SSMU BOARD OF DIRECTORS PUBLIC MINUTES

February 6, 2020

The Board of Directors meeting of the Students’ Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held in the SSMU Boardroom on Thursday, February 6, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

Present: Phoebe Lee (Chair, non-voting), Sam Haward (Officer, non-voting), Bryan Buraga (Officer), Sanchi Bhalla (Officer), Rohan Bhutkar (Legislative Councillor), Ana Paula Sanchez (Member-at-Large, by teleconference), Jonah Levitt (Member-at-Large), Mustafa Fakih (Legislative Councillor), Billy Kawasaki (Officer), Jack Kline (Member-at-Large), Wing Wong (Parliamentarian, non-voting), Adam Gwiazda-Amsel (Officer, arrival at 18:28), Michal Chernov (Governance Manager)

Absent: Jordyn Wright (Legislative Councillor), Adin Chan (Legislative Councillor), Paige Collins (Member-at-Large)

1. Call to Order: 18:18

The Chair calls the meeting to order at 18:18.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The SSMU acknowledges that McGill University is situated on the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe nations, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst Indigenous peoples. The SSMU recognizes and respects these nations as the traditional custodians of the land and water on which it is located.

3. Adoption of the Agenda -- ADOPTED

4. Nominating Committee Report

The Parliamentarian explains that there were three (3) vacancies on the Judicial Board for justices, as well as a vacancy for International Representative on the Board. The Parliamentarian adds that after looking over the report he came to the realization that the justices should be predominantly hired from the Faculty of Law, but in light of the positions going up for recruitment on Smart Recruiters prior to this discussion, they proceeded with 2 law students and one non-law student. The Parliamentarian remarks that communication was a problem in this process as he sent multiple emails to the VP Internal for Law Students and the process should have been that they would elect their own candidates and present them to the SSMU upon which the SSMU would select from their candidates.
The Parliamentarian explains that for the vast majority of interviews, two members of the NomComm sat in on them, and then directs the Board of Directors to look to the screen for individual scores. The Parliamentarian points out that they picked candidate A, and screened for conflicts of interest. The Parliamentarian adds that there were originally four (4) International Representative candidates, of which two dropped out. The Parliamentarian states that in terms of the non-law Justices there was one person who was disqualified, as they previously had an executive role in the SSMU. The Parliamentarian recommends that in the future, interview questions for Judicial Board and Board of Directors must be changed as they do not elicit meaningful responses from candidates, as they are too vague and do very little to help identify if one candidate is better than another.

Director Buraga asks if HR coordinators were helpful in this process, to which the Parliamentarian responds that they were helpful in scheduling interviews, but they found this to be an extra layer of bureaucracy and personally believes that if skipped this step, it would be more efficient.

[Director Gwiazda-Amsel arrives at 18:28.]

VP Finance states that per the Committee Terms of Reference, Equity Commissioners are not to sit in on those interviews.

Director Fakih asks if the two NomComm members that sat in on the interviews were consistent with the applicant pool. The Parliamentarian asks for a clarification, to which Director Fakih responds, rephrasing as to whether they had considered discrepancies in interviewing between Person A or B and C and D (referring to the interviewing members). The Parliamentarian says that they did their best to have the same people sit in on as many interviews as possible however due to scheduling constraints this was not always possible and they had to have different people sit in at different times when this situation arose.

Director Buraga asks if the composition of two (2) Law students and five (5) non-Law students on the Judicial Board poses a problem. The Parliamentarian responds that they had this discussion and they decided that all the candidates would be brought up to speed regardless and this would not be a problem. Since the posting had already gone out, they had decided that to rescind the smartrecruiters application and to say that these positions would go exclusively to Law students would not be fair to students who had taken the time to submit their candidacies for the position.

5. Report of the Executive Committee

Director Buraga remarks that this is everything they have passed in the last few weeks and that they have had executive committee meetings back to back due to the time sensitive nature of some hires and if anyone has any questions they are free to ask him at this moment.

VP Finance explains that SSMU has stepped in to guarantee a contract for Savoy Society. In the past, SSMU would do this through simply giving out cash in the form of funding, but VP Finance says that he
does not feel that is a sustainable model and instead offered to get their payment dates pushed back to February 10th, and sign their contract on their behalf, which would have SSMU be legally bound to pay this contract of $9,000 dollars, if Savoy Society cannot make the payment by the deadline.

6. Legislative Council Motions for Ratification

   a. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Internal Regulations of Student Groups 2020-01-16 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

   b. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Effective Committees Policy 2020-01-16 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

   c. Motion Regarding Adoption of the SSMU Mental Health Policy and Plan 2019-01-09 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

   d. Motion Regarding the Adoption of the Gendered and Sexual Violence Committee Terms of Reference 2020-01-16 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

   e. Motion to Appoint Councillors Fakih, Mackie, and Dandamudi as Members to the Finance Committee -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

   f. Motion to Appoint Councillor Fried to the Affordable Student Housing Committee 2020-01-30 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

7. Email Approvals

   There are no email approvals.

8. Minutes for Approval

   a. Board of Directors Public Minutes 2020-01-09 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

9. Motions for Approval

   a. Motion to approve service provisions for the Involvement Restriction Policy and to mandate the VP Finance and Operations Director sign the policy -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

10. For Discussion

   a. Involvement Restriction Policy
Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that everyone should have received a copy of the involvement restriction policies which allows faculties to share information about restriction from events which includes a list of individuals who have committed acts of violence, such as sexual violence or racial discrimination amongst others that are defined in the Policy. Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that the SSMU would have to give about an hour every two weeks of the Anti-Violence Coordinators’ time to coordinate this and consolidate information from all the faculties and if someone is running an event and wants access to this list, the Anti-Violence Coordinator would be the one to compile this list and send it to the event coordinator. Director Gwiazda-Amsel is looking for the Board’s permission to approve the policy.

Director Kawasaki asks if the Faculty of Law will sign as well. Director Gwiazda-Amsel says that the only faculties that have expressed interest are the “Big 4”, as well as the Faculty of Education and Faculty of Medicine, but the Faculty of Law is not at the point of signing it yet but have expressed interest.

Director Buraga asks if they should first run this through Legislative Council. Director Gwiazda-Amsel says no, as they already have an Involvement Restriction Policy, which is why he previously remarked that the substantive portions of this document do not apply to the SSMU as they already have the Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy. This is simply to allow the faculties to have a central resource and does not actually change their policies, which is why they are not adopting it. They are not bound to anything, but are signing that they agree to undergo the processes outlined below (referring to the document). They recognize that the work on SSMU's end is being done by the office of the Anti-Violence Coordinators and that this is the process by which someone can seek out the involvement restriction policy.

Director Levitt asks who was involved in writing this document, Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that original versions were drafted by the Engineering Undergraduate Society, and then copied by the other “Big 4” undergraduate societies. The policy was then sent to Miller Thompson and screened by Equity Commissioners and then ratified.

Director Bhutkar asks what the process of amending the policy would look like. Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that within the policy, there is a Governing Committee that is responsible for the administration and upkeep of the policy. It would be the governing committee that would oversee amendments. Director Gwiazda-Amsel adds that they already have their Sexual Violence Mobilization and Advocacy Coordinator conducting research on the policy to look out for areas for possible improvements. Director Gwiazda-Amsel states that the Governing Committee could recommend changes and the benefit of this is having all the faculties in the room present at the same time. Ideally the Equity Commissioners from each Faculty would return with the information to their respective faculties, at which point, each Faculty would have to ratify and sign the new policy, which may take up to two (2) weeks.

11. Confidential Session: 18:47
The Board of Directors enters into Confidential Session at 18:47.

12. **Adjournment: 19:59**

[Signature]
Bryan Buraga, President