



SSMU BOARD OF DIRECTORS PUBLIC MINUTES

March 31, 2022

The Board of Directors meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference on Thursday, March 31, 2022 at 18:00.

Present: Alexandre Ashkir (Chair, non-voting), Jaz Kaur (Parliamentarian, non-voting), Eric Sader (Officer), Karla Heisele Cubilla (Officer), Sarah Paulin (Officer), Darshan Daryanani (Officer, non-voting), Sacha Delouvrier (Officer, non-voting), Ghania Javed (Council Member), Charlotte Gurung (Council Member), Yara Coussa (Council Member), Benson Wan (Council Member), Melissa Dunn (Member at Large), Kevin Franceschini (Member at Large), Asiyah Siddique (Member at Large)

Absent: Claire Downie (Officer), Daniel Dufour (General Manager, non-voting)

1. Call to Order: **18:12**

The Chair calls to order the meeting at 18:12 on March 31, 2022.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The SSMU acknowledges that McGill University is situated on the traditional and unceded territory of the Anishinaabeg and Haudenosaunee nations. The SSMU recognizes and respects these nations as the true and constant custodians of the lands and waters on which we meet today. Further, the SSMU commits to and respects the traditional laws and customs of these territories.

3. Attendance

The chair notes the absence of Director Downie and General Manager.

4. Adoption of the Agenda – **APPROVED**

Director Coussa inquires about moving the motion of statement, item 11.b after ratifying item 9.c.

Director Paulin motions to adopt the Agenda, seconded by Director Coussa. There is no opposition.

The Agenda is adopted.

5. Executive Committee Public Report – **FOR APPROVAL**



Officer Daryanani presents the Executive Committee Report. He mentions that hirings have been approved. VP Student Life is holding an event on April 7th. He approved motions for consultations for legal counsel and these will be further discussed in the meeting. The SSMU awards will take place on April 6th.

6. Announcement by Officer Daryanani

Officer Daryanani presents a timeline regarding the Notice of Default received by SSMU from McGill University, in a working document. He mentions that the Palestine Solidarity Policy was adopted with a majority of 71.1%. The following day, the Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) Fabrice Labeau sent a Notice of Default to Officer Daryanani with regards to the Memorandum of Agreement with McGill University. He mentions that the process of receiving letters is private and internal at this moment, and would be communicated transparently to the student body. On March 24th 2022, the Board of Directors and the Student Body received the statement sent by the MRO sent to all McGill University staff and students. Following that day, he presented a statement of notice of default. As well as ability to contest the results through the Judicial Board. He thanks members within call and legislative members for passing a motion regarding the statement in response to the MRO. He published another statement to clarify the situation with regards to the Palestine Solidarity policy and notice of default. On March 28th 2022, the Executive Committee approved \$5,000 for legal consultation regarding Notice of Default. He communicated with legal counsel. The next day, a brief meeting was held with the Deputy Provost Labeau along with Officer Daryanani, VP Student Life, and VP Finance. He mentions that most of the discussion centered around the MRO. He is waiting to consult with the council, recommendations of next step notice of MRO. He mentions that the timeline of the review will go until next week. He clarifies that the next steps are the following. First, clarify with the legal council. Second, waiting for legal review and recommendations. Third, conducting review with the judicial board as well as a review taken by election SSMU. He presents documents that have been forwarded to legal counsel and consulting notice of default.

Question period:

Question:

Director Coussa asks to share a link. She follows inquiring whether the Deputy Provost had been pressured with the MRO previously.

Answer:

Officer Daryanani responds that the document is shared in Drive, and is not a public document. He also answers that the MRO has been used as a tool to inform SSMU or hold. He answers yes.



Question:

Director Coussa asks for a recent example.

Answer:

Officer Daryanani responds that in November 2019 Deputy Provost Labeau came to the SSMU Legislative Council regarding a motion that was being presented for approval; once motion was adopted, then the Deputy Provost Labeau sent an email to the student body about the motion.

7. Presentations:

a. Triple Play 3-month report (Lainie Yallen)

Lainie Yallen presents a pilot project with results of Triple Play 3-month. There were over 3,000 students, highly hosted event clubs. She shows highlights that there has been strong momentum, work clubs and activities night, Monday competition, press conferences in tribune and daily, various retreats by different clubs. Platform gave clubs autonomy, and involved students from different parts of the world.

The motion was passed for a 3-month contract, but SSMU has the possibility for a unique contract. SSMU only paid \$1 for a seat filled, and did not encounter fixed fees. In general, the feedback is excellent from students making new friends. There are different large scale events that worked. As returning to events, Triple Play can provide an inclusive way whether not on campus or not going to different events for health safety reasons. Provides a hybrid form to reunite. She recommends continuing the service for the next twelve months with no fixed fees.

Director Heisele Cubilla mentions that the contract of the motion will be presented in the confidential session given the unique contract provided to SSMU. However, Lainie will be available for further questions.

Director Coussa brings positive feedback with the platform.

Question:

Officer Delouvrier mentions positive feedback. He inquires usage rate projections as there is a return to in-person activities.

Answer:

Lainie clarifies that it will be usage-based.



There are no further questions on the presentation.

8. Question Period (5)

Question:

Director Coussa notes that the Legislative Council approved a motion to oppose the MRO from McGill University. Hence, she hopes that the motion will be ratified and ratify the statement about the president and campaign coordinator worked on. She mentions that the Legislative Council opposed it. She does not see why the board would not ratify it.

Question:

Does the board of directors support or oppose McGill's decision on divesting holdings in 1985?

Answer:

Director Coussa responds that the Board of Directors support McGill's decision on divesting in South Africa in 1985. She reminds that the Divest of Human Right policy has been ratified by the BoD. So, the SSMU, legislative counsel, and the board, are mandated to respect decision on divesting for human rights.

Officer Daryanani responds that SSMU was incorporated in 1992-1993. This was the first time the Board had a lease with McGill, so the BoD supports the divesting. But SSMU did not exist until after.

Question:

Member of the gallery ask that with Director Downie's resignation, does the Board think that this could have been prevented? How does the Board plan to mitigate the vacancy of her seat on the caucus given that the presidency has previously forfeited?

Answer:

Officer Delouvrier responds that he is saddened to hear about resignation. He can't speak of further actions. He reiterates the argument of Director Downie written in her letter that it could have been prevented.

There are no further questions.



9. Legislative Council Motions for Ratification:

a. [Motion Regarding Accessible Libraries 2022-03-24](#) – **UNANIMOUSLY RATIFIED**

Director Coussa motions to approve by unanimous consent. Seconded by Director Sader. There is no opposition.

The motion is unanimously ratified.

b. [Motion Regarding the Nomination of the Auditor for the 2023 Fiscal Year 2022-03-24](#) – **UNANIMOUSLY RATIFIED**

Director Sader motions to approve by unanimous consent. Seconded by Director Heisele Cubilla. There is no opposition.

The motion is unanimously ratified.

c. [Funding Committee Report 2022-03-24](#) – **UNANIMOUSLY RATIFIED**

Director Coussa motions to approve by unanimous consent. Seconded by Director Dunn. There is no opposition.

The motion is unanimously ratified.

d. [Motion Regarding Statement by SSMU in Response to MRO 2022-03-24](#) – **UNANIMOUSLY RATIFIED**

Director Coussa motions to approve by unanimous consent. Seconded by Director Gurung. There is no opposition.

The motion is unanimously ratified.

10. Motion for Approval

a. Motion to ratify the Legislative Council-mandated [statement](#) against the MRO linked here and publish it by Tuesday, April 5, 2022 – **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

- i. The statement will be sent to SSMU legal for approval
- ii. If legal has amendments that do not affect the spirit and meaning, these can be added without further consultation
- iii. If legal has amendments that do affect the spirit and meaning, the statement should be sent for approval by the Board before being published.



Director Coussa motivates the motion. As mandated by the Legislative Council, the statement was written to oppose the communication sent by McGill University. The MRO and Deputy Provost Labeau undermine student independence and agency, violating the rights of students of their independent student making.

Question period:

Question:

Director Heisele Cubilla asks if this was consulted with SSMU's legal counsel.

Answer:

Director Coussa responds that legal is not necessary, no confidential information is revealed. The statement does not make a statement as to legal issues nor regarding notice, nor taking stand on that.

Question:

Officer Delouvrier asks if Director Coussa revised the MRO in depth.

Answer:

Director Coussa responds that she is confident that it does not breach any matter.

Question:

Director Heisele Cubilla suggests consulting legal. She proposes a friendly amendment to have a legal counsel review the statement.

Answer:

Director Coussa requests to vote on motion. She then allows for a friendly amendment after first prioritizing motion as it stands. She states that she does not want to waste resources on legal matters.

Question:

A member of the gallery mentions that the original motion mandated legal consultation. He reads the statement. Is this motion still in order given information?

Answer:

Director Coussa thanks the member for pointing that out.



Director Coussa asks to pass a motion and have it reviewed by lawyers before publishing.

Director Heisele Cubilla proposes a motion reaching out to legal counsel.

Question:

Officer Delouvrier asks Director Coussa to pass motion probationarily pending approval of legal, but if it has amendments, then another motion will be rendering this one.

Answer:

Director Coussa answers that if legal counsel amendments to the statement, that does not change meaning as changing word, then she mentions that then a motion could not pass again.

Officer Delouvrier agrees. Director Coussa inquires to have Officer Daryanani reach out to lawyers.

Officer Daryanani mentions he is comfortable, and inquires specific matters on what he must reach to legal counsel. He clarifies that this is a costly procedure and it takes time even if it's tomorrow. He compromises to send email shortly.

Question:

Director Coussa asks the Chair that the board is the highest governing body, could the wording be overpassed?

Answer:

The Chair answers that the Board of Directors is the highest governing body. The board could write a statement, but not particularly ratified motion 9.d. As it would not fulfill mandate of motion 9.d to pass a statement without completing the caveats of the motion.

Question:

Member of the gallery Saad asks that motions being passed are not relevant if there are not enough people getting attention, he expresses that there is a disappointing 16.5% of votes. He mentions that there needs to be more participation in democratic processes. He mentions that the administration would not take motions seriously until participation increases.



Answer:

Director Gurung responds that regarding Officer Daryanani should be consulted on, she mentions that VP Delouvrier and VP Heisele Cubilla considerations of being careful about MRO is necessary.

Director Heisele Cubilla stresses that it is important to consult legal counsel.

Director Coussa responds that she does not want to consult legal unless deemed necessary and she also considers the tight deadlines.

Director Coussa responds that she is in full agreement with member of the gallery Saad. She states that it is essential to have higher vote participation. She mentions that this is a recurrent issue, and it is a legitimate vote. She states that the executive team may be not legitimate enough to be ruling, and makes it less democratic. There was an increase in votes, but the policy in question had the most votes. 16% is a low turnout, it is still a legitimate referendum. She disclaims to make a weak argument due to exhaustive days.

Director Javed mentions that the motion passed at Legislative Council and ratified at Board. This is the next step to approve motion, so motion is not trusty against policy, nor concerns of having enough voters, or violating the Memorandum of Agreement. It is against McGill administration's tactic to not respect policies. She stresses to pass motion and reaffirm commitment to students, referendum, and democracy policies.

Director Gurung mentions that the statement is great, but the precarious situation with McGill makes it a misstep for them. She mentions that not consulting legal would be a misstep for the board. She agrees with consulting legal.

Officer Delouvrier mentions that there were more voters, which is important. He stresses that policy came from the student body and respected all student body from the Board. He expresses that if there is disappointment with turnouts, then members may feel free to go back into faculty and have higher turnouts.

Director Coussa encourages to vote positively in statements depending on legal review. She mentions that it is duty to not depend on the university, and that the Board has agency. She continues that low turnout is an accessibility issue, disconnected to SSMU being an inaccessible space. She states that the low turnout undermines the momentum and message behind referendum questions, in particular, this one.



Director Javed motions to vote on amendments by unanimous consent. Seconded by Director Coussa. There is no opposition.

Question:

Member of the gallery mentions that procedural rules are unclear to him. He asks if there is a mechanism to have an emergency Board mechanism to ratify it? He stresses to wait until legal consultation.

Answer:

The Chair mentions that there is an emergency meeting, or motion could pass by email, and could be moved to the next Board meeting.

Director Coussa motions to approve unanimously motion 10.a with amendments. Seconded by Director Javed. There is no opposition.

11. Minutes for Approval:

- a. Board of Directors Public Minutes 2022-02-10 – **APPROVED**
- b. Board of Directors Public Minutes 2022-03-10 – **APPROVED**

Minutes are approved as distributed. There is no opposition.

12. Motions for Approval:

- a. Motion to approve the [SSMU Awards Budget](#) (Director Heisele Cubilla) – **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Director Heisele Cubilla presents the budget. She did not pass it via the Board, but now is presented publicly.

Question:

Officer Daryanani asks Director Heisele Cubilla if she is excited for SSMU awards?

Answer:

Director Heisele Cubilla responds that she is excited to highlight the efforts of the McGill community.



Director Heisele Cubilla motions to approve by unanimous consent. Seconded by Director Javed. There is no opposition. The motion is approved unanimously.

13. Confidential Session: **19:16**

The Board of Directors enters into a Confidential Session at 19:16.

14. Adjournment: **22:44**

The Board of Directors returns to Public session to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 22:44.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Risann Wright', is positioned above a horizontal line.

Risann Wright, President

APPROVED