

Call to Order – 1:33 pm, January 21, 2015 | SFU West Gym

*Exact numbers of votes cast were provided by the head scrutineer, Zied Masmoudi – Vice President Student Services. Vote percentages are rounded to the nearest whole figure.*

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The Meeting was called to order by Zied Masmoudi – Vice President Student Services.

### 2. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR

The members nominated and appointed a Chairperson for the Special General Meeting.

#### MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:01

Masmoudi

*Be it resolved that* Chardaye Bueckert – President be appointed as the chair of the 2015 SFSS Special General Meeting.

#### CARRIED

**401 in Favour – 97%**

**11 in Opposition – 3%**

The Board of Directors acknowledged that the meeting was being conducted on Unceded Coast Salish Territories, which included the Squamish, Musqueam, Stó:lo, and Tsleil-Waututh people to the current knowledge of the Society. This acknowledges the fact that no treaty has been signed with the government relinquishing control over the territory.

### 3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEETING RULES

The meeting will consider the agenda prepared by the Board of Directors. Changes or additions to the agenda may be proposed at this time.

The Chairperson will provide a brief overview of Robert's Rules of Order, a system of meeting rules and procedures that the Student Society uses for the general meeting.

The Chairperson identified the scrutineers (the Faculty and At Large Members of the Board of Directors as per AP-27), who were under the direction of the head scrutineer (the Vice President Student Services), and indicated that they were responsible for conducting quorum checks where necessary. Further, the notice calling the meeting was circulated to all members as per Bylaw 11.2.

The main purpose of the SGM was to consider business discussed at the October 2014 Annual General Meeting. The high level of member interest resulted in venue capacity and safety issues. The current Special General Meeting had been called to enable all interested members to speak to matters on the agenda at the annual general meeting.

A Society-produced video providing a short overview of Robert's Rules of Order was shown to the membership.

The Board of Directors wished to finish the meeting in two hours, in recognition of the busy schedules of the membership and other commitments which the membership were involved in. However, the Board desired to ensure that all members could speak fully to the matters on the

agenda AND make an informed decision. The following guidelines were thus provided by the chair to govern discussion:

- No member may speak more than twice to any motion.
- No one who has spoken previously would be allowed to speak again until any member who has not yet spoken has had the opportunity.
- Members were requested to make all comments as concise as possible and avoid repetition.
- Members may speak for up to five minutes per comment, with the Vice President External Relations fulfilling the role as timekeeper.

An explanation of the microphone setup was provided (in favour/against). It was expressed that for purposes of expediency and to avoid assumptions, the They/Them/Their pronouns would be used by the chair in reference to members.

All members in the space were identified by the Society as members of the SFSS in good standing.

Items 5a and 5b were identified as special resolutions requiring 75% of votes cast in favour in order to pass.

The agenda was circulated as part of the notice of meeting. As a special meeting, no new items could be added.

**MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:02**

Woodbury

~~Whereas we have been recently informed that SFSS legal counsel with expertise in the BC Society Act has given legal opinion that the votes to approve the debenture and the bylaw can be held by an online referendum in March of this year;~~

~~Whereas many students here expressed the desire to vote here today but cannot attend due to work, school or other rigid obligations; whereas this meeting has been scheduled during peak instructional hours;~~

~~Whereas the memorandum of understanding of September 2012 between the university and the SFSS planned for Build SFU construction to begin in January of 2016; therefore voting in March would not cause a delay according to the original plans;~~

~~Whereas it states in the SFSS constitution in point 2.c that the mandate of the SFSS is to promote meaningful and undergraduate participation and in point 2.d, to facilitate collective action by undergrads at SFU;~~

~~Be it resolved to remove 5.a, the Build SFU project debenture and 5.b, the SFSS bylaw creation from the agenda with the intention of holding them as referendum questions online in March.~~

It was argued by the motivator that it would be more democratic of the Society to have both questions submitted as referendum questions, which would allow significantly more students from all campuses to be involved in the decision-making process. Although the substance of the motion was in order, the SGM could not order a matter to the referendum question. The chair ruled the motion out of order and recommended that the motivator simply move to postpone the matter indefinitely at the time of discussion for the motion; an amendment to the agenda was not deemed necessary to fulfill the goals of the motion.

#### **MOTION RULED OUT OF ORDER**

#### **MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:03**

Woodbury

*Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted as presented.*

#### **CARRIED**

**521 in Favour – 99%**

**5 in Opposition – 1%**

#### **4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

The 2013 SGM minutes were made available for consideration by members.

#### **MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:04**

Munez

*Be it resolved that the minutes of the April 3, 2013 Special General Meeting of the Simon Fraser Student Society be adopted.*

#### **CARRIED**

**507 in Favour – 99%**

**2 in Opposition – 1%**

#### **5. RESOLUTIONS AND SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS**

##### **a. Build SFU Project Debenture**

The chair explained that the resolution would grant the Board of Directors a one-year period of authority to arrange for the financing necessary to construct the Student Union Building and to grant a debenture to secure the SFSS's repayment obligations to a financial institution.

Under the Society bylaws and the BC Society Act, authorization to enter a debenture requires a special resolution with 75% of votes cast in favour.

#### **MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:04**

Langmead

- a. *Whereas* The Simon Fraser Student Society (the "Society") and Simon Fraser University ("SFU") have agreed to enter into a project (the "Project")

for the construction of a new student union building and stadium on SFU's Burnaby campus.

- b. *Whereas* a referendum was passed by the members of the Society (the "Members") on March 22, 2012 in favour of the development of the Project.
- c. *Whereas* the Society will need to borrow money from third parties to fund the development of the Project and is seeking such financing on the best available terms. In order to obtain such funding, the Society may be required to grant or issue security, in the form of a debenture, promissory note, mortgage, general security agreement or other security instrument, for the repayment of any amount so borrowed.
- d. *Whereas* the Society's by-laws (the "By-laws") provide that its directors (the "Directors") may, for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of the Society, borrow, raise or secure the repayment of money and may authorize the issuance of security on the whole or part of the property or assets of the Society, present and future, including Society fees now or hereafter due or payable, except that no debenture shall be issued without sanction of a special resolution.
- e. *Whereas* the Society Act (B.C.) similarly requires that any issuance of a debenture by the Society be approved by the Members by special resolution and permits the Members to grant a general power on the Directors to issue debentures for a period of one year from the date on which such resolution was passed.
- f. *Whereas* it is expedient for the purposes of facilitating the Project that the Members exercise the authority conferred upon them under Society Act (B.C.) and the By-laws by giving the Directors the authority to borrow such amounts as may be required in order to pursue the Project and to secure the repayment of such borrowing in the manner that the Directors see fit.

*Be it resolved* by special resolution that:

1. The Directors are hereby authorized, for a period of one year from the date hereof, on behalf of the Society, to borrow from such persons, firms, corporations, societies, co-operatives, credit unions, trust companies, banks or other lenders as they deem desirable, such amounts as are determined reasonable or necessary by the Directors for the purposes of the Project, on such terms as the Directors may from time to time approve.
2. The Directors are hereby further authorized, for a period of one year from the date hereof, on behalf of the Society, to secure repayment of any and all borrowing in such manner as the Directors consider to be in the best interests of the Society, including, without limitation, by the creation, granting and/or issuance of debentures, promissory notes, mortgages, general security agreements and such other security instruments charging all or any portion of the real or personal property of the Society, all on

such terms as the Directors may from time to time approve, without further authorization from the Members.

3. Any two Directors or officers of the Society are hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the Society, under seal or otherwise, any agreement, debenture, mortgage, security agreement or other instrument that such person deems necessary or desirable to effect any borrowing by the Society or to give and perfect any security granted by the Society.

During the Spring 2012 referendum, a question was brought forward to the membership to approve the creation of the Build SFU levy to fund the construction of a Student Union Building [SUB], which was approved by the membership. In working towards this goal, the SFSS has conducted significant consultation and outreach, including 4,800 hours of outreach by the Build SFU street team, 30 focus groups, 8 community updates, 6 workshops, all of which were done to consult the undergraduate student population on their vision of the ideal building. The results of these were used to determine the location of the SUB and the types of spaces. Additionally, the Build SFU project includes a mandate to construct a 2,500 seat stadium, and potentially a Fieldhouse linking the stadium with the Lorne Davies Complex, in collaboration with the university. The Society was now asking the membership for permission to enter into a debenture to begin construction of the SUB.

**MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:05**

Woodbury

~~Whereas we have been recently informed that SFSS legal counsel with expertise in the BC Society Act has given legal opinion that the votes to approve the debenture and the bylaw can be held by an online referendum in March of this year;~~

~~Whereas many students here expressed the desire to vote here today but cannot attend due to work, school or other rigid obligations; whereas this meeting has been scheduled during peak instructional hours;~~

~~Whereas the memorandum of understanding of September 2012 between the university and the SFSS planned for Build SFU construction to begin in January of 2016; therefore voting in March would not cause a delay according to the original plans;~~

~~Whereas it states in the SFSS constitution in point 2.c that the mandate of the SFSS is to promote meaningful and undergraduate participation and in point 2.d, to facilitate collective action by undergrads at SFU;~~

~~Be it resolved to postpone from this meeting indefinitely motion 5.a, the Build SFU project debenture from the agenda and with the intention of holding them as referendum questions online in March.~~

A member indicated that members based on the Surrey and Vancouver campuses have expressed frustration in being unable to participate in the SGM discussions, considering both the impact on students based on these campuses as well as the impact on students entering the

university over the next three decades. As such, the member requested that the vote on the matter be shifted online to become more democratically sound.

A Director replied that the Board was unaware of the possibility of approving such a matter via referendum until recently, which had prevented the Society from pursuing the question during the Fall 2014 Referenda. However, the matter had been brought to the membership's attention during the October Annual General Meeting, and shifting the decision to a referendum will both delay the project and have financial implications to the Society amounting to at least \$10,000. Additionally, the Special General Meeting had a financial impact on the Society amounting to nearly \$7000. Significant time had been put into the advertising the meeting over a number of weeks. Additionally, not all members choose to partake in referendum questions, just as not all students attend annual and special general meetings. As the membership in the space was likely ready to vote on the matter, the director implored students to vote the motion down.

A member indicated that they had spent significant time in the West Gym already and were concerned that they would not be able to participate in the vote on these special resolutions regardless, as they would have to leave for other commitments soon.

There was a desire to have the discussion on the project immediately and that there was no point postponing such a discussion.

It was expressed that the vote disproportionately targets the Burnaby campus student body. The project focuses on improvements on Burnaby campus as opposed to any other SFU campus. Members of the Society in programs such as Fine Arts are based in Vancouver campus exclusively, while a number of members in Surrey-specific programmes have their entire degree based out of that campus. As such, concern was raised around the Society's decision to host a meeting at a time and place where those students who were not being benefited by the project could not attend. Preference for an online vote was expressed.

A representative of the Mechatronics Systems Engineering Student Society, the Interactive Art and Technology Student Union, and the Software Systems Student Society spoke in support of the motion. All three programmes are based entirely in Surrey and represent approximately 1,500 members. During informal surveys, members of these department student unions expressed issues with the location of the SGM on the Burnaby campus which directly affected their ability to attend the meeting.

A member who was involved in the Build SFU Student Advisory Committee had conducted their own outreach in 2012 and 2013 to music and performing arts student groups. One of the largest groups would not respond to many enquiries. When Build SFU conducted activities to gauge the population to determine the programming priorities for the new building, very few students from the music community attended. The programming for the building was thus established based on these opinions of those who attended. The member criticized representatives of music clubs who knowingly avoided involvement in the consultations.

A point of order was raised that the discussion was limited to postponing the motion.

**POINT OF ORDER SUSTAINED**

In regards to the argument by a director that loans from banks would expire should the matter be postponed, a member indicated that the Bank of Canada just lowered their interest rates. Therefore, the member expressed that would actually be more desirable for the current offer to expire and for a better offer to be negotiated with the financial institution given the more desirable financial environment. Further, more students will have to leave when classes start and will not be able to participate.

**QUESTION CALLED ON MOTION TO POSTPONE**

**400 in Favour – 78%**

**113 in Opposition – 22%**

Munez

**MOTION FAILED TO BE POSTPONED INDEFINITELY**

**251 in Favour – 49%**

**261 in Opposition – 51%**

*A quorum check was conducted by the scrutineers.*

The assembly was reminded that 4800 hours of outreach was conducted by the Build SFU Street Team alone, amounting to 200 full days of outreach. Although three campuses are difficult, it was expressed that this vote had already been conducted once.

Members of the assembly asked why the vote could not be done online.

A member expressed opposition to the motion, as they did not perceive that the Society had received a sufficient democratic mandate to pursue a \$65 million loan based upon the close number of yes and no votes during the 2012 referendum. The speaker further reminded the assembly that SFU has traditionally been a school for working class students, and by 2022 the levy will have a substantial impact on students in the future who juggle jobs school and student loans and living expenses. They implored the assembly to consider the impact of a \$90 per semester fee to students in the future.

A member saw the Build SFU project as one fundamentally about community. The groups in opposition to the motion were identified by a member as having not been present at any of the consultation and research stages. It was expressed that Build SFU was for SFU as a whole, and while it could not provide for the needs of all students, it would be space that fulfilled the needs of the majority of members and provide both a home for students and opportunities for community building activities. This had the potential of making SFU a better school for the next 50 years.

No To Build SFU member expressed that members of the Build SFU street team and administrative staff have indicated in the past that project is inevitable and that it cannot be changed or stopped, and that the meeting is a formality to approve the loan. They indicated that this was not the case, than that the membership could remove the levy funding Build SFU or demand that the project take a different approach. They outlined the opportunities available to the membership.

- Vote yes and the project continues as planned
- Vote no and the student population has not yet provided the board with authorization to take out a debenture. Two referendum questions would then be submitted:
  - A question on the continued collection of the Build SFU levy
  - A question on severing the Stadium from the Build SFU project.

It was expressed that the university has significant motivation and resources to build the stadium by itself independent of the SFSS' Student Union Building. This would allow the membership to reduce its financial and ethical burdens of building the Stadium as well as the Student Union Building. Further, the referendum questions would allow more students across all campuses to take part in an issue that would affect three decades of students.

A member expressed a desire for alumni to fund the project.

The Vice President External Relations replied that over the last 8 months, sponsorship has been sought for the project. However, the Society discovered that the process was both complicated and expensive. The board has not ruled out seeking advancement, and in the future Build SFU may be able to work with SFU Advancement after they wind down the 50 year anniversary fundraising campaign. Until the building construction begins, it may be presumptuous to seek external funding for the project.

A member expressed that students could always find spaces to sleep, study, or play video games. However, many students have difficulty finding money, and many student have not been able to handle the financial burden of university and have been forced to drop out. They did not want the project to become a major financial burden for future students. They also pointed out that Build SFU street team members had engaged in significant outreach, but they have only provided one side of the argument, which morally weakened the project. Finally, they expressed concern that the Board of Directors were acting as vote scrutineers, and that the process was simply by show of cards as opposed to physical voting.

Another member indicated that the outreach for Build SFU had been paid for by members, and that any further delays would only serve to waste student money invested into the initiative.

A member of the varsity team expressed that they were enrolled in classes with members of the No to Build SFU campaign, which spurred them to do research on the project from both sides of the argument. They assumed that all members present would have done similarly and arrived that the meeting having understood the full implications of any decision. They expressed shock and offense to the choice of the Society to show a series of Build SFU videos prior to the meeting, in what they characterized as infomercials, as opposed to information on the financial institution or other information that would have assisted in the decision-making process. They



felt that it was tasteless and/or authoritarian to present such advertising immediately prior to the meeting.

SFU Concert Orchestra representative indicated that many campus music clubs, a number of which were present at the meeting, would be positively benefitted by the space made available in the Student Union Building. It was expressed that the shift to a referendum question would be a waste of student money, and any delays would simply result in more lost student dollars which could be going towards building community. A member expressed a desire to ensure that students would be left with a legacy.

A member agreed that the building would contribute to building community at SFU, but the way the vote was being conducted would not effectively represent all members being affected in the long run, and therefore the matter should be reconsidered at a later time.

It was clarified for the assembly that the 4800 hours of outreach by the Build SFU Street Team was paid time, and that the street team were paid at \$14.58 per hour as per the SFSS Collective Agreement.

**QUESTION CALLED ON THE MAIN MOTION**

**334 In Favour – 74%**

**123 in Opposition 26%**

Chapman

**MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:06**

McInnis

~~Whereas it is more in line with democratic principles to allow people to vote according to their conscience and without peer pressure;~~

~~Whereas voting by ballot is a more accurate method of counting votes;~~

~~Whereas certain student groups and individuals have expressed concern over repercussions should they openly take a stance or should their members be known to have voted a certain way;~~

~~Be it resolved to vote by secret ballot.~~

**SECRET BALLOT MOTION FAILED**

**179 in Favour – 40%**

**268 in Opposition – 60%**

**SPECIAL RESOLUTION FAILED**

**310 in Favour – 65%**

**164 in Opposition – 35%**

**b. SFSS Bylaw Creation**

The desire of the motion was to provide assurance for any lender that the SFSS would continue to collect the levy until a loan was repaid.

326 still in room at 2:59pm, quorum is still present.  
Stenographer took a temporary leave, returning at 3:01pm

**MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:07**

Untawala/Amended Masmoudi

*Be it resolved* by special resolution that the following By-law be created and accepted as presented in the form of Bylaw 24 – Student Society Fees:

*The Society may not revoke, reduce or otherwise cancel a duly approved student society fee that has been implemented for the purpose of repaying a loan made to the Society or on the basis of which a loan has been made to the Society if the effect of such revocation, reduction or cancellation would be to cause the Society to be unable to repay the loan as it became due.*

**MOTION AMENDED**

**382 in Favour – 99%**

**1 in Opposition – 1%**

The chair expressed that the goal of the new bylaw was to provide assurances to lenders that the Build SFU levy approved by referendum on 2014-03-22 would not be revoked while the loan was outstanding.

A member indicated that the previous motion on the debenture was not approved, so this motion was likely unnecessary.

The assembly was reminded that the motion was not specific to Build SFU. Rather, this would apply to any and all loans pursued by the Student Society and therefore should be considered separately.

**QUESTION CALLED ON THE MAIN MOTION**

**245 in Favour – 90%**

**27 in Opposition – 10%**

Poughkay

**SPECIAL RESOLUTION FAILED**

**202 in Favour – 68%**

**94 in Opposition – 32%**

**6. NON-BINDING QUESTIONS**

**a. Greek Letter Organizations**

The assembly was reminded that the following were opinion polls. As such, there was no threshold necessary for any vote, as the findings would not result in any actions on the part of the Society.

**MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:08**

Bryan

*Whereas* in 2008 a non-binding plebiscite question was posed asking if students were in favour of Simon Fraser University rescinding its ban towards on and off campus Fraternities and Sororities;

*Whereas* the question passed with 56.95% in favour,

*Whereas* the SFSS cannot house Greek Letter Organizations as clubs due to policy and insurance restraints;

*Whereas* since 2008 five Greek Letter Organizations have been established at SFU under the SFSS club Greek Representation and Interest Development (GRID);

*Whereas* the established Greek Letter Organizations have been working with the SFSS in order to communicate with the membership,

*Whereas* the November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2014 town hall constitutes an open dialogue venue between the general membership and students involved with Greek Letter Organizations;

*Whereas* Greek Letter Organizations seek the opinion of the general membership;

*Are you in favour of* having Greek Letter Organizations at Simon Fraser University?

Since 2012, three fraternities and 2 sororities have been established at SFU, as well as one interest sorority group. This was not including 2 professional fraternities. Over 160 members at present, with 200 projected by the end of the semester. On campus, they have raised over \$30K over 3 semester, contributed over 8000 hours of volunteer service, and have been participating in democratic processes. Membership requires a GPA minimum higher than the SFU requirement, and groups provide academic support for their members, including tutoring and graduation resources. Through network of alumni across the organizations, the groups have boasted a 30% employment rate through their networks alone. Internal scholarships have provided \$5000 to members.

Clubs provide specific interests, but goal oriented clubs do not provide for a purely social atmosphere where members can meet others with like interests who are dedicated to the university. Additionally, fraternities and sororities can change based on the interests of the members on a yearly basis, they are not required to dedicate themselves to a single cause. Many events on campus are open to the public. Such events have been so popular that the groups have been asked by the Highland Pub to host recurring events. The groups offers large body of individuals who are involved on campus, all of whom wish to change SFU into a more community based school. However, the current issues of status impact the success that Greek organizations can have on campus. Concerns were expressed around the preconceptions and judgments around the fraternity not being in line with the reality of the groups, particularly given the decades since fraternities first tried to colonize on campus. The groups expressed an interest in having space for discussion and dispelling myths.

A member expressed confusion as to why these groups could not achieve the same goals of philanthropy and community outside of a fraternity or sorority system and within the current SFU framework, particularly given issues that have arisen in the recent past in the United States regarding fraternity conduct. They also expressed concern around the issues of reinforcing

gender stereotypes due to the membership policies of these groups, as well as long histories of gender-based issues.

A member of a sorority brought up that Canadians have freedom of association, which should be respected by a liberal university such as SFU. Additionally, members should not be advocating to shut down a club just because they do not believe in their mandate. As such, the assembly should not be involved in deciding whether a group should be allowed. They implored the members to vote based on principle.

Point of Information raised – Due to gender binary ways that fraternities are structured, there were concerns around the inclusion of gender queer students and non-binary students.

A Sorority president indicated that the definition of feminism was equal rights for both genders, and that there was a place within Greek life for both genders. Further, they accept every single gender without regard to what members identified with.

#### **QUESTION CALLED ON THE MAIN MOTION**

Hedekar

*Quorum count was triggered at 3:35pm and the meeting was declared quorate.*

#### **SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING EXTENDED UNTIL 4:00PM**

Wall

**APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **OPINION POLL RESULTS**

**192 in Favour – 77%**

**55 in Opposition – 33%**

#### **b. SFSS Food and Beverage Services**

##### **MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:09**

Potvin

*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?

The Board of Directors wished to gauge public support for the SFSS Food and Beverage Services, in the spirit of referendums conducted on other major SFSS services. The FBS was a costly service, with a deficit for the current year projected to be close to \$400,000, and has been higher in previous years. Management has made significant improvements to FBS efficiency, but a deficit will likely remain. Highland Pub remains a hub of social events operated by student organizations, and provides opportunities for clubs and student groups to raise funds and run functions.

The assembly was reminded that the Board was not bound to make any decisions based upon membership opinion, and that there were no immediate plans to change Food and Beverage Services operations.

**MOTION SGM 2015-01-21:10**

Potvin

~~Whereas in the previous opinion poll, the question was called before a very significant point of information could be requested, namely what are the effects on — on the insurance costs and how will those effects affect us as students, I call to reconsider.~~

The Chair expressed that it would be out of order to move such a motion in the midst of another motion. Further, the matter was a non-binding opinion poll and therefore has no force and effect. The Board welcomed further discussion on the matter amongst the membership into the future.

**MOTION RULED OUT OF ORDER**

Another director expressed that the Food and Beverage Services by nature was run as a service, and therefore was always subsidized. This begged the question of the level of deficit that the members saw as acceptable from the service. A number of years ago, a long term plan was established to minimize the deficit. This included renovations to the Highland Pub, the hiring of a new FBS General Manager mandated to reduce losses and improve operations etc. It was expressed that it would likely not be desirable to halt the process of improvements when the FBS was beginning to see major progress. Additionally, if FBS was shut down entirely, the Student Society would have to absorb approximately \$180,000 per year to maintain the space. Further, approximately 70 club events are operated per year at the Highland, generating approximately \$10,000 in funds for student organizations.

A student employee from FBS and the student union representative for CUPE (the union for FBS staff) indicated that the numbers provided to the membership thusfar have been incorrect compared to the numbers circulated by the Food and Beverage Services General Manager to all staff members, amounting to a nearly \$100,000 difference in yearly numbers. The representative pointed out that the new Collective Agreement would reduce the deficit, alongside a number of other measures being pursued by the service which has been consistently reducing its debt. FBS employed nearly 38 students, providing stable, well paid, and flexible employment opportunities for all students. FBS also provided one of the few places where students have the opportunity to gather and break boundaries between students/staff/faculty. FBS was seen as an institution at SFU which support community and social activity on campus.

The representative of the MSESS, SSSS, and IATSU expressed that only 7 members present in the space were Surrey-based students, which would severely impact the results of the opinion poll. The assembly was reminded that students from other campuses were unlikely to utilize FBS, and the unions were largely indifferent to the provision of such services. The assembly was reminded to consider the students who could not attend and who are not benefited from such services.

A student employee expressed that the Highland was a gathering place for students to have a cheap beer and hang out, and that student happiness would be greatly impacted by the loss of such a service.

A director wished to address the issues of financial discrepancies. In 2010, the BOD made a move to allocate operating costs of FBS (charged to the FBS on a square footage basis) into the SFSS general operating costs, which impacted comparisons of the deficit on a year to year basis. In the current year, the Board made the decision to allocate these costs directly to FBS again for greater transparency – as such, \$110K in operating costs was reallocated back to the department. The General Manager of FBS vetted the document, and the Board had no interest in deceiving the membership.

A director reminded the assembly that the Food and Beverage Services was made up of other businesses beyond the Highland. At present, SFU also had two monopolizing companies — Tim Hortons and Starbucks — which was also frequented by student groups. As such, the FBS deficit was allocated to all units. There was a desire to see if the membership saw value in all components of FBS, or if they only saw value in the Highland Pub.

A student employee expressed that no other venue on campus serves the same function as FBS. Clubs and student unions hold meetings, mixers, and events in the space, which provides for an internal economy where student money was being used in student services, which would otherwise be spent at other companies.

Student employee – there is no where else on campus that serves the same function. Clubs not only hold functions, but also hold meetings in the space. Student unions use the space to allow students in the department to get to know each other. This is SFSS money that will go to outside businesses. This would remove money within the internal economy to people who aren't in the university. Further, the student employment opportunities through FBS are stable, flexible, and provide students with the income they need to graduate from university. Finally, the service builds social ties, friendships, and contributes to a vibrant campus culture.

#### **OPINION POLL RESULTS**

**204 in Favour – 99%**

**3 in Opposition – 1%**

All members were thanked for attending and participating in the democratic processes of their Student Society.

#### **7. MEETING ADJOURNMENT 4:00pm**

*MT Note: The SGM Minutes presented above includes details recorded by the Student Society Minute Taker, as well as information captured verbatim by the Society retained stenographer, of Accurate Realtime Reporting Inc.*