

Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the 2013/2014 University Students' Council of the University of Western Ontario held on February 26, 2014 in Council Chambers, Room 315, University Community Centre

Note: This meeting can be viewed in full or in part via streaming video at <http://www.usc.uwo.ca/government/council/meetings/index.asp>.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m.

2. O CANADA

The Deputy Speaker led Council in the singing of O Canada.

3. WESTERN SCHOOL SONG

The Deputy Speaker led Council in the singing of the Western School Song.

4. ATTENDANCE

Present

Addison, Emily	Fong, Eric	McCann, Catherine
Aideyan, David	Gil, Nicholas	Ng, Hilarie
Baertsoen, Alicia	Gillis, Avery	Nguyen, Lisa
Bhatia, Meghan	Ginou, Chris	Nishimura, Mitchell
Blixt, Taylor	Goodfield, Taylor	Obradovic, Vladimir
Bonofiglio, Michelle	Grainger, Tom	Palin, Brandon
Bricknell, Doug	Hamel-Carassi, Isabelle	Pearson, Jordan
Campbell, Haley	He, Jenny	Perkins, Lindsee
Carter, Jen	Henshaw, Mark	Pilo, Nikki
Chan, Adrienne	Hirsh, James	Schnurr, Cooper
Clemente, Angela	Holdren, Melissa	Sobel, Jacob
Cohen, Robbie	Jansen, Jazmyn	Soti, Emily
Cousins, Sean	Jim, Gucio	Syed, Ahsan
Crich, Laura	Kalsi, Gurvir	Tithecott, Emerson
Eftekharpour, Amir	Kremic, Stefan	Ward, Cody
El-Boraie, Ahmed	Lamoureux, Connor	Whelan, Patrick
Emms, Sarah	Litchfield, Jack	Wolfe, Nicholas
Engineer, Anish	Litsas, Maria	Wright, Steven
Eve, Reagan	Mabtoul, Karima	Yang, Megan
Faller, Adam	Mathews, Alex	Zhu, Maggie

Absent With Regrets

Chan, Caleb
DeCaluwe, Kyle

Doshi, Samik
Griffin, Sabrina

Krishnapillai, Samanta

Absent Without Regrets

Atwal, Harman
Cote, Dalai

Giles, Alyssa
Li, Kelsey

Yin, Carol

Non-Voting Members and Observers

Jasmine Irwin, Vice-President Communications
Spencer Brown, Vice-President Finance
Adam Smith, Vice-President Student Events
Kojo Hayward, Governance Officer
Richard Sookraj, Senator
Brian Belman, Associate Vice-President External
Carrie Passi, Managing Director, Financial and Corporate Resources
John Champagne, Executive Director, CASA
Michael McDonald, Manager of Stakeholder Relations, CASA
Matt Helfand, President-elect
Sid Wilson, Event Chair, Relay for Life
Andrew Lalka, Speaker

Deputy Speaker: Arjun Singh

Recording Secretary: Andrew Shaw

5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

**Motion to adopt the agenda as presented.
Litsas/Addison/Carried**

6. RATIFICATION OF MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS

There were no minutes to be ratified.

7. SPEAKER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Deputy Speaker congratulated the successful candidates from the recently completed elections and wished good luck to the Vice-Presidential candidates who had just begun campaigning.

8. MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pearson announced that the Faculty of Information and Media Studies Students' Council would be hosting the System Error Undergraduate Student Conference on March 1st in Natural Science 145.

Bhatia announced that the Science Students' Council would be hosting Chris Hadfield at Alumni Hall on February 27th and that students could purchase tickets from Western Connections.

Emms announced that the Arts and Humanities Students' Council would be hosting its first formal in a number of years at Martini Bar on March 7th.

9. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE WESTERN COMMUNITY

Hamel-Carassi, on behalf of the Student-to-Business Conference, reminded Council of the opportunity to get involved with and attend the upcoming Student-to-Business conference.

10. PRESENTATIONS TO COUNCIL

10.1 Relay for Life

Wilson presented to Council regarding the upcoming Relay for Life event to be held on March 22, 2014 and encouraged Council members to sign up teams with their constituencies.

Is there a limit to the number of teams?

Wilson responded that there was no limit to the number of teams and encouraged teams to choose their own team theme to represent themselves.

How many people can be on a team?

Wilson answered that the standard number of team members was 10 and that the competition for most donations was based on teams having 10 members.

10.2 CASA Review (See Appendix #1 for Presentation.)

Eftekharpour presented the findings of the Review Committee and its recommendations regarding the USC's membership in the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations (CASA). He also noted that a motion would be appearing later in the meeting on this subject.

Would moving to associate member status with CASA affect the fees paid by students?

Eftekharpour answered that the USC would only pay half of the fees it currently pays as an associate member.

What is the difference between CASA and another federal lobbying group such as the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS)?

Eftekharpour responded that, in his view, CASA is more focused on the discussion of student concerns and CFS is more focused on discussing social issues.

What is the benefit of CASA hiring more bureaucratic staff?

Eftekharpour answered that more staff meant an increased capacity for the organization to forward student issues and that student leaders would always have the ability to be a check on the staff members employed by CASA.

**Motion to extend the time allotted for the presentation by 5 minutes.
Jim/Pearson/Carried.**

Why does the USC not just leave CASA altogether?

Eftekharpour advised that the USC's By-Laws hold Council to a deliberative standard and that CASA's By-laws also set restrictions on how member schools may leave CASA.

What is the role of CASA's Board of Directors?

Eftekharpour responded that the CASA Board exercised the normal fiduciary duties of a not-for-profit Board and that they had very little role in the leadership of the organization.

Does CASA help the USC with advertising campaigns regarding student issues?

Eftekharpour answered that CASA will not independently advertise on a campus without permission from the member council but will assist if the member council wishes.

10.3 CASA Representatives (See Appendix #2 for Presentation.)

Champagne and McDonald presented on behalf of CASA, highlighting some of the successes CASA has had in lobbying to the federal government.

Having also heard the previous presentation, what would the presenters do if they were in the Council's shoes regarding membership in CASA?

McDonald responded that it was his duty to present the organization to stakeholders. He added that the organization could not change everything overnight, particularly given that the priorities of CASA change each May based on the priorities of the membership in that given year. McDonald stated that there was a need for continuity in this regard which would help the organization find a clear direction.

How have CASA's efforts impacted the bottom line for students?

McDonald highlighted initiatives such as the creation of the Millennium Scholarship Foundation, loan protection, and individual programs such as vehicle exemptions.

**Motion to extend the time allotted for the presentation by 10 minutes.
Litsas/Carter/Carried.**

How is CASA's size beneficial to its lobbying efforts?

McDonald responded that more voices equalled more leverage with the government and that it was hard to get the government to listen to organizations that did not synergize the viewpoints of a large number of constituents.

Champagne added that it was also beneficial that the staff of CASA are not too far removed from being students themselves and the terms of CASA staff reflected this.

What benefits are there to retaining full membership in CASA?

McDonald advised that full membership would allow the USC to have a role in directing the policies of the organization and to retain a vote at the table. He added that if CASA has more money (i.e. through organizations remaining full members) it can better represent the concerns of its member organizations.

Champagne added that he challenged future student leaders or Executives to take leadership of CASA and help effect change in the organization from the inside.

How will the loss of student fees from organizations moving to associate member status affect student representation?

Champagne advised that the next CASA budget had not been drafted yet but that it would mean that the current resources of CASA would be stretched thin.

**Motion to extend the time allotted for the presentation by 2 minutes.
Pearson/Pilo/Carried.**

Can you give an example of Western's influence at CASA?

McDonald responded that Western was engaged on CASA policies including the policy of one school-one vote. Champagne added that Western students had been actively directing CASA to follow the model set by the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance, an organization in which the USC has had a strong leadership role.

**Motion to recess for 15 minutes.
Engineer/Perkins/Carried.**

Council returned from the recess at 9:31pm.

10.4 Budget Presentation (*See Appendix #3 for Presentation.*)

Brown presented the 2014/15 USC Budget to Council and encouraged all Councillors to meet with him in the coming weeks if they have any questions ahead of the upcoming discussions.

What is the purpose of the budget discussion scheduled to be held on March 5th?

Brown responded that the Executive wanted Council to have an additional opportunity to discuss the budget as a group prior to the Annual General Meeting, partially to avoid a repeat of last year's lengthy AGM.

Will the March 5th meeting be a full meeting of Council?

Brown advised that it would be a full meeting.

Motion to allow the Standing Committees bringing business before Council to present prior to the other Standing Committees.

Carter/Schnurr/Carried.

Motion to move the New Business section of the agenda to immediately follow the Standing Committees bringing motions and to precede the remaining business on the agenda.

Litchfield/Addison/Carried.

11. WESTERN STUDENT SENATE REPORT

Pilo reported on behalf of the Western Student Senators.

12. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE REPORTS

[\(http://westernusc.ca/councillors-corner/\)](http://westernusc.ca/councillors-corner/)

Whelan presented an update of the activities of the Executive since the last Council meeting.

Does the Executive have any comment on the voter turnout of the recent elections?

Whelan advised that there was no official comment at the moment but that the organization was noticing trends that needed to be looked into before commenting further.

Motion to acknowledge the receipt of the Executive Report(s).

Palin/Chan, A./Carried.

13. REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS (*See Appendix #4 for Presentation.*)

Whelan reported on the activities of the Board of Directors and advised Council that the Nominating Committee was currently reviewing applications for the Board.

14. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

(All Standing Committee reports can be viewed on the USC website at <http://westernusc.ca/standing-committees/>)

14.1 Local and Campus Affairs

Hirsh presented the report of the Local and Campus Affairs Committee.

Motion #1 – Advocacy Papers Policy

Be it resolved that Council pass the Advocacy Papers Policy as presented.

PILO/Hirsh/Carried as amended. C13/14.7.1

(See Appendix #5 for the proposed policy)

Pilo presented the motion and highlighted that the policy represented a more comprehensive approach to advocacy policy than the previous policy. Hirsh added that the policy added more force to the policy process.

Arguments For	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More comprehensive approach to advocacy policy - More force and effect - Builds on an improves current Purple Papers model 	

Be it resolved that the policy be amended to include the provided preamble and additional clauses (as noted in Appendix #5) as reviewed by the Local and Campus Affairs Committee.

PILO/Soti/Carried. C13/14.7.1.1

Pilo advised that the Local and Campus Affairs Committee had met following the agenda deadline for this Council meeting and had requested that the noted changes be made to the policy.

The amendment was carried and debate returned to Motion #1.

Motion #1 was carried.

14.2 Provincial and Federal Affairs

Wright reported on behalf of the Provincial and Federal Affairs Committee.

Motion #2 – CASA Review

Whereas, the review of the USC’s CASA membership that was scheduled for the 2012/13 Council year has been completed,

~~Be it resolved that, Council adopt the recommendations of the review as stated in the conclusion of the review, namely “that the USC reduce its membership in CASA to an associate-level membership or its equivalent in CASA’s new by-law, to be passed this calendar year.”~~

Be it resolved that the USC reduce its membership in CASA to an associate-level membership or its equivalent in CASA’s new by-law (to be passed this calendar year);

Be it further resolved that the USC meaningfully engage in reform efforts next year at CASA, culminating in the scheduled CASA review ;

Be it further resolved that the USC assess those reform efforts, and if deemed sufficient by next year’s council, then the USC join back as full members, and if insufficient, that the USC leave CASA completely.

BONOFIGLIO/Wright/Carried as amended. C13/14.7.2

Bonofiglio presented the motion, explaining that the motion followed upon the recommendations of the previously presented CASA review.

Arguments For	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduced membership puts pressure on CASA to reform - The USC is not the only school to have concerns with CASA - Leaving completely is premature and changing status allows time to reflect - Taking a year to evaluate CASA membership is a low-risk proposition for the USC - Gives the USC power and clout 	

Be it resolved that the motion be amended to include the exact wording of the conclusion of the CASA presentation in place of the current BIRT statement.

Eftekharpour/Engineer/Carried. C13/14.7.2.1

The amendment was carried without debate and debate resumed on Motion #2.

Motion #2 was carried.

14.3 Governance and Agendas

Lalka presented the report of the Governance and Agendas Committee.

Motion #3: By-Law #3 Amendment

Whereas the USC joins external advocacy organizations in an effort to coordinate large-scale provincial and national advocacy efforts with other student associations,

Whereas these external advocacy organizations provide service by communicating USC priorities to decision-makers,

Whereas the USC entrusts external organizations with certain responsibilities, such as responsible use of student fees, representation of the USC's brand, and making recommendations on its behalf to decision-makers,

Whereas the USC and its elected council must be completely free to decide their level of involvement in the organization, as per internal by-law requirements and procedures, and without unreasonable constraints established by the external organization,

Be it resolved that, Council pass the proposed amendments to By-Law #3.

BRICKNELL/Grainger/Carried as amended. C13/14.7.3

(See Appendix #6 for the amended By-Law)

Bricknell presented the motion and added that the changes to the By-law represented the USC asserting the terms whereby it would enter into a relationship with an external representative group.

Be it resolved that section 2.02 (2) of the By-law be struck and replaced with "Official reviews will be conducted by the Chair of the Provincial and Federal Affairs Standing Committee, in consultation with the Vice-President External and the Standing Committee."

Be it further resolved that section 2.02 (3) of the By-law be struck and replaced with "Official review statements must be approved by the Standing Committee on Provincial and Federal Affairs, the Executive Group, and ratified by Council."

Eftekharpour/Wright/Carried. C13/14.7.3.1

Arguments For	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removes Conflict of Interest of VP External who often sits on an external executive - Empowers the Standing Committee - A process for the Standing Committee to follow is in the works 	

The amendment was carried and debate moved back to Motion #3.

Do the added clauses in By-Law #3 limit the USC external representative options? Would they prevent the USC from going back to CASA?

Eftekharpour responded that the language was intended to be limiting as these are terms that the USC should be specifying regardless of the organization in question and that Council should approach the changes as not being tied to one organization but as in the best interests of the USC in general. He added that the changes will set a parameter that CASA will have to conform to.

What other options would the USC have if CASA does not make changes?

Eftekharpour advised that he believed that CASA was the right partner for the USC but that changes needed to be made to make CASA more effective.

What is STU15?

Eftekharpour answered that STU15 is a student council/union counterpart to the U15 group that represents a collection of 15 universities in Canada.

Does OUSA have plans to lobby federally?

Eftekharpour advised that no plans were in place at the moment but that a discussion would happen in the near future on the topic due to the number of OUSA member schools having problems with CASA.

Is it reasonable to stipulate that there be no restrictions to leaving?

Eftekharpour responded that the stipulation reflected the principle that the USC should be allowed to leave when and if it wants.

Is it appropriate to use the By-law as a means to put pressure on an external organization?

Eftekharpour answered that the principles reflected in the By-law, while applicable to the current situation with CASA, would ideally be held by the USC on a long-term basis and would not be a short-term amendment for another purpose.

Be it resolved that the words “this includes” be struck from the proposed section 2.06 (1), 1.

LITCHFIELD/Addison/Carried. C13/14.7.3.2

There was no debate on the amendment. The amendment was carried and debate resumed on Motion #3.

Could CASA file a lawsuit against the USC for passing and carrying out By-Laws that contradict those in effect at CASA when the USC agreed to join CASA?

Eftekharpour advised that the political landscape at the time would not allow for a lawsuit.

Be it resolved that the proposed section 2.06 (1) be amended to read “The USC shall not join and shall endeavour to remove itself from any organization that limits the autonomy of the USC in any of the following ways:”

HIRSH/Perkins/Carried. C13/14.7.3.3

The amendment was carried without debate and debate resumed on Motion #3.

Motion #3 was carried.

15. NEW BUSINESS

The Deputy Speaker advised Council that the 12pm deadline to adjourn the meeting (as per the Standing Orders of Council) was approaching and advised Council that it should hear the proposed New Business motion before deciding whether to adjourn the meeting.

New Business Motion #1

Be it resolved that Council strike an ad-hoc committee ~~to review Elections and the Governance portfolio with the attached Terms of Reference.~~ with the express purpose of collecting information in anticipation of a review of the USC’s elections procedures as per the terms of reference presented.

Be it further resolved that Council ~~re-form this committee with eligible members on March 26th to complete the long-term goals of the committee.~~

LITCHFIELD/Pilo/Carried as amended. C13/14.7.4

(See Appendix #7 for Ad-Hoc Committee Terms of Reference)

Litchfield explained that the intent of the motion is to respond to a number of concerns that were raised during the elections period and make recommendations to Council to resolve the issues.

Is the motion of such a nature that it is too time-sensitive to go through the proper agenda process?

Litchfield responded that the hope was for the Committee to begin working as soon as possible and that he did not want the Committee to get lost among the already busy legislative agenda.

If the Committee is struck today, is there a concern that it will not be able to fulfill its mandate before the end of the academic year?

Litchfield responded that the Committee's mandate would likely require it to sit over multiple years and that starting sooner would just allow the Committee more time.

Jim expressed a concern that the Council did not have time to review the Terms of Reference and that he would be in favour of tabling this motion until the following meeting (March 5th) to allow Councillors time to review the motion.

What is the motivation for bringing this motion forward at this time?

Litchfield responded that the motion was in response to endemic concerns across campus.

Is there a way for Council to demand that the business be tabled to a future meeting?

The Deputy Speaker advised that Council could refer the motion back to a Standing Committee.

Pearson expressed that he felt that it would be in the best interests of Council to deal with this matter now given the opportunity presented to clean up elections.

The Deputy Speaker advised that the meeting was approaching 12am and that if Council were to wish to continue they would need to overturn his motion to adjourn (as per the Standing Orders) with a 2/3rds vote.

Motion to overturn the ruling of the Speaker and continue with the business on the floor.

Perkins/Soti/Carried.

Does Council need to specify a time at which to adjourn or does the meeting carry on indefinitely?

The Deputy Speaker advised that the meeting would continue until the end of the time-sensitive business and that if Council wished to consider another motion it would need another 2/3rds vote.

Arguments For	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of the portfolio overdue - Want to address concerns with the way Elections were run - Want to show that the USC is responding to students' concerns - Good opportunity for Council to take a look at the organization - Duty to critique the organization - Allows students-at-large to also have a role in evaluation - Beneficial to start the evaluation now - Committee could give a preliminary report to Council to address timeline concerns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role of the Governance and Agendas Committee to evaluate the efficiency of Council operations (e.g. Elections and governance) - Ad-hoc Committee an overreaction to the concerns on the floor, would be better to task staff with the review - The lack of timeline and vagueness of the Committee Terms of Reference is problematic - Would be more receptive to a review of the past election and not a review of all of Governance

What is the history of the Governance Portfolio?

Whelan answered that the portfolio was originally under the President and was moved under the Governance Officer after the 2009 Governance Review to be arms-length from the Executive. He added that at this time it was unclear how the portfolio was accountable to Council.

Motion to table New Business Motion #1 to the Special Meeting of Council on March 5th.
Bricknell/Litsas/Withdrawn.

Can Council consider a motion to table if it already voted to extend the meeting to consider this business?

The Deputy Speaker advised that Council could consider a motion to table.

Arguments For	Arguments Against
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Want to have the opportunity to debate now

The motion to table was withdrawn and debate returned to New Business Motion #1.

Be it resolved that the Portfolio Service Level and Program Review Committee be tasked with the review of the Governance Portfolio in place of the Ad-Hoc Committee.

ADDISON/Crich/Withdrawn. C13/14.7.4.1

Arguments For	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can set a date at which Council would like a response from the Standing Committee - Ad-Hoc Committee has the danger of possibly being populated by individuals with vendettas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that PSL Committee has too much work as it is - Don't want to pass the motion off to another Committee - Intention of motion is for members of the current Council to be on the review committee, which is jeopardized if the Standing Committee does not do the work in time - Want to keep the mandate of the Ad-Hoc Committee broad - The perception of sending it to a Standing Committee might be that the USC isn't doing anything

Is it within the powers of the Standing Committee to review Commissioner and Coordinator positions?

The Deputy Speaker advised that the Committee could review anything and everything under the portfolio, including positions. Whelan advised that the Committee would not necessarily review the By-Laws and rules, but rather the volunteer structures of the portfolio and the policies and procedures that the volunteers enforce.

The amendment was withdrawn and debate returned to New Business Motion #1.

**Motion to call the question.
Grainger/Mabtoul/Defeated.**

Should there be a timeline set for the Ad-Hoc Committee?

Lichfield responded that he felt that the timeline had to be open-ended to allow the committee to accurately fulfill their mandate. He added that March 26th would be too soon for the committee to present the entirety of their findings.

Was this motion intended to come to Council via the normal agenda process or is it being raised as New Business a sign that the intention was to bypass Standing Committees?

Litchfield advised that circumstances prevented the Terms of Reference from being ready for the agenda deadline.

Is it the intention of the Ad-Hoc Committee to change membership at the end of the Council year when the original members are no longer Councillors?

The Deputy Speaker advised that the Terms of Reference stated that the membership of the Committee would only need to be voting members at the time the Committee was struck.

Is the spirit of the motion to investigate the immediately prior election or elections of previous years as well?

Litchfield responded that the intention was to look at the prior election, which would likely shed light on some annual problems that stem back to previous elections.

Can Council task the USC’s administrative staff with conducting such a review and returning to Council with results?

Litchfield responded that he would be satisfied with such a solution.

The Deputy Speaker advised that Council could not task staff members directly.

Motion to table New Business Motion #1 to the Special Meeting of Council on March 5th and task the President to find administrative solutions in place of an ad-hoc committee.
Litchfield/Carter/Withdrawn.

Arguments For	Arguments Against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would allow Council to use the resources it already has and then to return and discuss later - It would be better to have the discussions outside of committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is important to do the review quickly - There are two separate issues and the ad-hoc committee is necessary - If Council is going to strike an ad-hoc committee it is better to do it sooner than later

The motion to table was withdrawn and debate resumed on New Business Motion #1.

**Motion to call the question.
Grainger/El-Boraie/Defeated.**

Be it resolved that the motion be amended to read “Council strike an ad-hoc Committee with the express purpose of collecting information in anticipation of a review of the USC’s elections procedures as per the terms of reference presented.”
GIL/Ward/Carried. C13/14.7.4.2

Be it resolved that the following BIRT statement be added to the previous amendment.
“**Be it further resolved that** Council re-form this committee with eligible members on

March 26th to complete the long-term goals of the committee.”

ADDISON/Perkins/Carried. C13/14.7.4.2.1

Whelan called for the roll to be called to ensure the meeting retained quorum.

Present

Addison, Emily	Engineer, Anish	Nishimura, Mitchell
Bhatia, Meghan	Faller, Adam	Obradovic, Vladimir
Blixt, Taylor	Gil, Nicholas	Palin, Brandon
Bonofiglio, Michelle	Gillis, Avery	Pearson, Jordan
Bricknell, Doug	Hirsh, James	Perkins, Lindsee
Carter, Jen	Jansen, Jazmyn	Pilo, Nikki
Chan, Adrienne	Lamoureux, Connor	Soti, Emily
Cohen, Robbie	Litchfield, Jack	Tithecott, Emerson
Cousins, Sean	Litsas, Maria	Ward, Cody
Crich, Laura	Mabtoul, Karima	Whelan, Patrick
Eftekharpour, Amir	McCann, Catherine	Wolfe, Nicholas
El-Boraie, Ahmed	Ng, Hilarie	Wright, Steven
Emms, Sarah	Nguyen, Lisa	Yang, Megan

Absent

Aideyan, David	Giles, Alyssa	Kremic, Stefan
Atwal, Harman	Ginou, Chris	Krishnapillai, Samanta
Baertsoen, Alicia	Goodfield, Taylor	Li, Kelsey
Campbell, Haley	Grainger, Tom	Mathews, Alex
Chan, Caleb	Griffin, Sabrina	Schnurr, Cooper
Clemente, Angela	Hamel-Carassi, Isabelle	Sobel, Jacob
Cote, Dalai	He, Jenny	Syed, Ahsan
DeCaluwe, Kyle	Henshaw, Mark	Yin, Carol
Doshi, Samik	Holdren, Melissa	Zawalsky, Michael
Eve, Reagan	Jim, Guccio	Zhu, Maggie
Fong, Eric	Kalsi, Gurvir	

Quorum was reached with 39 members in attendance.

The secondary amendment was carried and debate returned to the primary amendment.

The amendment was carried and debate returned to New Business Motion #1.

New Business Motion #1 was carried.

16. RECESS

**Motion to recess the meeting until March 5th at 7pm.
Jansen/Gillis/Carried.**

The meeting recessed at 1:45 a.m.

President

Recording Secretary

Approved on: _____

Sign In/Sign Out

<u>Name</u>	<u>Time In</u>	<u>Time Out</u>
Ginou, Chris		11:15
Mathews, Alex		11:15
Eve, Reagan	7:23	
Syed, Ahsan	7:40	11:20
Baertsoen, Alicia	8:10	
Gillis, Avery	9:00	
Campbell, Haley	9:34	11:11
Grainger, Tom		1:15