



FALL 2017 SSMU GENERAL ASSEMBLY

1. Call to Order - 18:07

Meeting called to order at 18:07.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The speaker presents the land acknowledgement.

3. Adoption of Standing Rules at the Fall 2017 General Assembly

The speaker explains that the legislative council approved the rules last council, but this was only symbolic, and they must be approved here now. He adds that SSMU uses Robert's Rules, meant to facilitate debate and ensure that all voices are heard equally. Questions and statements must be addressed to the Speaker. He adds that members do not need to be experts on Robert's rules. The three main tenets of the standing rules are that: one cannot speak until the Speaker calls on them, when one speaks, all comments should be directed to the Speaker, and main motions can be amended.

The standing rules are projected on the screen and read out by VP Koparkar.

There are no questions regarding the standing rules.

Voting for motion for adoption of the standing rules: Motion passes.

4. Approval of the Agenda

The speaker explains that motions received were late motions, and there are two options to move forward. Since there are so many late motions, the Speaker can suggest that we can suspend the rules using a two thirds majority, which is the same amount needed to add each motion to the agenda. He explains that adding a motion to the agenda does not mean that you are voting in favour of it, only that you want to hear debate on it. The two options are voting separately, or suspending the rules and voting all at the same time.

The speaker asks if there are any points or motions on the floor.



Kevin Zhou from Arts motions to suspend Roberts Rules to add all motions at once. The motion is seconded by Andre Lametti from Medicine. The vote is too close to tell (need $\frac{2}{3}$), so a count is in order. The motion marginally passes.

Jonathan Glustein suggests a point of order to count the ballots physically rather than having the speaker do so as each raises them, because it may be difficult to see them. He suggests having them counted either by tally or by roll call. He would like an individual count for the motion.

Tre Mansdoerfer from Engineering suggests that in previous GAs they had SSMU representatives physically grabbing the ballots to count and then passing them back. This allows for a physical vote of the ballots rather than a visible one. This motion is seconded by Andrew Figueiredo in Arts. Voting on this motion is done by the default raising of placards. The motion fails.

Jonathan Glustein reiterates that he has serious concerns with simply voting by raising with placards. He can't accept that simply raising placards when it is so close is fair.

Jonathan Glustein motions to conduct a vote on whether to vote by collecting placards, by collecting placards.

Sara from Arts says that in the interest of democracy, it would be a waste of time to collect the ballots that way. We already voted on this, so it was counter-productive to change the voting.

Andrew Figueiredo states that we all want to make things quick and expedited, but it would be best to collect the placards in the interest of democracy.

Corinne Bulger from Arts has a point of personal privilege, suggesting that people wave hands rather than snapping. The speaker rules as chair that snapping is out of order because it is disruptive.

Jonathan Glustein adds that the reason why he is so concerned about the vote is that they don't even know the motions yet because they were submitted late and they haven't yet heard them. There may be motions that people want to hear and certain that people don't. His procedural motion is to vote by collected placard on whether to vote to suspend the rules by collected placard. Seconded by Andrew Chase in Arts.



Jonathan Glustein retracts his motion and proposes to revote on suspension of Robert's Rules to add all motions together. Seconded by Jim Smith in the Faculty of Arts. Motion for re-vote fails.

Jonathan Glustein asks a point of inquiry on what the original tally was for the motion to suspend the rules to add all the motions simultaneously. The speaker is consulting with the Parliamentarian and repeating the calculation. 131 were in favour, with 76 opposed. 131 divided by 207 is 63%, so it did not originally pass. The $\frac{2}{3}$ for the suspension did not pass, so we are still the adoption of the agenda phase.

There were some motions submitted more than 24 hours in advance, and 1 submitted less than 24 hours in advance, so each needs to be added to the agenda with a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority.

The Speaker invites those who submitted the motion to stand in line for the microphone and motion to amend the agenda to add their motions, because the Speaker cannot do this. The Speaker is simply explaining the process of adding motions to the agenda. He stresses that voting to add the motion is just a procedural statement, and not a political one at this point.

Lauren from Arts motions to add the motion "Motion advocating for SSMU to urge McGill's Participation with the international institute of education" Seconded by Corinne Bulger. The motion passes.

Arisha Khan from Arts motions to add the motion to nominate the auditor for the fiscal year of 2018. Seconded by Tre Mansdoerfer from Engineering. The motion passes.

Connor Spencer from Arts motions to add a motion for SSMU to condemn the disciplinary action against Khan at Dalhousie. Marine Mackarney from Arts seconds. The motion passes.

Alison from Arts motions to amend SSMU sustainability policy. Seconded by Andrew Adamalli from Arts. The motion passes.

Mira Herman in Arts motions for a motion regarding non-confidence on the SSMU President. Jad Kershamaw in Arts seconds.



Jonathan Glustein motions to conduct voting procedure by collection of placard. Manradi from Engineering seconds the motion. The speaker got 90 votes in favour and 129 opposed, so the motion fails.

Jemark Earle motions that the executive abstain from the vote. The Speaker states that this is out of order because it is a procedural matter, and in the GA executives are members at large.

Kevin Zhou asks if motions of non-confidence can be carried out in a regular GA, and the Speaker says they can be carried out here because the content of the motion does not contradict the governance documents, which is all he can say at this time.

A member motions for a secret ballot. Seconded by Lamine Masanni in Arts. This motion passes.

The speaker requests that everyone stay in their seats as they distribute the secret ballots.

Alison Ghu asks in a point of inquiry whether students can show their placards as they hand in their ballots to prove they are allowed to vote. (Certain students, such as exchange students, can only enter the GA as observers and not as voters)

The motion, via secret ballot, on the addition to the agenda of a motion of non-confidence in the SSMU President, with 162 in favour and 130 opposed, fails because it had 56% in favour and not the $\frac{2}{3}$ necessary.

Ben from Arts motions to reconsider the vote based on that it is because of the President's actions that the motion was late. The Speaker rules this out of order.

Catherine Jeffrey from Arts asks in a point of inquiry why the vote was done this way, stating that it is because of the President's actions that the vote had to be done like this. The Speaker explains that the vote was done this way because of the motion to vote like that, and states that no personal jabs will be tolerated during a time when only motions and points are being considered.

Vote on Adopting the Agenda: The Agenda passes.



5. New Business

1. Ratification of 2017-2018 Board of Directors

The Speaker reminds those who need a whisper translation that the translators are available, and they simply need to notify a volunteer.

The Speaker presents the motion.

Maya Koparkar from Arts motions to divide the question for each individual nominated director during voting. Seconded by Andrew Adamallik in Science.

Andrew Figuieredo in Arts believes that the question shouldn't be divided because almost 1 hour and a half has been devoted to procedural matters, and the question shouldn't be divided.

Jonathan in Arts states that dividing the Question is unconstitutional because of Section 6.4. The Speaker spoke to the Chief Justice in advance and it is not unconstitutional. Jonathan reads the section out. He states that Section 6.5 states that the GA must ratify based on the the whole board.

The Speaker explains that they spoke to the Chief Justice and PARliamentarian for 30 minutes and decided that the "whole" is meant to be "the whole General Assembly". This is how it was interpreted and this is what the Speaker received confirmation on.

The Speaker recesses for two minutes.

The Speaker states that with further consultation with the Chief Justice that 6.4 and 6.5 in the Constitution (which are projected on the screen and read out by the Speaker) mean that the original motion is wrong because it includes the names of the President and the VP Finance, and their names are not up for debate today. As such, their names are removed from the motion to leave 10 people.

A motion is needed from the floor to take out the names of Muna Tojiboeva and Arisha Khan, because they are constitutionally allowed to be in the Board.



Ray Fodor in Arts and Sciences motions to amend the motion to remove the names of the President and VP Finance. The VP Student Life Jemark Earle seconds the motion.

Patrick in Arts asks why the motion to divide exists. The Speaker replies that that motion was in fact nullified, and now we are amending the motion to take out Arisha Khan and Muna Tojiboeva from the list of names. The amendment passes.

Debate on the main motion

Jean Bachand asks whether the motion can now be divided, explaining that the reason is that there are some people who they may want to ratify and others who they may not want to.

The Speaker explains that right now this is not debate over voting procedure, but that motion can be suggested during voting procedure.

Member from Arts asks a point of Parliamentary Inquiry of whether the Speaker would entertain amendments to provide for the removal of some Directors. The Parliamentarian will check the constitutionality.

Laura in Engineering states that the Constitution 6.10 mandates diversity on the Board of Directors, and says that she can't tell from the names listed whether this follows the Constitution.

Jonathan Glustein in Arts says that Section 6.10 only has to do with Vacancy and not with this, and the member may be referring to the Terms of Reference, which has nothing to do with this. He asks if the member can clarify what is not seen as diverse in the names. The member responds that she said that they can not tell from the names whether it fulfills the constitution.

Patrick in Arts states that it is clear that the motion to divide is politically charged and asked why we are allowing this to come forward and undermine democracy. The Speaker responds that this is not a motion to divide.

Move into voting procedure.

The Speaker recesses.



The Speaker says that from the recess they reconvened and were asked by a Member at Large what the rule of process is for a director. Based on the constitution, to remove someone from the board of directors, it needs to come from the board itself and must pass with $\frac{2}{3}$ if removing a non-officer member. To remove an officer, as interpreted by the judicial side is that you would need to call for the removal of the officer using a special general assembly, not this one.

The Speaker entertains motions on voting.

Chantal in Arts motions to divide the question per person. Laura in Engineering seconds the motion. The motion to divide the question passes with 106 in favour and 64 opposed.

Jonathan puts a point of order as a notice to the speaker that this will be put under protest with the Judicial Board.

The Speaker explains that as each vote moves for each member, one can vote in favour, against, or abstaining.

Andrew Figuieredo has a point of parliamentary inquiry on why there was no debate on the division of the question. The Speaker responds that they saw in the rules that debate is not allowed in the division of the question section. The Speaker adds that they will triple check.

The Speaker recesses for two minutes.

The Speaker apologizes for the recesses and updates that they have determined that the motion to divide the question has not debate. The Speaker will entertain debate regarding each person, and they will then move onto a vote. The Speaker reminds the members that they are debating on the individual's merits, and cannot be an attack on the personhood, and the Speaker will not entertain debate that falls outside of the person's merits and qualifications. He reminds them that the necessary qualifications can be found in the Constitution on the SSMU Website.

Motion to ratify Vivian Campbell's appointment. The motion passes.

Motion to ratify Jemark Earle's appointment. The motion passes.



Motion to ratify Madeleine Kausel's appointment. The motion passes.

Motion to ratify Maya Koparkar's appointment. The motion passes.

Motion to ratify Noah Lew's appointment. The Speaker and Parliamentarian each counted twice. With 73 in favour, 12 abstaining, and 105 opposed, this motion fails.

No motion for recess, but a pause taking place as some members leave and quorum is checked. Quorum has been maintained. The Speaker explains that the faculty restriction has been removed in April due to an amendment. The Speaker will announce official quorum tally once the tally is completed.

Motion to ratify Mana Moshkforoush's appointment. The motion passes.

Motion to ratify Josephine Wright O'Manique's appointment. With 23 in favour, 86 opposed, and 24 abstentions, the motion fails.

Motion to ratify Jessica Rau's appointment. With 86 in favour, 3 opposed, and 84 abstaining, the motion passes.

Motion to ratify Alexander Scheffel's appointment. With 20 in favour, 87 opposed, and 26 abstaining, the motion fails.

Motion to ratify Kevin Zhou's appointment. With 119 in favour, 1 opposed, and 28 abstaining, this motion passes.

The Speaker explains that technically the Whereas clauses now need to be voted on. The motion passes.

2. Motion to Approve the Auditor for the 2017-2018 Fiscal Year

The Speaker presents the motion.

There are no points or motions on the floor.

Voting procedure by default placard. The motion passes.



3. Motion Advocating for SSMU to Urge McGill's Participation with the International Institute of Education's Syria Consortium for Higher Education in Crisis

The Speaker presents the motion.

Noor Mamlouk Babu in Arts states that according to the UN, 40,000 schools in the last year alone have been destroyed. 80% of Syrian refugees in Lebanon are not in school. The majority of refugees are not in school in the countries that mainly take in these refugees. It should be understandable why they are being called the lost generation and why this is a crisis. Despite this, there has been no institutional support. As students at McGill, we all understand the importance of education in leadership, and this is a change for McGill to step up and create a change rather than just talking about it.

Andrew Figuiereido in Arts says that he thinks he speaks for everyone when he says that this should have a unanimous yes vote. There are many divisive issues at McGill but this is one that everyone can agree on, according to the Member.

Voting by default placards. With 1 abstention, the motion passes.

4. Motion for SSMU to Condemn the Disciplinary Action Being Taken Against Masuma Asad Khan at Dalhousie

Connor Spencer from Arts gives context that this is a student politician who had a formal complaint launched against her for her activism with the Student Union, and the University decided to go through an official process, taking place in November and December, about discrimination against white people in her discussion of white fragility with regards to the Canada 150 events.

There are no more points or motions on the floor.

Default voting by placard. With 3 opposed and 10 abstentions, and the rest in favour, the motion passes.

5. Motion Regarding Amendments to the SSMU Sustainability Policy



Nadine Pataez in Arts asks a point of inquiry over whether more motions will be entertained from the floor. The Speaker says this is possible if the rules are suspended, but asks that this is brought up again after this main motion is voted on.

Default voting procedure by placard. With an overwhelming in favour, 3 against, and 8 abstentions, the motion passes.

Nadine Pataez in Arts motions for a suspension of the rules in order to add to the agenda a Motion Calling for a Concrete Action Plan Regarding Club Displacement from the SSMU Building During the Closure. Anna Paula Sanchez seconds the motion.

Emad Nodin in Engineering has a point of order to add on the agenda that motion 5c has passed. The Parliamentarian resolves this.

The Speaker explains that the motion to suspend the rules has been retracted at this time because the motion is not yet written out. In order to introduce a main motion, it needs to be written out and sent to parliamentarian@ssmu.ca.

6. Question Period

Laura in Engineering asks the Speaker when the deadline was for the not late motion and when it was published. Constitutionally speaking, the Speaker replies that it is 3 weeks, and that publicity is not his domain. Laura follows up asking constitutionally whose responsibility it is to deal with publication. The Speaker states that technically under the Constitution, all General Assembly preparation should be done between the President and the Speaker. Laura asks the President when the deadline was for the motion and where it was publicized.

Noah Capon from Arts asks the VP Internal, according to section 10.13 of the Constitution the VP Internal is responsible for the communications strategy of the Society, why the building closure was not communicated to students and why the building closure update was not communicated to students until Monday despite another email being sent out on Friday by the McGill administration. VP Koparkar calls on the VP Student Life to contribute. VP Student life replies that the email was sent on Sunday. He adds that the Facebook event was created for the tenants of the building and was linked in the official notification sent to the tenants, and apologizes that it was created before the official Listserv.



Marina from Arts and the Daily asks why this year's Board of Director's meeting minutes are not verbatim and are instead general summaries. VP Khan answers that there was concern from the last Board of Directors that it costed too much money, but if the student body wants verbatim minutes, they can advocate the board to spend the extra money for the recording secretaries to make the minutes verbatim. To do this, a member can request the board to create them verbatim. There is nothing structurally preventing this, besides costs. Marina follows up asking where exactly to submit this request, and the Speaker replies that this can be directed to the Chair of the Board.

Andrew states that the VP External has been using the SSMU page to send out emails advocating for provincial associations, and asks if this is a clear conflict of interest. VP Spencer replies that she was mandated to observe AVEQ and be a connection with them. It was only this last council that she was mandated to start communicating with other student unions. She was using the tools of her job to do her job. In her listserv sent out today, UEQ was included since she has now received the official mandate to connect with UEQ.

Catherine Jeffrey in Arts asks where the President is. The Speaker states that this is not an appropriate question at this time but he isn't sure.

A member states that based on the minutes of the Board of Directors, there is no representation of the financial decisions. The VP Khan responds that the minutes include these financial decisions and are available online and asks for clarification, since the audit was represented both to the board and to legislative council. VP Khan adds that she is not mandated to report every single transaction, which would take up over 40 hours to do line by line. Typically the VP finance reviews the budget biannually, and so at the end of the semester she will be reviewing this. She asks for clarification on what specific reports the member is looking for.

Member from arts asks VP Khan what information she leaked from the BoD, why she leaked it, and why she initially lied. VP Khan maintains that what was considered to be a leak was not a confidential email and it brings up a greater conversation over what the Board considers to be confidential. She cannot answer a question on why she leaked information because she doesn't feel that she did.

Marina asks why the Board of Directors Resolution Book hasn't been updated since June 2016, and whose responsibility it is to do that. VP Student Life replies that they will provide an answer later after communicating with the chair of the board. Marina asks



how it will be communicated to the public. VP Student Life asks how she would like it to be delivered. He suggests that it can be included in the Resolution book when it is updated.

Eli in Arts states that the VP Finance is mandated to provide a budget report by October 31 in the legislative council, and the last legislative council was the last before this deadline. VP Finance replies that because the budget report was not revised last year, she did state at legislative council that she would be cleaning up the last report and would instead give a report near the end of the semester and would be creating a budget for the next fiscal year.

Arno in Arts asks the President what her thoughts are on the motion of adding to the agenda a motion of non-confidence in the President. Even though it didn't reach $\frac{2}{3}$, it did reach a simple majority and Arno believes it deserves a response. They add that he would like to know if she is doing anything to try to calm the general discontent surrounding her position.

Jordan in Science asks the VP External whether she will condemn the anti-semitic sentiments of Democratize SSMU. VP External replies that this is not particularly relevant to her specific portfolio, but she encourages anyone to pursue equity complaints through the VP University Affairs portfolio.

The SSMU constitution stipulates that SSMU documents must be in French and English, and asks why the Document hasn't been updated in French since 2013, and asks why many documents are non-existent in French when the constitution states that SSMU has the two official languages of English and French. VP External thanks the member for raising the concern, because it is very important. She switches to French to say that even introducing French in this space is very important, and thanks the member for bringing this to her attention and would be happy to work with the member on this. VP Oke adds that the previous VP University affairs was working with the Faculty of French language and literature in translating SSMU documents, and this process was unfortunately halted but they are in communication with a Professor to bring this back.

Andrew Chase in Arts states that the VP External was unable to answer multiple questions about what the political issues at stake with the vote of non-confidence were, and asks when transparency will be given. The VP External responds that the idea of political views was never mobilized by the VPs, as can be seen in the livestream and the official statement that is available to anyone who asks. It was only in the following



statement by the President that the idea of political statements was mobilized, and VP Spencer was waiting for the President to answer this question and she didn't.

The President returns to the room so Arno in Arts re poses their question. They ask about the growing discontent surrounding the President, which the President has replied to in the media, and which he feels the motion presented was about, so he asks if the President has any kind of answer about what she is thinking of doing. If such a motion is coming forward, they think it comes from a place where people do not feel included. They ask what her views are. The President replies that there are 24,000 people at McGill so 160 are not a majority. 160 people voted no to a Director only because he was Jewish, and the discontent seems to be coming from one issue that is political and has nothing to do with work performance. The minutes are on the website and have been there for quite some time, and the procedure on approving minutes has been followed. She understands issues of transparency but thinks it is being used as a scapegoat. She is sick and tired of the GAs being seen as the majority of the people while decisions of 100 people affect the numerous other students at McGill. Arno follows up that their question is about a general atmosphere of discontent and asks how the President will make efforts to include the students who are discontented. President Tojiboeva states that she is open to ideas on how to open the conversation, but she is not in favour of problematic personal targets. She is open to a friendly and open dialogue but thinks it may be difficult to reconcile when it is about personal attacks. She is open for a friendly dialogue where real amends can be made.

Another question is reopened for the President. The question is when the deadline was for non-late motions and where it was publicized. The President responds that the deadline was October 4th, and she apologizes that it wasn't published, and they were dealing with some internal issues.

Nadine Pataez motions to suspend the rules in order to put forward the motion Calling For a Concrete Action Plan Regarding Club Displacement in the SSMU Building Next Year. Seconded by Patrick from Arts. With 78 in favour and 35 opposed, this passes with 69%. The rules are suspended to add the motion.

New motion:

Nadine Pataez in Arts proposed the motion and is an executive for the players' theatre. They have had a lot of trouble, because as a theatre they have special needs in terms of relocation. She reads out some SSMU policy, saying that SSMU's primary obligation is to support SSMU groups. Student endeavours shall be prioritized over any other



endeavour in SSMU space, according to the website. She reads this as SSMU saying they are here for clubs and want to help them. Speaking on behalf of her executive team, they feel abandoned. They already scheduled four shows in the Spring and now had to sit down with a Director who was excited about the show and say that it can potentially not be put on. They had to completely cancel a comedy show that they host, they had to move up their production of the McGill drama production. They have been around for almost 100 years and are a part of the McGill and Montreal culture, and they feel abandoned by a society that is supposed to represent them. At the Building Closure Information Session, they asked if there would be any support, like monetary support, but the only response they got were vague requests to email them, and it feels like nothing is being done, which is why she is calling for this motion. She rereads the “be it resolved” clauses. She also acknowledges midnight kitchen.

Dudley in Arts who works for midnight kitchen states that they are also worried and that a kitchen is a harder thing to find than an office. She would like to second the stated concerns and also say that dealing with the executives has generally been unhelpful, although she understands that they inherited this problem. Particularly speaking with the General Manager has been problematic and they have felt neglected and wonder what the GM’s priorities are if it isn’t about supporting clubs, since that is what keeps SSMU running.

Jemark Earle in Music suggests a friendly amendment to change the title to stay “student groups” rather than “clubs” to reflect the language used in the Constitution. VP Earle asks a question about the first “Be it Resolved” clause, asking for clarification on what it means. The mover replies that it has been difficult to meet with the VP Student Life, and the Director had to send multiple emails to get an appointment, and the clause is mainly to make sure that people get an appointment.

A member asks the mover for clarification on if a concrete plan would require specifics, considering the diversity of the groups involved. She asks if it will have certain criteria, will be general, or will involve case-by-case discussions. The mover responds that she leaves it up to the executives as to how this will come into play, but she wants to know that they will support them, but it ultimately boils down to how they want to deal with it.

Samuel in Arts motions to add an amendment. The amendment is friendly, and is being sent to the Parliamentarian to be added to the motion.

Move to voting for main motion. The motion passes. Quorum is maintained so it passes as a general assembly motion.



7. Announcements

Vincent in Arts is the VP Internal of the SWSA, and they just voted to present a motion condemning Bill 62 as racist and islamophobic and they encourage SSMU to do the same. The Speaker adds that a motion regarding Bill 62 will be put forth at the next legislative council.

A member in Arts motions to suspend the rules to add question period for 15 minutes. Seconded by Andre Lametti in medicine. The VP Internal says that while she is amenable to questions, she encourages everyone to be conscious of time and the volunteers here and she recommends those interested in asking questions to attend executive office hours, since a lot of people don't know about this direct access to executives. The Speaker adds that question period also occurs in legislative council.

Vote on adding 15 minute question period. The motion fails with 52 in favour, and 42 against. The $\frac{2}{3}$ needed are not reached. The Speaker states that the next legislative council is November 2nd and there is a question period then.

Connor Spencer in Arts announces that on November 3 there will be a panel on municipal elections about the municipal election occurring on November 5, followed by an info session on what you need to know to vote in the municipal election.

Jemark Earle in Music announces that they need people to register for club and service workshop which is mandatory to maintain their status.

Arisha Khan in Arts says there is a mandatory club audit workshop taking place on October 28 from 9-5. This is a response to the audits not being up to par.

8. Executive Reports

1. Vice-President (External Affairs)

The Vice President External Affairs Connor Spencer presents the report.

2. Vice-President (Internal Affairs)

The Vice President Internal Affairs Maya Koparkar presents the report.



Bee from Arts asks about the role of providing more accessible events, and asks about events that are often drinking-centred. She asks what more accessible events look like concretely to the VP Internal. The VP replies that she is working on developing events for Innovation Week, and also wants to ensure that other events are planned besides Faculty Olympics in the Winter Semester.

Molly in Arts asks about what the First Year Shadowing program will look like. VP Internal clarifies that the FYC execs will be shadowing the SSMU executives.

Note: Quorum lost at 22:20 (10:20 PM).

3. Vice-President (Finance)

The Vice President Finance Arisha Khan presents the report. The audit workshop is from 10-12 PM, not 9-5, as stated in the original announcement.

Andrew Figuiere do in Arts asks if the VP anticipates any fee increases or serious decreases in student services with the building closure. The VP Finance replies that there is always a need for a fee increase, and a reason why there was a deficit last year is that there was no fee increase. In terms of the financial impact of the building closure, they are trying to talk to McGill about not having to pay for that, and they are also looking into having the building fee potentially allocated to affairs other than just the building.

4. Vice-President (Student Life)

The VP Student Life Jemark Earle presents the report.

5. Vice-President (University Affairs)

The VP University Affairs Isabelle Oke presents the report.

Andre Lametti from Medicine states how the assessment policy doesn't pertain well to the medicine faculty and asks VP Oke if they have considered how the assessment principles will pertain to different faculties. VP Oke responds that it is the Deputy Provost Student Life and Learning and not the VP who is moving this forward, but the principles will be more general regarding good pedagogy and would not have any binding effect of faculties, but would allow these faculties to



develop their own assessment policies that reflect the needs of that specific faculty.

6. President

The President Tojiboeva presents the report.

Julia in Arts asks a question regarding the Board of Governance. The Secretary General to PGSS has stepped down, meaning there is a vacancy, so the President is the only speaking student on the Board of Governance, and so the member asks what sort of things the President considers when she speaks at the Board, and asks what concrete steps for representation and accessibility the President is taking in terms of the Board. The President responds that they have strict rules in terms of how to ask questions from the public, but she typically asks questions in committee to focus on details in the executive committee and NGE. The member asks a follow-up question if the President cannot speak in the meetings. The President replies that she can, but that she usually does it in the committees because there is more time and it has more impact, because in the Board it is essentially almost final.

Laura in Engineering asks about the Tribune article by the Sustainability Commission stating that reasons for dissent against the President are not necessarily political, and asks what the President will do to fix the mistakes outlined in the article. The President responds that she didn't read the article, but in terms of the Sustainability commissioners, there is very little institutional memory and documents to base actions off of, so the President is attempting to change that by creating these documents to aid in transition, as outlined in the report.

Member motions to suspend rules to add question period of 12 minutes.
Seconded by Jamal from Science.

Andrew Figuiereado states that each executive has office hours which are a good option for questions.

A member says he messaged the President to ask about executive hours which are during the GA, and did not receive a response.

With 25 in favour and 16 opposed, the motion fails.



Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

Tel: (514) 398-6800 | Fax: (514) 398-7490 | recsec@ssmu.ca

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

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

9. Adjournment

Andre Lametti motions to adjourn. Ray Fodor seconds. The motion passes. The general assembly is adjourned at 22:57 (10:57 PM)

APPROVED