

Call to Order – 3:01 pm, September 22, 2015 | West Gym

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

The Meeting was called to order by Darwin Binesh – Vice President Student Services. The Vice President announced that the meeting had attained quorum with 315 members assembled. They provided an overview of the structure of the meeting, including the agenda, the process for addressing questions of the membership during the meeting.

### **2. TERRITORIAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Kathleen Yang—Vice President External Relations led the assembly in a territorial acknowledgement. The Board of Directors recognized that meeting is being conducted on the traditional and unceded territories of the Coast Salish peoples, which includes the Skxwú7mesh (Squamish), Musqueam, Stó:lo, and Tsleil-Waututh people to the Board of Directors' current knowledge. The term 'Unceded' recognized that the land was never relinquished to the British Columbian nor Canadian governments. Members interested in such issues were directed to visit the Simon Fraser Public Interest Research Group space in the Transportation Center/Rotunda, or to contact the Vice President External Relations directly.

### **3. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR**

The members nominated and appoint a Chairperson for the Annual General Meeting. For the 2015 Annual General Meeting, the Board of Directors sought out an external and unbiased individual with a wealth of parliamentary experience to chair the meeting. The Vice President Student Services introduced John Noonan as the Board's recommended chairperson, and provided an overview of their credentials to the membership for their review.

#### **MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:01**

Binesh

*Whereas* the Board of Directors would like to facilitate the Annual General Meeting with an external chair to ensure an effective and efficient meeting.

*Whereas* John Noonan is a Professional Registered Parliamentarian and brings 10 years of experience leading meetings with Robert's Rules of Order.

*Be it resolved that* John Noonan be appointed as the chair of the 2015 Simon Fraser Student Society Annual General Meeting.

**CARRIED**

### **4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEETING RULES**

The chair indicated that they had met with the Board on numerous occasions in order to prepare themselves for the role, and thanked the assembly for their trust and confidence. They provided the assembly with an overview of the Roberts Rules of Order—a system of meeting rules and procedures that the Student Society uses for the general meeting—along with the meeting standing rules—established to ensure courtesy, fairness, and equality amongst all speakers—circulated amongst the assembly. The term 'special resolution' and the specific voting numbers required for such resolutions under the BC Society Act (approval by  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the votes cast). They also introduced Michelle Laurel, an

associate of the Chair who would be timekeeping throughout the meeting and informing speakers of their time limits.

**MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:02**

Binesh

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

An open space session at the end of the meeting was designated to allow members with issues beyond those already addressed within the agenda.

**CARRIED**

**5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the 2014 Annual General Meeting was made available for consideration by members.

**MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:03**

Gildersleve

*Be it resolved that the minutes of the October 22, 2014 Annual General Meeting of the Simon Fraser Student Society be adopted.*

The membership was informed that all meetings were documented in the form of minutes. A member raised a question around when the minutes of the 2015 Special General Meeting would be made available to the membership for approval. Concern was raised that if the minutes had to be approved at another Special General Meeting, the minutes may be unapproved in perpetuity. It was expressed to the assembly that this was an oversight of the Board and that the minutes would be made available for review at the 2016 Annual General Meeting.

**CARRIED**

**6. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Enoch Weng—President presented the Society Annual Report detailing the activities of the Board of Directors from October 23, 2014 to September 21, 2015. They indicated that the Board had been highly engaged in work benefitting the membership and provided some highlights of such work:

- Many of the services provided by the Student Society seek to help save students money—such as the UPass BC Programme, the SFSS Copy Centre, and the Extended Health and Dental Plan—as well as supporting students in need—such as through the SFSS Food Bank Program and the Legal Aid Clinic.
- The Board of Directors has been pushing towards a separation of governance and operations. This recognized the change that was necessary given the expansion of the organization and the university over the past 50 years, as well as changing work processes and technology.

- The Society’s new Executive Director—Martin Wyant—has been leading the process in overhauling the organization to align to this new vision.
- The SFSS has been deeply engaged in advocacy work, including supporting other student advocates as in the case of the Kinder Morgan pipeline protests.
- The SFSS Food Bank Programme provides grocery vouchers to students in financial need. This programme took over the administration of such a program after the closure of the SFU operated food bank.
  - Over 1,000 students have been served by the programme over the past year.
- Pursuing accessibility review of SFSS spaces and services
- Many changes have been made to the Build SFU project by the current Board in response to student need:
  - Build SFU motions had been separated between the Student Union Building and the Stadium projects, thus allowing the membership to vote separately.
  - The Build SFU bursary has been doubled, such that students in financial need can have their financial burdens alleviated through a return of their levy contributions.
  - The Board was exploring options to restructure the Build SFU levy to reduce costs on students, and seeking sponsorship to reduce the total cost of the project.

The President provided a Walt Disney quote to the membership, explaining that the Society is ultimately owned by and accountable to the membership.

**MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:04**

*Be it resolved* that the 2014—2015 report from the Board of Directors be adopted.

**CARRIED**

**7. RESOLUTIONS AND SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS**

**a. Approval of a Debenture in Respect of the Construction of a New Student Union Building**

**MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:05**

Chen

- A. *Whereas* the Simon Fraser Student Society (the “**Society**”) and Simon Fraser University (“**SFU**”) have agreed to enter into a project for the construction of a new student union building on SFU’s Burnaby campus (the “**SUB Project**”).
- 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 SUB Project and the related project for the construction of a new stadium on SFU’s Burnaby campus (the “**Stadium Project**”).

- C. *Whereas* the Society will need to borrow money from third parties to fund the development of the SUB 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 bylaws (the "**Bylaws**") 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 SUB Project that the Members exercise the authority conferred upon them under the *Society Act* (B.C.) and the Bylaws by giving the Directors the authority to borrow such amounts as may be required in order to pursue the SUB 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 SUB Project, on such terms as the Directors may from time to time approve. For greater certainty, this authorization extends only to the SUB Project and excludes the Stadium Project.
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 done for the purposes of the SUB Project 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.

The following is a summary of the debate which ensued over the motion:

- In the Fall 2014 SFU Undergraduate survey, 51% of respondents found it difficult to make meaningful social connections, and were dissatisfied with the social environment on SFU in reducing academic stress. This statistic was perceived to be unacceptable. A member expressed that wandering around campus looking for friends was difficult, and the lack of an overt social environment at SFU resulted in loss of academic motivation. The Student Union Building was seen as a solution by providing a central space for students to build social connections and are encouraged to be part of their community. As agents of social change, students could vote for the project and create major change for the student experience at SFU.
- Question arose of why the project was being brought back when students already voted no on granting the debenture back in Spring 2015. Additionally, concern was expressed around the decision to pursue the question via AGM as opposed to referendum, especially when the Board of Directors and the Build SFU General Manager had been aware since Spring that this was a possibility. While this question was answered in a Build SFU issued video, the answer had been phrased as the AGM being the best way to move the project forward, as though the Board decided to bring the matter to the Annual General Meeting such that it would have a chance of passing as opposed to having it fail in the referendum. As such, it seemed that the Board of Directors had engineered the meeting in order to pass the motion.

Corbett Gildersleve—Applied Sciences Representative was asked to respond to this allegation. They expressed that in reviewing special resolutions pushed through referenda over the past number of years, these resolutions tended to be doomed to fail, particularly in cases such as the Build SFU project that were more contentious. As such, the Board selected the AGM as a venue where there was some opportunity for the membership to speak to the matter and for the motion to pass, subject to the will of the membership.

- A member expressed that starting at SFU was a sad experience, and that they hoped for the inclusive campus environment that was often glamorized in movies. In their increasing involvement in clubs, they found that space was an area of constant conflict for clubs on campus, that the incredible work of clubs and student organizations were being hidden due to the lack of space. Build SFU would be directly addressing these spatial needs on the Burnaby campus.
- An email was circulated by the SFSS the evening before the Annual General Meeting announcing the meeting time and the possibility of academic accommodations. The little notice between the email and the meeting made it virtually impossible to arrange academic accommodations to attend the meeting, resulting in a lower student turnout than otherwise possible. Further, concern was raised that Vancouver and Surrey students were

disproportionately unable to vote due to the necessity to transit in order to participate in the meeting and express their opinions

- A director expressed that the membership received an email a month prior to the meeting
- A director—who was also a student in a Surrey-based program— expressed that they had been in contact with all Department Student Unions based on the Surrey campus, as well as all Deans of the academic units. It was raised that the reason that voting was unavailable on the satellite campuses due to the \$40,000 bill that would have to be paid in student dollars in order to extend voting. The Board has sent numerous emails and contacted numerous groups throughout the Surrey campus regarding the project and its importance. They further expressed that Build SFU would the space for the work of artists—many of whom were registered in the Faculty of Communications, Art, and Technology programs based out of Surrey and Vancouver campuses—to be showcased beyond the niche artistic communities within their respective academic departments, through the various rehearsal, performance, recording rooms, and screens within the building.
- A fifth year student expressed that the assembly should consider the needs of the first year students who would be impacted by the project and who didn't get a chance to have their voice heard in any other venue, especially when the meeting was earlier in the year compared to previous years.

Question was raised around the issue of academic accommodation, as the original email sent by the Vice President Student Services a month ago did not include any information on the possibility for academic accommodation. The Vice President University Relations replied that the matter was approved at Senate the week prior, and that the email was only to serve as a reminder of the option above and beyond the social media and website announcements.

A first year student asked where information on the project was available. The Vice President University Relations expressed that the Build SFU Think Tank on the 2000 level of the Maggie Benston Centre was a physical space that houses floor plan and the project staff who could answer any questions about the project. Buildsfu.ca also provides an online portal for all information regarding the project

- A volunteer of the SFSS expressed that the Build Project was an opportunity for the students of SFU, regardless of their backgrounds, to leave a legacy for decades of students, and an opportunity to build upon the contributions of decades of students prior.
- A department student union executive based out of Surrey expressed that the separation of the Stadium and Student Union Building votes was insufficient, as students in Surrey programs would be contributing substantial amounts of money towards a project they may never use. The student implored the assembly to consider that members of the other campuses were not being adequately represented at the meeting, and that the university had three campuses. It was expressed that in a federal election, the requirement for voters to transit out to another city in order to cast their votes would also be considered infeasible.

- A student expressed that they understood the concerns around the meeting being ‘engineered’ to pass the Build SFU project. However, they expressed that in their six years at SFU, they didn’t care, regardless of whether a vote was in a general meeting or online with all information available. As such, they questioned the assertion of the meeting being engineered to pass the vote, and instead believed that the AGM was selected in order to provide more clarity. Further, they expressed that Build SFU was instrumental in building a supportive community particularly for students with depression, who could benefit greatly from a tightknit community which the Student Union Building would help support.
- A member expressed that they would not be voting in favour due to the undemocratic nature of the process, as a small number of students present at the Annual General Meeting would be deciding on the fate of the greater student body, particularly when the vote could have been pursued online through referenda. Further, they felt that money should be spent on initiatives that benefit students on all campuses.
- A member rejected the characterization of the votes at the 2015 Special General Meeting as a ‘no vote’ against the project, as a 66% vote in favour in any other venue—barring the requirements of the BC Society Act—would be considered a supermajority, and in politics a 66% vote would be a ‘yes vote’. Further, clubs and student unions at the university have a desperate need for space and tangible solutions to these issues—this was particularly true for the Student Rotunda groups [*MT Note: student organizations based out of the Transportation Centre building*] who would no longer have a home beyond 2017 when SFU retook the space. Proposals for new student spaces such as a sexual assault support centre also required space which Build SFU was in a position to address. Concerns around deferred maintenance are immaterial to the debate, as these were new buildings being constructed as opposed to old buildings that had to be repaired.

A question on support for students in financial need was ruled out of order and was recommended to be asked during the Open Session agenda item.

A question from the floor pertained to the continued interest of potential lenders for the project. The Vice President University Relations expressed that the preferred lender for the Student Union Building continue to be Scotiabank, and that they were very interested in the outcome of the vote.

- A student expressed that the project was outside of the student zone of affordability, particularly for students who work and pay for their own way through school. The levy costs would force students to begin taking out loans, and bursaries were an insufficient solution as many students in need do not receive them despite applying repeatedly. Further, the student expressed that deferred maintenance was an issue with some relation to the project, as SFU would be responsible for maintaining the new stadium, and the \$25 million contribution by SFU to the project would also likely be sourced from maintenance funds.

- A Surrey-based member stated that they would be speaking for themselves rather than have other members ostensibly speaking on behalf of the Surrey campus. They expressed that they applied to study at SFU, as opposed to any particular campus, and that all members belonging to various groups were still SFU students at the end of the day. Community could not be built by drawing artificial lines across the student population. The assembly was reminded that Burnaby students helped build the Surrey campus, and that students 'belonging' to certain campuses also study on the other campuses. Further, the Student Union Building was a vision and a dedicated space for student life, similar to how the library was a dedicated place for studying.
- A member involved with the No to Build SFU campaign implored the assembly to consider that the debenture for the Student Union Building would be paid for through student loans, as many students would not be able to afford groceries otherwise with the additional costs. A \$90 levy was the equivalent to two weeks worth of food for some students on campus, many of whom were already having to access the SFSS Food Bank Program. Additionally, they expressed confusion around the assertions of there being difficulty in finding community, as all of those supporting the project have clearly found their community on campus. As such, the assembly was implored to vote in consideration of the students after them.
- The Vice President Student Services expressed that they along with the team of staff and volunteers did their best to plan out the Annual General Meeting, and apologized for the lack of online presence for the AGM.  
They expressed that when they began at SFU, they began with the university having a reputation for causing depression in students, as well as having the highest suicide rate of any university in Canada, both of which had a substantial negative impact for students beginning their university careers. The Student Union Building would serve to address these reputational issues, as well as providing for a well-rounded university education through non-academic pursuits. The project has been further improved by the concerns that have been raised by the No side, and the hope was that these concerns would continue to guide improvements to the project rather than ending all progress. A Student Union Building has been under discussion since 1966, as mentioned in a copy of *The Tartan*, and yet no progress has been made until now. As such, the project had accepted a historic mandate and one voted in by students to approve the Build SFU levy in the first place. While the Student Union Building wouldn't address all problems at SFU, no progress would be made if the student body waited on a theoretically perfect solution.

A question arose regarding the privacy of voting and whether there would be ballot boxes. It was replied that voting would occur through of hands holding the voting card provided to all members when they entered the space.

- A member expressed concern around the undemocratic nature of the vote, as only 1% of the student body was currently in the room and was therefore in no way a supermajority. It was



necessary for the entire student body across all campuses to determine whether they wished for the project to continue.

- A director expressed that they would be graduating from SFU soon, but the Build SFU project afforded them with an opportunity to take part in the creation of a building for the benefit of new students into the future. The project would lead to improvements for SFU as a whole and would support new students entering the institution, and therefore was worth supporting.
- A member expressed that the legacy being left behind for students was \$65 million in debt. The assembly was mainly made up on Burnaby based students even though students across all campus would be paying equally for the building. Solutions were requested to ensure that students based on other campuses do not pay the same amount as Burnaby based students, such as the levy being assigned based upon course load on the Burnaby campus. Surrey and Vancouver students were not going to be able to use the building and therefore should not pay for it.
- A member recognized that everyone present was seeking to create the best possible university, whether that was through voting yes or no for the project. They indicated that they would be voting yes because they believed that this was the best for the community. As a student with a disability, the member has approached the SFSS Board of Directors frequently with concerns regarding the accessibility of the student society and the university at large. They expressed respect for the work of the Vice President Student Services and the Vice President University Relations for doing their best to improve the accessibility of the meeting after continuous discussions over months with the member. The member considered Build SFU a small investment with major returns towards building a community environment that currently only existed in small pockets amongst small populations of the campus. The current SFU situation was not good, and provincial funding was desperately needed, but the student union building was necessary. They reminded the assembly that components of the project such as the nap room were driven entirely via student input, and the Build SFU staff facilitated the student will in the process

A member attempted to call the question at the center microphone, but was informed that they could only do so through one of the debate microphones.

- A member expressed that they were disappointed, as they attended the meeting to vote in favour of the project, but could not do so as a result of the voting system being used at the Annual General Meeting. They had been listening to and agreed with the benefits of the project in building community, which was counter to the way that the voting was being done. Human beings were social creatures who worry about belonging. As the voting was by hand and therefore public, anyone who voted no would clearly be identified as being in the minority, and there would therefore be a fear of voting as they would like. The member would be voting in opposition to the project as a result of these democratic deficiencies.

- A member involved in a music club in SFU expressed their frustration with the constant issues of space bookings on campus, arising from class bookings and other space conflicts. The Student Union Building would provide space for clubs to enjoy music or any other activity they wished. They questioned why other music clubs would vote against a project addressing space for music clubs. The building would address the interests of the student body.

**QUESTION WAS CALLED**

Masmoudi

*During the tabulation of the results, the assembly moved onto the next special resolution.*

**b. Approval of a Debenture in Respect of the Construction of a New Stadium**  
**MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:06**

Sharma

- A. *Whereas* the Simon Fraser Student Society (the “**Society**”) and Simon Fraser University (“**SFU**”) have agreed to enter into a project for the construction of a new stadium on SFU’s Burnaby campus (the “**Stadium Project**”).
- 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 Stadium Project and the related project for the construction of a new student union building on SFU’s Burnaby campus (the “**SUB Project**”).
- C. *Whereas* the Society will need to borrow money from third parties to fund the development of the Stadium 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 bylaws (the “**Bylaws**”) 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 Stadium Project that the Members exercise the authority conferred upon them under the *Society Act* (B.C.) and the Bylaws by giving the Directors the authority to borrow such amounts as may be

required in order to pursue the Stadium 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 Stadium Project, on such terms as the Directors may from time to time approve. For greater certainty, this authorization extends only to the Stadium Project and excludes the SUB Project.
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 done for the purposes of the Stadium Project 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.

The following is a summary of the debate which ensued over the motion:

- A member would be voting in favour of both the Student Union Building and Stadium. Student athletes form part of the membership, and the stadium supports their endeavours as well as those of the membership at large such as through Relay For Life and music festivals. Further, this would compliment the Student Union Building in having an outdoor space for student activities, and would enable SFU to stop being one of the few universities without a stadium. The building would be student owned as opposed to SFU owned.
- A member expressed that the stadium would be university infrastructure and therefore the students have no business funding it and the Simon Fraser Student Society has no business attempting to make the student body fund it. It was deemed fallacious to follow the thinking that anything that benefitted the student body should be funded by the students. Improvements to buildings or the addition of more floors to campus buildings would also benefit the student body but should be funded by the university as opposed to the students.
- In 2011-2012, SFU began competing in Division II of the NCAA, but the university lacks the infrastructure for all teams to play on their own campus. For example, the SFU football team has to play at Swanguard Stadium due to the lack of stadium space on the university grounds.

The stadium would provide an opportunity for students to engage with athletics on campus, would build up pride in the athletes to succeed, and would provide a venue for great community building events on campus. The hope was that the Student Union Building and Stadium together would allow the member to realise of the dream of students struggling with the idea of leaving school rather than going to campus.

Confirmation was requested on the operational process. The Vice President University Relations confirmed that the stadium would be paid for by student dollars through the Build SFU levy. After construction, SFU would cover the costs of operations and maintenance, and therefore students would not have to pay for these costs.

- A member recognized the benefits of the project to social life on campus, but expressed that many of the members choosing to vote no were considering the needs of the Surrey and Vancouver campuses, as well as raising concerns with the voting process. As such, the project was sound but should go through in a proper manner. The assembly was reminded that the original vote for the Build SFU project was at 52% through an online referendum. Additionally, it was raised that the current and previous Board of Directors Surrey campus liaisons have never attended a meeting of the Mechatronics System Engineering Student Society [MSESS], and yet Surrey students were expected to attend the AGM in Burnaby.
- It was raised that the responsibility of the Faculty Representatives to attend the meetings of their Surrey-based student unions, as opposed to the Surrey Liaison. Further, it was expressed that MSESS and IATSU (Interactive Art and Technology Student Union) students have never attended a meeting of the Surrey Campus Committee, for which the Liaison was responsible.
- A member expressed that there has been substantial growth and change at SFU over the last number of years, but this could be enhanced. The establishment of a Student Union Building, a Stadium, and large scale concerts would contribute to a legacy and an amazing opportunity for growth.

A question was raised around the attendance numbers at SFU Athletics games, and the reasoning behind the numbers. The Vice President Student Services indicated that anecdotally games in West Gym reach 400 to 600, and approximately 600 for football games. A major issue with attendance for teams has been getting students to attend games which were off campus. The principle as such was that bringing the team closer to campus would improve attendance.

- A member expressed admiration for the endeavours of the SFU athletes, and would support the athletics on an individual basis, they expressed that it was misleading to characterize the stadium as a piece that would build community. While the Student Union Building was open to all students, the stadium was for athletics. The member clarified that the 'stadium' label was also misleading as the students were paying millions simply to fund seating with partial coverage from the rain, which would end up being a university structure. Additional concern

was expressed around the potential for SFU to begin mirroring American universities in developing large funding pools for athletes at the expense of other communities and academics.

A member asked if a physical model of the stadium had been created, similar to the one created for the Student Union Building. The Vice President University Relations expressed that the seating was fairly simple and therefore a physical model had not been made. Images were available on the Build SFU website with renderings of the seating.

Another question arose of whether there would be a possibility of a Spring semester vote if the project debenture question did not pass. It was expressed that the Board of Directors has made it clear that it would not pursue any the projects any further if their respective special resolutions failed.

- A member expressed that they would be voting in favour of the Stadium in recognition of the different interests across the SFU community. Members were reminded that sporting events were social settings where groups can meet and socialize all while supporting their sports teams. This would serve to foster the diverse yet cohesive community that would be valuable to SFU. Rather than treating different groups on campus as fractures, they should be seen as diverse and supported.

Question was raised of whether the stadium would be covered, as this was not shown in the renderings. It was expressed that the stadium would be partially covered, similar to Percy Perry Stadium in Coquitlam.

Another question arose around whether the Student Society would receive any revenue from the stadium. The Vice President University Relations expressed that any revenue from the stadium would go towards SFU's portion of the stadium operational costs. The SFU AVP Students has confirmed that any profits exceeding the amount needed for maintenance and operations would be returned to the SFSS.

A member attempted to speak a second time prior to all speakers having had an opportunity to address the motion a first time. The chair indicated that they would be allowed to speak to the motion a second time once all other speakers have had the opportunity to speak.

#### **QUESTION WAS CALLED**

Masmoudi

During the tabulation of the results, the assembly moved onto the next special resolution.

#### **c. Simon Fraser Student Society Bylaw Creation** **MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:07**

Farah

*Be it resolved* by special resolution that the following bylaw 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.*

- The matter was brought forward as a procedural point, ensuring that the Society would never be placed into a financial situation where the debt could not be paid. The Board of Directors would continue to be seeking ways to reduce the Build SFU levy as a whole such that it would not be necessary to reach \$90 per semester.

In response to a question, it was clarified that the resolution would apply to all levies and loans that the Student Society engages in moving forward, including the Build SFU debenture questions.

- A member expressed that they were always taught to pay back their loans.
- Another member expressed that the student body should be fiscally responsible, and that the SFSS hosts many important services and could not afford to be bankrupt.

Question was raised—given the proposed changes to the BC Society Act—on whether the Society would have to seek approval from the membership in this manner moving into the future. It was expressed that the new version of the Society Act was not yet active and therefore the SFSS must operate under current legislation.

#### **d. Results of Special Resolutions**

##### **AGENDA ITEM 7A—APPROVAL OF A DEBENTURE IN RESPECT OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW STUDENT UNION BUILDING—MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:05**

472 votes cast, 405 in favour, 67 in opposition, 86% approval

##### **SPECIAL RESOLUTION CARRIED**

##### **AGENDA ITEM 7B— APPROVAL OF A DEBENTURE IN RESPECT OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW STADIUM—MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:06**

428 votes cast, 347 in favour, 81 in opposition, 81% approval

##### **SPECIAL RESOLUTION CARRIED**

##### **AGENDA ITEM 7C— SIMON FRASER STUDENT SOCIETY BYLAW CREATION—MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:07**

428 votes cast, 97% in favour

##### **SPECIAL RESOLUTION CARRIED**

*Members of the assembly began to exit the room during this time.*

## **8. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE VICE PRESIDENT FINANCE**

The Simon Fraser Student Society Vice President Finance provided an overview of the Student Society's finances from October 2014 through September 2015.

The SFSS is responsible for preparing financial statements, which are then provided to the accounting firm which performs an audit. The results of the audit are then provided to the SFSS Board of Directors. The Board of Directors on 2015-08-14 approved the audited documents presented to the membership. The Vice President Finance highlighted that, as per the motion passed by referendum in the previous fiscal year, a portion of the Space Expansion Fund was reallocated to the General Fund (\$5 per full time student, \$2.50 per part time student). The Food Bank Program levy also began at the time at \$0.25 per full time student.

A policy change was also implemented for the stability of the Student Society, where 5% of revenue collected each year is placed in reserve until such time that three months of gross operating expenditures are collected in the fund.

The Vice President Finance expressed that they were looking forward to the collaborative budgeting process that would begin in the Spring semester.

## **9. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE AUDITOR**

Gary Wozny of the Simon Fraser Student Society's auditor, Tompkins, Wozny, Miller & Co., provided an overview of the Student Society's audited financial statements. The statement of financial position was presented to the assembly. They expressed that the report was unqualified/clear, thus indicating that the statements presented fairly the financial position of the Society in all material respects in accordance to Accounting Standards for Non-Profit Organizations.

## **10. APPOINTMENT OF THE AUDITOR**

The auditor responsible for the coming year's audited financial statements will be appointed.

The Board of Directors recommends the re-appointment of Tompkins, Wozny, Miller & Co.

## **MOTION AGM 2015-09-22:08**

Szymczyk

*Be it resolved that* Tompkins, Wozny, Miller & Co. be appointed as Simon Fraser Student Society Auditor for the 2015—2016 year.

A request for Proposal was completed in the previous fiscal year, and the recommendation of the Simon Fraser Student Society Finance Office was to continue with this firm.

**CARRIED**

## **11. OPEN SPACE**

The Chair of the assembly thanked the assembly for the opportunity to chair the meeting, and expressed appreciation for the passion and enthusiasm of the membership in engaging with the three special resolutions.

The Chair duty was passed onto the Vice President Student Services, who explained that the Open Space was integrated into the agenda to allow for the membership to raise questions and concerns directly to

the Board in a minuted setting, and have them addressed immediately by members of the Board of Directors.

A question arose of where members could find information on the next steps for the Build SFU project. It was expressed that the next step would be for the SFSS to go to tender. The SFSS has already contracted Perkins and Will as its architect, who would assist in the tender process. The current estimated timeline for the project is the completion of construction in twenty months, however construction projects of this magnitude could incur delays. The next phase of the project would be on the Build SFU website and would be available through the Build SFU Think Tank or via email to the Board of Directors.

A member raised that projects sometimes go over budget, such as in the case of the UBC AMS Student Union Building. Contracts can be negotiated where contractors are penalized for failing to deliver on time, as in the case of the new Emily Carr campus. Question was raised on whether that could be prioritized when going to tender.

The Build SFU General Manager indicated that most if not all contracts would be fixed price, as this was a requirement of many of the lenders the SFSS was in discussion with. Information on which projects were under fixed price contracts would be available in the future. The Build SFU department would continue to oversee changes to the project to keep the project within the set budget.

A member expressed that there was still a very major separation between cultures in the school, and that this chasm has been evident within the meeting. Question arose around what would be done upon completion of the building to enhance community on campus.

The President replied that the current Board of Directors was prioritizing engagement on all three campuses. The President had found that there were a large number of micro communities on campus but there were no opportunities at the time to connect them together. As such, the Board had run and would continue to plan various events to connect and enable collaborations between clubs and student unions. The Vice President University Relations and the Communications, Art, and Technology Representative have secured office space on the Vancouver campus for a consistent presence on the campus, and a Surrey student space expansion program was currently underway. As student issues were endless, the SFSS could only tackle them one at a time, and the approval of the Build SFU project would alleviate a number of issues that would free the SFSS to address the next issue together with elected student leaders. The Board and management recognized the need to connect all campuses, and to create a strategic plan that encompassed the needs of all students.

The new Executive Director has already provided for a number of changes. A consistent five year vision was being put forward, which establish benchmark priorities enabling the development of long term solutions while still having the flexibility to address issues as they arose.

A member asked whether the Student Society would be able to negotiate to reacquire the offices spaces in the Maggie Benston Centre if space needs in the future exceed the available space within the Student Union Building. It was expressed that the surrender of space signed by the Board in the previous year was final. While the SFSS could negotiate with the university in the future, SFU was interested in expanding its spaces on the Burnaby campus, and similar to the impending loss of the Rotunda space, it would be unlikely that the university would come to an agreement to relinquish the space again.



A student requested that the Board provide the assembly with some initial solutions being considered to lower the impact of a \$90 levy.

The President expressed that the Board wished to financial burden on students and was committed to examining changes to the levy. Firstly, issues arose around the mechanism for determining which students were based on which campus. The Board was working with the SFU Registrars to determine a fair mechanism for applying the levy. Secondly, as the debenture was now signed and project architectural drawings available, the Board was now in a position where it could seek out sponsorship for the project. Coinciding with the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the university, the Board has been in discussions with the Mayor of Burnaby, SFU alumni, and other organizations who have been supportive of the project and may be able to potentially assist in lowering the cost of the project to students.

The Vice President University Relations reiterated that the Board has already doubled the Build SFU bursary contribution for the Fall semester. 3% of the levy collected from the student body was originally set aside for the bursary, such that any student eligible for bursaries under SFU's financial aid and awards system (which was a fairly rigid system which the Board would be reexamining) would have up to the full amount of their Build SFU levy contribution refunded to them along with their other bursaries. In August, the Board of Directors doubled this amount to 6%. In response to concerns raised earlier by members of the assembly, during the Summer 2015 semester 555 students were eligible to receive bursaries under SFU's criteria and all of them received 100% of their levy contribution. They expressed confidence that the increase to the bursary contributions would ensure that all students demonstrating financial need under SFU's criteria would receive their full contribution moving forward. The SFSS was also examining opportunities to grant a bursary in-house for part time students who currently do not meet SFU criteria.

The assembly was reminded that the Simon Fraser Student Society was based out of the Maggie Benston Centre, and that the current Board of Directors was in their positions until 2015-04-30. Students were invited to visit the Board office at any time with questions and concerns.

*The meeting continued with a raffle draw.*

The Chair thanked the assembly for their participation and thanked the organizing staff and board members for the quality of meeting organization.

## **12. MEETING ADJOURNMENT 5:22pm**

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