



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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

February 17, 2019, 2:00 PM:

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

In attendance: Garima Karia (Legislative Councilor), Mu Rong Yang (Legislative Councilor), Jessica Rau (Member at Large), Kyle Rubenok (Member at Large), Matthew McLaughlin (Vice President Internal), Jonah Levitt (Member at Large), Tre Mansdoerfer (President, non-voting), Jun Wang (Vice President Finance), Lucille Xiang (Member at Large), Bryan Buraga (Legislative Councilor).

Regrets: Jacob Shapiro (Vice President University Affairs), Andrew Figueiredo (Legislative Councilor).

AGENDA

1. Call to Order: **2:08 PM;**
2. Adoption of the Agenda - **ADOPTED;**
3. Public Session:
 - a. BoD Minutes 2018-11-13 (for Approval):

President Mansdoerfer asks can just have approvals for all of them as one, and is curious whether Directors can approve them without conversations about each one though. The President notes that if they want to redact the confidential session minutes from 3.e. that could be done. There is a consensus, and therefore the Confidential discussion in the public agenda of item 3.e. is removed. Director Rau notes that she attended the November session but is not listed as such. The President notes this to be changed. The Director also notes that the November 12th minutes are from November 13th. The President notes this to be changes.

- i. Director Rau was in attendance;
 - ii. Fix the date for November 13th;
 - b. BoD Minutes 2018-12-01 (for Approval):
 - c. BoD Minutes 2018-12-14 (for Approval):
 - d. BoD Minutes 2019-01-20 (for Approval):
 - e. BoD Minutes 2019-02-03 (for Approval):
 - i. Redaction of confidential discussion in public agenda.



f. Minutes omnibus – Approved:

President Mansdoerfer motions to vote in omnibus on these public minutes for approval, Directors Yang, Rau, Rubenok, Levitt, Karia, McLaughlin and Xiang are all in favour. Directors Buraga and Wang abstain. These minutes are therefore approved.

g. BoD Member at Large and International Representative (for Approval):

Nominating Committee Member at Large Sam Haward presents his report. Haward notes that this was submitted twice, once with the candidates' names redacted and once with their actual names for confidential purposes. Also remarks that the Nominating Committee has never submitted a full report before which is probably not good as it is a HR committee and that sort of thing needs to be transparent. The report contains a summary of what they did, how the process went, and any hyperlinks lead to documents that have been submitted to board, such as hiring grid and interview questions.

The next section details some issues encountered, such as with Smart Recruiters, where they could not access applications, delaying them about a week. The SSMU also does not have a conflict of interest policy so the Nominating Committee used a motion that has been proposed to council as a guide on how to do their work. Haward remarks that the Nominating Committee only has 4 voting members, this should normally be 6, and so sometimes a single vote would decide whether a candidate gets shortlisted or not, and this was a problem.

Haward recommends that next year there will need to be more members at large a little earlier into the school year to prevent drops. The interview rubric also needs revision as it was based on what HR envisioned and interpreted by the Nominating Committee at time. As a result, it is sometimes way too specific and makes it almost impossible to get a perfect score, and other times there is not enough detail for actual effective analysis to be done. Between now and j-board hiring this summer, Haward recommends this be re-done for both j-board and the Board of Directors. Overall, everything is fixable, and the whole period was very successful, Nominating Committee's most competitive ever, with 24 applications for 2 positions.

Questions and Debate:

President Mansdoerfer remarks that a process where the Nominating Committee come to the Board and outline their expectations and game plan going in to the selection might make process a lot better and supports getting more people involved in the positions.

Haward notes for Directors' consideration that candidates' names have been replaced with ABCD and E in the report, with their individual interview questions and responses linked



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

under their letters. These contain the scoring grid, which shows the final scores at the bottom, and the three sets of questions asked in the interview, situational questions, general knowledge of SSMU and interest questions, and Board specific questions. The recommendation from Nominating Committee is Candidate B. They scored the highest on their interview, had experience on the Board of a non-profit in MTL, worked with JED consulting, not on a SSMU project but another one, and had generally strong knowledge and interest in SSMU. Their reservations are more of a logistic nature, as not all members of the Nominating Committee were able to vote on this recommendation due to a conflict of interest. In addition, candidate D had a medical leave of absence last year that definitely affected their score on general questions but their performance on behaviour based and board specific questions was almost identical to candidate B's.

President Mansdoerfer asks if anyone has any thoughts, as knows that Directors Levitt and Rau are on committee as well as Director Figuerido.

Director Karia asks about Candidate D's leave of absence and the effect this had on the general questions, specifically what was the nature of these questions.

Haward replies that they were in the vein of "what kind of experience have you had", which given the candidate was not at school last semester, left them at a disadvantage.

VP Wang asks if is possible to remove any gender pronouns from interview questions, as it is not that impartial if you can redact candidate's name but know the person's gender. Haward agrees but notes that this would take some time. VP Wang replies that it is fine for now, as most are alright, and only candidate B has that issue.

Director Rau apologizes, as they were the one taking notes, and remarks that it is hard when speaking to someone, to refer to them as 'they' as it happens so quickly. VP Wang says that is fair, but is just wondering if it could be edited after. Director Rau says absolutely and that she will go in and edit it now.

Director Karia asks about the mention of a candidate having observed AUS council two days ago, and having changed their mind on the priority. The Director wonders which priority they are referring to. Haward clarifies that they were referring to their experiences, so how they had ranked their experiences. Director Karia is a bit bemused that attending AUS council made them change their priorities.

President Mansdoerfer asks if there are any questions from those attending over the phone.

VP Wang asks if Board will be choosing everyone on the shortlist, and inquires as to how many members they are hiring. President Mansdoerfer replies that the Board is selecting one Member at Large. They also have the ability to have real names associated with the



candidates, and then redacted from these minutes. From his experience over the summer, there is not a lot of value in having names associated unless Board picks a candidate and then wants to discuss that person as an individual after. This was an issue they encountered last Fall with a candidate. If people do want to see the names they can but the President does not think it is constructive.

President Mansdoerfer notes that it is between Candidate B and D, and asks if Candidate B's answers to the questions were really that much stronger. Director Rau replies that she interviewed Candidate B, not D, but based on the rubric alone, B was better. They have great finance experience and have sat on board before and therefore would be stronger candidate, especially given the short term they are being hired for and the fast on-boarding needed.

VP Wang notes that reading through interview guide, Candidate B is most qualified of the 4 candidates, but also likes C. And also B, as their JED experience, where they have intense recruiting cycle, would therefore bring a lot of experience.

Director Rubenok sees that there is a requisite called 'quality of integrity' where Candidate B has a score of 2, and asks what does this mean.

Haward replies that this question is: "can you name a time when you made a mistake and how you dealt with it?" The response to the question shows that their answer was not a strong example, in fact it was that the candidate came to McGill, entered the heterogeneous bubble here and had to learn to open themselves up. There was no explicit professional stake, and no owning up to their error.

President Mansdoerfer asks for clarification that this was a bad answer, reflective of someone with poor morals. Haward replies that this pretty much sums it up.

Director Levitt remarks that he interviewed candidate D, and that this decision was a bit of a challenge for him as he has conflict of interest with candidate B, but that he and Haward both agree that Candidate D interviewed very well, especially with behaviour based questions. Haward notes that the differentiating character between the two candidates is that candidate B has more professional experience and relevant experience, while candidate D has more knowledge of SSMU, governance and the Board and scored very well on behaviour based questions.

President Mansdoerfer says this will depend on what we see as more valuable. This term would be short, but could be extended after May 31st based on availabilities. The President thinks they should pick someone and not draw this out too much. The President asks if those attending remotely have any questions. He then asks if there is consensus among directors.



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

VP Wang asks if this member at large is a voting member or if this is the international representative. President Mansdoerfer notes there are two separate positions, and that this is the voting one, i.e. the Member at large. If it makes sense, the President notes that they could see candidate B's name to verify there are no issues.

Director Rau adds one more thing about Candidate B, noting that they did ask about the possibility of extending their term, showing interest in staying beyond May 31st. Director Karia asks to confirm that Nominating Committee's recommendation was Candidate B, with some reservations. This is confirmed by Haward.

President Mansdoerfer says that Candidate B makes sense, and remarks that it also makes sense to reveal the name of candidate now so that if any board members know of any issues they can bring them up now. Haward notes that this is better to do in confidential session. The President agrees and says he will send the reports to councillors now but that they will do the full vote in confidential session. For now, Candidate B seems like the better candidate.

Regarding the International Representative, Haward says that one candidate stood out here. There is also a candidate D that they reached out to, but they were not available at any point on the Nominating Committee's poll. They then asked the Candidate if there was a time that would work for them before the Board meeting, they did not reply and therefore have not been interviewed. Overall, the one clear standout candidate, Candidate E, performed very well in the interview, has a good knowledge of the SSMU, and is on the executive of a SSMU service. They have Communications experience, have the ability to be self-reflective, and reached out to past international student representatives and current directors to learn more about job.

President Mansdoerfer asks if there are other thoughts from Nominating Committee members or any questions or thoughts on this Candidate.

VP Wang does not understand the purpose of a non-voting Board member, as they would just be a figurehead. The VP does not see the point of sitting without voting, the representative would have no power. President Mansdoerfer points out that he is non-voting Board member, and yet jokes that he is relatively important to the Board. Then again maybe not.

Director Rubenok notes that one big service to international students is the health and dental plan, which gets approved at Board and therefore having an international student who benefits from this service at the table is fairly important.

Director Karia remarks that even if they are not voting, they can provide interesting insight and perspective is to be had from their input. VP Wang agrees but is concerned about the lack of incentive if the position has no ability to change anything. President Mansdoerfer encourages the VP to bring this up to the governance reform committee that he and VP



Shapiro are on as they are analyzing board there. Haward clarifies that international students only get the dental plan.

President Mansdoerfer asks if there are any other thoughts. To him, Candidate E seems head and shoulders above the rest so it does not really warrant much discussion.

Director Levitt notes that the candidate directly addressed being non-voting and still seemed interested. President Mansdoerfer agrees that there have been issues with retention for international reps based off of this non-voting status, so it is important to recognize.

Director Rubenok adds that Candidate E also reached out to Board members, such as himself and Director Rau, which shows both initiative and interest.

President Mansdoerfer says that Candidate E is the front runner, and they will talk more about them in confidential session. The President thanks Haward for a great report, noting that this is what Nominating Committee should be to share this report with public.

h. Involvement Restriction Legal funding (Approval)

President Mansdoerfer says this is a request from him to the Board, as he needs funding through the board whenever a legal fund is required. The President has been working on this this year, and the purpose is to create a faculty-wide policy to restrict people from participating in Frosh and from attending these events if they have been banned. Currently, if you were to commit sexual or physical violence at Arts frosh and get banned as a result, that ban would not extend to other faculty froshes. It is also event specific, and bans from carnival, e-week etc. only impact the specific event and not any others. For communicating those who have been banned, there is no legal way to do so right now, and he is working through it with all faculties, where everyone is on board and engaged. This funding would be to draft a Memorandum of Agreement between faculties and the policy itself in a structure that is legally sound. The President is requesting half of the amount required, and he will ask faculties to supply the rest. The estimate is \$4,500 plus taxes, so asking the Board for \$2,500 as taxes will likely bring this us to \$5,000.

Director Rubenok notes that it would be more like \$5,200 plus taxes so the amount the President would want is \$2,700. President Mansdoerfer agrees and amends his request to reflect that. The President clarified that the faculties will split the rest of the required amount proportionally, and that the goal is to roll this out at frosh next year so that any bans there are implemented over the rest of the year. The President concludes by emphasizing that this is a very serious issue, and impacts about 20-30 people per event, so 80-100 people over a year.



Director Rubenok asks if the legal language can be drafted in such a way that it could be extended to non-faculty events. For example, large-scale SSMU or SSMU club's events. The Director knows there are concerns about releasing the list of names but if a list of invitees could be sent in and individuals could then be flagged as not being recommended to participate that would be something.

President Mansdoerfer replies that this is end goal, to have it be in house and run by staff, and then could very attendees for big social events, like McMUN's social events. Eventually could also be a software to confirm if someone can go into student bar or event. Director Rubenok asks if we can ask the lawyers to cover all this now so we don't have to come back to them again at a later date. The President agrees.

Director Levitt asks what the Timeframe for this is. President Mansdoerfer responds that they should hear back in a week or two, so end of February, or beginning of March. It would then go to the faculties, and would be finalized and signed by end of school year, end of April, to be ready to go for Frosh in August. The President notes that everyone involved is on board and engaged so hopefully it goes well.

Director Rubenok asks if there will be a process for grandfathering in existing faculty-specific bans. President Mansdoerfer replies that this is not possible right now, and they would need to be newly processed, as waivers would have to have been signed at the time for the faculties to be able to disclose their bans.

- i. Motion to approve \$2,700 of legal fee funding for the Involvement Restriction policy – **Approved** :

The President Motions to approve \$2,700 to fund the legal work for the Involvement Restriction policy. All Directors are in favour and therefore it is approved.

- j. Legislative Council Motion (Approval) – **Approved** :

President Mansdoerfer presents the motions from last Legislative Council for approval. They are all in the drive for Directors to view.

Director Karia asks if Councillor Milchberg resigned in the end. President Mansdoerfer replies that he did not.

Director Buraga remarks that the messaging portion of the IRs was changed, and wants to make sure this doesn't violate anti-spammer or privacy laws, as for emails, you need to have a person's consent before sending newsletters or unsolicited emails to them.



Director Rubenok does not think this is on the SSMU, rather would be on candidate to ensure they are following those laws. He also notes that a certain amount of consent is implied in being friends with someone on Facebook or accepting their message request.

The President Motions to approve the motions from Legislative Council, this is approved unanimously.

- k. Motion to approve Sam Haward to be in confidential session for duration of Nominating Committee business – **Approved** :

The President asks if Director want Haward to stay for the Confidential session for the items involving the Nominating Committee. The Consensus is yes.

The President Motions to approve Haward to be in the Confidential session only for duration of the Nominating Committee business. All Director are in favour, therefore this is approved.

4. Confidential session
5. Adjournment: 3:07.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tre Mansdoerfer', written over a horizontal line.

Tre Mansdoerfer, President

APPROVED