

Minutes of the 5th Meeting of the 2014/2015 University Students' Council of the University of Western Ontario held on Wednesday, November 24, 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 7:22 p.m.

2. O CANADA & WESTERN SCHOOL SONG

The Speaker led Council in the singing of O Canada.

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

3. Appointment of new SSSC Councillors

Jack Litchfield, President of Social Science Students' Council, discusses the need to appoint 2 more councillors due to recent resignations and lack of interest. It is within the SSSC's constitution to appoint these councillors so long as they are ratified by council.

**Motion for Council to ratify the new SSSC Councillors.
LITCHFIELD/Germain/Carried.**

4. ATTENDANCE

The Speaker confirmed quorum was reached.

Non-Voting Members and Observers

Emerson Tithecott, Vice-President Communications
Andrew Lalka, Vice-President Finance
Sam Kilgour, Vice-President Student Events
Iain Boekhoff
Kevin Hurren
Katie Lear
Hamza
Amy O'Kruk
Harry Orbach Miller
Alex
Elizabeth Jewlal
Members of the Marching Band

Michael Kryworuk

Speaker: Doug Bricknell

Deputy Speaker: Suhail Dhalla

Recording Secretary: Jacob Kriszenfeld

5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Motion to amend the agenda to move the marching band referendum item of business immediately after the comments and questions from the Western community.

HELFAND/Argent/Carried.

Motion to move Item 14.2 Fair Trade Advocacy paper to the beginning of Standing Committee reports.

ADDISON/Macklin/Carried.

Motion to adopt the agenda as amended.

SINGH/Leung/Carried.

6. RATIFICATION OF MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS

There were no minutes to be ratified.

7. SPEAKER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Speaker announced that he and the Governance Officer will be changing their office hours, will make everyone aware in the new year. Speaker also reminds Council about proper decorum, and that clapping is against Robert's Rules of Order unless the motion passes unanimously. Speaker also reminds council to submit their regrets in advanced, and that attendance thusfar has been poor. Speaker also gave his remarks regretting last meeting's in-camera session. He reminded council about the proper procedure for an in camera session, and noted his disappointment that the last in-camera session's content was leaked to members outside of Council. He finally noted the ramifications should any future leaks of in-camera items occur. After consultation with the Governance Officer, GAC, and the President, Speaker asks for a motion to release the minutes from the in-camera session during October Council meeting's new business section

Motion to release the minutes of the in-camera session.

LUCAS/Leung/Carried.

What about members who are not present at the meeting when an in-camera session occurs, may we still discuss with them the content?

Bricknell- No, that is not allowed. However they may speak with Governance and myself in order to be made aware of the item.

8. MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no member's announcements.

9. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE WESTERN COMMUNITY

Perry Finnbogason speaks as a student at large to Council with regards to the recent Change Camp. He mentions that he believes the best way to communicate with Council is clearly through councillors, and it has been hard to communicate with this year's councillors. At this year's change camp, not many students knew who their councillors were, and to top it off there were very few councillors in attendance. If change was to really happen, and students voice really heard, councillors need to be engaged and involved in more events to engage with their constituents.

Matt Helfand notes in response to this remark that a valuable point is being raised. Although councillors are only part-time in the eyes of the corporation, and full time students, councillors need to make a better effort in attending events across campus.

Jack Litchfield apologizes on behalf of the Social Science students council caucus for having to leave early due to prior commitments.

10. PRESENTATIONS TO COUNCIL

Marching Band Referendum

Thomas Argent presents the motion to have a council-led referendum on behalf of the Marching Band to give them \$0.50 per student.

Be it resolved that, the University Students Council approve the following referendum question to be held concurrent with the winter election on Feb 10, & 11, 2015.

“Do you support the establishment of a \$0.50 student fee, to be adjusted annually with inflation, to be collected on behalf of the Western Student's Marching Band.

Be it further resolved, should the referendum carry, the USC be tasked to pursue cost sharing initiatives with the University Central Administration and Athletics.

ARGENT/Nash/Carried as amended. C14/15.5.1

Thomas Argent highlights some of the main reasons for the referendum. One thing he notes is that without the funding, students can potentially see the end of the Marching

Band for the foreseeable future. They are currently losing money due to travel and accommodation costs that other universities fund for their marching bands. Due to the lack of funding, event coordinators have undercut the band from various events. Council is not voting today whether or not they support the referendum, rather they are voting on the opportunity for the student body to voice their opinion on this question.

Liz Nash also notes that over 2700 students have signed a petition on the notion that this was a student-led referendum—which requires roughly 2500 signatures to have the question on the ballot. With that many students considering the issue we should also give the rest of the student body the same opportunity.

Any determination date for this referendum?

Thomas Argent defers to Elizabeth Jewlal.

Jewlal- We would be looking for something that would persist for the future so they can maintain their base line.

Would it be possible to look at structure in comparison to other universities similar to a feasibility study?

Lalka- Costs of running referendum is \$3000 which is allocated for referendum related costs. No additional costs of running referendum other than advertising we choose to do. Bylaw 2, section 22.01 shows structure for initiating a referendum. As such, this referendum will not affect any increases in costs as we have already allocated for such expenses.

Can you allude to this referendum with regards to the clubs' policies and procedures and how setting a student fee for a club could set a dangerous precedent?

Lalka- Policy as it stands shows that this referendum is within the spirit of the policy. In By-law 2 Section 22.03 (1)(i):

Student initiated referenda may not establish any fee to fund the activities of a USC Ratified Club, or Clubs.

This does not prohibit funding for activities that are simply supported by a USC Ratified Club

As such, our Governance structure is very robust in that it allows for clubs to appropriately gather the funding for activities important to the Western community. However, it is clear that this needs to go through council and not a student led referendum.

How many students typically come out and vote on these issues?

Helfand- It usually depends on the issue. For example, a bus pass referendum increases the amount of people coming to the ballot. Seen many referendums at Western, and typically a strong Yes or No side would increase the overall saliency of the issue. This referendum would likely have an increase at our polls.

What is the current amount of money that we give to all western clubs and what is that approximately per student and what amount is given to the band?

Lalka- USC does not give money directly to clubs, but we do incur costs of having a club system. Similar to the city of London and public library system. To answer the question, any where from \$400,000 to \$1,000,000 is collected, divided for 30,000 students, so club systems is roughly subsidized anywhere from 85-95%. That said, clubs do not receive any of the money and they also submit their membership fees directly to the USC where we charge an administration fee.

How would money be allocated, because it looks like it is an immediate fund? Can we give them a one time fee as opposed to annual funding?

Argent- The band is going to need to support for travel and all the up keeping of the instruments and the uniforms which is why the funding cannot be a one-time allocation.

Helfand- If we were to look at a one time fee it is not necessarily on the current cohort of students. For example, if we charge \$50 for current students for future students to enjoy the band it is not fair to the current cohort of students. The current generation of students do not want to pay as much for the future generation of students.

What is the funding gap in what they need to continue versus the cash they have on hand?

Jewlal- Currently the band needs \$30,000 just for this year.

How are other universities contribute their funding to their marching bands? Queens & McMaster as examples.

Argent defers to Jewlal.

Jewlal- Queens is through Athletics while McMaster is through their student union.

Lucas- Queens has a very well established system, fee is mandatory that everyone is required to pay.

Can we get a brief overview on the presentation since councillors were absent at the last meeting and there are new members of council?

Speaker- In respect for time and the marching band has already presented on this issue, we cannot show the presentation again.

Point of procedure- What is the total number of questions a member can ask?

Speaker- 2 questions per item of discussion.

Motion to change the wording to “Do you support” as opposed to “Would you”.

Mover and seconder of the motion agree to the change as a friendly amendment.

Speaker moves Council into Debate on the motion.

Arguments in favour:

- We are not voting on the position of the question rather we are voting to allow the student body to see the question. It would be very dangerous to not allow the question on the ballot.
- Would not set a dangerous precedent since we don't usually see these requests coming through
- Every 4 years referenda are up for review, so there is an opportunity to change the allocation of these funds.
- Dangerous precedent is not approving this questions but rather ignoring the 2700 students who signed a petition to have this question on the ballot.
- Executives have promised to work with Athletics to ensure a stronger partnership is built with the band.
- We are a last resort for the band to survive, if we vote against the motion it could potentially mean the end of the marching band at Western.

Arguments against:

- Major differences between Queens and Mac and how they receive our funding, Western might not be a good comparison to these schools.
- By allowing a motion like this to approve, USC is setting a dangerous precedent for numerous other campus clubs to have a referendum in order to attain funding
- Western doesn't have the infrastructure of having clubs looking for funding through referendums and other needs—we would be double funding
- Bands should get money, but there are too many concerns oversight the allocation of funds.
- Club is not clear on how they will use the funding, they are stating that they need \$30,000 but this proposal would only give them \$20,000.
- Marching bands were never apart of the clubs system until 2011, when they were given the title of accredited group—submit a budget which is later approved. They were given special privileges on campus and did not have to follow certain procedures. In 2011, the club had 3 choices 1) Become a USC club and gain more infrastructure but lose funding 2) become a USC service and gather their own funds but lose the ability to make decisions, and 3) align with athletics and get funding from them. Decision was to become a club since aligning with Athletics was a threat to running events outside of campus. Club has already breached inventory and travel policies of the USC. They

made their decision years ago and we should find ways to support them outside of this referendum

- Council should not be the last resort to save clubs, and Council might be past the buck for doing things that should be a joint operation.

Jack Litchfield proposes an amendment to the question

Be it further resolved, should the referendum carry, the USC be tasked to pursue cost sharing initiatives with the University Central Administration and Athletics.

LITCHFIELD/Grainger/Carried.

Call the motion to question.

LEUNG/Singh/Carried.

10.1 Get Out The Vote Presentation

Jen Carter, VP External, highlights the successes of the recent Get out the Vote program for the Municipal election.

Were there any reasons that people weren't voting in London because they were voting in their home riding?

Carter- Message was directed that you can vote in both, and was a major part of the campaign.

How many people voted in the advanced polls?

Carter defers to Lindsee Perkins

Perkins- 350 people roughly but not necessarily all students.

Carter- City doesn't collect voter information demographically.

Can we mandate councillors to participate in the program?

Carter- There were a handful of councillors who helped on the campaign and at the advanced polls. There was even a member of Team USC who was there at the booth for 10 hours straight. There is a piece of council that is broken and we don't see council engagement that we need. Executives are constantly going above and beyond, but we just simply need the help and support of councillors as they have the reach for Council to achieve its goals.

How did you get volunteers for the advanced polls?

Carter- AVP Municipal Affairs worked with Volunteer strategy. But the main strategy we used was to reach out to faculty council presidents and affiliate council presidents. Tried to reach out and promote the campaign while also promoting volunteers.

10.2 Peer Support Presentation.

Emily Addison, VP Internal, addresses council on new information and the future direction we are looking to take with the Peer Support Centre.

What is the vision for the training program for individuals in the peer support centre? Will it be standardized, or through the internal management of the coordinator?

Addison- More distinct from the centre and relates to the Peer Support network. might be what you are specifically talking about. We are speaking about the Peer Support centre which is the physical space. There will be structured training, and we are working all the details out now since we have a new volunteer resource structure—there were changes in the department over the summer. As such, the future hiring and training will be much more structured.

The person that will be in charge of the centre, where are they coming from and will it be full time etc?

Addison – Details are still being worked out, but will keep council informed on how it proceeds. There will most likely be an AVP or Intern running the centre, that's the person who the volunteers will come to. The other person will a resource for the volunteers who will be trained on conflict resolution etc.

10.3 Council Composition Presentation

John English, Presidential Commissioner and Composition of Council gives a presentation on the review of Council's composition as we are mandated to do every 4 years under By-Law #1.

Motion to extend the presentation 10 minutes.
NASH/Nishimura/Carried.

Motion to extend the presentation 10 minutes.
GOODFIELD/Crich/Carried.

Is it really democratically legitimate for us to claim that we represent all students?

English- Can make the same argument for a 4th year student voting on representatives when they wont even be there the following year. Can say the same for a student switching faculties that didn't get to vote for their representatives. Question is really do they need to be represented on this floor, and they very well can be without voting rights. And exceptions have to be created sometimes.

Would you say its unfair and unequal that first year students are not included in electoral process?

Helfand- John doesn't have all answers to these questions which would be more suited to be answered by Council during debate.

Given the time constraints and the number of speakers currently on the speaking list, the Speaker asks for a motion to cap the speakers list.

Motion to cap the speakers list

ARGENT/Leung/Carried.

If you were to ballpark percentage how much of current council reached out during consultations in the timeline?

English – Was a very disappointing turnout, about 20-25% of current council reached out with ideas, comments, and perspectives.

With the hard cap of 46 seats, not including exec and speaker, where do constituency presidents fit into this?

English – They are in this hard cap, so the president could make up the one elected representative position based on the hard cap structure.

Is your recommendation to have zero first year representatives on the USC?

English – Yes, all students on FYSC would be resource members, which are not voting members of council.

How did you take into the fact that voting members are treated as both shareholders in corporation and members in legislative assembly?

English- Interpreted the current numbers are they are as including the faculty council presidents.

Lalka – USC doesn't have any share capital based on our 1965 patent letters. It is not right to call them shareholders, rather they are members of the corporation.

Motion to recess for 10 minutes.

BONOFIGLIO/Rebus/Carried.

11. WESTERN STUDENT SENATE REPORT

Motion to move the Student Senate Report until after the Executive Reports.
SUSSMAN/Crich/Carried.

Nikki Pilo delivers a report on the state of the Senate and a little background information on what the body does.

12. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE REPORTS

Matt Helfand addresses Council on the recent update of Executives and their portfolio. Addison gave her report, followed by Carter, Tithecott, Kilgour, and Lalka.

What will be the structure of Team USC for this year and next year?

Kilgour- Basically, within O-week, we have decided to make a partnership. There were 3 essentially USC teams that had representation from Orientation Planning Committee, and some will be staying and operating through OPC mechanism. Charity for example used to report to VP Student Events and will now report to OPC. The WOAHS Team will no longer exist, since they did a lot of logistical work for the university. Team USC were bound to OPC policies but not bound to certain ones, which created a lot of grey areas.

Tithecott- There were two options, they could report to OPC, or change to a promotions team which was seen as more important. They aren't an official orientation group but that does not mean they cannot attend O-week.

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

SINGH/Hunt/Carried.

13. REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Isaac Jacobi, Chair of the Board of Directors, highlights some of the recent activities of the Board, including the updates on the appeals & board nominating committee and the appeals board.

14. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

14.1 Fair Trade Advocacy Paper

Motion # 1 - Fair Trade Advocacy Paper

Be it resolved that, Council (on the recommendation of the Local and Campus Affairs Standing Committee) approve the proposed Fair Trade Advocacy Paper as contained in Appendix # 1.

GERMAIN/Armstrong /Carried. C14/15.5.2

Richard Sookraj, Chair of the committee, gives a presentation on the Fair Trade Advocacy Paper that has been approved by LCA.

Emma Germain, speaking on behalf of the LCA committee, discusses the history behind the policy paper and the recommendations made.

How do we know fair trade in generally is something that students want?

Alex- Been working on fair trade issue since 2009, there has been a fair trade week every year where we celebrate and get a pulse for what the students know and think about fair trade week.

Germain- Council voted on this months ago, and decided what we are going to advocate for. As such, Council needs to pass this paper to truly advocate for Fair Trade.

Addison – Your decision to make as an elected representative is whether or not this is a relevant student for topics.

There's been a huge number of problems with Fair Trade and how effective is really is. What concerns were raised from the other side?

Alex- Did not write about the argument against Fair Trade in the paper, but considered during the process.

Why was this issue brought to council?

Addison- The process for policy paper is that an issue is brought to Council during the summer meeting. Council tasked the execs with developing a Fair Trade policy paper, and there was research available to develop the policy. Worked with Nick Soave, Advocacy Services Officer, to change the document and edit for LCA committee.

Will this policy harm us financially?

Addison- We took the paper to Mark Leonard, Manager of Food & Beverage with the USC, and this paper won't have any financial implications. Will be working with Food & Beverage to ensure this policy can be implemented properly.

Speaker moves Council into debate on the Motion

Arguments for:

- Engineers without borders is very pleased about the issue being brought to council, and other constituents have expressed their pleasure with this issue
- There has been talk about a legislative policy for some time about Fair Trade, and it's a good thing to have in place with little foreseeable problems

What is the difference between our fair trade products and the university's?

Addison- University doesn't control the products and content of each franchises' products. Anything coming out of hospitality services are franchise agreements, and hospitality services has little influence on their products. They do have some fair trade products, but not as extensive as what we want to be.

Alex- University has taken a lot of measures of the past several months to have more fair trade products, including the move to Fire Roasted coffee (a local London company) at Weldon.

Lalka- Policies are articulated in the USC's Strategic Plan. for the University, has its own operating plan called MAAP—which has principles and plans for companies coming into Western.

Speaker calls the motion to question

Emily Addison gives her thanks to Alex and her team for all their hard work.

Point of Order- Matt Helfand asks Council to amend the agenda to move the Orientation Week Referendum item before the Council Composition Review Recommendation. Reason being that we might meet beyond midnight, and council will have to vote to meet beyond midnight and if that fails the O-Week referendum will not have a chance to be heard.

SARAVANABAVEN/Suleman/Carried.

15.1 Motion #5 Referendum- O-week Pass

Sam Kilgour speaks to the reasoning behind the referendum to include O-week kit fees in the price of first year tuition

Posted Motion # 5 (O-week Pass Fee)

Be it resolved that, the University Students Council approves the following referendum question, to be held concurrent with the winter election on **February 10th and 11th, 2014:**

“Do you support the establishment of a \$90.00 fee, to be adjusted annually as per the cost of the program thereafter, to be levied on all first year undergraduate students who are

eligible to participate in Orientation Week? The mandatory fee will not be levied on upper year students, and replaces the past practice of selling an O-Kit to incoming students.”

SUSSMAN/Scripnick/Carried.C14/15.5.3

Nate Sussman, as mover of the motion, speaks to the need for this referendum to go to the student body. The merit of this decision is knowing the financial resources will be available for o-week ahead of time.

What would the opt-out procedure be like?

Kilgour- Still working on it and other technical details. The hope is that we have a lot of promotion and outreach to first years in the lead up to O-week and make it simple as possible.

Explain procedure for off campus students and how they would receive their passes compared to students in residence?

Kilgour- We would go back to the same procedure that OC uses now. There would be a central space for these students to go to and back up their kits.

Questions currently says fee it is “mandatory”, is this for the purposes of affecting how the referendum is carried out?

Kilgour- Yes, mandatory is in to make it clear about the kit. Council can include a clause to change this.

How will this affect professional school students?

Kilgour- Won't affect these students only affects people entering first year. The USC will try and accommodate new first year professional schools who wish to participate.

How would this affect exchange students participating in O-Week, since they have to pay to their tuition to their home school?

Kilgour- Similar to professional schools, if they want to participate the exchange students still can participate in O-week activities.

Can you speak to the financial risk since people pay for their tuition fees in different instalments?

Kilgour- USC currently meets all its liabilities when its comes to O-week. If we go over budget, than the USC is responsible for covering that cost.

Have you discussed revising any plans or strategy to make students aware of the fee and how much it is?

Kilgour- Would function a lot like the health plan, and we would make it clear. When the fees are adjusted, we would communicate the change to students. We do have one of the most financially accessibly orientation week programs in North America, so students will know these fees before they pay them.

Richard Sookraj asks to have it noted in the minutes that the opt-out procedure be clearly communicated to students.

Speaker moves Council into debate.

Speaker calls the motion to question.

14.2 Motion #1 Council Composition Review

Can we vote now on conducting the meeting beyond midnight?

The Speaker outlines the process for extending the meeting beyond midnight.

Kriszenfeld- If we go beyond midnight, the USC will reimburse Councillors with taxi-fare to arrive home

Motion to extend the meeting until the Motion #1, and #2 are heard.

Can Secretary-Treasurer of Board of Directors speak to the impact of tabling Motion #4 on the budget timeline?

Lalka- Budget timeline would pass this month but have different provisions for when it moves forward.

Helfand - Budget resolution procedure was approved by Board of Directors and LTPB. As well, Council has also seen a presentation on this item.

Motion to extend until Motion #1, #2, and #4 are heard
SINGH/Lucas/Carried.

John English addresses council regarding the recommendations within the Motion #1 and #2 for Council Composition.

Trevor Hunt addresses the meaningfulness of the report and the principles developed during the review.

Motion # 1 (Presidential Commission on Council Composition)

Whereas, the Presidential Commission on Council Composition has made a number of recommendations;

Whereas, to take effect By-Law #1 must be amended;

Whereas, Residence and First-Year Campus reps have been removed as Ordinary Members of Council;

Whereas, a strengthened First Year Student Caucus would be an ideal venue for issues related to first year students to be addressed;

Whereas, the Caucus Terms of Reference are out of date, and that caucuses could be an effective venue to address a number of other student issues;

Be it resolved that, the Council approve the following changes to **By—Law #1** as detailed in Appendix 1:

1. Amend <Section 4.03> to integrate ‘principles’ that guide Council composition;
2. Amend <Section 4.04 (1) and (2) to change Council composition reviews to two (2) years from four (4) years;
3. Amend <Section 4.04 (4)> to replace the 600:1 ratio to determine Council composition with a ‘hard cap’ of 46 Ordinary Members;
4. Amend <Section 4.04 (5)> to remove Residences and First Year Off-Campus reps as Ordinary Members;
5. Amend <Section 4.03 (2) vi.> to remove the six (6) Senators as Ordinary Members;
6. Amend <Section 4.03 (2) vii.> to remove the one (1) Governor as an Ordinary Member;
7. Amend <Section 4.03 (3) vii.> to allow all Senators and Governors to sit as Non-Voting Resource Members;
8. Amend <Section 4.03 (2) iv> to implement the Council seat distribution based on a ‘hard cap’ of 46 Ordinary Members and the removal of First-Year Off-Campus and Residence Councillors as Ordinary Members;
9. Amend <Section 4.03 (2) v> to require a by-election to fill a constituency president’s seat if she chooses not to sit on the USC Council, which changes the current procedure of allowing the president to appoint a voting member of their council to fill the seat;
10. Amend <Section 6.01 (1)> to add a Senior Operations Committee as a Standing Committee of Council. Note that a detailed terms of reference is included in the next section of amendments below.

Be it further resolved that, the **Caucus Terms of Reference** be revised as per the recommendations within the Presidential Commission on Council Composition report and be brought to Council at the January meeting for approval.

ENGLISH/Hunt/Tabled.

Speaker is elected by Council and not at large, yet the Speaker can be a tie-breaker in many situations, how would this exception be made under the proposed principles?

English- That’s an idea for future consideration.

Did you ever consider doing weighted votes?

Speaker disregards the question since ample time was made for consultations.

Which enrolment figure will be used to construct council's composition since we had to use last year's numbers?

English- Interpret this report as inaccurate, since we are not using this year's numbers, because the numbers are not released. The proposed change will be to review the council composition ever 2 years under new program as opposed to 4 years, so we can change the figures to reflect new enrolment.

How do you hope to encompass the growing number of students with the changing proportion from year to year?

English- With such a large proportion can you really represent that number of constituents. Changes were made because it is hard to hold a larger group of councillors accountable. The hard-cap figure won't negatively affect proportional representation, and the USC will still be one of the largest student governments in Canada.

Can we split up these motions, and if so can we table some of the individual items?

English- Items were brought to council as a whole, but Council can amend parts of the motion or table certain parts.

How would the numbers be affected by the division of motions?

English – More of a matter of principle. Did do math with forecast numbers from university, and the numbers presented would not be altered much with the new enrolment data—most that would happen is the addition of one new councillor.

Speaker moves Council into debate on the motion.

Speaking against:

- Major problem with eliminating first year voting rights from the USC, and as a result eliminating them from the USC as a whole.
- Should be looking to more ways to create effective representation as opposed to eliminating perceived double representation.
- We have seen more success with development and mentorship through the current system—we see more turnover from FYSC whereas residence representatives continue to sit on Council in different capacities.
- If we really wanted to get feedback from first years to better their experience we cannot remove first year residence representatives.
- Residence councillors allow for first years to get exposure to the USC, essentially one of the most effective ways to work with first year students.

Speaking in favour:

- A lot of concerns are around losing first year representation, but approving this motion will more accurately reflect democracy that we are experience in municipal, provincial, and federal assemblies.
- Issue is not with double representation, rather the issue is that the USC has no influence over housing—which oversees residences. It would be counterintuitive to have representatives on a body advocating for issues they don't have influence on. There are still ways to create development and mentorship opportunities to first years without having them voting on the USC.
- Little effectiveness in the role of residence representatives, past years as examples.
- Relationship with the Senate should only get damaged as much as the senators want to damage the relationship—senators would still be resource members of Council and have speaking rights

Motion to recess for 10 minutes.
CARMAN/Lesarge/Carried.

Matt Helfand proposes a motion to table Motion #1 and #2 to a Special Meeting in the first week of January. Council has a lot of opinions on this issue and if we continue the discussion we could be meeting until early in the morning. Council deserves to have a meaningful debate, but it's clear there should be more time given for councillors to form an opinion and garner research to make a meaningful decision.

English- Consultation went on for month and a half—started in late September—and this is very upsetting that this is happening now. Warned people that this item of business would carry weight, and it is very sad that we are tabling this now.

Jacob Kriszenfeld outlines when this motion will need to be heard with regards to the elections timeline.

Motion to table Motion #1 and #2 to a Special Meeting in January.
HELFAND/Pilo/Carried.

14.3 Motion #4 Creation of Budget Resolution Procedure

Motion # 4 – (Budget Resolution Procedure)

Be it resolved that, Council, on the recommendation of the Long Term Planning and Budgeting Committee adopt the Budget Resolutions Procedure as attached in appendix.
Be it further resolved that, Council, on the recommendation of the Long Term Planning and Budgeting Committee amend By-law 1 Section 3.11 to reflect the changes to the annual budget process as outlined in appendix.

Section 3.11—Annual Budget Process

(1) The annual budgetary approval process of the Corporation shall require:

- i. *a presentation to the Audit and Advisory Committee of an initial detailed budget whereby the Audit and Advisory Committee shall consider and advise the Board of Directors on approval of the budget;*
- ii. *a presentation to the Board of Directors of an initial detailed budget for the following fiscal year for consideration, amendment and approval;*
- iii. *a presentation to the Budget Sub-Committee of the Council Finance Standing Committee of an initial detailed budget for the following fiscal year for consideration, amendment and approval;*
- a. *The Budget Sub-Committee of the Council Finance Committee shall consider and make recommendations on each budgetary item in accordance with the priorities of the Corporation;*
- iv. *a presentation to Council of a detailed budget whereby Council shall be given five (5) days to consider and amend the budget;*
- v. *a presentation to the Board of Directors where they shall have final authority to approve the USC budget;*
 - 1. *The Board of Directors shall restrict their considerations of the budget to their duties as Directors of the Corporation;*
 - 2. *The Board of Directors shall not be permitted to approve a budget that is materially different from the one approved by Council;*
 - 3. *Should the Board of Directors reject the budget approved by Council, the USC shall enter a budget arbitration process as outlined in the Budget Resolution Procedure; and,*
- v. *that the budget be approved by Council no later than March 15th each year.*

ENGLISH/Ainsworth/Carried. C14/15.5.4

Jack Litchfield, Chair of LTPB, addresses council on this motion, which has been previously presented to Council.

Motion to call to question.

LUCAS/Argent/Carried.

15. COUNCIL BUSINESS

16. QUESTION PERIOD

17. NEW BUSINESS

18. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion to adjourn.
LUCAS/Sawyer/Carried.**

The meeting adjourned at 12:42 a.m.

President

Recording Secretary

Approved on: _____

Sign In/Sign Out

<u>Name</u>	<u>Time In</u>	<u>Time Out</u>
--------------------	-----------------------	------------------------