LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL DISCUSSION

All-Faculty Involvement Restriction Policy

What it is, the issues with the same, and where we could go next…

What the IRP is

Purpose

An agreement between SSMU and faculty associations to act on discrimination, harassment and violence, confidentially and without judgement.

Principle

Investigate in one environment, sanction in another, so a restriction no longer applies to one event and not the next.

Reach

Member associations, attendees and visitors, across offices, campus and events.

History

Signed in 2021, the first policy of its kind. Process detail and institutional memory have since faded.

How it is meant to work

Equity commissioner

Chairs the investigation and presents it. Appeals go to a different commissioner where possible.

Faculty committee

Investigates complaints in its own faculty. Make-up is left to each faculty.

Governing committee

All signatories, chaired by an AVC. Meant to hold the restriction list.

Restrictions go to the AVCs, who store them and share only what is needed, usually with the VP Social or Internal before events. AVCs also train commissioners and consult on complaints. SSMU can take high-profile appeals.

Why it cannot simply be amended

It is an agreement among every signatory, not an SSMU policy.

01

Convene

The governing committee has to meet, and it has proven hard to bring together.

02

Agree

Any change needs a unanimous vote of its members.

03

Ratify

Each faculty LC must then pass the change on its own.

Why it needs an overhaul

Investigation	The investigator is unclear and the faculty committee has no defined make-up. Timelines are fixed at four weeks which is unrealistic.
Fairness	Procedural fairness is undefined, and anonymous complaints strain it.
Confidentiality	No clear way to maintain or enforce it across a list held by 8 to 10 people.
Sanctions	Unclear how they apply to a bar, building, private venue or staff member, or how they are shared. Written consent from everyone listed is required.
Use	Only 4 to 5 sanctions reach the AVCs each year.

Recommendations

Rewrite or reduce in scale

Replace the current document with a leaner, workable one rather than patching it.

Define the missing pieces

Investigator, procedural fairness, event definition and how sanctions are applied.

Name accountable people

Each LC decides its delegate, who need not be the equity commissioner.

Provide oversight and training

AVCs train and support commissioners. SSMU facilitates, but faculties own the policy itself.

Next steps

Path A: Reconvene

Councillor representatives return to their faculties, confirm a delegate or equity commissioner, and bring recommendations to their LCs. The governing committee then meets.

Path B: Submit amendments

Send proposed amendments to the presidents. They will be reviewed in the winter semester as the edits are open access.

Thank you!

The floor is now open to questions and discussion