



Victoria University Students' Administrative Council

Regular Council Meeting | 27 July 2018 | VUSAC Board Room

Called to Order: 17:36 **Adjourned:** 20:30

In Attendance

Executive

Jayde Jones, *President*
Nickolas Shyshkin, *Vice-President Internal*
Devon Wilton, *Vice-President External*
Zoe Ritchie, *Vice-President Student Organizations*

Commissioners

Cameron Davies, *Academic Commissioner*
Carleigh Campbell, *Arts and Culture Commissioner*
Emilia De Fabritiis, *Commuter Commissioner*
Georgia Lin, *Equity Commissioner*
Alexa Ballis, *Scarlet and Gold Commissioner*
Jared Connoy, *Sustainability Commissioner (via proxy)*

Councillors

N/A

Staff

Alexa Breininger, *Chair*
Molly Simpson, *Chief Returning Office*
Tiger Fu, *Finance Chair*
Vibhuti Kacholia, *Equity Co-Chair*

Ex-Officio Members

Ali Kehl, *Orientation Co-Chair*
Christina Alcena, *CLC*
Thomas Siddall, *Victoria University Senate*

Guests

N/A

Regrets

Karen Mao, *Office Manager*
Tabina Ahmed, *Commuter Co-Chair*
Rehan Vishwanath, *Communications Coordinator*



Opening Business

Land Recognition

Carleigh explains their relationship to the land while reflecting on the fact that it is land which belongs to indigenous people. They invite everyone in the room to reflect similarly.

Additions to the Agenda

N/A

Approval of the Agenda

MOTION: Zoe Ritchie motions to approve the agenda as it stands.

SECONDED: Devon Wilton

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Ex-Officio Reports

Campus Life Coordinator, Christina Alcena (3 minutes)

Christina: Thanks for having me, it's great to finally come to one of these meetings, I can't wait to work with all of you during the year. Reiterating that I am here to support you in your new role, in addition to you all being a full-time students, I'm here to support you and I look forward to meeting with you all. Within my portfolio, Orientation has been my main priority and working on that with Ali, together we have been organizing a great week, in addition to Commo-O happening in two weeks, and training starting with international students orientation all the way up to the end of the week of Orientation. I'm also working on the transition mentor program, mainly updating and making some changes to the position. For more information about the changes to the program, go to vicorientation.com, they detail the program and segments of orientation that we are planning. If you need to meet with me, my email is very accessible christina.alcena@utoronto.ca, and I am always happy to meet. If you ever need to meet with other members of the Dean's Office, I'm happy to liaise, for example if you wanted to meet with Kelly Castle, you can go through me and I'm happy to make sure you have a meeting set up. I'll be here after the meeting if you want to chat about anything. I'm excited for my first meeting! Thank you!

Orientation Co-Chairs, Ali Kehl and Christina Alcena (3 mins)

Ali: Hi, so I'm Ali if we haven't met, thank you for bearing with me in the past few months about my Orientation updates. I feel very thankful, the Orientation Exec team is working very hard this summer. Lots of updates: we had an open forum today, where 15-16 leaders and transition mentors were in attendance. We talked about some of the changes that we've made in regards to Orientation and hearing about their previous experiences. We are getting close to being absolutely planned for Orientation, we have Commuter Orientation planned by Jayde that's



coming up, Zoe on the website, Devon is great, Alexa also amazing, Jayde, really great, all of the Exec, everybody doing amazing, Christina, wonderful. Things are going well, we are finalizing training for leaders, the schedule is good to go, we would appreciate it if council can promote Commuter Orientation online, happening from August 11th to the 12th, share on social media on your channels, and I believe that is our update. We ordered our VUSAC t-shirts for all of you, they're green as usual, you will all look pretty in them! That's about it.

Christina: Thank you!

Action Items

Appendix A – Elections and Referenda Code Proposal, Jayde Jones (20 minutes)

Jayde: I really hope that everyone has had a chance to read over the proposed Elections and Referenda Code (ERC), I have stressed it a lot. Having a vote is a very big responsibility and voting on something as big as adopting a new governing document is very important. The reason we are proposing the ERC now and not later is because in regards to elections, we have our fall elections coming up and for us to adopt a policy, it has to come into effect after two weeks, so we should propose it today. If we left this for an August meeting, the document would take into effect a week into the election cycle. It's a very long document, I do not want to get too into anything specific. Every new clause was in red, and we gave an explanation to each new change. Election reform was on my platform and many others' platforms, Molly stood out for this reason when she applied. I want to thank everybody on the committee and their ideas, I would love to give Molly a round of applause for all of her hard work, she has gone far and beyond what she is required to do **applause**. Even though that was a round of applause moment, don't be afraid to make some questions or comments. With that, I yield the floor.

Thomas: Article 12, it mentions Fall Elections twice but not Spring Elections.

Jayde: Little things like that we are happy to change, for grammar we will hold it and pass all small grammatical mistakes at the end, if that works. I'm sure others have found other things.

Devon: It is substantive actually, we should ask Molly about page 8 on this.

Molly: Yes, just a typo, Section 2 is for the Spring Elections to be open for three weeks.

Devon: Motion to amend Article 12, Section 2, to read "nominations period for Spring Elections shall be a minimum of 3 weeks". Only change is "Fall" to "Spring".

Zoe: Can we omnibus?

Jayde: We are adopting the document as a whole, nothing to omnibus, we can put the amendments forward, and amendments. Can we have Nick read back an amendment as it is proposed and seconded, and then omnibus at end?



Alexa Breininger: Let's hold off on voting until the end. For those of that do not know, an omnibus is grouping together a set of motions that are very similar if we do not want to go through every little thing, and just put together in one big vote. Anything else?

Cameron: Article 16, Section 1, for the All Candidates meeting, there is no provision for extraordinary circumstances and in Section 2 there is. I was wondering whether this was intentional?

Molly: You can send proxy to the All Candidates meeting, that should cover all extraordinary circumstances, but I am open to amending, but the idea is that you can send a proxy because that alludes to a extraordinary circumstance, while sending a proxy to Town Hall is not allowed, which is why we didn't add anything.

Thomas: I have a question about Chapter 2, Article 1, when we say amendments, if someone were to look at this an understand procedures, it is a bit vague.

Jayde: The ERC is meant to work in tandem with Council Policies and compliment the Constitution. If you haven't recently reviewed these or aren't familiar with them, it may not seem as clear, but as we are doing an overhaul of both the Constitution and Council Policies in the Fall, we don't want anything to be so bound by it that we have to overhaul this as well. We would hope our CRO and future CROs would be very familiar with these documents, we would have the Elections and Appeals Committee (EAC) should we have anything come up, and the Chair's job throughout the year is to interpret those documents. If somebody would to raise that point, the Chair would clarify that.

Devon: Zoe and I met before this meeting, we have four amendments that we would like to propose.

Alexa Breininger: To be clear we have four proposed amendments put forward by Devon and Zoe.

Devon: Four proposed amendments to Article 4, 7, and two to 14.

FIRST PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Zoe Ritchie motions to amend Article 4, Section 1a: from "that no VUSAC meetings occur during the campaign period; and" to "that no meetings of full council occur during during the campaign period, excepting emergency meetings; and"

SECONDED: Devon Wilton

Zoe: Just to expand on this, from my perspective, this document serves two purposes, one is to inform the CRO of duties and responsibilities, the other is for candidates to be able to make appeals. I think this wording this is vague in regards to meetings, for instance VUSAC has many kinds of meetings, it is generally clarified that when we say meetings it means a regular Council meeting, but sometimes we do have emergency meetings, but we could leave that to interpretation. If a candidate ever wanted to contest as a result of it, that would put us in a hard



situation. I think it is worth to clarify that, to make sure we mean that these are whole meetings, and not meetings of the executive, not commission meetings, and in the case we need to have an emergency meeting, we should have that option so we do not have that liability.

Jayde: Would a language change be a friendly amendment? If not, I won't put it to a vote. Meetings of full council are just referred to as "regular VUSAC Meetings" in the Constitution and Council Policies, and it may be more in-line if we use that term instead of "full council". If it's friendly we can vote, if not, then it's fine.

Zoe: That is friendly, we're good

Devon: I agree.

FIRST PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT B: Amending Article 4, Section 1a: from "that no VUSAC meetings occur during the campaign period; and" to "that no regular VUSAC Meetings occur during the campaign period, with the exception of emergency meetings; and"

SECOND PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Devon Wilton motions to amend Article 7, Section 4: to strike "or failure to submit a budget on time"

SECONDED: Zoe Ritchie

Devon: To speak to this, I think there are cases where failures to submit budgets on time are not grounds for disqualification, and it doesn't say that they would be disqualified, but it says "may" be disqualified. Just because this may stand for a long time, and in conjunction with Section 5 immediately follows, which says that this document should guide the CRO's decisions, I just want to give the CRO more discretion on submitting a budget on time. The explanation in Section 4 is sufficient.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to extend discussion by ten minutes.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

THIRD PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Devon Wilton motions to amend Article 14, Section 1b: from "Neutral parties are allowed to "like" posts, but "comments" and "shares" will be interpreted as an endorsement and result in a strike against the candidate in question." to "Neutral parties are allowed to "like" posts, but "comments" and "shares" will be interpreted as an endorsement and may result in penalties for the candidate endorsed"



SECONDED: Zoe Ritchie

Devon: In regards to this, it's about giving more discretion to the CRO, particularly if somebody comments on your post, I don't think that would mean you would be disqualified with that language, but I want to make it clear that it's at the discretion of the CRO.

FOURTH PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Devon Wilton motions to amend Article 14 Section 1b.i: to strike "(i.e., via deletion)."

SECONDED: Zoe Ritchie

Devon: My reasoning for this is that candidates can't control when they receive endorsements, I feel more comfortable if the document does not say that a candidate has to immediately delete a post if its been endorsed, a solution that makes more sense would be for the candidate to delete the comment, and have endorser unshare and delete their share. More discretion with the CRO and how they would want to deal with the situation.

Molly: That is what I meant, as in deleting the comment, not post. If we want to make it more clear by striking, that is fine with me.

Cameron: I think that within a reasonable timeline, it should be accounted for, if somebody does shares your post at 3AM, and then you only see it at 9AM, it's long but reasonable that you would be asleep and can't see it immediately. Within a reasonable timeline gives more discretion and flexibility to CRO.

Zoe: I think the only challenge is that what's reasonable is sometimes challenging when somebody makes an appeal that's very serious, for example "I think candidate should be disqualified because of this..." then the word 'reasonable' gets thrown up in the air, and that's where this language can be tightened a little, we don't want to be open to any grand liabilities of disqualification. That may be a challenge.

Jayde: I'm in support of this amendment, but language on "reasonable" is necessary in a document to this, particularly because we have an appeals body that sits to determine what is and is not reasonable. 'Reasonable' is a language that is used in the law to account for these kinds of things, hopefully we have constructed the EAC to work better than the law, which is often a tool for oppression, but hopefully we have structured the EAC such that we would trust them to interpret the word 'reasonable'. But I think this amendment brings some comfort to some, and doesn't bring change to its spirit.

Devon: I will clarify that the amendment wouldn't change the context of a reasonable timeline, and I understand that the spirit is remaining unchanged, I think some people read 'I.E' as something else, and somebody else as something completely different.

Alexa Ballis: This is in regards to Article 14, Section 1a, "The only exception to this rule is that candidates are permitted to change their personal "profile pictures" to reflect their candidacy and advertise voting." I feel like there should be a cap, or unless we don't want it to have a cap for



how many times candidates can change their profile pictures, because someone might find that loophole and post a new profile picture every day, and that's a form of advertisement.

Molly: I feel like we landed on being in favour of that.

Jayde: We did think that, what we decided that these are very new rules and part of what we wanted to do with social media was to simplify and the other part was to level the playing field, but we kind of get into the same conversation about neutral parties allowed to like, but are they allowed to sad and love react? We thought let's pair it down a little, leave it open to interpretation, and should we find in these Fall Elections that folks are changing their profile pictures everyday and it negated what we tried to do with this section, maybe we would look into changing it later. We have the intention to visit this after elections, and we would like to have it in place for Fall Elections so we can see how it operates, but if you feel it's important to clarify now then you can propose that.

Carleigh: Where did the discussion fall on? I don't think it clarifies here what exactly changing your profile picture means, how much can they write? What is their caption? You know?

Jayde: We fell on the exact same decision talking about that, we wanted to level the playing field, but not everybody can campaign equally well, so if you choose to write a paragraph because you have a paragraph platform, or just "vote for me I'm the best" then that's your campaign decision and that should affect the outcome in the election because those are decisions that you have made, but everybody has the opportunity to change the profile picture and caption what they want in terms of equal opportunity and that's where we landed on. That was the consensus of the Electoral Reform Committee.

Alexa Ballis: Thanks for clarifying.

Devon: I think that in these Fall Elections, with the kids being tech savvy these days if you will. When you run for a position, you see the rules and try to see where the loopholes are and maximize what you can do with posters and media and etc. It's something that people will put time into. In the fall elections, somebody could change their profile picture everyday, would that sway the elections? Probably not. However, I think I would like to propose a new amendments that I do not want omnibussed with the other amendments.

FIFTH PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Devon Wilton motions to amend Article 14 Section 1a from "a) Any Facebook campaigning is to be conducted via a public Facebook "page" (as opposed to a "profile"). The only exception to this rule is that candidates are permitted to change their personal "profile pictures" to reflect their candidacy and advertise voting." to "a) Any Facebook campaigning is to be conducted via a public Facebook "page" (as opposed to a "profile"). The only exception to this rule is that candidates are permitted to change their personal "profile pictures" once to reflect their candidacy, and advertise voting."

SECONDED: None

MOTION: Emilia De Fabritiis motions to extend discussion by ten minutes.



SECONDED: Carleigh Campbell

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Devon: The changes are basically that the profile picture can be changed once, to reflect that rule, and also to say that in the caption you can can whatever you want about your platform.

Thomas: I just want to comment on the bit about the profile picture, because algorithmically, people could hypothetically bypass that picture algorithm on Facebook and just post picture posts and inherently bypass the profile picture issue. Does a profile picture then become a post or does it not if consider the algorithm.

Jayde: So just for clarification, candidates are not allowed to profile on their own profiles anymore, this is the only exception to that, it all has to be done through a public Facebook page, which will then be advertised on the Elections Forum and on the VUSAC website and that's the idea behind everybody gets equal footing at the get go. I would love to, I am happy to accept *once*, even though I don't entirely agree, I just don't know if the language "share their platform", I don't think we should baby them in terms of telling them 'share your platform'. This is where we give everybody equal opportunity, what they choose to do with that opportunity. If we remove the ability for candidates to really do something different, are we taking away the spirit of elections? I'm more passionate about that then about how many times they change their profile picture. I would like to strike "share their platform".

Devon: The spirit of the amendment aligns, how to reflect that language, I wanted to broaden. I think this language should not limit what goes into the caption of the photo, and so by adding I would think it would actually broaden it. However I think that maybe now we have talked about it and suggest a better way which is to share Profile Pictures once, with an attached caption if they wish, and not have details about it. The way it reads now, you can only say "I'm running, vote here".

Molly: So first, I want to remind that we have a nominations package that has flexibility for me to be specific, and two information sessions. A big thing we wanted was openness to see what happens, then talk to Councillors about what we can propose, how it went, and what they like and didn't like. If I were to change it, it would be to change the profile picture once, and to advertise their candidacy and voting, because then that change allows you to talk about voting and links you to the website to do that, and you can add in a caption. I can't read this as a thing you are not allowed to caption, but it's something I will clarify at the All Candidates Meeting and go through these rules. I think we don't need too many specifics.

Zoe: In that spirit of flexibility and even playing ground, I am quite against just letting them change their profile picture once. Especially in Fall Elections, potential Councillor's platforms and priorities change as they run. I'm also just not sure if we really need to please it that much.



Jayde: With respect to this, we don't want policy to have to be amended every year, in respect to giving people wider options, it often means less language. Social media part of this it says: "anything not mentioned above." You can't campaign on that, and which is generally the spirit of a document like this. You look and see it's not accounted for, so if we add something like sharing and adding a caption only once is allowed, and then somebody changes their profile to a profile video, and that wasn't explicitly said in the document. The more general you keep it, the more you have year to year where a CRO can actually create some limits in the Nominations Package so they don't have to overhaul every year. We want to make this a longhaul document, an in some cases that means accounting for flexibility and trusting that the fifteen people can keep a CRO who has gone rogue in check, and that the EAC committee can do its job. Those fifteen people are the entire EAC and the VUSAC Executive. A lot of with what we deal with here is perhaps energy better directed to ensuring we built an appeals committee that can deal with every single case, because we can't account for every single case in here, and in some ways specificity is more limiting.

Thomas: Even the bits that mentions hashtags, I would recommend that you could just strike those out and just mention that all posts social media wise, should just include the hashtag #VUSACELECTIONS. In the event a new social media pops up and is a phenomena and people move to it, popping up during elections, it may not be enough time to change this document.

Devon: Point of order, can we finish talking about this current section, and then move to that on the social media hashtags?

Alexa Breininger: Yes. Let's stay within this, then we can move to that section later.

Devon: I would like to accept what Molly suggested as a friendly amendment. 'The only exception to this rule is that candidates are permitted to change their personal "profile pictures" once to advertise their candidacy,' that is the motion. I don't like the option for only changing it once, but I think doing a Facebook Page rather than doing Facebook Profile is having it work and be limited, we have to expect the possibility that somebody can change it multiple times. That is all.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to extend discussion by five minutes.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Molly: 'To advertise their candidacy and elections', as a friendly amendment.

Devon: Yes!

Alexa Breininger: Anything else?



Molly: Very quickly about social media, Section 9 of Article 14: “Any campaigning on a social media platform not listed above is forbidden and will result in a strike.”, to address social media it’s always tricky, after Fall Elections and I didn’t include a platform, then we can talk about its integration, but by only having the platforms here, it means I don’t have to check every single social media that exists.

Thomas: I would recommend that inclusive of changing facebook picture once, maybe also including Twitter in that. People are taking advantage of the “#mynewprofilepicture” feature. Just a recommendation.

Molly: The reason the Facebook profile is so limiting is because we are testing out the idea of making a Page for a campaign, whilst you can use your public Twitter, Instagram, Snapchat, so that’s why we are not limiting everything. I also searched up #vusacelections on Twitter, last time it was used was in 2015. But if y’all want that then that’s what you’re elected on.

Cameron: Before we vote on all. I have an amendment to article 16, 1d. Where it says “Failure to attend the All Candidates Meeting or to send a proxy will result in disqualification.”

SIXTH PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Cameron Davies motions to amend Article 16, 1d, adding "barring circumstances which the CRO deems to be extraordinary".

Cameron: I feel like it’s important to have it, there is a chance that somebody may have an emergency before the meeting and may not be able to find a proxy. Finding a proxy in these extreme situations should not be the most of their worries, it would be good to allow the CRO some flexibility.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to extend discussion by fifteen minutes.

SECONDED: Alexa Ballis

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Alexa Breininger: Does anybody have anything else to add to Article 16?

Jayde: For the part where the circumstances are deemed to be exceptional. Can I suggest that the power is not limiting to the CRO, so that if the CRO says a circumstance is not exceptional then one can appeal to the EAC? I would leave that as a little less structured.

Cameron: I’ll accept that as a friendly amendment.

SIXTH PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT B: Article 16, Section 1d, “barring circumstances that are deemed to be exceptional”

Alexa Breininger: We will vote on all of these later. Let’s move on.



Cameron: For Section 25, under Chapter 13. Section 4. I was confused by the wording there, on referenda.

Jayde: It was pointed out to us by a dedicated levy head, Aloysius, that for both Section 2 and 3, it used to say in Section 2 that “The VUSAC may hold a referendum in order to seek the direct advice of the VCU regarding any important issues, according to the petition guidelines outlined in Article 11 of the Constitution.”, but in Section 3 it said ““The VUSAC may hold a referendum in order to seek the direct advice of the VCU regarding any important issues”, so we struck clause 3 as a technical issue, so now it says that in Section 2, and Section 3 is what it is not currently proposed. It’s either section 3 or 4, depending on the version you have, that referenda results are considered binding.

Cameron: What i was thinking, it says if there is a referendum that passes with two thirds majority and 10% of the VCU then the referendum passes, this clause is very clear and VUSAC is bound by this referendum result. But it is not clear when only one of these conditions is met, or what makes it binding. Is it such that both have to bind VUSAC or just one?

Jayde: How it has always been interpreted, if there are more than 10%, at least $\frac{2}{3}$ vote in favour, VUSAC must do it. If there is a majority and it’s less than 10%, vusac then votes what do we think as elected representatives. We could change for clarify or do it when we see a round 2 of amending this policy.

Cameron: We can leave this for now.

Jayde: Let’s flag it.

Alexa Breining: Moving on.

Alexa: Article 28, Section 3, would it be possible to put a list of neutral parties and their names?

Jayde: Because this is a policy document, we should not list specific names but we could do that in the Nominations Package. Neutral parties have to be reached out by Molly saying that they are a neutral party.

Devon: Can I just clarify? I think Alexa was suggesting a subsection that we put neutral parties and their names in the Nominations Package and not the ERC.

Jayde: Ohhhhhh.

Alexa Ballis: Yes, that is what I meant.

Alexa Breining: Would you like to put that amendment forward?

Alexa Ballis: Yes

Zoe: We can omnibus it in.



SEVENTH PROPOSED IN-MEETING ERC AMENDMENT: Alexa Ballis motions to amend Article 28 Section 3, by adding subclause 3j. "j: the names of all neutral parties and their positions"

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions for a three minute recess.

SECONDED: Alexa Ballis

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Ali Kehl departs

MOTION: Zoe Ritchie motions to omnibus all amendments on the floor with exception to Devon's proposed amendment to Article 14, Section 1a.

SECONDED: Carleigh Campbell

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

MOTION: Zoe Ritchie motions to vote to approve the omnibussed amendments.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Omnibussed Motions on the Table:

1: Motion by Zoe Ritchie, seconded by Devon Wilton to amend Article 4, Section 1a: from "that no VUSAC meetings occur during the campaign period; and" to "that no regular VUSAC meetings occur during during the campaign period, with the exception of emergency meetings; and"

2: Motion by Devon Wilton, seconded by Zoe Ritchie to amend Article 7, Section 4: to strike "or failure to submit a budget on time"

3: Motion by Devon Wilton, seconded by Zoe Ritchie to amend Article 14 Section 1b from



"Neutral parties are allowed to “like” posts, but “comments” and “shares” will be interpreted as an endorsement and result in a strike against the candidate in question." to "Neutral parties are allowed to “like” posts, but “comments” and “shares” will be interpreted as an endorsement and may result in penalties for the candidate endorsed"

4: Motion by Devon Wilton, seconded by Zoe Ritchie to amend Article 14 Section 1bi: to strike "(i.e., via deletion)"

6. Motion by Cameron Davies, seconded by Nickolas Shyshkin to amend Article 16, Section 1d, from “Failure to attend the All Candidates Meeting or to send a proxy will result in disqualification.” to “Failure to attend the All Candidates Meeting or to send a proxy will result in disqualification, barring circumstances that are deemed to be exceptional”.

7. Motion by Alexa Ballis, seconded by Jayde Jones, to add clause j to Article 28, Section 3: “3j) the names of all neutral parties and their positions”.

MOTION: Devon motions to amend Article 14 Section 1a from "a) Any Facebook campaigning is to be conducted via a public Facebook “page” (as opposed to a “profile”). The only exception to this rule is that candidates are permitted to change their personal “profile pictures” to reflect their candidacy and advertise voting." to "a) Any Facebook campaigning is to be conducted via a public Facebook “page” (as opposed to a “profile”). The only exception to this rule is that candidates are permitted to change their personal “profile pictures” once to advertise their candidacy and the election"

SECONDED: Alexa Ballis

In Favor: Alexa Ballis, Jared Connoy (via proxy to Emilia), Cameron Davies, Emilia De Fabritiis, Jayde Jones, Georgia Lin, Nickolas Shyshkin, Devon Wilton

Opposed: Carleigh Campbell and Zoe Ritchie

Abstentions: None

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to extend by one minute.

SECONDED: Zoe Ritchie

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None



MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to formally adopt the Elections and Referenda Code presented in Appendix A and accepted amendments as a binding, governing document of the VUSAC as amended.

SECONDED: Carleigh Campbell

In Favor: ALL

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions for a five minute recess.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: ALL

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Appendix B – Equity Council Policy Amendments, Jayde Jones (15 minutes)

Alexa Breininger: We are now starting with Appendix B: Council Policy (CP) Amendments, put together by the Equity Commission from the Spring of 2018.

Jayde: There are two separate policy amendments, coming out of the Equity Commission last year, there was a Constitutional Review Committee (CRC.) They made some recommendations in the form of a Council Policy Review Committee (CPRC), under Shailee and Apefa, the previous Equity Commissioner and Equity Co-Chair, respectively. Vibhuti and Georgia, and myself worded it into policy. Hopefully you have read it, but I will give the floor to Georgia to speak on anything.

Georgia: I was on the CRC last year as a part of the Equity Commission, if anybody needs more context, I can expand on last year's committee and some of these recommendations.

Jayde: In the interest of time, if it's something Georgia and Vibhuti are comfortable with, I will yield questions to the floor. I'll motion to omnibus if we don't have questions, the motion is already moved by myself and seconded by Georgia to adopt each of these. Questions are welcome, conversations, amendments, whatever it may be.

Georgia: This is not an exhaustive list that of all of the amendments that were presented last year, there will be more amendments forthcoming in August.



MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to omnibus all Equity Amendments located in Appendix B - Council Policy Amendments.

SECONDED: Georgia Lin

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to accept the amendments to Council Policies.

SECONDED: Georgia Lin

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Summary of In-Meeting Amendments to Equity Council Policies Amendments:

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 6, Sections 1 & 2 of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B. Seconded by Georgia Lin.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 12, Sections 4 of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B. Seconded by Georgia Lin.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions, to amend Chapter 17, Sections 2 of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B. Seconded by Georgia Lin.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 8, Section 8.c.2. of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B. Seconded by Georgia Lin.

Alexa Breininger: We will now move onto the Amendments to Council Policies put forward to the President, also found in Appendix B.

Appendix B – Other Council Policy Amendments, Jayde Jones (15 minutes)

Jayde: Just to note, it felt appropriate to put forward the Council Policy Amendments put forth by the Equity Commission last year in this July meeting, since they had run out of time and were unable to do so in the 2017-2018 term. The Council Policies Amendments that I am putting forth stem from my platform that I campaigned on in the Spring 2018 Election and that would need to



be taken into effect in the Fall if approved. Not all of my planned amendments are included, and those will be brought forward when we have a full Council. In here, if there is an amendment that I campaigned on, then it says so. There are some little and big things, not all have seconders, but with regards to the Budgeting Committee, there is the Equity Commissioner voting member and Equity Co-Chair being a non-voting member, it's something that Georgia and Vibhuti were passionate about something they were passionate about, so Georgia is listed as the seconder. The motion regarding the Scarlet and Gold Commissioner for the Highball Committee, something I campaigned on was opening up to two general applicants and three Councillors. Alexa hasn't been officially listed as a seconder but those are the big ones that affect people in the room presently. I will not read through it unless there are questions on specifics.

Alexa: For Chapter 8, Section 8 about the Highball Committee, I really like the addition of two general VCU applicants, and I like the balancing of residence and commuter representation, however it is possible for a VOCA Coordinator to live in residence. It's possible that it won't accurately reflect commuter representation.

Jayde: How about changing it from "VOCA Coordinator" to "VOCA Coordinator, who shall be a commuter student."?

Alexa Ballis: I would like that!

Alexa Ballis: I would love to move to change Chapter 8 Section 8a.vi, amending from "VOCA Coordinator" to "VOCA Coordinator, who shall be a commuter student."

Alexa Breining: We will vote on this at the end.

Alexa Ballis: Another thing, I campaigned on having a Sustainability and Equity Commission Representative on the Highball Committee, while we can wait and test it out, I did run on it and I would like to have them represented on them on Highball Committee this year. As an amendment to add them to the Highball list.

Georgia: To clarify, are these representatives from the commissions?

Alexa Ballis: Yes, in addition to the committee, one each from the Sustainability and Equity Commission.

FIRST PROPOSED IN-COUNCIL CP AMENDMENT: Alexa Ballis motions to amend Chapter 8 Section 8a.vi, from "VOCA Coordinator" to "VOCA Coordinator, who shall be a commuter student."

SECOND PROPOSED IN-COUNCIL CP AMENDMENT: Alexa Ballis motions to amend Chapter 8, Section 8, to add sub-clauses viii and viv: "viii) One member of the Equity Commission" and "viv: One member of the Sustainability Commission".

Molly: Amendment #6, can I ask that somebody strike Section 3g.v) "Shall meet at least twice during an elections period: once at least one (1) week before the proposed date of nomination release, and once immediately after cessation of the 48 hour appeal period."



Jayde: Yes that's friendly.

Devon: Can I speak on that? Maybe a question: you're saying that if we strike this, will there be a set EAC anyways before nominations happen? And everybody that's on it will know?

Molly: Yes, that is the way it works. The way it works, Nick and Jayde pick the EAC four weeks before elections start, they set the constitution, the ERC, and nominations package. Making Jayde chair a whole meeting is not super needed, unless it's a big appeal and she thinks it's easier to do it in person.

Devon: Cool!

Georgia: Vibhuti wanted to go back to Proposed Amendment 2, Chapter 3, Section 5b.

Vibhuti: I think that having two representatives from the Equity portion of VUSAC is a little unnecessary, I think that having the commissioner is good enough, just because they are a voting member and they have equity minded initiatives in mind, but that is my two cents. If the Equity Commissioner wants to bring the Co-Chair along, then that's fine, but having it in the Council Policies is a little unnecessary.

Jayde: I initially proposed this too, but I got this idea after talking to people from people when I was campaigning. The thought was that it's important to have somebody who's a non-voting member, so who is not going to be in a position of having to make a position, and with respect to the Co-Chair, the idea was that they're one step removed and there should be someone who is non-voting to sit on the committee, because everybody else is a voting member. Honestly, I am pleased with having it just be the Equity Commissioner as a voting member, so I defer to the rest of the room

Cam: I was wondering whether we were getting ahead of ourselves, but there's talk about implementing an Equity Advisor position, and maybe this is something they can be a non-voting member for?

Georgia: We will discuss this at the August meeting, but it's important to just formalize this amendment right now in time for budgeting. I agree that the Co-Chair doesn't need to be in here constitutionally, but I would bring Vibhuti with me either way because she is more aware of finances than I am. Something Vibhuti and I have been talking about is the entire notion of people wanting as much equity representation as possible which is great, but in this case it's not a vital point for both equity representatives to sit on the committee. I am in favour of striking this.

Vibhuti: Also, I understand the aspect of having a non-voting member, but if we want to do something of that sort then there should be other Co-Chairs on that too, if you want a good non-voting presence, one versus everybody else is not enough. What was your vision?

Jayde: Basically my vision was for there to be no Co-Chair, but I am big on listening to people around me. We can't bloat a committee to the point where it can't function, but yeah I don't know, I'm happy if someone will second, I can amend to remove the Co-Chair as a member entirely.



Devon: Can I suggest friendly amendment? Equity Co-Chair can be on the committee if they wish, I want to hear what others have to say.

Alexa Ballis: I like what you're saying about having a non-voting member, but can we have another member of council as a non-voting member, but they don't have to be specifically the Equity Co-Chair, but just somebody else as a non-voting voice.

Vibhuti: In reference to Devon, that's lit, I love budget steering, I'm all about it. But I do not think it's something the Co-Chair position needs to take on if there is already equity representation.

Tiger: Can anybody sit on council for one meeting at a time? Like, if it relates to a specific portfolio or theme, if there were something related to Academics, Cameron can sit on it for that one meeting. My idea is some sort of amendment that would allow for anybody on Council to sit in the meeting if it pertains to them maybe.

MOTION: Alexa Ballis motions to extend discussion by ten minutes.

SECONDED: Jayde Jones

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Jayde: So budget steering meetings are closed, with my understanding, a situation in which the budget steering committee is allocating funds to clubs and commissions. If VUSAC were to have the opportunity to invite members of Council to talk through their budgets, it's an unfair advantage, while clubs don't have that option really. I'm not going to take Devon's amendment as friendly. If it's alright Alexa, move into a vote directly, on the amendment being amended that the Equity Co-Chair is struck.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Proposed Amendment #2 in Chapter 3, Section 5b.i) by striking "The Equity Co-Chair, as a non-voting member" entirely.

In Favor: Alexa Ballis, Carleigh Campbell, Jared Connoy (by proxy), Cameron Davies, Emilia De Fabritiis, Jayde Jones, Georgia Lin, Zoe Ritchie, Nickolas Shyshkin

Opposed: Devon Wilton

Abstentions: None

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to omnibus all proposed amendments as they stand, including First and Second Proposed In-Meeting CP Amendments by Alexa Ballis.

SECONDED: Georgia Lin



In Favor: Alexa Ballis, Carleigh Campbell, Jared Connoy (by proxy), Cameron Davies, Emilia De Fabritiis, Jayde Jones, Georgia Lin, Zoe Ritchie, Nickolas Shyshkin

Opposed: Devon Wilton

Abstentions: None

Georgia shushes Vibhuti who is making background noise

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to adopt the omnibussed Council Policies that were presented.

SECONDED: Emilia De Fabritiis

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Summary of In-Meeting Amendments to Proposed Council Policy Amendments:

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 1 of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B.

~~MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 3, Section 5 of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B. Seconded by Georgia Lin. Striked~~

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 7, Section 1.h. of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 8, Section 1.b. of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 8, Section 8 of the Council Policies to read as presented in Appendix B. Seconded by Alexa Ballis.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 18, Section 3 of the Council Policies



to read as presented in Appendix B. **Amended in-meeting by Jayde Jones to strike Section 3g.v.**

MOTION: Alexa Ballis motions to amend Chapter 8 Section 8a.vi, from “VOCA Coordinator” to “VOCA Coordinator, who shall be a commuter student.”

MOTION: Alexa Ballis motions to amend Chapter 8, Section 8, to add sub-clauses viii and viv: “viii) One member of the Equity Commission” and “viv: One member of the Sustainability Commission”.

Appendix C - Constitutional Amendments, Jayde Jones (20 minutes)

Jayde: I am sorry for talking so much, truly. Proposed Amendment #1 in Chapter 1, the Equity Commission suggested adding the word equitably, in that . That is tucked right in there. This is the amendment that i am proposing “[VUSAC] *which shall operate openly, equitably, and democratically to ensure that our needs are met*”. The other big thing, which is the amendment to propose the Mental Wellness Commissioner, that would be in Proposed Amendment #3, #4, and #6. I did a lot of research putting this together for each clause. The spirit of the proposed responsibilities stems from the existing commissioners in terms of wording, and precedent. To read my rationale:

“Mental health issues among university students have for a number of years been described as at crisis-level. On May 3, 2018 the Ontario government recognized this crisis and committed to providing an additional \$6 million to fund mental health services at post-secondary institutions, on top of the \$9 million already provided annually. Given such impressive, provincial-level results of student advocacy efforts, instituting a dedicated member of VUSAC responsible for advocating for more comprehensive and accessible mental wellness services for our students seems almost overdue. There is much to be done at the college-level with regards to connecting students with resources, sustaining discussions about wellness and stigma, and fighting for more, better supports to be available to the VCU. On-campus precedent for such positions include the University of Toronto Student Union (UTSU)’s Mental Wellness Commissioner and Commission, the University College Literary and Athletic Society (UC Lit)’s Mental Wellness Commissioner and Commission, Woodsworth College Student’s Association (WCSA)’s Mental Health Director, University of Toronto Engineering Society (EngSoc)’s Mental Wellness Director, and the Architecture and Visual Studies Student’s Union (AVSSU)’s Commissioner of Health and Wellness.” -Rationale for Proposed Amendment #3, on Chapter VIII, Article 15, Section 1.

In compiling the duties, there’s precedent for each single one on campus, and I pulled the things that were most effective from these positions, I reached out to those who currently hold these positions, and I think generally speaking to all my friends in the room, I did my best and I’m really passionate about this. I hope you see value in this, if you don’t, then that’s okay too. If you have gone through every clause, you can see where the spirit comes from with respect to the



Constitution as it stands and where the precedent comes from. I did not add any new duties, or make it obligatory for them to administer a full Commission. I would say the other big amendment in here is the procedure for uncontested in elections. It is not in the ERC, because we have to wait for this to pass. In the proposed amendment, every other rule of the ERC applies, but we decided as the ERC that if this amendment does not pass, then the ERC will pass at the very least. Everything in here is something I campaigned on and the more salient pieces of my platform. I yield the floor.

Thomas Siddall leaves

Georgia: Is there an amendment to add to the Equity Commissioner's to be a member of the Budget Steering Committee?

Jayde: There is not, the reason behind it, and it's a terrible reason, is because our Constitution and Council Policies are incoherent with one another, they don't make sense, contradict duties, list things that exist on one document by not the other. What we take it as is basically if a duty is listed in either or, then it's a duty. One thing we are going to work on as a Council, is to make our Council Policies and Constitution make sense and reflect one another, maybe that duty should be hosted in one place, but that is for a different day. We can't post an amendment on here today because we need 7 days for it to be posted up before the meeting, but if you want to propose it for August, that is perfectly fine. Our governing documents don't make sense and we will try really hard to make them make sense.

Molly: I would just like to look at Proposed Amendments 7 and 8, 7 is about the nominations form, if you are a First Year Councillor you only need 5 endorsements which is good, but if you're a first year student running for the VCC, you need 10 now. Because that requires 10.

Jayde: You are right, you would because it's a different position. We can clarify so that any student in first year seeking nomination to an office only requires five endorsements. I had not thought about that. I would leave it up to y'all, or hang on to it for alter, or operate as if it is 5 signatures for everything.

Molly: I would want to change it now, if it was up to me I would probably just say that "all governing bodies need 5 signatures", as somebody who was on governing body this year. Keeping it simple is a good way to get involved. I think we're going to have 7 or 8 VCC positions available, and if somebody just wants to run for that, I don't want it to be confusing on what's needed, of if you're a first year they will also join the VCC and not just run for Councillor. So the way I would do it is that you either need 5 signatures for governing bodies or you only need 5 for governing bodies if you're a first year.

Jayde: If there is a seconder for such a motion, I would love to then take that and propose the amendment so that it says "Nominations for First Year Councillor positions and seats on the VCC, VUS, or the BoR shall be signed by the nominee and a minimum of five nominators, and just including those three bodies, we will throw that right in there.

Devon: Can I propose a friendly amendment so that instead of 'seats', they're referred to as 'Student Representatives'.



Jayde: Yeah that's fine.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter 8, Article 21, Section 5b.i from "Nominations for First Year Councillor positions shall be signed by the nominee and by a minimum of five (5) nominators who are members of the VCU." to "Nominations for First Year Councillor positions and/or student representative positions on the VCC, BoR, VUS shall be signed by the nominee and by a minimum of five (5) nominators who are members of the VCU."

SECONDED: Carleigh Campbell

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Tiger Fu Leaves

Molly: Amendment 8. Uncontested elections one, this is fantastic. My only concern would be that if we could shorten the amount of days in by-elections to three days. As it stands right now, the All Candidates Meeting is on a Friday, you still have four days of pure campaigning and the CRO doesn't have to re-book things. The issue is that with four days throw it off, you have to rejig everything in regards to bookings, so I would say that three days is clean in terms of the All Candidates Meeting.

Jayde: The reason why it is currently four days, is to hopefully encourage the CRO to leave it open longer in the Fall so that first year students gain more comfort in their ability to run, and at the same time, you have done so much research into the role that I would be happy to lower it to three.

Devon: Question: wouldn't things need to be rejigged anyways? There isn't a way to reopen elections without, Section G, provides that the campaigned periods can't be shortened when it's reopened. I don't really care if its three or four, but if the reasons for change is so things would not be rejigged, they will always have to be rejigged, unless I'm misunderstanding.

Molly: You're right, in which case I'm fine with four because of rejigging, but my main concern is when you reopen it, it's just hard to rebook things for the byelection. I hope Maria is really nice to me.

Devon: Hopefully this doesn't get used that often, especially in the Fall, if it happens, everyone would work on your behalf because it is terrifying to have everything rescheduled, I feel for you.

Cameron: I wanted to raise some concerns about Section 6a.iii and iv. "An election shall be considered an "uncontested election" if at the conclusion of the All Candidates Meeting, it such that there are: iii. Two (2) or fewer candidates for First Year Councillor; and/or iv. Four (4) or



fewer candidates for Upper Year Councillor; and/or". To me, this allows there to be three candidates for first-year and five candidates for upper year, and that is considered a contested election, even though there are eight people running for eight spots. I'd like to see it bumped up to 3 or fewer for first year or 5 or fewer for upper year.

Devon: You're completely right, that is what we were trying to do. Jayde and I almost had an argument, well a friendly discussion about how to word this. You're right that the aim is to make sure that there is at least one person who will lose. Not to focus on that, but that's the easier way to describe it. You're correct.

Jayde: Not an argument

Cameron: I'd like to motion to amend Article 21, Section 6a.iii from "Two (2) or fewer candidates for First Year Councillor; and/or iv. Four (4) or fewer candidates for Upper Year Councillor; and/or" to " iii. Three (3) or fewer candidates for First Year Councillor; and/or iv. Five (5) or fewer candidates for Upper Year Councillor; and/or".

MOTION: Cameron Davies motions to amend Proposed Amendment #7, Chapter 8, Article 21, Section 6a.iii from "Two (2) or fewer candidates for First Year Councillor; and/or iv. Four (4) or fewer candidates for Upper Year Councillor; and/or" to "Three (3) or fewer candidates for First Year Councillor; and/or iv. Five (5) or fewer candidates for Upper Year Councillor; and/or".

SECONDED: Georgia Lin

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Devon: I am so glad you caught that, oh my goodness.

Cameron: This is why you keep math specialists on VUSAC.

Jayde: We worked on that policy for a good hour and a half with Devon and Nick.

Alexa Ballis: Clarification on Proposed Amendment #2, Section 4f. The Section already states that the VPSO "Shall a voting member of the Budget Steering Committee", however the addition of 4j would be the exact same subclause as 4f.

Jayde: That was an accident, I copy and pasted wrong. Can I ask if something is permissible? Can we vote on this as is, and then the numbering might change depending on what my typo issue was. We will vote on the concept, but the numerals shall change. The amendment to have the VPSO on the Budget Steering Committee was not in there originally.

Devon: It's already in the Constitution.



Jayde: Nevermind then, that's null and void. I retract Proposed Amendment #2.
#yesmypresident

Alexa Ballis: For Proposed Amendment #4, Section 4e, "Shall host or collaborate on at least two events per year", can that be one per semester?

Jayde: Yes, that is the idea, but because there "Shall host or collaborate on at least two (2) events per year which focus on mental wellness, stress relief, or more holistic student health and wellbeing," as well as one on breaking down stigma, I guess it's just about flexibility. I wouldn't be opposed for it to be one per semester, but what I've noticed in regard to VUSAC positions, a lot gets changed because it isn't followable. So, in creating this specific position, my hope is that it wouldn't need to be amended because somebody couldn't follow it. Because it is primarily an advocacy-based role, hopefully they host lots of events, but if they are more advocacy and policy focused, then three is kind of the bare minimum. Spreading those all over first semester wouldn't be ideal, I am hesitant to over-restrict those in the Constitution, even though I do see it playing out as one per semester.

Alexa Ballis: Makes sense, I can see your reasoning behind that. **ponders**. But because it's a new position, I'm just not sure how it will go, but we can revisit it next year. The reasoning for what I was thinking, to focus on mental wellness and stress relief, there are two periods in the year that have heightened times of stress, once per semester would be nice.

Zoe: I would second this, sometimes it's good to set those parameters in. Flexibility is good for commissioners, but it's good for somebody who does not have a predecessor.

Devon: I would not support it, but if it were in Council Policies it would be different. Policy Worst case scenario, if you don't fulfill your constitutional requirements, you can be impeached, it's a stupid little thing, it'll be fine either way and it doesn't necessarily matter. I wouldn't think that anybody would be impeached on the matter, probably ever.

Jayde: I am a fan of closing little loopholes, I would love to see the amendment on the floor but I wouldn't be able to vote yes on it.

Emilia: I went to the washroom. I have a small bladder. What did I miss?

Alexa Breininger: Alexa brought up the wording in Proposed Amendment 4, Section 5e. Twice per year or once per semester in regards to events.

Alexa Ballis: One thing before I move to suggest that amendment, for my duties in the Constitution, it says that I should have the Semi-Formal during First Semester, and Highball during Second Semester, and because they are similar dress up and dance events, it makes sense to separate them. It would be useful to the students for the VCU, although it may be common sense, that we specifically split them between two events per semester.

MOTION: Alexa Ballis motions to amend Proposed Amendment #4, Chapter 10, Article 19, Section 4e from "Shall host or collaborate on at least two (2) events per year which focus on mental wellness, stress relief, or more holistic student health and wellbeing." to



“Shall host or collaborate on at least one (1) event per semester which focuses on mental wellness, stress, relief, or more holistic student health and wellbeing.”

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: Alexa Ballis, Jared Connoy (by proxy), Cameron Davies, Emilia De Fabritiis, Georgia Lin, Zoe Ritchie, Nickolas Shyshkin.

Opposed: Carleigh Campbell, Jayde Jones, Devon Wilton

Abstentions: None

Alexa Breininger: This motion fails.

Devon: Does it? Isn't $\frac{3}{4}$ majority when it's an amendment to the Constitution and not on an amendment of an amendment to the Constitution?

Jayde: Oh shoot.

Devon: This is a constitutional crisis!

Alexa Breininger: I'm going to say that it affects the Constitution, and it is in the nature of a Constitutional Amendment, which is why it would be $\frac{3}{4}$ majority.

Devon: Got it.

Jayde: Anything burning on this package of amendments that somebody would like to address?

Zoe: I would contest this vote, I am turning it to Alexa or Cameron, whether you want to challenge the Chair.

Alexa Breininger: For Constitutional Amendments, we need a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority vote, this is an amendment on a Constitutional Amendment, what we have as our rules that we follow, it's not clear if Amendments to Constitutional Amendments require $\frac{3}{4}$, but as Chair I thought it would be best if we deal with the Amendment in a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority fashion.

Alexa Ballis: I would like to challenge.

Jayde: I will get the Robert's Rules book.

MOTION: Devon Wilton motions for a fifteen minute recess.

SECONDED: Nickolas Shyshkin



In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Resumption

Alexa Breininger: So, **the amendment passes**, in the interest of time we will explain later.

Devon: It was a vote of 3-1 to the Executive.

Cameron: Proposed Amendment #5, Section 3b: "[The Office Manager] Shall send a draft of each set of minutes to all VUSAC members, including staff members, and all those who are recorded as having spoken at the meeting within at least 72 hours following the end of each VUSAC meeting." I would like to clarify that to make sure for it to say that "those who were not present and that staff members always receive minutes to the meetings." In the past, I have had to wait for the minutes to be posted online, I would like to see them even if I was not present earlier on.

Jayde: That is somebody not doing their job. All VUSAC members including staff-members is already "all those". The reason that "and all those who are recorded as having spoken" is included, is because often times when you speak and when you're not on VUSAC, you don't have the opportunity to edit your own words, which in my opinion is not fair if everybody else was given the opportunity. It usually happens in practice.

Cameron: It would be nice to make it crystal clear, even though it's implicit, it's easy for somebody to gloss it over.

Jayde: I feel like this is explicit.

Cameron: I would like to propose that amendment. I just want it to be explicit. from "Shall send a draft of each set of minutes to all VUSAC members, including staff members, and all those who are recorded as having spoken at the meeting within at least 72 hours following the end of each VUSAC meeting." to: "Shall send a draft of each set of minutes to all VUSAC members, including staff members, all VUSAC and staff members who are not present, and all those who are recorded as having spoken at the meeting within at least 72 hours following the end of each VUSAC meeting."



Devon: I think it's unnecessarily complicated, it sounds like Staff Members are not members of VUSAC, I also think that because it's the Constitution, there's value in keeping it simple. So I will not support the motion.

Jayde: I think that the spirit is right, but policy like this should be as clean as we can possibly have. The Constitution is already a long document and is too wordy. We want it to be more concise. We shouldn't even have to include the words "including staff members", because the membership of VUSAC is already defined. I left it because that's a thing for another day. I'm not in support.

Devon: Not to appear unreasonably harsh, you're right that it hasn't happened in the past, I think it's just a matter of discipline.

Cameron: Can I re-amend that? Amend to "Shall send a draft to all set of minutes to all VUSAC members, to all VUSAC members regardless of attendance at the meeting, and those who are recorded to have spoken at the meeting."

MOTION: Cameron Davies motions to amend Proposed Amendment #5, Chapter 8, Article 16, Section 5b from "Shall send a draft of each set of minutes to all VUSAC members, including staff members, and all those who are recorded as having spoken at the meeting within at least 72 hours following the end of each VUSAC meeting." to: "Shall send a draft to all set of minutes to all VUSAC members, to all VUSAC members regardless of attendance at the meeting, and those who are recorded to have spoken at the meeting within at least 72 hours following the end of each VUSAC meeting."

SECONDED: Georgia Lin

In Favor: Carleigh Campbell, Jared Connoy (by proxy), Cameron Davies, Emilia De Fabritiis, Georgia Lin, Nickolas Shyshkin.

Opposed: Alexa Ballis, Jayde Jones, Zoe Ritchie, Devon Wilton

Abstentions: None

Alexa Breininger: Now we have run into the same problem as before.

Jayde: I would stick with what the Executive just voted on.



Devon: This changes something that wasn't changed before, whereas before we were changing something that was already being changed. It does affect the amount that this amendment modifies the Constitution.

Jayde: The threshold that we were voting on in the other room after looking at Robert's Rules, was increasing the modification to the Constitution, when you propose an amendment, obviously you're proposing a modification to the Constitution. So let's say you modify a Proposed Amendment. If the Amendment modifies the Proposed Amendment to a greater effect and affects the Constitution itself more, then you need $\frac{3}{4}$ majority, but if it modifies the Constitution itself the same degree as the original Proposed Amendment, then you only need a simple majority. It's up to Alexa to decide the degree in which it modifies. Somebody can challenge Alexa, but it is ultimately up to Alexa.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions for a three minute recess.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Alexa Breininger: **This motion fails**, my reasoning is that while it appears to be in the same spirit, it does add specific things to the role that weren't there before, even though it's something the Office Manager would be doing anyways. It adds a very specific role which I believe changes the threshold.

Cameron: When you say to that specific roll, those who voted against it felt it was already included in the role and that it was unnecessary.

Alexa Breininger: For me, it's the language, even though the Office Manager is expected to do so, it's hard because in theory, it's not changing anything because Office Manager does it anyways, but because it's a Constitutional Amendment, if you're adding something specific, I think it's enough of a change that would require the $\frac{3}{4}$ majority.

Cameron: One more question, as currently stands, you would read this not as constitutional duty, but rather as something not including to send minutes to those that are not present?



Alexa Breining: No, how I view it, in the original, it says “Shall send a draft of each set of minutes to all VUSAC members, including staff members (...)” that includes people who were not there, I would not say that adding that language is changing that, but I would say adding it specifically does change the amendment.

Devon: Just being conscious of time, I request the Chair that we table and go with voting on Appendix C.

Cameron: Okay, I would like to motion to table Proposed Amendment #5 until the next meeting.

Devon: Speaking against the motion, do we need to get these Constitutional Amendments done, or is this one not important?

Jayde: In my view it's important because it should be passed now and my reasoning is within the package. I find this one to be irrelevant, I say that with all love in the world. I don't think anything will change if we vote on it in August, but we will have to argue against the same things. We will end up in whatever situation back in August. I just wonder whether it is the best use of Council's time.

MOTION: Cameron Davies motions to table Proposed Amendment #5.

SECONDED: Georgia Lin

In Favor: Alexa Ballis, Jared Connoy (by proxy), Cameron Davies, Emilia De Fabritiis, Georgia Lin, Zoe Ritchie.

Opposed: Carleigh Campbell, Jayde Jones, Nickolas Shyshkin, Devon Wilton.

Abstentions: None

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to omnibus all Amendments that have been proposed except for Proposed Amendment #5, as they currently stand including any amendments made on the floor.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None



MOTION: Jayde Jones motions adopt all of the Amendments presented in Appendix C that were omnibussed.

SECONDED: Cameron Davies

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None

Summary of In-Meeting Amendments to Constitutional Amendments:

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter I of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C.

~~MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VII, Article 14, Section 2 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C. *Retracted*~~

~~MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VII, Article 16, Section 5 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C. *Tabled*~~

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VIII, Article 15, Section 1 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter X, Article 19, Section 3 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C. ***Amended in-meeting by Alexa Ballis.***

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VIII, Article 21, Section 2 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VIII, Article 21, Section 5.b. of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C. ***Amended in-meeting by Jayde Jones.***

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VIII, Article 21, Section 6 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C. ***Amended in-meeting by Cameron Davies.***

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to amend Chapter VIII, Article 21, Section 5 of the Constitution to read as presented in Appendix C.



Appendix D – Statement on University Mandated Leave Policy, Devon Wilton (15 minutes)

Alexa Breininger: Moving on to Appendix D. We have a motion on the floor to release a statement on behalf of VUSAC regarding University of Toronto Leave of Absence Policy. Devon, you have the floor.

Devon: You all attached Appendix D, this statement is short and sweet, and important. To give you an overview since it's the first time we will talk in depth about this during a meeting. The Governing Council of UofT enacted this policy on June 27th, 2018 which is a new policy for the University. It has been in the works for a long time, and the meetings I attended last year had students being consulted on it, with many open consultations albeit they were too short, and everyone weighed in on it, including the Ontario Human Rights Commissioner, saying that it fell short of the University's duty to accommodate its students, and this was the 2017-2018 academic year. The Policy was then amended, proposed in June, when students are not very present, and it was passed. The Executive, we released a statement about it earlier, just before the vote by Governing Council, that it hasn't been amended significantly enough to reach the duty to accommodate, it's meant to allow leaves that aren't disciplinary to those who need it, almost explicitly for people who have experiences with mental illness, and there are two thresholds for the governing policy that it lays out, and one, is if you're a harm to yourself or others, and the other, is if you are unable to engage in the essential activities required to pursue an education, and that's the issue that a lot of people had with it. It could be interpreted in so many ways, one is that if you are having an experience in mental illness, and that mean you can't come to class or you can't submit your paper on time, which can be described as the essential activities required to pursue an education. The University can do up to putting you on a mandatory leave of absence and which has all kinds of harms related to it, depending on your situation. Removal from student housing, removal from your community that you depend on as a support system, can cause issues with international students in regards to visas. All of these are complicated, but pose harm to students. It honestly feels like liability mitigation is what a lot of people have been saying, sort of like 'this person is a risk to themselves' or 'this person is not helpful to the university, so we're going to get them out of here'. Sandy Walsh, who is the Vice-Provost of Students(OVPS) told me in a meeting that students are most often referred to the OVPS by their divisions or by faculty members who notice that they are struggling. So that's why this statement is directed towards the Victoria College Administration, namely the Registrar, and Office of the Dean of Students. The way that Vic works, these are the two offices who most likely to refer students to the OVPS, where they will come to contact with this policy. We feel that this is our next step in resisting this policy since we were unable to prevent it from passing, despite grassroots activists who we try to support and endorse, and our own statement is mitigating the potential harm that the Policy has to students at Vic and in the community. The gist of the statement is we want to ask that if a student is ever referred to the OVPS, that the Dean or the Registrar or whoever, takes into account the risk of harm that the policy poses, and consider other accommodative options before doing so. We think this statement is important, it's not something that I have personally seen being done by other bodies, and we think it is an important next step in resisting this policy. It's a way of telling Administration to pay attention of the harm that can come to students, and so if there are any questions, I am happy to talk about



the policy. The reason we brought this to Council, because it would be valuable to have it as an open vote to Council so that we can attach all of our names to it, whereas the last statement was just the four Executives. The reason we did it as an Executive last time is because we did not have the luxury of time. But now, because it is a done deal, we'd like to hear all of your thoughts. If there are none, we can move to a vote.

Jayde: Thomas had to step out, he is one of the reps on the Victoria University Senate. He was here specifically to talk about this discussion item, so he has a statement that he wants me to read on his behalf. This is something that I am always happy to do, by the way.

"Thank you, for allowing me time today to speak to an issue that I find particularly close to my heart and history. This is kind of a prepared speech because I wanted to talk about my own personal relation to this policy. I've been actively involved against the University Mandated Leave of Absence Policy – as numerous others here have also been.

So about 6 years ago in middle school I was subject to a lot of taunting over my sexuality – which mind you I was still trying to figure out. I actually hated school and myself for a while and this caused me to perform poorly in class, so my math teacher refused to have me in class and sent me to this, I don't know what it would be called, a behavior issue class? I clearly remember telling one of the teachers in that room that I was being called gay, and that I thought I was. I was actually sent to the vice-principal's office who suspended me because she thought I needed time away from class. She thought a Mandatory Leave was best. She called my parents in to tell them why and in turn she basically outed me to my parents. It got around that I got suspended and it became a joke in my class that if you were gay you would get suspended.

Introspectively, I've had to fight this notion in me that I am a whole person and I shouldn't punish myself because of my gayness, yet the main reason for my week-long suspension was not that I was gay, but rather the citation was "depressed." About the mandatory leave of absence policy, my leave then and someone else's leave now doesn't really change anything about their mental health, and definitely does not tackle the stigma behind mental health. I want to highlight that here at Vic we have students of so many backgrounds and in my capacities, I have done what I can to highlight institutionalized violence, but I hope you'll vote to approve this letter and the coming constitutional amendment to begin to reverse course and disallow this policy at Vic.

Although regarding letters, it is no longer a symbolic approach to fighting this or any policy – what I mean by this is that most bodies have published letters and generally follow the same pattern of condemnation, wording of this policy, and points to make it better. Now that this policy has passed, simply following through with the standard framework is not enough, and instead we should recognize that the bureaucratization of this process has been happening in cases such as this; and the 2013 defederation; and Vision2030; and the divestment debacle. This tried and failed framework comes from the idea that vertical student bodies possess a power that doesn't require grassroots participation – and our electoral participation rates show that we need to do better than write letters. Ultimately though, I do support the leveraging of VUSAC's institutional power to recommend registrars not be allowed to use this mechanism as it is a way to block this policy.

I know I will be working with my counterpart in the Victoria University Senate, and your Vice President Student Organizations, to work on a mechanism that prevents faculty from facilitating the beginning of this mechanism. My friend and Woodsworth Director for Mental Health, Amelia



Eaton, has introduced legislation to the Woodsworth College Student Association regarding an ad hoc body dedicated to mental health that the entire university student population can join, and it would be CCR applicable. VUSAC should endorse that body, should the time come. Yet I cannot help but need to include some recommendations on which I believe this letter should include;

Firstly, do not accept anything less than structural change. Force the student unions to hop off their political pedestals and hold them to the account of protecting student health interests on campus, and have councils recognize their privilege. We hold the keys to health access on this campus and so you have a fundamental duty to enforce that.

And Secondly, be holistic. Vision2030 would disseminate the powers of student organizations on campus and across three campuses to act as unified. Speak with the power to represent the entire University, whereas our constituency may be only a small part of that.

We all chose to love Vic for a reason. It's why we are here. But Vic is not a mutually exclusive enclave from this policy, from university structuralism, and from mental health abuse stories. Be activists."

Devon: I want to thank Thomas for sharing. He has been very involved in activism against the MLAP, in sit-down meetings with the Government Council, and at protests, and that's great. I am glad that he appreciates that this is a thing that VUSAC can do as a professional organization, and that that's a part of the system.

MOTION: Devon Wilton motions for the VUSAC to release the statement regarding the University of Toronto Mandatory Leave of Absence Policy as presented in Appendix D.

SECONDED: Alexa Ballis

In Favor: All

Opposed:

Abstentions:

Commission Reports

Academic Commissioner, Cameron Davies (5 mins)

Hello, just wanted to let you about some meetings I've had recently. On June 28, I met with Josh Grondin, the UTSU VP University Affairs (VPUA), we talked about many different things, so if you want to know more, ask about these things after the meeting. On July 11th I met with Megan Littlejohn, who is Vic's Learning Strategist, she is leaving us at the end of July to go back to the Academic Success Centre, and they're hiring a new Learning Strategist. In regards to the Registrar's Office, Megan feels that some changes will be made to job positions, because there are a number of vacancies that have opened up, including Emanuel Melo's. Finally the last little point. I've been planning on working on my Commission Exec applications, I was planning to release them on August 1st, but we will see how that progresses based on some medical emergencies. I yield my time.



Zoe motions an exploding appendix

Commuter Commissioner, Emilia De Fabritiis & Tabina Ahmed (10 mins)

Emilia: A few updates, we had our first VOCA Exec meeting a few weeks ago, it went really well. Our Exec is still in the process of finalizing their schedules. The date for our Fall Pancake Day is TBA, and we will probably tell Council by mid-August. I would love if VUSAC can be our first pancake guest. I had a meeting with the Burwash Dining Hall, specifically AJ regarding commuter meal plans. They used to do a thing that every term, commuters could get two free meal passes to get into Burwash, which they stopped. It through the Dean's Office (DO) and stopped 2 years ago. I do not have a response from Wanda. Maybe I'll send another one. Basically I wanted to ask why the program stopped, and to see whether it can be taken into effect again, and done under the Commuter Commission portfolio. Some people may not be comfortable going to the DO to pick up such passes, maybe it would be more accessible for students to pick these up at VUSAC. I emailed clubs and levies regarding pancake collaborations that they would want to do throughout the year. I compiled this 10 page guide, on how to plan a commuter friendly event, called the Commuter Friend Event Planning Guide. It's important because not a lot of clubs and levies think about when planning their events, and I know it's easy for those on VUSAC to keep in mind commuter accessibility, but for smaller clubs, starting up clubs, this may not be something that they would really think about. The Goose had an off-campus event, maybe seeing if there are more ways to make it accessible. I included Hamilton for Nick's sake. The only other thing is that Commuter Appreciation Week is something I really want to do, it's a full week of programming to make incoming and returning commuter students feel welcome, I'm excited, so it's the first week of October. Those are all my updates!

Jayde: Thanks for all of the work, the Commuter Friendly Event Planning Guide is incredible. If you never get a response from somebody, come to me or Christina! That's that.

Equity Commissioner, Georgia Lin & Vibhuti Kacholia

Georgia: I was not present at the June Meeting but Vibhuti was. In June, the self-defense workshop was discussed, we have some very good news, Vibhuti has been in talks and working really hard. We are getting a free session of Wen-Do self defense, through the UofT Community Safety Office. It's for three hours at the end of September.

Vibhuti: September 26, on the Wednesday, from 6-9PM.

Georgia: If that goes well, it can be a recurring session, because the UofT Community Safety Office has a partnership with Wen-Do Toronto, so they've been working together for a long time. If that goes well with good turnout, it can be yearlong and we don't pay anything. I am going to have a Google Form sent to Council Members on Summer Equity Training, what you want to see changed, added, improved, how the topics were, and the Equity Reading List. We'd love to hear suggests on that. Vibhuti and I, we are making an orientation resource kit of off-campus resources. I am going to make a Facebook post on our internal page and I'd love to listen to any of your suggestions, such as mental wellness resources, sexual health clinics, that are off-campus. Mainly off-campus because I believe that there will be many on-campus resources made available for people to access in Orientation. It can also be helpful to commuters who may not always be on campus. That is it!



Scarlet & Gold Commissioner, Alexa Ballis (5 mins)

I have a survey out, we have over 100 responses out. **folks say wow**. However, 700 people go to Highball and I would like more feedback! Get your friends to fill it out! Share it on the groups you're a part of, I want that feedback. My Back to School event in the works, don't release anything about it, some things can change, not everything is feasible. That's all.

Executive Reports

Vice-President External, Devon Wilton (2 mins)

Devon: Caucus has been moved one day early, now it is the 22nd. Fingers crossed! Next thing is Goldring Students Centre Feedback Form, I will have a Google Form because VUSAC loves Google Forms, it's going to be great, I want 100 responses on mine. It will ask things such as how members of the VCU use the space, how often, how they want to use the space, and open boxes for suggestions. We will send it out to levies and clubs first, and then it will go to the entire VCU, then those responses can be taken to the Committee. For the renaming Ryerson initiative, VUSAC will be consulting with indigenous student groups, faculty, community contacts, possibly President Robins new Indigenous Advisory Committee if that kicks up anytime soon. If you want your voices heard or have any contacts, now is a great time to reach out about that. Jayde will talk about degendering washrooms, but that is something we have been working on and done a walkabout with some people.

Vice-President Internal, Nickolas Shyshkin (2 mins)

Nick: What I've been working on lately is a schedule for retreat, our fun two days together, October 13-14 are the dates, keep those in mind. I have a rough scheduling of what's happening when and what we will be doing. Any suggestions, icebreakers, whatever, let me know! I'll be doing Summer check-ins with Commissioners, Co-Chairs, and Executives in early August! Soon! Watch out for your emails.

Vice-President Student Organizations, Zoe Ritchie (5 mins)

Zoe: Productive Summer, doing a lot of one-on-ones with levy heads, lots of laughs and passion and resources sharing. I have never seen a group of levy heads excited to start early. Club registration will come out in one-two weeks, please share that. I'm working on a new handbook, different resources from different people. That's all from me. You're all expected to be at Orientation, your commitment is September 4th, 4-7PM.

President, Jayde Jones (5 mins)

Here are the headings since we are short on time, if you are interested about any of them in more detail, we can talk about them later. Since our last meeting, I was working on the new



ERC, Constitutional Amendments, and amendments to Council Policies that were passed or not passed. There is a survey about grad photography going around, 59 responses so far, we are working with Registrar's Office and Dean's Office to make sure graduate photography does not service VUSAC's needs, but it actually serves graduating students' needs. We are talking about maybe hosting it at the Registrar's Office rather than through VUSAC, you will hear more about that as it goes along since it's a contract. VUSAC Garden: it's growing, we will use the strawberries and kale during Commuter Orientation. Don't pick the food off. You're welcome to take some herbs, shoot me a message beforehand please. Gender neutral washrooms updated, I've been meeting with Scott, we've determined that degendering the third floor washrooms is the best next step in terms of increasing and not decreasing access, moving forward it's about what we can physically do. Free menstrual product update, I've been working with other divisions, working with UTSU for example, we are looking for a slogan to brand products under, i.e "Products brought to you by VUSAC: ____". Some suggestions were "Health First", another was "It's Free, period." I don't like those. Those at the Dean's Advisory Steering Committee know it went well, a lot of what we talked was on the table. Please talk to me afterwards if you want to know more. We will have another in August when Kelley is back. Orientation Exec, Christina and Ali have been supportive of my ideas, there is a bursary for Comm-O for students who can't afford to pay the amount to attend. We had a leader forum to get open feedback today. VUSAC's contribution to Orientation has been moved to get some ceramic mugs, VUSAC on the back, Orientation theme on the front. Big changes to Trads. It's super fun. Please like our social media. We are organizing the back room, put the dates in you calendar, add Council's numbers to your phones, many forms happening, compost bin in the office, and Printer update Listserv texting is in the works. You are all incredible!! This is the best VUSAC meeting that I have been to in 2 years.

MOTION: Jayde Jones motions to adjourn.

SECONDED: Devon Wilton

In Favor: All

Opposed: None

Abstentions: None