoption of the Agenda – APPROVED.
3. Confidential Session
 - 3.1. Legal Updates
4. Approval of Minutes
 - 4.1. Minutes from the 2017-02-06 Meeting of the Board of Directors - TABLED; and
 - 4.2. Minutes from the 2017-02-13 Meeting of the Board of Directors - TABLED.
5. New Business
 - 5.1. For Approval: Ratification of Council Decision from the January 26th and February 9th Meetings of the Legislative Council - APPROVED;

Adam: motion to do it.

Ben: seconded by Jonathan.

Chloe: [I did not read them].

Ben: would you like to read them?



Jonathan: which dates?

Ben: I'll pull them up, it's last meeting and the meeting before.

Jonathan: so last meeting and the meeting before?

Ben: of legislative council.

Jonathan: oh, I'm sorry.

Ben: I'll remind directors as well that this is a step in the process that is supposed to be largely... but I would rather not interfere with legislative council decisions. Although that's traditionally been how it's always been.

David: can we get an actual stamp given to us, and pass around a paper and stamp it?

Ben: no.

Chloe: I feel like the best way to do this is any ones that have a legal or financial impact on the society, that we should be made aware of it when we're making these decisions, I just want to know the document we should be looking at.

Ben: I'm going to pull it up, I think these are the two in question. The 7th... Oh wait, no. This is from last year. Um, yeah. 09. 26. There was literally one, and it was noticed. This is the 9th. That doesn't...

Kahli-Ann: there was more than that, there were four motions that were voted on, one was tabled.

Ben: yeah I'm a little confused why the documents are not all up there. For the last meeting of legislative council.

Chloe: can we table this one? Can we table February 9th.

Ben: there weren't 2 motions, there was like 10.

Kahli-Ann: no there were six notice of motion that are up there, and there were three notice of motions that were voted on and one motion put anonymously.

Ben: I don't know what happened there.

Ryan: unless they are cached on that page.

Igor: I think it would be prudent to approve them though, especially the electoral one.



Ben: yeah. Okay well I specifically. Ah, why did that happen. I'm just going to pull it up internally on our internal documents. Can I ask you to follow up with Wendy why those are not up?

Ryan: for the motions?

Ben: yeah.

Ryan: were they up there before though?

Ben: yeah. Okay, this was the agenda if everyone wants to take a look up there. The amendments that came forward were legislative electoral timeline, which were passed. Regarding the allocation the suspension of safe third-country agreement—those were passed with amendments. Motions regarding internal regulations of government. Those were tabled to this coming meeting. And motions regarding [inaudible] to the McGill community that was also tabled to this coming meeting. The rest were just notice, nothing passed.

Adam: were the minutes like, detailed?

Ben: they should be but those aren't approved at this body. Normally they're word-for-word. Our recording secretary does them word-for-word.

Adam: but they don't come to us to get approved?

Kahli-Ann: no, they go to Council.

Chloe: I don't see any reason why not. So motion to approve.

Ben: yeah, do people want to see the previous ones or not? Oh, it was just that. A notice until next meeting. Motion to approve, seconded by Kahli, all those in favour. Approved.

5.2. For Discussion: Board Adherence to the Statement of the Board of Directors.

Ben: Jonathan, you asked that be put up. Would you like to make a statement on it?

Jonathan: so I brought this up because I know we released a statement on Thursday and I want to make sure that director Sadikov and the stuff that has been outlined in that statement and also the Board is official statement released by the Board is also adhered to and that he's actually following up in that statement. I'd like to hear from Director Sadikov what groups he's been in touch with so far, if there's any concrete meetings that have been set up, who he's spoken to, and also on the topic of sensitivity training and educating himself more on Zionist issues what steps have been taken in that regard since the statement.



Igor: the steps are in progress, I have been in touch with several groups and individuals. I would have preferred this be requested earlier if you wanted a report related to that. There has been enough time since the statement has been released for me to?

Jonathan: I just wanted preliminaries, it's been two days, I'm not expecting the world I'm just asking...

Igor: well I'm setting up meeting with the groups that have reached out to me. Namely Israel and [inaudible] and Sin [inaudible] and also individuals who have reached out to me on an individual basis. Also in terms of training I'm also thinking of that as well but I have nothing concrete to report on that at this time.

Jonathan: so there's been no contact?

Igor: well, there's been contact but just nothing concrete.

Jonathan: what organizations have you been in contact with regarding training?

Igor: um. I guess it's a contact that precedes the statement per se so that's not really applicable. I'd like to retract that.

Jonathan: I'm not I really follow but okay. But one part of the statement was that...

Igor: not concrete progress to report.

Jonathan: no concrete progress to report.

Igor: it's been roughly two days.

Jonathan: yeah, I know, but from my personal perspective I expected the first steps to have been made in the last couple of days but I'm not... I just want to get a better understanding of where we are on that because if we as a Board are going to commit to trying to repair the harm that was done to the community I think it's important for us to know what specifically has been done to repair that harm. So that's where I'm coming from on this.

Igor: okay I'll speak to that further then. So I'm in the process of setting up meetings with those groups—those meetings would lead to personal apologies as I promised in the statement. Discussions relevant to it. If people then decide that they want me to pursue particular kind of training or educational resources, I will consider doing so at that time. Currently I... Well, I [have] training having to do with conflict resolution that was not a direct outcome of that statement. So I haven't a training at this time but I'm working on establishing a communication channel that would lead to that.



Jonathan: okay, um. In terms of educating yourself—I think that was another stipulation that was in the statement. Educating yourself about Zionism regarding...

Igor: well that's definitely been happening, as the Board meeting was said, more informally reading online resources as well as conversations with people who know more about the issue. Yeah, that's the shape it's been taking so far. Once again, once things calm down a bit and I look into more structured form of learning.

Jonathan: have you considered attending events? Like, run by Jewish organizations on campus that deal specifically with Zionism?

Igor: yes, I have considered doing so. I haven't done that in the last two days.

Jonathan: yeah, I'm just trying to give a plan for the future for the next week per se. Let me just ask you then—I understand two days isn't much to turn this around but what is your plan for the next week then to repair your relationship.

Igor: again, I will try to set up meetings for next week. That's the main thing that I'm going to be working on. In terms of attending events—educational events—I have not had the chance to... or, I haven't really planned when that to occur.

Jonathan: do you think this is really more an opportunity for you to be proactive in seeking out events as opposed to waiting for people to come and tell you about them?

Igor: yes, I will be doing so. I hope you understand that I continue to be under a lot of pressure, and have had a lot of things to attend to in the past two days including meeting with the Administration.

Ben: Chloe?

Chloe: yeah, I just want to know if there was any updates on any promise of the letter. Are there any details?

Ben: yeah, I had a meeting with Thomas and Becky of AUS to talk about the vision of it. I can even show the document that we put together which were rough ideas. I think the intent this week was that there were four groups identified and that is two and two reached out to. Let's see if I can quickly find that. It laid out ultimate goals, rules, what we could potentially do, I think we have a meeting tomorrow? Oh yes, Monday we have it layered out at 7pm.

Chloe: I would just suggest heavy moderation at some points both at the beginning but also, I hate to say it but security, to be honest.



Ben: yeah we considered looking into—because there are people who are professional mediators. There are people who have certain specialties in mediating, specifically with this discussion in particular. I'm doing research to see if we can bring in anyone.

Chloe: I just wanted to change my comment, say that security might be necessary but not have any active presence because that can also make people feel uncomfortable. And then also, Peer Support Centre can operate when this is happen when this is going on so if people need it.

Ben: good point, that was not brought up before.

Chloe: or depending on where it is, if you get a room. A panel event, if it's in Leacock for example, they will often send remote volunteers to that room and operate even if it's not in their actual space.

Ben: very cool point.

Jonathan: just to respond to the point about moderation, I just think my goal from it anyway. The main thing I wanted to promote out of it was respectful discourse so I did want, to some extent, participation from the audience. And I know it's not as easy as getting everyone to hold hands and get along because it's hard to do on campus. Especially given how polarized it is, especially around Zionism. But my goal, I think Ben and Becky agree with me, is this would be slowly the first step... normalizing discussion and making it less polarized and trying to make people understand that they can disagree on but that certain ways of expressing that or violence is not the answer no matter how they do so. But of course that is very difficult considering the realities of campus right now.

Ben: yeah, I'll also mention that another step towards that could be a question submitting structure rather than people have submit it from the floor. Have people submitting in advance, and have a steering committee made of the groups that were listed in our contact like [inaudible] and Hillel and stuff, and they get to review those questions and decide which ones are a good idea to come forward and then additionally I think we wrote down an ultimate goal is recognizing that this might not the kind of event that turns out super, super perfect. There could be some escalation. But recognizing it's a step in some ways of activities. That eventually lead to an event where things go perfectly. But anticipating in advance that things probably won't. And recognizing the realities of that.

Ben: at this time, I can't actually see those minutes as well. I guess they haven't come forward yet. Like, I guess we are super short handed on resources because of the deficit that we are in. Like things sometime take some time. I'm going to contact Lauria and make sure those are up as soon as possible. And then we can vote on them, maybe we can get those out to the public. Because I think people want to be able to review those.

Jonathan: well I have a few more things regarding this discussion. I would like Director Sadikov to update the Board regularly with the process he's making with the steps that we've outlined in his statement. I



think this is a very fast-moving situation. Well I do respect that this must be a very tough time for you, and this can't be easy to balance everything that is going on. That steps need to be made now to rectify the situation because if, as I've said before, we expect students to have the legitimacy there actually has to be concrete action people see taken. Because it's not enough to say we respect Director Sadikov's apology, he expressed remorse. Other people need to see it too and I think the best way to do that is getting yourself out in the community and engaging with people that you seem to have hurt by your statement. So to that end, I mean I would like something twice a week for the first week and then we can discuss from there. Like an emailed-out report just to report to us just stating what you have done since the last report and what plans you have in the works going forward. So I'd like to hear your thoughts on that.

Igor: I can report at regular Board meetings, I don't think I am... yeah, like obviously I will set up the meetings with the relevant groups as possible. And I will follow up however we choose to pursue in that direction. But the other commitments were, especially those that concern learning are medium-term commitments. And like right now I don't believe I have the energy and mental capacity to report to the Board twice a week. I'm able to report at each regular meeting. If once things become a little easier on that front I'm open to reconsidering that but I can't commit to that at this time.

Chloe: can I propose maybe like a less formal reporting, and maybe informal updates and be flexible on that? I think there are relevant points on both sides, but a simple Facebook message to all of us like "oh, I met with these groups" it wouldn't be subject to debate or discussion outside of meetings but to keep us informed and in the loop would be helpful but with the understanding that nobody is to be starting a debate on Facebook.

Jonathan: yeah, just to let us know what's going on. To keep us in the loop and know what you're doing in respect to the things we outlined.

Igor: okay, sure. I will inform you of the steps that I take.

Jonathan: because also it would be useful for the Board to reference if someone were to ask "what's steps have been done" for the Board to have a statement to say "well, Igor has done X, Y, Z" and we can point to that as steps that have been taken. And yeah, I think that's important that those are done. And as I said I understood completely—school comes first—but this should come second, in my opinion. And your mental health honestly as well. I think it should come after that.

Ben: cool. Is there anymore discussion at this time. Awesome, do we have a motion to adjourn? First Adam, seconded by Jonathan. That will be enough. 7:26.



Students' Society of McGill University
Tel: (514) 398-6800 | Fax: (514) 398-7490 | ssmu.ca
3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3
Le conseil de direction, l'Assemblée générale et le conseil d'administration

6. Adjournment: 7:26 PM.

Muna Tojiboeva

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-08-09

APPROVED