

UNIVERSITY
OF
TORONTO

STUDENTS'
UNION

Board of Directors Meeting Package

Wednesday May 18th, 2016 | 18:00

WW 126

Agenda of the 2nd Board of Directors Meeting

Wednesday May 18th, 2016 | 18:00

WW 126 (Woodsworth College 119 St. George Street, Toronto, ON M5S 1A9)

Attendance

Executive Committee

Jasmine Wong Denike, President
Mathias Memmel, Vice-President Internal
Cassandra Williams, Vice-President University Affairs
Lucinda Qu, Vice-President External
Farah Noori, Vice-President Equity
Shahin Imtiaz, Vice-President Campus Life
Ryan Gomes, Vice-President Professional Faculties
Nour Alideeb, UTMSU President

Division I Directors

Cole Mellows, Innis College
Nadine Abdel-Ghafar, New College
Sila Elgin, New College
Nicholas Grant, New College
Damian Di Blaise, St. Michael's College
Leanne Grupusso, St. Michael's College
Georgina Merhom, St. Michael's College
Sarah Harrison, Trinity College
Chimwemwe Alao, University College
Mira El Hussein, University College
Ryan Hume, University College
Garnet Lollar, Victoria College
Stephanie Spagnuolo, Victoria College
Christina Badiola, Woodsworth College
Ahmad Ilyas, Woodsworth College
Sebastian Salomon, Woodsworth College
Paul Rhamey, Transitional Year Program
Jacob Reinertson, Computer Science
Victoria Liao, Humanities
Alissa Mirochnitchenko, Life Sciences
Vacant, Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Tsukasa Kikuchi, Rotman Commerce
Timothy Law, Social Sciences

Board Observers

Tka Pinnock, Executive Director

Division II Directors

Faizan Akbani, Professional Faculties at-large
Sophia Wang, Professional Faculties at-large
Marienka Bishop-Kovac, Faculty of Architecture and Visual Studies
Joshua Raisin, Faculty of Dentistry
Addy Bhatia, Faculty of Engineering
Danja Papajani, Faculty of Engineering
Andrew Sweeny, Faculty of Engineering
Naomi Maldonado-Rodriguez, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
Justin Kim, Faculty of Medicine
Katie Grundy, Faculty of Nursing
Adriana Too, Faculty of Pharmacy
Orvin Lao, Toronto School of Theology
Aidan Fishman, Faculty of Law
Jacob Feldman, Faculty of Music

Division III Directors

Sarah Amjad, UTMSU
Teresa Bai, UTMSU
Noor Bajaj, UTMSU
Noor Chaudhry, UTMSU
Sharon Lui, UTMSU
Ameera Marlewski, UTMSU
Fatima Mohamed, UTMSU

General Equity Directors

Nish Chankar
Falhad Mohamoud
Krunal Kanani
Ramz Aziz
Jayme Nadolny
Lee Grace

Guests

1. Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at HH:MM

2. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

MOVED: MEMMEL SECONDED:

Be it resolved that the Agenda be approved as presented.

3. Appointment of Speaker

MOTION

MOVED: MEMMEL SECONDED:

Be it resolved that Billy Graydon be appointed as Speaker of the 2016-2017 Board of Directors.

4. Message from Speaker

5. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

MOVED: MEMMEL SECONDED:

Be it resolved that the following sets of minutes be approved as presented:

Policy and Procedures Committee: May 12th, 2016;

Professional Faculties Committee: May 9th, 2016;

6. Restriking of Policy and Procedures Committee

MOTION

MOVED: MEMMEL SECONDED:

Whereas a temporary Policy and Procedures committee was struck at the April 30th Transition Meeting with a restricted mandate to add G.E.D. seats on Union Committees;

Be it resolved that the term of the committee be extended to the June Meeting of the Board of Directors with a full mandate; and

Be it further resolved that the Committee's membership remain the same with the addition of _____, General Equity Director.

7. Striking of CFS Committee

MOTION

MOVED: GOMES SECONDED:

Whereas the University of Toronto Student's Union is a member student union (Local 98) of the Canadian Federation of Students; and

Whereas St. George members of the UTSU are recognized as members of Local 98 and Mississauga members of the UTSU are recognized as members of Local 109 of the Federation; and

Whereas on July 28th, 2015 the 2015-2016 Board of Directors struck an ad-hoc CFS Committee; and

Whereas the 2015-2016 ad-hoc CFS Committee released a draft report at the final meeting of the 2015-2016 Board of Directors on April 30th, 2016.

Be it resolved that the Board strike an ad-hoc CFS Committee for the 2016-2017 term; and

Be it further resolved that the President, VP Internal & Services, VP External, an additional Executive chosen by the Executive Committee, one director from division I, one director from division II, and three additional directors from division I or II be elected by and from the Board of Directors to serve on the 2016-2017 ad-hoc CFS Committee; and

Be it further resolved that ex-officio speaking rights be extended to the following:

- a. All division I and division II directors
- b. The heads of all college student societies
- c. The heads of all professional faculty student societies
- d. A representative from the Arts & Science Student Union; and

Be it further resolved that this committee will update the draft report prepared by the 2015-2016 ad-hoc CFS committee such that the report:

- a. Outlines the overall impact of the Federation upon UTSU members at the St. George Campus represented as CFS Local 98.
- b. Analyzes the various criticisms and accomplishments of the Federation across the country
- c. Is released to the board by the end of the Fall Session.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday June 14th at 6pm on the St. George Campus.

Note: Food will be made available after sunset for Directors fasting during Ramadan.

9. Other Business

10. Adjournment

MOTION

MOVED: SECONDED:

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourns at HH:MM

Minutes of the 1st Profac Committee Meeting

Monday May 9, 2016, 18:00
UTSU Front Room

Attendance

Ryan Gomes, Vice-President Professional Faculties
Jasmine Wong Denike, President
Danja Papajani, Faculty of Engineering
Katie Grundy, Faculty of Nursing
Marienka Bishop-Kovac, Faculty of Architecture
Justin Kim, Faculty of Medicine
Jacob Feldman, Faculty of Music
Sophia Wang, Professional Faculty At-Large
Aidan Fishman, Faculty of Law
Adriana Too, Faculty of Pharmacy
Andrew Sweeny, Faculty of Engineering
Saarthak Saxena, Faculty of Engineering

1. Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at 18:20.

2. Approval of the Agenda

MOTION

MOVED: GOMES SECONDED: WONG DENIKE

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

3. Architecture Renaming

MOTION

MOVED: Bishop-Kovac SECONDED: Gomes

Be it resolved that the Policy and Procedures Committee rename the Director position currently referred to as the “Director, Faculty of Architecture” in the UTSU Policies and Bylaws to “Director, Faculty of Architecture and Visual Studies.”

DISCUSSION

Bishop-Kovac explains that the faculty has both graduate students and undergraduate students and, that “Architecture and Visual Studies” is the name of the undergraduate component. The two undergraduate programs are architecture and visual studies.

Papajani asks for clarification.

Bishop-Kovac explains that you need a master’s degree to become a professional architect, but there are undergraduate programs in architecture as well. A few years ago, these undergraduate programs were transferred from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the Faculty of Architecture, which was previously a graduate-only faculty. The “Daniels” after whom the faculty is named is a donor.

CARRIED

4. Discussion – Faculty-Specific Issues

Gomes invites the committee members to talk about their respective faculties and the issues that their faculties face. Gomes states that he wants the UTSU to do more for professional faculties.

Feldman states that he is at the Faculty of Music. The primary issue is a lack of student space—music students need space in which to practice. There is not a lot of space available in the primary music building, and the secondary music building (near Alumni Hall) is used by the faculty administration most of the time.

Wang, who is the President of the Faculty of Music Undergraduate Association, states that the FMUA recently tried to get space in the new Centre for Civilizations and Cultures at 90 Queen’s Park Crescent to build a new student centre, but was denied despite the FMUA agreeing to a sizeable donation. She states that while the Faculty of Music is the best-funded professional faculty at the university, it is nonetheless regularly short of money, largely because the nature of the program requires instructors who teach students one-on-one instead of in a lecture-style setting. She would like the UTSU to work on access to arts and science courses for professional faculty students.

Fishman states that he is at the Faculty of Law. He explains that tuition fees for law students are unregulated (not capped), and that U of T has the highest law school fees in the country. He notes that because students graduate with so much debt, they are under pressure to practice corporate law as opposed to what might be described as public interest law, which pays less well. The Students’ Law Society, which represents law students, blames the problem on the faculty hiring too many expensive professors—the same professors who then sit on the faculty’s governing body. Another problem is professors reusing old exams, the answers to which are sometimes still floating around. There have been three recent instances of students knowing the answers to exams in advance because of this.

Grundy states that her program—nursing—is a small, intense, second-entry program. There are fewer than 200 students in each year, and the program runs from September to June. She speaks highly of the Faculty of Nursing and the Nursing Undergraduate Society, which represents nursing students. One issue facing the faculty is the isolation of nursing students, including their isolation from mental health services. Another is that nursing students pay tuition fees until the end of June but lose access to athletic facilities after April.

Too states that Pharmacy students face a similar issue.

Grundy adds that Dentistry students have the same issue, too.

Gomes explains that the administration often just uses the arts and science schedule for everyone.

Grundy concludes by adding that many nursing students are interested in social justice events, including those run by the UTSU, but simply do not hear about them in time, if at all.

Sweeny states that his faculty—the Faculty of Engineering—is the largest professional faculty at the university. The most serious issue facing engineering students is that the system is extremely unforgiving: it is almost impossible to drop a course or to go part time. Another issue is that the Engineering Career Centre, which runs the Professional Experience Year program, is completely useless. PEY is one of the main draws of U of T engineering, but the ECC does very little to cultivate placement opportunities, which is what it is supposed to do. The career counsellors are also not very helpful. Additionally, PEY students pay \$1,000 in tuition fees as well as levies like Hart House, despite not being on campus.

Papajani states that she would like Engineering to be less “fratty” and more engaged with the wider U of T community. She wants it to be more involved in social justice and extracurricular activities like music. She qualifies all of this by adding that, as a first year, she does not know as much as Gomes, Saxena, and Sweeny.

Saxena states that the Professional Faculties Committee could support the professional faculty student societies that are not as old and established as the Engineering Society.

Gomes adds that, when he was Vice-President Academic at the Engineering Society, the faculty struck a committee to investigate the ECC. It only met once, and had a very limited discussion. He concurs with all of the points raised by Sweeny.

Too states that until recently, Pharmacy was a second-entry bachelor's degree. Now, it is a four-year doctorate. Pharmacy students are in the same position as nursing students: their program is very compressed, and they are generally isolated from UTSU services. All pharmacy students are in class during regular working hours, which is when the UTSU is open. Also, pharmacy students continue to pay full fees in their fourth year, when they are not on campus.

Bishop-Kovac states that the Faculty of Architecture is currently moving from 230 College to 1 Spadina. There are 1,000 undergraduate students, and they do not have enough space in which to build their models. To make matters worse, the faculty has started encroaching on the student space that does exist. Also, the current building is old, falling apart, and probably a health hazard. The new student space at 1 Spadina is not obviously a safe, accessible space, and Bishop-Kovac wants to work with the Social Justice and Equity Commission to make it one. She also wants to raise awareness of the UTSU and its services, including how to opt out of the health and dental plan. Finally, the faculty does not have a lot of funding available for students in financial need. She asks if the GRIT Lab currently located on the roof of 230 College will stay after the UTSU moves into the building.

Gomes states that it will, but adds that Wong Denike knows more.

Wong Denike states that, to her knowledge, the UTSU will not be changing anything on the roof of 230 College.

Bishop-Kovac asks if the current group will continue to run the GRIT Lab.

Gomes states that it will, and that he will get that in writing.

Kim states that he is a medical student, and medical students tend not to know much about anything outside of the Faculty of Medicine. They also do not know much about the UTSU, because the Medical Society more or less looks after them. Medical students are not actually on campus for the second half of their degree, although they pay full fees regardless. Kim suggests that the UTSU fees paid during those two years might be better used by the Medical Society.

Feldman states the Royal Conservatory of Music is open to a partnership with the Faculty of Music that would give the university access to the RCM building.

Wong Denike states that the Executive will raise the RCM proposal with the Vice Provost Students at their next meeting.

5. Discussion – Campaigns for the Year

Gomes begins by addressing tuition fees. The caps on fee increases will expire in 2017, and the UTSU will seek to have them renewed. It is important that professional faculty students not be left out. For example, the cap on professional faculty fee increases is currently higher than the cap on Arts and Science fee increases, which is unfair.

Saxena asks for more information about tuition fees at the Faculty of Law.

Fishman explains that fees have increased from \$12,000 a decade ago to more than \$30,000 today. The problem is that many of the professors have high salaries but do not do any teaching.

Feldman asks if any of the fees went to the new Law building.

Fishman states that the building was funded primarily through corporate donations.

Gomes asks which professional faculties require their students to take Arts and Science courses.

The members representing first-entry faculties raise their hands.

Gomes states that, sometimes, professional faculty students need to take specific Arts & Science courses for their programs. They should get priority access to these courses. This is an issue to be raised with the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Wang states that she has specific ideas, but will bring them up after the meeting.

Gomes states that he wants to address the feeling of isolation that many professional faculty students feel. He would like to see the Professional Faculties Committee become a commission, because commissions have budgets and are open to all UTSU members. The commission is also more conducive to inter-faculty collaboration.

Too states that inter-faculty programming has a bad reputation at the Faculty of Pharmacy, because the mandatory inter-faculty programming that currently exists (involving Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy) is not very good. He states that Gomes' proposal would therefore need to be different in order to attract interest.

Grundy states that what is being proposed would be voluntary.

Gomes speculates that programming organized by the student societies would be better—and better-received—than programming organized by the faculties themselves.

Wang states that inter-faculty work needs to start during Orientation, before isolationism sets in.

Wong Denike suggests hosting small events for professional faculty students over the summer. The UTSU could host joint barbeques with the professional faculty student societies. Collaborative pub nights are another option.

6. Next Meeting

Gomes states that meetings will be held monthly during the summer. The next meeting will likely be in early June.

7. Other Business

Wong Denike encourages everyone to come to the Board of Directors retreat from Friday, 17 June to Sunday, 19 June. She explains how to register.

8. Adjournment

MOTION

MOVED: Gomes SECONDED: Too

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

CARRIED

Meeting is adjourned at 20:15.

UNIVERSITY
OF
TORONTO

STUDENTS'
UNION

Minutes of the 1st Policy & Procedures Committee Meeting

Wednesday, May 11, 2016, 18:00
UTSU Tower Meeting Room

Attendance

Mathias Memmel, Vice-President Internal
Jasmine Wong Denike, President
Ryan Gomes, Vice-President Professional Faculties
Nour Alideeb, UTMSU President
Noor Bajaj, UTMSU Director
Nish Chankar, General Equity Director
Garnet Lollar, Victoria College Director
Andrew Sweeny, Faculty of Engineering Director

Guests

Tka Pinnock, Executive Director

1. Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at 18:14.

2. Approval of the Agenda

MOTION

MOVED: MEMMEL SECONDED: GOMES

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

Gomes asks if he could add an item related to a motion passed by the ProFac Committee.

Memmel states that it can be discussed under Other Business. He further states that the agenda for the Committee was set by the Board with a restricted mandate. He states that the agenda probably should not be altered.

CARRIED

3. Committee Composition

MOTION

MOVED: Memmel SECONDED: Lollar

Be it resolved that the policy on Union Committees be amended such that:

The Membership of the Bursary & Grants Committee is as follows:

- President
- Vice-President Internal & Services
- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) additional Director from Divisions I, II

The Membership of the Budget Committee be as follows:

- President
- Vice-President Internal & Services
- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) Director from Division III
- Two (2) Additional Directors from either Division I, II and/or III

The Membership of the Executive Review Committee is as follows:

- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) Director from Division III
- One (1) additional Director from Division I, II and/or III

The Membership of the Organizational Development & Services Committee is as follows:

- President
- Vice-President Internal & Services
- One (1) additional Executive selected by the Executive Committee
- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) Director from Division III
- One (1) Additional Director from Division I, II and/or III

The Membership of the Policy and Procedures Committee is as follows:

- President
- UTMSU President or designate
- Vice-President Internal and Services
- Vice-President Professional Faculties
- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) Director from Division III

The Membership of the Student Accessibility Committee is as follows:

- President
- UTMSU President *or designate*
- Vice-President Equity
- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) Director from Division III

The Membership of the St. George Clubs Committee is as follows:

- President
- Vice-President Campus Life
- Vice-President Internal & Services
- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) additional Director from Divisions I, II
- Three (3) additional community members from Union recognized campus club

The membership of the Professional Faculties Committee is as follows:

- President
- Vice-President Professional Faculties
- All Directors from Division II

The membership of the Student Refugee Committee is as follows:

- Two (2) Directors from Division I
- One (1) Director from Division II
- One (1) Director from Division III

DISCUSSION

Mommel states that this motion reflects the current composition of standing committees as outlined in the Policies. He states that at this meeting, the Committee should come to some consensus as to how the composition of committees should be altered to include General Equity Directors and then he will accept the changes in the form of a friendly amendment. He asks the committee how they believe the GEDs should be added to standing committees.

Sweeny states that the General Equity Directors should be able to run for open seats. He notes that if the open seats are restricted to particular divisions, they should be open to GEDs from those divisions. There should be one GED-specific seat added to each committee, except for the Student Accessibility Committee and the Student Refugee Committee, to which two GED-specific seats should be added. He further adds that GEDs should be able to sit on the Professional Faculties Committee.

Gomes disagrees with Sweeny's proposal. Gomes states that Sweeny's proposal would create ten seats for only seven GEDs, resulting in GEDs having many more opportunities to sit on committees than directors from other divisions. He notes that GEDs might not want to sit on more than one committee. Gomes supports allowing GEDs to run for open seats but is opposed to GED-specific seats, because altering the base composition of the committees will make them less proportional. He also adds that most GEDs will come from Division I. Gomes states that the fairest solution is to allow GEDs to run for open seats, and to add GED-specific seats to certain committees, specifically the two that Sweeny mentioned. Gomes is also open to adding a GED specific seat to the Policy and Procedures Committee.

Sweeny states that he is less worried about disproportionality because the GEDs do not represent a college or faculty; they represent the whole university. He states that this is similar to At-large directors who do not represent the professional faculty in which they happen to be enrolled. Sweeny states his openness to counter-proposals.

Gomes clarifies that his intention is to preserve the representation of Division II and Division III students. He was not suggesting that GEDs represent colleges and faculties.

Sweeny states that he would like at least one GED-specific seat each on the Student Accessibility Committee and the Student Refugee Committee, and maybe one on Executive Review Committee. The other committees are less crucial.

Lollar agrees with Sweeny's original proposal, and notes that the proportional representation of Divisions would not be significantly affected.

Pinnock agrees with Lollar. She suggests adding GED-specific seats to each Committee as opposed to limiting them to running for the open seats.

Mommel states that GED seats are not intended to be filled by mutually-exclusive criteria, hence the name of the position. He states that the intention behind their creation was to take an intersectional approach to equity and that the seats should be open to all GEDs.

Bajaj states that all GED-specific seats should be open to all GEDs. For example, the GED specific seat on the Student Accessibility Committee should not be restricted to the GED responsible for the Students with Disabilities Sub-Commission, in order to avoid tokenization.

Wong Denike agrees with Bajaj regarding tokenization, but notes that almost all of the GEDs applied with specific portfolios in mind.

Lollar states that the open seats already result in disproportionality.

Gomes states that, most of the time, the open seats are held by Division I directors. His role as Vice-President Professional Faculties is to represent Division II students, whose representation will be further diluted if GED-specific seats are added to committees.

Sweeny states that he is concerned that Gomes' proposal would not ensure a GED presence on every committee.

Mommel states that Executive Committee intends to find a procedural way to ensure that the same people do not sit on every committee. He suggests that GEDs be given a right of first refusal: if no GED wants a GED-specific seat, the seat will then become an open seat.

Bajaj suggests that GEDs be non-voting members of committees.

Mommel responds that GEDs were created in order to give the representatives of marginalized groups a role in how the UTSU makes decisions. Not giving them voting rights would run contrary to their purpose.

Lollar states that the committee's goal should be to ensure that GEDs sit on committees and Gomes' proposal does not achieve that. He further states that Division II directors will sit on all committees regardless.

MOTION TO AMEND

MOVED: Mommel SECONDED: Lollar

Be it resolved that one G.E.D. seat be added to the following committees: Bursaries and Grants Committee, Budget Committee, Executive Review Committee, Organizational Development and Services Committee, Policy and Procedures Committee and St. George Clubs Committee.

Be it further resolved that two (2) G.E.D. seats be added to the Student Accessibility Committee and the Student Refugee Committee.

Be it further resolved that membership of the Professional Faculties Committee be as follows:

- President
- Vice-President Professional Faculties
- All Directors Enrolled in a professional Faculty.

AMENDMENTS ARE ACCEPTED AS FRIENDLY

Lollar states that Gomes has made valid points regarding proportionality.

Mommel states that the GED hiring process should be re-examined with proportionality in mind.

CARRIED

4. Other Business

Gomes states that the Faculty of Architecture Director, Marienka Bishop-Kovac, would like her constituency to be renamed. It is currently the John H. Daniels Faculty of Landscape,

Architecture, and Design. The proposal is to rename it the Faculty of Architecture and Visual Studies, in keeping with the programs offered by the faculty. The Professional Faculties Committee has passed a motion encouraging Policy & Procedures Committee to make this change.

5. Adjournment

MOTION

MOVED: Memmel SECONDED: Wong Denike

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

CARRIED

Meeting adjourns at 19:26.