

# **University of Toronto Students' Union**

**Local 98, Canadian Federation of  
Students**

## **Board of Directors Package 10**

**April 24, 2014 | 14:00 |  
Croft Chapter House**

## **NCA Credo for Ethical Communication**

*Approved by the NCA Legislative Council in 1999*

Questions of right and wrong arise whenever people communicate. Ethical communication is fundamental to responsible thinking, decision making, and the development of relationships and communities within and across contexts, cultures, channels, and media. Moreover, ethical communication enhances human worth and dignity by fostering truthfulness, fairness, responsibility, personal integrity, and respect for self and others. We believe that unethical communication threatens the quality of all communication and consequently the well-being of individuals and the society in which we live. Therefore we, the members of the National Communication Association, endorse and are committed to practicing the following principles of ethical communication:

- We advocate truthfulness, accuracy, honesty, and reason as essential to the integrity of communication.
- We endorse freedom of expression, diversity of perspective, and tolerance of dissent to achieve the informed and responsible decision making fundamental to a civil society.
- We strive to understand and respect other communicators before evaluating and responding to their messages.
- We promote access to communication resources and opportunities as necessary to fulfill human potential and contribute to the well-being of families, communities, and society.
- We promote communication climates of caring and mutual understanding that respect the unique needs and characteristics of individual communicators.
- We condemn communication that degrades individuals and humanity through distortion, intimidation, coercion, and violence, and through the expression of intolerance and hatred.
- We are committed to the courageous expression of personal convictions in pursuit of fairness and justice.
- We advocate sharing information, opinions, and feelings when facing significant choices while also respecting privacy and confidentiality.
- We accept responsibility for the short- and long-term consequences for our own communication and expect the same of others.

This portion of [www.natcom.org](http://www.natcom.org) is managed by Jennifer Peltak. If you have suggestions or additions, please contact her directly. NCA: 1765 N Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202-464-4622; 202-464-4600 (fax)

Source: <http://www.natcom.org/policies/External/EthicalComm.htm> (1/19/2005 8:24:42 PM)

## RULES OF ORDER AT A GLANCE

To Do This:	You Say This:	May You Interrupt the Speaker?	Must You be Seconded?	Is the Motion Debatable?	Is the Motion Amendable?	What Majority is Required?
Object to incorrect procedure being used	Point of order	Yes	No	No	No	No vote taken, chair rules
Seek clarification from the previous speaker	Point of information	Yes, if urgent	No	No	No	No vote taken, chair rules
Object to something which prevents your continued participation (eg. excessive noise)	Point of personal privilege.	Yes	No	No	No	No vote taken, chair rules
Object to a motion being considered	I object to consideration of this motion.	Yes	No	No	No	2/3 Majority
Consider something out of its scheduled order	I move the agenda be amended in order to deal with the following item...	No	Yes	No	No	2/3 Majority
Overturn the ruling of the chair	I challenge the chair on...	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Majority
Change a motion	I move that the motion be amended to read...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Have a motion studied more before voting on it	I move that the motion be referred to...	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Postpone further discussion on a motion until later in the meeting	I move that the motion be tabled until...	No	Yes	Only to time	Yes	Majority
Postpone consideration of a motion until a future meeting	I move that the motion be postponed until...	No	Yes	Only to time	Yes	Majority
Raise a matter previously tabled	I move that motion...be lifted from the table.	No	Yes	No	No	Majority
Reconsider a motion already voted on earlier in the meeting	I move that motion...be reconsidered.	Yes	Yes	Yes (if original motion was)	No	Majority
End debate on a motion	I call the question.	No	Yes	No	No	2/3 Majority
Ask that everyone's vote on a particular motion be recorded in the minutes	I call for a roll call vote.	No	No	No	No	No vote required, chair rules
Recess the meeting	I move that the meeting recess until...	No	Yes	Only to time	No	Majority
End the meeting	I move that the meeting adjourn.	No	Yes	No	No	Majority

# Board of Directors University of Toronto

## Students' Union

### 2013 – 2014

	Last Name	First Name	Constituency or Position
<input type="checkbox"/>	Akhtar	Waiz	University of Toronto Mississauga
<input type="checkbox"/>	Arif	Nabil	University of Toronto Mississauga
<input type="checkbox"/>	Barberousse	Nia-Imara	Faculty of Music
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bastan	Frishta	University of Toronto Mississauga
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bodley	Joseph	Ontario Institute for Studies & Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bollo-Kamara	Yolen	Vice-President Equity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bridge	Vanessa	Faculty of Engineering
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brown	Cullen	St. Michael’s College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Chin	Suyoung Aaron	Faculty of Pharmacy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coleman	Ben	Arts & Science At-Large
<input type="checkbox"/>	Crase	Benjamin	Trinity College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Durrani	Bilal	St. Michael’s College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Emadi	Yasmeen	Vice-President Campus Life
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ekpunobi	Nzubé	Arts & Science At-Large
<input type="checkbox"/>	Gobért	Shak	Victoria College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hamaimou	Fatima Zahra	University of Toronto Mississauga
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hashim	Dalia	New College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hossain	Nadiv	University College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Khalil	Alexandra	Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Khan	Khalid	New College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Khan	Onik	Vice-President External
<input type="checkbox"/>	Khan	Vere-Marie	St. Michael’s College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kondan	Silviu	New College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Krawczyk	Masteusz	Professional Faculty At-Large
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lorn	Katrina	Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design
<input type="checkbox"/>	Malik	Maaham	University of Toronto Mississauga
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mathur	Sanchit	Faculty of Engineering
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nguyen	Catherine	Faculty of Dentistry
<input type="checkbox"/>	Petrolo	Josephine	Woodsworth College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Phan	Helen	Professional Faculty At-Large
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pramanick	Tannishtha	Woodsworth College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Quenneville	Aimee	University College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Roman	Tonia	Faculty of Nursing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sajjad	Munib	President
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sandeela	Muhammad Bilal	University of Toronto Mississauga
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scherloski	Lynn	Victoria College
<input type="checkbox"/>	So	Agnes	Vice-President University Affairs
<input type="checkbox"/>	Theodore	Melissa	UTMSU Representative
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tint	Htay	Transitional Year Program
<input type="checkbox"/>	Warnica	Will	Innis College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Wasserman	Alexander	Faculty of Medicine
<input type="checkbox"/>	Wathey	Cameron	Vice-President Internal & Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Wun	Billi	Faculty of Law
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yang	ZiJian	Woodsworth College
<input type="checkbox"/>	Zang	Ming	University of Toronto Mississauga

# AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Thursday, April 24, 2014 | 14:00 | Croft Chapter House

---

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

## 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded:

Be it resolved that the agenda for the April 24, 2014 UTSU Board of Directors meeting be approved as presented.

## 3. GRIEVANCES

In accordance with the Union's Grievance Procedure Policy, the Board will resolve two grievances filed with the Union's Grievance Officer (Appendix A, p. 110).

## 4. FINAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded:

Be it resolved that the UTSU Board of Directors approve the Final Executive Reports as presented (p. 6).

## 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded:

Be it resolved that the April 24, 2014 minutes package including the following documents be approved by the UTSU Board of Directors:

- a. Board of Directors, *March 28* (p. 72)
- b. Elections & Referenda Committee, *April 21* (p. 90)
- c. Executive Committee, *April 8* (p. 85)
- d. Policy & Procedures Committee, *April 9, 10* (p. 94, 108)

## 6. MOTION FOR THE UTSU TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITIES OF RADICAL ROOTS

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded:

Be it resolved that the UTSU assume the responsibilities required for the Radical Roots Levy.

## 7. HEALTH AND DENTAL PLAN REPORT

## 8. MOTION TO TAKE A POSITION ON THE STUDENT SOCIETIES SUMMIT REPORT

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded:

Be it resolved that the UTSU \_\_\_\_\_ (*supports, condemns*) the Student Societies Summit report and recommendations (Appendix B, p. 164).

## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Thursday, April 24, 2014 | 14:00 | Croft Chapter House

---

### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded:

Be it resolved that the April 24, 2014 meeting of the UTSU Board of Directors be adjourned.

# **FINAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS**

**APRIL 2014**

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO STUDENTS' UNION

# **FINAL REPORT: PRESIDENT**

## **In This Report:**

- 1. Divisional Society Outreach**
- 2. University Relations**
- 3. Tri-Campus Organizing**
- 4. Unpaid Internships**
- 5. Bottled Water Free Campus**
- 6. Minimum Wage Campaign**
- 7. Access Copyright**
- 8. Successes**
- 9. Final Note**

### **1. Divisional Society Outreach**

This year, I prioritized reaching out to divisional societies at the St. George campus. The Executive felt that the UTSU needed to open communication, clarify its purpose and identify how we could work cohesively with the college and faculty councils. We requested the opportunity to make presentations to each divisional council and were invited to the St. Michaels College Student's Union, University College Literary and Athletic Society, Woodsworth College Students Association, Innis College Student Society and the New College Student Council. We saw our relationships with each of these student societies grow and a stronger base of communication was maintained. There is still much to do in developing stronger relationships with these councils. I hope that the UTSU can continue to build upon the foundations that were created this year.

### **2. Divisional Society Outreach**

This past year, Professor Meric Gertler was appointed the 16th President of the University of Toronto. Additionally, the University welcomed a new Vice President and Provost, Cheryl Regehr. We welcomed them and coordinated personal meetings with them to develop a working relationship. The UTSU has had several successes working with senior administrators this year and maintaining an environment of professional and friendly interactions. The victories the UTSU has won this year have been monumental.

This year, the President's office become more consultative, demonstrating that the new President intends to take the role in a new direction. We can see this from President's Gertler attendance



of the Toronto350.org lobby session calling for UofT's divestment in Fossil Fuels and his collaborative approach in helping develop a committee made with student union representatives in greater advocacy for greater public funding for UofT.

### **3. Divisional Society Outreach**

The UTSU has been a leader in keeping the three campuses of the University of Toronto united in advocacy initiatives. From organizing for the reduction of tuition fees to rallying against sweatshop labour across the world, the UTSU worked cooperatively with representatives at the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, the Scarborough Campus Students' Union and the Association of Part Time Undergraduate Students. We maintained open communications and have worked diligently on several events throughout the year. We co-organized for UofT's latest Homecoming, co-organized for the tri-campus Montreal Reading Week trip and a great UofT tri-campus Orientation parade. We continue to encourage increased coalition-building between students and workers unions at the University of Toronto.

### **4. Unpaid Internships**

The UTSU has been a leader in organizing and educating students on the practices of illegal unpaid internships across the country. Since our open letter addressed to the Minister of Labour Yasir Naqvi, we have been asked by several media, governmental and policy organizations for our input on unpaid internships. I was personally invited to do several interviews in major news outlets such as CBC's Lang and O'Leary Exchange, Newstalk 1010 and several local and national newspapers. We have also been asked to speak at several panels and speak about student organizing in the fight against unpaid internships. We are now in the midst of a petition drive in collaboration with Students Against Unpaid Internship Scams and the Canadian Interns Association.

### **5. Bottled Water Free Campus**

I am proud that the UTSU was one of the cornerstone campus organizations that convinced Canada's largest university to eliminate the sale of bottled water and begin building infrastructure of filtered water stations across the three campuses. This year, we collaborated with the UofT President's office under then President Dr. David Naylor to commemorate the campus elimination through the installation of a plaque at Convocation Hall.

## **6. Minimum Wage Campaign**

This year, we joined other students and workers unions across the province to discuss with our membership increasing the minimum wage. We collected thousands of petitions on calling the Ontario Government to raise the minimum wage to \$14. While tuition fees in Ontario are the highest in Canada and are rising at three times the rate of inflation, outpacing every other cost students face the minimum wage in Ontario has remained unchanged for the past five years and certainly has not increased at the same rate as inflation. It is shameful that students and young workers are largely stuck making poverty line wages that make it impossible for students to maintain healthy lifestyles while working to pay for tuition. Our work is continuing, but we got the government to pay attention and increase the minimum wage to \$11.00 an hour.

## **7. Access Copyright**

We have been outspoken in our opposition to the Access Copyright agreement the University signed on to. This agreement forced students across the University of Toronto to pay an additional \$27.50 on top of their tuition fees for supposed protections for using copyrighted work. However, federal legislation under the Copyright Act already protect students and others using copyrighted work for educational purposes. Because of our work and the students' unions at the University of Toronto, we were victorious in lobbying the UofT administration to reject an extension of the agreement and to refund the fee that was levied onto all students. We are now a part of the planning to build a UofT-based copyright office with the UofT Library Committee.

## **8. Successes**

As a union, we have had a stellar because of our lobbying, organizing and mobilization. We have exceeded expectations in providing cost-saving services, accessible and affordable events with huge turnouts and providing victories through our advocacy work that our students can remember and benefit off of for years to come. Some of our victories include:

- Change to the current Flat Fee tuition structure on a provincial level as part of our Stop Flat Fees campaign
- organized UofT's Homecoming and saw thousands of student participate

- national leader in the fight against illegal unpaid internships
- developed coalitions for broader organizing alongside workers and students unions
- eliminated the Access Copyright fee of \$27.50 levied against all students at the University of Toronto
- worked with residence association against the creation of a private residence that would be built on 245 College St.
- introduced a UofT Volunteer network called the “Blue Crew” that gives our members the ability to volunteer in our organizing
- developed a survey with students’ unions across the GTA in the campaign called “We Ride: Students for Greater Transit Access”
- launched a new Academic Appeals Guide that gives students the basic resources to all our members across the 12 faculties.
- hosted UofT’s largest ever Orientation Concert with Lupe Fiasco
- hosted UofT’s first ever Alternative After Party on front campus
- co-organized in UofT’s largest Montreal Reading Week with over 800 students attending
- organized our best ever Winter Week of Welcome with our first ever Clubs and Summer Job Fair and our free winter concert headlined by July Talk
- developed a new website with easier access and features for our members to use
- held our first ever Policy Townhall to aid our members in shaping our students’ unions policies and directives
- introduced new services for our members to access including the sale of Buffalo Bills tickets, Raptor’s Tickets, Ripley’s Aquarium and Casa Loma tickets
- expanded our Good Food Box program
- created a brand new Student Survival Guide for our new members during Orientation

## **9. Final Note**

After spending eight years at the University of Toronto, I have seen an evolution in how our institution operates. And after all these years, I have only solidified my belief that student action works and that the students’ union is an essential voice for students.

As President of the UTSU, I can not only be thankful to not only the volunteers, staff and executive of this year, but to the years of previous executives, staff and volunteers that have put their blood, sweat and tears in the most victories the students’ union has ever seen in one year. The victories we have had today could have never

come to be without the contribution of everyone who helped shaped the campaigns, services and events.

What I must note is that this has also been one of the most difficult years for myself as a student organizer. However, I could not have gotten through the hardships I have had without my family. These members of my family include Cameron Wathey, Agnes So, Onik Khan, Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Yasmeen Emadi and Sandra Hudson.

As I now embark on a path leaving the UTSU and graduating, I can look back in admiration of what a true collective is. A collective that works in the interest of protecting students, works with local, provincial and national partners in the fight for accessible and affordable education and is a national leader when it comes to student organizing and advocacy initiatives.

To my fellow students, I say thank you and will always work tirelessly to help students in building a progressive student movement that remains inclusive and principled in equity and justice for all.

In Solidarity,  
Munib Sajjad  
President (2013-2014)  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
Local 98 of the Canadian Federation of Students

# **FINAL REPORT: VICE-PRESIDENT INTERNAL & SERVICES**

## **In This Report:**

- 1. Member Services**
- 2. Club Services**
- 3. Union Operations**
- 4. Union Communications**
- 5. Union Finances**
- 6. Board Of Directors**
- 7. Final Note**

## **1. Member Services**

### **Health & Dental Plan**

The UTSU provides comprehensive for health and dental coverage for members through the National Student Health Network. Plan details can be found online at [www.greenshield.ca/studentcentre](http://www.greenshield.ca/studentcentre) > University of Toronto Students' Union (SAC).

The UTSU continues to see increases in the usage of the membership plan since the 2008 recession. Students have taken advantage of claim forms and courier services available at the UTSU Office. The International Student Identity Card (ISIC), customized by the Canadian Federation of Students, is also available at the Office and can be used as a Plan Identification Card. The insurance provider has also been active with its Fraud Prevention Program to provide security for our members.

To promote the Health and Dental Plan, the UTSU heavily advertised in the member's handbook with three pages dedicated to administration, discount networks and opting out.

Outside of the eligible coverage, Green Shield Canada continues to make available dental and vision care discounts for our members through their Discount Network. In September, the National Student Health Network also launched a savings program with participating Loblaw stores, including caps on dispensing fees, prescription eyewear discounts, and 10 per cent Tuesday discounts for students.

As required through referendum, any member can opt out of the Health Plan so long as they have adequate coverage through another plan. Likewise, any member can choose to opt out of the Dental Plan. Additionally, members can enroll their spouse and dependents into either plan. The opt-out and enrolment deadline this year was October 4, 2013. Refund cheques for the 2013-2014 Health and Dental Plan were mailed to home addresses in March 2014.

The Union encourages members to inform the Union of any desired extensions in coverage.

### **Food & Clothing Bank**

The UTSU Food and Clothing Bank is the fifth largest Daily Bread Food Bank in the City of Toronto. The program is run every Friday from 12:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. in the Multifaith Centre. This popular service is available to currently-enrolled students and provides support for single students and student families in need, allowing them to cover basic food costs. A clothing bank also exists, located on the second floor of the building outside the prayer space. Each year, we collect clothing from the UofT community and make it available to students in need.

Each, the UTSU runs fundraisers and seeks assistance in supporting the Food Bank. This year, the UTSU collaborated with Hart House to host a \$10 lunch special on March 26, 2014. Many student groups participated in the fundraiser including and helped raise funds for the Food Bank. The Food and Clothing Bank saw an increase in its operational costs due to the University's cancellation of the work-study program for students' unions.

### **Good Food Box**

The Good Food Box program has grown substantially since it was moved online two years ago. This service provides healthy fruits and vegetables to students on campus. The program offers six different options, including organic, and focuses on providing as much local produce as possible.

The program is run bi-weekly with deliveries on alternate Wednesdays and order deadlines on alternate Mondays. Purchases are made either online with credit card or through cash or debit at the UTSU office.

This past year, the Union has seen a substantial increase in the popularity of the program. Because we receive in excess of 40 boxes on a regular basis throughout the academic year, the UTSU has established a multiple hubs for deliveries on campus including the Transitional Year Program (TYP), Woodsworth College Residence, and the Varsity Centre.

### **Raptors Discounted Tickets**

The UTSU sold two sets of discounted tickets for Toronto Raptors games for the 2013-2014 academic year. The first set of tickets was for the Raptors vs. the Golden State Warriors on March 2, 2014. The second set of tickets was for the Raptors vs. the Oklahoma City Thunder on March 21, 2014. Tickets were \$36.00 for Balcony seats for the Golden State Warriors and \$78.00 for the Lower Bowl Endzone for the Oklahoma City Thunder. Tickets were sold at cost and sold out quickly.

### **Wonderland**

The UTSU saw an increase in the sale of Wonderland tickets this year. Particularly, the sale of two-visit tickets increased. Next year, the Union should attempt to have a large push for sales at the beginning of the summer semester.

### **Ripley's Aquarium**

Since December 2013, the UTSU now sells Ripley's Aquarium tickets at the office. The tickets are sold for \$25.40, which is roughly \$10 cheaper than purchasing them at the aquarium. Since the implementation of this new service, the ticket sales have steadily increased. For the 2014-2015 we have tripled the amount of tickets we initially purchased in December 2013.

### **Three-Cent Photocopying & Printing**

The UTSU offers a 3-cent black-and-white photocopying service. The service is offered at-cost and is the least expensive printing service on campus. The service continued to grow throughout the year and became one of the most popular services of the Union. Due to the popularity of the service and the current capacity of the UTSU, the Union is currently researching strategies to expand the program into the Student Commons while maintaining the current service in a sustainable capacity.

### **Discounted Bixi Bike Memberships**

Last year, the UTSU began offering discounted yearlong memberships for Bixi Bikes to members that can be purchased at our office to be used for online BIXI registration. The service was popular during the summer, and the Union looks forward to continuing to offer this service throughout the year.

### **Faxing**

The UTSU continues to offer free local faxing from the UTSU office. The UTSU continues to also offer long-distance and overseas faxing at a minimal cost.

### **Individual Academic Endeavour Grants**

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the UTSU reorganized the Individual Academic Endeavour grant to be allocated by the Bursary and Grants Committee as opposed to the Clubs Committee. Applications were due this year on March 3, 2014. The implementation of the new policy allowed for smoother process in determining the grant requests in a timely manner.

### **Book Bursary**

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the UTSU created a new policy that established a timeline, qualifications and expectations for the Book Bursary program. In the 2013-2014 academic year Book Bursary applications were

due on October 25, 2013. 25 applicants were allocated 100 increments based on the financial need expressed in their application.

### **Bursary & Grants Committee**

The Book Bursary Committee has been restructured as the Bursary and Grants Committee to ensure it keeps a year-round mandate. This year we allocated all funding to 30 Book Bursary and 25 Individual Academic Endeavour Grant applications. Thank you to Htay Tint, Katrina Lorn and Aimee Quenneville for their work on the committee this year.

### **Organizational Development & Services Committee**

The Organizational Development and Services Committee met to oversee and make modifications to Union services throughout the summer, fall and winter, including a fee adjustment to the Health & Dental plan and the finalization of the plans for the Mobile Kiosk. Thank you to Cullen Brown, Josephine Petrolo, Fatima Zahra Hamimou and Alexandra Khalil for their work on the committee this year.

### **Post-Secondary Metropass**

In the fall of 2009, the UTSU, along with other GTA Students' Unions, fought against a proposed increase in the TTC Volume Incentive Program (VIP) and won the first ever Post-Secondary Student Metropass at an even better rate. In 2010-2011 the Post-Secondary Metropass was introduced. The program allows students to purchase Metropasses at TTC stations in addition to the UTSU office. The program requires students to apply for a TTC student identification card that is available at Sherbourne Station, but also on campus twice a year through Trans ID services. Trans ID Services were on campus on Wednesday, September 4, 2013 during the Union's Clubs Day and on Monday, October 28, 2013. Both days saw a large turnout.

### **Income Tax Clinic**

The UTSU Income Tax Clinics provide members with free one-on-one assistance filing their taxes each year. The Income Tax Clinic period began on April 1, 2014 and will run until May 7, 2014. All UTSU members are eligible for a free appointment. Appointments can be booked online at [www.taxclinic.utsu.ca](http://www.taxclinic.utsu.ca). Student volunteers that have been trained through the Canada Revenue Agency's Volunteer Income Tax Program organize the clinic.

Last year, the program assisted roughly 500 students over the month of April with their taxes. This program continues to be incredibly successful as the majority of the appointments have been booked, allowing us to help hundreds of members.



Through membership in the Canadian Federation of Students, individual students are also able to file their taxes for free through ufile.ca. Ufile.ca is Canada's leading online tax preparation software. It is easy to use and, because it is fully compatible with the Canada Revenue Agency's NETFILE service, will reduce the wait time for your tax refund.

### **International Student Identification Card (Isic)**

The International Student Identity Card (ISIC) is an internationally recognized student card that can be used for travel and entertainment discounts around the globe. Students are able to come into the office and get a free ISIC because we are members of the Canadian Federation of Students.

This year, the UTSU worked with the Canadian Federation of Students and Greenshield Canada to merge the ISIC with the Greenshield Student Plan Identification Card. Students are now able to have their policy plan directly on their ISIC instead of manually printing the Greenshield identification off of the website.

The Union issued cards a number of times across campus to ensure students had access to the cards prior to long-weekends, reading week and the winter break. The UTSU has also made a concerted effort to engage students in professional faculties who might not otherwise access the program. ISIC Blitz dates were scheduled on the following dates:

July 16, 17, 18, 2013 — Sidney Smith  
August 6, 2013 — Robarts Library  
September 4, 2013 — Clubs Day  
September 4, 2013 — OISE  
September 10, 2013 — Street Festival  
October 2, 2013 — Sidney Smith  
October 16, 2013 — Faculty of Nursing  
November 28, 2013 — Faculty of Dentistry  
December 13, 2013 — Faculty of Dentistry

### **Dollars For Daycare**

The Union continues to lobby for better childcare on campus. We provide a childcare subsidy through a levy fund that provides support to students who cannot afford childcare. Through a student levy, funds are collected each year to support student families. Student families were able to apply for Dollar For Daycare Funding starting in October. Each year around \$28,000 is distributed to students in need.

### **Cell Phone Charging Stations**

The UTSU has decided to purchase charging stations and will include images of the UTSU logo. These charging stations are lightweight and portable allowing the Union to easily move a charging station from one

location to the next. One station will be permanently positioned within the Union's office while two other charging stations will be implemented during outreach. These charging stations are portable and have been used during outreach and even been borrowed out to other colleges and clubs for their events. They're a very useful tool and have charging cables for all types of phones.

### **Blue Crew Program**

Introduced this past year, the blue crew program hopes to engage students in volunteer work with our organization and externally in the broader community. The UTSU recognizes volunteer experiences and creates meaningful opportunities for students to participate in. Launched in early October, over dozens of students have joined the program in October. Students participating in the program will receive a certificate of volunteerism for a minimum of 16 hours as well a movie ticket. Students may wish to volunteer for a month or a term and can continue to earn volunteer credits for greater rewards.

### **Princeton Review**

The UTSU has partnered with The Princeton Review to bring discounts to members! Members may use the code TORUTSU\$100 when registering.

The Princeton Review is an educational company that helps students prepare to write standardized tests such as the MCAT, LSAT, GMAT, GRE and DAT. They offer multiple preparation options including classroom courses, live online courses and private tutoring! Conveniently located nearby at Bay and Bloor, they also run courses on university campuses across the country.

The Princeton Review is working with the UTSU to save you money! All UTSU members can receive \$100 off of any Princeton Review course in Canada using the promo code TORUTSU\$100. Members can register at [www.princetonreview.com](http://www.princetonreview.com) or at 1-800-2Review.

### **Bills Vs. Ravens Tickets**

On Sunday September 29 the UTSU executives along with members of the student body and public traveled to Buffalo New York to watch the Ravens vs. Bills football game at the Ralph Wilson stadium. The trip included coach-busing transportation from the UTSU office to the stadium, light refreshments, and other free material that was given out. The event was an overall success.

## **2. CLUB SERVICES**

### **Clubs Recognition**

The 2013-2014 club recognition process began on May 1, 2013. As of November 1, over 200 clubs have been recognized, with many more being processed each day. To apply, clubs need to obtain Office of Student Life, Arts & Science Students' Union or Engineering Society recognition; complete the UTSU recognition form found on our website ([www.utsu.ca](http://www.utsu.ca)) and email their constitution to [clubs@utsu.ca](mailto:clubs@utsu.ca).

## **Clubs Funding**

The UTSU implemented two new types of funding and reformed some major aspects of the clubs policy to better reflect the needs of clubs. The Union created start-up funding to help new clubs establish themselves in a sea of larger clubs. The Union also created reconsideration funding to ensure that the clubs that need the most funding have an opportunity to appeal to the committee. Other changes include the incorporation of funding deadlines, the hardening of process surrounding summer funding and the restructuring of the policy to make it clearer in its full scope.

### **2013-14 Funding Deadlines**

Summer Funding Deadline: Friday, July 5, 2013

Long-Term Funding Deadline: Friday, October 18, 2013

Start-Up Funding Deadline: Friday, January 17, 2014

Short-Term, Individual Academic Endeavour Funding Deadline: Friday, February 7, 2014

Reconsideration Funding Deadline: Friday, March 7, 2014

## **Clubs Printing**

UTSU clubs have access to free photocopying and printing at the office. This service works on a credit-based system. Each group is allotted 1,000 credits for the Fall and Winter sessions (September-May) and 500 credits for the summer session (May-September). The printing credit cost allocation is as follows:

Black & white 8.5" x 11" = 1 credit each

Black & white 8.5" x 14" or 11" x 17" = 2 credits each

Colour 8.5" x 11" = 2 credits each

Colour 8.5" x 14" or 11" x 17" = 4 credits each

## **Bulk Purchasing**

The UTSU uses a bulk purchasing system to order Orientation t-shirts, laundry bags, reusable water bottles and clipboards. Through using this system, students have been able to purchase ethical to ensure fair labour, sustainable materials and an ethical market.

Clubs can now purchase ethically produced T-shirts, bags, pens, buttons, lanyards, notebooks, clipboards, drink ware and more - that can be customized with your own artwork - any time throughout the year. In order

to purchase items prior to Orientation, clubs must confirm sales by the middle of May. The year-round service has a much quicker turnaround time.

### **Banner Printing**

Clubs can custom order banners for events or simply as a means of promotion. This service is offered year round. Sizing and costs for our banners are as follows:

5' x 3' for \$70 + HST = \$79.10  
6' x 3' for \$75 + HST = \$84.75  
6' x 4' for \$80 + HST = \$90.40

### **Clubs Training**

To be eligible for clubs funding, a campus group must attend at least one Club Executive Training session each year.

Between May and November, the UTSU trained over 350 club executives from over 200 clubs. Sessions were held on the following dates:

June 28, 2013  
July 13, 2013  
July 21, 2013  
August 25, 2013  
September 21, 2013  
September 28, 2013  
October 11, 2013  
December 5, 2013  
January 10, 2014.

These sessions provide clubs with useful information on various topics including an overview of UTSU clubs funding, anti-oppression training, and other clubs services.

### **Service Groups Training**

The UTSU oversees about 11 levy groups who bring vital services to members of the UTSU at the St. George and Mississauga campuses. At the annual UTSU Service Groups training, held this year on August 14, groups in attendance voted to change their name from "UTSU Levy Groups" to "UTSU Service Groups". It was decided that this new name would better reflect the nature of their organizations and help to highlight the services that they offer to UTSU members. At the annual Service Groups training we highlighted the importance of understanding the memorandums to help build better strategies in reaching out to the members at large. There was a strong consensus in highlighting the service principles in their work and have thus decided to rename them Service groups.

## **3. OPERATIONS**

## **Staff Positions**

As of this September there are two full-time staff working at the UTSU supporting Campus Life initiatives: the UTSU Events Coordinator and the UTSU Clubs and Service Groups Coordinator.

The Clubs and Service Groups Coordinator is dedicated to overseeing recognition, funding and clubs services. This new staff position is responsible for liaising with UTSU Service Groups, formerly known as Levy Groups.

The UTSU Events Coordinator will coordinate logistics and provide other support associated with the UTSU's many events, including Orientation. We also employed more than 125 part-time and casual staff.

## **Associates**

Much of the work that has been tasked to the Executive is only accomplished through the dedication of the Associate Vice-Presidents. Thank you to all the associates throughout the year: Igor Samardzic, Silviu Kondan, Akshan Bansal, Nzube Ekpunobi, Umair Qadeer, Jess Leduc-Robert, Rowena Symss, Khalid Khan.

## **Front Desk Staff**

The UTSU has seen a huge growth in service following the implementation of the copy service. In order to cope with the growth, we have had to hire more students at our front desk. Thank you the fantastic work of our front desk staff.

## **Orientation Committee**

The Orientation Coordinators of the Union have the responsibility of planning and hosting the Union's annual Orientation Day as well as carrying out the responsibilities stated in this policy. The Executive Committee hired Igor Samardzic and Chantelle Sukhu as the 2013-2014 UTSU Orientation Coordinators and Justin Raj as the Orientation Graphic Designer. Each of these individuals have continued to work with the UTSU throughout the year and to improve its services and its events for our members. We thank each of them for their work.

## **Vice-President Campus Life**

The Vice-President Campus Life is one of the six executives of the Students' Union. The VP Campus Life is responsible for overseeing Orientation, clubs funding and student life related matters of the university. The hiring committee has forwarded two candidates to be considered by the 2014-2015 Board of Directors at the consecutive board meeting.

## **General Meetings**

The UTSU hosted its Annual General Meeting on Thursday, November 22, 2012 in the Medical Sciences Building. The Bylaw changes that passed have been updated on the website.

Approval of 2012 AGM Minutes - Passed

Receipt Of The 2012-2013 Audited Financial Statements - Passed

Appointment Of Auditors for 2013-2014 - Passed

2013 AGM - 01: Motion To Amend Bylaws To Comply With The Canada Not-For Profit Corporations Act Requirements - Passed

2013 AGM - 02: Motion To Endorse The Raise The Minimum Wage Campaign - Passed

2013 AGM - 03: Motion To Investigate The Board & Commission Structure - Passed

2013 AGM - 04: Motion To Create An Online Form For Members To Report Issues & Concerns - Passed

2013 AGM - 05: Motion To Reprimand Students Against Israeli Apartheid - Defeated

### **Policies & Procedures Committee**

The Policy and Procedures Committee reviewed a number of operational and issues-based policies including Clubs Policy and policies related to changes in the Canada Non-Profit Corporations Act. Thank you to Masteusz Krawkyck, Maaham Malik, Melissa Theodore, Patrick Zang, Silviu Kondan, Catherine Nguyen and Munib Sajjad for being outstanding committee members.

## **4. UNION COMMUNICATIONS**

### **Publications**

The UTSU produces a number of materials that engage members with their students' union & campus community. Furthermore, the Union distributes reports on municipal, provincial and federal governance. This year, the Union produced an Academic Appeals Guide, a report for Governing Council on International Students, a report on Flat Fees at the University of Toronto, and are currently working on a report on the Drop Credit Policy. On the national level, the Canadian Federation of Students produced a report, "Public Education for the Public Good", and the Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario published a number of provincial reports to encourage positive change for students in post-secondary education policy.

### **Members' Handbook**

Every year the Union purchases a large number of member's handbooks to engage members of the Union through information on services, campaigns and events of the Union. The 2013- 2014 member services handbook includes Executive portfolios, Board of Directors photos and information,

and information on our services, campaigns and events. The handbook's design is completely different from last year's, replicating the theme of the 2013 UTSUFest. The UTSU provided over 20,000 handbooks to our members.

## **Mailers**

Every year the Union prints a hard copy newsletter, which is sent to all members who have registered at the time of the mailing (late August, usually about 35,000 members). The annual "summer mailing" informs members about the Union's services and campaigns, Orientation and other back-to-school activities, and important information on how to access or opt out of the UTSU Health & Dental Plan. Because it is impossible to reach every member with the mailer, in 2013, the Union added a "spring mailer" which was sent to all first-year students in early June. This helped to ensure first-year students about their Union and its activities. In addition, we were able to deliver the summer mailing newsletters directly to most residence rooms or mailboxes in early September.

## **Wall Calendars**

The Union has brought back the popular dry-erase wall calendars for a second year. The wall calendars were extremely well received. Some are still available through our office and various outreach initiatives.

## **Annual Report**

For the past several years, the UTSU has produced an Annual Report that is presented at the Annual General Meeting. The report summarizes the successes and ongoing work of the students' union since the previous General Meeting. The document has been completely redesigned and has been a popular pick at the UTSU tables.

## **Training Guides**

The UTSU developed a detailed and ever-growing clubs training manual to ensure campus clubs are aware of policy, process, services and funding. A similar guide has also been created for levy groups. The guides are a helpful tool for understanding the operations of the Union but also how to access and collaborate with the students' union.

## **Clubs Directory**

This annual directory lists all clubs on campus as well as student societies, course unions and service groups. It also includes information about UTSU clubs services, how to start a club, how to access funding and details about the annual semi-formal Unity Ball. The UTSU produced a Clubs Directory for release during Orientation Week. The directory is one of the most popular publications that the UTSU provides.

### **Orientation 2013 Video**

On June 15, the Executive team participated in the creation of a video to promote the UTSU 2013 Orientation week and UTSUFest. The video featured the UTSU Executive team and provided an overview of the highlights of our upcoming Orientation events.

### **Utsufest 2013 Video**

On August 6, the executives released the UTSU Fest 2013 video to promote the events that will be held during UTSU's orientation week. Each executive spoke about the particular events that will occur throughout the week including the Clubs Fair on September 4 at Hart House Circle, the U of T Parade, concert, after party and alternative after party being held on September 6. These events will be followed by the StreetFest on September 10 and Homecoming on September 14. The video contains footage from the previous year's orientation week events.

### **Meet Your Executives Video**

On September 19, the executives decided to take a different approach to their annual "Meet Your Executives" video. Instead of shooting the average video in your formal interview manner, the executives focused on showing their comical side. The idea behind the new video is to poke fun at the Executives while also show that the UTSU is an engaging place that members can get involved in. Each section on the executives portrays their humorous side while also emphasizes their portfolio. The offbeat video is a new approach that hopefully will project the UTSU in a positive manner that people will think is humorous.

### **Website**

This year the UTSU worked on massive website overhaul. The new responsive website has a cleaner look and far easier to navigate. A large footer provides easy access on each page to contact information, bylaws and policies, audited financial statements, minutes and agendas, media releases and other key information. The services are sub-categorized in a more logical way to help members find what they are looking for, and also include an extensive "Know Your Rights" page. The clubs section includes more interactive forms for applying for funding, recognition, and nominating a club for an award. Members can now access all Union publications quickly and easily online. Finally, new components include automatic e-mailers, RSS feeds, sliders on the home page and more. We are very pleased we were able to complete this extensive project over the course of the year. We would like to thank everyone who contributed to the website overhaul.

### **Social Media**



The UTSU uses a variety of social media applications to reach out to the student community. Since the switch from a group to a Facebook Page two years ago, the page has grown to 6,815 likes.

We've also seen a large increase in our Twitter followers, which has grown to 5, 244 followers. Additionally, the Union maintains a YouTube page with over 17,402 views.

The UTSU also partners with the "OOHLALA" Mobile app to engage members on their smartphones. The application allows students to access campus events, local discounts and special offers. The Union participated in promoting the application through the annual 'Capture the Flag' game to win an iPad and UofT Bookstore gift certificate. We a fall game from November 4 - 7, 2013 and a winter game from March 25 - 27, 2014.

### **Email Listservs**

The UTSU uses several email listservs to effectively communicate with our members. The Union sends out a monthly e-newsletter made up of emails collected throughout the year. Unfortunately, the task of collecting emails continues to be an arduous task. The Union is continually lobbying the University for access to membership lists and the provincial government for right to organize legislation to ensure better communication with our members.

### **Mobile Kiosk**

The purchased a mobile kiosk that would act as a roaming Union office across campus. The kiosk will be implemented as brand for the Union across campus and offer essential services such as transit and entertainment discounts for hard to reach constituents. The Office of Student Life provided us with assistance in securing space and storage. The kiosk is ready for use and will be seen around campus more frequently in during the summer months.

### **Outreach Survey**

The UTSU represents over 47,000 students from the St. George and Mississauga campuses. With a membership this large, it is often difficult to get tangible feedback from our members. In an effort to better serve our members, a survey was created for Directors and executives to hand out during outreach in the summer of 2013. The survey helped us to determine the effectiveness of our outreach on events, services and campaigns, and will provide information on how we can improve. We also received some great ideas on how we can improve our events, services, and advocacy from the feedback.

## **5. UNION FINANCES**

### **2012-2013 Audit**

The general membership approved the 2012-2013 audit at the Annual General Meeting on November 27, 2013. Thank you to the Operations Coordinator Adnan Najmi and the Executive Director Sandra Hudson for their help in preparing the audited statements with the Union's auditors.

### **2014-2015 Preliminary Budget**

The outgoing Vice-President Internal and Services has worked with the Incoming Vice-President Internal and Services, Operations Coordinator and Executive Director in the preparation of the 2013-14 Proposed Budget. The budget will be approved at the first board meeting for the 2014-2015 Board of Directors.

### **Budget Committee**

The Union's budget committee is tasked with overseeing the development of a responsible budget that ensures adequate resources are directed to the priorities and operations of the Union. This year, the committee has helped in reshaping the presentation of the budget to more adequately reflect where funding is prioritized and allocated. Thank you to committee members Zijian Yang, Khalid Khan, Muhammed Bilal Sandeela, Alex Wasserman, Vere-Marie Khan, Nadiv Hossain and Munib Sajjad for being outstanding members.

## **6. BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

### **Meeting Schedule**

The UTSU hosted eleven meetings of the Board of Directors. Thank you to all the board members that have contributed their time to make the meetings and ensure the Union is held accountable to its membership. The Board of Director meeting dates were as followed:

- April 26, 2013
- June 26, 2013
- July 26, 2013
- August 21, 2013
- September 27, 2013
- October 29, 2013
- November 19, 2013
- January 24, 2014
- February 12, 2014
- March 28, 2014
- April 24, 2014

### **Board Binders**

The UTSU developed binders for the Board of Directors to ensure that board members are well aware of the Union, its operating structures and

the events, campaigns and services. The board binders were distributed at the board retreat, which was held on June 21 – 23, 2013. Thank you to everyone who worked endlessly to produce the binders.

## **Board Retreat**

From June 21 through June 23, 2013, the Board of Directors attended the Kempenfelt Conference Centre in Innisfil, Ontario for our annual Board Retreat. On our three-day retreat, Executive Committee members provided each Director with a binder filled with information that they can use to inform their constituents about the UTSU, our services, campaigns, and events. This retreat also served to inform Directors of their roles and responsibilities throughout the year. The retreat also included several presentations about the UTSU, how we function, organize events & campaigns, our services and the budget. We also participated in team building activities including baseball, volleyball, and even paddle boating. The retreat concluded with the second UTSU Board of Directors meeting on Sunday, June 23, 2013.

## **2013 Fall By-Elections**

The UTSU held its Fall by-elections in October 2013 as there were several vacancies for the 2013-14 Board of Directors. Elections were held for the following seats: the Faculty of Law, Faculty of Nursing, Faculty of Dentistry, Toronto School of Theology, Ontario Institute in Studies of Education and the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Engineering. Thank you to Will Warnica, Helen Phan, Ben Coleman, Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Munib Sajjad for work on the Elections and Referenda Committee. A full report of the Chief Returning Officer was included in the November 2013 Board Report.

## **7. Final Note**

Before my term began I did not know too much about the University of Toronto Students' Union. I was like many other students at the University of Toronto: focused on doing well in my classes while trying to make my time count while at University. Sure I have been involved in numerous clubs and campus organizations, but I would have never expected to be where I am right now when I first came to Toronto for university. Getting involved in the students' union has been one of the most fulfilling experiences during my academic career and I am extremely grateful to have been elected to this role.

From the viewpoint of the Vice-President Internal & Services, I have witnessed this students' union grow rapidly. Awareness of the University of Toronto Students' Union is steadily increasing on campus as we have placed tremendous effort on our public image this year. We have quadrupled the amount of posters we distribute on campus thanks to our graphic designer and post-it-up staff. The mass distribution of posters around campus has made a notable difference at our events and the use of

our services. Our online presence has also been fantastic, as we substantially increased the amount of followers on our social media pages. The re-modification of the website has made information readily available and accessible to our members. We have even been working on re-inventing our brand identity. These are the little things that have increased the use of our services and generated additional awareness of our advocacy work and events on campus. None of the hard work could have been possible without the groundwork laid by previous executives as well as the entire 2013-2014 team, from the staff to our volunteers to our associates to our Board of Directors. By working together we proved how much we are able to accomplish and enrich the university experience for students who too just want to make the best of their time here. I am very proud of all the victories we achieved and hope to continue the momentum going into the 2014 – 2015 year.

**In Solidarity,**  
**Cameron Wathey**  
**Vice-President Internal & Services**  
**University of Toronto Students' Union**  
**Local 98 Canadian Federation of Students**

# **FINAL REPORT: VICE-PRESIDENT UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS**

- 1. UofT Governance**
- 2. Victories**
- 3. Publications**
- 4. Professional Faculties**
- 5. Meetings**
- 6. International Students**
- 7. Transitional Year Programme**
- 8. Final Note**

## **1. UofT Governance**

- i. RELATIONS WITH STUDENT GOVERNORS & CENTRAL STUDENTS' UNIONS

This past year, the UTSU has developed a strong relationship with our fellow sister students' unions and student Governors. I organized a joint presentation with UTMSU-Designate, Melissa Theodore, President of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students, Susan Froom, Vice-President Academics & University Affairs of the Scarborough Campus Students' Union, Ranziba Nehrin and Finance & University Governance Commissioner of the Graduate Students' Union, Aman Gebru at the December 12 Governing Council meeting. This presentation served to provide an overview of the mandate and initiatives of the central students' unions to the governors, but was also a chance to educate the governors on various issues surrounding post-secondary education, and how students and governors can work together on these issues. The presentation was well-received and has prompted movement on several items such as a shuttle bus between the Scarborough and St. George campuses, winter residence access for students at UTM, representation for international students on Governing Council, and shared lobbying for more government funding.

During the past year, I have also been actively participating regular meetings with the student governors and representatives from the central students' unions. These meetings are designed to foster regular communication between the central students' unions and the student governors, especially around items that are discussed at Governing Council. Topics that were discussed include the potential for a working group on government funding at the University, issues of access and representation for international students, such as tuition fees and lack of OHIP coverage. These meetings are really beneficial to strengthen our common lobbying effort and able us to

construct strategies in a collective manner.

On January 22, I attended a student constituency meeting organized by the student governors of the Governing Council. University of Toronto President Meric Gertler, Governing Council Chair Judy Goldring and the Governing Council Secretary Louis Charpentier were also in attendance. Discussed topics included tuition fees for undergraduate, graduate and international students. Meeting attendees also discussed the lack of funding for post-secondary education from the government. This meeting was helpful in developing ideas to create a future joint student and administrative working group to lobby for more funding for universities.

## ii. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT SOCIETIES SUMMIT

In the fall semester, the Office of the Provost organized the Undergraduate Student Societies Summit. Participants included two representatives from each of the undergraduate college councils, professional faculty councils, the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, Arts and Science Students' Union and the UTSU. Vice-President Equity Yolen Bollo-Kamara and myself served as the representatives from the UTSU to attend the summit. This summit also includes various administrative faculty members whom were appointed by the Office of the Provost to facilitate the Summit meetings. An ongoing concern for the UTSU was that the vast majority of the union's members and stakeholder groups are unable to participate in this discussion that largely focuses on the services, advocacy, operations, and governing structure of the Union. Campus clubs and levy groups that have a particular stake in student society governance processes had no direct representation on the Summit. As well, our sister students' unions for example like the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) and Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) were excluded from this summit that heavily discussed any possible policy changes regarding the student societies at UofT. Although non-summit members were allowed to submit written submissions to the summit, there were no discussions of these submissions.

At the February 10 meeting, UTMSU representative Melissa Theodore announced that the UTMSU would cease participation in the Summit, and presented a letter to Summit participants. The letter detailed various concerns, including that the Summit process represents a breach of student union autonomy and unfairly excludes numerous stakeholders and general membership. The letter also stated that the

UTMSU was in receipt of hundreds of petitions from its members, demanding that the UTMSU and the UTSU withdraw from the Summit.

At the February 12 meeting of the Board of Directors, there was an extensive discussion about the implications of UTMSU's withdrawal, and how the UTSU should proceed. Many Board members expressed concerns with the Summit process, and the consensus was that the UTSU should consult its membership before taking action. I then undertook a survey of the membership. The overwhelming response was that the UTSU should cease participation in the Summit and create a more democratic process that is autonomous from the University administration. At the Student Societies Summit meeting on Friday, March 7, I announced that the UTSU would no longer participate, presenting a letter that referenced the results of the survey and expressed the UTSU's concerns that the process is unbalanced, undemocratic and lacks transparency.

The UTSU would like to construct a forum that is not controlled by the central administration in which allows all undergraduate students, clubs and levy groups and sister student unions to attend to further listen and address any concerns or suggestions to the UTSU.

## **2. Victories**

### **i. ACCESS COPYRIGHT**

On June 7, the UTSU received a letter from Vice President and Provost Cheryl Misak regarding the University of Toronto's decision not to extend their current agreement with Access Copyright. In January 2012, UofT and Western University signed onto a one-year agreement with a publications licensing organization called Access Copyright, effectively forcing all students at UofT to pay an extra \$26 in ancillary fees to protect UofT from potential lawsuits on copyright infringement. The license agreement was unnecessary as federal legislation already protects the rights of those in academic institutions to access copyright materials for educational purposes.

The UTSU was a vocal opponent to Access Copyright, and had spent the past year lobbying the university to retract the deal. It is because of the hard work of student representatives from the UTSU and allies at UofT and the Canadian Federation of Students that the University has decided to not extend their agreement with Access Copyright. This is a huge victory that saves students over \$1.5 million dollars

each year. The UTSU would continue to remain active to advocate for developing fair copyright policies and a copyright office for our memberships.

ii. FLAT FEES

On October 23 I launched a “Stop Flat Fees” campaign, with a focus on lobbying the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, Brad Duguid to prohibit the implementation of flat fees at any threshold below 100 per cent of a full course load. In 2009, the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Toronto implemented a flat fee structure at a 60 per cent threshold, meaning that students taking three or more courses are forced to pay for five. Several programs at the University of Toronto Mississauga also operate under a flat fee structure. Throughout this campaign, the UTSU and the UTMSU have been talking to students in person across St. George and Mississauga campuses about this issue and collectively collected over 5000 signatures to be delivered to Minister Brad Duguid. In December, the Ministry released a new tuition fee policy that limit the amount of fees that the university can charge students. Under this new policy, 100 per cent of tuition fees can only be charged if students are taking an 80 per cent course load or higher. This victory saves some domestic students over \$2300 per year and international students \$13,000 each year. However, the UTSU will continue to lobby for a tuition fees structure that students will only pay for the amount of courses they are taking and prevent other institutions to implement such unfair policy to students.

### **3. Publications**

i. ACADEMIC APPEALS GUIDE

On March 7, the Academic Appeals Guides were completed and available for distribution to the membership. The Academic Appeals Guide is a project that seeks to provide members with information and resources on various academic appeals and petitions processes at the University of Toronto. It covers each faculty, and includes information about the steps to take when facing difficulties with course assignments, exams or final grades. This guide will also be useful for reviewing the academic appeals policies and processes across the University in future. I would like to thank Policy & Student Rights Coordinator Doly Begum, Graphic Designer Justin Raj and Executive Director Sandy Hudson for their dedication and hard work in assisting to produce this guide.



ii. DROP CREDIT POLICY LOBBY DOCUMENT

The Drop Credit Policy Document is currently in progress and will hopefully be readily available for our membership for the summer term.

**4. Professional Faculties**

i. OUTREACH

At the beginning of the school year, I attended the OISE and Faculty of Dentistry Orientation event to introduce incoming students about the UTSU's cost-saving services, events and advocacy work. Students had the opportunity ask questions about the health and dental plan and how to get involved with the UTSU. Items such as agendas and club directories were distributed. Throughout the year, I also hosted different Lunch N' Learn sessions to engage with students at professional faculties to learn about the UTSU. I also went to different faculties to distribute the International Students Identity Card. It is important that the UTSU actively engaged with our members and provide different opportunities for professional faculties students to stay engaged with the UTSU.

ii. UNFAIR FEES VIDEO

The UTSU collaborated with the Faculty of Dentistry Director in this past year and produced a video to raise awareness of the high tuition fees that students at the Faculty of Dentistry of UofT are facing. This video involves Dentistry students to talk about their own personal stories of the challenges they face with such high tuition fees in the discipline. This video provides an interactive way for students to engage with lobbying efforts to reduce tuition fees. This video is a great start for gathering different testimonies from students across different faculties and programs at UofT to address the barriers of high tuition fees and the relation to the lobbying effort for more provincial funding for post-secondary education in the future.

**5. Meetings**

i. HART HOUSE BOARD OF STEWARDS

The Board of Stewards is Hart House's highest governing body and jointly oversees the affairs of the House with the Warden. I represented the UTSU at this body. Throughout the year, the Board of Stewards met once a month to discuss matters occurred within

Hart House including motions on the recommendations of the Co-curricular Record Working Group and the Hart House Green Heritage Infrastructure Renewal. There were also presentations on the Hart House Budget and different Hart House committees. The UTSU continues to participate in Hart House Board of Stewards meetings to ensure that Hart House continues to be accessible to members. Hart House does not receive any funding from the central university and has a long-standing structural deficit. The Union will remain steadfast in opposing the increase of student fees while the university contributes no financial support to Hart House.

ii. STUDENT LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Student Library Advisory Committee provides an opportunity for students to participate in critical planning and decision-making for the University's Library System. Librarian Julie Hannaford chaired the meeting. The Committee meeting met throughout the past year and discussed topics like the University of Toronto Libraries' Strategic Plan 2013-2018, Access Copyright, suggestions for enhanced services and Robarts Zoning Project. It is important for the UTSU to continue to represent its members in this decision-making process.

iii. FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Food Advisory Committee is a body that serves to receive feedback from the university community and developing relationships with students and groups across campus. Vice-President Internal & Services Cameron Wathey and I represented the UTSU at this Committee. The Committee met several times throughout the year. Committee members were able to receive updates of the food services' operation, the meal plan program, current renovation of food locations on campus, and upcoming initiatives such as Veggie Mondays and the Local Food Challenge from Jaco Lokker, Director of Food Services at the meeting.

On March 6, Policy & Student Rights Coordinator Doly Begum and I had the opportunity to present the findings of the Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario's findings from its Taskforce on Campus Food Services, sharing student concerns with the Committee. It is important for the UTSU to be participating in this committee to ensure food on campus is affordable, nutritious and diverse.

iv. COUNCIL ON STUDENT SERVICES

The Council on Student Services (CoSS) is mandated by the Government of Ontario and is the only committee at the UofT where the majority of members are students. CoSS serves a dual purpose of ensuring student involvement in decisions to change student service and approving any substantial increase of non-tuition ancillary fees at the Office of Student Life, Hart House and the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education. It also serves as a body of oversight and consultation for wider student services within the University. The Executive Committee has four voting seats on the Council on Student Services. President Munib Sajjad, Vice-President Equity Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Vice-President External Onik Khan and myself sat on CoSS.

At the February 3 meeting, the UTSU collaborated with the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Graduate Students' Union to put forward two motions that were passed. The motions asked that CoSS recommend to the University Affairs Board and to the Governing Council to allocate a better space as determined by the Transitional Year Program (TYP) community if TYP is to be moved from 49 St. George Street. The motions also recommended that the University investigate properties that have been newly acquired by the University as potential new homes for the Transitional Year Programme. The intent of the motion was to ensure the continued success and autonomy of TYP, and facilitate its ability to provide adequate services to students enrolled in the faculty.

#### v. ACADEMIC & STUDENT RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Academic and Student Rights Commission hosted several meetings throughout this past year. Commission meetings are open to all UTSU members. The meetings provide a platform for members to voice their opinions, and provide ideas and direction for UTSU campaigns and projects for the year. Discussion topics this past year include the Stop Flat Fees campaign, Unfair Fees/Unfair Work campaign, international students' rights awareness and the academic appeals guide.

#### vi. CO-CURRICULAR RECORD CLUBS AND ORGANIZATION WORKING GROUP

The UTSU has been involved in the creation of a co-curricular record over the past few years. The co-curricular transcript will list all verified UofT extra-curricular activities to supplement a resume. This working group allows the UTSU to stay engaged with the

implementation process of the Co-Curricular Record. Participants in this working group reviewed the findings of a consultation and discussed how to capture the work of students involved in clubs and other student organizations on the Co-Curricular Record. The UTSU will continue to participate in this process.

## **6. International Students**

### **i. FAIRNESS FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS**

This past year, I have also brought awareness of international students issues on campus. I was elected as the provincial and national international students commissioner at the Canadian Federation of Students general meetings for the year. I wrote an op-ed called “We are not Cash Cars” which was published on November 25 in the Varsity to address some of the barriers and challenges that international students face. During the year in meetings with other central students’ unions, student governors or University administration, I have also raised the issue of the need to have international students representation at the Governing Council when important policies like tuition fee raise that also affect international students is discussed at this body.

On January 20, I was invited to speak at the Ryerson Students’ Union’s Student Action Committee meeting. The topic of this meeting was the issues that international students face. I spoke about my experience as an international student, work that the UTSU and the Canadian Federation of Students has been undertaking for international students and challenges that international students face. It is important to recognize to work with other student organization at other institutions to work on the international students issues.

On March 5, I hosted an International Students Town Hall organized by the Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario (CFS-ON). At the town hall, the CFS-ON launched the “Fairness for International Students” campaign to advocate for international students around tuition fees, health care and immigration policies. There was also a discussion facilitated by an immigration lawyer on recent immigration changes that would affect international students and their options when applying for permanent residence status. In addition, the Town Hall included a workshop on filing taxes online for free through Ufile software. The UTSU will continue to support and participate in the “Fairness for International Students” and “OHIP4ALL” campaigns to advocate for the rights of international students.

## ii. OHIP FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Another important issue surrounding international students rights awareness is advocating for getting back international students on OHIP. The UTSU has been working with the University of Toronto to develop a letter advocating for the return of OHIP to international students. In 1994, the Government of Ontario disqualified international students from receiving OHIP benefits under the auspice of an austerity budget. International students not only contribute to the Ontario economy by paying federal and provincial taxes, but, by and large, they graduate and remain in Canada, and continue to contribute to our economy. The letter will be sent to the provincial Liberal leadership candidates as well as members of the opposition. I also participated in producing a video with the CFS-ON to call for the province to restore OHIP for international students and get rid of UHIP. The UTSU has also been collecting petitions from students across campus to sign on this initiative.

## 7. Transitional Year Programme

The UTSU in this past year has been working with the Transitional Year Programme Preservation Alliance (TYPPA) to address the concerns of the programme being reallocated and forced out of its current home 49 St. George Street to 123 St. George Street by the University as a result of the construction of Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering's new Centre for Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Both TYP faculty, alumni and current students see this move as a bad fit for a program that was tailored to the needs of marginalized and disadvantaged students.

On November 18, representatives of the UTSU attended a town hall hosted by the TYPPA. Many students, faculty, alumni and community members voiced their concerns related to program cuts and the reduction of full-time faculty, the proposed move of its current address and potential structural changes that threaten the autonomy of the program

On January 15, 2014 the UTSU, along with the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS), and the TYPPA attended a meeting of Governing Council's Planning and Budget Committee to discuss the concerns of TYP of the proposed move. Vice-President Equity Yolen Bollo-Kamara and myself spoke to concerns that TYP students had not been consulted regarding this move and the proposed demolishing of TYP House, and that the proposed new space for TYP was inadequate for the structural needs of the

program.

On the February 27 Governing Council meeting, Vice-President Equity and myself again speak at this meeting to address the TYP concerns. Susan Froom, President of the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS), and several alumni and current students of TYP also spoke to this item. There was a rally of students, alumni, faculty and community members held outside the meeting, organized by the TYPPA and supported by the UTSU and APUS. The UTSU and APUS were present. Despite the peaceful nature of the rally, there was a heavy police presence, and many students and community members were barred from attending the public Governing Council meeting. The UTSU will continue to support TYP to ensure the program is housed in an adequate and accessible space and receives sufficient support from the University for its continued success.

## **8. Final Note**

It has been a productive and exciting term. Major victories like the change of flat fees structure, the termination of contract between the University and Access Copyright or the production of the Academic Appeals Guide would not have been accomplished without the help with my fellow amazing executive team, executive director, our staff at the UTSU, my associate, the board and volunteers.

I would like to sincerely thank every single one of the above members who assisted me with ideas and helped with my work throughout the year. I have learned a lot being the Vice-President University Affairs of the UTSU and I can't be more thankful for all the students who voted for me for giving me this amazing opportunity as their student representative to serve them this past year. I also want to thank the Canadian Federation of Students for their great leadership in assisting me as the International Student Commissioner to not only being a part of a great organization but broaden my view of the power of working with other students. I will never forget how important it is to advocate for my members to fight for a better, affordable and accessible post-secondary education.

Looking forward, I hope what UTSU have abled to accomplish this year can be carry on and more great initiatives can be achieved by working with other student organizations like our central sister students' unions, campus organizations, clubs, and members.

**In Solidarity,  
Agnes So  
Vice-President University Affairs (2013-2014)  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
Local 98 of the Canadian Federation of Students**

# **FINAL REPORT: VICE-PRESIDENT CAMPUS LIFE/EXTERNAL**

## **In This Report:**

- 1. Orientation/Lupe Fiasco**
- 2. Homecoming**
- 3. Alternative After Party**
- 4. Clubs Training**
- 5. Pedestrianize St. George Street**
- 6. All-Way-Cross-Walk**
- 7. International Day of Action Against Death Traps**
- 8. Garment Industry Speaker Series**
- 9. Campaign Against Unpaid Internships**
- 10. Minimum Wage Increase**
- 11. Fall Reading Week**
- 12. Final Note**

Executives have the opportunity to work on several events, campaigns and other initiatives that accumulate throughout the year. No formal report is a true reflection of all the things we work on. With that said I wanted to talk about the things that I have directly worked on rather than just participated in. My year was one of complexity as I had the opportunity to lead two portfolios, Vice-President Campus Life and Vice-President External.

## **1. ORIENTATION/LUPEFIASCO**

Orientation is fundamentally the largest and coolest thing that I had the pleasure of overseeing this year. I am glad I was Vice-President Campus Life during my first six months at the UTSU. The UTSUfest was everything I envisioned and more.

The UTSU had heard feedback that there should be a bigger headliner. In order to secure an international headliner, we needed more funding from sponsorship than in previous years. In order to achieve this goal, we had a team of eight Orientation team leaders instead of just two Orientation Coordinators. This included sponsorship coordinators (2), marketing



coordinators (2) and logistic/recruitment coordinators (2). By securing more sponsorship funding than in previous years we were able to secure Muhammad Jaco, also known as Lupe Fiasco.

## **2. HOMECOMING**

Given the political climate at UofT, I thought it was important to have an event that brought all students together. I pitched the idea of a Homecoming during my presentation at the first Board of Directors meeting. I successfully chaired the Homecoming committee and worked with many students across the college student societies, professional faculty societies and other universities to make this event happen. This event was part of the #1UofTLove campaign, broadening the Unions involvement with athletics on campus. Homecoming 2013 or #UofTHoco13 was extremely successful and I thank individuals in the committee (Kevin, Chantal, Andrew, Maddie, Shaka, Tom, Herun, Anthony, Ryan, Khrstyna, Grayce, Tahsin, Munib - apologize if I am missing anyone, and especially Cameron Wathey) and staff at Varsity Blues Athletics (Ivan Canete) for pulling off a large scale event in just six weeks. My hope for next year is that the Trinity College Meeting and the Engineering Society joins us in the festivities.

We learned what many of us knew all long but had been forgotten. UofT has school spirit and we are proud of our school. During orientation we are used to competing against each other but a sporting event like Homecoming really brings it home that our degree says “University of Toronto”.

## **3. ALTERNATIVE AFTER PARTY**

A new event that we tried this year was “The Alternative After-Party”; this event was for students who for any reason did not wish to participate at the night club event. Students who participated were able to enjoy themselves with a movie screening, herbal-shisha, popcorn and s’mores. I recommend planning for this event starts earlier. Working with other student groups such as the Muslim Students Association will help make the event more successful. Thank you to Noor Baig, Khalid Khan, Umair Saeed and Farhia Farah,

Overall the UTSUfest-13' was great, having it on front campus really made the event special.

#### **4. CLUBS TRAINING**

Clubs play an essential role on campus; they provide UofT students with a sense of community. The UTSU plays a huge role with clubs; allocating funding, recognizing clubs and teaching clubs skills and tips they should know. This year we introduced a clubs survey that generated feedback for services, rentals and workshops to help us improve our services. We had more clubs training during this summer than in previous years. Around 350 clubs were trained.

#### **5. Pedestrianize St. George Street**

This year, the Community Action Commission built on past goals and initiatives from the previous year commission and VP External. The pedestrianization of St. George Street is a multi-year project. This year we continued the example set by previous Commissions and VP Externals in advocating for the closure of St. George Street. We achieved incremental successes in realizing this goal. The second annual St. George Street Festival was held on Sept 10, 2013 that drew thousands of pedestrians onto St. George street. The initiative was a success in using the Street Festival as an organic showcase of showing the benefits of a closed street. The permanent closure of Wilcocks Street has received positive feedback from students and the community at large. The UTSU has this year alone hosted more events on this common area than it has in the past. This outdoor area has seen a definite increase in usability by both students and staff and will hopefully act as an example of the benefits of outdoor student spaces. The Commission's hope is that it will continue to work with the other UTSU portfolios in increasing awareness of pedestrianization, holding more events on Willcocks Commons, continuing the UTSU Street Festival closure, and working with both internal and external stakeholders in achieving small successes towards the ultimate goal of a complete closure.

#### **6. All-Way CrossWalk**

The commission has put forward plans to explore the possibility of an all-way crosswalk at the intersection of St. George Street and Harbord. This intersection is arguably the busiest on campus and is the epicenter of Robarts library, Rotman Commerce, and the Faculty Arts and Science. We have advocated for an all-way crosswalk to improve safety, increase the efficiency of students traveling across campus and as a small step towards the overall goal of pedestrianizing St. George Street.

## **7. International Day of Action Against Death Trap**

The collapse of the Rana Plaza factory in Bangladesh in April 2013 led to the death of over 1100 men, women and children in what is considered by many the deadliest structural collapse in modern times. The Commission worked with other interested parties and stakeholders in carrying out a day of action. On June 29, 2013 individuals came together to voice their concern for businesses to take responsibility for their participation in a cycle of unsafe working conditions for garment industry workers. This was the first protest I organized and I was thrilled, I think protests are a great exercise of a democratic society. We protested to raise awareness, inform the public and speak out against a complete lack of understanding for garment workers. The initiative was fueled by the lack of participation by some businesses in signing the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh. The accord has to date been signed by 150 apparel companies from 20 countries. I was able to collaborate with the Toronto and York Region Labor council along with Ryerson Students Union and the York Federation of Students.

## **8. Garment Industry Speaker Series**

This is my last event and I believe that this internationally renowned leader will be a great way to close an amazing year, the founder and chairperson of BRAC Sir Fazle Hasan Abed. BRAC is the largest NGO in the world that has expanded into a world wide enterprise that specializes in a multitude of issues: women rights, poverty, micro-finance, sustainability, education, agriculture and community empowerment among others. The talk will focus on the garment industry and discuss Sir Abed opinion on the Rana Plaza

collapse one year later. Sir Abed's opinion in this matter will provide a refreshing account on the matter from someone who is not only from Bangladesh but also the surviving Bank from the incident was BRAC Bank. The event will take place on Saturday April 26, 2014 in the Hart House Music Room.

## **9. Campaign Against Unpaid Internships**

The campaign against unpaid internships has been an issue that the Commission has been advocating for several months now. The Commission has been engaging with students and holding regular discussions with various stakeholders. We have also been actively promoting petitions for students to sign up. Although there is still room for continuing this cause, the noise that we have been making has been paying off. The Ministry of Labour has taken some steps to curb this problem, most recently with the intervention of the government in the magazine industry by stopping unpaid internships. We continue to call on the government to enforce and protect those individuals that are in unpaid internships across all industries and year round. We have and will continue to engage with all levels of government to proactively take up this issue.

## **10. Minimum Wage Increase**

The Commission has been advocating for the increase in the minimum wage to \$14. We have spent our time and energy engaging with students over the last several months and discussing the challenges faced by many individuals. The cost of living has increased faster than the rate of inflation, and so has many other needs such as transportation and tuition. We are hopeful, however, since the Liberal government has approved a minimum wage increase for the first time since 2010. Though the increase to \$11 was very small, we hope that further increases will be promised by parties if there is an election. We campaigned on the 14th of every month with fellow student unions and labour unions.

## **11. Fall Reading Week**

Advocating for a fall reading week has also been an initiative that the commission has supported this year. This is an issue that effects all students and should be implemented as soon as possible. Currently, Scarborough Campus has a fall reading week, St. George has a two day break and Mississauga has no break. The Commission has teamed up with other stakeholders especially mental health groups, to promote the necessity for students to regroup, reflect and catch up on work before the regular exam and midterm season starts.

## **12. Final Note**

Finally, in closing I would like to thank all of the volunteers, students, leaders, staff members of the Community Action Commission and others that have made my time at the UTSU an enjoyable one. I have learned a lot of things in my role first as the Vice-President Campus Life and then as the Vice-President External for the UTSU. I want to thank Igor Samardzic and Chantelle Sukhu for not only being the most boss orientation coordinators on this campus for the UTSU, but even better friends. I would also like to take this opportunity to say something to my fellow executives, I think we surprised a lot of people this year and got things done. Your support and hard work through the times we had to play defense or run offense is what got us through the past 12 months. Lastly, Sandy Hudson, thank you for being a great mentor this past year. Your dedication to accessible education, your ability to listen to others before offering solutions has helped me learn a lot.

It has been an incredible year, and I wish the newly-elected Directors and Executive members all the best for the upcoming year.

**In Solidarity,**  
**Onik Sultan Khan**  
**Vice-President External**  
**University of Toronto Students' Union**  
**Local 98 Canadian Federation of Students**

# **FINAL REPORT: VICE-PRESIDENT EQUITY**

## **In This Report:**

- 1. Social Justice And Equity Commission**
- 2. Expression Against Oppression**
- 3. Events**
- 4. Committee On Mental Health**
- 5. World University Service Of Canada Committee**
- 6. Student Societies Summit**
- 7. Campus And Community Events**
- 8. Final Notes**

## **1. SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EQUITY COMMISSION**

This year, the Social Justice and Equity Commission has been an incredible space for students to get involved in discussions and events about issues that affect our campus and communities. This year, the Commission created the Committee on Mental Health and successfully collaborated with many campus groups on various initiatives, including the largest eXpression Against Oppression event series ever! It has been a pleasure to see a growing number of regular attendees, who have participated in planning and promoting the various initiatives that the Commission has worked on this year.

Unfortunately, this year has also included numerous incidents that have threatened our campus community. In September, the Muslim Students' Association (MSA) approached the UTSU regarding concerns about an event featuring Robert Spencer, who has been banned from the United Kingdom and is infamous for his racist, Islamophobic and xenophobic comments. We worked with the MSA to ask the campus group that had invited him to reconsider, and to ask that the University administration to intervene if they did not. The group cancelled the event; the administration, however, refused to take stance against hate speech on campus. Shortly after this incident, the UTSU and many others became aware of an article that quoted University of Toronto lecturer David Gilmour, who indicated that he was not interested in teaching books by non-heterosexual writers, women and individuals of Chinese decent. Several students approached the UTSU and spoke of experiences of being marginalized in his classroom. We also saw the presence of men's rights activists on our campus continue to grow, the vandalism of a banner hung on campus with homophobic language, and many other incidents that demonstrate the necessity of continuing the fight against all forms of oppression and assert the right of all students to a safe, inclusive campus.

Thank you to all the members of the Social Justice and Equity Commission and the many groups we've been able to work with throughout the year,

for volunteering their time, ideas and perspectives to build a better University for all.

## **2. EXPRESSION AGAINST OPPRESSION**

eXpression Against Oppression (XAO) occurs twice a year, and seeks to educate and engage students in various local and global social justice and equity issues. This year, the Social Justice and Equity Commission sought to organize a variety of events, providing students with numerous avenues to get involved. Overall, eXpression Against Oppression was a great success!

### **October 21 | Wen-Do Women's Self Defence Workshop**

This event was co-hosted with the Community Safety Office, and featured a free, practical women's self-defense workshop and a discussion about combating gender-based violence on campus.

### **October 23 | VisibiliTEA: Queer Women at UofT**

VisibiliTEA was a follow up event to a queer women's social that was hosted during Queer Orientation. Tea and snacks were served over a discussion about the visibility of queer women at the University of Toronto. The Social Justice and Equity Commission collaborated with LGBTOUT for this event.

### **October 24 | Night of Expression coffeehouse**

This event featured a variety of performances that celebrated the ways in which individuals express themselves and are empowered to resist oppression. The evening included a drag performance, spoken word, story telling, singing and much more!

### **October 28 | Capoeira Workshop**

The UTSU collaborated with BRAZUCA (Brazilian Culture in Canada) to host this event, which was facilitated by Capoeira Malês. It featured a free workshop allowing attendees to learn the basics of the Brazilian martial art, and included a tutorial on playing several traditional instruments and a discussion about the history of capoeira.

### **October 29 | Film Screening: Venus Noire**

Venus Noire is based on the true story of Saartjie Baartman. This event was hosted in collaboration with the African Students' Association

### **October 30 | What's on your mind? 5 Buck Lunch**

This event was co-hosted with Health and Wellness and in collaboration with Active Minds, the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students, the Centre for Women and Trans People, Campus Health Initiative, Healthy U Crew, Let's Talk Health, Move U, Peers are Here, Powerful Minds, and Students for Barrier-Free Access. It was held at Hart House during its biweekly 5 Buck Lunch, and featured a mental health resource fair and several activities to get students engaged in discussion about the

promotion of mental health on campus.

### **February 3 | Crafty Crabs: Jarring your Anxieties**

This event was a crafting workshop held in collaboration with Crafty Crabs, a new peer support group for folks living with social anxiety that is based at the Centre for Women and Trans People.

### **February 12 | Night of Expression: Celebrating the Experiences of Immigrant and Refugee Students**

This Night of eXpression was another coffeehouse night, this time focused on providing space for newcomers to Canada to talk about their experiences. It was co-hosted with the local World University Service of Canada (WUSC) committees at the University of Toronto, through which several refugee students are sponsored yearly.

### **February 13 | Screening of Fruitvale Station**

Fruitvale Station tells the story of Ryan Coogler, who was killed by the police at a subway station in Oakland, California. This event was co-hosted with the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students and the Black Students' Association, in recognition of Black History Month.

## **3. EVENTS**

In addition to eXpression Against Oppression, the Social Justice and Equity Commission was also able to organize many other events, often in partnership with other equity-seeking groups both on and off campus.

### **December 6 | The National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women and Children**

The UTSU assisted in organizing a vigil for December 6, the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women and Children, in collaboration with the Status of Women Office, Sexual and Gender Diversity Office, and a number of other campus organizations. I also helped to facilitate a discussion about taking action to end violence against women and children.

### **Late June | Pride**

We worked with students, staff and faculty across the University in planning various events to recognize and celebrate the Pride festival as a community. The UTSU participated in the tri-campus Pride Planning Committee, hosted the highly successful second annual Pride Picnic, and built a float for the University of Toronto contingent in the Pride Parade, in collaboration with the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students, the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union.

### **September 19-30 | Queer Orientation**

The UTSU worked with the Sexual and Gender Diversity Office and a committee that included the other central students' unions and many queer



and trans groups across campus to organize the annual Queer Orientation. The Union hosted Ally Night, a discussion about being an ally in the LGBTQ context; organized a University of Toronto contingent in the AIDS Walk for Life; collaborated with LBGTOUT to host a queer services and groups fair; and helped organize the Queer Women on Campus social.

#### **September 23 | disOrientation Panel Discussion**

We worked with the Ontario Public Interest Group (OPIRG) and a number of other groups to organize disOrientation, an alternative orientation that focuses on engaging students in political, environment and social justice issues. The UTSU organized an event called *Free Education: Is It Possible?*, a panel discussion about the possibilities of a fully-funded education system and existing barriers to accessing post-secondary education, in which I, and Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario Chairperson Alastair Woods participated.

#### **December 5 | International Women's Day event**

The Social Justice and Equity Commission co-hosted an event with the Equity Studies Students' Union (ESSU), in recognition of International Women's Day. It featured a self-defence workshop, guided meditation session, and an engaging discussion about community safety at the University of Toronto.

#### **March 17-23 | Recognition of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination**

The UTSU worked with other members of the Advisory Committee of the Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Office to hold an event in recognition of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and to celebrate the efforts of students, staff and faculty engaged in anti-racism work.

### **4. COMMITTEE ON MENTAL HEALTH**

This year, the Social Justice and Equity Commission created the UofT Committee on Mental Health in response to a motion to address issues of mental health on campus, which was submitted to the penultimate general meeting of the UTSU. The Committee includes individual students who are interested in promoting mental health and representatives from many campus groups engaged in advocacy around this issue. It has provided a safe space for many to express their personal experiences with Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), and navigating the limited resources available for students with mental health concerns, and to develop recommendations for the administration to better serve students. The Committee also hosted the "What's on your mind?" 5 Buck Lunch, and worked on a "How happy are you?" campaign during October, encouraging students to choose a number between 1 and 10 that represented their current level of happiness, and starting a discussion about mental wellbeing.

Members of the Committee also met several times with Janine Robb, Executive Director of Health and Wellness at the University of Toronto, and staff of CAPS, to express student concerns with mental health services and support, and to develop a strategy to address them. The University of Toronto recently created the Provostial Committee on Mental Health, made up largely of members of the upper administration, which will be developing a mental health strategy over the coming year. The Committee on Mental Health will continue to work to ensure student voices are heard, and to push for a fall reading week and increased funding for CAPS as part of this strategy.

## **5. WORLD UNIVERSITY SERVICE OF CANADA COMMITTEE**

Every year, the UTSU sponsors a student through the Student Refugee Program organized by World University Service of Canada (WUSC). The student receives permanent resident status on arrival, and the UTSU's WUSC committee works to facilitate their enrollment in courses, a space in residence, and other aspects of their transition to Canada. This year's student is from Syria, and has been very active in the Committee since his arrival.

This year, the UTSU opened up the Committee to include students who are interested in being involved but are not members of the Board of Directors. We also expanded the mandate of the Committee to include more collaboration with the other local committees at the University of Toronto, and hosted a performance night featuring the experiences of immigrant and refugee students as part of eXpression Against Oppression. The event was a great success, with many students, including members of the WUSC committee, taking the stage to tell their personal stories. We look forward to the continued growth of the WUSC Committee over the next year.

## **6. STUDENT SOCIETIES SUMMIT**

This year, the University administration created the Student Societies Summit, which included two representatives from each undergraduate college and faculty council at the University of Toronto St. George campus, the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) and the UTSU, purportedly to address conflict between divisional societies and the UTSU. From the outset of this process, the UTSU expressed concern about the structure of the Summit, particularly that many groups were excluded, including the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS) and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union, and the role of the University administration in creating and administering the process. However, Agnes So, Vice-President University Affairs, and I were chosen to represent the UTSU, and we attended every meeting before deciding to withdraw from the process in early March.

As the meetings progressed, Agnes and I grew increasingly concerned about the structure of the Summit, the role of the administration, and the threat to the autonomy of the UTSU and all student societies at the University of Toronto. The exclusion of the aforementioned unions, our clubs and levy

groups, and our individual members made for an unbalanced discussion in which the perspective that was overwhelmingly heard was that of the college and faculty council representatives. These groups have vastly different stated mandates than that of the UTSU, and also stood to gain from discussions that could lead to increased funds for their societies at the expense of the work of the Union. This imbalance made negotiation difficult, in addition to the fact that individual students and campus groups who benefit from the work of the UTSU in various tangible ways were not permitted to participate, nor were the SCSU and APUS, which also had differing perspectives to contribute.

We reported these concerns to the Executive Committee, to the Board of Directors, to the faculty representatives on the Summit, and to members of the senior administration. The faculty representatives acknowledged some of these concerns, but stated that they did not create the Summit or determine which groups would be represented within the process. The University administration chose the faculty representatives and established the structure of the Summit, which led to a further concern about its role in the process. The University administration cannot be viewed as impartial or unbiased; the UTSU and other central students' unions must inevitably oppose the administration from time to time, in advocating for our members. This year, the University expressed frustration with the Union's work on flat fees, in particular, when we succeeded in altering the unfair fee structure and saving some of our members thousands. For this reason, it was clearly problematic for the University administration to orchestrate a discussion in which the outcome might be the recommendation of policies that could limit the ability of the UTSU to advocate for its membership.

We also identified many other concerns with the Summit process. Substantive terms of reference were never provided, and the UTSU could not in good conscience continue to participate in a process in which the specific purpose and potential outcomes were not clearly defined. The bias of some of the faculty representatives was also made apparent, as they frequently singled the UTSU out for criticism of policies that were consistent with those of the other divisional representatives and often attempted to steer the discussion toward specific conclusions. The UTSU, alone, was often called upon to respond to aggressive questioning that was difficult to prepare for as the discussion often deviated from the agenda distributed in advance, on the whim of the faculty representatives. Several of the participating divisions privately commented on this clear bias to Agnes and me.

Lastly, our ability to engage in the discussion was continuously undermined, not only by the faculty members, but also by some of the student society representatives. Despite being chosen by the Executive Committee to speak for the UTSU at the Summit, the legitimacy of Agnes and I as UTSU representatives was consistently called into question, and our sometimes-differing opinions and stated concerns about the structure of the Summit were construed as a failure to understand what some other participants considered to be the "real issues." The equity and advocacy work of the UTSU was mocked and dismissed, as was the important work of UTSU clubs and levy

groups, which was exacerbated by the fact that they were not permitted to participate and speak for themselves.

After receiving hundreds of petitions from our members at the University of Toronto Mississauga and the subsequent withdrawal of the UTMSU, the UTSU Board of Directors had an extensive discussion in which Agnes and I, other executives and many members of the Board expressed their concerns, concluding by consensus that the UTSU must consult its members as to how to proceed. Our membership overwhelmingly stated that they did not believe that the UTSU should not participate in discussions in which members of the administration, or student societies with differing mandates could influence its bylaws, policies or fees, and that changes to the structure of the Union by its members. For this reason, and for the reasons stated above, the UTSU withdrew from the Summit.

The UTSU is currently developing an alternative process that seeks to resolve the issues raised in the Summit without the problematic structure and undue influence of the University administration. This is due to begin before the end of April. All college and faculty councils will be invited and encouraged to participate, in addition to UTSU clubs and levy groups, individual members, and other undergraduate students' unions at the University of Toronto. At the first meeting, the terms of reference and structure of this process will be further developed by attendees. We look forward to continuing these discussions in an open, democratic forum that is accessible to all members.

## **7. CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY EVENTS**

This year, I've had the opportunity to participate in numerous events and address several groups in my capacity as Vice-President Equity and as Women's Commissioner on the Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario Executive.

### **August 30 | Moving Forward Scavenger Hunt**

Vice President-University Affairs and I were asked to address students participating in a scavenger hunt organized by the Moving Forward program of Accessibility Services. We spoke about the services, events and advocacy work of the UTSU, and opportunities for students to get involved.

### **September 16 | Faith and Philosophical Leaders Dinner**

This event is organized annually by the Multi-Faith Centre. I was invited to address a number of faith, spiritual and philosophical-based clubs about opportunities for collaboration, and the work that the UTSU continues to do in support of their organizations. Sandra Carnegie-Douglas, the Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Officer and Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President Student Life also gave remarks at this event.

### **October 17 | Live Well to Learn Well Health Summit**

At this event, I gave a presentation on how to access clubs funding and other resources of the UTSU to students interested in developing initiatives to promote mental health at the University of Toronto. I was also able to speak about the mental health advocacy of the UTSU and connect with students who were interested in joining the Committee on Mental Health.

#### **December 15 | Nelson Mandela Memorial Tribute**

This event was organized by a coalition of student, community and faith groups to honour the life and legacy of Nelson Mandela. I had the privilege of giving a personal tribute to Nelson Mandela, alongside the Consul General of the South African High Commission and various other organizations. My remarks were focused on his strong commitment to truly accessible education as part of building an equitable society.

#### **February 26 | Unpaid Internships Rally**

President Munib Sajjad and I both gave remarks at a rally for action on unpaid internships, organized by Students Against Unpaid Internship Scams. We were invited to do so because of the important work the UTSU and the Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario has done over the past year in advocating for the rights of interns. The rally was held before a pre-budget consultation held by Ontario Minister of Finance Charles Sousa.

#### **March 27 | Presentation to House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance**

I was invited to address the Finance Committee in regards to a motion put forward to undertake a study of youth unemployment and make recommendations to the Government of Canada. I was able to speak about the work that the UTSU has done on unpaid internships, and to provide recommendations to address the underemployment of students and young people in Canada.

### **8. FINAL NOTE**

Thank you to everyone - members of the executive, board members who got involved, commission members, all the groups we collaborated with. Really proud of the work we've been able to do this year to educate and engage.

Many issues that occurred this year show the importance of the continued existence of a central students union that is progressive, works to safeguard the rights of students and fight for a truly equitable and accessible university and greater society. This is defined in our mandate and truly underpins all the work that I and the rest of the executive has done this year. Everything from accessibility to education - fighting against flat fees and further tuition hikes and starting a conversation about free education, fighting against unpaid internships and to increase the minimum wage. It includes training hundreds of clubs and levy groups, board members, orientation leaders.

Advocating for better mental health services and support for students, challenging stigma, making sure that the stress caused by high tuition fees, large class sizes, inadequate support is part of the conversation

This is tied to everything we do, from offering cost saving services and ensuring our events are affordable. Look forward to building an even stronger students' union and continuing this work as president with the incoming executive committee and board.

**In Solidarity,  
Yolen Vice-President Equity  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
Local 98 Canadian Federation of Students**

## **FINAL REPORT: VICE-PRESIDENT CAMPUS LIFE**

- 1. Events**
- 2. Campus Groups**
- 3. Final Notes**

### **1. EVENTS**

#### **i. Culture Show: A Trip Around the World**

On Wednesday, March 26, the UTSU hosted the Second Annual Culture Show in collaboration with the New College Student Council. The event was largely organized by the UTSU associates. This event showcased and celebrated the talent and diversity within the UofT campus community. Performances included various vocal, instrumental, and dance performance by the South Asian Alliance, the Tamil Students' Association, the Tibetan Association, Organization of Latin American Students, the Nigerian Students' Association, Dennis Tuyishime, Kevin Lunianga, the Korean Students' Association, Chantelle Sarika, and Powerful Minds. In addition to performances, students enjoyed a variety of culture foods. Not only was this event a huge success, it also raised fund for WUSC. We hope this event will continue to be an annual tradition, continuously taking on creative new ways to showcase the diversity on our campuses.

#### **ii. UTSU's Got You**

This year, the UTSU reached out to more students than ever before through our exam destressors. In addition to the exam sessions that typically take place in December and April, we added new sessions in our November midterm period. Together we worked together to provide late-night snacks for students, including sandwiches, fruits, coffee, tea, noodles and granola bars. We also visited more study spaces on campus, making sure we reached out to as many colleges and professional faculties. In addition to spaces on the St. George campus, this year UTSU's Got You hosted an exam destressor at the University of Toronto Mississauga. Thank you to all the Board members, Blue Crew volunteers and associates that helped out during these sessions.

November 4, 5, 6, 7, 2013: Robarts Library

December 9, 2013: Gerstein & Robarts Library

December 11, 2013: Pharmacy, Sanford Fleming & Robarts Library

December 16, 2013: D.G. Ivey & Robarts Library  
December 17, 2013: Cat's Eye Lounge, Kelly & Robarts Library  
April 8, 2014: UTSU's Got You Kick-off - Free Ice Cream Social ft. Ben & Jerry's  
April 9, 2014: Kelly & Robarts Library  
April 10, 2014: Gerstein & Robarts Library  
April 14, 2014: Sanford Fleming & Robarts Library  
April 15, 2014: Hazel Mccallion Academic Learning Center at the University of Toronto Mississauga

### **iii. Montreal Reading Week Trip**

This year, the UTSU, University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union, Scarborough Campus Students' Union, and the Ryerson Students' Union worked with TNT Tours to deliver the Montreal Reading Week Trip to students. This trip broke all-time records, with over 650 students attending between the four campuses. In addition to free daily tours of Montreal, optional activities included skiing, snowboarding, tubing, skating, and a tour of Quebec City. We are looking forward to bring another successful and safe trip for students next year!

### **iv. Winter Week of Welcome**

The third annual Winter Week of Welcome was held from January 13-18, 2014, welcoming new and returning students to the spring semester. Reaching out to as many students across campus, we saw larger turnouts than any previous year. A huge thank you to the dozens of Blue Crew volunteers, Board members and associates that helped us pull off this hectic, though enticing week.

### **v. Pancake Brunch**

The Winter Week of Welcome kicked off with a pancake brunch in Wilson Lounge. This event served over 600 students, giving them an opportunity to look towards the exciting events ahead.

### **vi. Clubs & Career Fair**

This year the UTSU collaborated with the Varsity Center and the Career Center to host the second Clubs & Career Fair at the Varsity Dome. This event brought together two major annual events on campus, drawing in over 1,300 students, eager to get involved on campus as well as those looking for a summer job. Free intermural sports were



offered in addition to free skating in the Varsity Arena. We look forward to more collaboration in the future.

**vii. Winter Concert**

This year, the Winter Concert featured the local Juno-award winning Toronto band, July Talk. The event saw a record-breaking turnout, filling up the Hart House Great Hall with over 300 students. Thank you to all the volunteers and staff that helped out with this event, ensuring a smooth night of live music.

**viii. Varsity Blues Volleyball Games**

The final event of the Winter Week of Welcome was in collaboration with the Varsity Blues #bleedblue campaign. Students watched as the Women's team beat the No.1 Ottawa GeeGee's in the fifth set with a 3-2 lead. Go Blues Go!

**ix. Unity Ball**

On Friday, February 28, the UTSU hosted the Fifth Annual Unity Ball, filling up the Chestnut Residence Ballroom with hundreds of campus clubs. Taking on an Oscar red carpet theme, the Unity Ball transformed into the Unity Ball Awards! The night included a three course halal dinner, a candy bar, a red carpet photo booth, and live music by DJ SoulSkank. This year the UTSU held a nomination period online for outstanding clubs and individual awards. Below is a list of award recipients:

- a. Academic and Student Rights Commission Award:  
Transitional Year Programme
- b. Outstanding Publication:  
The Muslim Voice
- c. Sustainability Commission Award:  
Toronto 350
- d. Outstanding Creative Arts  
Fly with Origami, Live your Dream  
UofT Bookeeping Education Enthusiast Society
- e. Social Justice and Equity Commission Award:  
Orphan Sponsorship Program

- f. Outstanding Graphics/Promotions:  
Design in Design
- g. Outstanding New Club Award:  
University of Toronto Public Speaking Club
- h. Outstanding Cultural Club:  
Indian Students' Society  
Organization of Latin American Students
- i. Outstanding Academic Union:  
Health Studies Student Union
- j. Outstanding School Spirit:  
South Asian Alliance
- k. Outstanding Executive Member:  
Mahsima Tahvoosi, Powerful Minds at UofT  
Widya Salim, Economic Students' Association
- l. Event of the Year:  
UTChinese 2014 New Year Concert, UTChinese Network  
Thai Pongal 2014: Tamil Students' Association
- m. Outstanding Executive Team:  
Chinese Undergraduate Association at UofT
- n. People's Choice Award:  
Greek Students' Association  
Healing Sounds of Music

## **2. CAMPUS GROUPS**

### **i. Clubs Recognition**

This year, the UTSU provided recognition to over 300 clubs, allowing clubs access to UTSU club services, including funding, photocopying, discounted banner printing, equipment rentals, consultation and executive training sessions.

### **ii. Club Funding**

This year we increased clubs funding and allocated five different types of funding: Summer Funding, Long-Term Funding, Short-term Funding,

Start-Up Funding, as well as Reconsideration Funding. The St. George Clubs Committee, comprised of Executive members, board members and community members, meets regularly throughout the year to discuss and review funding applications. By mid March, we were able to allocate any leftover funds to clubs who demonstrated need for additional funding as a result of unforeseen circumstances.

### **iii. 2013-2014 Funding Deadlines**

Summer Funding Deadline: Friday, July 5, 2013

Long-Term Funding Dealine: Friday, October 18, 2013

Start-Up Funding Deadline: Friday, January 17, 2014

Short-Term Funding Deadline: Friday, February 7, 2014

Individual Academic Endeavour Funding Deadline: Monday, March 3, 2014

Reconsideration Funding Deadline: Friday, March 1, 2014

### **iv. 2014-2015 Funding Deadlines**

Summer Funding Deadline: Friday, July 4, 2014

Long-Term Funding Deadline: Friday, October 17, 2014

Start-Up Funding Deadline: Friday, January 16, 2015

Short-Term Funding Deadline: Friday, March 6, 2015

### **v. Clubs Training**

In order for clubs to be eligible for funding, they must receive UTSU recognition and attend at least one Clubs Training Session every fiscal year. This is an opportunity for members to learn about the UTSU's structure, events, campaigns and services. Clubs also receive equity training and learn how to put together an adequate funding application. This year there were more training sessions offered than any of the previous years. Below are the dates for the training sessions held this year:

Friday, June 28, 2013

Sunday, June 30, 2013

Sunday, July 21, 2013

Sunday, August 25, 2013

Saturday, July 13, 2013

Saturday, September 21, 2013

Saturday, September 28, 2013

Friday, October 11, 2013

Thursday, December 5, 2013

Friday, January 10, 2013

### **vi. Clubs Committee**

Thank you to all the members of the St. George Clubs Committee for contributing their time and energy in allocating club funding, reviewing

clubs policy and creating new ideas for services and campaigns. I'd also like to thank our Clubs Coordinator: Vita Carlino for diligently communicating with our clubs to ensure a maximum allocation for each application. Thank you to committee members: Zijian Yang, Shafquat Arefeen, Peter Shao, Lydia To, Llyvell Gomes, Lynn Scherloski, Nadiv Hossain, Nia-Imara Barberousse, Cameron Wathey and Munib Sajjad.

### **3. Final Note**

First and foremost, I want to take the time out to thank all my fellow Executives, Directors, Staff, Associates, Blue Crew Volunteers, and members of the Campus Life Commission for their outstanding contribution towards improving student life on the University of Toronto campus community. Without you, I would never have been able to host the campus-wide events I did this year, nor would I have as much fun.

I also want to extend a huge thanks to our campus clubs and sister students' unions for collaborating with us on so many successful events this year, whether they showcased culture, academics or athletics. Without you, the University of Toronto Students' Union would not be as diverse as it is.

To the newly appointed Vice-President Campus Life, I would like to leave you with some words of wisdom. You may not know this yet, but you have quite possibly the biggest portfolio amongst the Executive Committee. (There's a reason why you have two associates!) Remember to always think BIG when it comes to events and consider all the resources you have on campus. Never be afraid to aim high, just keep your head held high as well. Don't get discouraged and continue to strive.

It has been an incredible year, and I look forward to seeing the new 2014-2015 team of Directors and Executives lead our student's union to new heights and continue to represent the students who elected us here at the University of Toronto.

In Solidarity,  
Yasmeen Emadi  
Vice-President Campus Life (2013-2014)  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
Local 98 of the Canadian Federation of Students

## **FINAL REPORT: UTMSU DESIGNATE**

- 1. Affordable and Accessible Post-Secondary Education System**
- 2. International Orientation**
- 3. Winter Residence Fees**
- 4. OHIP for International Students**
- 5. Split Tuition Fees**
- 6. Greater Transit Access (GTA) campaign**
- 7. The Hikes Stop Here**
- 8. International Students' Magazine**
- 9. Food on Campus**
- 10. Fair Elections Act**
- 11. Student Societies Summit**
- 12. UTM Governance Process**
- 13. \$14 Minimum Wage**

### **1. Affordable and Accessible Post-Secondary Education System**

Nancy Naylor, Deputy Minister at the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities, spoke on the changes in post-secondary education that the department rolled out at the end of the year at the CFS AGM. These included increasing the threshold for flat fees to 80 per cent by 2016, eliminating graduating and completion fees, enforcing a split tuition fee model and eliminating deferral fees. I had the opportunity to speak to her about those issues. I raised the issue of professional program fees. Professional program fees are yet another barrier to post-secondary education as the government allows these fees to increase at a much faster rate. Domestic students in these programs pay approximately \$14,000 a year and international students, whose fees are completely deregulated pay four times that fee. Students who enter these programs in their third year or later are required to pay extra tuition fees in “back charges” for second year and first year. These program fees also contribute to mental health concerns. Students are forced to take five courses per semester. This puts a tremendous strain on students as most of them are forced to work while in school. I told her that it was important for the government to do more to assist students struggling in these programs. I will continue to lobby the MTCU, so that they enforce this rule.

Fees for domestic and international students in professional programs are set to increase by five per cent and 11 per cent, respectively. This is unacceptable and ridiculous.

## **2. International Orientation**

International Orientation was held on September 14. For the first year ever, it was held in collaboration with the International Centre and Residence Council. The turnout was much better in comparison to previous years. The Department of Hospitality & Retail Services along with Chartwells sponsored the breakfast. We conducted information workshops in the first portion. In the second portion, we had an Amazing Race, which was conducted by Residence Council. The day ended at Bowlerama West.

## **3. Winter Residence Fees**

On September 25, I facilitated a winter residence forum in Oscar Petersen Hall. Students agreed that the Union should look into the following two options: that food be included in the \$400 they are required to pay in order to stay in the residence over the winter break, and that students who live in the townhouses have the option to opt out of the food portion of the fee.

In a conversation with the department of Residence and Student Life, we learned that there were no to decrease the fee. Through Places4Students, landlords were contacted in the surrounding areas. Over the winter break, landlords were willing to offer students a room from anywhere ranging from \$300 to \$375. At least one meal per day was offered to students. This is a great alternative for students. More information is on our website. Although we were unable to eliminate winter residence fees at UTM, this was a great alternative. Residence fees will increase by five per cent this year and we will continue to lobby the administration for these fees to be eliminated.

## **4. OHIP for International Students**

From February 10 to 14, we collected 500+ surveys for this campaign. International Students currently contribute \$3 billion to the economy, 70 per cent of them remain in Canada after completing post-secondary education and the government recently implemented a \$825 fee each international student attending post-secondary education in Ontario. For these reasons, and because adequate health care is a basic human

right, we believe that international students should be under the provincial medicare plan. In 1994, they were removed from OHIP eligibility. In PEI, BC and NL, international students are currently under their provincial plans and we believe that it should be the same for Ontario.

## **5. Split Tuition Fees**

University of Toronto charges students a 1.5 per cent interest fee, that begins in November if students have not paid off their tuition fees for that school year. The administration disguises this fee as a service charge. This interest fee amounts to 19.54 per cent annually, more than your average credit card. The University made over one million dollars from this fee alone. We lobbied the government and the university to eliminate this interest fee. Students on OSAP will be paying additional interest fees when they graduate. Since the majority of student on OSAP are marginalized, this interest fee acts as yet another barrier. In December 2013, the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities announced that all Universities would have to implement a Split Tuition fee model. Tuition fees will now be due in September and January. They will also be in line with OSAP distributions. Under this new model, the university will no longer receive as much money with the current interest fees model. However, the new policy does not prevent the university from charging deferral fees. Throughout the summer, it is imperative that the unions on all three campuses lobby for UofT to have no deferral fees moving forward.

## **6. Greater Transit Access (GTA) Campaign**

The GTA in the above name stands for Greater Transit Access. Student Unions in the GTA are collectively working on a GTA Transit Pass. At UTM, the U-Pass is an amazing service that we lobbied for and is currently being used as precedent. The majority of students, who attend UTM, are from Mississauga. However, there is a large population that commutes from surrounding cities. It is therefore imperative that transit for all students is accessible and affordable. UTMSU asked students to fill out approximately 1000 surveys to consult students on a way forward.

## **7. The Hikes Stop Here**

This campaign was created in response to the New Tuition-Fee Framework. The Ontario Liberal government released a New Tuition-Fee Framework outlining a plan to raise tuition fees three to five per cent each year for the next four years. At UTM, we have asked students to fill out surveys to get a sense of how students feel about tuition fees on campus.

Early in September, a few art students helped to chalk a timeline of tuition fees along the CCT walkway. It was well received and students voiced their concerns that tuition fees made them angry.

During a Halloween Carnival, on October 31, we held a funeral called Rest In Peace Affordable Education. Students were asked to write their debts on the debt wall, and were given material about The Hikes Stop Here campaign.

From February 24 through 28, we continued the petition drive for Hikes Stop Here. We collected approximately 600 petitions during that week.

## **8. International Students' Magazine**

We are in the midst of launching a new website is to provide International Students with information at a click of a button. The site will include information on the following: legalities (citizenship and immigration), transportation, events, a forum, jobs etc. The website will be launched in the fall semester. This magazine will be launched by the end of this month.

## **9. Food on Campus**

Last fall, I encouraged the food services department to implement \$5, \$6, and \$7 meal plans in the Temporary Food Court. In a recent meeting I advised them that there should also be combos in all other food courts as well, to make food on campus more affordable.

On March 13, I attended the Food Services Committee Meeting where we learned that the Food Services contract with Chartwells would be extended until June 2015, and then a request for proposals (RFP) process would begin. The first objective of the RFP process is to look into if we can run in-house operations moving forward. This is great news because UTMSU and UTSU have been fighting for in-house



operations for many years. Hopefully, we will be able to implement this in 2015.

I have been calling local farmers so that UTM can start its first ever Farmers Market in the fall. We will also be starting the Good Food Box Program in the summer.

## **10. Fair Elections Act**

On Tuesday February 4, Pierre Poilievre, the Minister of State for Democratic Reform, proposed Bill C-23, an amendment to the Elections Canada Act intended to "increase democracy". The most detrimental part of the act is that it will act as a barrier for youth to vote. Currently, Canada acknowledges the vouching process- this allows citizens (most likely family or a roommate) to swear for students, who do not have proper ID, so that they can vote. The Conservative Government has claimed that this will cut down on the voter fraud that exists with the vouching system. This is the same party that was accused of voter fraud in the last elections. Post-secondary students frequently move, more often than most Canadians, and maintaining government-issued proof of address is not only difficult but also costly. For students living on-campus, these barriers are magnified. They would have to officially change their address two times per year just to keep up.

Elections Canada was not consulted about this bill. They have plans on implementing changes this year that will increase youth voter turn, as only 38 per cent voted in the last Federal Elections. They are planning of have a campaign that will be geared towards the youth, having polling stations in universities, and allowing the use of voter identification cards. Other changes in the act include:

- Elections Canada will no longer be able to investigate the elections
- Elections Canada will no be able to speak about elections fraud
- Political donations will be managed more strictly. However, they can increase by 25 per cent
- Political parties will no longer be held responsible when their voter databases are used to commit electoral fraud.
- Elections Canada
- Elections Canada will not be allowed to campaign to a specific demographic
- Will not allow for the Chief Electoral Officer to make allegations of electoral fraud public.

Unfortunately, I was unable to participate and plan for the Day of Action due to the UTMSU Spring Elections.

## **11. Student Societies Summit**

Having received hundreds of positions by clubs, UTMSU left the Student Societies Summit. This summit was created by the administration and it is made up of student societies, excluding APUS (Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students), SCSU (Scarborough Campus Students' Union) and GSU (Graduate Students' Union). UTMSU believed that this process was completely undemocratic; as the conversations did not include any of our stakeholders – clubs, levy groups and individual students. UTMSU sat in a number of meetings and we realized that the administration and the other groups were trying to push an agenda. Essentially, they would like to change how we operate as autonomous bodies and turn the union into a Federation. This is a direct attack on student union autonomy. Reasons why UTMSU decided to leave are as follows:

- The Summit is undemocratic and does not allow for participation or engagement by our members.
- The Summit privileges some student groups over others, who have been disparaged and disrespected through this process.
- The Summit has been discussing scenarios that treat University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) students as second-class students of the University of Toronto, and bars us from participating in valuable student leadership opportunities.

As a students' union, we are further concerned that:

- The Summit represents a breach of students' union autonomy.
- The Summit has engaged in discussions about other students' unions who have been barred from participating. There have never been any specific terms of reference or information about the scope of this body provided to us. All information relating to its purpose has been vague.
- The Summit has encouraged the UTMSU and the UTSU to open ourselves up to litigation by violating contract law.

- The Summit seeks negotiation and compromise on an unequal playing field.
- The Summit fails to recognize and discuss incidents of bullying and intimidation tactics as part of the problem.

## **12. UTM Governance Process**

### **i. Campus Affairs Committee**

On February 10, I presented this body with a letter that highlighted our concerns with the new governance model. As we have witnessed, our opinion at QSS (Quality Services Students), a body that was made for students to have more say over student services fees, has become less important. The concerns highlighted in the letter are as follows:

- The decision by the University administration to pursue non-QSS approved priorities with no recourse from student representatives.
- Lack of a permanent secretary and meeting minutes been circulated without adequate notice.
- Lack of transparency
- A budget process that prevents members from adequately consulting their members. As a students' union, we are further concerned that:
- The current governance time-line does not permit for adequate consultation regarding the budgets of University services.

I was granted speaking rights later in the meeting. I highlighted that I thought that, similar to the Student Life Budget at St. George, a portion of the Student Life budget at UTM should come from the university's operating budget. Students should not have to bare the cost of it all. I also mentioned that a working group should be created under Campus Council that consists of members of the administration, governors and the students' union so that we can lobby the government collectively for more public funding. This left a resounding effect with the governors, as some of them came to speak to me after the meeting.

### **ii. Campus Council**

On March 5, I attended the Campus Council meeting. At this meeting, governors were presented with budget proposals on

student services, tuition fees, and student society fees. In regards to the student services budget, I expressed my discontent with the information that was portrayed at the meeting. At the QSS meeting on Friday January 17 students voted down the Athletics & Recreation budget, Health Services and some proposals under Student Services.

However, this information was inaccurately portrayed at the Campus Council meeting; the same increases that were voted against were presented for a vote, as the University of Toronto Index and the Consumer Price Index were now applied to the budgets. This was proof that the new governance structure has to undergo an extensive review. Student voices held no weight at the highest governance body at UTM. Quite frankly, QSS and the other student seat seem like a waste of time. It is the administrations ploy to say that students were “consulted.”

### **13. \$14 Minimum Wage**

From March 3 to the 7, we collected 500 petitions for the minimum wage campaign. Although the minimum wage is set to increase to \$11 on June 1, I believe that it should still rise to \$14. At \$11, workers are below the poverty line. Work is work, and we all deserve fair wages for their labour to cope with the frequent price increases.

# **FINAL REPORT: SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSIONER**

## **In This Report:**

- 1. Vegan BBQ**
- 2. EcoFest**
- 3. Sustainable Food**
- 4. Group Bike Ride**
- 5. U of T Fossil Fuel Divestment Campaign**
- 6. Collaborations and Network-Building**
- 7. Reusable Container Campaign**
- 8. Final Note**

As sustainability and the need for an environmental movement become more important in our society, the UTSU Sustainability Commission aims to push the campus to remain a centre for change and social equity. The Commission has achieved this goal in the 2013-2014 academic term and has taken sustainability at the University of Toronto in several new and exciting directions to ensure students and faculty keep striving towards less waste and reduced energy use.

## **1. Vegan BBQ**

To kick off the year, the Sustainability Commission partnered with the U of T Veg club to hold a Vegan BBQ on campus. Dig In! Campus Agriculture supported the event with some vegetables grown on campus. The event operated smoothly and surpassed expectations. Approximately 250 people lined up to enjoy vegan alternatives to hamburgers and hot dogs. Several people displayed interest in the Veg Club as well as the Sustainability Commission. It is important to remind the community of the inefficiencies of our diet and how a slight change can reduce our effect on the environment.

## **2. EcoFest**

In collaboration with several other environment-related clubs on campus, the Sustainability Commission organized a week of events to help grow the environmental movement at UofT. It was a busy week, with five events over five days, and we would like to thank all of the other groups and volunteers for their time and efforts to make this week happen.

### **The events included:**

### **‘Do the Math’ Screening at Bloor Hot Docs Cinema**

The ability of Toronto 350 to organize and execute such large events is remarkable. Hundreds of people attended the event to see the ‘Do the Math’ documentary and listen to riveting speeches given by Elizabeth May and Adria Vasil.

### **Garden Tour**

With support from Dig In! Campus Agriculture, a tour of all of the sustainable gardens on campus brought students to places on campus that few know exist. Several people were surprised to learn how much food is grown on campus and were excited to learn about the sustainable food initiatives at UofT. The tour concluded with a delicious meal at Harvest Noon, a popular café on campus that serves only the most local, fresh, and sustainable food they can get.

### **Climate Change Workshop**

The Commission invited Our Horizon to give a presentation of their idea to slow climate change to the students and community at UofT. Their idea to put warning labels on gas pumps inspired grassroots action and left the presentation with the audience feeling empowered to make a difference in the fight against global warming.

### **Reality Check Tour**

The Commission Toronto 350 and invited the Reality Check Team to give a presentation in Toronto as part of their nation-wide tour to promote the message of the dangers of fossil fuels.

### **Climate Change Rally**

In partnership with the University of Toronto Environmental Action (UTEA) group, we joined the large rally against Line 9 in Ontario. The reversal of the Line 9 pipeline was a key issue here in Toronto and we made sure the University of Toronto’s voice was heard against the traditionalists whose decisions will more strongly affect our generation.

## **3. Sustainable Food**

With the help of Dig In Campus Agriculture and the Veg Club, we have been successful educating and promoting a more sustainable diet. A lot of work was done on the UTSU Equity Garden and plenty

of vegetables were grown (and eaten!). We held a very successful vegan barbecue where nearly 300 people enjoyed alternatives to hamburgers and hotdogs. The Sustainability Office also coordinated a Fall Fling Event, where students pledged to be greener on campus and enjoyed some local-grown apples, vegan cupcakes, and hot chocolate.

#### **4. Group Bike Ride**

The Sustainability Commission has worked with BikeChain to help spread the importance of active transportation and reduce carbon emissions from personal vehicles, especially on campus. We have helped promote the new space that BikeChain is located at as well as co-hosted a group bike ride around campus. The group ride went well and we were able to help new cyclists feel more comfortable on the roads as well as equip them with some free gear.

#### **5. UofT Fossil Fuel Divestment Campaign**

Possibly the most significant environmental campaign in the past few years, Toronto 350 has devoted countless hours in preparing a divestment brief for the university, outlining the case for divesting the university's stake in fossil fuel companies. From collecting signatures for the campaign, to publicly endorsing it through the UTSU, to funding its amazing Divestment Meme Party, the Sustainability Commission has helped Toronto 350 realize this massive undertaking. We eagerly await a response from the university and hope that we have done enough to convince them that fossil fuels are not worth investing in.

#### **6. Collaborations and Network-Building**

As seen by the awesome events above, we could not have accomplished as much as we have without the help of several amazing groups on campus. Their dedication, passion, intelligent ideas, time, and efforts have paid off and we hope that they continue doing their amazing work as well as inspiring others to be more sustainable.

The Commission has taken steps to establish long-term relationships with some groups on campus and have begun building an extensive network of environmental leaders on campus. We hope that a more unified approach to environmentalism at UofT will result in larger, more exciting events in the future.

## **7. Reusable Container Campaign**

Finally, the Commission began an exciting new initiative, our Reusable Container Campaign. Following the success of the plastic-free water bottle campaign conducted by the UTSU, we decided to tackle the issue of Styrofoam containers on campus. After some research, we found that over one ton of Styrofoam waste is created at UofT from the food trucks on St. George street alone! We decided that this was unacceptable and began brainstorming ideas for how to change the status quo. First, we approached the food trucks and several of them allowed us to post on the side of their truck a message saying 'we accept your reusable containers'. Since they are on the side of the truck, customers have taken notice and will hopefully consider bringing their own containers rather than just accepting the waste of Styrofoam. We chose to speed up the change by giving out reusable containers to customers for free. Over the winter semester, we handed out nearly 100 reusable, microwave safe, dishwasher safe, and BPA free containers to food truck customers. Lastly, we gave out gift cards to students who we saw using reusable containers on campus. The Commission believes that once people take notice of others using reusable containers, there will be a large shift away from Styrofoam. This may take a couple more years and we hope that the campaign will be continued in the future.

## **8. Final Note**

I would like to thank the UTSU for this amazing experience; I really enjoyed my time spent as the Sustainability Commissioner. I would also like to thank my awesome volunteers who helped me accomplish our goals for the year. I believe the environmental movement at the University of Toronto is in good shape and I'm excited for the future of sustainability on campus.

**In Solidarity,  
Benvenuto Triolo  
Sustainability Commissioner  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
Local 98 Canadian Federation of Students**



# **MINUTES**

**University of Toronto  
Students' Union**

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**March 28, 2014**

## AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

### IN ATTENDANCE:

Waiz Akhtar, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Frishta Bastan, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Nia-Imara Barberousse, Faculty of Music  
Joseph Bodley, Ontario Institute for Studies & Education  
Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Vice-President Equity  
Ben Coleman, Arts & Science At-Large  
Nzube Ekpunobi, Arts & Science At-Large  
Yasmeen Emadi, Vice-President Campus Life  
Fatima Zahra Hamaimou, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Dalia Hashim, New College  
Silviu Kondan, New College  
Mateusz Krawczyk, Professional Faculty At-Large  
Sanchit Mathur, Faculty of Engineering  
Josephine Petrolo, Woodsworth College  
Helen Phan, Professional Faculty At-Large  
Munib Sajjad, President  
Muhammad Bilal Sandeela, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Agnes So, Vice-President University Affairs  
Melissa Theodore, UTMSU Representative  
Htay Tint, Transitional Year Program  
Will Warnica, Innis College  
Cameron Wathey, Vice-President Internal & Services  
Billi Wun, Faculty of Law  
ZiJian Yang, Woodsworth College

### BY PROXY:

Nabil Arif, University of Toronto Mississauga to Frishta Bastan, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Suyoung Aaron Chin, Faculty of Pharmacy to Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Vice-President Equity  
Nadiv Hossain, University College to Yasmeen Emadi, Vice-President Campus Life  
Khalid Khan, New College to Dalia Hashim, New College  
Onik Khan, Vice-President External to Cameron Wathey, Vice-President Internal & Services  
Maaham Malik, University of Toronto Mississauga to Frishta Bastan, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Catherine Nguyen, Faculty of Dentistry to Agnes So, Vice-President University Affairs  
Tannishtha Pramanick, Woodsworth College to Ben Coleman, Arts & Science At-Large  
Aimee Quenneville, University College to Ben Coleman, Arts & Science At-Large

Lynn Scherloski, Victoria College to Agnes So, Vice-President University Affairs  
Ming Zang, University of Toronto Mississauga to Melissa Theodore, UTMSU Representative

### EX-OFFICIO:

Brad Evoy, University of Toronto Graduate Students' Union  
Susan Froom, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Anthony O'Brien, Kinesiology and Physical Education Undergraduate Association  
Raymond Noronha, University of Toronto Mississauga Students Union

### GUESTS:

Zoe Adesina, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Farsihta Amanullah, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Hamza Amsari, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Ebi Agbeyegbe, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Nicky Bhatti, University College  
Filip Budouru, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Bryan Chelvanaigum, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Nyasha Chikowore, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Arsu Christian Goalla, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Hassan Havili, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Mahd Elmi, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Pierre Harfouche, Faculty of Engineering  
Raiyyan Khan, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Walied Khogali, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Genny Lawen, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Muhammad-Mohsin Maqsood, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Sarah Niedoba, Varsity Newspaper  
Ridwan Olow, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Francesco Otello-Deluca, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Ramello Peralta, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Ryan Persaud, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Sarah Qidwai, University College  
Ro'a Saafan, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Vipulan Vigneswaran, Woodsworth College  
Theodore Yan, Varsity Newspaper

## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting is called to order at 17:14.

### **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that the agenda for the March 28, 2014 UTSU Board of Directors meeting be approved as presented.

#### **CARRIED**

### **3. REPORT OF CHIEF RETURNING OFFICER**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: So

Be it resolved that the Chief Returning Officer report be approved as presented.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Hudson states that the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) had to leave while the Board waited for those stuck in traffic to arrive. She states that the CRO asked her to present the report on her behalf. She states that recommendations will be submitted to Elections & Referenda Committee at a later date. She states that there was a closure of the University of Toronto Mississauga campus on Wednesday, March 12. She states that on March 14, polls were opened on the Mississauga campus for the same amount of time in which the campus was closed on March 12. She states that there was a large volume of complaints during the elections, some of which were not urgent. She states that the CRO is concerned about the timelines for required responses. She states that there was a total of four requested recounts, however, those who requested the recounts failed to send scrutineers. She states that student press consistently published articles about alleged issues and events before the CRO had proper time to investigate and address the issues, which resulted in false information being distributed to the electorate. She states that the CRO wishes to thank the Deputy Returning Officers and staff of the UTSU. She states that the CRO congratulates all the candidates.

#### **CARRIED**

### **4. RATIFICATION OF ELECTIONS RESULTS**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Yang

Be it resolved that the UTSU Spring 2014 election results be ratified.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Harfouche states that the Board of Directors should not ratify the elections results because of fairness. He states that the board did not set the additional voting date on Friday, March 14. He states that even though it seemed like the right thing to do, it was a violation of the Union's bylaws. He states that the election dates are set in advance and altering them last minute put some candidates at a disadvantage. He states that there

## AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

was online voting during the time the University of Mississauga campus was closed, so students could still vote. He states that the additional day was equitable but that he believes it was legally problematic. He states that the Elections and Referenda Committee (ERC) can make decisions, but that the board was not consulted. He states that at the end of the day it is the law that binds the Union. He states that he sent a letter to the Provost asking for her thoughts. He states that her response to situation was quite serious. He states that he did not think the response would be so harsh, but that she is considering withholding fees from the Union. He states that as Vice-President University Affairs-elect, he is concerned about fees being withheld. He states that he does not want to spend the year fighting for resources. He states that he would not need to do this if the elections were not ratified. He states that he asked appeal to the ERC meeting but was not invited to attend a meeting. He states that there is no legal reason why he was not invited.

Sajjad states that on Wednesday, March 12 when inclement weather resulted in the closure of the University of Toronto Mississauga campus, the ERC was left with the decision as to whether to add the additional polling day or not. He states that UTM students prefer to vote via the paper ballot system. He states that the students' society conducts their vote via ballot, that students at the UTM campus have rejected online voting and that there is no culture of online voting on the campus. He states that five hours of paper ballot polling that was available to St. George students was not available to students on March 12 due to the closure of the campus. He states that the ERC has the responsibility to ensure that students are able to vote during the elections. He states that the additional day was a compensation for the closure of the campus. He states that Mother Nature broke the bylaws by forcing the closure of the campus. He questions as to whether this discussion would occur if this very situation took place on the St. George campus. He states that the ERC had to make sure students were able to vote and uphold the spirit of the elections. He states that the Elections Procedure Code allows the ERC to make decisions about situations such as this.

Froom states that it might be useful to be guided by practices in other electoral jurisdictions. She states that she researched policies surrounding federal, provincial and municipal elections in situations such as the one that occurred at the UTM campus. She states that if this type of situation were to occur in municipal, provincial and federal elections, the CRO is allowed to extend hours of the elections. She states that it might be advisable for the board to take note of policies and how polls can be extended in extenuating circumstances. She states that the Union's decision was reasonable. She suggests adding a more explicit section to the Elections Procedure Code regarding polling during extenuating circumstances for future elections.

Emadi states that the ratification is at the hands of the board, but that the ERC also has the authority to make decisions during the election period. She states that Harfouche's decision to write to the University's administration was not necessary since the decisions surrounding the elections are left to the ERC and the board. She states that the UTM had less hours to vote altogether than St. George, even with the March 14 voting day. She states that Harfouche's campaign manager publicly supported the polls being opened on March 14 on Facebook prior to the ballots being counted. She states that she believes the students arguing in opposition to the ratification have motives that have nothing to do with fairness to students.

Raymond Noronha states that that the ERC made the right decision to extend voting to Friday, March 14 and thanks them for the extension. He states that University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union members are also UTSU members and he finds it offensive that some students are attempting to eliminate the votes from Mississauga students. He states that UTMSU members like to vote for their candidates in person and that it is equitable to extend voting. He states that voting in person provides candidates

## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

with more of an opportunity to talk to candidates. He states that he is in favor of ratifying the results.

Brown states that the issue is about the board being consulted. He states that it is unlikely that a board meeting could have been called in a timely manner. He states that the decision that the ERC made was the best way to address a difficult situation. He states that there is currently no bylaw that addresses snowstorms. He states that it would not have been practical for the board to meet on such short notice to decide on the additional voting day. He states that he understands why people have more trust in paper ballots, and states that the vote should be ratified. He states that holding another election or destroying ballots would be ridiculous and undemocratic.

Mathur states that from an equity point of view the additional voting day was a good decision. He states that even still, he believes that it was illegal. He states that no one thinks that there were ill intentions but that he believes the issue is a legal one. He states that there is no ulterior motive. He states that he is nervous that the Union will be sued. He states that consulting the board would have likely resulted in the same action and would have been legal, in his opinion. He states that board members should not think about this in terms of equity, but in terms of legality.

Tint states that he got an email from Mr. Harfouche about this issue. He states that since he was elected as a Director of the Board he attempted to connect with other board members to work on projects together. He states that he requested to connect online with Mr. Harfouche. He states that Mr. Harfouche refused to connect with him. He states that he has observed Mr. Harfouche's conduct at board meetings. He states that it is clear Mr. Harfouche does not have the best interests of students in mind and that his request should be withdrawn. He states that he is unsure about legality but that Mr. Harfouche has shown that he should not be trusted. He states that we are in a digital age with digital communication but that direct communication is important. He states that this is why some students prefer to vote in person.

Yang states that the Elections and Procedures Code states that there must be a certain amount of polling stations open at both campuses for the duration of the election. He further states that the snowstorm and subsequent closure of the UTM campus led to a violation of this rule, as there were no polling stations open at UTM on Wednesday afternoon. He further states that the decision to extend voting at UTM was to make up for the lost voting hours at UTM. He further states that although the Bylaws and EPC do not address this specific circumstance, it is up to the ERC to make a decision for the greater good of all members.

### **MOTION TO CALL TO QUESTION**

Moved: Aktar

Seconded: Bastan

### **FAILED**

Hudson states that the Elections and Procedures Code states that the ERC is responsible for considering issues and events that are not considered in either the Code or the Bylaws and Policies. She states that legally, a situation that is out of human control is called an Act of God. She states that UTSU's governing documents do not account for Acts of God. She states that part of her job is to ensure that the Union abides by all applicable laws and that she often liaises with the Union's lawyers. She states that she is not concerned about the legality of the of the ERC's decision. She states that neither the Bylaws nor the EPC was violated. She further states that the CRO is currently working on a mission statement for the ERC because there seems to be confusion about the purpose of providing notice of polling locations. She states that the purpose of providing notice is not to for the benefit of campaigners, but instead for the benefit of members to ensure that they know where they can exercise their right to vote. She states that the

## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

broader issue to consider is whether UTM students knew there was an additional voting day on the Friday. She states that the ERC did their best to notify voters. She states that she is confident that the Union is not in a compromising legal position.

Vigneswaran states that the Elections Procedures Code states that there must be a specific amount of polling stations at the St. George and UTM campuses during elections. He states that having polls open on Friday violates the EPC. He states that this is a matter of following bylaws. He states that he previously supported the extra day because he did not know that it was against the Bylaws.

Ekpunobi states there is an issue of equity. He states the membership's right to vote overrules the inadequacy of the Bylaws to consider extenuating situations. He states that the board must decide what to do with the ethical dilemma and which decision respects the rights of the membership to engage in a democratic process; throwing out the election, throwing out ballots or allowing Mississauga students commensurate hours of voting as what was lost. He states that democracy is at stake, and that the Board should not marginalize a students' right to vote due to limitations of the Bylaws.

Bollo-Kamara states that the Bylaws were violated by an Act of God. She states that the St. George had polling stations but UTM did not have polling stations and therefore the Bylaws were violated on the day that the Mississauga campus was closed. She states that this violation was impossible to avoid by any action of the ERC. She states that it is reasonable that a decision was made to address this violation of members' rights. She states that the board should support the decision that makes most sense that best respects the membership.

Coleman states that he does not believe that having another election would result in a fairer election. He states that ratification is the right thing to do. He states that if he were on the ERC during this election he would have made same decision as the ERC did.

Sandeela states that all sides of the argument should be taken seriously. He states that the Board should do what is best for the organization. He states that it is far more equitable to count the votes on the Friday than to ignore them altogether.

Theodore states that as a UTM student she is concerned that the team making complaints thinks that UTM students are second-class citizens. She states that there was an Act of God and the time missed on Wednesday was shifted and made up on Friday; it was not an extension of voting.

Hashim states that the Bylaws state that the board should have been consulted. She further states that there is an issue of practicality and that having a Board meeting in such a short time to make a decision pertaining to the elections would not have been as practical as having the ERC decide on the issue at hand. She further states that this is about fairness and that the Bylaws should be amended to clearly consider this type of circumstance. She states that at the end of day the board should confirm that this decision was fair, practical and equitable and should not dismiss elections results.

### **MOTION**

Moved: Krawczyk

Seconded: Akthar

Motion to call to question.

### **CARRIED**

### **MAIN MOTION CARRIED**

Wun, Quenneville and Mathur in opposition.

## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

### **5. EXECUTIVE REPORT**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Theodore

Be it resolved that the March Executive Report be approved as presented (pg. 55).

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey presents the executive report to the board.

Emadi states that the income tax clinic that begins on April 1. She states that there was a food bank fundraiser earlier during the week. She states that there will be a UTSU's Got You for the month of April and one night will be held at the UTM campus for the first time ever.

So states that there was an international student townhall and the turnout was excellent.

*Hamaimou exits at 18:21.*

So states that there was a rally for the Transitional Year Programme. She states that students and even the administrator who oversees the Programme were not permitted access to the Governing Council. She states that the meeting was heavily guarded by police.

So states that the Union released an Academic Appeals Guide this month. She thanks volunteers and staff for their assistance with this project.

Bollo-Kamara states that she attended and spoke at a rally about unpaid internships. She states that she was incredibly proud that this issue, which first began with a letter sent the Ministry on behalf of the Union has gained traction in the mainstream media. She states that she was invited to make a presentation to the Federal Standing Committee on Finance about the issue. She states that she traveled to Ottawa to make the presentation this week, which was very well received by Members of Parliament.

Emadi states that the Union's annual Unity Ball Awards saw a record number of attendees. She states that the Montréal reading week trip was also a huge success and had reached record numbers as well.

Wathey states that the free Tax Clinic will begin in April and encourages the board to promote this service as well as use this opportunity to receive assistance on their own taxes.

Coleman states that he is concerned with the Union's withdrawal from the Student Society Summit. He further asks whether the Union will hold an open meeting with all the Unions at UofT as well as the Student Societies. He asks whether issues regarding summit will be brought to the board.

So states that in her letter she declared her intention to have an open discussion about the issues students want to discuss with respect to the UTSU. She states that she has been very open all year. She states that board members are welcome to approach her to discuss these issues and concerns.

Bollo-Kamara states that the Board should discuss what this open meeting should look like and that the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS) should be included along with other campus groups and general members.

## AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

Froom states that APUS was excluded from Student Societies Summit. She states that APUS was initially told they would be able to make an oral address, but was then subsequently denied. She states that the Summit is closed and inaccessible. She states that she is seriously concerned that APUS was not included in the discussion. She states that the Provost stated she would have ability to present directly to the administration, but that APUS still wants an open discussion with everyone. She states that she is unsure why the administration is preventing other undergraduate students' unions from participating. She states that the administration is still talking about what is best for student governance, which is undemocratic and disrespectful of students' rights.

Coleman asks when the open forum will take place.

Bollo-Kamara states that the intention is for the open forum to occur before May 1, 2014.

## CARRIED

### 6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Phan

Be it resolved that the March 28, 2014 minutes package including the following documents be approved:

- a. Board of Directors, *February*
- b. Bursary & Grants Committee, *March 24*
- c. Budget Committee, *March*
- d. Clubs Committee, *March*
- e. Elections & Referenda Committee, *March*
- f. Organizational Development & Services Committee, *March*
- g. Policy & Procedures Committee, *March*

#### DISCUSSION

Emadi externalizes March 19 Clubs Committee minutes for further discussion.

Brown externalizes March 18 & 24 Organizational Development & Services Committee minutes for further discussion

Emadi states that the application was defeated because in order to receive Reconsideration Funding the UTSU Clubs Policy states that a group must prove 100 per cent of their original allocation in the form of receipts. She further states that upon first receiving the application the receipts were not present, however, shortly after the application was initially defeated by the Clubs Committee the receipts were available.

#### MOTION

Moved: Emadi

Seconded: Bollo-Kamara

Be it resolved that the African Students Association receive \$1500 in Reconsideration Funding.

## CARRIED

Brown states that Organizational Development & Services Committee minutes were externalized to discuss the Union's Health and Dental plan. He states that the recommendation made by the Health & Dental Coordinator includes adding counseling



## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

services. He states that if the board votes not to increase the Health and Dental Plan fees that the Union would likely be required to remove features from the plan that are currently covered. He states that the fee increase is necessary because the services that are provided through the plan are in high demand.

Hudson states that students have been requesting psychological and counseling services to be included in the plan. She states that the most widely used item on the plan is anti-depressants. She states that with these concerns in mind the Health and Dental Plan Coordinator has recommended a 6.6 per cent increase to include psychological services and dispensing fees. She further states that if the board does not choose to go with the 6.6 per cent increase to include these additional features then the board should still increase the plan by 5.25 per cent to account for industry inflation and to keep all the current features of the plan.

Brown states that he worries about adding the counseling and psychological services because UofT already provides a similar service known as CAPs. Brown further states that the new service, however will allow members to seek additional assistance outside of CAPs.

### **CARRIED**

#### **7. UTSU HEALTH AND DENTAL PLAN FEE (for approval)**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Tint

Be it resolved that a fee adjustment of 6.6 per cent (or \$9.11) per year, per student for the UTSU Health Plan fee and an increase of 6.6 per cent (or \$8.21) per year, per student for the UTSU Dental Plan fee be approved as permitted by our membership.

##### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the Organizational Development & Services Committee minutes were externalized to discuss the fee increase. He further states that he has already read the Health and Dental Plan Coordinator's recommendation for the Health and Dental Plan Fee.

### **CARRIED**

#### **8. STUDENT COMMONS FEE (for approval)**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Bodley

Be it resolved that a fee adjustment increase of \$0.75 per session per St. George member to the Student Commons fee be approved as permitted by our membership.

##### **DISCUSSION**

The Chair states that the approval for the Student Commons fee occurred several years ago through a referenda, however, the board is mandated by the University's administration to approve this fee each year.

Wathey states that the referenda for the Student Commons occurred in 2007 and that the board should approve the fee increases.

## AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

### CARRIED

#### 9. CPI FEE ADJUSTMENTS (for approval)

##### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Warnica

Be it resolved that the following adjustments be approved:

- an increase of \$0.26 per session, per member, to the UTSU (i.e. Students' Administrative Council) membership fee; and
- an increase of \$0.11 per session, per member, to the Canadian Federation of Students membership fee; and
- an increase of \$0.01 per session, per member, to the WUSC Student Refugee Program fee.

##### DISCUSSION

Wathey states that each year, these fees are adjusted by CPI adjustments according to the Union's Bylaws.

### CARRIED

#### 10. COUNCIL ON STUDENT SERVICES (COSS) FEE INCREASE MOTIONS

##### a. HART HOUSE

##### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Bollo-Kamara

2014-2015 Fee:

Full-time (St. George) – \$80.51
Part-time (St. George) – \$16.11
Full-time (UTM/UTSC) – \$2.47
Part-time (UTM/UTSC) – \$0.50

Be it resolved that the UTSU Board of Directors *objects to* the 2014-2015 budget for Hart House and increase in sessional fees for a full-time student on the St. George campus to \$80.51 (\$16.11 for a part-time student); and that the sessional fees for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC of \$2.47 (\$0.50 for a part-time student), as provided to CoSS by Bruce Kidd, Warden.

##### DISCUSSION

Bollo-Kamara states that she recommend that the board object the fee increase. She states that CoSS votes on whether fees should be increased and this Committee has a student majority. She states that Hart House is an integral part of community. She states that the Union works closely with Hart House and that we are very appreciative of the partnership. She states that it is troubling that the University administration does not provide any funding to Hart House. She states that it is problematic for an increase to Hart House to come solely from students and that Hart house should also receive central funding from university.

Coleman asks if Bollo-Kamara knows what the consequences are if the board

## AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

choses to vote against the fee increase.

Bollo-Kamara states that students should not continue to fund these fees if the University does not support these programs financially on principle. She states that Hart House can still seek an increase through the University Affairs Board.

Evoy states that these increases have already been proposed to Governing Council's University Affairs board without the consultation of CoSS. He further states that the Board's vote will not directly have an effect on this.

Froom states that if CoSS objects to fees increases then the fees are only able to increase according to adjustments by the Uof T Index, which is slightly higher than CPI. She states that if the board votes against these increase the fees will increase regardless, but the Board can still prevent the initial fee increase, which is higher than what the UofT index allows.

*Wun leaves at 18:57.*

Evoy states that these increases can only be approved if CoSS votes in favour of the increase first.

### CARRIED

#### **b. FACULTY OF KINESIOLOGY & PHYSICAL EDUCATION, CO-CURRICULAR PROGRAMS**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Bollo-Kamara

2014-2015 Fee: Full-time (St. George) – \$157.07  
Part-time (St. George) – \$31.41  
Full-time (UTM/UTSC) – \$18.22  
Part-time (UTM/UTSC) – \$3.64

Be it resolved that the UTSU Board of Directors *objects to* the 2014-2015 budget for the Faculty of Kinesiology & Physical Education, Co-Curricular Programs and increase in sessional fees for a full-time student on the St. George campus to \$157.07 (\$31.41 for a part-time student); and that the sessional fees for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC of \$18.22 (\$3.64 for a part-time student), as provided to CoSS by Ira Jacobs, Dean.

##### **DISCUSSION**

Bollo-Kamara states that the Union has an excellent partnership with the Faculty of Kinesiology & Physical Education, Co-Curricular Programs. She states that the Faculty does receive funding from the central administration, but it has not increased in as long as anyone from the faculty can remember. She states that funding from the central administration has been frozen since at least the 1980s. She states that she recommends that the Board object to the increase based on the principle that the University should also support athletic programs.

Sajjad states that he sat on the Council of Athletics and Recreations (CAR). He states that despite the lack of increase in funding from the administration CAR has not seen a decrease in the services, but in fact an increase.

### CARRIED

## AGENDA

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

### c. STUDENT LIFE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Bollo-Kamara

2014-2015 Fee:

Full-time (St. George) – \$142.22
Part-time (St. George) – \$28.44
Full-time (UTM/UTSC) – \$0.00
Part-time (UTM/UTSC) – \$0.00

Be it resolved that the UTSU Board of Directors *objects to* the 2014-2015 budget for Student Life Programs and Services and increase in sessional fees for a full-time student on the St. George campus to \$142.22 (\$28.44 for a part-time student); and that the sessional fees for a full-time student at UTM or UTSC have zero dollar increase, as provided to CoSS by Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life.

#### DISCUSSION

Bollo-Kamara states that students fund about 60 per cent of the funding for Student Life programs and services. She states that an increase is not necessary. She further states that every year Student Life asks for an increase which are denied. She states that they still manage to function. She states that it is unfortunate that CoSS has to approve the Student Life budget as a whole rather than voting on certain aspects of the organization that need prioritization. She states that she would like to put forward a motion to vote on increasing or decreasing services of Student Life separately.

#### CARRIED

### 11. APPROVAL OF UTSU REVISED BUDGET

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that the UTSU 2013-2014 Revised Budget be approved as presented.

#### DISCUSSION

Wathey provides an overview of the revised budget. He states that the Union has a surplus at the time of the meeting, but will most likely be closer to breaking even due to the costs expended in the final couple of months. He states that the majority of the costs are what was expected. He further states that the Social Justice and Equity Commission went over budget. He states that the Union is waiting for the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students to provide their portion of the costs of the XAO "Fruitvale Station" film screening, which will put the Social Justice and Equity Commission closer to what was budgeted.

Hudson states that the reason that schedule 9, salaries and wages, is over budget is due to the increase in the amount of student jobs the Union provided this year, mostly through the postering service and the food bank.

#### MOTION TO CONTINUE *IN CAMERA*

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Theodore

## **AGENDA**

Board of Directors Meeting 9 of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, March 28, 2014 | 16:00 | CCT, Mississauga Campus

---

### **CARRIED**

*The meeting continues in camera at 19:15.*

*The meeting continues ex camera at 19:20.*

### **12. NEXT BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

Wathey states that the next meeting will be a joint meeting between the outgoing 2013 – 2014 Board of Directors and the incoming 2014 – 2015 Board of Directors. He states that he will circulate a doodle poll via email for schedules, and that the meeting will occur near the end of April.

### **13. OTHER BUSINESS**

Coleman states whether a vote is needed to destroy the ballots from the 2014 Spring Elections.

The Chair states that a vote from the board is not necessary. He further states that the ballots serve no status after the board ratifies the election results.

O'Brien states that he would have appreciated more notice if there were to be a discussion surrounding the Student Society Summit at this board meeting.

Coleman states that he would like to know whether the Union will fine students for violations made during the elections. He asks if candidates will be informed about the fact that they are not in fact obligated to pay the fines.

Hudson states that she cannot speak for the Chief Returning Officer, but that to her knowledge, no students had been fined in this election. She further states that students have not been fined for elections violations for years. She states that she recognized that *The Varsity* reported that students would be fined, but that this information did not come from the CRO. She states that this was one of the issues the CRO had mentioned as a problem with respect to the student press. She states that the EPC allows the CRO to fine students as an option, but not a requirement.

### **14. ADJOURNMENT**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Yang

Seconded: Hashim

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

### **CARRIED**

The meeting adjourns at 19:30.

# **MINUTES**

**University of Toronto  
Students' Union**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**April 8 2014**

# MINUTES

Executive Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 8, 2014 | 14:00 | UTSU Office

---

## IN ATTENDANCE:

Munib Sajjad, President  
Cameron Wathey, Vice-President Internal & Services  
Agnes So, Vice-President University Affairs  
Yasmeen Emadi, Vice-President Campus Life  
Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Vice-President Equity  
Sandra Hudson, Executive Director (non-voting)

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting is called to order at 14:12.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: So

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

### CARRIED

## 3. UTSU'S GOT YOU

### DISCUSSION

Emadi states that the snacks have arrived this morning. She further states that all the items for "UTSU's Got You" are ready and at the Multi-Faith Centre. She further states the dates and locations for "UTSU's Got You". She further states that we should bring ice cream to the University of Toronto Mississauga Campus.

Sajjad states whether we are able to book a van to transport the item for the University of Toronto Mississauga Campus.

Emadi states that we should book a van. She states that we are leaving at 1:30 and the UTSU's Got You at UTM will begin at 3:00 at their library.

## 4. RAPTORS PLAYOFF TICKETS

### DISCUSSION

Sajjad states that tickets are available. He further states that we should consider looking into tickets. He further states that he looked into how viable it is to sell these tickets.

Hudson states that the maximum amount we can purchase is 20 according to her email from the provider.

Wathey states that he is concerned about selling these tickets.

Emadi states that we cannot reserve any tickets for anyone.

## **MINUTES**

Executive Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 8, 2014 | 14:00 | UTSU Office

---

Sajjad states that we should go for 20 tickets for Game 2 and purchase more if they are available.

So states that we should ask if we can get more tickets then.

### **5. BLUE JAYS TICKETS**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad states that we can buy these tickets through a different company. He further states that we should also look into TFC tickets.

Wathey states that the only Blue Jays tickets should be considered if we purchase tickets for games in September so we can promote them during frosh week. He further states that it would be difficult to sell these tickets during the summer months as it easier for people to purchase tickets at the actual ballpark for the same price.

### **6. OFFICE CLEAN UP**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that we should clean the office before the new executives arrive.

Hudson states that the graphic designer office will be relocated and that means that the office needs to be cleaned. She states that we can clean the office Wednesday, April 16 and Thursday, April 17.

### **7. NEW EXECUTIVES**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the new executives will be in the office shortly and that the outgoing executives should contact the incoming executives and begin working on their transitions with them before the end of the month.

### **8. APRIL BOARD MEETING**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the April Board meeting is scheduled for April 24 and that this meeting will be a joint board meeting.

### **9. PPC MEETINGS**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that there was a meeting today and we passed several policy amendments due the changes in the CNCA and as well amendments to the clubs policy. He further states that there was a motion about the Board structure that was tabled for further discussion.



## **MINUTES**

Executive Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 8, 2014 | 14:00 | UTSU Office

---

Bollo-Kamara states that the policy did excellent work on the board reform and that there should be greater discussion about this.

### **10.COMMISSIONS**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that if any executives plan to hold a commission meeting it must be held before April 17 if the commission meetings should be included in the April board meeting package.

### **11.STUDENT SOCIETY SUMMIT**

#### **DISCUSSION**

So states that she wants to have the forum that was discussed at the March board meeting and we should talk about finalizing a date.

Emadi states that exams go until April 30 and that from personal experience she knows that students have exams up until the last day.

Sajjad states whether it is possible to have the forum this month.

So states that it should be held on April 30 and invite all student union and societies at UofT to attend.

Bollo-Kamara states that she will schedule another meeting to further discuss the forum.

### **12.END OF YEAR REPORTS**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that he appreciates that the majority of the executives submitted their reports already. He further states that he will be working on the design with the graphic designer for the reports throughout this month and may need more information from the executives for the reports.

### **13.ASSOCIATES**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the associates have been excellent all year and that their contracts end at the end of this month. He further states that the executives should hold an appreciation party for the associates.

So states we that should provide them with gifts.

### **14.THANK YOU & END OF THE YEAR PARTY**

#### **DISCUSSION**

## **MINUTES**

Executive Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 8, 2014 | 14:00 | UTSU Office

---

Sajjad states that there will be a "Thank You" party for the Board, volunteers, and associates at the end of the month or early next month. He further states that he will plan the "Thank You" party.

### **15. CAMPUS LIFE INTERVIEWS**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Emadi states that she has contacted the applicants and will be holding interviews with the hiring committee this week.

### **16. MOTION TO RENEW MEMBERSHIP FOR TORONTO YORK REGION LABOUR COUNCIL**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Wathey

Be it resolved that the UTSU executive approve \$1000 from the Executive Committee to renew its associate membership with the Toronto York region labour council.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad states that our membership with the Toronto York region labour council has expired and the membership lasts for a year and should be renewed.

#### **CARRIED**

### **17. MOTION TO HAVE ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS WITH THE STAFF**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that the executive director be mandated to hold one-on-one meetings with the staff of the union.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that he would like the staff to hold one-on-one meetings with the executive director to know what projects they are working on and how the executives can work with them on these projects. He further states that this is very beneficial for the Union to have these meetings frequently.

#### **CARRIED**

### **18. ADJOURNMENT**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Emadi

The meeting adjourns at 16:18.

# **MINUTES**

**University of Toronto  
Students' Union**

**ELECTIONS & REFERENDA  
COMMITTEE**

**April 21, 2014**

## **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Monday, April 21, 2014 • 13:00 • UTSU Office

---

### **ATTENDANCE:**

Joseph Bodley, Ontario Institute for Studies & Education Director  
Munib Sajjad, President  
William Warnica, Innis College Director

### **NON-VOTING:**

Sandra Hudson (Executive Director)

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 13:32.

### **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Bodley

Seconded: Warnica

Be it resolved that the Wednesday, March 20, 2014 Elections and Referenda Committee agenda be approved as presented.

#### **CARRIED**

### **3. CRO RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Warnica

Be it resolved that the Recommendations of the Chief Returning Officer be accepted.

### **DISCUSSION**

Bodley asks if it is feasible to redraft the Elections Procedure Code at this time.

Sajjad states that Flor suggested that she could draft language.

Hudson states that she could be asked to stay on to do so, or that the members of the ERC who are continuing on to next year could take on the task.

Sajjad states that both options should be discussed.

Sajjad states that he believes that the timeout for the single sign-on system should be a shorter period of time.

Hudson states that she can request this from the Simply Voting company, and that it is not necessarily a requirement to end single sign-on altogether, which the University requested that the UTSU implement in an online voting system.

Warnica states that he is surprised that the ballots are not randomized.

## MINUTES

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Monday, April 21, 2014 • 13:00 • UTSU Office

---

Hudson states that the names on the ballots are randomized, but not the ballots themselves.

Warnica states that if the order was randomized, it might solve the abstention issue.

Hudson states that she will request that Simply Voting do this.

Warnica states that he does not understand how online voting disenfranchises certain groups.

Sajjad states that the lack of polling stations affected turnout.

Hudson states that she believes that disenfranchisement is not the right term to use. She states that the issue is visibility and reminding certain students to vote.

Bodley states that her statement about voter turnout is interesting. He states that it is interesting that less people voted than in the last similar election. He asks if the ERC has the power to eliminate online polling.

Hudson states that the ERC does have that ability, but that she strongly recommends against it. She states that given the strong feelings that the membership has about it. She suggests bringing it up with the board or the general membership at the General Meeting.

Bodley asks how many polling locations there were prior to online voting being implemented.

Hudson states that there were polling locations at the Faculty of Law, Faculty of Pharmacy, Faculty of Kinesiology, the Larkin Building and OISE.

Bodley states that he does not believe that elections should ever be solely online. He states that the drop in turnout from professional faculties is concerning and that it should be rectified.

Warnica states that he heard from Director Benjamin Coleman that the cost of the vote was less than when the vote was held by paper ballot.

Hudson states that she is unsure where he would have gotten enough information to make that analysis. She states that this year's election was more expensive than in past because of how much money the online system costs.

Bodley states that not just OISE, but all faculties be considered with respect to spring breaks.

Bodley asks if it is possible to have a "silent period" between the nomination period and the campaign period.

Hudson states that it existed in the past and it is possible.

Sajjad states that two or three days would be sufficient.

Bodley states that he recommends a 72-hour grace period.

Sajjad agrees.

## **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Monday, April 21, 2014 • 13:00 • UTSU Office

---

Warnica agrees.

Sajjad states that he thinks that it is fair that candidates be required to notarize translated text. He states that it is difficult to expect the Chief Returning Officer to translate text.

Bodley states that this makes sense. He states that the diversity of the campus should be recognized and encouraged. He states that it is difficult to expect the Chief Returning Officer to approve text that they cannot understand. He states that notarized text may be the fairest way to proceed.

Sajjad states that regardless, all materials need to be approved by the Chief Returning Officer, and there needs to be a way for this to happen.

Sajjad asks if recommendations about poll clerk staffing must be included in the Elections Procedure Code.

Hudson states that Flor is working on a "Best Practices Guide" for future Returning Officers. She states that language about human resources could be kept in that guide.

Sajjad states that he believes that this is the best way forward.

Sajjad states that Flor should be requested to write suggested text for updates to the Elections Procedure Code.

Sajjad states that he suggests that research and statistics be gathered for online votes in the future.

Bodley asks if a recommendation should be made by the Elections and Referenda Committee to remove online voting. He states that he is aware that this is a difficult issue to consider and that it should be considered by the General Meeting.

Sajjad states that research is necessary and that the next Committee should be encouraged to undertake more research.

## **CARRIED**

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Bodley

Be it resolved that the meeting be adjourned.

## **CARRIED**

The meeting was adjourned at 14:58.

# **MINUTES**

**University of Toronto  
Students' Union**

**POLICY & PROCEDURES  
COMMITTEE**

**April 9 & 10, 2014**

## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 11:21.

### **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Kondan

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

### **3. CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT REQUIREMENTS**

#### **MOTION TO CLARIFY OFFICERS OF THE UNION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Kondan

Be it resolved that Bylaw I (11) "Definition of "Executive"":

"Executive" shall mean a member elected or appointed to serve a position on the Executive Committee."

Be amended to read:

"Executive" shall mean a member elected or appointed to serve a position on the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee serve as the Officers of the Union."

#### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the Officers of the Corporation should be clearly stated in the Bylaws.

#### **CARRIED**

#### **MOTION TO AMEND PROCESS TO CALL A GENERAL MEETING**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that Bylaw III(1)(ii)(c):

"A written request, stating the purpose of the meeting, signed by no less than 500 members of the Union, of whom no more than 125 members can be from any one constituency."

Be amended to read:

"A written request, stating the purpose of the meeting, signed by no less than one (1) per cent of the membership of the Union, of whom no more than 0.25 per cent can be from any one undergraduate faculty of the University of Toronto."

#### **DISCUSSION**



## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

Wathey states that one (1) per cent of our membership is equivalent to approximately 470 members.

Hudson states that the lawyers have stated that this is not necessary, but that it is a better way to represent our membership.

### **CARRIED**

#### **MOTION TO CLARIFY VOTES TO GOVERN**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Kondan

Be it resolved that Bylaw III (6) be added to read:

##### **Votes to Govern**

A majority vote of the present members at a quorate meeting of the Board of Directors permits a motion to be carried, unless otherwise specified elsewhere in the Bylaws or the most recent edition of Roberts Rules of Order.

In the event of a tie, a motion shall fail.

### **DISCUSSION**

Hudson states that this clarifies that the Chair cannot break a tie and that our democracy works off of "majority rules" and not consensus or another type of decision-making model.

### **CARRIED**

#### **MOTION TO CLARIFY THE SPEAKER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Adam

Be it resolved that Bylaw III(7) be added to read:

##### **Speaker of the Board of Directors**

The Speaker of Board of Directors shall act as the Chair of the Board of Directors and General Meetings for the year.

The Speaker shall be ratified by the Board of Directors at the first Board of Directors meeting upon recommendation from the President and the Vice-President Internal and Services.

Be it further resolved that the Operational Policy dated 2009 December 03 entitled "Speaker of the Board of Directors" be amended to expunge the "Selection" and "Proxies and Voting" sections.

### **DISCUSSION**

Hudson states that this moves the process from our policies to our bylaws. She states that the lawyers stated that this should be done. She states that the proxies section is being removed because there will be no proxies as of May 1, 2014 as per the November 2013, AGM.

## AGENDA

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

### CARRIED

#### **MOTION TO CHANGE MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND EMPOWER OBSERVERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that Bylaw V(1)(a)(vi) "Vice-President, Campus Life (non-voting)" be amended to read: "Vice-President Campus Life"

Be it further resolved that Bylaw V(1)(e):

e. "Non-voting members:

- i. Executive Director
- ii. All unionized staff
- iii. Speaker
- iv. Elected full-time undergraduate student representatives of the University of Toronto Governing Council
- v. Vice-President, Campus Life
- vi. Sustainability Commissioner

Be amended to read:

e. "Additional Directors (non-voting):

- i. Executive Director
- ii. Speaker
- iii. Sustainability Commissioner"

Be it further resolved that a new Bylaw, to be entitled Bylaw V(2) read:

Observers of the Board of Directors:

Observers of the Board of Directors shall have the following rights:

1. The right to receive all Board of Directors meeting packages, including meeting minutes
2. Speaking rights at all Board of Directors meetings

Observers of the Board of Directors shall be comprised of:

1. All staff of the Board of Directors
2. Elected full-time undergraduate student representatives of the University of Toronto Governing Council
3. Designated representatives of College and Faculty student societies as described in the Union's Policy

### DISCUSSION

Hudson states that the CNCA does not allow *ex-officio* members of Boards of Directors. She states that this language allows the same group of representative to observe and have automatic speaking rights. She states that non-voting "additional" directors are permitted, but continue to have fiduciary responsibilities to the Board. She states that responsibilities cannot be forced on to unelected Observers, only rights.

### CARRIED

## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

### **MOTION TO CLARIFY SIGNING OFFICERS; EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Adam

Be it resolved that Bylaw VIII(3)(a) "President" be amended to add:

- iv. Serves as a signing officer of the Corporation;
- v. Has the authority, along with one other signing officer, to bind the Union to contracts, agreements or other obligations.

Be it further resolved that Bylaw VIII(3)(b) "Vice-President, Internal and Services" be amended to add:

- iv. Serves as a signing officer of the Corporation;
- v. Has the authority, along with one other signing officer, to bind the Union to contracts, agreements or other obligations.

Be it further resolved that Bylaw XIV(2)(a) be amended to add:

- iv. Serves as a signing officer of the Corporation;
- v. Has the authority, along with one other signing officer, to bind the Union to contracts, agreements or other obligations.

### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the lawyers have recommended that this be added to the Bylaws. Currently, this typically happens per a vote of the first Board of Directors meeting.

### **CARRIED**

### **MOTION TO CLARIFY BANKING ARRANGEMENTS**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Kondan

Be it resolved that Bylaw IX be amended to include the following:

- 4. **Banking**  
"The banking of the Union is shall be transacted at a bank or credit union designated by the Officers of the Union."

### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that the lawyers have recommended that this be added to the Bylaws.

### **CARRIED**

### **MOTION TO ADD INVALIDITY CLAUSE**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that Bylaw XVI be added to read:

## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

### **1. Invalidity**

The invalidity of any Bylaw or provision shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining Bylaws or provisions.

### **2. Omissions and Errors**

In the event that there are any omissions in giving notice to any member, director or officer or non-receipt of any notice when given in accordance with the Bylaws such errors or omissions will not invalidate any action taken to any meeting to which the notice pertained.

## **DISCUSSION**

Hudson states that the lawyers have recommended that this be added to the Bylaws. She states that if the University makes an error in the membership list provided to the UTSU, such as omitting members by accident prior to a General Meeting, but that the UTSU follows every other rule required of them, that provision will mean that such an omission will not invalidate the General Meeting. She states that the first clause ensures that if one portion of the Bylaws are improper, it does not invalidate the entire Bylaw package.

## **CARRIED**

### **MOTION TO ADD GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Kondan

Be it resolved that the Operational Policy dated 2013 March 28 entitled "Grievance Procedure" be expunged.

Be it further resolved that Bylaw XVII be added to read:

#### **Grievance Procedure**

The Union intends to make itself an open and accessible space to all members. The Union shall have an operational grievance policy that facilitates a structured mode to grieve.

#### **Procedure**

In the event that there are any omissions in giving notice to any member, director or officer or non-receipt of any notice when given in accordance with the Bylaws such errors or omissions will not invalidate any action taken to any meeting to which the notice pertained.

1. Any alleged violation of the administration or procedures of the Union's Bylaws by the Directors may be dealt with by filing of a grievance by any member of the Corporation. Any such grievance shall be put in writing and addressed to the Grievance Officer, who shall be the Speaker of the Union.
2. In order to be valid, a grievance shall be submitted to the Grievance Officer within 30 days of the alleged violation taking place.

## AGENDA

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

3. The Grievance Officer shall ask for a written response from the person or persons responsible for the matter in contention. This response must be received within two weeks of the request.
4. The Grievance Officer shall meet with the parties concerned within two weeks of receiving the response referred to in (2) above, and attempt to effect a mutually satisfactory resolution of the matter.
5. If the matter cannot be resolved in the above manner, then a meeting of the Board must be called within thirty days of the meeting referred to in (3) above.
6. At this Board meeting, one authorized representative from each side shall present his or her case and answer any questions from the floor.
7. The resolution of the issue shall be decided by majority vote of the Board present at the meeting.

## DISCUSSION

Wathey states that this is simply being moved from the Policy booklet to the Bylaws. He states that a timeline has been added.

## CARRIED

### 4. AMENDMENTS TO CLUBS POLICY

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Adam

Be it resolved that the Clubs Policy be amended to read:

#### PREAMBLE

*The Union must maintain a policy and mechanism for the recognition of campus organizations. For the purpose of this policy, all such organizations, wishing to use "University of Toronto Students' Union" or "UTSU" in their names, and all groups wishing to access Union services and to participate in Union sponsored events, must first be recognized by the Union.*

*Union "members" are defined as University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU) members as outlined in UTSU By-Laws, unless otherwise specified. Campus club(s), group(s), and campus organization(s) are used interchangeably and only refer to St. George campus-recognized clubs.*

#### RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

*The responsibility for the implementation of this policy is delegated to the Vice-President Campus Life, and/or their designate, as well as the St. George Clubs Committee (hereafter known as "Clubs Committee"). All administrative decisions to deny or withdraw recognition or funding will be reported regularly to the Clubs Committee for discussion and ratification. In the case of denial or withdrawal of recognition, a statement of reasons will be provided.*

*It is the responsibility of the Union to notify the previous year's clubs listserv, the Arts and Sciences Students' Union and the Engineering Society to reapply for recognition.*

*The Union will host at least one (1) Clubs Executive Training session in both the Fall and Winter terms and at least two (2) Club Executive Training sessions in the Summer term.*

## AGENDA

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

*The Clubs Committee has the right to request an independent evaluation of a clubs budget or conduct an audit of a club if it wishes.*

*Union sponsorship recognition on all promotional and advertising materials regarding the event may be requested by the committee. Minimum fulfillment of the requirement will be the following: the display of the Union logo and the words "Sponsored in part by the UTSU, your Students' Union" and the display of a Union banner and/or promotional materials at the event. It is the responsibility of the campus club to obtain said promotional materials from the Union.*

*Funding, services, and other support for campus clubs are a vital aspect of the operations and budget of the UTSU. As such, campus clubs are expected and encouraged to participate in the democratic decision-making processes of the UTSU, including, but not limited to, the UTSU Commissions and the UTSU Annual General Meeting.*

### RECOGNITION GUIDELINES

*Union recognized clubs must apply for recognition annually to maintain clubs status. The UTSU recognition period begins on May 1 and ends on March 1 of any given year. Recognition requires clubs to submit a completed clubs recognition form, a copy of the club's current constitution and confirmation of having received Office of Student Life recognition.*

*Recognition of campus groups shall be assessed annually according to the following constitutional criteria:*

- 1. The objectives and activities of groups seeking recognition should be seen as attempting to contribute to the educational, recreational, social or cultural values of the University of Toronto community.*
- 2. Recognized clubs must uphold the Canadian Human Rights Code. This includes policies that uphold discrimination against race, national or ethnic origin, colour, status, creed religion, sex, sexuality, gender identity, gender expression, age, class, mental or physical ability or political orientation. This is not an exhaustive list.*
- 3. Campus clubs must obtain recognition by the Office of Student Life, Arts and Sciences Students' Union, or the Engineering Society prior to applying for UTSU recognition.*
- 4. Recognized campus groups may not engage in activities that are commercial in nature. This is not intended to preclude the collection of membership fees to cover the expenses of the organization, charges for specific activities, programs or events, or to prohibit groups from engaging in legitimate fundraising and sponsorship. However, a recognized campus group cannot:*
  - i. Have as a major activity a function that makes it an on-campus part of a commercial organization.*
  - ii. Provide services and goods at a profit when that profit is used for purposes other than to benefit the organization.*
  - iii. Provide individual financial compensation to some or all of its officers/executives*
- 5. Union recognized groups must have a minimum of 30 members, comprised of at least 50% Union members.*
- 6. The Union requires a club's constitution to include:*
  - i. An organizational name*
  - ii. An mandate/purpose*
  - iii. An organizational structure (including executive structure)*
  - iv. An definition of membership*

## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

- v. *An election procedure*
- vi. *An financial and administrative procedures*

*The Union will provide constitution templates to groups on the Union website.*

7. *Union members must fill at least 75% of leadership positions of a campus club.*
8. *If a club acts in a manner that is inconsistent with its constitution, the Union may revoke its recognition. The club may apply for recognition status at the start of the next academic year. Clubs will be given at least one month's notice to make any necessary changes to avoid removal of recognition from the Union.*
9. *The Union will not recognize a club that replicates the function, principle, or name of another recognized club as determined by the Clubs Committee. A proposed club that bears similarities to another recognized club, but can provide proof of difference for the purpose of recognition, may appeal to the Clubs Committee as to why the proposed club should be recognized and be considered to receive funding.*
10. *Union recognized clubs should aim towards implementing the Union's Sustainability Policy during club events.*
11. *UTSU Service Groups automatically receive access to clubs services excluding clubs funding.*

### **CLUBS FUNDING GUIDELINES**

*Preamble: The UTSU disperses clubs funding to campus clubs to cover operational costs for host campus activities. The Clubs Committee determines clubs funding. The UTSU offers five types of clubs funding: short-term, long-term, summer-term, start-up and reconsideration.*

### **CLUBS FUNDING REQUIREMENTS**

*The Union's Clubs Committee will assign funds to clubs in accordance with the established guidelines outlined below.*

1. *Any groups applying for funding must be a UTSU recognized club.*
2. *Groups receiving student levies are ineligible for clubs funding.*
3. *Initiatives that receive funding shall be done in such a way that they adhere to section 4 of the UTSU Clubs Recognition policy, are not aimed at generating profit, and that they maintain a limited amount of corporate involvement.*
4. *A group has attended 100% of at least one Clubs Executive Training session.*
5. *Clubs funding is determined on a case-by-case basis. Relevant criteria include, but are not limited to:*
  - i. *Projected participation rate of Union members*
  - ii. *The existence and/or significance of other funding sources*
  - iii. *Diversity of activities and programs*
  - iv. *Levels of outreach and promotion*
  - v. *Past funding and receipts received*
  - vi. *Other criteria as determined by the Clubs Committee as they see fit*
6. *Each grant request shall include:*
  - i. *A completed application funding form.*

## AGENDA

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

- ii. *An itemized budget and expense statement. The submitted budget must follow the UTSU budget template.*
  - iii. *Descriptions of events including sample promotional material, if available, from current or previous years.*
  - iv. *The current membership list of the group. This includes, but is not limited to, name, phone number, e-mail, student number, university status, program and/or faculty of each campus club member.*
    - a. *When a campus club can demonstrate the need for anonymity of its members, a campus club may request bypassing membership lists.*
7. *The Union will generally not subsidize the following expenditures:*
- i. *alcoholic items and/or beverages*
  - ii. *capital assets including, but is not limited to:*
    - a. *Electronic equipment*
    - b. *Furniture*
  - iii. *business cards*
  - iv. *club apparel*
  - v. *honoraria, personal compensation and gifts*
8. *Clubs must rely on non-Union funding sources for at least 50% of their total expenses for long-term or start-up application's operating budget. Clubs must also rely on non-Union funding sources for at least 50% of the total campus club's short-term or summer-term application's event budget.*
9. *Failure to comply with the above guidelines in full will result in a group being ineligible for funding for a term determined by the Clubs Committee.*

### **SHORT-TERM FUNDING**

**Preamble:** *Short-term funding aims to provide support to campus clubs that either host one activity a year or host multiple activities but are applying for funding of one predominately larger activity. Short-term funding is intended for campus clubs that operate specific events, campaigns or services that have specified costs such as conferences, publications or fundraisers.*

**Criteria:** *To be eligible for short-term funding the club must be recognized for the current year and must have attended a Clubs Executive Training prior to submitting a funding application. The application must be received at least two weeks prior to the scheduled activity or event.*

**Allocation:** *Short-term funding shall not exceed \$500.00.*

**Deadline:** *The deadline to request short-term funding is the first Friday of February in any given year.*

**Funding Distribution:** *Refer to Schedule A*

**Restrictions:** *Short-term funding excludes:*

- i. *Long-term funding*
- ii. *Start-up funding*
- iii. *Multiple short-term funding*

### **LONG-TERM FUNDING**

**Preamble:** *Long-term funding is intended for campus clubs that operate throughout the year. Funding is intended for campus clubs that host multiple events with varying expenses and revenues.*



## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

**Criteria:** To be eligible for long-term funding the club must be recognized for the current year and must have attended a Clubs Executive Training prior to submitting a funding application.

**Allocation:** Long-term funding has no maximum allocation.

**Deadline:** The deadline to request long-term funding is the third Friday of October in any given year.

**Funding Distribution:** Refer to Schedule A

**Restrictions:** long-term funding excludes:

- i. Short-term funding
- ii. Start-up funding

### **SUMMER-TERM FUNDING**

**Preamble:** Summer-term clubs funding is intended for campus clubs that host events during the summer term. Funding is intended to provide an early reimbursement for clubs that are applying for long-term funding later in the year.

**Criteria:** To be eligible for summer-term funding the club must be recognized for both the previous and current clubs recognition period and have attended the previous year's Club's Executive Training.

**Allocation:** Summer funding allocations shall not exceed more than \$250.

**Deadline:** The deadline to request summer funding is the first Friday of July in any given year.

**Funding Distribution:** Refer to Schedule B

**Restrictions:** Expenses must occur between May 1 and August 31 of any given year.

### **START-UP FUNDING**

**Preamble:** Start-up funding is intended for campus clubs that have not applied for clubs funding in the previous two (2) years. Funding is intended for campus clubs that have recently been established or have a small operating budget.

**Criteria:** To be eligible for start-up funding the club must be recognized for the current year and must have attended Clubs Executive Training prior to submitting a funding application. A campus club applying for start-up funding cannot have applied for UTSU clubs funding for the past two (2) years.

**Allocation:** Start-up funding shall not exceed \$500.00.

**Deadline:** The deadline to request start-up funding is the third Friday of January.

**Funding Distribution:** Refer to Schedule A.

**Restrictions:** Start-up funding excludes:

- i. Short-term funding
- ii. Long-term funding
- iii. Summer Funding

### **RECONSIDERATION FUNDING**

**Preamble:** Upon reviewing all applications received in good standing, the Clubs Committee may revisit long-term, and short-term applications that have submitted receipts totaling their allocation. Funding is intended to provide additional funds to clubs that have shown responsible use of Union

## AGENDA

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

*funds and a need for additional financial resources in the fiscal year. Reconsideration funding is limited and shall not effect the campus clubs application in the following year. Funding is considered limited and not guaranteed to exist year-to-year within the clubs budget.*

**Criteria:** *To be eligible for reconsideration funding, campus clubs must have produced receipts for the total funding allocated through previous UTSU clubs funding as well as produced additional receipts indicating financial need. Funding is allocated based on the remaining funds in the clubs budget.*

**Allocation:** *Reconsideration funding has no maximum allocation.*

**Deadline:** *The deadline to request or be considered eligible for reconsideration funding is the first Friday of March in any given year.*

**Funding Distribution:** *Refer to Schedule B.*

**Restrictions:** *Reconsideration funding cannot be used to increase a Summer-Term funding allocation.*

### FUNDING DISTRIBUTION

*Upon the approval of the Board of Directors, funding distribution will occur according to the following schedule and criteria:*

#### **SCHEDULE A**

##### **\$1-\$500**

*70% of the grant will be forwarded to the campus group. Each campus group that receives a grant must submit a final financial statement of account for the project funded, including receipts, pictures of the event if available and a brief description of the event within one month of the completion of the event. Upon receipt of this documentation, the group shall receive the final 30% of the grant. However, should the group fail to comply with any of the guidelines in this policy; the second installment of the grant will be withheld.*

##### **\$500-\$2000**

*50% of the grant will be forwarded to the campus group. Each campus group that receives a grant must submit a final financial statement of account for the project funded, including receipts, pictures of the event if available and a brief description of the event within one month of the completion of the event. Upon receipt of this documentation, the group shall receive the final 50% of the grant. However, should the group fail to comply with any of the guidelines in this policy; the second installment of the grant will be withheld.*

##### **Over \$2000**

*40% of the grant will be forwarded to the campus group. Each campus group that receives a grant must submit a final financial statement of account for the project funded, including receipts, pictures of the event if available and a brief description of the event within one month of the completion of the event. The second installment shall be issued once receipts have been submitted for 40% of the allocation. The final and remaining 30% of the installment will be received once all receipts are submitted. However, should the group fail to comply with any of the guidelines in this document; the second installment of the grant will be withheld.*

*Submission of receipts to receive balance of funding as per Schedule A must be received at the UTSU office by May 15<sup>th</sup> in any given year.*

#### **SCHEDULE B**

*Distribution of funds is contingent upon the campus club providing 100% of the receipts for their funding allocation.*

## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

### UNITY THROUGH DIVERSITY

*The Clubs Committee will also fund Unity Through Diversity, which will focus on campus engagement with different cultures and communities through collaborations that showcase our campus clubs.*

### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that nothing has changed in the preamble. He states that only the Rights & Responsibilities section has been changed. He states that the display of the UTSU logo and banner is a responsibility so that our members will know that UTSU funds are spent on encouraging campus life. He also states that this section was changed to encourage clubs to attend commission meetings and the Annual General Meeting.

Sajjad states that these provisions were changed with consultation of the clubs on the Clubs Committee.

Wathey states that the language was also improved with respect to grammar and proper terminology.

### **CARRIED**

## **5. MOTION TO AMEND THE BOARD STRUCTURE OF THE UNION**

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that Bylaw V.1(a-d) be amended to read:

- a. The following Executive positions:
  - i. President
  - ii. Vice-President, Internal and Services
  - iii. Vice-President, University Affairs
  - iv. Vice-President, External
  - v. Vice-President, Equity
  - vi. Vice-President, Campus Life
  - vii. President of UTMSU or Designate from the UTMSU Executive Committee
- b. Constituency Directors (10)
  - i. International Students' Director (1)
  - ii. LGBTQ Director (1)
  - iii. Women's Director (1)
  - iv. Racialized Students' Director (1)
  - v. Indigenous Students' Director (1)
  - vi. Mature Students' Director (1)
  - vii. Students with Disabilities'
  - viii. Director Residence Directors (1)
  - ix. Commuter Directors (2)
  - x. Athletics Director (1)
  - xi. First-year Representative (1)
- c. Arts and Science at Large Directors (3)
- d. Transitional Year Program (1)

## **AGENDA**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, April 9, 2014 | 11:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

- e. Professional Faculty At Large Directors (3)
- f. Campus Directors (University of Toronto Mississauga) (4)

Be it further resolved that consultations be undertaken with students' societies, clubs and service groups prior to the Annual General Meeting to solicit feedback, amendments, and other suggestions.

### **DISCUSSION**

Wathey states that this motion was proposed by Sajjad through an ongoing investigation that began after a motion to look into re-structuring the Board of Directors was approved at the annual general meeting. He states that this is the beginning stages of this investigation and will consult students' societies, clubs and service groups throughout the summer and fall terms until all groups are satisfied with the end result.

Adams states that she would like to table this motion to discuss the motion further with the executives at the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union.

Wathey states that this motion is not final and clarifies for Adams that this is only an initial proposal.

Sajjad states that this motion was brought forth at this time after careful review from Ekpunobi's report that was discussed at the past 2 Policy & Procedures Committee meetings. He further states that he is willing to table the motion at this time at the request of Adams as he greatly respects the relationship with the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union.

Adams states that she would like to table the motion for another day.

### **MOTION TO POSTPONE**

Moved: Adam

Seconded: Sajjad

### **CARRIED**

### **MAIN MOTION POSTPONED**

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved: Kondan

Seconded: Adam

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

### **CARRIED**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40.

## MINUTES

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Thursday, April 10, 2014 | 19:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 19:07.

### 2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

### 3. MOTION TO AMEND THE BOARD STRUCTURE OF THE UNION

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that Bylaw V.1(a-d) be amended to read:

- a. The following Executive positions:
  - i. President
  - ii. Vice-President, Internal and Services
  - iii. Vice-President, University Affairs
  - iv. Vice-President, External
  - v. Vice-President, Equity
  - vi. Vice-President, Campus Life
  - vii. President of UTMSU or Designate from the UTMSU Executive Committee
- b. Constituency Directors (10)
  - i. International Students' Director (1)
  - ii. LGBTQ Director (1)
  - iii. Women's Director (1)
  - iv. Racialized Students' Director (1)
  - v. Indigenous Students' Director (1)
  - vi. Mature Students' Director (1)
  - vii. Sustainability Director (1)
  - viii. Students with Disabilities'
  - ix. Director Residence Directors (1)
  - x. Commuter Directors (2)
  - xi. Athletics Director (1)
  - xii. First-year Representative (1)
- c. Arts and Science at Large Directors (3)
- d. Transitional Year Program (1)
- e. Professional Faculty At Large Directors (3)
- f. Campus Directors (University of Toronto Mississauga) (4)

Be it further resolved that consultations be undertaken with students' societies, clubs and service groups prior to the Annual General Meeting to solicit feedback, amendments, and other suggestions.

### DISCUSSION

Sajjad states that at the previous Policy & Procedures Committee meeting the committee discussed reforming the board. He further states that the motion was proposed after reviewing the report submitted by Ekpunobi.

## **MINUTES**

Policy and Procedures Committee of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Thursday, April 10, 2014 | 19:00 | University of Toronto Students' Union Office

---

Nguyen states that most Faculties vote for the representative who then runs in the Union's elections. She states that this structure would allow for the Faculty societies to have more say at the Professional Faculty Committee.

Hudson states that these directors should liaise with service groups on campus.

Wathey states that it is very important that consultation is undertaken. He states that this new structure calls for a similar Committee as the Professional Faculty Committee for the college societies. He states that this will give the college societies a direct say in students' union affairs, and may solve some of the issues that have been raised.

Kondan states that this is a good way forward.

### **CARRIED**

## **4. ADJOURNMENT**

### **MOTION**

Moved: Nguyen

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that the meeting is adjourned.

### **CARRIED**

The meeting was adjourned at 19:25.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE DOCUMENTS**

# **APPENDIX A(1)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE POLICY**



## **Operational Policy - Grievance Procedures**

### **PREAMBLE**

The Union intends to make itself an open and accessible space to all members. The Union shall have an operational grievance policy that facilitates a structured mode to grieve.

### **PROCEDURE**

- (a) Any alleged violation of the administration or procedures of the Union's Bylaws by the Directors may be dealt with by filing of a grievance by any member of the Corporation. Any such grievance shall be put in writing and addressed to the Grievance Officer, who shall be the Speaker of the Union.
- (b) The Grievance Officer shall ask for a written response from the person or persons responsible for the matter in contention. This response must be received within two weeks of the request.
- (c) The Grievance Officer shall meet with the parties concerned within two weeks of receiving the response referred to in (b) above, and attempt to effect a mutually satisfactory resolution of the matter.
- (d) If the matter cannot be resolved in the above manner, then a meeting of the Board must be called within thirty days of the meeting referred to in (c) above.
- (e) At this Board meeting, one authorized representative from each side shall present his or her case and answer any questions from the floor.
- (f) The resolution of the issue shall be decided by majority vote of the Board present at the meeting.

# **APPENDIX A(2)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE 1: SUMMARY**

## **APPENDIX:**

### **GRIEVANCE 1**

Date of Submission: March 26, 2014  
Submitted By: Ye Huang, Nicky Bhatt, Anna Yin, Baliqis Hashiru & Vip Vigneswaran (the “Grievors”)  
Respondents: Elections and Referenda Committee (the “ERC”)

#### **Summary**

Attached are the initial grievance and the response from the ERC. The grievance related to allegations of irregularities with the Spring 2014 UTSU elections. In their response, the ERC rejected the allegations.

As per the UTSU’s Grievance Procedure, a meeting was scheduled between representatives from the Grievors and the ERC on April 11, 2014, to come to a mutually satisfactory resolution of the matter. At the meeting, the Grievors proposed that the election results for the 2014-2015 Executive be thrown out and new elections be held. The ERC maintained that the elections results should stand.

The proposal to throw out the elections results for the 2014-2015 Executive is complicated by the fact that the Board has already ratified the results and cannot hold a re-vote on the same question, and by the fact that the Board does not have the authority to externalize decisions of the ERC.

#### **Resolution**

At the April 11 grievance resolution meeting, the Grievors acknowledged that the only foreseeable way by which new elections can be held for the 2014-2015 Executive is for the current 2014-2015 Executive-elect to resign or be removed from office and for the resultant vacancies to be filled through a by-election.

As such, the Grievors agreed to seek, as a resolution to the grievance, a vote of the Board, requesting the resignation of the 2014-2015 Executive-elect. The ERC opposed the need for such a vote based on their rejection of the claims contained in the grievance.

At this Board Meeting, as per the UTSU Grievance Procedure Policy, one representative from the Grievors and one representative from the ERC will present their cases. The issue will be decided by majority vote of the Board.

# **APPENDIX A(3)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE 1: ORIGINAL SUBMISSION**

Mr. Askhon Hashemi  
Speaker, University of Toronto Students' Union  
12 Hart House Circle  
Toronto, ON M5S 3J9

---

Mr. Speaker and Directors of the UTSU Board,

This letter serves as a formal complain regarding the Spring 2014 Elections. It is our belief that this election was marked by serious irregularities and violations of UTSU Bylaws, and therefore not meaningfully free or fair. We urge you to consider the motion to approve the elections out of order as the report of the CRO and the ERC meeting minutes point to numerous occasions where they acted against the EPC and the Bylaws. To put this motion on the agenda and to have it passed by the Board of Directors may unwillingly put supporting directors in direct contravention of the law.

Most notably, there exists three major courses of action which would bring the motion back in line with the Union's bylaws.

- 1. That all ballots cast on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup> at the University of Toronto Mississauga campus be discarded and that a recount of the remaining ballots be conducted, for reasons elucidated below:**
- 2. Fresh elections be scheduled for the Executive positions of the UTSU, to take place as soon as possible.**
- 3. The UTSU Board seek legal counsel to conclude that the elections or were not conducted within the scope of the Bylaws or the EPC.**

To this effect, there exists 1 severe perversion of the Union's Bylaws.

- A) The decision of the CRO and/or Elections and Referenda Committee (ERC) to extend voting beyond its predetermined schedule to include the hours of 10 AM to 3 PM on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup>, only by paper ballot and only at the UTM campus, and in violation of both the Electoral Procedures Code (EPC) **and the UTSU's own Bylaws;**

Other rulings of the CRO and the ERC put them in direct contravention of the EPC. The elections procedure code is not a Bylaw of the Union but is binding on the Union as it was approved by the Board in an earlier meeting. To this effect, we will highlight three other specific severe perversions of the election process earlier this month, namely:

- B) The relocation by the CRO/ERC on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup> of one polling station from the Communication, Culture and Technology (CCIT) Building, where it had operated throughout the week, to the Davis Building, without informing either the general student public or the candidates for election, and in violation of the EPC;
- C) The presence on the paper ballots of the name of Luis Moreno, a former candidate for the position of Vice-President External who had dropped out of the race on March 6<sup>th</sup>;
- D) The \$340 fined on Anna Yin despite the CRO failing to follow due process outlined in the EPC

throughout Anna's appeal. Namely, the CRO not providing Anna Yin with the evidence presented against her before the appeal, giving her little time to prepare. The EPC specifically states that the CRO must provide the evidence within 24 hours of the ruling.

Mr. Speaker, we urge you to consider the bylaw violations herein and to protect the Corporation from potential legal action.

### **A. The Decision to Extend Voting Hours at UTM on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup>**

On Wednesday, March 12<sup>th</sup>, the second day of voting the Greater Toronto Area experienced an unexpected downfall of snow and freezing rain, hampering transportation across the city. Many students encountered difficulties reaching class on all three U of T campuses. UTM was in fact officially closed around 1 PM, although the St. George campus, as always, stayed open throughout the day. A number of student leaders, including UTSU President and ERC Chair Munib Sajjad, complained about the Administration's decision to keep St. George open, citing safety and equity concerns.

In light of this situation, an announcement was posted on the Elections Notice Board on the afternoon of Thursday, March 13<sup>th</sup> noting that additional voting hours would be held only at UTM, and only for paper ballots, from 10 AM to 3 PM on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup>. These extra voting hours violated both the EPC and, more importantly, **the UTSU's Bylaws**, and serve as our most serious grievance with elections process. However, since Pierre Harfouche, a member of our slate and VP University Affairs-elect, has already submitted a detailed complaint regarding this issue, we shall keep our remarks here fairly brief.

Intuitively, the decision by the CRO/ERC to add extra voting hours at UTM makes some sense; UTM alone lost approximately five hours polling station operation due to the closure of campus, and these were basically transferred to Friday. However, this narrative collapses under even the slightest bit of scrutiny. Firstly, no UTM students were truly denied their right to vote by inclement weather, because, with this year's addition of online voting, any student who was prevented from reaching the polling station in person after 1 PM on March 12<sup>th</sup> could simply have voted online on that very day or the following day. More fundamentally, although the St. George campus avoided a full-blown closure, there is no disputing the fact that thousands of St. George students hailing from Richmond Hill, Brampton, Scarborough and other distant GTA locations were physically prevented from reaching campus on March 12<sup>th</sup>. Therefore, if voting was to be extended, it should have been extended at both campuses.

In addition, there are manifest equity-related reasons that election dates are meant to be set well in advance and not altered once the Voting Period has begun. The UTSU goes to great lengths to make its elections accessible to all members, subsidizing candidates if they can demonstrate financial need, for example. Moreover, many U of T students juggle academic obligations with part or full-time work and familial duties. In order to contest UTSU elections, these individuals must be able to know definitively, and well ahead of the Voting Period, when they must make time to campaign. Extending voting hours, for whatever reason, discriminates against low-income and marginalized students who cannot simply drop everything and make themselves available for another day on the campaign trail. In order to protect these students' right to stand for UTSU office, we will see below that the Union Bylaws have established a somewhat cumbersome procedure for setting or altering election dates.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the fact that the decision to extend voting at UTM may have been

made with only the purest motives, it was in blatant contravention of both the EPC and the Bylaws. Clause 1.j of the EPC under “Administration of Elections” clearly states that “On voting days, no fewer than 8 polling stations on the St. George Campus and no less than 3 polling stations on the Mississauga Campus... shall be set up by the Chief Returning Officer”. Of course, there were no polling stations set up at St. George on March 14<sup>th</sup>, so this clause was violated.

In their defence, the CRO and ERC might cite clause 3.a.iii under “Rules for Elections”, which states that **“The CRO and ERC both have the power to make decisions about issues and events not otherwise covered by this Code”**. However, this cannot reasonably be understood to mean that the CRO or ERC can violate other sections of the EPC, such as 1.j above – rather, it empowers them solely to make binding decisions other than those already included within the EPC. In any case, 3.a.iii falls under the section of the EPC dealing with campaign violations, so it is unclear if it would be applicable to election dates in any case.

Next, members of the ERC might point to clause 1.h under “Administration of Elections”, which appears to give the ERC the ability to set the election schedule. However, clause 2.b.iii of the UTSU Bylaws under “Election of Board of Directors”, forthrightly states that **“The schedule for elections for the Board of Directors shall be set by the Board of Directors, with recommendation from the Elections and Referenda Committee in consultation with the Chair of the UTMSU Elections and Referenda Committee”**. As you know, under Section 1 of the Bylaws under “Board of Directors”, all Executives are also considered members of the Board of Directors.

Thus, we appear to have a confusing contradiction between the EPC and the Bylaws. Nonetheless, clause 1.b of the EPC under “Powers of the Elections Procedures Code” helpfully clarifies that **“Where this Code is in contradiction of the Union Bylaws, the Bylaws will prevail”**. Therefore, since the Board of Directors was never consulted about the decision to extend voting hours at UTM, that decision was completely illegal, the polling stations operating on March 14<sup>th</sup> were illegitimate, and all ballots cast on that day should not be considered relevant for the Union's elections, which had legally ended on the previous day.

With access to the ERC minutes, it is now clear that the ERC and CRO met on March 12<sup>th</sup> to formally decide to extend voting at UTM, and then briefly discussed Pierre's initial appeal of the extended voting hours on March 15<sup>th</sup>. On neither occasion did the CRO or any member of the ERC even consider the fact that the extension of voting hours **violated the UTSU Bylaws**. Indeed, the only sort of reasoning provided anywhere were comments by the CRO on March 15<sup>th</sup> to the effect that if the March 14<sup>th</sup> votes were to be discarded to the absence of St. George polling stations in accordance with clause 1.j of the EPC, votes from the St. George campus on March 12<sup>th</sup> would also have to be discarded because the UTM polling stations were not open after 1 PM on that day.

Here, we would also like to point out a misinterpretation of clause 1.j, the clause only states states that the required number of polling stations must be “set up by the Chief Returning Officer” on each voting day, but not necessarily that each polling station remain operational all day. This rule was designed to be this way - as it permits voting stations to close early during the day - which is frequently done when there are booking mishaps. To be brief, the fact that only St George remained open Wednesday does not contravene the EPC. However, opening stations at UTM only on March 14th did put the UTSU in contravention of its democratically determined bylaws.

Our last complaint to this issue lies in the fact that the ERC and the CRO failed to notify Pierre that his complaint had been addressed. Pierre emailed the chair of the ERC on Monday and requested to be

present at the hearing. However, he was never told the hearing had already taken place. The minutes of the ERC indicate that the ERC also instructed President Munib Sajjad to respond to Pierre and explain the decision. Pierre alleges this never occurred. If a court of law is to find that the ERC acted in good faith when violating the Union's bylaws, it cannot explain the ERC's decision to not communicate their decision to Pierre Harfouche.

Finally, while Pierre did take the appropriate steps in initiating a complaint to the ERC about the additional voting hours at UTM, the ultimately responsibility lies in the speaker and the Board to determine whether or not to declare the motion to ratify these elections out of Order and in Contravention of Union Bylaws. We urge the Speaker to reject this motion and if it is still in order, we urge the Board of Directors to carefully consider the UTSU Bylaws which state **“The schedule for elections for the Board of Directors shall be set by the Board of Directors, with recommendation from the Elections and Referenda Committee in consultation with the Chair of the UTMSU Elections and Referenda Committee”**.

We recommend two courses of action

1. Refuse to ratify the election and recount the ballots excluding the votes cast at UTM on Friday. While it is true that discarding votes is not ideal, voters who cast a ballot on Friday were already casting their ballot after the election. Had they known voting Friday was illegal, they could not elect to vote another day - the election would have been closed. Had voting hours been extended in the early hours on Thursday, it would be reasonable to assume that voters who would have cast their vote during legal hours were deprived and therefore the board is disenfranchising voters.
2. Refuse to ratify the election and call a new election for any executive positions and board of director elections which would be affected by the ballots on Friday. While it is true that UTM students could not elect their board representatives, some St George students may have cast a ballot on Friday at UTM. A investigation into whether close races would be impacted should be conducted. This is unlikely to change any results but the ERC and the CRO should report on this issue and the election results could be ratified by the Board of Directors at the next meeting.
3. Seek legal counsel to ensure that if the UTSU Board approves these elections it would not be violating bylaws. It is important to remember that everyone here is a student and none of us are experts in law. It would therefore be prudent for the Board to seek legal counsel to review the extension of voting hours at UTM and ensure it complied with Union Bylaws.

**It is for this reason that we demand that all ballots cast on March 14<sup>th</sup> be discarded, and that a recount of the remaining ballots be conducted in order to determine the real winners of the Spring 2014 UTSU Elections.**

## **B. The Relocation of a Polling Station to the Davis Building on March 14<sup>th</sup>**

In addition to the previously mentioned concerns, another serious irregularity took place on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup> at UTM. Throughout the week, UTM had hosted three polling stations in accordance with the EPC. Two had been located in the CCIT, while the other was located in the Instructional Centre (IB). On March 14<sup>th</sup>, however, one of the polling stations previously situated in the CCIT was moved instead to the Davis Building. As the attached screenshots will demonstrate, this move was not mentioned, as one might have expected, in the CRO's announcement on March 13<sup>th</sup> that



voting would be extended at UTM.

Consequently, members of Team Unite, as well as doubtless many members of the general voting public, had no idea that one of the polling stations had been moved. For that reason, Team Unite did not send campaigners to the Davis Building on March 14<sup>th</sup> and did not campaign there at all. At the same time, at least one Executive candidate and volunteers for Team Voice were aware of the shift to the Davis Building approximately half an hour before polls opened, and thus did send campaigners there on March 14<sup>th</sup>. For that reason, voters at the Davis Building polling station were only exposed to one slate, and Team Unite was disenfranchised in terms of its ability to sway voters.

More importantly, the decision to relocate the polling station to the Davis Building without giving fair notice to Team Voice or the general public was a blatant violation of the EPC. Clause 1.k of the EPC under “Administration of Elections” states that “Polling locations shall be publicized at the start of the campaign period”. This year, the campaign period began on March 4<sup>th</sup>, and the Davis Building was not publicized as a polling location on that date or at any point afterwards. Therefore, the Davis Building polling station was illegal, and all ballots cast there should be considered null and void, especially in light of the severe disadvantage to Team Unite caused by the CRO's inexplicable failure to announce the relocation of the polling station even when the extended voting hours at UTM were announced.

Our Presidential candidate, Ye Huang, made many of these same points in a complaint sent to the CRO on March 14<sup>th</sup> itself, which is attached to this letter. The CRO responded to this complaint doing so on March 20<sup>th</sup>. Her ruling has been reproduced here:

**Date: March 16, 2014**

**Time: 17:00**

On March 15, 2014 at 17:09, the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) received a complaint that the operation of a polling station in the Davis Building at University of Toronto Mississauga on March 14, 2014 from 10am-3pm contravened the Elections Procedure Code. The complainant went on to allege that member of “UofTVoice” were aware of this information prior to the general public being made prior to this information, giving “UofTVoice” an advantage. The complainant contended that in respect of the above, all the votes from the Davis Building should be disposed of and not counted towards the results.

Article IV.1.j. “The Elections and Referenda Committee” of the Elections Procedure Code states “ To ensure a fair and equal distribution of polling stations, locations shall be ratified by the Elections and Referenda Committee on recommendation of the CRO in consultation with the ERC Chair. In allocating polling stations, the ERC will consider factors including, but not limited to, cost, logistics, proximity to other polling stations, accessibility, traffic, and poll locations in previous elections.

Article IV.1.j. “The Elections and Referenda Committee” of the Elections Procedure Code states “Polling locations shall be publicized at the start of the campaign period.”

Upon investigation, the CRO has determined that there has been no violation of the Elections Procedure Code. The CRO acknowledges that the original polling stations for University of Toronto Mississauga did not include the Davis Building. However, the Davis Building had been ratified as a polling location by the ERC on January 8, 2014, and was not used on March 11-13, 2014 due to a prior booking. Additionally, it was at the request of UTM students the polling station was moved to the Davis Building on the morning of the final day of voting. Finally, due to the scheduling of an ancillary day of voting to accommodate for the closure of University of Toronto Mississauga on March 12, 2014 as a result of weather conditions, it was deemed necessary to accommodate the students’ needs in this respect.

Upon investigation, the CRO has determined that members of “UofTVoice” were not informed of the polling station in Davis prior to the general public. Members of “UofTVoice” were at the University of Toronto Mississauga campus well in advance of the polls opening at 10:00 and saw the polling stations being set up at the same time as the general public.

The CRO has decided that the above issues are not sufficient reason to dispose of the votes from the Davis Building, in that to do so would disenfranchise University of Toronto Mississauga voters and would not contribute to a fair election for the entire constituency of the University of Toronto Students' Union

On that very same day, Huang filed a detailed appeal of this ruling, intending to make his case before the ERC. To date, Munib Sajjad, Chair of the ERC, has yet to formally respond to Huang's appeal or even acknowledge that he has received it.

In that appeal, which has also been attached, Huang highlighted the errors made in the CRO's original ruling. She begins by citing clause 1.j to prove that the CRO/ERC are empowered to determine the location of polling stations, something that was never in dispute. The Crux of Huang's complaint lies in cause 1.k under administration of the elections of the EPC. The CRO's ruling simply states that she is aware of the clause and that she may have violated it. She offers an intuitive explanation for why the polling station had to be moved, noting that the Davis Building had been otherwise booked March 11<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup>. She also reasons that the Team Voice Executive candidate could have discovered the location switch early by simply being in the right place at the right time. **Both of these explanations are plausible and we do not dispute them, but neither address the legal concerns surrounding the Davis Building polling stations.** The Board is responsible to review the Bylaws, and the membership's will in making decisions, but cannot ignore either. Ultimately, we are bound by our bylaws and the EPC and we cannot arbitrarily choose to violate one clause or another.

The CRO does continue to state that the Davis Building had been ratified by the ERC as a polling station on January 8<sup>th</sup>, something we are not disputing. However, the EPC is clear and states that the polling station must be advertised at the **start of the campaign period** which occurred on March 3<sup>rd</sup>. Moreover, the minutes of the January 8<sup>th</sup> ERC meeting have not yet been made public, and there is no way that Team Unite could have been expected to be aware of their decisions at that time. Pierre, a member of the Board and member of team UNITE, was at work all day on Friday March 14 and could not give the team tips to run across a rogue voting station. Finally, the CRO claims that to discard the ballots cast at the Davis Building would be to “disenfranchise” those who voted there, and to “not contribute to a fair election for the entire constituency of the UTSU”. We now know that the ERC met again on March 20<sup>th</sup>, after Huang had appealed the CRO's initial ruling, and failed to even mention his appeal. This is yet another example of the ERC President acting in bad faith toward complainants and appellants, and failing to provide due process to members of the UTSU.

We maintain the exact opposite. It seems self-evident to us that blatant and unjustified violations of the EPC, as occurred in this case, are a leading cause of unfairness in UTSU Elections. Indeed, to allow “rogue” polling stations to operate without informing the general public or the competing slates of their existence disenfranchises all voters who cast fair and legitimate ballots at fair and legitimate polling stations.

On this basis, we insist that even if , for whatever reason, the other ballots from March 14<sup>th</sup> are not discarded, **the ballots cast at the Davis Building polling station must be discarded, and a recount ordered for the remaining ballots in order to determine the true winners of the Spring 2014 UTSU Elections.**

### **C. The Presence of Luis Moreno's Name on the Ballot**

Initially, all five Executive positions were to be contested by one candidate each from Team Unite and Team Voice, with the addition of Luis Moreno as an independent candidate for the position of Vice-President External. However, at the All-Candidates Debate held on March 6<sup>th</sup>, Luis used his allotted speaking time to announce his withdrawal from the race and endorsement of Team Unite candidate Nicky Bhatti in his stead. It was widely expected that his withdrawal would be reflected in the absence of his name from the ballot.

However, this was not the case. By March 12<sup>nd</sup>, the second day of voting, it became clear to everyone that while Luis's name had been removed from the online ballots, it remained on the paper ballots, causing much confusion. On that very day, Nicky dispatched an email to the CRO complaining about this state of affairs, and that correspondence has been attached to this email. The CRO noted that ballots has been printed before Luis's withdrawal on March 6<sup>th</sup>.

At this point, the CRO assured Nicky that notices detailing Luis's withdrawal had already been posted at all polling stations, rather than simply ordering poll clerks to manually cross his name off individual ballots, which would have been a far more effective solution. More worryingly, The Medium, UTM's campus newspaper, [reported on March 17th](#) that when their reporters had visited polling stations at UTM on March 12<sup>th</sup>, no such notices were visible and poll clerks were completely unaware of any such problem. Numerous voters at the St. George campus corroborated this information by stating that some polling stations at downtown campus also lacked the required notice. Thus, hundreds and perhaps even thousands of voters were robbed of their right to make an informed decision by this mysterious failure to implement the CRO's pledge.

The unofficial results released on March 17<sup>th</sup> showed that Grayce Slobodian, the Voice candidate for VP External, had defeated Nicky by only 15 votes, with an extraordinarily high number of spoiled ballots. Upon automatic recount, this margin of victory was expanded slightly to 38 votes. At the automatic recount on March 19<sup>th</sup>, scrutineers were able to extract critical information, which is displayed below:

Name	Online	Paper	Total
Nicky BHATTY	1937	618	2555
Grayce SLOBODIAN	1026	1567	2593
Luis MORENO	0	319	319
Spoil	789	151	940
ALL Spoil	789	470	1259

This table shows that the majority of “spoiled” paper ballots were in fact mistakenly cast for Luis Moreno, and that the 319 ballots cast for him obviously influenced the final result, since the 319 that he received dwarfs the eventual margin of victory. Indeed, for 16 ballot boxes, representing a specific station on a specific day, 90-100% of the supposedly “spoiled” votes were cast for Luis, probably indicating the complete absence of a notice throughout the day.

Already on March 18<sup>th</sup>, Nicky and Luis had sent almost identical emails to the CRO and ERC, which are attached as well. Therein, they formally appealed the election result, and argued that either the votes cast for Luis should be transferred to Nicky, because one had endorsed the other, or, more plausibly, that fresh elections be scheduled specifically for the position of Vice-President External. As

of our submission of this letter, neither the CRO nor the Chair of the ERC, UTSU President Munib Sajjad, have responded to or at all acknowledged Luis and Nicky's appeal of the results.

As it turns out, the official package for the March 28<sup>th</sup> Board of Directors meeting reveals that the CRO and ERC indeed met to discuss Luis and Nicky's appeal on March 20<sup>th</sup>, albeit without informing either of the complainants of this fact or giving them notice to appear in person. Firstly, the CRO alleges that the appeal was submitted more than 48 hours after the announcement of unofficial results, and thus not admissible. However, attached documentation shows that the appeal was submitted at 11:15 AM on March 18<sup>th</sup>, which is well within 48 hours of the announcement of unofficial results which took place on the evening on March 17<sup>th</sup>.

Moreover, the CRO and ERC failed to substantively address the complaint. They argued that it was unreasonable to simply transfer all of Luis's ballots to Nicky because it is impossible to divine the exact intent of those voters. On this note, we agree that a difference in opinion may influence the result. However, they fail to address the more reasonable argument that the election for VP External should be rerun, given that the presence of Luis's name on the ballot had a significant impact on the final result. Finally, by failing to notify the complainants that their complaint had been considered, and failing to post the results to the Elections Notice Board, the ERC acted in bad faith and is seen to be concealing elements of the election from the voting public.

**On this basis, we contend that the election for the position of Vice-President, External specifically was irredeemably flawed, and that the current “unofficial” result should not be ratified. A new election should be held at the earliest possible occasion in accordance to the Bylaws.**

## **D. The Near-Disqualification of Anna Yin**

On March 14<sup>th</sup>, just as voting finally concluded after the added day at UTM, the Team Unite candidate for VP Internal, Anna Yin, received an email from the CRO noting that she had received enough demerit points to be disqualified from the election. The contents of this email were soon posted on the Elections Notice Board, and consisted of the following:

**Date: March 14, 2014**

**Time: 14:00**

On March 13, 2014 at 11:55, the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) received a complaint that Vice-President Internal and Services candidate Anna Chenchun Yin had violated the Elections Procedure Code. The complainant alleged that the candidate engaged in intentional misrepresentation of fact, malicious or intentional breach of elections policy by knowingly presenting false information to voters, violating Article VI.1.d.vi and Article VI.1.d.viii “Fair Play” of the EPC. The complainant attached audio evidence of the alleged violation.

Article VI.1.d states “Candidates shall campaign in accordance with the rules of Fair Play. Breaking the rules of fair play include, but are not limited to: malicious or intentional breach of elections policy; misrepresentation of facts.”

Upon investigation, the CRO has determined that there is sufficient evidence to find multiple violations of the Elections Procedure Code.

Ms. Yin claimed that the UTSU membership fee was \$345. Ms. Yin has already been told to correct this claim in a previous ruling. This is in violation of VI.1.d.viii.3 and VI.1.d.vi and is intentional breach of elections policy, in addition to both intentional and gross misrepresentation of fact.

Ms. Yin claimed that the UTSU has no report indicating where funds are spent. The CRO has investigated and found that there is an audit report on the UTSU website as well as budgets. This is in violation of VI.1.d.viii.3 and is both intentional and gross misrepresentation of fact.

Ms. Yin claimed that the UTSU's largest expense is Executive salaries. The CRO has investigated and found that this false. This is in violation of VI.1.d.viii.3 and is an intentional misrepresentation of fact.

Ms. Yin claimed that the UTSU allowed the University of Toronto Mississauga to leave the organization in the past and divert fees to UTM. The CRO has investigated and found that this is false. This is in violation of VI.1.d.viii.3 and is a misrepresentation of fact.

Ms. Yin claimed that the UTSU is preventing autonomous organizations from "leaving" the UTSU by citing UTSU bylaws. The CRO has investigated and found that this is false. This is in violation of VI.1.d.viii.3 and is a misrepresentation of fact.

Ms. Yin claimed that a Student Society Summit was created to investigate undemocratic UTSU bylaws. The CRO has investigated and found that this is false. This is in violation of VI.1.d.viii.3 and is a misrepresentation of fact.

There is a concern that this false information has been presented to multiple students multiple times, deceiving potential voters to secure votes.

Ms. Yin has engaged in:

Misrepresentation of facts **(maximum demerit points: 3)**

Intentional misrepresentation of facts **(maximum demerit points: 10)**

Gross misrepresentation of facts **(maximum demerit points: 20)**

Malicious or intentional violation of Elections Procedure Code or Policy **(maximum demerit points: 20)**

Failure to comply with the spirit and purpose of the elections **(maximum demerit points: 35)**

**The following demerit points are issued for this complaint:**

**Chenchen Anna Yin:**

3 demerit points for misrepresentation of facts

10 demerit points for intentional misrepresentation of facts

15 demerit points for gross misrepresentation of facts

15 demerit points for malicious or intentional violation of the Elections Procedure Code or Policy

15 demerit points for failure to comply with the spirit and purpose of the elections

**Total demerit points: 63**

Essentially, Anna was to be disqualified on the basis of making various statements about the current state of the UTSU that the CRO deemed to be false. In and of itself, this is a ridiculous state of affairs: Can anyone imagine a candidate in a federal, provincial or municipal election being disqualified for making statements of dubious veracity? This is a major failing of the EPC as it currently stands.

But more importantly, the failure of the CRO and ERC to adhere to the EPC's rules governing the appeals process made this whole episode even more tortuous for Anna. Firstly, in contravention of clause 3.e.iii under “Rules for Elections” in the EPC, the CRO failed to make the evidence of Anna's supposed crimes available to her. Anna even went as far as requesting the evidence - something the EPC does not require her to do. Even after requesting the evidence, Anna was never able to examine the evidence until a few minutes before her appeal - giving her little time to prepare and formulate coherent arguments. Thus, by failing to comply with 3.e.iii, the CRO distorted due process from the beginning, and the demerit points should have been dropped automatically, whether Anna was guilty of the offence or not. This is comparable to a case where an individual has actually committed a crime, but the police somehow violate the accused's rights before coming to trial. This would result in the abandonment of all charges in a Canadian court, and the same should be good enough for the UTSU.

Additionally, the key piece of evidence in Anna's case was a voice recording that allegedly featured her making the comments ascribed to her in the complaint. Even after the 24-hour deadline had elapsed the CRO refused to provide a copy of this recording to Anna or even a written transcript of it, only offering to send her a written submission from the complainant. This was supposedly done to protect the anonymity of the individual who submitted the evidence. Nevertheless, it is clear that Anna's ability to prepare a defence for herself in advance of her appeal hearing before the ERC was rendered almost useless by the CRO's refusal to send her the recording, because the case could plausibly have hinged on the quality/clarity of the audio recording itself. A mere written submission from the complainant, which may be at variance with what actually occurred, is of little use.

Indeed, when Anna, after significant delays, defended herself before the ERC, it emerged that the audio recording did not feature her saying the words ascribed to her in the CRO's original ruling. Moreover, there was nothing in the recording that compromised the anonymity of the one who recorded it. Thus, the CRO once again violated due process by refusing Anna access to the evidence called against her, one of the most basic principles of any fair justice system. We thus assumed that the ruling and demerit points would be dropped entirely. Instead, on March 16<sup>th</sup>, the ERC rendered the following ruling:

**Date: March 16, 2014**

**Time: 21:27**

On March 16 at 18:00, Vice-President Internal & Services Candidate Anna Chenchen Yin appealed CRO Ruling 028 to the Elections and Referenda Committee (ERC). Ms. Yin was assigned 58 demerit points in the ruling for violating Articles VI.1.d.vi & viii “Fair Play” of the Elections Procedure Code (EPC).

The ERC allowed Ms. Yin and Ms. Yin's representative to make an appeal on her behalf. The appellant requested that the demerit points assigned for “Fair Play” to be reduced based on the following argument:

- That she did not receive evidence of her violation within 24 hours.
- That she told a student that students pay a “fee” of \$345 to the UTSU, but did not refer to this as a membership fee.

- That while she said that there is “no report indicating where fees are spent”, that she later stated that there is an audit report released on an annual basis.
- That while she said that Executive Committee salaries are the largest expense of the UTSU, she later corrected herself, and stated that Executive and staff salaries are the largest expense.
- That she did not claim that UTM students “left” the UTSU, but said that UTM fees were “diverted” or remitted.
- That the claim that the UTSU was preventing autonomous groups from leaving is true, and corroborated by a letter written by former UTSU President Shaun Shepherd, dated February 27, 2013.
- That the claim that the Student Societies Summit was created to investigate undemocratic bylaws was an opinion, not a fact.

The Committee reviewed the audio evidence and decided the following:

- Ms. Yin misrepresented the membership fee.
- Ms. Yin misrepresented the fact that the UTSU provides reports of where membership fees are spent.
- Ms. Yin misrepresented the largest expense of the UTSU.
- Ms. Yin claimed that UTM students “left” the UTSU.
- Ms. Yin’s claim that the UTSU was preventing autonomous groups from leaving is untrue, and Mr. Shepherd’s letter referred to the process to alter membership fees only.
- That the claim that the Student Societies Summit was created to investigate undemocratic bylaws was stated as fact, but could be an opinion understood by the membership.

On the matter of “misrepresentation of facts”, the Committee resolved to uphold the ruling of the CRO. On the other matters, the Committee agreed with the CRO that there was intentional misrepresentation and gross misrepresentation of facts. The Committee did not agree that her violations were sufficient to warrant disqualification.

In summary,

**The Committee reduced the amount of demerit points issued for this violation to 29.**

**Total Demerit Points**

**Anna Chenchen Yin: 34**

In essence, despite the violations of due process described above, and despite considerable evidence marshaled by Anna to prove that her alleged statements did not constitute “misrepresentations of facts”, the ERC upheld the CRO’s original ruling. However, the ERC decided to downscale the number of demerit points assigned, saving Anna from disqualification. Still, she was left with 34 demerit points and thus a \$340 fine, a hefty amount for many U of T students. At this point, the UTSU appeals process was exhausted, and Anna had nowhere else to appeal the fine remaining against her. In light of the CRO’s multiple violations of due process and the general weakness of the case arrayed against Anna, we consider this fine to be a grave miscarriage of justice.

**In summary, we believe that this entire incident highlights the failure of the CRO and ERC to respect due process and the requirements of the EPC, a tendency that undermined the fair conduct of the entire election.**

## Conclusion

Overall, it is clear that the Spring 2014 UTSU Elections were marked by irregularities and illegal actions the likes of which have not been seen at this university for many years. We are not complaining about the use of campaigners from outside the Union and the little grievances students had with the elections in general. Rather we contend that ratifying this election would be to undermine Union Bylaws and may put the UTSU against the Policy on Ancillary Non Academic Fees, the consequence of which is to not ratify the elections. It is alarming that even after 12 days of Pierre's original complain, he has received no response from the CRO or the ERC.

The CRO and ERC will likely try to reassure the UTSU Board of Directors that the Spring Elections were a grand success, that they proceeded without incident, and, as the CRO's Final Report states, that "all complaints and appeals were ultimately dealt with". Unfortunately, while the CRO did run a great election, with high turnout, major decisions were made in violation of both the EPC and **the UTSU Bylaws**, that may have altered the elections result. Simultaneously, the complaints and appeals process did not function in a fair and orderly manner, with the result that many burning questions central to the outcome of these elections remain unanswered. Thus, we are sadly forced to conclude that the unofficial results as they currently stand are illegitimate and illegal, and we plead that the Speaker finds the motion to ratify the elections out of order.

We also plead that the Board of Directors decide to take any of three actions.

- 1. That all ballots cast on Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup> at the University of Toronto Mississauga campus be discarded and that a recount of the remaining ballots be conducted, in order to determine the legal outcome of the elections.**
- 2. Fresh elections be scheduled for the Executive positions of the UTSU, to take place as soon as possible.**
- 3. The UTSU Board seek legal counsel to conclude that the elections or were not conducted within the scope of the Bylaws or the EPC.**

It has truly been a very well fought election campaign by all. We cannot ignore, however, that crucial mistakes were made in administering these elections. As candidates who presented ourselves for your very seats, we urge you to respect the Bylaws that were established and respected by numerous UTSU Boards before you.

Signed,

Ye Huang, Candidate for President  
Nicky Bhatta, Candidate for Vice-President, External  
Anna Yin, Candidate for Vice-President, Internal  
Baliqis Hashiru, Candidate for Vice-President, Equity  
Vip Vigneswaran, Campaign Manager

cc: Munib Sajjad, President - University of Toronto Students' Union  
cc: Board of Directors - University of Toronto Students' Union  
cc: Sandy Hudson, Executive Director - University of Toronto Students' Union



# **APPENDIX A(4)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE 1: ORIGINAL RESPONSE**

**DELIVERED BY E-MAIL**

April 04, 2014

Ashkon Hashemi

Speaker of the Board of Directors  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
12 Hart House Circle  
Toronto, ON M5S 3J9

**RE: RESPONSE TO GRIEVANCE "FCL.pdf"**

Dear Mr. Ashkon Hashemi,

Thank you for forwarding the grievance ["FCL.pdf"] ("**the Grievance**") on April 01, 2014. This correspondence serves as the official response of the Elections and Referenda Committee ("**the Committee**") of the University of Toronto Students' Union ("**UTSU**").

The Grievance makes the following allegations about the Spring 2014 Elections of the UTSU:

1. **The election was marked by "serious irregularities and violations of UTSU Bylaws".**
2. **The election was "not meaningfully free or fair".**

The Committee rejects both of these allegations. The Committee is confident that in each action taken by both the Chief Returning Officer ("**CRO**") and the Committee itself, the Bylaws, Policies and the Elections Procedure Code were strictly adhered to and the membership was respected. Each action taken by the Committee and the Chief Returning Officer was for the express purpose of providing fair elections for the membership of the UTSU.

The Grievance makes the following allegations with regards to violations of the UTSU Bylaws and Elections Procedure Code:

1. **The decision of the [Elections and Referenda Committee] to extend voting beyond its predetermined schedule to include the hours of [10:00 to 15:00] on Friday, March 14, only by paper ballot and only at the University of Mississauga Campus [is] in violation of both the [Elections Procedure Code] and the UTSU's own Bylaws.**
2. **The relocation by the CRO/ERC on Friday, March 14 of one polling station from the Communication, Culture and Technology (CCIT) Building, where it had operated throughout the week, to the Davis Building, without informing either the general student public or the candidates for election [is] in violation of the EPC.**

The Committee rejects both of these allegations. I will address the allegations in turn.

## 1. PAPER BALLOT VOTING AT THE MISSISSAUGA CAMPUS

### SUMMARY OF FACTS:

- The Committee set a schedule of elections on January 8, 2014<sup>1</sup>.
- The schedule of elections was approved by the Board of Directors on January 24, 2014<sup>2</sup>.
- The schedule of elections included three voting days for both online and paper ballot voting: March 11, March 12 and March 13, 2014.
- On March 12, 2014, the University of Toronto closed the Mississauga campus at 13:00 due to inclement weather. Paper ballot voting was forced to close.
- On March 12, 2014, the Elections and Referenda Committee resolved to provide a commensurate number of hours of voting on March 14, 2014 at the Mississauga campus to account for the early closure<sup>3</sup>.
- On March 13, 2014, the Committee announced that replacement paper ballot polling hours would be implemented.

The University of Toronto Students' Union Bylaws contain the following clauses relevant to this issue:

- **BYLAW VI.2(b) "SCHEDULE OF ELECTIONS":**  
"The schedule of elections shall include:
  - i. Notice of the date of the elections and nomination procedure shall be given to members by campus publication and Union website at least fourteen (14) days prior to the start of the nomination period.
  - ii. No less than sixteen (16) hours of polling over a period of no less than two (2) days.
  - iii. The schedule for elections for the Board of Directors shall be set by the Board of Directors, with recommendation from the Elections and Referenda Committee in consultation with the Chair of the UTMSU Elections and Referenda Committee"
- **BYLAW VI.3 "ELECTION PROCEDURE CODE":**  
"In addition to this Bylaw, there shall be an Election Procedure Code governing the elections of the Board of Directors, which must be approved by the Board of Directors, based on the recommendation of the Elections and Referenda Committee. The Election Procedure Code may not have sections externalized. The Board may only send the document back to the Committee for review and revisions."

The University of Toronto Students' Union Elections Procedure Code contains the following clauses relevant to this issue:

- **EPC ARTICLE I "INTERPRETATION":**  
"The Chief Returning Officer and the Elections and Referenda Committee make all interpretations to this Code."
- **EPC ARTICLE II.1(b) "JURISDICTION":**  
"Where this code is in contradiction of the union bylaws, the bylaws will prevail."

---

<sup>1</sup> See Schedule 'A' on page 18 for the minutes of the January 8, 2014 Elections and Referenda Committee meeting as approved by the Board of Directors on January 24, 2014.

<sup>2</sup> See Schedule 'B' on page 21 for the relevant portion of the minutes of the January 24, 2014 UTSU Board of Directors meeting as approved by the Board of Directors on February 12, 2014.

<sup>3</sup> See Schedule 'C' on page 24 for the March 12, 2014 minutes of the Elections and Referenda Committee as approved by the Board of Directors on March 28, 2014.

- **EPC ARTICLE II.2(a) “ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS PROCEDURE CODE”:**  
“It will be the duty of the Chief Returning Officer, the Deputy Returning Officer(s) and the Elections and Referenda Committee to administer this Code and to uphold its spirit and principles.”
- **EPC ARTICLE IV.1(h) “ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS”:**  
“The ERC sets the Election and Referenda schedule for the Fall and Spring Election periods.”
- **EPC ARTICLE IV.1(j) “ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS”:**  
“On voting days, no less than eight (8) polling stations on the St. George Campus and no less than three (3) polling stations on the Mississauga Campus, with no more than two (2) stations at the same location, shall be set up by the Chief Returning Officer. To ensure a fair and equal distribution of polling stations, locations shall be ratified by the Elections and Referenda Committee on recommendation of the CRO in consultation with the ERC Chair. In allocating polling stations, the ERC will consider factors including, but not limited to, cost, logistics, proximity to other polling stations, accessibility, traffic, and poll locations in previous elections.
- **EPC ARTICLE VI.3(a)(iii) “ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA AUTHORITY”:**  
“The CRO and the ERC both have the power to make decisions about issues and events not otherwise covered by this Code.”

To support the allegation that the Bylaws have been violated by the Committee with respect to these issues, the Grievance cites:

- a) **Bylaw VI.2(b)(iii),**
- b) **EPC Article IV.1(j), and**
- c) **EPC Article II.1(b)**

The Grievance further makes arguments about fairness, alleging:

- d) **“Extending voting hours discriminates against low-income and marginalized students who cannot simply drop everything and make themselves available for another day on the campaign trail.”**
- e) **The Committee and the CRO failed to notify a complainant that his complaint had been addressed and were therefore not acting in “good faith”.**

The Committee’s response to these allegations is as follows:

**a) BYLAW VI.2(b)(iii)**

The Committee has fully complied with Bylaw VI.2(b) in its entirety.

- The University of Toronto Students’ Union approved a schedule of elections as per the recommendation of the Committee on January 24, 2014.
- Notice of the date of the elections and nomination procedure was provided to members by campus publication and Union website at least fourteen (14) days prior to the start of the nomination period.
- The schedule of elections provided no less than sixteen (16) hours of polling over a period of no less than two (2) days.

This Bylaw makes no mention of **alternative dates for voting should an act of God occur**. The Bylaw is clearly discussing the schedule of elections under *normal circumstances* as it discusses notice and nominations provisions that are not in dispute with respect to this issue.

I draw attention to the fact that the sum total of the "Schedule of Elections" is required to specify polling hours, polling days, nomination days and a nomination period as per Bylaw VI.2(b)(iii). The provisions of this Bylaw were in violation only insofar as the Schedule was unable to be upheld due to events outside of human control. It cannot be applied to a situation such as was experienced on March 12, 2014 during the Spring 2014 Elections.

**b) EPC ARTICLE IV.1(j)**

The Committee has fully complied with EPC Article IV.1(j) in its entirety.

- As specified in the schedule of elections provided to members, no less than eight (8) polling stations on the St. George Campus and no less than three (3) polling stations on the Mississauga Campus with no more than two (2) stations at the same location were operational.
- The locations of the polling stations were ratified by the Elections and Referenda Committee on recommendation of the CRO in consultation with the ERC Chair.

Neither this Article, nor any other Article of the Election Procedure Code, makes mention of what the Committee's responsibilities are **should an act of God occur**. The provisions of this Article were in violation only insofar as the polling stations on the Mississauga Campus were unable to remain open due to events outside of human control.

The Committee relies on its responsibilities as per EPC Article II.2(a) and EPC Article VI.3(a)(iii). In an effort to uphold the spirit and principles of the election, and as empowered to make decisions about issues and events not otherwise covered by the Code, the Committee resolved the following:

- To ensure that the expectations of as many students as possible were met, the Chief Returning Officer, in consultation with the Committee Chair, resolved to keep the St. George Campus polls operational, even though the three (3) polling stations on the Mississauga Campus were forced to be closed due to an act of God.
- To ensure that the membership had equivalent access to the polls, regardless of which campus they engage in studies, to open polls on March 14, 2014, for a commensurate number of hours as were lost at the Mississauga Campus on March 12, 2014.

The Grievance alleges that the Committee has misunderstood the provisions of this clause and goes on to provide its own interpretation, stating the following:

*"Here, we would also like to point out a misinterpretation of clause 1.j, the clause only states states [sic] that the required number of polling stations must be "set up by the Chief Returning Officer" on each voting day, but not necessarily that each polling station remain operational all day. This rule was designed to be this way - as it permits voting stations to close early during the day - which is frequently [sic] done when there are booking mishaps."*

The Committee relies on EPC Article I, and reminds the authors of the Grievance that only the Chief Returning Officer and the Committee can make interpretations to the Code. This is to prevent individuals with an interest in the outcome of the elections from affecting the results in their favour. The authors of the Grievance cannot possibly be know why this provision was written as it was, as it predates the Spring 2014 Election.

I draw attention to the fact that, read in conjunction with Bylaw VI.2(b)(iii), it is clear that the “Schedule of Elections” is required to specify polling hours. The Committee ensured that polling hours were publicized with the notice. As such, the polling stations at the Mississauga Campus were required to be operational all day on March 12, 2014. The Committee reiterates that this provision was in violation only insofar as the polling stations on the Mississauga Campus were unable to remain open due to events outside of human control.

**c) EPC ARTICLE II.1(b)**

The Grievance alleges that Article IV.1(h) is in contradiction of Bylaw VI.2(b)(iii), and as such, the Bylaw should prevail.

The Committee rejects the interpretation that there is any contradiction between the Code and the Bylaws. The Committee has the responsibility of setting the schedule of the election. The schedule is then sent to the Board of Directors for ratification. This occurred on January 24, 2013 for the Spring 2014 Elections, August 21, 2013 for the Fall 2013 Elections, January 14, 2013 for the Spring 2013 Elections, etc.

As per this requirement, on March 12, 2014, the Committee resolved to provide a commensurate number of hours of voting on March 14, 2014 at the Mississauga campus to account for the early closure. This provision was ratified by the Board of Directors on March 28, 2014.

**d) DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LOW-INCOME AND MARGINALIZED CANDIDATES**

The Committee rejects any claims that their actions are discriminatory against marginalized groups. This argument suggests that the Committee should privilege the very small minority of members who seek election over the membership, and is in violation of EPC Article 2.II(a). Additionally, these candidates have a direct relationship with the CRO and are able to voice such issues should they exist, so that they may be addressed. While the Committee received correspondence from one candidate who attempted to appeal the Committee’s decision to provide commensurate voting hours at the Mississauga campus, reasons of access and equity did not figure into his complaint. He began to use the argument that candidates who are “single mothers” would not have equal access to campaigning<sup>4</sup>. It is both offensive and against principles of equity to use an identity to which one does not ascribe to win an argument that would provide material benefit to oneself, and it is clear that this is the intention behind this claim. In fact, the individual who forwarded the Grievance publicly stated his support for the polling day on March 14, 2014 prior to the results of the election being released.

One of the Committee’s prime responsibilities is to ensure that the membership has fair and equal access to the polls, regardless of campus of study and faculty of study. There are several ways that the Committee attempts to meet this objective, not the least of which is to poll the membership on multiple days at multiple locations and to provide adequate notice of the election dates and locations. To be very clear, these provisions are not made so that candidates are able to devise strategies with which to approach the membership; this is up to the candidates themselves who shoulder the total responsibility of campaigning and campaign strategies.

The closure of the Mississauga campus due to events beyond human control limited access to the polls for thousands of students enrolled at the Mississauga campus in such a way that would privilege students enrolled on the St. George Campus. Students may elect to enroll at the Mississauga campus for various reasons, including:

- They prefer the campus.
- Their program of study is not offered at any other campus.

---

<sup>4</sup> This argument was made at the UTSU Board of Directors meeting on March 28, 2014.

- They cannot pay the flat fees levied to Arts & Science students at the St. George Campus.
- They cannot afford to leave home due to financial constraints.
- They cannot afford to leave home due to familial constraints.

To be very clear, failure to address the disenfranchisement of students enrolled in the Mississauga Campus would have amounted to the blatant disregard for a large portion of the membership. This portion of the membership are made up of students who could be studying at the Mississauga campus simply because they are low-income, enrolled in a particular program, simply prefer the Mississauga Campus or for any number of reasons. To have failed to address the unequal access to the polls would have been in contravention of Article II.2(a).

**e) NOTIFICATION TO COMPLAINANTS ABOUT COMPLAINTS BEING ADDRESSED**

The Committee rejects any claims that their actions were not in “good faith”.

The EPC does not provide members with the ability to appeal a Committee decision. Despite this, in good faith, when a complaint was sent to the CRO on March 13, 2014, the Committee considered the complaint. There is no provision for a hearing of such a complaint. Despite this, in good faith, the Committee informed the complainant that they would consider his comments on March 13, 2014. The Committee subsequently considered justification for the complaint forwarded to them on March 14, 2014. There is no provision for providing a response to such a complaint. Despite this, in good faith, the Committee resolved to respond to the complainant, who was informed that he would receive a response by the CRO on March 20, 2014. On March 20, the Committee met to discuss the response, and a response was sent to the complainant on March 28, 2014.

The authors of the Grievance should be made aware that the Chief Returning Officer and the Committee have duties and responsibilities to the membership beyond responding to correspondence from candidates. The complaint in question was received the day before the opening of a previously unscheduled polling day. During that time, the CRO and the Committee were engaged in duties involved with setting up another polling day, including scheduling additional staff, booking space and securing additional materials. Additionally, the count night was moved from March 13, 2014 to March 14, 2014. The CRO and the Committee were also engaged in duties involved with setting up an unscheduled count, scheduling additional staff, setting up the space, booking vehicles and securing materials. In addition to all this, the CRO and Committee continued to respond to correspondence from candidates and members queries, responding to media requests where appropriate and patrolling the Mississauga campus.

Despite all this, at all times, responses were delivered in a timely manner. With respect to such responses, the Committee and the CRO prioritized complaints and appeals that were admissible as per the EPC, as these complaints have specific response timelines. All other correspondence was responded to as soon as possible.

## SUGGESTED REMEDIES

The Grievance suggests the following remedies for the alleged violations above:

1. **Refuse to ratify the election and recount the ballots excluding the votes cast at UTM on Friday.**
2. **Refuse to ratify the election and call a new election for Executive positions.**
3. **Seek legal counsel to ensure that a ratification of these elections is not in violation of the Bylaws.**
4. **Discard all ballots cast on March 14 to determine the “real winners” of the election.**

The Committee’s response to these suggested remedies are as follows:

1. The election results have already been ratified as of March 28, 2014. The Board of Directors has considered the matters contained herein at length. The Committee is confident that the Bylaws have not been violated and will not undergo another expensive, resource-heavy recount. This is not in the best interests of the membership and is in contravention of EPC Article II.2(a).
2. The Committee has no authority to call a new election. Calling a new election would be in contravention of Bylaw VI.2(a)(i) “Schedule of Elections”: “The Union shall hold...a general election in the Spring Session between February 1 and March 31 of each year, for the positions of Executive and Directors”.
3. The Committee is confident that it has not violated any Bylaws and has the support of the Board of Directors. Seeking legal counsel on the matter would be an unnecessary expenditure of student funds. However, should the outcome of the Grievance procedure insist on this remedy, the Committee would be happy to oblige.
4. The Committee has no authority to discard ballots. Any outcome that orders the destruction of ballots would be in violation of Article II.2(a) of the Elections Procedure Code and would disregard the will of hundreds of members based on an issue for which neither they nor the Committee had any control.

I trust that the above information is a comprehensive and complete response to the portion of the Grievance regarding paper ballot polling at the Mississauga Campus. Please inform me if you require more information.



## 2. POLLING LOCATIONS

### SUMMARY OF FACTS:

- The Elections and Referenda Committee set a schedule of elections on January 08, 2014.
- The schedule of elections was approved by the Board of Directors on January 27, 2014.
- The schedule of elections included the Mississauga Campus Davis Building as a polling location.
- The booking agent at the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union informed the Chief Returning Officer that the Davis Building was unavailable on March 11, March 12 and March 13, 2014, due to a prior booking.
- On February 13, the Chief Returning Officer reported to the Committee that to compensate, an additional poll would be placed at a building with an existing poll.
- On March 12, 2014, the University of Toronto closed the Mississauga campus at 13:00 due to inclement weather. Paper ballot voting at all Mississauga locations were forced to close.
- On March 12, 2014, the Elections and Referenda Committee resolved to provide a commensurate number of hours of voting on March 14, 2014 at the Mississauga campus to account for the early closure.
- On March 13, 2014, the CRO contacted the booking agent at the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union and informed them that we would need to resubmit our booking for an additional day.
- The booking agent submitted the original request. As the Davis building was available on March 14, 2014, it was booked.
- The CRO and Chair of the Committee discovered that the poll was located at the Davis building on the morning of March 14, 2014.

The University of Toronto Students' Union Elections Procedure Code contains the following clauses relevant to this issue:

- **EPC ARTICLE II.2(a) "ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS PROCEDURE CODE":**  
"It will be the duty of the Chief Returning Officer, the Deputy Returning Officer(s) and the Elections and Referenda Committee to administer this Code and to uphold its spirit and principles."
- **EPC ARTICLE IV.1(k) "ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS":**  
"Polling locations shall be publicized at the start of the campaign period."

To support the allegation that the Elections Procedure Code has been violated by the Committee with respect to this issue, the Grievance cites:

**a. EPC Article II.1(b)**

The Grievance further makes arguments about fairness, alleging:

- b. At least one Executive candidate and volunteers for "Team Voice" was aware of the relocation of a Mississauga Campus poll, "disenfranchising" [sic. assumed to mean disadvantaging] "Team Unite".**
- c. The Change of polling location was not announced when the announcement of the new polling location was made.**

The Committee's response to this allegation is as follows:

**a) EPC ARTICLE II.1(b)**

The Committee has fully complied with EPC Article II.1(b) in its entirety.

- At the start of the campaign period, all polling locations were publicized.

The authors of the Grievance should be made aware that neither the UTSU nor the Committee control space on campus. From time to time, during elections, booked polling locations are required to move for various reasons. During the Spring 2014 election, the Bahen poll, the Kelly poll and one of the CCT polls were moved due to events beyond the control of the Committee. During the Fall 2013 election, the Bahen poll was moved on one voting day due to events beyond the control of the Committee. During the Fall 2012 election, the OISE poll was moved on one voting day due to events beyond the control of the Committee. In each case, the polls were relocated with little notice provided to the UTSU, preventing the Committee and the CRO to provide notification to the membership. Oftentimes, the Committee and the CRO were informed after the polls were already relocated. In the case of the Spring 2014 CCT poll, the CRO was informed after the poll was relocated. In each case, the polls were still visible and accessed by the membership.

The Committee relies on its responsibilities as per EPC Article II.2(a). In an effort to uphold the spirit and principles of the election, the Committee views all votes cast at each moved polling location valid. To do otherwise would disenfranchise voters, and would leave the validity of hundreds of votes in the hands of building administrators.

**b) CANDIDATES PROVIDED PRIOR, PRIVILEGED KNOWLEDGE**

The Committee rejects the claim that any candidates were provided with prior knowledge of the relocation of any poll. As stated above, the CRO and the Chair of the Committee discovered that the poll was located at the Davis Building on the morning of March 14, 2014. As such, the Committee could not have provided any candidate with prior and privileged knowledge. Presumably, the candidate discovered the poll being set up on the morning of March 14, 2014.

**c) CHANGE OF POLLING LOCATION NOT ANNOUNCED DURING NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL DAY OF POLLING**

The Committee could not have announced the change of poll because they were not made aware of the change until after the notice was delivered. Notice was not provided for the relocation of the Bahen or Kelly Library polls for similar reasons.

## SUGGESTED REMEDIES

The Grievance suggests the following remedy for the alleged violation above:

1. **Discard the ballots cast at the Davis Building polling station and order a recount to determine the “true winners” of the election.**

The Committee's response to these suggested remedies are as follows:

1. The elections have already been ratified, and the matter contained herein has been considered at length. The Committee is confident that the Elections Procedure Code has not been violated and will not undergo another expensive, resource-heavy recount. This is not in the best interests of the membership and is in contravention of EPC Article II.2(a).
2. The Committee has no authority to discard ballots. Any outcome that orders the destruction of ballots would be in violation of Article II.2(a) of the Elections Procedure Code and would disregard the will of hundreds of members based on an issue for which neither they nor the Committee had any control.

I trust that the above information is a comprehensive and complete response to the portion of the Grievance regarding polling locations. Please inform me if you require more information.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

The Grievance continues on to make the following complaints about the process through which the Spring 2014 Elections were executed:

1. **The presence on the paper ballots of former candidate Luis Moreno who forfeited the election on March 6, 2014 was a “perversion of the election process”.**
2. **The \$340 fine levied onto Ms. Anna Chenchen Yin “despite the CRO failing to follow due process outlined in the EPC throughout Anna’s appeal.”**
3. **The Election was run in a manner that is in contravention of the University of Toronto *Policy on Ancillary Non-academic Fees*.**

The Committee rejects each of these allegations. I will address the allegations in turn.

## **1. BALLOTS THAT CONTAINED THE NAME OF A CANDIDATE WHO FORFEIT**

### **SUMMARY OF FACTS:**

- The Chief Returning Officer confirmed and announced the candidacy of Mr. Luis Moreno for the position of Vice-President External on March 2, 2014.
- The CRO confirmed with an external printer that if soft copy ballots were sent to print by March 4, 2014, they would take three business days to complete.
- The ballots for all positions were sent to print on the evening of March 4, 2014<sup>5</sup>.
- The ballots for all positions were delivered on the morning of March 7, 2014.
- Mr. Luis Moreno announced that his forfeiture on the evening of March 6, 2014, after the printer had already closed for the day.
- The Committee removed Mr. Moreno's name from the online ballot.
- New paper ballots could not be ordered in time for voting days.
- On March 9, 2014, the Committee resolved to inform members via a notice placed inside voting screens alongside candidate statements.
- The CRO received an Appeal of the Elections Results past the forty-eight (48) hour deadline required in the EPC.
- The CRO investigated the Appeal as though it had been submitted on time, and made a ruling and recommendation to the Board of Directors, as is the process prescribed in the Code.

The University of Toronto Students' Union Elections Procedure Code contains the following clauses relevant to this issue:

- **EPC ARTICLE VI.3(a)(iii) "ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA AUTHORITY":**  
"The CRO and the ERC both have the power to make decisions about issues and events not otherwise covered by this Code."
- **EPC ARTICLE IX "APPEALS OF ELECTION RESULTS":**  
"The CRO and the ERC both have the power to make decisions about issues and events not otherwise covered by this Code."
  - a. Any candidate may challenge the validity of their election result in a written submission containing their reasons to the CRO within forty-eight (48) hours of the close of the voting period.
  - b. The CRO, on behalf of the ERC, shall investigate any appeal and make a recommendation to the Board on the appropriate action.
  - c. Upon the recommendation of the ERC, the Board may refuse to ratify any single Director election. The Board may not amend rulings of the CRO or ERC.

To support the allegation that the ballots containing Mr. Moreno's name amounted to a "perversion of the election process", the Grievance alleges:

- The ERC did not provide Mr. Moreno or Nicky Bhatti an opportunity to address complaints regarding the presence of Mr. Moreno's name on the ballot in person when he appealed the results of the election.**
- Not all polling locations had a notice behind voting screens about Mr. Moreno's withdrawal.**

---

<sup>5</sup> See Schedule "D" on page 27 for the email that was sent to the printer containing the soft copy ballots.

The Committee's response to these allegations is as follows:

**a) THE APPELLANT WAS NOT GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAL IN PERSON**

The Committee has fully complied with EPC Article IX in its entirety. The appellant did not comply with EPC Article IX, though the Committee, in good faith, acted as though he had<sup>6</sup>. EPC Article IX does not provide appellants with the right to appeal in person. Mr. Bhatti provided a thorough statement that the Committee and the CRO considered, ruled upon. The ruling was publicized and a recommendation was provided to the Board of Directors as prescribed in EPC Article IX.

**b) NOT ALL POLLING LOCATIONS HAD A NOTICE BEHIND VOTING SCREENS ABOUT MR. MORENO'S WITHDRAWAL**

The Committee rejects this allegation. The Chief Returning Officer double-checked each voting screen each day to ensure that the notice was affixed to voting screens. No valid complaint was submitted alleging lack of notice, and no evidence to corroborate the claim was provided to either the CRO or the Committee.

Even in the event that the notice had not been affixed, the authors of the Grievance should be made aware that the provision of a notice was a courtesy, and not required. The Chief Returning Officer investigated procedures to address candidate forfeiture in various public jurisdiction. In rules for our municipal, provincial and federal elections, no such notice would have been provided. The Committee is confident that it acted above and beyond what could be expected, given that the optimal solution; a reprint of the ballots; was not possible.

The Grievance suggests that the Committee should have considered instructing Poll Clerks to scratch out Mr. Moreno's name. The Committee relies on EPC Article VI.3(a)(iii) in the justification of its actions. In response to the suggestion, the authors should be made aware that simply because they have an opinion that a course of action that was not considered was preferable does not lead to the conclusion that a "perversion" of the electoral process occurred. The Committee did discuss this suggestion after the close of the polls and concluded that it would have been impractical. The potential for error is very high. The wrong candidate's name could have been scratched out. Certain polling locations may have forgotten to scratch out the names. There may not have been an opportunity to train Poll Clerks about this additional expectation. The Committee concluded that the course of action it decided upon was the best case scenario to adequately inform the membership with little room for error.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Grievance states that Mr. Bhatti submitted his appeal within forty-eight (48) hours of the announcement of unofficial results. The EPC states that appeals must be submitted within forty-eight (48) hours of the close of voting.

## **SUGGESTED REMEDIES**

The Grievance suggests the following remedies for the alleged violation above:

- 1. Refuse to ratify the Vice-President External election.**
- 2. Call a new election for the Vice-President External position.**

The Committee's response to these suggested remedies are as follows:

1. The elections have already been ratified.
2. The Committee has no authority to call a new election. Calling a new election would be in contravention of Bylaw VI.2(a)(i) "Schedule of Elections": "The Union shall hold...a general election in the Spring Session between February 1 and March 31 of each year, for the positions of Executive and Directors".

I trust that the above information is a comprehensive and complete response to the portion of the Grievance regarding paper Mr. Luis Moreno's name appearing on the ballot. Please inform me if you require more information.

## **2. UNJUSTLY LEVYING A FINE ONTO A CANDIDATE**

### **SUMMARY OF FACTS:**

- The Chief Returning Officer received a significant complaint regarding claims made by Vice-President Internal & Services candidate Anna Chenchen Yin on March 13, 2014. The complaint was submitted along with audio evidence.
- The CRO ruled that Ms. Yin should be issued 58 demerit points for the complaint on March 14, 2014 at 14:00.
- Ms. Yin stated via an email sent at 13:48 on March 15, 2014 that she wanted to review the evidence prior to making an appeal.
- Ms. Yin stated via a subsequent email sent at 16:13 that since the evidence was not delivered to her in 48 hours, she considered the ruling “null and void”.
- The CRO responded to Ms. Yin via email at 17:11 that she could not provide the original evidence because of her requirement to preserve the anonymity of the individual who submitted the complaint, a right accorded to all complainants in the EPC, and a right specifically requested in this case. The CRO offered to provide a transcript of the audio.
- Ms. Yin stated via email at 18:50 that she only wished to review “authentic” evidence and that a transcription would not suffice. She stated that she wished to appeal.
- The Committee decided to play the audio for Ms. Yin at her appeal hearing.
- Ms. Yin immediately stated that she could identify the individual who requested to remain anonymous from the audio.
- The Committee decided that the portion of the appeal that alleged wrongdoing on the part of the CRO with respect to providing evidence was without merit.
- The Committee reduced the total demerit point count for Ms. Yin to 34 to preserve her eligibility as a candidate.

The University of Toronto Students' Union Elections Procedure Code contains the following clauses relevant to this issue:

- **EPC ARTICLE I “INTERPRETATION”:**  
“The Chief Returning Officer and the Elections and Referenda Committee make all interpretations to this Code.”
- **EPC ARTICLE II.2(a) “ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS PROCEDURE CODE”:**  
“It will be the duty of the Chief Returning Officer, the Deputy Returning Officer(s) and the Elections and Referenda Committee to administer this Code and to uphold its spirit and principles.”
- **EPC ARTICLE VI.3(a)(i) “ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA AUTHORITY”:**  
“i. The CRO has the sole authority to enforce the provisions of this Code. The ERC may enforce this Code where no ruling is given by the CRO.”
- **EPC ARTICLE VI.3(i) “PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS”:**  
“Where the CRO or ERC finds there has been a violation of the Election Procedure Code by a Candidate or a Non-Arm’s-Length Party of the Candidate, the CRO or ERC may:
  - i. Assign a demerit point penalty resulting in a fine against a Candidate.
  - ii. Declare that an election in a particular constituency be ruled void.
  - iii. Assign no demerit points, but attach a financial penalty of no greater than \$45.00 (forty-five dollars) per offence.”



- **EPC ARTICLE VI.3(o) “EVIDENCE FOR RULINGS”:**
  - i. For a ruling to find a candidate in violation of the code, there must be evidence which gives due cause to believe that the violation has occurred.
  - ii. If this evidence is personal testimony, then it must be submitted to the CRO in writing, and the CRO must know the identity of the person giving the testimony. The CRO may withhold the identity of the person giving testimony from any other party, including the ERC and must withhold that person’s identity if requested.
  - iii. Evidence that is used in making a ruling must be made available to any candidate that a ruling finds in violation of the code, within twenty-four (24) hours of the ruling being made.

To support the allegation that the fine allegedly levied to Ms. Yin was unjust, the Grievance alleges:

- a. **The CRO acted in “bad faith” toward complainants and appellants and failed to provide due process to members of the UTSU by not providing evidence of complaints to candidates.**
- b. **The CRO has failed to respect due process and the requirements of the EPC and this was a “tendency”.**

The Committee’s response to these allegations is as follows:

**i. THE ALLEGED FINE**

No fine was levied unto Ms. Yin or any other candidate for demerit points assigned to them throughout the elections. This portion of the Grievance is wholly baseless.

Though EPC Article VI.3(i) allows the CRO and the Committee to levy a fine per their discretion, the CRO and the Committee chose not to take this course of action. Ms. Yin and the authors of the Grievance may have assumed that a fine was being levied due to inaccuracies reported in *The Varsity*, which was a problem throughout the Spring 2014 Election that the CRO was compelled to make a public statement about. Regardless, the Grievance regarding the fine is without merit as there is no fine.

**a) THE CRO FAILED TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF COMPLAINTS TO CANDIDATES**

The Committee rejects this allegation. The Committee relies on EPC Article I, EPC Article II.2(a). These articles make it clear that the Chief Returning Officer and the Committee are the only bodies who may interpret the Code. The Committee further relies on EPC Article VI.3(o). The Chief Returning Officer is required to “make evidence available” and did so. She actively provided evidence upon request, which was sufficient in her reading of previous elections procedures and the passive language used in EPC Article VI.3(o)(iii). There was no complaint about this procedure to this point.

The Committee further relies on EPC Article VI.3(o)(ii). The Chief Returning Officer is required to preserve the anonymity of complainants. The individual who submitted the complaint against Ms. Yin specifically requested to remain anonymous. The CRO responded to Ms. Yin within hours of her request for evidence, which she requested one hour prior to the 24-hour deadline. The CRO offered to make the evidence available in a format that would not compromise the anonymity of the complainant and Ms. Yin refused the offer. The Committee is confident that the CRO was carrying out her duties as required under EPC Article VI.3(o)(ii), as Ms. Yin stated that she recognized the voice of the individual who submitted the complaint immediately upon hearing the audio evidence that the Committee elected to provide.

The authors of the Grievance should be made aware of the CRO’s responsibilities as per EPC Article VI.3(a)(i). Though Ms. Yin stated that she considered the ruling levied against her null and void, she had no authority to do

so. The Committee and the CRO did everything possible to ensure that all responsibilities required of them in the code were strictly adhered to.

**b) THE CRO HAD A TENDENCY TO IGNORE DUE PROCESS**

The Committee rejects this allegation. This allegation is an ad hominem that is without corroborating evidence and lacks specificity because it is baseless. In fact, the authors of the Grievance repeatedly publicly lauded the work of the CRO throughout the process. The Committee is confident that the CRO at all times followed the procedures outlined within the Elections Procedure Code.

**There were no suggested remedies for this portion of the Grievance.**

I trust that the above information is a comprehensive and complete response to the portion of the Grievance regarding the alleged fine levied to Ms. Yin. Please inform me if you require more information.

**3. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO POLICY ON ANCILLARY NON-ACADEMIC FEES**

The Committee rejects this claim. The *Policy on Ancillary Non-Academic Fees* requires students' societies to operate in an "open, accessible and democratic fashion". The Committee is confident that it has done so in the administration of this election. The Grievance provides no specific complaint or evidence to suggest that the Committee has done otherwise.

Additionally, it is worth noting that the complaints about irregularities came from unsuccessful candidates and affiliates of unsuccessful candidates who may be unsatisfied with the results. These former candidates must recognize that though they may not appreciate conceding defeat, they must do so in order to respect the elections process and the membership whom they sought to represent.

I trust that the above is a satisfactory, complete and comprehensive response. Please let me know when the meeting is to be scheduled.

Regards,

m.  


Munib Sajjad

President

e: president@utsu.ca

t: 416.978.4911 x223

## **APPENDIX**

### **SCHEDULE 'A'**

January 8, 2014 Elections and Referenda Committee meeting minutes  
as approved by the UTSU Board of Directors on January 24, 2014.

#### **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, January 8, 2014 • 17:00 • UTSU Office

---

#### **IN ATTENDANCE**

Joseph Bodley  
Maaham Malik  
Will Warnica  
Munib Sajjad  
Sandra Hudson (non-voting)

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 17:26.

#### **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Bodley

Be it resolved that agenda be approved as presented.

#### **CARRIED**

#### **3. INTRODUCTIONS**

Members of the Committee introduce themselves.

Sajjad states the mandate of the Committee.

#### **4. OVERVIEW OF SEATS TO BE ELECTED**

##### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad gives an overview of the seats to be elected in the UTSU general elections in the spring.

#### **5. OVERVIEW OF BYLAWS, POLICIES, AND ELECTIONS PROCEDURE CODE**

##### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad reviews the relevant sections of the By-laws, Policies and Elections Procedure Code.

Warnica states that the Elections and Referenda Committee also made recommendations that should be reviewed.

Hudson reviews the recommendations from the previous Elections and Referenda Committee.

#### **6. MOTION TO HIRE CHIEF RETURNING OFFICER (CRO)**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Warnica

Be it resolved that Alexandra Flor be hired as the Chief Returning Officer for the Spring 2014 elections and referenda.

## **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, January 8, 2014 • 17:00 • UTSU Office

---

### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad distributes the resumes and gives an overview of how the interviews went.

Malik asks how many people applied in total.

Sajjad states that there were four applicants.

Bodley states that Flor's application was the most professional.

### **CARRIED**

#### **7. ELECTION DATES**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Malik

Be it resolved that the nomination period for the 2014 Spring General Elections start on February 13, 2014 and end on February 27, 2014; and

Be it further resolved that the campaign period for the 2014 Spring General Elections start on March 3, 2014 and end on March 13, 2014; and

Be it further resolved that the voting days for the 2014 Spring General Elections be on March 11, 2014 to March 13, 2014.

### **DISCUSSION**

Bodley states that this timing works well for OISE students, who will be on practicum in the first week of March.

Malik asks why the nomination period is more than two weeks and starts on a Thursday.

Hudson states that the nomination period used to be two weeks. She states that the Elections and Referenda Committee last year decided that the period should be extended by a couple days, since reading week was in the middle of the nomination period,

### **CARRIED**

#### **8. ONLINE VOTING**

##### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad states the history of online voting.

Hudson states that the online voting system will be set up for this election.

Malik asks if voting hours are set.

Hudson states that the Elections and Referenda Committee can set voting hours if they like.

## **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, January 8, 2014 • 17:00 • UTSU Office

---

### **9. POLLING LOCATIONS**

#### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Bodley

Be it resolved that the polling locations for the Spring Elections be located in: Davis Building, CCIT, Sidney Smith, the Faculty of Law, OISE, Dentistry, Bahen, Isabel Bader, Gerstein, and St. Michael's College or Knox College.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Hudson mentions that there have been issues securing OISE as a voting location in the past.

Bodley states that he will ask the Student Teachers' Union if they can facilitate booking a polling location in OISE.

Malik asks if the polling locations that the previous Chief Returning Officer recommended for removal have been removed in this motion.

Sajjad states yes.

Malik asks how far campaigning materials must be from polls.

Sajjad states six metres, as per the Elections Procedure Code.

#### **CARRIED**

### **10. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad states that he will send all the recommendations to the Committee for review before the next meeting. He states that any amendments to the Elections Procedure Code should be made at the next meeting.

Sajjad states that he will need the availability of the Elections and Referenda Committee members for future meetings.

Bodley asks if he can call in to meetings if he cannot be present.

Sajjad states that speakerphone and Skype are options.

Warnica asks if he should connect with Coleman about the Schedule of Common Costs.

Hudson states that he should make an effort to reach out to him about it.

### **11. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Bodley

The meeting was adjourned at 18:38.

## SCHEDULE 'B'

Excerpts of the minutes of the January 24, 2014 UTSU Board of Directors meeting  
as approved by the UTSU Board of Directors on February 12, 2014.

### MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, January 24, 2014 | 16:00 | OISE 2214

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Waiz Akhtar, University of Toronto  
Mississauga  
Nabil Arif, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Nia-Imara Barberousse, Faculty of Music  
Frishta Bastan, University of Toronto  
Mississauga  
Joseph Bodley, Ontario Institute for Studies  
& Education  
Yolen Bollo-Kamara, Vice-President Equity  
Vanessa Bridge, Faculty of Engineering  
Cullen Brown, St. Michaels College  
Suyoung Aaron Chin, Faculty of Pharmacy  
Ben Coleman, Arts & Science At-Large  
Benjamin Crase, Trinity College  
Yasmeen Emadi, Vice-President Campus  
Life  
Shak Gobert, Victoria College  
Fatima Zahra Hamaimou, University of  
Toronto Mississauga

Dalia Hashim, New College  
Nadiv Hossain, University College  
Vere-Marie Khan, St. Michaels College  
Silviu Kondan, New College  
Mateusz Krawczyk, Professional Faculty At-  
Large  
Sanchit Mathur, Faculty of Engineering  
Catherine Nguyen, Faculty of Dentistry  
Josephine Petrolo, Woodsworth College  
Tannishta Pramanick, Woodsworth College  
Munib Sajjad, President  
Agnes So, Vice-President University Affairs  
Melissa Theodore, UTMSU Representative  
Htay Tint, Transitional Year Program  
Will Warnica, Innis College  
Cameron Wathey, Vice-President Internal &  
Services  
Billi Wun, Faculty of Law  
ZiJian Yang, Woodsworth College  
Ben Coleman, Arts & Science At-Large

#### BY PROXY:

Khalid Khan, New College to Dalia Hashim,  
New College  
Helen Phan, Professional Faculty At-Large  
to Cameron Wathey, Vice President Internal  
& Services  
Aimee Quenneville, University College to

#### GUESTS:

Umair Qadeer  
Jesse Leduc-Robert  
Nzube Ekpunobi  
Fiona Del Rio

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting is called to order at 16:18.

*Hamaimou and Gobert enter the meeting at 16:24.*

#### 2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

##### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: So

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

#### CARRIED

*Hashim & Pramanick enter the meeting at 16:27*

#### 3. EXECUTIVE REPORT

##### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that the Executive Report be approved as presented.

...

## MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, January 24, 2014 | 16:00 | OISE 2214

Wathey states that the Executive Committee attended the Canadian Federation of Students National General Meeting in November. He further states that Jessica McCormick of the Memorial University of Newfoundland and Bilan Arte of the University of Manitoba were elected as the National Chairperson and National Deputy Chairperson, respectively.

Emadi states that the Winter Week of Welcome was held during the second week of January. She further states that the pancake brunch, clubs and career fair, concert, street festival, and Varsity Blues volleyball games were all very successful, and that much positive feedback was received from attendees.

So states that she and Bollo-Kamara continue to attend meetings of the Student Society Summit. She further states that the meetings have progressed to addressing very specific points of contention, with the stated goal of clarifying the positions of each divisional society and students' union.

Emadi states that hundreds of students studying late at night were served sandwiches, snacks and beverages at Kelly Library, Gerstein Library, Ivey Library, the Cat's Eye at Victoria College, Sanford Fleming, and the Pharmacy Building. She states that the Blue Crew program, launched this year, has been very successful in recruiting volunteers for UTSU's Got You and other events.

Triolo presents the sustainability report. He states that the Sustainability Commission has recently launched a campaign to encourage students to use reusable containers in campus cafeterias and at food trucks as an alternative to Styrofoam and other disposable containers. He states that the Commission has been working to support Toronto 350's campaign calling upon the University of Toronto to divest from fossil fuel companies.

Wathey states that there was a meeting with the University of Toronto President Meric Gertler on Wednesday, January 22, 2014. He states that the discussion centered around points of collaboration, including lobbying for transit discounts and improved transit infrastructure, increased government funding for post-secondary education, and for OHIP for international students.

Wathey states that the Executive Committee has been working hard to develop a new website, which will be launched during February. He states that the new website has a very user-friendly interface, and works well on smartphones and tablets. He further states that the website will allow for better, more frequent event updates.

Coleman asks if students will be able to make purchases from the website.

Hudson explains that for an initial period purchases from the website will remain as they are. She states that the purchasing feature will be updated at a later date.

## CARRIED

*Brown enters the meeting at 16:40.  
Yang enters the meeting at 16:43.*

## 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Mathur

## MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Friday, January 24, 2014 | 16:00 | OISE 2214

---

Be it resolved that the January 24, 2014 minutes package including the following documents be approved by the UTSU Board of Directors:

- i. Board of Directors, November 19 (p. 20).
- ii. Executive Committee, *January 15* (p. 28).
- iii. Elections & Referenda Committee, *January 8* (p. 33).
- iv. Clubs Committee, *December 6, 10, 13, 16 & January 6, 20* (p. 37).  
*Page 65 change for BLOGUT*  
*Page 64 cange from Vita*  
*ZiJian Yang's name spelt wrong in the club's committee meeting*
- v. Social Justice & Equity Commission, *December 2 & January 20* (p. 88).
- vi. Campus Life Commission, *January 9* (p. 100).
- vii. Academic & Student Rights Commission, *December 13* (p. 104).

## DISCUSSION

Coleman asks to externalize the Elections and Referenda Committee minutes. Coleman states that he would like to know whether it is possible to track when students are accessing the voting website.

Hudson states that it is possible to track when votes are cast, but not when students are accessing the website.

## CARRIED

### 5. ARTS & SCIENCE AT LARGE APPOINTMENT

#### MOTION

Moved: Wathey

Seconded: Sajjad

Be it resolved that Nzube Ekpunobi be appointed to fill the vacant Arts & Science At-Large Director position for the remainder of the 2013-2014 academic year.

*Ekpunobi provides a presentation of his goals and priorities.*

## CARRIED

*Hossain enters the meeting at 17:12.*

### 6. MOTION TO RECESS

#### MOTION

Moved: So

Seconded: Krawczyk

Be it resolved that the meeting be recessed for 15 minutes.

## CARRIED

*The meeting resumes at 17:21.*

*Del Rio enters the meeting at 17:21.*

### 7. MOTION FOR CHANGES TO BYLAW V – BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO BE PUT



## **SCHEDULE 'C'**

March 12, 2014 minutes of the Elections and Referenda Committee  
as approved by the Board of Directors on March 28, 2014.

### **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, March 12, 2014 • 17:00 • UTSU Office

---

#### **ATTENDANCE:**

Joseph Bodley, Ontario Institute for Studies & Education Director  
Munib Sajjad, President  
William Warnica, Innis College Director  
Maaham Malik, University of Toronto Mississauga Director (telephone)

#### **NON-VOTING:**

Alex Flor (Chief Returning Officer)  
Sandra Hudson (Executive Director)

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting is called to order at 17:17.

#### **2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Bodley

Seconded: Warnica

Be it resolved that the Wednesday, March 12, 2014 Elections and Referenda Committee agenda be approved as presented.

##### **CARRIED**

#### **3. UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA CLOSURE**

##### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad states that the University of Toronto Mississauga closed at 13:00 on March 12 due to inclement weather. He states that the UTSU was required to close the polls at 13:15 as a result. Sajjad states that Flor has approached him concerned that accommodations should be made for UTM students.

Flor states that while there is still online voting available, some students vote due to the visibility of polling stations and the opportunity to approach and ask questions of students who are campaigning. She states that she is concerned that Mississauga students will be disenfranchised due to the early closure. She states that while this force of nature is out of the hands of the Committee, that she recommends that the Committee seriously consider making accommodations for these students.

Warnica states that he agrees.

Bodley states that the polls should be open on Friday, March 14 at the University of Toronto Mississauga for the same amount of hours as they were closed on Wednesday March, 12.

Flor states that the logistics may be very difficult and that this decision may not even be possible.

Warnica asks if votes would still be counted on Thursday, March 13 if polls were open until March 14.

## **MINUTES**

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, January 8, 2014 • 17:00 • UTSU Office

---

### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad distributes the resumes and gives an overview of how the interviews went.

Malik asks how many people applied in total.

Sajjad states that there were four applicants.

Bodley states that Flor's application was the most professional.

### **CARRIED**

#### **7. ELECTION DATES**

##### **MOTION**

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Malik

Be it resolved that the nomination period for the 2014 Spring General Elections start on February 13, 2014 and end on February 27, 2014; and

Be it further resolved that the campaign period for the 2014 Spring General Elections start on March 3, 2014 and end on March 13, 2014; and

Be it further resolved that the voting days for the 2014 Spring General Elections be on March 11, 2014 to March 13, 2014.

### **DISCUSSION**

Bodley states that this timing works well for OISE students, who will be on practicum in the first week of March.

Malik asks why the nomination period is more than two weeks and starts on a Thursday.

Hudson states that the nomination period used to be two weeks. She states that the Elections and Referenda Committee last year decided that the period should be extended by a couple days, since reading week was in the middle of the nomination period,

### **CARRIED**

#### **8. ONLINE VOTING**

##### **DISCUSSION**

Sajjad states the history of online voting.

Hudson states that the online voting system will be set up for this election.

Malik asks if voting hours are set.

Hudson states that the Elections and Referenda Committee can set voting hours if they like.

## MINUTES

Elections and Referenda Committee Meeting of the University of Toronto Students' Union  
Wednesday, March 12, 2014 • 17:00 • UTSU Office

---

Flor suggest that scrutineers can take photos of the boxes in the van.

### 5. THE VARSITY

#### DISCUSSION

Sajjad states that an article was written stating that a poll clerk complained that she wasn't hired based on her college affiliation.

Hudson reminds committee members that they should discuss issues with respect to hiring interviews *in camera* so as not to inadvertently contravene privacy or labour law.

#### MOTION

Moved: Sajjad

Seconded: Warnica

Be it resolved that the discussion continue *in camera*.

#### CARRIED

The discussion moved *in camera* at 17:46.

The discussion moved *ex camera* at 17:56.

### 6. "ROBOTEXT" ALLEGATIONS

Flor states that some students have complained that they received unsolicited text messages from UofT Voice. She states that she is not taking media requests on the matter, as *The Varsity* seems to have made up their mind on the situation without investigation.

Sajjad states that the complainants allege that UofT Voice is sending unsolicited text messages to students.

Flor states that UofT Voice has been able to provide evidence that the students who complained signed up for the service. She states that she was able to compare the handwriting on the evidence to documents in her office written by the complainants.

Flor expresses concern that *The Varsity* is writing articles before she has a chance to rule. She states that some candidates seem to have a direct connection with *The Varsity* and are using the publication to affect the perception of how events are occurring.

### 7. ADJOURNMENT

#### MOTION

Moved: Warnica

Seconded: Malik

Be it resolved that the meeting be adjourned.

#### CARRIED

The meeting is adjourned at 18:01.

## SCHEDULE 'D'

Email sent to the printer containing the soft copy ballots

### 2014 Elections Ballots - Final to print

elections x



**Justin Raj**

Mar 4



to mike, Executive, UTSU, Esman

Hi Mike,

The attached folder contains all 16 ballots in separate pdf files as requested. Please pay very careful attention to each file name, as each pdf file name is labelled with the appropriate quantity of ballots to be printed. Each individual set of ballots is to be printed on a different coloured paper.

Confirm you have received them.

Regards,

Justin Raj  
Graphic Designer  
University of Toronto Students' Union  
Local 98 Canadian Federation of Students

12 Hart House Circle || Toronto, Ontario || M5S3J9  
Tel: (416) 978-4911 || Fax: (416) 978-2018 || [justin@utsu.ca](mailto:justin@utsu.ca)  
<http://www.utsu.ca> || Follow us on Twitter @utsu98

Orientation 2013-Where will you be?

IMPORTANT: The information contained in this email message and any attachments is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended recipient, please: (1) notify me immediately by replying to this message; (2) do not use, disseminate, distribute or reproduce any part of the message or any attachment; and (3) destroy all copies of this message and any attach

# **APPENDIX A(5)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE & SUMMARY**

## **GRIEVANCE 2**

Date of Submission: April 8, 2014  
Submitted By: Vip Vigneswaran (the "Griever")  
Respondents: Cameron Wathey & Yolen Bollo-Kamara (the "Respondents")

### **Summary**

Attached are the initial grievance and the response. The grievance alleged that at the March 28, 2014 UTSU Board of Directors meeting, the Respondents violated a section of the Elections Procedures Code (EPC). The Respondents rejected the allegation.

As per the UTSU's Grievance Procedure, a meeting was scheduled between representatives from the Grievors and the Respondents on April 11, 2014, to come to a mutually satisfactory resolution of the matter. At the meeting, the Griever suggested that the conduct of the Respondents necessitated a re-vote on the motion to ratify the Spring 2014 UTSU elections. The Respondents maintained that their conduct was appropriate and that a re-vote was unnecessary.

### **Resolution**

Since the Board cannot hold a re-vote on a motion that has already been adopted, it was resolved that the Griever and the Respondents would seek the Board's interpretation of the section of the EPC in question moving forward.

At this Board Meeting, the Griever and one representative from the Respondents will present their cases. The issue will be decided by majority vote of the Board.

# **APPENDIX A(6)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE & ORIGINAL GI A 6=GG=CB**

## Grievance 2

### Initial Grievance

Dear Mr Hashemi

I am emailing you as a part of the grievance procedures outlined in the UTSU policy manual.

On Friday March 28, at the UTSU Board meeting, Cameron Wathey moved a motion to ratify the 2014 - 2015 election results. I contend that this motion was out of order as the EPC explicitly states that members of the board who are candidates in the election must remove themselves from all business pertaining to the elections as of the nomination period, and if the motion is out of order then the election results aren't "ratified".

EPC – Article VI – Rules for Elections

#### 1.b. Conflict of Interest -

Any current member of the Board or staff, volunteers and committee members of the Union seeking election must remove themselves from all involvement relating to the Elections at the start of the nomination period.

During the meeting, it is clear that Cameron Wathey involved himself in business relating to the Elections instead of abstaining. For one, he moved the motion pertaining to ratifying the election. As we all know, there were pending questions and concerns regarding the election which were addressed at the meeting and are currently being addressed through grievance procedures. By supporting the motion to ratify the elections, Cameron signalled he believed nothing was wrong with the election procedure and could have encouraged his supporters on the board to vote with him.

Students should abstain from voting to ratify their own election as it causes others in the room to be compelled to vote with them if they are likely to seek an important position on the UTSU or an associate position next year. While we can't know whether or not other board members voted with Mr Wathey to approve the elections due to this reason, Mr Wathey had a responsibility to abstain to ensure this wouldn't happen.

The minutes of the meeting should show that Yolen, Presidential Candidate, also spoke in favor of ratifying the elections. This is also a conflict interest as she failed to remove herself from all involving relating to the Elections. Again, students seeking nomination for positions and positions on committees on which Yolen will serve next year as a virtue of her office, could have been inclined to vote with or against her. Again, we cannot know if this was the case, but the Conflict of interest rule exists for this very reason - to ensure the outcome of the election is independent of the candidates who nominate themselves.

If I am not mistaken, when the board elects a VP Campus Life and nominates students to committees, they do so in a secret ballot. This ensures that Board members do not influence each other when voting and ensures to Board members elect individuals for their merit and not because the wind is blowing in a particular way that particular evening.

I would appreciate a formal investigation into this complaint, as well - I understand if you can only facilitate this after the first grievance is addressed.

Thank you for your time,

Vipulan Vigneswaran



# **APPENDIX A(7)**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **GRIEVANCE & ORIGINAL RESPONSE**

April 10, 2014

RE: Response to Grievance

Dear Mr. Hashemi,

On behalf of Yolen Bollo-Kamara and myself, I write in response to the Grievance that you forwarded to us on April 9, 2014. The grievance contends that the motion to ratify the election results duly considered and passed at the March 28, 2014 meeting of the UTSU Board of Directors, was out of order because I moved the motion and because both myself and Ms. Bollo-Kamara spoke to the motion.

It is our contention that there was nothing improper about our conduct at the March 28 meeting and that the motion to ratify the election results, duly considered and passed at the March 28 meeting, fulfilled all requirements for a motion to be in order.

The grievance alleges that both Ms. Bollo-Kamara and I violated a requirement to refrain from speaking to the ratification. Our response to this allegation is as follows:

#### **EPC article not applicable to ratification vote**

The grievance alleges that Ms. Bollo-Kamara and I were prohibited from speaking to the ratification motion because Article VI, Section 1.b. of the Elections Procedure Code (EPC) states that “any current member of the Board or staff, volunteers and committee members of the Union seeking election must remove themselves from all involvement relating to the Elections at the start of the nomination period.”

This clause of the EPC is not applicable to the ratification vote and is taken here completely out of context. Section 1 of the “Rules for Elections” clause is titled “Campaigning” and considers the conduct of Board members, among others, specifically during the campaign period. This provision is in place to prevent candidates from unduly influencing the results of the election by virtue of their office.

It is not applicable elsewhere and has no force or effect on the ratification vote. Once the campaigning period for the elections has concluded, as they had before the March 28, 2014 meeting, there is no prohibition against candidates voicing their opinion on the election process.

#### **Past Practice**

The fact that Article VI, Section 1.b. “Campaigning” is not applicable to the ratification process is supported by past practice. Candidates in the UTSU elections have always been permitted to speak and vote (if eligible) to the issue of ratifying the election results.

It would be unfair, arbitrary and undemocratic to retroactively apply an unrelated section of the EPC to the conduct of Board Members when such an interpretation has never been contemplated.

#### **Election Results Ratified in Accordance with UTSU Bylaws**

As the above makes clear, there is nothing in the EPC prohibiting Board members from moving or speaking on a motion to ratify Election results. In fact, the UTSU’s operational documents mandate that a ratification vote must take place at the subsequent meeting of the Board following the election results (EPC, Article VIII.2.b). Bylaw VI.1.e also states that the results of all elections must be submitted to the Board for ratification.

As the Vice-President Internal and Services, it is my role, in part, to prepare the agenda and ensure that all resolutions required by the Bylaws and Policies are duly considered. If I was derelict in my duty to ensure that such required motions were on the agenda, they would still be required to be considered, as per the Bylaws and Policies.

### **No Undue Influence**

The grievance also goes on to make what can only be characterized as a hypocritical allegation regarding the exertion of undue influence during the vote to ratify the election results.

The entire purpose of debate during a motion is to attempt to influence the outcome of the vote. In the absence of a prohibition on speaking rights at the Board meeting, we had every right to speak to the motion, just as supporters and candidates for one of the teams running in the elections had every right to attend the meeting, speak against ratifying the election results and attempt to sway Board members.

It should be noted that the griever, who was also the campaign manager for one of the teams running in the UTSU elections; Nicky Bhatti, who was the unsuccessful VP External Candidate for one of the teams running in the UTSU elections; and Pierre Harfouche, who was the successful candidate for VP University Affairs for one of the teams running in the UTSU elections, all attended the meeting and spoke in opposition to ratifying the election results. Other Board members who publicly supported one of the teams in the election also spoke and voted, including Aimee Quenneville, who voted against, Ben Coleman, who was a scrutineer for team Unite and voted in favour, and Zijian Yang, an unsuccessful candidate who ran on a team with me and voted in favour. It is curious therefore that we have been singled out for exerting undue influence when the griever, his supporters and others acted similarly.

### **No Requirement to Abstain**

The griever also speculates that “students should abstain from voting to ratify their own election as it causes others in the room to be compelled to vote with them if they are likely to seek an important position on the UTSU etc.”

Other board members were free to voice their opinions and vote however they wanted. At no point was it suggested, implied or otherwise put forward that voting in favour of ratification would translate to some kind of special favour, and the griever does not provide any proof to the contrary. Instead, he presents a number of unfounded allegations based, self-admittedly, on pure speculation: “we can’t know whether board members voted with Mr. Wathey to approve the elections due to this reason” and “again, we cannot know if this was the case . . .”

What we do know is that no board member brought this up as an issue at or subsequent to the meeting. While we understand why it might be convenient for the griever to make this argument, it is a false allegation and we resent the implication.

### **Confusion Between Voting for Candidates and Ratification Votes**

The grievance also confuses the distinction between the campaigning and election process on the one hand and the ratification process on the other. As already noted, the griever erroneously cites a section of the EPC related to “Campaigning” as the reason why a required vote on ratifying the election results was “out of order.” A similar error is also present in his comparison of the UTSU’s processes for electing the VP Campus Life and representatives to various committees with the March 28 ratification vote.

The grievance asserts that “when the board elects a VP Campus Life and nominates students to committees, they do so in a secret ballot. This ensures that Board members do not influence each other when voting and ensures [that] Board members elect individuals for their merit and not because the wind is blowing in a particular way that particular evening.”

While we do not share the griever’s cynical assumption that Board members make decisions based on a whim, it should also be pointed out that he is factually mistaken in his characterization of the process. In fact, in direct contradiction to the point he is trying to make, the processes for electing the VP Campus Life, Committee Members and Executive Members is analogous and not contradictory as the griever asserts:

- The elections for VP Campus Life, Committee Members and Board Members are all executed via secret ballot. The VP Campus Life and Committee Members by a secret ballot vote of the entire Board (including candidates running for Committee positions) and by a secret ballot vote of the entire membership in the case of the Executive.
- The ratification vote for all the positions is not executed via secret ballot for any of the positions. In all instances, the Board votes to ratify the results through a simple motion at a Board meeting. And in all instances, there is no prohibition against the elected individuals speaking and voting (if they are eligible to vote) on the ratification.
- In all instances, Board members can motion for a secret ballot vote for whatever reason. It is our understanding that such a request has never been made.

In fact, this analogy between the processes is instructive in that it demonstrates that there is no contradiction between the recent ratification vote and UTSU rules and past practices.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, neither Ms. Bollo-Kamara nor myself acted improperly in our roles as Directors on the Board, nor did we attempt to change the results of the election or misrepresent the process in any of our actions. Our actions were in keeping with past practice, are supported by other practices of the Board of Directors, and are required as per the Bylaws and Policies of the organization.

Sincerely,

Cameron Wathey

# **APPENDIX B**

## **University of Toronto Students' Union**

### **STUDENT SOCIETIES SUMMIT REPORT**

# **Report**

## **University of Toronto Student Societies Summit**

**Prepared For: Professor Cheryl Regehr  
Vice-President and Provost**

**Prepared By: Summit Faculty**

**Professor Don Ainslie  
Professor Joe Desloges (Chair)  
Professor Graham White  
Professor Linda White**

**April 14, 2014**

**Report  
University of Toronto  
Student Societies Summit**

<b>i. Summary and Recommendations . . . . .</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1. Rationale, Mandate, and Structure . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Student Societies: Policies, Definitions, and Roles. . . . .</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Democracy and Accountability. . . . .</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Recommendations . . . . .</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Acknowledgments. . . . .</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix A – Background on Student Society Disputes. . . . .</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix B – Participants in the Student Societies Summit . . . . .</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix C – Meeting Dates of the Student Societies Summit . . . . .</b>	<b>31</b>

**i. Summary and Recommendations**

1. That the Governing Council of the University of Toronto establish a robust policy for student societies that, while recognizing the autonomy of those societies, also reinforces their obligations to represent and benefit members and includes a process for creating or restructuring societies.
2. That the new policy for student societies require that every society use an arms-length Chief Returning Officer (CRO) who has been appropriately certified by the University.
3. That the new policy for student societies include the establishment of a university-wide Student Society Appeals Board that would serve as a court of final resort for all complaints about the conduct of particular student societies, including elections complaints.
4. That the new policy give the Appeals Board the power to issue binding directives to student societies, where nonconformity with such directives would be grounds for the Provost, on the basis of the “Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees,” to withhold fees from a society for failing to operate in a “open, accessible and democratic” fashion.
5. That, to guide the deliberations of the new Appeals Board and to flesh out the requirement that student societies operate in an “open, accessible and democratic” fashion, the Office of the Vice-Provost Students develop governance guidelines, including guidelines for the conduct of elections.
6. That these guidelines address appropriate use of voting technologies, the role of slates in elections, rules for the involvement of non-society members in society elections, and the need for societies to ensure that all their constituencies are appropriately represented in their activities.
7. That these guidelines address how executives within societies can increase accountability to their membership.
8. That the new policy for student societies be implemented as soon as possible, following consultations with student societies which were not part of the Summit, campus groups and clubs, and other University stakeholders.



## **1. Rationale, Mandate, and Structure for the Student Societies Summit**

On June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013, the Executive Committee of Governing Council determined that, in light of the ongoing disputes between some of the divisional full-time undergraduate student societies regarding the distribution of student fees and democratic reform, it was best to defer further discussion on the proposed Student Commons Agreement and the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Student Commons to a future cycle of Governing Council. Instead, the Executive Committee urged further discussion between the societies in the hope of a satisfactory resolution or another constructive solution.

In August of 2013, then-Provost Cheryl Misak launched the Undergraduate Student Societies Summit, a process that would bring together representatives from the relevant full-time undergraduate student societies who were at the centre of the disputes to engage in facilitated discussions around the central issues, attempt to resolve some or all of these outstanding disputes, and determine a clearer pathway on which to proceed that would make it possible to take the Student Commons motions forward to Governing Council. (Further details of the background to the student society disputes and the call and general mandate for the Summit can be found in Appendix A.)

The societies invited to participate in the Summit were those that represent full-time undergraduates on the St. George and Mississauga campuses of the University of Toronto where student membership is determined by registration in a Faculty, College, or Division and on whose behalf the University collects mandatory fees under the aegis of the “Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees” (2003).

The Student Societies Summit was asked to consider:

- In a Policy environment in which there are currently four representative student governments (the University of Toronto Students’ Union [UTSU], the Scarborough Campus Students’ Union [SCSU], the Graduate Students’ Union [GSU], and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students [APUS]) recognized by Governing Council and supported by mandatory fee deductions from students in the relevant constituencies, how can the sometimes distinct interests of divisional societies be supported and respected in a democratic manner?
- What are the implications of these answers on the evolution of the democratic structures of the student governments or on fee support for the activities of the divisional societies?

The Summit participants were asked to explore these questions in the context of the issues raised by plebiscites on fee diversion that had been held by several student societies in 2012-13. It was anticipated that the discussion would include broader issues of principles for democratic governance and possible reforms to existing U of T practices. From the outset, it

was made clear that the Summit did not have the authority to make policy changes itself (only the Governing Council can do that) but that its outcomes and conclusions might suggest that further analysis should be undertaken as part of a policy review by Governing Council.

### ***Structure, Membership, Participation, and Meetings of the Summit***

Participation in the Summit was limited to societies for full-time undergraduates on the St. George and Mississauga campuses that fall under the “Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees.” The societies to which this policy applies that were not invited – SCSU, APUS, and the GSU – were not included because they were not centrally involved in the controversies over student governance that had arisen between UTSU and some divisional societies. Those student groups to which the policy does not apply – the large number of voluntary clubs, teams, and associations – were not included because no student is required to join them nor does the University collect fees on their behalf.

Each of the invited student societies was asked to select two representatives of its choice to represent it at the Summit meetings and in the Summit proceedings. The invited societies were:

- University of Toronto Students’ Union
- UTM Students’ Union
- Arts & Science Student Union
- Dental Students’ Society
- Engineering Society
- Faculty of Music Undergraduate Association
- Innis College Student Society
- Medical Society
- New College Student Council
- Nursing Undergraduate Society
- Physical Health & Education Undergraduate Association
- St. Michael’s College Students Union
- Student Teachers’ Union
- Students’ Law Society
- Transitional Year Program Student Association
- Trinity College Meeting
- Undergraduate Pharmacy Society
- University College Literary & Athletic Society
- Victoria University Students’ Administrative Council
- Woodsworth College Students’ Association

The list of participants and their role in each of the respective student societies is provided in Appendix B.

The Summit was intended to be a substantial, principled, and facilitated conversation. To that end, four faculty members, chosen for their expertise in democratic theory and practice as well as in governance structures and policies, were invited to participate and facilitate Summit discussions:

- Professor Donald Ainslie (Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts & Science, and Principal, University College)
- Professor Joe Desloges (Department of Geography and Department of Earth Sciences, Faculty of Arts & Science, and Principal, Woodsworth College) (Chair)
- Professor Graham White (Department of Political Science, University of Toronto Mississauga)
- Professor Linda White (Department of Political Science and the School of Public Policy and Governance, Faculty of Arts & Science)

The four faculty members were participating solely as individuals and did not represent the views or opinions of any student society or the University administration or any of its governing bodies. Like all participants, the faculty were there to speak freely and openly about the issues raised by Summit participants. In matters of the Summit mandate, the faculty participants were not tied to any constituency, bound by any agreement, or forced to take sides on any issues. However, faculty were free to be constructive and critical on the issues raised and participants were encouraged not to construe their opinions as a bias or influence on behalf of other parties.

Summit meetings were usually also attended by Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students and First-Entry Divisions; Mr. David Newman, Director, Office of Student Life; Professor Mark McGowan, Special Advisor to the Vice-Provost Students (fall term only); and Ms. Meredith Strong, Director, Office of the Vice-Provost and Student Policy Advisor (spring term only). These Summit attendees did not participate in discussions except to present or clarify existing policies and governance structures, or changes in any of these in the past. The Office of the Vice-Provost Students and First-Entry Divisions also kindly provided logistical support for the Summit.

As the Summit was being constituted in early September, all groups not invited to participate in the Summit and other members of the University community were encouraged to provide written submissions. The Summit received 12 such submissions, including input from the SCSU, the GSU, APUS, five associations/clubs, and one individual. All Summit participants were encouraged and welcomed to make reference to the issues and concerns raised in each of these submissions throughout the entirety of the proceedings.

Student societies selected their representatives in September 2013 and Summit meetings began October 7, 2013. Ten meetings of the Summit participants were held between October 7 and March 14, 2014 (see Appendix C for a list of the dates and times of each of the meetings). For the purposes of continuity and to ensure a “free to speak” atmosphere, Summit meetings were closed and only those representatives chosen by their societies were invited to attend

each of the meetings. The two exceptions were a substitution following a permanent withdrawal due to medical reasons and another where the initial individual chosen to participate had not yet been elected to the student society's executive. In addition to the formal Summit meetings, participants wishing to meet with the faculty facilitators in a separate meeting were invited to do so starting in early 2014. Four student societies took advantage of that opportunity.

Attendance at the Summit was good. Conflicts with classes were the most common reason for some not being able to attend certain meetings. Where possible, meeting times were moved to accommodate participation of the majority of Summit members. Five student societies did not attend any of the meetings: the Dental Students Society; the Faculty of Music Undergraduate Association; the Nursing Undergraduate Society; the Transitional Year Program Student Association; and the Undergraduate Pharmacy Society.

Input from all Summit participants was encouraged both in meetings of the whole group and in several breakout group discussions. While some participants were critical of one another's perspectives on a number of governance issues and other points of discussion, the Summit meetings allowed for open and respectful dialogue amongst the individuals participating in the meetings. All participants were given the opportunity to express their own views and the views of their constituencies across all of the meetings.

After attending the first seven meetings of the Summit, UTMSU withdrew from participation at the beginning of the eighth meeting citing differences with the Summit mandate. The faculty facilitators, as well as other student society participants, took issue with some of the detailed points regarding conduct of Summit meetings raised by UTMSU in announcing their withdrawal. At the beginning of the penultimate meeting, UTSU also withdrew from Summit participation citing differences. Both UTMSU and UTSU were invited to return to the table in the event their views changed; the faculty facilitators also extended a continuing invitation to meet with each group separately, as we did with the other participant societies. No additional meetings with individual societies occurred.

### ***Summit Objectives***

At the beginning of the Summit several objectives were articulated:

- to obtain a clear understanding of the role of full-time, undergraduate student societies which are mandated to represent the common interest of their members, each of whom pays compulsory fees;
- to develop a set of principles for student societies that centrally reflect open, accessible, and democratic governance;
- to survey past, present, and possible future governance reforms in light of the principles articulated by the group;
- to consider alternative governance structures for the student societies that might better meet the agreed upon principles;

- to identify areas of consensus and areas of significant disagreement on student society governance;
- to develop a framework that would allow for increased collaboration and cooperation amongst student societies;
- to advise the Provost on the outcome of these discussions either indicating that a consensus position had emerged or making recommendations as to key issues that need to be considered in a future debate on policies relating to student societies.

## **2. Student Societies: Policies, Definitions, and Roles**

Hundreds of student organizations exist on all campuses of the University. In addition to the student societies discussed in detail in this report, over 800 campus groups are recognized via the University's Offices of Student Life at the three campuses. Each division also has a recognition process for campus groups specific to those divisions; other clubs and committees operate through Hart House. Discipline or department-specific course unions also operate and are supported by divisional student societies. And student societies also recognize a plethora of student clubs and levy groups, the latter of which are specialized organizations, such as Bikechain and the Sex Education Centre, supported through a dedicated fee, the funding for which is approved through referenda and approved at the University Affairs Board (UAB) of Governing Council.<sup>1</sup>

In sum, the range of student organizations on the three campuses is simply enormous and all play important roles in the educational mission of the University. At the Summit we discussed a number of those roles. They include:

- enabling students to learn outside of the classroom through co-curricular activities (clubs, teams, and so on);
- in the case of the central student societies, facilitating cross-divisional community;
- providing services to students;
- advocating for students' common interests to the divisional or university administration, or to the various levels of government or other wider community groups;
- building inclusive communities;
- representing various constituencies of students.

### ***Current University Policies that Guide Student Societies***

The U of T Act of 1947 (specifically section 34, a clause that is incorporated into the current version of the amended 1971 Act through section 2.14) allows the university to enable students

---

<sup>1</sup> A small number of other central student organizations, such as *The Varsity* and the CIUT radio station also exist to provide a specific service to the University community.

to create divisional and other similar student societies as the “recognized official medium of the communication” between the administration and the students.

The University’s “Policy on the Recognition of Campus Groups” (last revised in 1993), which articulates the terms for voluntary student associations on the three U of T campuses, states that: “Recognition as a ‘campus group’ is a privilege based upon observance of certain procedures and acceptance of certain responsibilities. It follows that this privilege can be withdrawn if these procedures are neglected or responsibilities abrogated by the organization or group.”

The Policy articulates the importance of autonomy of campus student organizations and that “the University will not attempt to censor, control or interfere with any group on the basis of its philosophy, beliefs, interests or opinions expressed unless and until these lead to activities which are illegal or which infringe the rights and freedoms already mentioned.”

But the Policy also states under section 1 (b) that: “Responsibility for the maintenance of the policy and mechanism, where campus-wide organizations or organizations drawing members from more than one division or constituency of the University are concerned, should be vested in the University Affairs Board of the Governing Council.”

The UAB also has responsibility over the collection of compulsory non-academic incidental fees for a number of campus services, such as Athletics and Hart House, central student societies, and divisional student societies. Governing Council recognizes four central student societies that represent students across the university: UTSU, the GSU, APUS, and SCSU. In addition, because of the size and complexity of the university, and the multiple communities that have formed within it, Governing Council recognizes student societies tied to divisions and, in the case of the St. George campus, to colleges.

All of these central and divisional student societies are authorized to set fees, which are collected on their behalf by the University. These fees can be seen as a form of “benefit taxation” where students are required to support co-curricular activities that benefit them. Thus a key point that emerged from the Summit is that the threshold to justify the University’s collection of mandatory fees on behalf of a student society should be a *sufficient common interest* among the students that would qualify the society’s activities as a *common benefit*. There was disagreement amongst the Summit participants, however, about whether that demonstrable common interest required centralized student associations or multiple, decentralized, perhaps overlapping student organizations.

In addition, because the University collects these fees on behalf of student societies, it has a responsibility to ensure that the money is being spent appropriately. What ‘appropriate’ means, though, is quite vague under the current policy. The University’s “Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees” is clear that student societies on behalf of which mandatory student fees are collected are expected to have “orderly and democratic governance” and behave in an “open, accessible and democratic fashion.” The Policy does not provide any

specific guidance on what those criteria mean and what comprises the appropriate conduct of those organizations other than to state that student societies must have constitutions and/or by-laws that structure the procedures for orderly and democratic governance of the society. Section B 1 of the Policy outlines other specific requirements including regularly reporting on the society's financial position, an annual audit, a procedure to deal with complaints from members, and so on.

Section B 3 of the Policy states that, if the Office of the Vice-President and Provost has "reason to believe" that student societies are not following the terms of their constitution and are not operating in an "open, accessible and democratic fashion", then that Office can withhold student societies' fees, with a possible appeal to the UAB. The Policy does not specify, though, any tests to determine whether student societies are sufficiently "open, accessible and democratic."

We have learned through the Summit process that there is a significant lack of policy to guide the University in its relations with student societies. In addition to there being no specific language around what "open, accessible and democratic" governance means, the "Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees" provides no guidelines for the Provost to deal with complaints about student societies. No policy exists to ensure that student societies are in fact benefiting the students whom they represent or what the criteria are for student societies to demonstrate that they represent the common interests of their members. And there is no policy allowing for the evolution of societies, and specifically no policy concerning whether, how, and when students should be able to leave a society that has been given recognition to represent them. Similarly, there is no policy that specifies how new student societies could emerge.

This lack of policy is relevant in light of some divisional societies' plebiscites on fee diversion; but it is also relevant as new divisions have emerged, including an undergraduate program in the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, and the creation of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health. Some student societies voiced support for a criterion of sufficient common interest to justify the recognition of a new grouping of students in second-entry professional programs such as Law, Medicine, Education, and Dentistry. It is not clear what the process would be for that recognition to be pursued absent agreement from the current student societies.<sup>2</sup>

It was particularly striking to us that there was no student society that represents the distinct interests of St. George campus undergraduate students, given that UTSU represents both UTM and St. George students. In the current policy framework, if students on the St. George campus

---

<sup>2</sup> In 2004, the University Affairs Board of Governing Council recommended that Governing Council recognize the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU) to replace the Students' Administrative Council (SAC) as the representative student committee on campus. That recommendation followed a jointly held referendum among undergraduate students at UTSC and a request from those student societies.

collectively decided to establish a society to represent their distinct interests apart from UTM students, it is not clear how the University could respond.

### **3. Open, Accessible, and Democratic Student Societies**

Summit participants spent a good deal of time discussing both the principles and the on-the-ground realities of democracy in student societies. Prior to embarking on this discussion, however, participants were asked to articulate the attributes that they considered important for student governments. These included:

- effective feedback and communication;
- representation of various communities;
- accountability;
- transparency, especially in budgeting;
- good fiscal management;
- commitment to equity and diversity;
- impartial elections and electoral processes;
- advocacy at the central and divisional levels of university administration, to various levels of government, and to the wider community;
- facilitating interdivisional student connections and opportunities;
- autonomy from the University administration.

Overall, consensus was evident on principles of democratic governance. As well, participants recognized that no single path exists to healthy democratic processes and that significant variation is possible in achieving and maintaining democratic student societies. Very substantial disagreement arose when it came to evaluating specific processes, structures, and cultures currently found in student societies. The degree of democracy in the structure and operation of UTSU was the subject of extensive discussion.



## ***Principles***

As the previous section explains, University policy requires student societies that receive mandatory fees from their members to operate in “an open, accessible and democratic fashion.” Participants at the Summit collectively identified a number of principles essential for student societies to meet these criteria. Elections naturally figured prominently in the discussion but it was also understood that democracy in student societies entails far more than elections.

Elections: Elections must be entirely free and fair, ensuring all students equal opportunity to participate as voters and as candidates. This entails neutral administration of electoral processes and adjudication of disputes.

Accountability: Student societies must be accountable to their members. This requires the provision of full, timely, and comprehensible information to members as well as the opportunity for students to make their views known to the leadership of student societies who in turn must be responsive to student opinion.

Legitimacy: Governance processes – both operating processes and processes for change – must be viewed as legitimate by members of student societies. Among other things, this requires that significant change only occur with extensive student support for both the processes leading to change and the outcome of change. It also means that student societies must be open to change in response to student opinion.

Balance: Democracy in student societies, as in all organizations, requires a balance between the rights of the majority and the rights of the minority (or minorities).

Summit participants recognized that given the wide range of student societies in terms of their size, mandate, and culture, no ‘one-size-fits-all’ formula is possible that could ensure democracy in student societies. In particular, both the possibilities and the constraints are quite different for student societies with a few hundred or perhaps a thousand or two members and societies such as UTSU whose members number in the tens of thousands.

## ***What the Student Societies Said***

What follows is primarily based on what student society leaders said during Summit meetings, supplemented by information and opinion presented to us in meetings with the representatives of the student societies who took up our offer to meet with us privately, by review of documents (both those presented to the Summit, which were posted on the portal, and University and student society documents pertaining to policies, constitutions, operating procedures and the like), and by review of articles in campus media.

### *Elections*

It was generally agreed that the perennially low turnout in student elections is a serious problem that raises questions about the legitimacy of student societies. While it is possible to interpret low rates of turnout as indicating satisfaction with current arrangements, it was widely acknowledged that the very low turnout characteristic of student elections reflects unhealthy levels of disengagement and cynicism among students as to student societies and their governance. No consensus emerged as to effective ways of increasing turnout or of enhancing student engagement with student societies.

Beyond the universally accepted principle that students required by the University to pay student society fees should be entitled to vote in student society elections and referenda, little agreement was evident as to what commitment to democratic principles means when it comes to rules and procedures for elections. Even the precept that payment of mandatory fees entails voting rights was interpreted differently when it came to UTM students: since a high proportion (perhaps as high as 80 per cent) of fees paid to UTSU by UTM students is returned to UTMSU, some Summit participants felt that UTM students should only be entitled to a partial vote in UTSU elections.

Rules and procedures for student society elections vary widely. In evaluating them we sought to identify best practices – which would not necessarily apply in the same way in all instances – as well as minimum practices. While student societies should aim for best practices, they should at the very least establish and adhere to minimum practices.

We did not hear of any significant concerns about accuracy of voting lists or about disenfranchisement of students legitimately entitled to vote. Summit participants were very positive about how the availability of on-line voting makes it easier for busy students to vote. Some student societies permit on-line voting continuously during election periods. UTSU only permits on-line voting during the hours that polling stations are open, on the grounds that untoward voting practices could occur at other times. Some student societies noted that the University's "uElect" on-line voting system cannot currently handle alternate voting systems such as the single transferrable ballot.

Summit participants did voice serious concerns about the administration of elections and about processes for adjudicating complaints. The position of Chief Returning Officer (CRO) is crucial in

ensuring well-run and fair elections, especially considering the extensive powers that CROs wield, which can extend to disqualifying candidates. A number of student societies indicated that they have difficulty recruiting CROs in part because of financial constraints and in part because it is not easy to find persons knowledgeable about student politics yet neutral and unbiased (and perceived to be neutral and unbiased).

Especially in light of the short campaign and voting periods typical of student society elections, the structure and procedures of the bodies assigned to adjudicate allegations of improper electioneering and appeals of CRO rulings are of fundamental importance. Here practices vary widely and serious criticisms are widespread. While shortcomings became evident in the practices of several student societies (some of which indicated that they are reviewing their structures and procedures in this regard), UTSU came in for particular criticism. Its Election and Referenda Committee (ERC), which among other things, decides on appeals of the CRO's decisions and has the capacity to disqualify candidates, is composed of three UTSU executive members and three board members. With the UTSU leadership adjudicating complaints and appeals about election procedures and outcomes, there is substantial risk that ERC decisions will affect candidates who previously were slate running mates or supporters of ERC members. Summit participants argued that this arrangement violated the principle that the administration of elections and the adjudication of electoral disputes should be neutral.

We heard a good many arguments to the effect that, although in formal terms all candidates in student society elections are treated equally, the reality is that incumbent candidates or members of a society's executive running for new executive positions enjoy significant advantages. It is typically the case that some executive members of student society governments run for office in subsequent elections. Indeed, many Summit participants noted the benefits of having had prior experience in the society executive when taking on new roles, especially the highest leadership positions.

Summit participants cited a number of factors that they believe favour such incumbents and the slate of which they are members, such as their higher name recognition and the short campaigns which put non-incumbents at a disadvantage in making themselves and their ideas known to voters. The advantage of incumbency was particularly significant in UTSU executive elections, according to some participants because UTSU policy requires executive members to reduce their course loads substantially,<sup>3</sup> typically to one full course or less, whereas almost all non-incumbents must be full-time students to be eligible as candidates.<sup>4</sup> Participants noted that it is more difficult for non-incumbents to run an effective two-campus campaign, as is expected of candidates for positions at UTSU, with its bi-campus membership.

---

<sup>3</sup> *UTSU Policy Manual*, "Operational Policy – Executive Member Responsibilities," October 30, 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Professional Experience Year students are also UTSU members without being enrolled as full-time students. In addition, students of the Toronto School of Theology are members of UTSU, even if they are enrolled as part-time students or in a graduate program.

Aside from concerns about administrative and adjudicative processes and about incumbency, several other issues were raised by Summit participants relating to elections. These included the legitimacy of slates, campaigning by non-student society members, funding, and timing of UTSU executive and board elections.

Slates of candidates are common in some student society elections; others have formal prohibitions against them. Some participants regarded slates positively, arguing that they made for more coherent campaign platforms, whereas others thought that slates could be cliquish and discourage students from becoming involved in student governance.

The practice of campaigning in student society elections by persons who are not members of the society generated much discussion but no agreement. Some student societies do not permit non-members to participate in their elections. Among the student societies that are open to this practice, it is with regard to UTSU that controversy is most substantial. We heard Summit participants voice deep criticisms of the practice of officials from student governments at other universities and of the Canadian Federation of Students campaigning on behalf of UTSU executive candidates. Opponents to this practice argued that it is inappropriate and unfair for non-University of Toronto students to be involved in U of T student elections. Others, primarily the representatives from UTSU and UTMSU, defended the practice on the grounds that candidates should be able to call on friends to help them campaign.

Campaign expenses did not emerge as a major source of concern during the Summit. The limits on candidate spending vary widely. Some student societies impose very low limits on candidates – \$100 or less (at least one student society permits no spending on behalf of candidates) – whereas candidates for UTSU executive positions can spend up to \$1200 each. There was general agreement that the setting of spending limits and other campaign finance issues should be left to individual student societies. One important exception was a proposal, supported by some Summit participants, that if persons who are not society members participate in student society elections, imputed costs of their work on candidates' behalf should be counted against the candidates' allowable expenses.

Finally, mixed views were expressed as to whether the election for UTSU executive should be held at the same time as the elections for UTSU board members from the various UTSU constituencies. Those favouring the current practice of simultaneous elections cited logistical benefits as well as the value of having issues discussed for all UTSU elected positions at the same time. Those opposed suggested that campaigning for high-profile UTSU executive positions overshadowed elections for board members at the constituency level, deflecting attention from important local issues.

### *Student Society Structure and Operations*

Student societies and their executives and/or boards are structured and operate in widely different ways. A few student societies, such as UTSU and the Engineering Society (EngSoc) are established as not-for-profit corporations and thus subject to the new Canada Not-For-Profit

Corporations Act, which will require certain practices and prohibit others (such as voting by proxy at board meetings).

A number of student societies indicated that as a result of discussions at the Summit they are considering or implementing significant changes in their structure and operations relating to board composition, electoral processes, and the role of membership meetings (including annual general meetings [AGMs]). UTSU indicated that it is engaged in a review of its practices, in part to ensure compliance with the new act, but little information was available on the scope and the process of this review.

One issue which generated extensive discussion and disagreement at the Summit was the process for changing student society policies or their basic constitutions. In some societies, motions for change, sometimes significant change, can simply be brought to an AGM and voted on. Other societies require notice periods, minimum numbers of proponents and/or supermajorities (more than 50 per cent) for approval. This is an area where several student societies are revisiting their procedures in order to ensure that they are responsive to their members. UTSU procedures for handling motions arising from members came in for vigorous criticism. Under UTSU's by-laws, which serve as its constitution, any proposed amendment to the by-laws requires prior approval by the Policy and Procedures Committee<sup>5</sup> and the approval of three-quarters of the UTSU board in order to go forward to a vote of the members. Some Summit participants argued that this provision was highly undemocratic in that it effectively lets the UTSU board and executive block any proposed changes not to their liking. Others defended the policy for ensuring that by-law proposals were well-structured and consistent with other policies and procedures.

The Summit also discussed the use of proxies, which in some societies are used at board/executive meetings and/or at AGMs. For incorporated societies, such as EngSoc and UTSU, the new act prohibits proxy voting at board meetings, but permits it at membership meetings. Summit participants generally agreed that proxy voting at membership meetings was acceptable, given the challenges for students to balance course schedules with meeting attendance, but opinion was divided on the number of proxies that any single person should exercise. No agreement was reached on a reasonable number, though several participants favoured a limit of two or three proxies per person and some criticized UTSU's practice of allowing one person to hold up to ten proxies as open to abuse.

### *Communication and Information*

Summit participants were universally agreed that good communications with members is essential in a democratic student society and that communications should flow in two directions: from the membership to society leadership and from the leadership to the

---

<sup>5</sup> Members of the Committee are: the President, a UTMSU designate, Vice-President Internal and Services, and three Directors, one from each Division, elected by the Board. See *UTSU Policy Manual*, "Operational Policy – Union Committees," April 18, 2006.

membership. It was widely acknowledged that student societies struggle to develop and maintain effective communications with their members.

Some student societies indicated that they make good use of social media, listservs, and similar technologies to keep students informed of their activities and to solicit student opinion and advice. This is encouraging but requires good quality information to be effective. For example, questionnaires must be carefully worded in order to avoid biased or inaccurate results.

Providing clear and comprehensive financial information to society members was singled out as especially important yet often problematic. Students want to know how their money is being used and society leaders have an obligation to be accountable for their financial stewardship. Incorporated societies are required to produce audited financial statements every year and the “Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees” requires that student societies annually submit audited statements to Office of the Vice-Provost Students. But these are often hard for students not intimately involved with the society in question to understand and at that may not provide useful information. Student society audits are usually focused on ensuring probity and accuracy of financial information; they do not generally comment on whether spending on particular activities or projects was wise or effective, which is what students want to know. A number of Summit participants agreed on the need to provide useful financial information to their members but indicated that they need help in doing so.

Summit participants said that not only must clear and comprehensive financial information be available to students but opportunities must also be available for members to question student society leaders about financial issues. According to some participants, not all societies provide adequate opportunities for such questioning, either at membership meetings or through other means.

Financial arrangements between UTSU and UTMSU were a subject of considerable controversy. Representatives from UTSU and UTMSU told the Summit that a significant proportion of fees paid to UTSU by UTM students are transferred to UTMSU.<sup>6</sup> Other participants argued that this was inappropriate special treatment of one student society and asked to see the formal agreement between UTSU and UTMSU setting out the details of the transfer. This request was refused on the grounds that breaching the agreement’s confidentiality provisions could lead to legal challenges, a response that was criticized by some Summit participants.

#### *Relations between Central and Divisional Student Societies*

A major focus of Summit attention was the relationship between UTSU, as one of the central student societies, and the divisional societies on the St George and Mississauga campuses whose members are also members of UTSU.

---

<sup>6</sup> During the Summit, UTMSU and UTSU representatives described a fee transfer in the range of 70 to 80%, though exact details were never provided.

Significant variations were evident between the formal relationships and the actual interactions between UTSU and divisional societies. College societies had frequent, if not always amicable, relations with UTSU, whereas some professional faculty societies had little interaction, formal or informal, with UTSU and knew little of its activities. Representatives of one professional faculty society indicated at an early Summit meeting that they were surprised to learn that their members paid fees to UTSU.

A number of Summit participants described the UTSU-divisional societies relationship as federal, recognizing that each 'order' of student governance operates in isolation from the other (though project-specific cooperation occurs), with no formal structural links, and relies on separate funding sources.<sup>7</sup> While there was general agreement that UTSU and the divisional societies should maintain their separate spheres of influence and cooperate when it seems sensible, some Summit participants believed that divisional societies should have some direct influence in UTSU governance processes; the UTSU representatives disagreed.

Most UTSU board members are elected from divisions.<sup>8</sup> However, UTMSU excepted, UTSU board members representing divisional students typically have no formal structural links with the divisional societies; a few divisional societies appoint the UTSU board members representing their students as *ex officio* members of their boards, and some elect them onto their boards (on the basis of an up-or-down vote). Several Summit participants reported that UTSU board members elected from their constituencies rarely if ever attended divisional society board or membership meetings and were seldom in communication with the leadership of the divisional societies or with students from the divisions they represent.

Finding this situation unsatisfactory, Summit participants brought forward various possibilities for direct involvement of divisional student society leadership in UTSU. One possibility that attracted substantial support was a restructuring of UTSU so that leaders of divisional societies would serve on the UTSU board. The UTSU representatives did not support this idea. Regardless of its merits or shortcomings, however, it would appear that the new Canada Not-for-Profit Corporations Act does not permit corporate board members to serve on the basis of having been elected as representatives of other organizations, so that restructuring of UTSU along these lines would not be possible.

The unique relationship between UTSU and UTMSU generated extensive discussion. UTSU is a bi-campus organization representing full-time undergraduate students on the St. George and Mississauga campuses. UTMSU, in addition to being the divisional society for both full-time and part-time students at UTM, also serves as the agent of UTSU on that campus by providing services to students there that St. George-based students receive from the UTSU directly. The

---

<sup>7</sup> The classic definition of a federal system is one in which two or more levels (or orders) of government exist within a single geographic area; fiscal, policy and administrative relations between governments may be minimal or extensive.

<sup>8</sup> Exceptions are the five elected executive members and various non-voting members including the Vice-President Campus Life.

fees transfer, described above, is meant to reimburse UTMSU for this service provision and UTSU also has a Bylaw (XIII) that recognizes its special relationship with UTMSU.<sup>9</sup> In addition, one of the seven UTSU executive positions is reserved for the UTMSU president or a UTMSU executive member designated by the president<sup>10</sup> and the UTM members of the UTSU Board of Directors are appointed from the UTMSU Board of Directors (though elected into these positions through UTMSU elections<sup>11</sup>).

Some Summit participants described the current UTSU/UTMSU relationship as an appropriate recognition of the distinct interests of UTM students that result from their attending U of T at a campus that is more than 30 km from the St. George campus. Other Summit participants were critical of the special place of UTMSU within UTSU which they saw as creating a democratic deficit for St. George-based students.

For example, UTM students have full votes for all of the elected UTSU Executive members while students on the St. George campus do not (they have no say on the UTM designated member of the Executive). And the fees arrangement between UTMSU and UTSU means that UTM students have control (via UTMSU) of most of the fees they pay to UTSU, while also having a full say on the Executive that oversees how the fees of St. George students are disbursed.

In addition, UTM undergraduates are already the largest constituency within UTSU by far,<sup>12</sup> and with the projected growth on that campus (expected to reach almost 14,000 by 2018), the disproportion within the various student communities represented by UTSU will only become further distorted, and make it more difficult to meet the principle of balance as articulated above.

Finally, some students noted that the bi-campus nature of UTSU and its acknowledgement of the distinct interests of UTM students leave St. George students without a society representing their distinct interests (UTSC students have their interests represented by SCSU).

In the absence of a St. George specific group, UTSU often steps in to represent these students, as in the Student Commons, despite a governance structure that allows for full votes by UTM students and their representatives on all matters, including campus-specific ones. Other student societies and groups also treat UTSU as having a special St. George mandate. SCSU, for example, in its submission to the Summit, describes the controversy over fee diversion as solely

---

<sup>9</sup> UTMSU's Bylaw XV outlines its relationship to UTSU.

<sup>10</sup> UTSU Summit participants noted that they are revisiting this relationship in light of the new Non-for-Profit Corporations Act that prohibits *ex officio* Board members.

<sup>11</sup> See UTMSU Bylaw V 3.c. Note that the other members of the UTSU Board of Directors that represent particular division or college constituencies are not elected through elections of the relevant divisional student society, but rather through a UTSU election.

<sup>12</sup> Although the Faculty of Arts and Science is larger than UTM, students in the Faculty are primarily represented on the UTSU Board by means of their College affiliations. There are only two at-large Arts and Science representatives (Bylaw V 3.c).



concerning the “undergraduate students’ union *at the St. George campus*.” The Polish Students Association, in their submission, emphasized the importance of UTSU clubs’ funding in building a “greater sense of community *on campus*” (emphasis added) a position that was echoed by the Greek Students’ Association, who lauded UTSU’s role in building community on the St. George campus, and by the Black Students’ Association who underlined the need for “events and joint responses to issues related to race, ethnicity, and social justice *on campus*” (emphasis added). Lesbian, Gays, Bisexuals, and Trans People of the University of Toronto (LGTOUT), in their submission, refer to the referendum establishing funding for the Student Commons as having involved “the entire membership of the UTSU,” when in fact only St. George UTSU members were eligible to vote; similarly, they point to the significance of UTSU support for clubs and association like theirs to student life *on the one campus*. Even UTSU, when describing their reasons for leaving the Summit, emphasized their important role in providing services on “this very, very big campus,” without acknowledging their UTM membership.<sup>13</sup> But UTSU is a bi-campus organization with no specific St. George campus brief.

Another fundamental structural issue that surfaced repeatedly during the Summit was what many participants saw as the anomalous situation of the inclusion of second-entry professional students in what is primarily a first-entry undergraduate student society. While it was widely acknowledged that all University of Toronto students share various high-level interests, participants from second-entry programs (notably medicine and law) indicated that they shared few interests with undergraduate students and maintained largely separate suites of clubs and student services from those supported by UTSU.

### *Evolution and Structural Change within Student Societies*

Early in the Summit process, participants took part in a “blank slate exercise” – thinking about how student government at the University of Toronto would best be organized if none of the current governance structures existed and everyone were starting totally afresh. While most participants acknowledged the value of large inclusive student governments, substantial support was registered for the view that, if starting from scratch, the principal authority and resources should be assigned to the local (i.e. divisional) governments. Opinion was divided as to the appropriate number of central governments and how they should be constituted: on the basis of campus, full or part-time status, undergraduate, graduate or professional faculty, or other criteria.

A related discussion addressed the merits and downsides of what was termed “fractionated” student governance, that is, a large number of relatively small student societies with no overarching student organizations to coordinate or direct their activities. Among the benefits identified were an opportunity for particularly direct, effective representation of student interests; the ability of local governments to give priority to and devote resources towards their

---

<sup>13</sup> Given that UTSU does not provide any services at UTSC, ‘campus’ here cannot be taken to be referring to the entire U of T campus. The context makes it clear that they mean to refer solely to the St. George campus.

principal concerns; and the potential for genuine collaboration on issues of wider interest (on the model of the St George Roundtable). As well, it was suggested that fractionalized student governance would not necessarily preclude collaboration on service provision in order to realize economies of scale, for example in offering a health and dental plan, nor would clubs and advocacy necessarily be adversely affected.

Conversely, participants noted various negative consequences to fractionalization, including the potential for harm to clubs and levy groups that go beyond divisional boundaries; difficulty making progress on projects that affect large numbers of students, such as the Student Commons; potential problems in the effective and economic provision of services to students; challenges in organizing advocacy for the larger student population to the University administration and to government; a risk that institutional university identity might be undermined; and a recognition that not all students prefer to be closely connected to their local communities.

Although it was understood that neither a blank slate nor extensively fractionalized student governance were realistic possibilities, these discussions proved useful in bringing to the fore basic issues germane to the Summit. They also raised the fraught – but central – question of whether students in identifiable constituencies, such as colleges or professional faculties should be able to have some or all of their fees diverted from UTSU to their own societies or to secede altogether from UTSU. Representatives of some divisional societies argued that their members had spoken clearly in plebiscites of their desire for fee diversion but that UTSU controlled and blocked potential mechanisms for fee diversion or secession.

The Students' Administrative Council (SAC, the named used before the adoption of the 'University of Toronto Students Union' in 2006) included graduate students until the formation of the Graduate Students' Union in 1968. Similarly, full-time undergraduates at the Scarborough campus left SAC in 2004, with the SCSU taking over the role of the representative student government for those students in their interactions with the University administration. In each case there was mutual agreement that the distinct interests of students within a particular division or campus were best served by a separate organization.

But it became evident that under existing UTSU by-laws no possibility exists for groups of students to formally dissociate themselves from UTSU, either by way of fee diversion or outright secession, should the UTSU leadership be unwilling to countenance such a possibility. As some Summit participants noted, this made for a striking paradox in that the University continues to change in fundamental ways as a result of the ongoing development of tri-campus structures within the University, including the Tri-campus Framework of 2002<sup>14</sup> and the development of Campus Councils within Governing Council in 2013. Nonetheless, the architecture of the central student government at St George and UTM is all but impervious to change should the UTSU leadership not support it.

---

<sup>14</sup> Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses," Robert Birgeneau, Adel Sedra, and Carolyn Tuohy, University of Toronto, 2002.

## 4. Recommendations

We hold that the current policy framework that governs the relations between student societies and the University is untenable. As we discussed in Section 2, the current policies focus on the collection of fees. But, given that the University requires mandatory membership in student societies as part of its registration process, the University owes students the assurance that the societies in question are operating to their benefit and with appropriate levels of accountability. The controversies of the past few years that precipitated the Summit as well as the discussion that ensued as part of its activities lead us to *recommend that the Governing Council of the University of Toronto establish a policy for student societies.*

This policy should include the following elements:

- recognition of the importance of students' autonomy in governing their societies' affairs;
- recognition that such autonomy is constrained by the University's obligation to ensure that student societies provide benefits to their members that are proportional to the fees those members pay, and that operations of societies are democratic, with appropriate mechanisms for members to influence their operations not only through elections but also more broadly;
- recognition that one important benefit that student societies offer is the representation of their members' interests to divisional, campus, and university-wide administrations; however, given the size of the University, only a relatively small number of societies should be mandated to represent students to the University as a whole;
- a process that would allow a new divisional or multidivisional student society to be established (e.g. second-entry professional undergraduates; St. George campus first-entry undergraduates);
- a process that would allow for restructuring of student societies.

Given the importance of fair election processes to the legitimacy of student societies' operations, *we recommend that the new policy for student societies require that every society use an arms-length Chief Returning Officer (CRO) who has been appropriately certified by the University.*

One possibility would be requiring each student society to designate at least one member each year who would be trained by the Office of the Vice-Provost Students on best practices for elections. Each student society would then have to name its CRO from the pool of trained election overseers, with the proviso that the CRO would come from a different society from the one she or he is overseeing. We also believe that the University should offer honoraria to students who serve as CROs, with the amount being proportional to the size and complexity of the society.

Moreover, as the discussion in Section 3 should make clear, though all Summit participants shared a commitment to certain general principles for democratic governance of student societies, there was no consensus on how those principles should be specified in policy. The autonomy of the societies means that each uses its own preferred conception of the different principles. The principle of legitimacy as articulated above, however, requires that students be able to recognize that such societies are operating appropriately. We believe, given the University's role in compelling membership and collecting fees on behalf of students, that ultimately it must be the guarantor that societies are indeed serving the interests of their members as democratically expressed through fair elections and other forms of accountability. Students thus must have a means to challenge how societies operationalize and apply the shared democratic principles.

*Thus we recommend that the new policy for student societies include the establishment of a university-wide Student Society Appeals Board that would serve as a court of final resort for all complaints about the conduct of particular student societies, including elections complaints.* Such a Board should include students, faculty, and staff, and should be guided by a volunteer with significant legal experience such as a retired judge.

During the course of the Summit, we learned that two shortcomings of the current "Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees" are its vagueness in describing the "open, accessible and democratic" operations required of student societies and its limiting the University's capacity to address cases where a society is believed to fall short of those standards other than by withholding fees from it – a particularly drastic penalty given the significant benefits that societies provide for their members.

To remedy these shortcomings *we recommend that the new policy give the Student Society Appeals Board the power to issue binding directives to student societies*, where nonconformity with such directives would be grounds for the Provost, on the basis of the "Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees," to withhold fees from a society for failing to operate in a "open, accessible and democratic" fashion.

In order to guide the deliberations of the new Appeals Board, and to flesh out the requirement that student societies operate in an "open, accessible and democratic" fashion, *we recommend that the Office of the Vice-Provost Students develop governance guidelines, including guidelines for the conduct of elections* (and that these guidelines be updated regularly).

Given the differences between the extant societies, we believe that no one-size-fits-all set of practices can be prescribed. Thus we prefer the model of a set of guidelines, with some latitude, that would allow each society to craft its distinctive policies in light of its own traditions and history.

The principle of fair elections, as described in Section 3, means that each society's election policy should be designed to maximize the possibility for students to cast informed ballots on leadership of the society. Thus, the guidelines for student society elections should address:

- how best to use voting technologies;
- the role of slates in elections, given that an elected executive should be kept accountable either by the general membership or by a Board of Directors that is elected independently of the executive;
- rules for the involvement of non-society members in society elections;
- the need for societies to ensure that different constituencies within their memberships are appropriately represented in their activities, usually by having specially elected representatives to the society that act on their behalf.

In addition, the guidelines should address how executives within societies can increase accountability to their membership by:

- listing acceptable mechanisms for ensuring that the general membership has the capacity to direct or overrule the executive;
- restricting the use of proxy votes so that no particular sub-group within a society can monopolize its governance or mechanisms for accountability.

We recognize that any new policy for student societies should be developed only following consultation with those societies not participating in the Summit (notably, the GSU, SCSU, and APUS), as well as with the various student associations and groups, and also the tri-campus community more broadly. At the same time, the Summit resulted from many years of dissension within the student body. Summit participants expressed impatience at the pace of change and many of them noted that they were about to graduate and did not want to see their work at the Summit or in years prior go to waste. Accordingly, *we recommend that the consultations proceed expeditiously and that the new policy for student societies be implemented as soon as possible.*

## ***Acknowledgements***

The faculty facilitators would like to thank the student leaders who participated in the Summit and all student leaders throughout the University. We recognize their incredible commitment to their organizations, their willingness to undertake these highly important leadership roles, and their strong desire to make a difference. Almost all positions are unpaid and voluntary in nature and our student leaders undertake these roles while balancing commitments to studies. We recognize the significant challenges therein and appreciate their accomplishments.

We would like to thank other associations, clubs and individuals for their interests in, and submission to, the Summit. We thank the Vice-Provost, Prof. Jill Matus, and the Office of the Vice Provost Students for logistical support for the Summit. It would not have been possible to bring together such a busy group of individuals without their support and dedication. In particular our thanks go to Terri Cook, Sarah Burley, and Mike LeSage for organizing meeting invitations, meeting locations, and coordinating/posting meeting documents. We thank David Newman for taking careful notes at each of the Summit meetings and making them available to all Summit members. Our thanks also go to David Newman, Meredith Strong and Mark McGowan for responding to requests for documents pertaining to existing university policies.

## ***Appendix A – Background on Student Society Disputes***

To: Governing Council  
Members of the University Affairs Board  
Mr. Ben Crase, Trinity College Meeting  
Mr. Mauricio Curbelo, U of T Engineering Society  
Mr. Munib Sajjad, UTSU

CC: The Varsity

From: Cheryl Misak, Vice-President & Provost

Date: May 24, 2013

RE: Fee Diversion Referenda: Governance and Policy Context

Please distribute widely.

We have seen over the last year an ongoing series of complaints and frustrations on the part of some divisional student societies towards the University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU). Trinity College Meeting (Trinity) and the Engineering Society (EngSoc) have recently held referenda requesting diversion of fees collected by the University on behalf of UTSU.

The response of the Office of the Provost during these debates between student societies has been to encourage electoral and representational reforms on UTSU's part and to note to the divisional societies that the Office of the Provost cannot simply divert fees from UTSU to them. I write now to amplify and provide more contextual information after the vigorous debate at the May 23, 2013 meeting of Governing Council.

### Governance and Policy Context

The *University of Toronto Act, 1971* sets out the powers of Governing Council, which include those granted under the *University of Toronto Act, 1947*. Among the powers in the latter Act is the power to recognize "committees" representative of the students, now called "student societies."

Governing Council has chosen to recognize various student societies for specified purposes. UTSU is one such society. Governing Council has also enacted the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees* to deal with, among other things, the collection of fees on behalf of such student societies. The *Policy* states that a student society is an organization "on whose behalf the University collects a compulsory non-academic incidental fee, in which membership is automatic and determined by registration and status in a particular division or program, or in one of a number of divisions or programs of the University of Toronto".

Undergraduate students in Arts and Science at Trinity College, and in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, are among the many members of UTSU, which automatically represents full-time undergraduate students, as defined by division of registration, registered in a faculty on the St. George campus in a program leading to a degree, diploma or certificate.

It is important to note that the Governing Council itself, by policy, has both recognized UTSU as a student society, and has committed itself to collecting fees to support its activities. It is also important to note that there is no current provision in policy for the administration, acting on behalf of Governing Council, to divert compulsory fees from UTSU to local divisional societies such as Trinity or EngSoc. Diversion of compulsory student society fees to local or divisional societies would require a policy change, since Governing Council has not chosen to enact policy providing for such action, nor has it given the Provost authority to do so.

A significant feature of the Governing Council's recognition of student societies is the autonomy they receive, subject to the requirement expressed in the *Policy for Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees* that such societies operate in "an open, accessible and democratic fashion, following the terms of their constitutions" and subject to the need for financial transparency for audited financial statements and other financial provisions.

Governing Council has given the Provost a role in ensuring that these standards are met. The same policy states that where the Provost has reason to believe that a society is not operating in an open, accessible and democratic fashion, the Provost can take various steps which ultimately may lead to the withholding of the fees the University collects on behalf of the society, subject to an appeal to the University Affairs Board of Governing Council.

I have had cause to withhold fees once during my term as Provost, with respect to a divisional student society. When the democratic issue was resolved, the fees that had been withheld were flowed to the student society in question. I do not have the authority to divert fees. That is, I do not have the authority to withhold fees and then redistribute them to other student societies.

#### Where does the University Affairs Board (UAB) fit into this picture?

The terms of reference of the UAB state in section 5.2 that with respect to compulsory non-academic incidental fees, such fees are approved by the Board. Changes to those fees must of course be consistent with the policies of Governing Council. The diversion of fees is not permitted in those policies. At the meeting of Governing Council on May 23, the Secretary of the Governing Council commented on the interrelationship of the Governing Council's own policy and the terms of reference of the UAB. There is no conflict between the two.

At the University of Toronto, policy creation falls within the authority of Governing Council, which has chosen to exercise this authority in a way that is typical of governance boards – by looking to administration to develop, consult, and eventually put forward proposed policies for Governing Council's consideration. Governing Council looks at the big picture and the interests of the University as a whole. Through its meetings and other work, Governing Council engages its members, representing various estates including students, in arriving at conclusions as to



how it wants its powers to be exercised via policy, as it has done in the case of the *Policy on Compulsory Non-Academic Incidental Fees*.

### The Provost's Role in Ensuring Open, Accessible and Democratic Operation

It is not necessary for me to get into the background details, but it suffices to say that for several years concerns have been brought forward by students about whether UTSU has been operating in an open, accessible and democratic manner, particularly with respect to elections issues. The persistence of these concerns has led to my Office becoming involved on several occasions. I have highlighted the importance of electoral reform, and, most recently, have indicated clearly that in the complex University of Toronto context, on-line elections are an essential feature of open, accessible and democratic operation. I have indicated to UTSU, in writing, that on-line voting must be available for the 2014 elections. If that is not the case, the clause in the *Policy* with respect to the withholding of fees will be applied. I have also indicated my expectations regarding electoral reforms, including the redundancy of proxy voting in an on-line voting environment. I am pleased that UTSU has committed, in writing, to making on-line voting available and has instituted various electoral reforms. I and my office will continue to monitor UTSU's progress in meeting these expectations.

But electoral reform is not the whole of the picture. It is clear that some divisional societies have become so dissatisfied with UTSU that they are seeking to have fees, which would otherwise go to UTSU, diverted to their own organizations for similar purposes but under local administration. Trinity and EngSoc have gone so far as to conduct referenda, indicating overwhelming support for fee diversion. Trinity and EngSoc have asked that this issue be placed on the UAB agenda. I have recommended to the Chair of the UAB – and she has agreed – that such a motion not be placed on the agenda since it is not consistent with Governing Council policy, as stated above.

### What are the next steps?

First, consistent with the concept of autonomy of student societies, the issues that are being raised are ones that the students themselves ideally should agree upon. But, given the importance of enhancing the student experience through activities supported by student societies, we are not prepared to let such significant points of dissent among the students be ignored. Accordingly, I am arranging for meetings between UTSU, Trinity and EngSoc to take place to discuss the matters that have sparked the fee diversion referenda on May 30 and June 6. I have indicated that it is best for the parties to meet on their own initially – this is, after all, an issue for the students themselves – but thereafter my Office would be pleased to arrange a facilitator. I have consulted with both the Dean of Arts and Science and the Dean of Law regarding a suitable expert to assist, and I hope to have someone available soon.

Second, while it is of course possible that Governing Council will decide to change its *Policy* so that fee diversion is allowed, the case for fee diversion will need to take into consideration demarcation issues, possibilities for fragmentation, the impact on students as a whole, and so on. Any such proposal for policy change, that is, would require a careful process.

In sum, the Provost's Office takes these issues very seriously and we are working actively to assist in productive change. There is real prospect for a resolution when electoral reform, on-line voting, and facilitated discussion are combined with what I hope will be a spirit of collegiality among the students, recognizing that coherent sub-groups among them have some unique interests that the body as a whole needs to consider.

So as not to prejudice the dialogue, I will be limiting my public statements on this matter. But I will be reporting to governance at appropriate times as the issues move forward. This will include an information session involving governors and student leaders. As matters currently stand, I do not believe that this issue should be placed on the agenda for the next UAB meeting.

I remain optimistic that the upshot of the ongoing conversation will be a strengthening of democracy in our student governments and a fair and responsive use of student fees that balances campus-wide and divisional interests.

**PDAD&C #19 2013-2014**

To: PDAD&C

From: Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President & Provost

Date: September 12, 2013

**RE: Update on Undergraduate Student Societies Summit**

At its meeting on June 17th, the Executive Committee of Governing Council determined that, in light of disputes between divisional student societies and student governments regarding the distribution of student fees and democratic reform, the proposed Student Commons Agreement and the Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Student Commons would be deferred for consideration by Governing Council in a future cycle. For background on those disputes, please see the attached memo.

In order to resolve those outstanding disputes, and make it possible to take the Student Commons motions forward to Governing Council, former Provost Cheryl Misak last month set up an Undergraduate Student Societies Summit. The Summit, including experts in democratic theory and practice and student group representatives, will consider the issues and facilitate both discussion between the student groups and a satisfactory outcome on which we can proceed.

The Summit participants are asked to consider the following:

- In a Policy environment in which there are currently four representative student governments (UTSU, SCSU, GSU, APUS) recognized by Governing Council and supported by mandatory fee deductions from students in the relevant constituencies, how can the sometimes distinct interests of divisional societies be supported and respected in a democratic manner?
- What are the implications of these answers on the evolution of the democratic structures of the student governments or on fee support for the activities of the divisional societies?

These questions will be explored in the context of the issues raised by recent fee diversion referenda but are not limited to the fee diversion issue alone. Although the Summit cannot effect policy changes (only the Governing Council can do that), if it concludes that further analysis should be undertaken, it may suggest issues that could be considered as part of a policy review. The Summit is intended to be a substantial, principled, and facilitated conversation.

In order to broaden the group of student leaders providing input into the discussion, UTSU and all the divisional/collegiate societies represented by UTSU will be able to send members to the Summit. **We have extended the original (September 1) deadline until the end of this week and have invited each of the following groups to name up to two members to participate:**

- University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU)
- UTM Students' Union (UTMSU)
- Arts & Science Student Union (ASSU)

- Dental Students' Society
- Engineering Society (EngSoc)
- Faculty of Music Undergraduate Association
- Innis College Student Society
- Medical Society
- New College Student Council
- Nursing Undergraduate Society
- Physical Health & Education Undergraduate Association
- St. Michael's College Students Union
- Student Teachers' Union
- Students' Law Society
- Transitional Year Program Student Association
- Trinity College Meeting
- Undergraduate Pharmacy Society
- University College Literary & Athletic Society (UCLit)
- Victoria University Students' Administrative Council (VUSAC)
- Woodsworth College Students' Association

Other student groups including the Scarborough Campus Student Union (SCSU), the Graduate Students' Union (GSU), and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS), student clubs, and other members of the University community are invited to make written submissions, and the Summit members might invite in-person submissions as well. **Please send written submissions to David Newman, Director, Student Life (dl.newman@utoronto.ca) by October 1, 2013.**

The faculty Summit members will be:

- Professor Donald Ainslie (Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts & Science, and Principal, University College)
- Professor Joe Desloges (Department of Geography and Earth Sciences, Faculty of Arts & Science, and Principal, Woodsworth College)
- Professor Graham White (Department of Political Science, University of Toronto Mississauga)
- Professor Linda White (Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts & Science)

Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students & First Entry Divisions, Professor Mark McGowan, Special Advisor to the Vice-Provost Students, and Mr. David Newman, Director, Student Life, will provide support from the Administration. Professor Desloges will act as Chair of the Summit meetings.

We will begin next week to schedule the first meeting of what is likely to be a multi-meeting process. The Summit may call on Professor Brian Langille, from the Faculty of Law, to facilitate the discussions and/or the outcome. The Summit will meet as necessary through the Fall 2013 term. It will give updates and report its conclusions to both Governing Council and the Provost

## Appendix B – Participants in the Student Societies Summit

Name	Affiliation	Role
<b>FACULTY SUMMIT MEMBERS</b>		
Prof. Joe Desloges (Chair)	Geography/Earth Sciences/ Woodsworth	Professor
Prof. Donald Ainslie	Philosophy/University College	Professor
Prof. Graham White	Political Science UTM	Professor
Prof. Linda White	Political Science/Public Policy- UTSG	Professor
Prof. Brian Langille	Law	Professor
<b>ADVISORS &amp; ADMINISTRATION</b>		
Prof. Jill Matus	Administration	Vice-Provost, Students & First-Entry Divisions
Prof. Mark McGowan*	Administration	Acting Vice-Provost, Students & First-Entry Divisions / Special Advisor to the Vice-Provost, Students & First-Entry Divisions
Meredith Strong**	Administration	Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students & Student Policy Advisor
David Newman	Administration	Acting Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students & First-Entry Divisions / Director, Office of Student Life
<b>STUDENT PARTICIPANTS</b>		
Yolen Bollo-Kamara	UTSU – University of Toronto Students Union	Vice-President Equity
Agnes So	UTSU – University of Toronto Students Union	Vice-President University Affairs
Raymond Noronha	UTMSU – University of Toronto at Mississauga Students Union	President
Melissa Theodore	UTMSU - University of Toronto at Mississauga Students Union	Vice-President External
Xiao Tian	ASSU – Arts and Science Students Union	President
Dylan Chauvin Smith	ASSU – Arts and Science Students Union	Executive Member
No participant	DSS - Dental Students' Society	
No participant	DSS - Dental Students' Society	
Mauricio Curbelo	EngSoc - Engineering Society	President
Thomas Santerre	EngSoc - Engineering Society	Vice-President Communications
Jessica Leung***	FMUA - Faculty of Music Undergraduate Assoc.	Vice-President
Mathias Memmel***	FMUA - Faculty of Music Undergraduate Assoc.	Chief Financial Officer
Mary Stefanidis	ICSS - Innis College Student Society	President
Ryan Lamers	ICSS - Innis College Student Society	Vice-President

Kim Blakely	MedSoc - Medical Society	President
David Bastien	MedSoc - Medical Society	Vice-President Finance
Ashkan Azimi	NCSC - New College Student Council	President
Craig Maniscalco	NCSC - New College Student Council	Vice-President Administration
<i>No participant</i>	NUS - Nursing Undergraduate Society	
<i>No participant</i>	NUS - Nursing Undergraduate Society	
Anthony O'Brien	KPEUA - Kinesiology & Physical Education Undergraduate Association	President
Craig Cuizon	KPEUA - Kinesiology & Physical Education Undergraduate Association	Vice-President Communications
Mike Cowan	SMCSU - St. Michael's College Students Union	Past President
Alex Zappone	SMCSU - St. Michael's College Students Union	President
Teresa Maida	STU - Student Teachers' Union	Treasurer
Joe Bodley	STU - Student Teachers' Union	External Coordinator
Brendan Stevens	SLS - Students' Law Society	President
Peter Flynn	SLS - Students' Law Society	Vice-President, Student Affairs & Governance
<i>No participant</i>	TYPSA - Transitional Year Programme Students' Association	
<i>No participant</i>	TYPSA - Transitional Year Programme Students' Association	
Benjamin Crase	TCM - Trinity College Meeting	Male Head
Maha Naqi	TCM - Trinity College Meeting	Female Head
<i>No participant</i>	UPS - Undergraduate Pharmacy Society	
<i>No participant</i>	UPS - Undergraduate Pharmacy Society	
Nishi Kumar	UCLit – University College Literary & Athletic Society	President
Ryan Phillips	UCLit – University College Literary & Athletic Society	Vice-President
Jelena Savic	VUSAC - Victoria University Student Administrative Council	President
Zack Medow	VUSAC - Victoria University Student Administrative Council	Vice-President External
Rhys Smith	WCSA - Woodsworth College Students' Association	President
Michael Amiraslani	WCSA - Woodsworth College Students' Association	Vice-President External Affairs

\* Sept. to Oct. 2013; \*\* Jan. to present, 2014; \*\*\* did not attend Summit sessions.

## ***Appendix C – Meeting Dates of the Student Societies Summit`***

October 7, 2013; 3-5 pm; Governing Council Chamber

October 26, 2013; 2-4 pm; Croft Chapter House, UC

November 1, 2013; 1-3 pm; Croft Chapter House, UC

November 15, 2013; 1-3 pm; Rm 728; Bissell Building

December 11, 2013; 10-12 am; Governing Council Chamber

January 15, 2014; 10-12 am; Governing Council Chamber

January 27, 1-3 pm; Governing Council Chamber

February 10, 2014; 2-4 pm; Governing Council Chamber

March 7, 2014; 1-3 pm; Governing Council Chamber

March 14, 2014; 1-3 pm; Governing Council Chamber