

At the advertised start time of 2:30 pm: quorum has not been achieved. Meeting commencement was delayed for thirty minutes, as per By-Law 10 in order to attempt to achieve quorum at 250 members in attendance.

Call to Order – 3:00 pm, October 26, 2011

Quorum had not been achieved at the advertised start time of 2:30 pm. Meeting commencement was delayed for thirty minutes, under the terms of By-Law 10.

Call to Order – 3:00 pm, October 26, 2011

1. Roll Call of Attendance

Board of Directors

- President..... Jeff McCann
- Treasurer Keenan Midgley
- Internal Relations Officer Jordan Kohn
- External Relations Officer Kevin Zhang
- Member Services Officer Lorenz Yeung
- University Relations Officer Marc Fontaine
- At-Large Representative Arry Dhillon
- At-Large Representative Danielle Hornstein
- Faculty Representative (Arts & Social Sciences) Kyle Acierno
- Faculty Representative (Applied Sciences) Lahz Dropsy Kikabou
- Faculty Representative (Business) Hao Lin
- Faculty Representative (Communication, Art & Technology)..... Jenni Rempel
- Faculty Representative (Education) Shiva Manavipour
- Faculty Representative (Environment)..... Maziar Kazemi
- Faculty Representative (Health Sciences)..... Spencyre Hackett-Martin
- Faculty Representative (Sciences) Tabrez Hussein

Society Staff

- Communications Coordinator Stijn Daenens (Registrations)
- Policy & University Relations Coordinator..... Hattie Aitken (Resource and Minuting)

Visual Translation Services

- CART Service Wayne Bilko

Guests

- Tompkins, Wozny, Miller & Co. Gary Wozny
- 88 Registered Students

Incomplete list of student speakers:

- Isaac Louie
- Susan
- Stephanie Duran
- Joanne Bettocchi-Barrow
- Aleks Besan
- Rick Chan
- Maria Persdottir
- Peter Gill
- Jordan Andom
- Chelsea Mackie
- Nina Halave-Thompson

..... Allan Kelly
..... Amir Ali
.....Aswin Kumar

2. Call to Order

President Jeff McCann: Called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. 30 minutes past the advertised start time. Attendance: 105.
The agenda items that would be addressed are those outlined in By-Law 10 as long as at least 20 members attend.

3. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR

MOTION AGM 10-26-11:01

Duran / Bettocchi Barrow

Be it resolved that Lorenz Yeung be appointed as the Chair of the 2011 SFSS Annual General Meeting.

CARRIED

Yeung commenced to Chair the meeting at 3:04 pm.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEETING RULES

Yeung stated that the meeting would consider the agenda prepared by the Board of Directors and would be conducted using Roberts Rules of Order.

He explained that:

1. A Point of Order may be called if in your perception, someone has violated Roberts Rules. Then the Chair will hear your point.
2. A Point of Information may only be called when the speaker is requesting information or clarification only about an item that is on the floor and what is going on in the meeting. This is only for questions or clarifications if, for instance, you cannot hear someone; you do not know what is being discussed; you do not know what a term means.
3. A motion must be moved and a seconded, then discussion about the issues can go ahead before a vote is taken.

As quorum was not met, no changes or additions to the Agenda could be made.

Microphones were set up so that speakers in support of a motion speak at the south microphone and those against, at the north microphone.

DISCUSSION

Louie stated that he had an item for the Agenda.

McCann reiterated the provisions of By-Law 10 where quorum has not been met. Only the basic items required by the Constitution may be addressed and no other items may be added to the Agenda as business items. He then read out the terms of By-Law 10.

When the meeting has at least 20 members in attendance but less than the 250 to achieve a quorate meeting, the order of business is limited to the items that are in the By-law, which are:

1. Appointing the Chair
2. Receiving and filing the minutes of the last Annual General Meeting
3. Receiving the Annual Board Report
4. Receiving the Treasurer's Report

5. Receiving the Auditor's Report

6. Appointing the Auditor for the coming year

The Agenda would therefore be limited to those items at this meeting.

The order of business can be changed, but items cannot be added to the Agenda.

Louie repeated that he had an item for the Agenda, and had missed class to attend the meeting to address it.

A speaker stated that there are a significant number of students attending and there are motions that students want to include on the Agenda. Proposal: Those students who brought motions to the meeting are allowed to present them to the meeting and that the wording is recorded in the minutes, be taken into consideration, and possibly ratified into the Agenda.

MOTION AGM 10-26-11:02

Sakai / C. Chan

Be it resolved to adopt the Agenda as presented.

MOTION AGM 10-26-11:03 TO AMEND

C. Chan /

Be it resolved to move the Receipt of Report From the Auditor to follow the Adoption of the October 5th, 2010 Annual General Meeting Minutes.

Yeung said that since the financial statements were still being printed, that item would be moved lower down on the agenda so that everybody can get a copy before the Auditor presents them. He asked Chan to withdraw the motion.

C. Chan /

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Gill asked if the by-law constraint was on making motions versus putting items on the Agenda for discussion or reporting to allow students an opportunity to voice concerns and express how they feel, or would they be shut out and silenced. This meeting is supposed to give students to examine how the Board has been operating.

McCann stated that items cannot be added to the Agenda, but after the business meeting is finished, discussions could be conducted.

Gill asked McCann if he was stating essentially that since quorum was not achieved, students should not even be here. That students could watch this on video, and that there was no point in us skipping class to be here. There is no point in students missing class to attend the meeting if they cannot have a chance to speak.

McCann replied that each motion could be discussed. When the motion to receive the Financial Statements is on the floor, students could discuss and ask questions about the Financial Statements, for example. Questions can come forward about any other item that is on the Agenda as presented, based on By-Law 10.

Persdottir said that discussion period is common to give students the opportunity to voice their concerns on issues, and asked that the Board respect the number of students who attend.

Susan requested that minutes be taken during the discussion period.

Yeung said that this would be done.

Susan said that usually quorum is not met at SFSS annual general meetings, and proposed that something be done about that. Students have no voice year after year. By-law amendments should be considered at this meeting.

Yeung reiterated that since quorum had not been met, that could not be done at this meeting. Informal discussions of matters that students brought to the meeting may be entertained after the business

Agenda is dealt with, even though, according to the Constitution, we cannot actually discuss those items as agenda items. After the agenda has been exhausted, we could have an informal discussion.

Susan reiterated informal discussions following the business meeting be minuted so that students' voices appear in the record of this meeting with every concern that students bring to the Board's attention.

McCann said that everything would be in the meeting record.

Susan: I want to make sure that every single word counts, because I think right now the priority is students' opinions. It is a constitutional issue, and this is something we understand. Historically, quorum is usually not met at these meetings, and I would like to propose that something be done about that, because year after year, students do not get to voice what they like. [Applause] Each year the AGM is probably one of the only spaces and times during the year that we can actually amend bylaws. When that will be possible during this particular meeting? Yeung: To amend the bylaws, we would have to have the 250 quorum.

Susan: So bylaws can never be amended?

Yeung: If we have 250 people, yes.

Chan: The agenda is distributed to the attendees, so I would again move to put the auditor's report immediately following the adoption of minutes.

Aitken: Point of order. The motion does not comply with Roberts Rules. You need to move it and then you speak to it, but you did it in reverse order.

MOTION AGM 10-26-11:04 TO AMEND

Chan / Kumar

Be it resolved to amend the Agenda to move the Audit Report to follow immediately after Adoption of the Minutes

Yeung: Discussion on the change of the agenda of the order? Seeing no discussion, we will go to a vote.

CARRIED

Abstention: M. Sakai

Yeung: And now to the main motion to approve the agenda as amended.

Persdottir: Lots of students wanted to be here but this is the busiest week of midterm exams and there is also a conflict with Forum scheduling later on today. The Board did little to publicize the meeting well.

Manavipour: Board members are students, some of whom are also missing class to be here. Do not make accusations; it is a personal choice that students make to attend the AGM or not.

Board: Applause.

Lieberman: We are paying you to be here. There is a difference. Lots of students would be here if they were paid to do so.

Chan: Called a Point of Order to move on with the Agenda.

Lieberman: Robert's Rules are not fun. He should have asked "Aren't you guys paid?" Whether students come with Agenda items or not, clarity is the issue. He again asked if items could be added to the Agenda.

Leung: No, but the order of items can be changed with the consent of those in attendance in response to an amendment.

Lieberman: Can there be additions to existing Agenda items?

Leung: No.

Louie: wanted to address Manavipour's comments.

Leung: The meeting must move on.

Louie: the Board has scheduling control of the AGM and has set it to end at 5:00 pm. Forum begins at 4:30 pm.

Kumar: Last year's meeting was over in one hour.

Chan called the question.

Though there was no question on the floor, Persdottir opposed calling the question.

Yeung said that a vote would be taken on going to the vote on the motion. We are voting to vote. Right now, we were discussing the adoption of the agenda, and we had discussion going. Chan wanted to end discussion, so he called the question. Because Persdottir opposed calling the question, we have to have a vote on whether we want to just move on and vote on adopting the agenda or if we want to continue discussion.

Leung: Ended the discussion and called for a vote on going to a vote.

YES: 40

NO: 32

ABSTENTIONS: 3

Noted abstention: Noonan

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Yeung: Now we are going to vote by show of hands to adopt the agenda as amended.

YES: 37

NO: 18

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION AGM 10-26-11:05

Sakai / Andom

Be it resolved to adopt the minutes of the October 5th, 2010 Simon Fraser Student Society Annual General Meeting.

DISCUSSION

Lieberman asked that time be taken to make sure that each item is discussed.

Yeung: This is the time to discuss the minutes. I will give some time for people to stand up. Is

everybody comfortable with the minutes? Seeing no more discussion, all those in favour of adopting the minutes from last year. Anyone opposed?

CARRIED

6. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE AUDITOR

Gary Wozny, a representative from the Society's auditor, Tompkins, Wozny, Miller & Co., provided an overview of the Student Society's audited financial statements.

Wozny stated that he would go over some of the financial statements in the auditor's report starting with the Statement of Operations, also known as an Income Statement: Society Revenues And Expenses for the 12 months for the fiscal year ended April 30, 2011, showing changes in Fund Balances-see page 3.

a. Fund Accounting

1. General funds handle day-to-day administrative business.
2. Capital Asset fund- all fixed furniture and equipment costs as well as the Society's leasehold interest in the MBC, as well as the University Centre Building where the Pub is and so on.

b. Revenue Sources

1. This year there were more students enrolled, so there was more revenue, and that is the reason for the increase over last year: \$6.99 million this year versus \$6.81 million.
2. The retail services, \$1.615 million. This includes Food and Beverage Services and the Copy Centre. There were Pub renovations done during part of the year, so some of the revenue generation was curtailed.
3. General office revenues, \$69,000 versus \$51,000, and a little bit less rental revenue this year: \$103,000 versus \$115,000. That is primarily because Travel Cuts did not renew its lease in the MBC and no other tenant has been paying rent for that space.
4. The Graduate Student Society's share of the Service and Cost-Sharing agreement with the SFSS shows \$33,000 as revenue.
5. There was more interest and miscellaneous revenue this year, \$76,000 versus \$42,000.
6. The total revenues were \$8.254 million in fiscal year 2009-10, and \$8.588 million for this fiscal year, 2010-11.

c. Expenses Overview and Comparison

1. Retail services: \$1.97 million versus \$2 million.
2. Administration and Finance Office: \$207,000 versus \$209,000.
3. General office: \$219,000 versus \$198,000.
4. Building operating costs: \$108,000 versus \$95,000.
5. Activity program expenditures: \$1.123 million.
6. Discretionary grants for department student unions and clubs: \$72,000 and \$91,000.
7. Student bursaries: \$10,000.

Total revenue: \$ 3.845 million

Total expenses - operating fund: \$3.8 million

Excess of revenue over expense for the year: approximately \$42,000.

d. Society Development Fund

Representing and advocating for the interests of undergraduate students at Simon Fraser University

The overall revenue totals *do* include the Society Development Fund fee revenue of about \$450,000. Collections commenced in 2009. These funds are set aside for legal costs related to the dispute with the Canadian Federation of Students over the validity of the 2008 SFU referendum to leave the CFS.

e. Capital Asset Fund

Amortization and depreciation for the year: \$461,000.

f. Space Expansion Fund

Expenditures: \$264,000.

g. The Undergraduate Health Plan Fund

Expenditures of \$3.65 million, of which the vast majority relate to the premiums paid to the provider.

h. First Nations Student Association Fund

Expenditures: \$51,000.

i. Accessibility Fund

Nominal expenditures.

For the year, the total revenue is \$8.85 million; expenses were \$8.234 million.

Excess of revenue over expense for the year: \$356,379.

DISCUSSION

McKay: It has been stated that there is a deficit. Do you think that is accurate, and where we would be able to find it in the budget?

Wozny: These statements show actual numbers for the past year, not a budget. The numbers are what they are.

- The general fund has a \$42,000 revenue excess over expenditures.
- The amortization and the capital asset fund, a cost of \$461,000.
- The space expansion fund, which is really for a specific purpose apart from general operations, has an excess of revenue: \$680,000.
- The undergraduate what the health plan has \$41,000 excess revenue.
- First Nations Student Association: \$3,700.
- Accessibility fund balance: \$48,000.

McKay: So we have more revenue than we have expenses?

Wozny: Yes.

McKay: So no deficit?

Wozny: Right.

McCann: That \$1.996 million figure artificially inflates the actual money available to the SFSS to budget and spend. These statements show our general fund including the SDF amount, which includes money that we collect that used to go to the CFS, for which we are now being sued. There is about \$400,000 we are not allowed to spend.

We take a portion of SDF fee revenue and put it aside for the lawsuit, and we do not spend it. It is earmarked for expenses related to the CFS dispute resolution and potential payment to CFS in case we lose that lawsuit. Currently, it amounts to about \$764 per student.

Our operating budget shows a deficit, because we do not use the money in the SDF

McKay: Technically, we have the funds and we are sort of technically not in a deficit, but if the legal case went against the Society, then we would be in a deficit?

McCann: We are being sued for it, but there is a difference between our operating fund and the other funds.

McKay: The general fund shows more revenue than expense; correct?

Wozny: It is called a Society Development fee, decided by referendum. Those funds were set up in a separate bank account to be used only in the CFS dispute. We had to include it in revenues.

Persdottir: I know a lot of the Directors are accountants-in-training, but I would like to direct my question to the auditor. Given what you have just told us in response to McKay's question, is it fair to say that the Society is in a deficit? And if so, where do you identify the key problems in the budget?

Wozny: It is a very good question, but unfortunately, we do not deal with the budget, per se. Our job is to report on the actual numbers, and we are not management. But the numbers are what they are. The general fund reflects the daily operations. Then you have the other funds for specific purposes, so it depends on how you look at it.

- On a global basis, if you include all the other funds, there is a surplus of \$353,679.
- If you look to the basic daily operations, you have excess of revenues of \$42,152, but there is the amortization amount of \$461,000.
- If you net those two together, there is a deficit. But there are surpluses in the other funds that are designated for specific purposes by referendum.

Persdottir: A follow-up question. When the Board of Directors moved to lock out their staff, they claimed that there was a deficit in the operating budget. Can you speak to that issue? I understand that the numbers reported here were for the previous fiscal year, but in general, can you speak to the financial situation with regards to the operational costs of the Society?

Wozny: When did the lockout take place?

Persdottir: July through September 2010.

Wozny: These statements are for the year ending April 30, 2011, so the lockout occurred after the end of the year. These numbers do not address that issue.

Persdottir: Prior to the lockout, there must have been a reason why they locked out their staff, right --

Wozny: We are not privy to that.

Persdottir: In the year leading up to the lockout, was there a problem in the operating finances?

Wozny: I am sorry, I cannot answer that. The numbers are what they are. We do not manage the Society. What happens after the year reported today is in this current fiscal year.

Persdottir: It is totally understandable that you are not fully familiar with the whole political dimension of this. I would still like to ask you one final question. When you sat down and summarized the finances for the Society for the previous fiscal year, did you, at any point, think, "Oh, wow, this Society is in a shitty spot"?

Wozny: Not especially. There is a big potential dispute with the CFS. By definition, the Society Development Fund, had to be counted as revenue and the legal costs have been netted from it. You could look at it and say, "If I took out that Society Development Fund, if I knew I'd end up losing the legal dispute, I'm going to have to give up all that equity and give back that money to the CFS."

It depends on how one looks at it. If you took that fund out of the overall financial report, it would

show a deficit in the general operations.

Halave-Thompson: Point of information. My confusion arises from just trying to figure out how it is that that particular CFS fund is not actually separated from the numbers. Is there a reason?

Wozny: As soon as the Society voted to withdraw from the CFS, they continued to collect a fee, and by referendum, they set up a Society Development fee. From an accounting point of view, we had to show it in revenue. There is no real restriction on it. The Board at the time made a decision, with advice of legal counsel, that it might be a good idea to put as much of that fee into a separate bank account in case you do not win the legal dispute.

Halave-Thompson: What is the final surplus or deficit?

Wozny: The numbers from a pure accounting point of view are here. The SDF revenues have to be included in the Society figures because they are part of the Society operations.

Halave-Thompson: Could you not advise the Society to set up a separate contingency fund for this?

Wozny: They set up a separate bank account for it.

Halave-Thompson: So it is going to be called in the future a contingency fund?

Wozny: They have not called it that, and they have set aside some of their net equity remaining in this Society. It has called an internal restriction related to the CFS dispute.

Wozny moved on to the statement of financial position, also known as balance sheet, page 2, bottom right. This sets out the Student Society's assets, liabilities, and net equity at the end of the fiscal year. You will see the same presentation. You have the various funds that we talked about in the operational statement.

1. General Fund

- a. General Fund Cash and term deposits set aside in each of the funds.
 - \$4.284 million in cash and terms
 - Another \$1.342 million.
 - i. Of this amount, \$1.118 million is set up in a separate bank account that relates to the CFS dispute.
 - Accounts receivable, \$77,000, versus \$91,000 last year.
 - Inventory of \$49,000: Food and Beverage as well as paper and supplies.
 - Some prepaid amounts. The biggest amount is the undergraduate health plan premium payment of \$1.13 million to the provider.
- b. General fund-current liabilities, the accounts payable and accruals.
 - \$728,000 of debt in that fund, what you would expect in payables, HST etc.
 - That type of thing accrued to staff, and about \$315,000 is due to the University for your share of operating costs in the MBC.
 - Some minor deferred revenue of \$18,700.
 - \$541,000 of equity set aside internally for the Society Development Fund or the CFS dispute.
 - \$128,000 for the health plan reserve.
- c. Repair and replace reserve of \$20,000-another internal restriction. This is required in the lease with the University. 3 percent of your catering revenues must be set aside in a fund in case you have to replace equipment or do major repairs.

\$689,328 is your equity in the general fund.

2. Capital Asset Fund

This is the net book value of capital assets and related equity. This year, \$1.194 million in additions were incurred, of which a good chunk relates to the renovation of the Pub.

3. Space Expansion Fund

You can see a substantial amount of cash, and it has \$3.619 million of equity.

4. The Undergraduate Health Plan

There is not too much equity remaining, just \$6,200.

5. First Nations Student Association

Fund has equity of \$119,540.

6. Accessibility Fund

\$ 235,000 of equity.

Overall:

- There are assets of \$12,171,000
- Equity and fund balances of \$12,170,000

Wozny referred to page 1, bottom right: the independent auditor's report.

We reported that we conducted our audit according to auditing standards. The auditor is responsible to fairly present the statements to the new Board currently managing the Society. Our job is to do that audit of the statement and express an opinion whether the statement is presented fairly in accordance with Canadian generally-accepted accounting principles, which we believe they do, and most importantly, it is what we call a clear or unqualified opinion.

Gill: What is a forensic audit and how does this Society audit differ from a forensic audit?

Wozny: This is what we call a financial statement audit. Our job is to audit the statement to ensure they present fairly, in accordance with generally-accepted accounting principles. The numbers are what they are and they follow accepted principles. Forensic audit is much, much different. Forensic auditors are really looking for fraud or something along those lines. They tend to examine every piece of evidence there is and go from there. If an auditor is engaged to do a forensic audit, it usually means that someone is concerned that there is a major fraud or stealing of funds or something like that.

Forensic audits cost a lot of money. We do not do them.

Besan: The Board manages the Society.

Wozny: Correct, and they hire staff to assist them.

Besan: Which they did not have for a while when there was a lockout, so they were advising themselves. What independent bodies exist out there that can make sure that the Board is actually being accountable apart from, say, a forensics audit?

Wozny: All you can do is get an audit like this that shows the numbers. If someone spends \$100,000 on wages, that is what they spend. If someone is concerned that they're not efficient or they're not paying staff enough, or paying them too much, or not providing a service, that's to be decided through the a process like this, where you vote on what to do.

Besan: Voted on by 105 students, I suppose. Thank you.

Persdottir: I came to this meeting hoping to essentially call for a forensic audit of the Student Society,

and I would like to take this opportunity to read out my motion, as I was hoping to put it forward.

*Whereas the Board of Directors are elected representatives accountable to their membership;
Whereas the Board have repeatedly failed to publish their agenda and minutes in a timely manner, thus violating policy;
Whereas the Board violated their own Rule number 14, items 2 and 4 in order to effectively increase their stipends, and
Whereas the SFSS is currently in a supposed budget deficit, and
Whereas the Board allocated up to \$350,000 with a 30 percent error margin to renovate the Atrium for private-sector use, bringing the number up to \$845,000 to renovate the cafeteria which appears to be inconsistent with the Board's stated commitment to fiscal responsibility, and
Whereas there's a concern that the funds are being used up at an unprecedented rate, and
Whereas the Board locked out their professional office staff, including the two financial coordinators, from July 10th to October 11th of this year --*

Manavipour: Point of order.

Speaker: Just let her finish.

Manavipour: We already went through this in the beginning ...
(Heckling)

Manavipour: Point of order.

Yeung allowed Manavipour to speak.

Speaker: Let Persdottir speak.

Yeung: Manavipour wants to voice her point of order, and then I will make a decision.

Manavipour: We already went through the agenda, and no motions are being added. This item right now is for the auditor's report. Everybody has the opportunity to ask questions, but this is not an opportunity to bring motions. This is just asking questions, so please be respectful to the auditor. This is a time for discussion and questions, not to bring motions forward. We already had that discussion.

Yeung: Maria is aware that she cannot add a motion, she just wants to read it out. I think it is fair for her to voice the motion for the information of the meeting.

Persdottir: I am well aware that I cannot actually put forward this motion, but I just read it out the way I worded it. Continuing from where I was interrupted:

*Whereas the Board locked out the office staff, including the two financial coordinators, for a total of 94 days, and as a result of this, important obligations relating to the financial and administrative operation of this Society were neglected for a substantial amount of time, and
Whereas it is in the interest of all SFSS members, as well as the current and all future Boards, to ensure that no financial malfeasance has taken place since the Board was installed, particularly during the staff walkout,
Be it resolved that the Board appoint the auditors for the 2010-2011 fiscal year to conduct a forensic audit to be done before no later than January 15th, 2012.*

[Applause]

Yeung: Thank you, Maria.

Bilko: Everybody needs to slow down.

7. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Yeung introduced a report detailing the activities of the Board of Directors from October 6, 2010 to October 26, 2011 and asked that members please wait until presenting Directors finish their sections before asking questions.

AGM 10-26-11:06 MOTION

Ali / Noonan

Be it resolved to adopt the 2010- 2011 report from the Board of Directors.

SFSS SERVICES - Lorenz Yeung, Member Services Officer

1. Health and Dental Plan

The health and dental plan was extended. During the by-elections last October, the Board put forward a referendum question to increase the amount students would pay per year to \$230 to account for the fluctuations in our plan. Our health and dental plan is still quite new here, so there are still changes as the plan is stabilizing according to the level of student usage. Unfortunately, that referendum question failed and so we had to go through another round of decisions about what areas of coverage to reduce in order to live within the existing cap on the fee of \$198/student.

2. U-PASS

We are now in the new U-PASS program. Last year's External Relations Officer and I, Science Director at the time, started negotiations with Translink in August. They finally ended this summer. The Treasurer and I signed the new contract, with the monthly fee of \$30. Every single publicly-funded post-secondary school in B.C. has the exact same pass.

STUDENT SPACE – Marc Fontaine, University Relations Officer

A. RENOVATIONS

1. The Maggie Benston Centre Student Lounge

This space is on the lowest floor of the MBC outside of Health and Counseling Services. It is something that came about after student consultations earlier this year and it is something I found, while digging through files, that the students wanted since the year 2000. So it is finally happening and we are excited about that.

Gill: Can you please outline and explain the student consultation process, what exactly happened, how long was the process? Could you describe what a student consultation process is?

Fontaine: I was not on the Board at that time, but there were ads placed on our web site, on our Facebook groups and other social media, as well as ads in the local newspaper asking students to submit their comments. We received a healthy number of comments from the students and

Gill: What was that number?

Fontaine: I have no idea. I was not on that Board at that time.

Gill: But you're counting that information now --

Yeung: Please leave detailed questions until the end of the section or we are not going to get through the report. Thank you.

Fontaine: The results of the consultation were discussed at the Student Space Oversight Committee, and the members of that Committee, including students at-large and Forum representatives, discussed what happened with this space, what would be feasible, and what it took it to manage and decided what would be feasible with the space. Is that satisfactory?

2. The Atrium Cafeteria

There were consultations conducted about this space that we are in right now in 2008. I was not on the Board at that time, but I have seen the results. We did another student consultation this year with students coming in here and as well as surveying students on what they would like in this space. We

also looked at the results of the University's consultations and annual reports to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to confirm that students want more food options and they want more and better gathering space. This big project was also brought to Forum for consultations and so that the students would be aware of this.

We can all see from looking around here, on a day other than today when there's an audience set up, that this space is run down, the tables are always on an angle because they're missing feet. It is an ugly space, it is really dark, and it needs renovations. Students have told us this repeatedly. And we have a Space Expansion Fund for this exact purpose, to renovate our Student Society spaces, of which this is one, and we are finally moving to renovate it. The Board last year tried to renovate it. It is a difficult process going through the necessary University processes, et cetera. Efforts were made to renovate it in 2008, and I am sure, for years before that. We are finally trying to do this now.

We are renovating the space, but it is expensive. We will build three new vending units, but it will also renovate this space, brighten it up, hopefully with new furniture and things for the students. It is not a renovation that will only benefit three commercial vendors. I know there's some concern about that. It will bring in three private food vendors and not just food services offered by the Student Society. I do not see that as a bad thing. Other operations around here are private.

3. Highland Pub

The Pub renovations were completed this year, and we had a grand re-opening in September. You can go upstairs and see what renovations were done. We did some informal surveys last month, and people seem to really like it. We tried to make it as good as it can be for students.

4. Out on Campus and the Women's Centre

These Centres are getting further renovations. The lounge in Out on Campus was renovated, I think last year or two years ago. We are fixing up the employees' office and the vestibule. The Women's Centre will be getting new window coverings, some carpeting, and potentially other improvements.

5. Pub Washrooms

Finally, we are renovating two washrooms that are in the Pub building outside of The Undergrounds, one level below the coffee shop. These washrooms are used on Pub nights, so are really well used. They are disgusting, so they are being renovated. That also went through the Student Space Oversight Committee.

B. Copier Service Upgrades

No renovations have been done, or are planned, for the Copy Center, but we have brought in new photocopiers to replace the five-cent copiers in the hallway. We will be trying to make that a better service for students.

C. UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

The Gondola Project

This is still something we are discussing with Translink and University administrators. It has been in the news a lot. We are support this project, and we will see if it happens in a few years.

DISCUSSION

1. Atrium Food Vendors

Gill: You spoke of a concern with new food vendors coming in, and my question actually addressed the corporate chain presence at our University. There is some discussion as to whether or not this is going to be a threat to The Ladle and its performance. Is the idea that the SFSS business, The Ladle, is going to be run in the same spot? This should perhaps should be a concern for the SFSS, knowing there have been numerous renovations in the Pub, for example, and profits have not been seen because of this. I believe this is another project, which could have a similar outcome.

Acierno: Point of information. You said profits have not been seen. Where you got that information?

Gill: There could be profits, but in order to pay off the amount of money that has been spent to renovate the Pub, I do not think there is a significant profit enough for that.

Acierno: Where are you getting your numbers?

Gill: From talking to different people. I do not admit to seeing numbers myself, honestly, but I have had people who are employed in the Pub telling me this; people using the services and who, like ourselves, have been involved in dialogues with the SFSS, who have these numbers or who have at least suggested that this is the case. You could speak to that right now (to Fontaine). Thank you. That is the first of my concerns.

Fontaine: You have said a lot of things. Corporate chain presence is not my jurisdiction. That would come to another Committee to put out a call for vendors, and which would make a recommendation to the Board to decide which vendors would be the appropriate for the space.

The Ladle is our fast-food vendor there. It is a very good business for us. It is one of our most profitable businesses. We are doing this renovation and adding the food vendors, hoping that it will bring more students into this building, thus bringing more students to The Ladle.

There is a bigger picture here. It is more than just three food vendors. There is the student experience at SFU. There is more than the Space Expansion Fund. We look out for students, we try to do what students want at the University. We have a Space Fund to make student spaces better. This is a way to make student spaces better. The alternative would be not to renovate the space, then we would have an even bigger dump in here and The Ladle might have a bit more of a monopoly, but that's not why the Student Society is here. We are here to serve students. Yes, it might create a bit more competition for The Ladle. I don't think that's a bad thing. I think it will bring more students in here who would otherwise go to Cornerstone for food. This is a central location on campus.

2. Pub Profits and Space Renovations

Fontaine: re: Pub renovation and profits: the cost of Pub operations does not take into account the cost of space renovations. It is not a private business. It is done differently. The Pub is seen as a service, and so renovating it from the Space Expansion Fund allows us to make a better space for students.

The Space Expansion Fund has nothing to do with the revenues or profits from any of our food vendors. The Space Expansion Fund is used to renovate spaces for students. And by using the space fund to add leased food vendor outlets, we will gain revenues from the food vendors that will go into our operating fund, which helps us fund other operations.

Louie: I have several questions for Marc Fontaine. My name is Isaac Louie. When the Pub is running a deficit this year, why are we looking to expand the Atrium space? I understand that renovation is an important thing for this space, given the need for lighting and a more vibrant space. I was wondering why we were looking at expansion to bring in three new vendors that would be competing with the Pub. We would be collecting money and revenue through rents, but would we not be losing money through

students utilizing our own space, like catering at the Pub or something, or holding meetings at the Pub?

Fontaine: I have heard this concern several times. It is a valid concern that I shared once, before I dug more into the issue. The Pub has run a deficit for almost every year of its existence, and it is kind of a miracle when it has not. That (generating a profit) would probably be celebrated heavily around here, and I do not know the last time it did run a profit. Space renovations and adding a fast-foot type of outlet here is different from the Pub. They are different clienteles, they want different things. In a business sense, it is a different market.

Louie: Would it be fair to say that where you stand on the Pub, a guaranteed loss year after year? An accepted loss. Is that a fair statement of where how you stand on that?

Fontaine: It sounds like you are putting words in my mouth that I think the Pub should lose money or something, and, no.

Louie: What you are saying is it is accepted and the Board celebrates it.

Fontaine: When it is a profit, it would be celebrated!

Louie: Could you talk a little bit about the idea of a Pub running a deficit.

Agess: Point of information about the Pub running a deficit. I work at the Pub, and I have heard a lot of conflicting information about this. I heard that from various people I work with that potentially the Pub supplies food and beverage for other events and that don't necessarily make money or fall under the budget of their event, and then that the loss of funds are amalgamated into the Pub's costs throughout the year. Is that true?

Fontaine: First, I am not the person to answer that, and I do not think that is a point of information. You have to get in line to speak.

Agess: Is there an actual Pub deficit?

Yeung: We can address that question during the Treasurer's Report, which is later in the agenda.

Louie: The concern I had was that we're expanding the space, there's still no guarantee of who's going to occupy the space and who's going to lease it, so then there's no guarantee of actual money that would be coming in, so we're spending and we're losing money. We also have this other cost--is it just an accepted cost or is there actually a plan in place to bring in some business into the Pub? Is that not the mandate of that Space Committee?

Fontaine: No. The Finance and Commercial Services Committee.

Yeung: We are renovating the space because it is a dump, and we have the idea of putting in three new vendors. We are aware that we have our own food services, so the Commercial Services Committee will be reviewing who gets that space--preferably, vendors who do not compete with what the Pub serves, and most likely, they will not be serving alcohol. They will have to lease that space, and with such a central location, we can charge a prime rate and we will make revenue from that. It has nothing to do with Pub losses.

Louie: Is there also some revenue collected based on their sales? Would we get a cut of that?

Yeung: No.

3. Renovations

Louie: My second question to Fontaine: could you detail what the Out on Campus renovation is?

Fontaine: A new floor in the office and vestibule, and the thermostat is being moved from the vestibule to the office, as required.

Noonan: I have a question about the MBC Lower Lounge. I know that not a lot is done with that space now, if it was renovated as a more social space, has the Space Committee looked at providing privacy barriers for students using the Health and Counseling Services. It is not exactly a totally private space, but if that were a social space, it is a little more open than some people might feel comfortable with. Did you have ideas about that.

Fontaine: I definitely do. Since the beginning of the project, we have been meeting with Health and Counseling Services, the Director, and the Associate Director of health promotion, and they have sent us a number of concerns that we have fully addressed. The HCS windows will probably be frosted. If you look at the area where the lounge will be in the fall semester or the spring, it is a very busy area. It will be a different configuration with cubicles, but there are a lot of people down there. We have dealt with this issue, and I think there will not be a problem.

4. Student Space Consultations

Louie: Why was SFPIRG not mentioned in this report?

Fontaine: That is something still under consideration.

Louie: Even though there has been a motion at Board that was on the table, referred by the Student Space Oversight Committee? Why was it not mentioned when it has obviously been considered?

Fontaine: Because consultation could happen or will happen.

Louie: Is this not SFSS policy, to have a consultation?

Fontaine: We will have a consultation.

Lieberman: I have a few questions. One of them is regarding consultations done here at the Atrium. You said you have carried out consultations with students. Would you be able to give some more information on that, re: how many students, or was it only students who came here because as a student, I do not remember being consulted about that. How did the consultations happen? I noticed your concern about the quorum, and you saying that we do consultations. If those students' voices are so important, I would say it is important also, to hear the number here. What was that consultation? Was it just speaking to the people using the space here at a given time?

Fontaine asked Dhillon to answer the question.

Dhillon: I carried out the consultation process. We did as much as we could. We had full-page ads in the PEAK, not only for the Atrium but also for the Lower Level MBC Lounge., which we ran several times. If you do not read the PEAK, how else are we going to reach out to you? We also did consultations with the people here as well, and consulted through any, which way we could.

We asked for student input in many different forms, and I think we had close to 200 inputs, which is not the largest. But for a student consultation, look how hard it is to get people to get to an AGM! Getting people to fill in a consultation document is actually quite a bit of effort.

Fontaine: We hear a lot about student concerns at the SFU Board of Governors and from knowing University administrators. There was the En-vision SFU project--people said things suck on campus. They want variety, lower-priced, good food. SFU is starting a Food Services Advisory Committee that I am on. We talk about food a lot on this campus. So realistically, do we need to interview 10,000 students to know that they want more food in this space? No. We are elected to make decisions. That is why the Board is here, so we do not need to consult students on everything to every degree.

Food, everybody likes -- people want better food that is easily accessible on campus, so in this situation, what is wrong with getting more food vendors here?

Lieberman: I am not saying anything is wrong. I was just asking about the consultation process. I completely agree we need more food and better food. I am all in agreement for that. I even would like to suggest to you guys that you could perhaps, I'm speaking as a student, I don't come to Atrium because of what you're saying, the shitty food and it's depressing that reason. I used to come in my first year, but not anymore. I do not go to the Pub either. Do you know what? It is out of my way, too. When I come here, sometimes I do not know what I am going to eat. Maybe I come here because it is the closest place. Maybe if the Pub had a stand here, I would buy from the Pub instead of buying from others.

Perhaps you can get the Pub to be among those considered for the new vending spots.

Fontaine: That is actually being considered.

5. Responsibility for Financing Renovations

Lieberman: The other thing is the washrooms that were mentioned. Do the students pay for every renovation?

Fontaine: Only for Student Society Spaces. About 20 years ago, we went to referendum to start a Space Expansion Fund. I was three at the time, so it was not I, but the students have had this fund for a long time to build student spaces. The majority of the costs of building this floor in the MBC were paid from the Space Expansion Fund that was created by special levy approved by referendum. That is how we own this space. We also have a lease for the Rotunda, and we are using money from the Space Expansion Fund for renovations there. We cannot renovate University space.

Lieberman: Why should the students have to deal with the washrooms? We already pay a lot of money to this University, then to even have us paying for the washrooms. ..that is something that you people have to work on.

Fontaine: It also came to the Committee, that exact question. Those washrooms are in our University Centre Building. We have a lease with the University for the building. We could press the University to pay for those renovations, but we did make it an issue with them last year, and they put half a million dollars into renovations for other washrooms on the campus. They only have so much money, and now they only get half a million dollars a year from the Ministry for upgrades. They are a bit pressed for money. In this situation, we thought rather than have the University pay for this renovation, we would use our Space Expansion Fund, which is very large at this time, to renovate a space for students and the University could spend its limited funds to renovate campus washrooms. It is a bit of a give-and-take in the interests of students, and I still believe it is the right decision.

6. SFPIRG Space

Lieberman: Okay. Another question related to the Rotunda space. There is no mention of the SFPIRG space, or consultations on renovations to Out on Campus or the Women's Centre. Could you give us some more information on what are your plans for that space and why, and since you said that you planned to do a consultation, do you have a plan which is going to help.

I appreciate you people taking your time to go out and talk to people about things. But you're making decisions based on 100 people or 150 people, and you send e-mails and do surveys too-I think that's something you could do a lot more, run consultations. As a student, I do not feel like I was part of that consultation, and that is an issue. Can you explain a little bit more on all the Rotunda spaces? Fontaine: The Committee approached Rotunda space issues improperly in the summer. We have acknowledged that, and we met with SFPIRG later in the summer. They talked about space consultations. We did not agree with all the points because we see the space consultations as SFSS undergraduate student space. Therefore, we will be consulting with all of our undergraduate about what the students want there. Our preliminary plan that we came up with at the Committee, is to have a web survey for undergraduate student participation. It will be e-mailed to every student at SFU. SFPIRG can publicize it how it likes, and we want all students to participate. We think that is a very good goal. We also think this should be extended to all SFSS spaces that are operated by non-profit organizations. We are not saying that we do not want any non-profits in the building. That is not at all what I am trying to do here. I want the space consultations tell us what the students want to do with the space. Do they think the space is being used properly, as efficiently as they want it to be used? Do they value having space occupied by groups compared to more student study space. There are many possibilities.

We approached this badly in the summer. We already had the meeting with SFPIRG and we shared

comments, and I appreciate that. We took all those comments and created what we thought was a good plan. We had a staff member who has been here many years, help us develop this plan for consultation. It is not a final proposal right now. It can always change, but we think it is a good, cost-effective and realistic way to reach out to every student. We do not want to get just 100 people. We want to get a thousand people.

Lieberman: You said you had plans, so are you proposing something at this point.

Fontaine: We have created a draft proposal. We sent it to SFPIRG, CJSF and the PEAK on the weekend and they received it on Monday. It might be with us tonight at Forum—it depends on whether Forum wants to discuss it or not. Forum is where we discuss things with representatives from active department student unions from all academic departments. We have meetings lined up soon with SFPIRG, CJSF and the PEAK, to talk to them about it.

Lieberman: You did not answer my question. Is there a plan, what is it about? What is your proposal, beyond the consultation?

Yeung: I want to be fair to the other people waiting in line. Maybe you can talk to marc afterwards. Thank you.

Lieberman: I think this is in the interests of all of us, not only mine. Please do not silence me. Thank you. [applause]

Besan: Re: that e-mail sent out to those three organizations: I am curious whether this is actually going to be brought to Forum, because it is 4:28pm—Forum starts at 4:30pm. Two minutes left.

Here are my concerns:

- a. This information was not forwarded to SFPIRG in enough time before the Forum meeting today, and that is a concern because there was not ample space for this organization to respond to this particular survey put forward. You say this is something that you say you would like SFPIRG to use as much as you would like the SFSS to use this survey in order to reach as many students as possible. However, this survey is not something that SFPIRG had any say in putting together, so how is that fair?
- b. In that particular survey, there are a number of different organisations that are also pinpointed: CJSF and the PEAK. These are other organizations that lease space from the SFSS as well. I believe a lot of conversation about that has been problematic; no one is sure whether paperwork has been misplaced, and none of these groups actually received that e-mail, none. The timeline to finish the survey is the beginning of January, 2012. Why is it these groups are not alerted at all before this meeting, say?

Rempel: Point of order. I think we should keep comments relevant to the items in the Annual Board Report, which is what we are discussing right now, as we have a limited amount of time to share at this meet meeting. We should remain on topic.

Besan: When we can talk more about space when I have a say—I do not feel I have a say here because quorum was not reached.

Yeung: I think what you are saying is relevant. Just keep it precise. Your comments about Forum were not pertaining to this discussion. Please keep your questions short and precise and everybody can be heard. Please keep in mind we still have 75 percent of this report to go through, and there are people who want to ask questions behind you. Thank you.

Fontaine: The draft document was only finished on Friday last week. It is hard to send it to SFPIRG before it is finished. We sent it to SFPIRG on Friday, and Forum only meets once a month. We would like to get Forum's input on the draft document today, if possible. I know a request was made to remove it from the agenda, but it was too late. Forum can decide whether it wants to hear about it or not. That is where we go for initial student consultations. That is our advisory body. We will be meeting with SFPIRG—that was always the intention. I am sure it probably appears that SFPIRG is

being cut out of this. It is not the intention at all. We created a document that we thought was fair for our membership. Our membership is not the same as SFPIRG's and not the same as the other groups, but that is fine. We represent our membership, and that is undergraduate students. So we will be consulting with our students, and doing an on-line survey. Our consultation document offers the opportunity to make comments. This was all discussed with SFPIRG. There are obviously changes to it that they were not expecting, but the original document that we received in August from them was not what we were expecting.

Besan: Why was there no conversation before there was a such radical change in the approach to a consultation process design? A completely different survey came out of nowhere.

Louie: You said it was always the intention to consult SFPIRG. Is that including when the motion was passed at the Space Committee?

Fontaine: No, we realized we made a mistake. We have a Forum meeting once a month. I would like to bring this to Forum's attention to hear what they have to say. We will schedule a meeting with SFPIRG, of course. This is a draft document. The timeline in it might change. It is not set in stone. It is a proposal that our Committee and our working group decided was feasible and that would be sent to SFPIRG and our other groups for discussion. Does that answer your question?

Besan: I will talk to you later. Fontaine: Okay.

Gill: I do not feel like there has been enough consultation with regards to the renovation of this space, especially for money that is going to be allocated. The way the Society is trying to deal with other student organizations on campus that undergrads use is unacceptable. Instead of talking to them and trying to communicate with them, they have taken a aggressive, ideological stance to try to shut these organizations down. That is unacceptable.

Bettochi-Barrow: I am a Forum representative. Forum meeting is supposed to begin now at 4:30 pm.

Yeung: I indicated that the AGM would go past 4:30 pm, and in that case, Forum would start afterwards.

7. Atrium Vending Revenues

Gill: My question with regards to the renovation of this space is: how many decades will it take for the private companies that are being subsidized to pay off what the Society spent for the Atrium renovations?

Fontaine: We could renovate this space and not add food vendors. It would still cost \$600,000 or some large amount, but there would not be the revenue coming in. The Space Expansion Fund is meant to build or renovate our spaces. We are not getting any revenue from the zero-level MBC renovation, and you are not complaining about that. Why should this be an issue, when we are using it to renovate Student Society space. The Fund grows by \$900,000 a year. It might be a big amount to spend in a year, of course, but that much is collected every year. Should we sit on it forever and not do anything with students' money, or should we use that money for space renovation and renovate student space?

Gill: I think you should renovate student spaces without attacking other spaces on campus that other student groups occupy.

Fontaine: That has nothing to do with it.

Gill: You have not answered my question. How many decades will it take for the three business that move into this space to pay off what we are putting into this space? How much revenue will we get every year from these three businesses?

Acierno: Is this space being renovated so that three new companies can come in and offer food, or is this space being renovated for students?

Fontaine: For students.[Applause]

I will not answer that question because that is not how the Space Committee looks at spaces. We look in terms of how renovations benefit students.

Students want this space renovated. They also want food. So we are creating space, we are more creating food options, and we are also helping our bottom line on the operations side so that we can pay our staff, have legal clinics, and do more for students. It is a side benefit. That is why we have a Space Expansion Fund to renovate spaces. It is not to add food vendors, so I will not give you an answer because that is not why we have it. [Applause]

Gill: Can you tell me how much revenue the three businesses are going to be contributing to the Society?

Midgley: It will be approximately 13 years at an 8 percent return annually. So I agree with Marc, we are getting money for operating our organization, as well as providing a service to students. Students all want food. I have been here for 13 years. I never come down here.

Rempel: Please note the time that the Committee meets: that is an excellent time to continue these discussions. I am grateful for all the excitement about student space.

Fontaine: The meetings are on Fridays every second week, at 1:30 pm in MBC 2290. I provided a week's notice to SFPIRG of the last meeting.

8. Space and Fees Collected by Referendum and Administered by SFSS

Speaker: My name is Nina Haladay-Thompson. I'm going back to the financials just to clarify something, and it's the non-discretionary allocated funds that are received by the Society for dispersal to SFPIRG, the PEAK Publications Society, the radio station CJSF, FNSA, the World University Services of Canada, and Sustainable SFU, which I understand is a new organization. Are these what you refer to as non-for-profit organizations because they have a different organisational model? How does it relate to the spaces that they use and responsibility to the spaces funded by students through the Space Expansion Fund?

Fontaine: That money appears on our statements because the University Act allows the Student Society to collect money from students for these groups with approval by referendum, and for SFU to bill students for that money and transfer it to the SFSS to channel through to these organization. We do not put it in our bank accounts and then give it to them. It is not profit or revenue for us. It just flows directly through.

Haladay-Thompson: What we are talking about are the student spaces where these organizations provide services to students. Is the Space Expansion Fund is completely separate and has nothing to do with the money you collect for these groups?

Fontaine: Completely separate. 15 dollars per student per semester goes into that Fund.

Haladay-Thompson: When negotiating for the space that is used, you have separate types of agreements with each of these organizations?

Fontaine: Yes.

Haladay-Thompson: Where is World University Services of Canada?

Fontaine: I believe they are a floor below us; we do not give them space.

Haladay-Thompson: Sustainable SFU?

Fontaine: They have University space.

Haladay-Thompson: SFPIRG and the radio station pay a dollar a year for their spaces so the University subsidizes that space, is that correct?

Fontaine: We have had a lease with the University for all of the Rotunda space on the Mall level and the south side of the floor below between the large stairways coming up from the bus stop

Haladay-Thompson: Point of information. When does that lease expire?

Speaker: July, 2013.

Yeung: Why did you ask?

Haladay-Thompson: I wanted the entire meeting to know. It is confusing for all of us to understand how renovations for these other spaces, which is not necessarily the case for these non-for-profit organizations; correct?

Fontaine: Correct.

Haladay-Thompson: You still have to renegotiate agreements with these spaces.

Fontaine: Yes. We have a lease with the University for the Rotunda that includes the Women's Centre, Out on Campus, as well as the space that we lease out to FNSEA, ACHSA and SFPIRG. We have an area there for non-profit organizations and businesses and provide the central lounge space as well.

Haladay-Thompson: The ones that I have listed are all non-profit-generating services.

Fontaine: Yes, from my point of view.

Haladay-Thompson: That is your job, to go and talk to all those people, and this is what I am trying to understand, when it comes to allocating funds for renovations. I know my student fees go to different places, partly to these other organizations. All undergraduate students pay the fees that support these organizations.

Fontaine: Student fees also support the Peak and the SFSS. The Peak generates revenue by selling advertising. The majority of funding comes from undergraduates; that is because there are more undergraduates than graduate students. I believe that the Peak is the only organization that generates some revenue from advertising.

9. Pub Washrooms and Gender Designation

Speaker: My name is Alecs Besan, and I have two questions.

About washroom renovations in the Pub, it says there are renovation plans for two washrooms. Are those gender-specific washrooms? Is there a gender-neutral washroom available?

Fontaine: There are gender-specific washrooms in *this* building, but not in the Pub.

Besan: Has there been any discussion about creating a gender-neutral washroom in the Pub for the patrons there that feel more comfortable using that sort of facility?

Fontaine: No.

Besan: How would one raise such an issue?

Fontaine: Let a member of the Board know.

10. Weight of Majority Responses in a Consultation Process

Besan: When you were discussing the consultation process, you said it would be your personal, or the collective wish of the Board, to hear from every student if that was possible, on student space. Are you were planning to address concerns of -- this might sound slightly inflammatory-- the tyranny of the majority? A majority of students might have a particular view of a particular space. I would like to know if you have any measures in place to account for the fact that there may be some students who are disadvantaged or who have a greater need for that space than others. They may be a minority whose voices may not be heard if *every* student responded, so their concerns would not be interpreted as a priority. I was wondering if you had any methods for addressing that.

[Applause]

Fontaine: It is a great point. I agree that our decisions should not be based on a 100% majority view of how to handle SFSS student space. I completely understand that. We represent the undergraduate student population and act in their interests, so we will ask them what they would like to do with our space. I understand that there are groups on campus that need space, and that the majority of students might not vote for that. That is not a problem for me at all. By the same token, when I am looking at the results, and I am not the only person to decide what to do with space, I would not be looking simply

from a non-majoritarian view. If 1% of students want things a certain way, and 99% clearly do not, and I do not really understand why that 1% wants (a space), it could be that they may need or have other representation on campus, depending on the constituency they fall into. It is a balancing act. So, the SFPIRG and OOC spaces are a great example. I think they are fantastic spaces. Possibly more than 50% of the students don't want those spaces to be used that way, but on the other hand, there's a clear need for it. In that case, I would vote to keep them there. It is hard to explain it, but I know what you are saying. It will be a consideration for me, definitely.

Besan: There is no formal procedure or philosophy?

Fontaine: We have discussed it at length in our working group and Committee meetings. That is a concern, and we will address that when the results come out.

11. Student Space Oversight Committee and SFPIRG Space Consultation

Besan: There is a fair amount of misinformation and confusion floating around regarding the SFPIRG lease and the other groups, including those in the Rotunda. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify some of those misunderstandings.

First, I wanted to make it clear that some of the groups, including SFPIRG, provide dynamic student space and volunteer training for students, and many of these organizations have been on campus for well over 30 years, like SFPIRG for instance. The SFSS has been here longer. The SFSS Student Space and Oversight Committee (SSOC) have attempted to evict some of these groups.

Fontaine: The Board did not support this.

Besan: From what I understand, the SSOC put forward a proposal at a Board meeting where it was passed. Is that correct?

Fontaine: No, that is not. It was referred back to SSOC.

Yeung: Just to clarify, the lease on that space had expired. It was not an eviction.

Persdottir: From what I understand, on July 28th the SSOC recommended that the SFSS Board terminate the current lease with SFPIRG. That sounds like an eviction to me. This really seemed like an ill-conceived attempt to go ahead with renovating that space and replace SFPIRG with 24-hour student study cubicles, which I understand was the SSOC's recommendation.

Fontaine: No, that is not right.

Persdottir: And obviously this was done in violation of the SFSS's own policy. I would refer to Standing Order 15.3.c, which states that the Committee must organize and conduct consultations with all parties involved in space planning, including the general membership. On October 21st, the SSOC approved a proposal for a space consultation process. We have heard that that e-mail went to SFPIRG over the weekend. It was received on Monday the 24th, two days ago. And it was clear that this proposal was going to be put forward at the Forum meeting today. That gave SFPIRG only two days to respond. They were not included in drafting this proposal. It looks pretty bad to me.

I want to acknowledge that the SFSS technically says it leases this space from the University in a contract that is set to expire in 2013. It is really irresponsible and unwise to evict a longstanding tenant from a space on campus when the lease with the University is going to expire in such a short time.

Why wasn't this included in the AGM report? Clearly, this has been dealt with in committee this summer. Why wasn't the consultation proposal mentioned?

Fontaine: Because I requested that it not go in this report. Not everything is put in this report. I am on a Food Committee. It is not in this report. There is so much that could go in this report. It is just a matter of how much we decide to put in it.

12. Current SFSS Consultation Proposal

Persdottir: You have said that the proposal for a consultation process that has been put forward is a fair

one and that it is an extensive process. From what I understand, you gave SFPIRG one or two days to respond to it. You gave CJSF and the Peak even less, or no time to respond to it. The proposal is for a one-month consultation process period. This would be during the time when people are busy writing papers, preparing for finals, and so on and so forth. The entire process is to be done by January 2012. It does not make any sense whatsoever to me that an organization present on campus might be kicked out in less than three months. How is that democratic? Could you and the entire SSOC please answer.

[Applause]

Fontaine: This is simply a proposal for a consultation. It went to SFPIRG last Friday. We have Forum meetings once a month, so we will hopefully discuss this with Forum today and see what they think about it. It is not a final document. We will schedule a meeting with SFPIRG to discuss what we think is a good plan for space consultations. I do not really agree with much of what you said, and a lot of the facts that you mentioned or assume are correct, in terms of dates and meetings. We never wanted to put in cubicles, for instance. You are taking this as if this is written and gold-plated and it is finished. It is not. A group of students drafted the document a good way to consult with students. That group is composed of elected students or those who otherwise represent students on SSOC or a working group struck by that Committee. It took into account when we discussed with SFPIRG on August 8th or whatever dates that was. It is not a final document. Why wouldn't we take it to Forum to get their input on it? Otherwise, we have to wait until November or January. Our term is almost up by that time.

You are also saying students are busy. Students are busy all the time, whether at the beginning of a semester with orientation or midterms, which happens over a six-week period, or at the end. It is always a bad time and you are always going to get complaints about timing and deadlines. We are doing consultations with students. Not everybody is going to agree that it is the best thing. There are different perspectives. We, as a Board, and the SSOC, are elected to represent the needs of 25,000 students. We will SFPIRG's needs into account, including those of its users and its groups. We have learned a lot from them, and that is fantastic, but we will do a space consultation that we think accurately represents our students, our membership, which is the SFSS undergraduate student population. If you put roadblocks everywhere, we will never get to a consultation; we do not know if students want that.

Persdottir: I want to clarify my final question. It is clear to me that the proposal for a consultation process has a set time limit that is to expire in January. So, given that, how are you possibly going to be able to consult with SFPIRG, Forum and give all the affected parties, including the general membership, enough time to consider this proposal, because it is a major proposal.

Fontaine: The timeline can be adjusted

Persdottir: Are you willing to change the time line?

Yeung: I want to know why you have not addressed SSOC before this AGM. You are well aware of where the Board of Directors offices are and that all of us are in there every day. You have come to one Board meeting, but you have not addressed any of these issues today to the Society prior to this meeting. That is my question to you, why you have not come to the Space meetings to address these points.

Persdottir: Because honestly I think it was a shock to all the members of the SFSS who also utilize the SFPIRG space, that this was going to be put forward and so soon. I was under the understanding that you were negotiating in good faith with SFPIRG, and then this proposal arrived and shocked us all. In my opinion, it is disgraceful, and an extremely poorly designed consultation process.

Manavipour: Could you please answer the question? It was a direct question. Why haven't you brought this to a Space meeting and have chosen the AGM instead to bring this up?

Besan: We were actually looking at it and reading it on our own time too.

Yeung: It is a draft. Nothing is set in stone, like we said. None of us have ever said that you cannot come to a committee and voice your concerns. Frankly, we would rather work cooperatively with you. [Heckling]

The committee schedules are on the web site.

Rempel: Point of order. Let's use the microphone and not be yelling across the room.

C. Chan: Point of information. I had to attend class for the last hour; where are we on the Agenda?

Yeung: That is a very good point of information, actually. We are still on page 2 and 3 of the Annual Report. Let us carry on with the speakers' list.

Besan: I have a question actually for Arry Dhillon. My understanding is that the consultation process has actually had several different formats, and at one point, you had a more extensive consultation drafted but this did not even reach the Board. It was proposed and was killed at SSOC early in the summer. I want to know more about that, and why is this happened. I think that particular project proposal of yours was far more inclusive, definitely more considerate, in terms of differences of opinion and so on. Why was that not accepted? Why is something like that not going to be drafted again? I would like to see something like that. And I would like to reference how the UBC Alma Mater Society handled their student union building consultation with their members. You could reference that model. I do not think spreads in the Peak are effective, and I think you have already recognized this. Why do you keep repeating those methods as if they are legitimate consultations?

Zhang: Can you make that question clearer? The proposal was taken to the SSOC, and the Committee decided not to move forward with it.

Besan: I wonder why.

Zhang: I do not know.

Yeung: We can continue with this in a second.

8. Appointment of the Auditor

Gary Wozny has been here waiting very patiently for us to get through the agenda. The appointment of the auditor is at the end of the agenda. I suggest that we move to that quickly and we can continue where we left off. Is that okay? We need a mover and a seconder, and then we can vote.

AGM 10-26-11: 07 MOTION

Barrow / C. Chan

Be it resolved that Tomkins, Wozny, Miller and Company be appointed as the SFSS Auditor for the 2011-2012 year.

CARRIED

Yeung: Thank you Maria.

Bilko: Everybody needs to slow down.

Yeung: Thank you very much, Mr. Wozny. [Applause]

Wozny left the meeting at 3:57 pm.

4. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Yeung introduced a report detailing the activities of the Board of Directors from October 6, 2010 to October 26, 2011 and asked that members please wait until presenting Directors finish their sections before asking questions.

MOTION AGM 10-26-11:04

Ali / Noonan

Be it resolved to adopt the 2010- 2011 report from the Board of Directors.

SFSS Services - Lorenz Yeung, Member Services Officer

Return to the University Relations Officer's Report on Student Space

Besan: Though I did not get an explanation why that more extensive consultation process that was proposed was not adopted, I think that choice was a wrong choice. I have a different question: why is it there's still a continuation of the same methodologies used in the consultation process if we have already seen that they don't reach a significant number of students. Could that be reconfigured?

Zhang: I could answer the SFPIRG consultation question...

Besan: I did not ask about SFPIRG. It is more about the renovations here in the Atrium.

Dhillon: The Atrium renovations? The Board has not ratified a final plan for it yet, so the Board could stop it if they wanted to. Consultations were done and we moved on from there.

For the proposed process, Fontaine is planning to send it out in a newsletter that goes to every student, and if they decide not to read it or participate, then that is their prerogative.

Speaker: My name is Megan Sakai, and I'm the Cognitive Science Forum Rep. I am on SSOC, and in the working group that helped develop this proposal that everyone is talking about now. I just wanted to emphasize that this is a draft proposal, as many people have said before. People talk about being surprised at seeing it for the first time, whenever it happens that they received it. This is our version, "our" being the SSOC working group formed to come up with a proposal for a comprehensive consultation process: our view of what we think a good consultation process might be.

When we met with SFPIRG, we were presented with a document that outlined their views and said what they thought a fair consultation process would look like. This is just our reaction to that. We thought it would be a good thing for us to do, to take it back to the Committee, and ask, from our perspective, what would this consultation look like? This is not our view of what to do, this is our proposal and we are sending it out to get feedback. It is not an order. We are asking for feedback, and to that extent I would like to advertise that we've created an e-mail address: consultations@sfss.ca to which students can send any comments or suggestions about a consultation process. And while I agree this meeting forum is a really lovely one to have a discussion, if it is something more specific about this document that you want to address, I suggest that you send it to that e-mail address. I will be the one answering that and making a report back to SSOC. That is all I wanted to say. Thank you. [applause]

Dhillon: It is already 5:05 pm. We have spent almost an hour and a half on the University Relations Officer's report section. I think it is only a draft. I was hoping that we could give the External Relations Officer a chance to speak and get on with his part of the report.

Besan: Point of clarification. Will you go back to the discussion about space consultations?

McCann: We have committees where the details can be discussed in depth, and we have Board meetings every Wednesday at 10:30 am. We have the entire calendar on our web site. We can go back to that discussion, but I recommend that we take it back to the committee level. If we get on with the report, we could always come back and sit here for a while longer.

Kumar: Point of clarification. Are there other forums that are more effective to voice opinions in this regard? So, if I voice my opinions at this meeting, it would not be as effective as going to, a space meeting, or a Board meeting? There are other ways, since this is not set in stone yet? McCann:

Absolutely.

Kumar: So we are possibly wasting our time here if we are voicing our concerns now?

McCann: I would not use those words. I always think it is important to be heard.

Kumar: But as for affecting your decisions or maybe a collective decision in this regard, speaking here is not even partially as effective as going to the actual space meeting where the actual decision is made?

McCann: That is correct. Kumar: Thank you. [Applause]

C. Chan: Point of information. Does the SFSS Forum have the power to overrule decisions made by the Board of Directors? McCann: No.

Aitken: Point of order. Somebody said that the space committee will make the decision. It will not. It will compile the feedback, make a report, and make a recommendation to the Board. Then the Board will make the decision.

Louie: With that said, that the Board will make the decision, why the space oversight committee feel that it is their mandate to regulate or investigate the legitimacy of student-led organizations like SFPIRG or ACHSA?

Fontaine: That is not the point of this consultation. It is a consultation on student space directed at the undergraduate student population: our members.

Louis: Why is it coming up with SFPIRG?

Fontaine: Because SF:IRG is in SFSS space.

Louis: We (SFPIRG) function as a student space, so why do we have to defend our space and why are you interfering with our work, which has been clear since July?

Fontaine: Because it is the Student Society's space that you lease from us.

Persdottir: Point of order, information, or whatever. The University technically owns the space. You lease it from SFU. You sublet the space to SFPIRG, you are not the landlord.

Yeung: Point of information is to ask for information only and not to blurt out --

Persdottir: Point of information. If somebody is saying something and they are not able to answer the question, somebody else can answer if they have knowledge about that.

Yeung: You have to directly address the person or the issue.

Leon: I am just thinking if the SFPIRG is not considered a student space but the students run it and its Board is composed of students, and students use the space, then what is it?

Fontaine: It is an organization that does things for students, and it is located in a space that is leased to it by the Student Society, which the Student Society leases from the University.

Leon: So if students use the space, it would not be considered just student space?

Fontaine: Yes, it is a student space. Is it the student space that would be best in that area? That is the point of this consultation.

Gill: If the SFSS lease with the University expires in 2013, how come you don't wait until then to decide what to do with the space? Is it responsible to change the space when you might not have it yourself in a couple of years' time? [Applause].

Fontaine: I do not fear that the University will not renew its agreement with the SFSS for that space. It will be discussed with the University. If that was our way of thinking, then we would never do anything, because there is always something coming up. The lease on *this* building expires in some years, so are we not going to do anything here? There would never be any progress if there were so many roadblocks in the way. There would never be anything happening, because there is always something, some challenge.

C. Chan: That's why, as a Forum Rep, I will forward all this information to the membership that I am elected to represent, so they can make the decision and they can ask me to voice their opinions. Thank you. [Applause].

5:10 pm **Advocacy Report from the External Relations Officer**-Kevin Zhang

Zhang: This year our lobbying effort will be on three key issues.

Representing and advocating for the interests of undergraduate students at Simon Fraser University

1. The first is the elimination of student loan interest rates.
2. The second one is the re-establishment of the provincial need-based grant program.
3. The third is to increase core funding to all Universities.

For the first time ever, Advocacy Committee can actually collaborate with other student societies, such as the University of Victoria Student Society, UBC's Alma Mater Society, Capilano Student Society and so on. This the first time in four years that we have been able to do that and we think this is a pretty phenomenal effort. If we can work together, our demands are strong on student issues.

Our committee has worked really hard for this, and I believe many of our efforts have been overlooked by students because they don't see where we're working so hard to try to make the student life, the student experience, better.

We are often portrayed as - this year, especially, as corporate managers, but we are not. We are just students, just like you, and we want to fight for the rights that you deserve and the better education that you want to have. And this is the vision of Advocacy this year, and this is the vision of the SFSS. Thanks.

[Applause]

C. Chan: How successful were those campaigns?

Zhang: The elimination of student loan interest rates, we have seen in real progress in that area. We have had the government make statements that were incorrect, that were criticized in public, and we also had Andrew Petter and different presidents from different universities address that issue. So, I think that we have made some real progress.

Ashley: I noticed in the renovation and student spaces, you had the Gondola, and I was wondering if the Advocacy Committee would be interested in taking that as well, because I think that a large number of students

Speaker: Point of information. I am wondering about budget cuts to Advocacy and whether I can get that clarified.

Zhang: Yes, our budget for this year has been cut, but we believe we can be more efficient in how we do campaigns, we can do better with different ways to communicate with students, such as web sites. Instead of giving out posters and food, let us actually get students interested in this campaign and get them involved. There have been cuts, but we can be more efficient with the money.

Speaker: I saw a lot more from last year's Advocacy Committee. I think advocacy is all about engaging with the students, and thus far, I have not seen much this year. That leads me to conclude that it has something to do with budget cuts. Is that how you feel?

Zhang: The first event in Advocacy last year, the very big one, was November 10th. This year, we are having an event on the same day. You will see it in the upcoming semesters.

Rempel: Can I propose an amendment to the report? Ashley brought up a good point--the Gondola issue right now is listed under other services, however, the Advocacy Committee is handling it. It would be more relevant to include it under the advocacy and external relations part of the report.

Yeung: It is also under the Advocacy Section.

Manavipour: The Advocacy Committee has not been as active, quote/unquote, compared to last year. It is not because of budget. We need people to join the committee. We have a volunteer icebreaker tomorrow that is going on at 5:30 pm, so we encourage everybody, students, to get involved. Right now, there has been a lack of involvement in Advocacy and it is difficult to engage students much, so that is the reason: we do not have the numbers, and it would be great for students to join.

Speaker: If I had room to make motions at this meeting, which I do not, I would propose that Advocacy have more money for its actions.

Yeung: You can do that at a Board meeting or Financial Administration Committee.

Speaker: But the Board would vote on this, not the student membership.

Yeung: We are students.

Speaker: But not the student population. I am concerned about that.

Ashley: Has the Advocacy Committee considered other mediums of publicizing such icebreakers and the need for students to be on the Committee? There has not been an active role in recruiting students to be on Advocacy. I have never seen a sign, I have never heard about it. Can you address that, please, Kevin?

Zhang: Yes, we have been actively looking for students. We have actually gathered many students for instance, through the latest round of emails about the SFPIRG space. Students have expressed interest in the Advocacy Committee. E-mails have been sent out and communicated with the student population.

Speaker: So no one is interested in joining the Advocacy Committee at all?

Zhang: That is not true.

Speaker: Why do you not have a full committee, even though you meet every week?

Zhang: We are going to appoint reps at the Forum meeting right after this meeting.

Acierno: About Advocacy's budget: At the beginning of this year when we doing our budgeting for the 2011-2012 year, every line item suffered. The bursary was cut, funding for department student unions and clubs was cut. Advocacy was also cut. This was due to the deficit that we spoke of before. Although Advocacy has not been as publicly active as it was last year, I think what has been happening in the background is important. The collaborations that have been built between the different Universities, like Kevin mentioned, between UBC, UIC and SFU will help us moving forward. The report said we were looking forward to working with Occupy Vancouver and doing something downtown, and in the meantime, we're going to be looking forward to working with other groups on campus, including SFPIRG, so we look forward to that conversation later.

Events Committee

Yeung: I will pass this over to Spencyre Hackett-Martin, Chair of the Events Committee.

Hackett-Martin: I am going to say the things that are the most important. In September, we hosted a beach party event. It was a good event to get first-years really excited about university, and we had over 100 people show up

We are currently have a Pub Night Sponsorship Program. It is an opportunity for clubs and DSU's to get security and ticket printing and posters funded for Pub events. This allows groups who cannot really afford to have events at SFU because it is expensive, and it is an opportunity for us to help out so students can hold events, sell tickets, then make some money for their club or DSU.

That is what I wanted to report.

Speaker: Point of information. Does Events Committee pays for publicizing these events?

Hackett-Martin: Events Committee sponsors costs for Pub Nights, security and up to \$50 in printing charges at the SFSS Copy Centre. There is a committee budget that we use for that, and for planning other events.

Speaker: Does this have to be a registered DSU or club? Do they keep the door sales? Hackett-Martin: Yes.

They keep all their ticket sales revenue, so it is up to them to promote the event, but we help them by covering pretty much the most expensive things.

Surrey Campus Committee

Yeung: Amir Ali, is here. He is a member of the Surrey Campus Committee. I will give a quick rundown. As you know, SCC is the Student Society's representation on the Surrey campus. It is very events oriented, as you can see in the outline here. They have plenty of amazing events like a welcome

barbecue and many more planned. The Board has an SCC Liaison, Jenni Rempel, who attends all the meetings.

Staff Relations

Yeung: Next we have the staff relations report; I will pass this over to Jordan Kohn.

Kohn: We now have a collective agreement with CUPE 3338, Unit 5. It is not finalized yet but agreement has been reached. The Union and the Employer, as well as the employees, are working diligently to get a final version and copies ready for signing this week or next. This process started in 2009 and has just recently concluded. There is not much I can say about other staffing relations issues. Most of that is conducted in confidence between the Employer and individual Union employees.

Persdottir: I am aware I cannot put forward a motion, but I would like my voice to be heard on this issue. Please respect what I am about to read, and you can respond to it after.

Whereas at a Board meeting on September 7th, the Board of Directors voted to double the allowable stipend Directors could receive for the length of the Board's lockout of their employees;

Whereas this was done without notice or due process or consultation with the membership, in violation of SFSS policies, (I'm citing Standing Order 16 in the policy manual);

Whereas the SFSS Rule 10 states that Society decisions and policies be made through proper channels of the Society's structure and elected, and appointed positions are not to be used for personal gain;

Whereas this created a situation, where individual Directors personally profited from denying student services that they had paid for and keeping SFSS staff locked out from doing their jobs;

Whereas on October 5th, 2011, the Board rescinded this increase in stipend pay for most Directors, but confirmed the increase for two Directors, MSO Lorenz Yeung and Internal Relations Officer Jordan Kohn;

Whereas the Society's own records show that Jeff McCann, Kevin Zhang and Marc Fontaine also received extra stipend pay on September 15th, 2011;

Whereas members of the Labour Relations Committee received additional compensation for their participation on the Committee at an hourly rate of \$14.65;

Whereas there is strong reason to believe that several of the Committee members used these funds to effectively pay themselves during the lock out, potentially violating the agreement with CUPE 3338-5 and SFSS staff

Be it resolved that no Board member receive any extra pay as a result of the above-mentioned stipend increases, and in any case in which that compensation has already been paid, that that payment be deducted from future payments to these executives.

[Applause]

Persdottir: You can respond to that.

Acierno: We did make that motion. We were very clear about that, and we sent the Board minutes out to Forum so everybody would know we did it. We were not trying to hide anything. After some deliberation, we rescinded that motion and we did not receive any other money. I want that to be on the record.

There was a tremendous amount of pressure and stress that all of the directors were under, not to mention the 40 to 60 hours that every Board member was working on top of that. I think that sometimes it is easy to sit back and point the finger and maliciously attack us and say that what we are doing is completely wrong.

I can speak from the bottom of my heart: everything we have done, we have done in the best interests of this Society and of our members. That motion was rescinded. I personally, and all the other Forum reps I know, did not receive one extra cent, while we were not doing our jobs, not doing our school work, and under a whole bunch of pressure that you don't really care about, and that's just the reality of the situation.

Speaker: Why were students not informed? Your own policy requires that the Remunerations Committee should have handled this first.

Yeung: That is why it was rescinded. Secondly, SFU restricts our use of student email addresses, so we could not send this information out to all students.

5:30 pm: Bilko left the meeting and visual translation service ended.

Acierno: We were mistaken to vote on the additional payments on the 7th.

C. Chan: Do all Society members count as the employer? Is the employer signing for the Board or for the Society? A question for the Treasurer: the audited statements show a fund balance of \$12,170, 887 for the year ending April 30, 2011. After expenditures are accounted for, that leaves over \$2.5 million. How can you claim that the SFSS is broke?

Kohn: Every Letter of Agreement with the Union is signed on behalf of the SFSS, the employer as represented by the Board of Directors. The Board represents the membership. The employer's representative is the Internal Relations Officer or the Staff Liaison Officer.

C. Chan: The response to my question is not clear.

McCann: Look on Page 3 at the changes in assets for income and expenses, not the asset value included in the figure that you quoted. See the General Fund total expenditures-\$400,000.00 in revenues is set aside in respect of the legal suit with the Canadian Federation of Students in case the judgment requires us to pay outstanding fees or other moneys to the CFS. Subtract this amount to get a better idea of the SFSS finances.

Morgan-Fiear (Astronomy Club): Our club has 400 members. We did not cross the picket lines during the lockout. We are concerned about the impact of the lockout on Clubs and DSUs and we want the Board's assurance that a lockout will not happen again.

Kohn: Certain thresholds must be achieved before a lockout could be called, for example, the parties have met in mediation and an agreement to cease mediations has been reached. Or, if negotiations have reached an impasse that neither party can break. Legally, once notice of intent has been given, a lockout can begin only 6 months in advance of the collective agreement's expiry date, or after it expires. The current contract will expire in 2013.

Persdottir: I allege that there was misinformation provided to the Board meeting on September 7th, in fact, lying took place.

Please clarify: was the extensive process defined in Standing Order 16: Remuneration Committee suspended in order to increase stipends at the September 7th Board meeting?

Yeung: No, not in that meeting. A decision was made by a direct vote of the Board, but that was rescinded two weeks later, with the exception of increases to the Internal Relations Officer and to me, the Member Services Officer. We were both absent at that meeting.

Persdottir: This is a violation of your policy. It is a question of intent. How could the Board be unaware of its own policy and proper procedures? I requested and 3 weeks later received a record from the Finance Office of amounts paid to Directors during the lockout period. The Society did pay all Executive Officers increased stipends for the first half of September.

McCann: The Board's decision was in effect for one pay period.

Persdottir: All but Kohn and Midgley were paid well over \$1,000 for that 2-week period, with the median being a \$250 increase. Did you effectively pay yourself an increased stipend according to the proposal initially put forward September 7th?

Yeung: Yes, but the decision was rescinded after one pay period.

A. Ali: The payments were based on hours of work put in.

C. Chan: Answer Persdottir's questions please!

Persdottir: Members of the Labour Committee, Midgley, Fontaine, McCann and Yeung, were paid additional compensation for participating at \$14.58/hour before and during the lockout. According to the statements for the lockout period, all members received several thousand dollars in July and later, significant amounts, for example: Yeung was paid \$2,000 for August. Time sheets show that you did the work of locked out staff members.

1. What exactly were you doing on a per hour basis, for which you were paid this money?
2. Why is it that the Labour Committee members were compensated for work done and got increased stipends as well?
3. Why weren't just the Internal Relations Officer and the Member Services Officer paid according to the agreement at the Labour Relations Board. It seems that several Directors were paid when they were not to be doing staff's work.

McCann: The agreement did not come into effect until some time after the lockout began. Hundreds of hours of preparation for negotiations was needed—200-250 hours a month—and lots of work. We were paid at approximately \$14.50/hour.

Besan: The student employee wage you initially proposed was less than \$14.50/hour.

McCann: That is a good student wage, but there was so much work to do and time to put in.

A. Alia: The Labour Committee would have been paid anyway, by policy, whether there was a lockout or not.

Persdottir: Can you guarantee that the Labour Committee was not compensated to do the work of locked out staff?

McCann: Yes, after agreement with CUPE on this issue. SFSS policy defines payment to committee members during contract negotiations.

Persdottir: Yeung was paid \$4,700 for one month, either August or September.

Yeung: I worked over 300 hours in one month.

Alison: The impact of the lockout on me, personally, was great. I am a student, queer and a woman; I am hurt and affected by the Board's decision to lock out staff and close Out on Campus and the Women's Centre. These areas provide extremely vital and life-saving services to the campus community. The greater importance of resolving the labour dispute over providing services to the membership was implied when the Board closed these centers. The Society's obligation to serve students was not met.

Yeung apologized for the adverse effects of the lockouts and encouraged ongoing dialogue about that.

Avis: What is the process by which the Pub is determined to be in debt.

Yeung redirected discussion back to labour relations.

McCann requested that all areas of the Board Report be covered first, and then take discussion further if the membership so wishes.

Response: general agreement.

Kumar called the question.

C. Chan opposed.

Yeung called for a vote on going to the question. The membership agreed. C. Chan abstained.

Yeung called for a vote on adopting the Report.

C. Chan called a point of order, which was ruled out of order as the vote was under way.

MOTION CARRIED

In Favour: 26

Opposed: 4

Abstentions: Rempel, Leon

4. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE OMBUDSPERSON

Yeung explained that there will be no further required reports at SFSS annual general meetings because the SFSS no longer provides direct Ombuds services. The University, the SFSS and the Graduate Student Society jointly fund the Ombuds office. The Ombudsperson reports to SFU Vice President, Finance and to the Ombuds Advisory Committee, on which the SFSS and the GSS have student and staff representation.

5. RECEIPT OF REPORTS FROM THE TREASURER

Yeung stated that Midgley had left the meeting to attend class, so there would be no report.

McCann stated that Appendix 1 on page 10 of the Board Report, there are several student fees as decided by referenda that flow through the SFSS. The SFSS Activity Fee of \$32.99 now includes \$7.64, as approved by referendum, which had been levied for CFS membership dues until the SFSS referendum to leave the CFS passed in 2008.

Appendix 2 shows the funding increases that were made to the 2011-2012 budget to achieve a balanced budget, as well as increases made during the lockout to restore all services.

Appendix 3 is the Letter of Agreement with CUPE 3338-5 to hold a referendum to reallocate \$5 to several internal budgets from the current \$15 paid per fulltime student to the Space Expansion Fund.

AGM 10-26-11:06 MOTION

M. Chan / C. Walters

Be it resolved to approve the Treasurer's Report for 2010- 2011 report.

CARRIED

Opposed: C. Chan, A. Kumar

6:02pm **OPEN FLOOR**

Yeung opened the floor to continue discussion of issues that members wanted to raise.

PUB Deficit

Kumar: If a group sponsored for a Pub Night has an unsuccessful event, are the losses are incorporated into the Pub's financial picture? If so, is this why the Pub is in debt?

McCann said that if a DSU puts in and gets a catering order from Food and Beverage Services, it covers the cost from its core budget or with SFSS grant funds. The Pub would not take the loss unless the DSU defaults on payment, but he is not aware of a situation like this occurring.

This is not why there is a Pub deficit situation. Food and Beverage Services includes the Pub, The Ladle, Catering Services, and Higher Grounds Café. Renovations over the past year have reduced revenues due to Pub closures.

Kumar: Renovations were paid from the Space Expansion Fund, not operating, so why were there expenses during times when the Pub was closed?

McCann: Overhead expenses still needed to be covered.

Kumar: Has the Pub made money after renovations were completed?

McCann: This is a subsidized service to students. We charge 25 cents a wing, for instance, to attract as many students as possible. We pay higher than industry standard wages to our student employees and this affects our expense lines.

Kumar: Was the decision to lock out staff confidential? Could an email have been sent to students to notify them of the situation in bargaining? Could you legally have informed Society members; did you take steps to do this? Students are shareholders; Board members are elected by students and are managers of the Society and its finances. The Member Services Officer did not tell students about the situation.

McCann: No, we did not tell students. Yes, we could have legally notified students. Labour disputes are within the purview of the employer, in this case, the Board. We followed legal advice in coming to the decision to lockout the staff and followed all appropriate processes.

Kumar: It was the right decision to lock out the staff, but why weren't students notified if it was legal to do so.

McCann: We were bound by confidentiality and the logistics of the situation in the context of a labour dispute.

C. Chan: Point of order. Beyond a doubt, Kohn is not responding to the questions.

Kumar: Yes, he is. However next time, students want to know much more about it.

Besan: Will Forum meet today?

Leung: Normally Forum does not happen at the same time as the Annual General Meeting. It will be up to Forum to postpone for a month—a Forum representative should let me know if a meeting is wanted.

Acierno: Forum reps want to know if there is a meeting today or not; there are some representatives waiting in Forum Chambers right now.

6:11pm

Leung notified the meeting that the speakers list would be cut off after the remaining 2 speakers addressed the meeting.

Leon: Point of information regarding stipend payments. Besides members of the Labour Committee, was anyone else paid extra during the lockout?

Leung: Lawyers.

Rempel: I worked a lot as a Faculty Representative and was not compensated beyond my regular stipend.

Leon: I know that directors were working, but it's not clear if it was a conflict of interest for the Board to approve additional payments to Board members. Were there more hours available, especially since the decision had to be rescinded because it was made in violation of policy?

McCann: One two-week pay period was the limit of the approval for extra payment for work done.

Executive officers were all paid extra based on hours worked. All directors put in more hours during that period.

Leon: Were directors working on the dispute or on usual directors' responsibilities?

McCann: Some were involved with labour negotiations and some with regular duties of their portfolios.

Leon: Then there was a conflict of interest. In the 'outside world', you could be sued for this.

McCann: Payment was made for more hours worked on things related to the labour dispute, not necessarily just for direct involvement in bargaining. Labour disputes are not business as usual.

Leon: I am worried if there was a conflict of interest. I appreciate that the Board is here and taking the time to talk about this, but please take responses and reactions into account, especially regarding procedures, for students to have a greater understanding of how the decision to lock out staff came about.

Kumar: I spoke to a staff member in the Women’s Centre the other day and heard that there is considerable backlog. More time and hours is needed for the Women’s Center and Out on Campus services to get back on track. Would the Board have to approve more paid staffing hours to do this?

Kohn: This would be something that would be discussed in a working conditions meeting, not in a public discussion. The Employer, the Union representative, and the employee(s) will meet to discuss these issues. If adding more paid time to an area makes sense, I would bring the matter to a Finance and Administrative Services Committee meeting and make a recommendation to increase paid hours for example. FASC would decide to provide more money to do this or not; Board would approve it if FASC recommended it. Speak to the Treasurer about any such issues arising from the lockout.

6:19pm Yeung called orders of the day and the meeting was adjourned.

[Applause]

*AGM-minutes-10-26-10.doc
hja/cupe333805*