

Call to Order – 1:31 pm, December 18, 2014 | Executive Conference Room

## 1. Roll Call of Attendance

### Committee Composition

President (*chair*)..... Chardaye Bueckert  
Vice President Finance..... Adam Potvin  
Vice President Student Services .....Zied Masmoudi  
Vice President External Relations ..... Darwin Binesh  
Vice President Student Services ..... Kayode Fatoba (*via phone*)  
Vice President University Relations ..... Moe Kopahi

### Society Staff

Build SFU General Manager..... Marc Fontaine  
Campaigns, Policy, and Research Coordinator ..... Pierre Cassidy  
Executive Director..... Colleen Knox  
Food and Beverage Services General Manager ..... John Flipse  
Student Union Organiser..... Antonio Daling  
Minute Taker .....Dion Chong

### Guests

Faculty Representative (Communications, Art, and Technology)..... Shirin Escarcha

## 2. Adoption of Agenda

### MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:01

Potvin/Amended Kopahi, Potvin  
*Be it resolved to adopt the agenda as amended.*

The executive was reminded that referendum related questions could not be amended at an SGM.

*Student At-Large Nominations motion added.*  
*Reports from Executive Officers and Staff struck*  
*All minutes postponed to next BOD meeting*

### CARRIED AS AMENDED

## 3. New Business

### a. Amendment – Nonbinding Plebiscite on the Food and Beverage Services Operation

#### MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:02

Potvin/Amended Potvin/Potvin/Masmoudi  
*Be it resolved to amend the SGM agenda item approved at BOD 2014-12-10, under delegated BOD authority, to read:*

*Whereas the Food and Beverage Services (FBS) is comprised of the Highland Pub, The Higher Grounds Coffee Shop, The Ladle Vegetarian restaurant, and catering services;*  
*Whereas this is a nonbinding opinion poll;*  
*whereas the SFSS is interested in seeking the membership's opinion;*  
*Are you in favour of continuing to operate the Food and Beverage Services?*

Concern was raised around the one-sided nature of the question; the FBS General Manager indicated that the third clause of the original proposed motion eliminated any opportunity for substantive discussion. Should the membership be in favour of closing FBS, the Society would have to absorb fixed permanent costs of nearly \$200,000 per year that is currently managed by the department. The committee was reminded that the results of the recent round of collective bargaining will allow for \$100,000 in savings per year as a result of staff turnover and new staff entering into the new wage rate.

It was expressed that, had the Board been interested in questioning whether FBS should continue to exist, the matter should have been brought up years ago during the period of significant service mismanagement. However, as progress was currently being made to rectify the issues and drastically reduce service deficit, the closure of FBS would result in the organization missing an opportunity to see the full effects of the changes come into fruition. The Committee was reminded of the contributions of FBS to student life through event planning and catering services provided to the student population. A question could be raised around whether the deficit associated with FBS was offset by the intangible assets offered to the community.

A question could be raised around whether Food and Beverage Services was a service or a business and therefore the direction taken by the department.

The Vice President Finance indicated that the goal of the original question was to have a substantive poll of the membership's thoughts on the provision of such services through the SFSS, including a neutral presentation on facts and figures. If a strong majority (defined by the Vice President Finance as over 70%) voted against the motion, preparations would be made to close the FBS, otherwise FBS would be maintained. No proposals had yet been drawn up around Board actions should a strong majority be in favour of or against the motion.

*[MT Note: EXEC 2014-01-26 expressed that the above comments were a hypothetical situation where an overwhelming show of support or opposition would force the Board to take action]*

A number of directors expressed concern that the matter was being discussed at the SGM. Concerns included the inclusion of a question that could be addressed through non-SGM venues, the little opportunity for research to be conducted by the membership prior to the decision being made, attention being taken away from promoting the Build SFU project, and the plans by the VP Student Services to distribute an online services survey within 2 weeks of the SGM that would address FBS. Further, the SGM may cause the Board to be in a difficult position where they must act according to the results of the plebiscite –regardless of whether the matter was nonbinding – as the board would still be held accountable for representing student needs. However, the Board did not have to act on the suggestions if the Directors do not feel that it is in the best interests of the Society.

The committee was reminded that the current EXEC meeting was the 7<sup>th</sup> society meeting that has discussed the SGM agenda, and that communications material had already been designed to include FBS as a discussion item. Further, the question had the opportunity to address some key issues:

- Desire of the membership for FBS to continue operating at a deficit, and the acceptable threshold for such a deficit
- Operating the pub only versus operation of all FBS units

Given the response rates of surveys, including those conducted by the university, the distribution of a web survey and a question at the SGM may not be mutually exclusive.

Asking the membership for a threshold without providing information pushes the membership may also cause bias in the way the question is perceived.

**MOTION AMENDED**

**MOTION AMENDED**

The Executive Committee was reminded that next steps were needed; should students be strongly in favour of one option or the other, the actions to be taken based on their feedback may seriously impact how students vote.

*Fatoba disconnected at 1:59pm*

A one pager of information with contact information could be added as an appendix to the agenda. In moving forward, the thought around the specifics of how to move forward with FBS could be discussed at Board or Council and posted publically.

A director indicated that focus should be maintained on Build SFU. The history, finances, and nontangible benefits of FBS would not be adequately covered in 20 minutes. A websurvey could provide a mandate for the next board to move forward. However, Executive Committee was reminded that it may not be ideal to overturn a decision of the Board under BOD delegated authority.

The goal is to seeing whether a strong majority of members at the SGM wishes to maintain FBS or close it, as such discussions would allow the Board to avoid having discussions in the future around the continued operations of FBS.

Typically, plebiscites are recorded as a pass/fail, as opposed to records of strong majorities. Aside from minutes, there would be few records of the Executive Committee's desire to find a majority.

**CARRIED**

*Flipse left at 2:13pm*

**b. CPR – BOD Set Meeting Times**

**MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:03**

Binesh

*Whereas* CPR 2014-11-03:03 recommends to BOD the following;

*Be it resolved under delegated BOD authority to add a clause to R-12 which reads All Board Meetings shall be set on Wednesdays from 2:30pm.*

CPR was in favour of setting a meeting time, although there was concern that future boards could simply remove any such policy. Such a policy would ensure that BOD members would always book the appropriate time off, such that all members would always be able to make all BOD meetings.

The Executive Committee was reminded that academics do come first – it was the right of students to run and to take office. It was not deemed fair to the membership to dissuade electoral candidates who could not make an arbitrarily set time.

Council had been meeting at the same time for a number of years; if Councilors could make a set meeting time, so could BOD. However, the Council had the right to change the time to be more accommodating for members if they wished.

It was expressed that directors can choose to take classes which do not conflict with the proposed time, although this may not be an option for students nearing the end of their degree who needed certain courses to complete their credentials.

If board already is able to find meeting times which work for all 16, there should not be a problem with maintaining the current system. While times could change if the Board identifies a more accommodating timeslot, a director felt that the time within the proposed policy should be the assumed default.

Concern was raised that students within faculties and departments with set schedules – as was the case for the Faculty of Applied Sciences students – would be discriminated against if a set time was in place. It was felt that candidate knowledge of the possibility for policy change would alleviate any such concern. Additionally, the current system also discriminates against students based on other campuses.

Bylaws allow the president to call a board meeting at any time. In order to enable a more democratic process, they brought forward a policy proposal to engage the entire board of directors into the discussion.

*Fatoba entered at 2:18pm*

It was raised that the proposed time would conflict with committees that had already set their meeting time for the Spring semester.

Concern was raised around the Board making a decision on a policy which works for the current board but may not work for future boards, particularly since new directors may not understand how to change policies, and therefore would assume that policies are permanent

Questions were raised on how elected representatives could represent their constituents if BOD meetings were scheduled outside of their availability.

A point of order was raised that the proposal had yet to serve the notice of motion.

### **POSTPONED TO 2<sup>nd</sup> BOD MEETING OF JANUARY**

#### **c. Senate – Request for Academic Amnesty**

##### **MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:04**

Kopahi/Amended Masmoudi

*Whereas* a request has been submitted to the SFU Senate to grant students academic amnesty to attend the January 21, 2015 SFSS SGM;

*Be it resolved that* the SFSS endorse and support the request for academic amnesty for students attending the January 21, 2015 SFSS SGM under delegated BOD authority.

*Be it further resolved to* appoint Moe Kopahi - Vice President University Relations to attend the Senate meeting of January 5th, 2015 on behalf of the SFSS.

Senate Committee on Agendas and Rules had already met, although it was not known if the matter had been approved to be placed on the Senate agenda. A question was raised as to who would be speaking to the matter. It was seen as most appropriate for a BOD designate to speak to the matter at Senate.

### **CARRIED AS AMENDED**

#### **d. Appointments – Women’s Centre Coordinator Hiring Committee**

##### **MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:05**

Masmoudi/Amended Masmoudi

*Be it resolved to strike a hiring committee for the Women's Centre Coordinator Position under delegated BOD authority.*

*Be it further resolved to appoint Zied Masmoudi and a member of the Women's Centre Collective as the employer representatives on the hiring committee, with Rebeccal Langmead as an alternate.*

Convention has typically been that a member of the Women's Centre Collective is provided one of the two seats for the employer representatives. This had already been conducted by the BOD in the current year for the Out on Campus emergency coordinator hiring.

Concern was raised that the Collective was not the employer and therefore should not be involved in hiring decisions. However, it was expressed that members of the collective work closely with area staff at the Women's Centre to deliver services and understand the operations of the area intimately. Additionally, the coordinator is expected to advise and take advice from the Collective, composed of both SFSS and GSS members given the joint funding of the space (although GSS has no say on staffing or hiring). As the employer has little interaction with the day to day operations of the Women's Centre, providing for a collective designate to sit on the hiring committee was seen as an ideal option. The Board could provide expectations, but directors expressed reservations around the board being involved in the operations of the Women's Centre.

Given discussion on separation of management and governance, it may be odd for the Executive Director not being involved with hiring of a position around programme management, which the collective members may not be prepared to make. It may be less desirable for a politically motivated body to make decisions.

It was reminded that the hiring process was collectively completed by the board and the union. Additionally, an additional 6 hiring committees were incoming and there may be some impact to the time of Executive Director if they were to be involved with each and every committee as a member. Further, Hiring Committees often invite the Executive Director to participate in the process to some capacity regardless.

The organization recognizes certain departments operating on a collective nature and the goal for years has been to enable these collectives, which participate in the governance and operation of the particular departments, to have a say in the hiring process of the individuals who resource and facilitate the programming of the area. It may be conflicting to remove the voice of the membership given their close relationship in taking advice and advising the coordinator. The Executive Director indicated that their participation on the hiring committee would be based entirely on the decision of the Board.

EXEC was reminded that if collective was given one seat, Board would still have another seat to oversee the hiring process, alongside the two union seats. If the employer chooses not to continue the practice of providing the collective with an opportunity to participate, the collectives would have to be served notice of this change.

EXEC conducted a straw poll and amended the motion accordingly.

#### **CARRIED AS AMENDED**

#### **e. Appointments – General Office Student Staff Hiring Committee MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:06**

Kopahi/Amended Kopahi

*Be it resolved to strike a hiring committee for a General Office Student Staff under delegated BOD authority.*

*Be it further resolved to appoint Moe Kopahi and Deepak Sharma as the employer representatives on the hiring committee, with Kayode Fatoba as an alternate.*

A number of board members expressed interest in serving on the hiring committee.

*Escarcha left at 2:51pm*

EXEC conducted a straw poll and amended the motion accordingly.

**CARRIED AS AMENDED**

**f. ADV Matter – Advocacy Campaign Proposal Template  
MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:07**

Binesh

*Be it resolved to receive, file, and enforce the presented Advocacy Campaign Proposal Template.*

The attached template had been created to ensure that campaign proposals had clarity and uniformity. The motion was worded to ensure that the CRP Coordinator would file the documents for continuity purposes. Further, enforcement would ensure that all campaign proposals would follow this document structure, and would facilitate staff support. The Committee was asked to assist with the enforcement phrase, ensuring that any advocacy initiative taken up by the organization followed the template.

**CARRIED**

**g. ADV Matter – Frontrunner Women’s Student Governance Campaign School  
MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:08**

Kopahi

*Whereas an new initiative to encourage young women to become involved in student government called FrontRunner has been created;*

*Be it resolved that the SFSS promote the FrontRunner women's student government campaign school, taking place January 16-18th, 2015, to its membership under delegated BOD authority.*

A director raised concern around the language used within the original motion, as there was concern that the motion portrayed the organization as one which was unsafe for women, particularly given controversies of the previous year.

The item had been brought to Executive Committee as Advocacy Committee (ADV) would not be meeting for the remainder of the year. Committee members were informed that the item would be brought to the EXEC agenda and a number of members expressed their support for the initiative. While current board already has a diverse makeup, but there was always an opportunity to enhance minority representation.

A director was concerned that the wording of the motion may engender notions that the SFSS is unfair, or the election process is prejudiced against self-identified women. Additionally, there was concern that women would have an organization behind them which would prejudice the

elections system, and thus it was preferred to simply enhance the election process and to continue internally driven advocacy for women.

Women's participation was an issue at all levels of governance, whether due to financial, social, or other barriers. The campaign school was seen as an opportunity for women to have the confidence to move into other layers of politics in the future. BC Federation of Labour has done similar types of schools in the past. The matter was seen as an important normative statement around the underrepresentation of women in the SFSS.

It was recommended that the Board consider a internal audit to enhance the organization as a platform for a student expression beyond simply that of a specific gender.

support of the initiative was seen as an opportunity for the board to enhance the electoral process with no financial impact to the organization.

### **CARRIED AS AMENDED**

#### **h. ADV Matter – Transit Referendum Outreach**

##### **MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:09**

Potvin

*Whereas* a referendum to fund public transit infrastructure in the Lower Mainland will be taking place in Spring 2015;

*Whereas* the majority of the members of the SFSS utilize the Upass and public transit;

*Be it resolved* to grant up to \$800 from line item 820/23 (Advocacy) for promotional material and outreach supplies to support transit referendum outreach activities with Sustainable SFU and the Graduate Student Society under delegated BOD authority.

Advocacy Committee had been notified of the initiative, the Advocacy budget was still healthy, and campaigns had already been conducted around the subject.

Concern was expressed that UPass Advisory Committee delegate had not been contacted on the matter, although it was expressed that they had been copied on all correspondences. Executive officers would follow up.

*[MT Note: EXEC 2014-01-26 noted that an email was sent on 2014-01-03 to include both UAC members in the matter]*

### **CARRIED**

#### **i. Committee Student At-Large Appointments**

##### **MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:10**

Kopahi

*Be it resolved* under delegated BOD authority to open Student At-Large nominations for vacant positions as of January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015 until January 23rd, 2015, for ratification by the BOD during the week of January 26th, 2015.

Build SFU General Manager indicated that outreach would be conducted in January and this would be an opportunity to point interested members towards the opportunity.

As per EXEC, Build SFU would continue to use the web survey system to administer the Student At-Large nomination process independently of the process used for other committees.

**CARRIED**

**4. In Camera Session – Ombudsperson Review**

**MOTION EXEC 2014-12-18:11**

Masmoudi

*Be it resolved to move the meeting in camera with management*

**CARRIED**

**5. Attachments**

Advocacy Campaign Proposal Template.pdf

FrontRunner Campaign School.pdf

MemorandumofUnderstanding-Extension.pdf

Senate Request.pdf

Transit Referendum Outreach Funding Proposal.pdf

**6. Adjournment**

---

DC /CUPE 3338