

Call to Order – 2:37 pm January 28, 2015 | Forum Chambers

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.

1. Appointment of the Chair

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:01

Bueckert

Be it resolved to appoint Shirin Escarcha – Communications, Art, and Technology Representative as chair of BOD 2015-01-28

CARRIED

2. Roll Call of Attendance

Board of Directors

President..... Chardaye Bueckert
Vice President External Relations Darwin Binesh
Vice President Finance..... Adam Potvin
Vice President Student Life Kayode Fatoba
Vice President Student Services Zied Masmoudi
Vice President University Relations..... Moe Kopahi
At-Large Representative Rebecca Langmead
At-Large Representative Jeremy Pearce
Faculty Representative (Arts & Social Sciences)..... Brady Wallace
Faculty Representative (Business) Shadnam Khan
Faculty Representative (Communication, Art & Technology)..... Shirin Escarcha
Faculty Representative (Education) Katie Bell
Faculty Representative (Environment)..... Tesicca Truong
Faculty Representative (Health Sciences)..... Ayla Kooner
Faculty Representative (Sciences) Deepak Sharma

Society Staff

Build SFU General Manager..... Marc Fontaine
Executive Director..... Colleen Knox (*late*)
Staff Representative.....
Campaigns, Research, and Policy Coordinator Pierre Cassidy
Minute Taker Dion Chong

Guests

Chief Electoral Officer..... Oscar Lira
Member..... Amir Ali
Member..... Alex Betsos
Member..... Colin Woodbury
CSSS Corbett Gildersleve
Graduate Family Housing..... Samit Bains
HSU Kaitlyn MacInnis
Member..... Lia Fallah
Member..... Kevin Kumar

Regrets

Faculty Representative (Applied Sciences)Ben Rogers (*academic*)

3. Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:02

Bell/Amended Langmead/Sharma/Bueckert/Langmead

Be it resolved to adopt the agenda as presented.

The following items were struck from the agenda: all reports, new business (Board set time, IEC, auditing, office supplies, speakerphone, concert, staff)

The following items were added: New Business (election timelines), Discussion (Build SFU/SGM Debrief)

CARRIED AS AMENDED

4. Ratification of Regrets

Applied Sciences Representative has indicated that they had an academic conflict for the semester. The motion would only approve regrets for the current meeting.

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:03

Truong

Be it resolved to ratify regrets from:

Faculty Representative (Applied Sciences)Ben Rogers (*academic*)

CARRIED

5. Matters Arising from the Minutes

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:04

Kopahi

Be it resolved to receive and file the following minutes omnibus:

BOD – 2015-01-07, 2015-01-14

FASC – 2015-01-15

GC – 2015-01-07, 2015-01-14

CARRIED

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:05

Kopahi

Be it resolved that "VP Finance" replace "Director" in the Dec. 10 BOD meeting minutes concerning the Offer to Lease Agreement discussion.

Be it further resolved that the VP Finance's opposing vote to the Offer to Lease Agreement be recorded in the Dec. 10 BOD minutes.

The Vice President Finance took issue with their comments within the discussion in question not being directly attributed to their position.

The assembly saw the matter as one which could be delayed. There were further questions of whether the matter was in order.

POSTPONED TO BOD 2015-02-04

Bueckert

6. Appointments/Resignations

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:06

Truong

Be it resolved to appoint the following members to the respective SFSS

Committees:

Commercial Services Committee – Elaine Zhang

Events and Promotions Committee – Anson Wong

Members had yet to be contacted to ensure they can make the committee meeting time.

CARRIED

7. New Business

a. Policy Suspension – R-12.1

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:07

Wallace/Amended Bueckert

Whereas the CEO 2014-2015 stepped down midterm;

Whereas the CEO 2015-2016 was hired late as a result;

Be it resolved to suspend R-12.1 Elections Timeline until 2015-04-01 to account for late CEO hiring

The differences was minimal and would allows the election process to continue smoothly and in a timely manner. The Board of Directors was reminded that the Chief Electoral Officer was hired 1.5 months late.

Voting period for the upcoming 2015 General Elections was projected by the CEO to be March 24-26, which was the last full week before the easter weekend.

Board was reminded that policy suspensions required a sunset clause and a purpose within the motion.

QUESTION WAS CALLED

Kopahi

CARRIED AS AMENDED

b. ADV – Lower Mainland Transit Referendum Position

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:08

Langmead

Whereas ADV 2015-01-15 recommends the following;

Be it resolved that the SFSS officially adopt a position of support for the "yes" vote in the Lower Mainland Transit Referendum.

A provincial refernedum, projected to occur between March and May, was being put forward to consider funding for Translink. This would implement a 0.5% increase to sales tax to fund a 10

year transportation plan developed and approved by the Mayors Council. This plan would have numerous benefits to the SFU population, including:

- Light Rail service in Surrey
- Increased Skytrain frequency
- True express buses between Burnaby and Vancouver campus
- Express buses between Langley and Surrey Campus
- 30% improved bus service

It was notable that the plan did not include the Burnaby Mountain gondola project. This was the only funding mechanism for transit. In anticipation of the referendum, collaborations had already been approved with the Graduate Student Society and Sustainable SFU.

The Board has been engaged in providing service to the satellite campuses, and a yes position would support the membership based on those campuses.

While the matter had not been officially brought to Council, it was expected that the matter would be reported to Council via committee reports by the Councillors currently sitting on the Advocacy Committee.

CARRIED

**c. ADV – Better Transit and Transportation Coalition Pledge
MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:09**

Kopahi

Whereas ADV 2015-01-15 recommends the following;

Be it resolved that the SFSS endorse the Better Transit and Transportation Coalition pledge.

The Coalition was made up of several municipalities (including the cities of Surrey and Vancouver), UBC AMS, CUPE, United Autoworkers Union, amongst other organizations, effectively forming the yes side of the referendum.

The Coalition has multiple ways to participate. Formally joining an organization would require the Society to pursue a referendum question as per its bylaws. Rather, an opportunity existed for the Society to endorse the coalition and collaborate on an ad hoc basis. This was particularly important as the Coalition had directly reached out to the SFSS with an interest in mobilizing the 20,000 possible voters on all campuses who could benefit from the enhanced transit services.

CARRIED

**d. ADV – FrontRunner Letter of Support
MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:10**

Kopahi/Amended Langmead

Whereas self-identified women hold less than 50% of elected seats at all levels of government municipally as reported by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, provincially and federally as reported by the Library of Parliament (Julie Cool, 2010, “Women in Parliament”);

Whereas self-identified women make up 54% of the SFU undergraduate student body yet only constitute 37.5% and 16.7% of the current SFSS Board of Directors and Executive Committee, respectively;

Whereas self-identified women have been consistently underrepresented on the SFSS Board of Directors and Executive Committee relative to their proportion of the student body over the last 4 years;

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

Whereas ADV 2015-01-15 recommends the following;

Be it resolved that the Simon Fraser Student Society Board of Directors write an official letter of support for the FrontRunner women's student government campaign school, written by the Vice President External Relations and signed by the President and the Vice President External Relations.

Action Item: Vice President External Relations would write the letter.

It was expressed that the only currently serving female student union president in the province should co-sign the letter.

Advertising on social media was already approved and conducted

MOTION AMENDED

The organizers of the initiative asked to support legitimacy through such a letter. They are a nonpartisan organization. This would support potential funding opportunities.

CARRIED

e. FASC – Increase – Council Stipends

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:11

Wallace

Whereas FASC 2015-01-15 recommends the following;

Be it resolved to increase 832/20 Council Stipend by \$5075 from the unrestricted surplus to account for four additional Council meetings.

The increase in question was announced to be the final Council stipend increase needed for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The Vice President Finance indicated that they would approach CPR in the future with a policy proposal to limit the number of Council meetings that can be called.

CARRIED

f. FASC – Increase – Management Consultant

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:12

Kopahi

Whereas FASC 2015-01-22 recommends the following;

Be it resolved to increase 689/20 Management Consultant by \$45,000 from the unrestricted surplus due to 2 HR incident which required the need for an external consultant.

Staff Liaison Officer – employer has certain obligations under Collective Agreements and legislation. Human Resources management required expenses that could not be disclosed. Amendments made to clarify the language and the timeline of the HR incidents.

CARRIED

g. ADV – Sex Week 2015 Contracts

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:13

Kopahi/Amended Langmead

Be it resolved to task Vice President University Relations Moe Kopahi and President Chardaye Bueckert to sign contracts for speakers for the Sex Week initiative.

Sex Week has been organized. The BOD simply needs to approve two signing officers to sign two invoices.

The BOD has already accorded the committee the authority to expend funds.

CARRIED

8. Discussion

a. Build SFU/Special General Meeting Debrief

At Large Representative Rebecca Langmead: Prior to the beginning of the term for the current Board of Directors, directors set out the top three objectives for the year, with two of them relating to Build SFU and the general meeting necessary to approve the debenture question, bylaw addition, and any other items of interest to the Board to be held January or February. On 2015-01-02, which was 2 weeks prior to the SGM, the Board of Directors held a meeting. During the reports portion, only 4 of the 15 board members present spoke of the Special General Meeting as a priority, and only 4 indicated that they had conducted outreach. In a review of the timesheets, Langmead noticed that FARM and EXEC only mentioned the SGM a total of 13 times on their timesheets, while Langmead had over 20 mentions on their timesheet alone. As of 2015-01-28, a number of directors were identified as having failed to fully complete their timesheets, including the Vice President External Relations, Communications, Art, and Technology Representative, Health Sciences Representative, and Vice President Student Life. Directors recognized that not all BOD members were mandated to conduct SGM outreach as a result of other projects relating to the SGM, including meeting planning and work on financial transparency.

There was a sentiment that the Board of Directors had become the unofficial yes campaign for the SGM and the Build SFU Department. A question was raised to the Executive Officers of whether they agreed that the Board of Directors should be in support of a project of the Board created by the SFSS. All Executive Officers expressed that they were in agreement, although the Vice President Finance indicated that they were only in support insofar as to ensure project transparency.

There was a desire to know the intention of the question and why it wasn't brought up at the Executive Committee meeting. Langmead indicated that they held back from asking the question given the sentiment of the Executive Committee to have a discussion on the SGM on the Board of Directors meeting agenda.

Question was raised on the rationale behind preventing the Build SFU General Manager and Executive Officers from speaking at the SGM, as a number of misconceptions held by the membership could have been resolved. Executive officers indicated that they were not barred from speaking to any motion, and in fact many did attempt to speak but were prevented from doing so as a result of the membership choosing to call the question. This included answering questions on how the Society did its utmost to lower the barrier for participation for members based on other campuses. Further, the President was chairing the meeting and therefore could not speak to any motions. Finally, the majority of Faculty and At Large Members acted as vote scrutineers and therefore could not speak. It was indicated that setting an arbitrary distinction between EXEC and FARM was dangerous.

Additional concerns were raised, including the false nature of a number of points brought up by members, the failure to adequately explain the implications of calling a questions, and the lack of an external chair.

Question was raised around the confusion amongst the Board in relation to the opportunity to present the question via referenda. A number of Directors were under the impression that AGM/SGM were the only possible options for passing special resolutions, while others indicated that they understood that referenda was a possibility for passing special resolutions.

In speaking to students, CRP Coordinator was under the impression that an SGM was the only possible venue for a debenture question via their interpretation of the BC Society Act. When informed that legal counsel provided a different interpretation, they informed the President that they should follow interpretation of legal counsel. It was expressed that legal counsel opinion shed new light on the conversation, but until provided with such an opinion the BOD had no reason to believe that their interpretation was incomplete.

Woodbury left at 3:25

A director was confused by how such misinformation occurred despite having a department dedicated to the project, alongside the 16 board members and the remainder of the Society staff. The General Manager expressed surprise that the Board had been confused on this matter, as there was an understanding from the General Manager's side that all options had been provided to the Board, weighed, and the general meeting having been considered the most logical option and thus supported by the Board. An in person meeting allows for informed discussion and informed voting, as well as opportunities for dialogue and answers to queries immediately before voting, none of which are possible in referenda. The General Manager did not believe that they ever stated that a general meeting was the only option and they apologized for any inferences resulting from their information. They also indicated that the question was never asked of them. During the Board's priority setting session, the AGM/SGM were always identified as primary goals and priorities.

The President up until a week prior to the meeting shared the understanding that the SGM was one of many options. At the Senate meeting approving academic amnesty, a senator incorrectly stated that the SGM was the only option for passing the special resolution. In order to clarify, they approached legal counsel which provided the interpretation that referenda was an option. Further, the Board was reminded that the Society Act and Bylaws are not private documents and the section relating to special resolutions was very vague – it is complicated legislation that can be taken in a multiple ways. The Society bylaws does not explicitly indicate that debenture questions can be approved by referenda, while the Society Act expresses that Special Resolutions can only be approved via a quorate general meeting UNLESS an alternative

mechanism for voting had been adopted by the organization. It is not deemed appropriate to admonish staff or board members in this manner at a meeting.

The President formally apologized for any misinformation and indicated that they provided an answer to the best of their abilities without any ill intent.

At-Large Representative wished to ensure that all members were aware that the Board of Directors had done its due diligence to maintain transparency and did not seek to deceive the membership in any way. The Board was reminded to reflect on their own mistakes in the process and to move on.

A director indicated that the issue they perceived was that the Board was not adequately well versed in information. This point was contested, as the Society Act and Bylaws were public documents that were online. A member found the line of comments offensive, given transparency in project finances and outreach materials.

A director drew a distinction between trying to be transparent as opposed to simply being transparent, and that the Society failed to be the latter given the failure to provide referenda as an option to the membership.

Kumar left at 3:39pm

On the larger question on transparency and legitimacy, the BOD was reminded that holding a SGM to address the issues of students being unable to access the AGM space was a positive development, and a reflection of the Board's conviction to continue to work for the membership. It would be necessary for the Board to continue to mirror this conviction in its actions moving forward.

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:14

Langmead

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

CARRIED

MOTION BOD 2015-01-28:15

Bueckert

Be it resolved to move the meeting ex camera

CARRIED

The Board was interested in hearing the opinion of the guests present at the meeting.

A member indicated that the motivation to develop the No to Build SFU campaign was sourced from the myriad of issues they perceived from the AGM, beyond those already addressed by the Board. A statement had been released on the website to hint at the direction of the No campaign. They would be hosting large forums on all three campuses to determine the continued work of the campaign, which the Board was invited to be present at and participate in. The primary issues identified by the campaign were that of biased language and outreach (students being blatantly misinformed by street team members), uneven outreach (minutes indicated that athletes were targeted for attendance as they would vote, while professors

weren't provided the same quality of outreach). No side voters had different motivations for voting no – some only opposed the stadium portion of the project, other saw the stadium of the least expensive portion of the project and therefore more realistic to fund. Some disliked how the project has been carried out, others have wanted to move student money towards issues including deferred maintenance. Members had multiple meetings within their constituency groups on the matter and had varied reasoning for opposing or supporting the project, with significant concern relating to the impact on satellite campuses. While they recognized the logic of having the general meeting at the Burnaby campus given the student population present and its centrality between the campuses, there was concern that this creates divides and adversarial relationships between the campus communities.

A director identified the crux of the issue being that of a disconnect between the Board and the membership in the messaging that was being delivered. The No side was vehemently opposed to biased messaging in its impact on transparency, while the Board was in favour of biased language to push forward the project. As a percentage of the population did not support the project, the Board was not doing its utmost to represent all sides.

Members recognized the right for individual directors, as members of the student society, to have an opinion on the project, and for the board to take sides on an issue. But an issue arose when undecided members walk into the meeting, providing advertising opportunity for the side in favour of the SUB while not providing the opportunity for the No side to also provide information. This impacted the ability of the membership to make an informed choice on the matter. As a governance body, the SFSS was seen as having a responsibility to provide space for the dialogue, regardless of the organizational stance.

Further, the Stadium has been neglected in the outreach. Purpose of the stadium and the reasoning that it was attached to a Student Union Building project was not fully understood by all members.

The methods of soliciting student feedback was not seen as adequate, particularly since such a campaign had to be created in order for certain students to feel like their voices were heard.

Faculty and At Large Members were tasked to conduct outreach amongst their constituents and friends. While the faculty representatives brought the information back to their faculties, the At-Large Representatives came from an athletic background and were invited to speak to the athletes directly as a result of this connection. Opposition was expressed by At-Large Representative Langmead to the notion that athletes should not have a vote and that the results of any question was invalid as a result of student athlete participation or outreach. The Board was reminded that many of them were elected on small margins, which impacts the direction of the organization regardless. Further, questions and concerns could be raised through a myriad of outlets, including meetings with Directors and through the Build SFU Think Tank.

It was expressed that presentations from both sides of the argument had issues and that there were opportunities to open lines of communication both internally and externally

Action Item: The board would informally appoint a liaison to communicate with the No to Build SFU campaign.

The board will have offline conversations to determine logistics moving forward. There was a desire to have full and frank conversations at meetings, and particularly to acknowledge the voices of members who were putting in the effort to conduct research, attend meetings, voice their opinions, and run campaigns.

9. Attachments

14Dec10-NewsRelease(FINAL)-CoalitionLaunches-SupportsMayorsTransportationPlan.pdf

14Nov28-Coalition-MembershipPledge(finaldraft).pdf

REDACTED - Spring 2015 At-Large Committee Applications - Applicant Information.pdf

10. Adjournment 4:20pm

DC /CUPE 3338

Better Transit + Transportation Coalition

Membership Pledge (final draft)

Dear transit and transportation supporter,

The Better Transit & Transportation Coalition (BTTC) is a new organization comprised of sectors ranging from business, labour and transportation users, to post-secondary students, tourism and environmental organizations.

Our purpose and common interest is to ensure Metro Vancouver region residents vote in favour of a regional public referendum question on the Mayors' Council Regional Transportation Investment Plan and Vision. This referendum will likely occur as a mail-in ballot in late March, 2015.

At the same time, we want to ensure that the revenue recommendation in that ballot is fair and equitable for all sectors, and that the ballot question is easily understood by voters.

It is important to note that the Mayors' Council's proposed revenue source and ballot question will be announced by mid- December, with a provincial cabinet approval expected on December 17, 2014.

The BTTC steering committee is reaching out for support from organizations like yours throughout the Metro Vancouver to apprise you of our progress and ask for your support in one of two ways:

- a) Become a member of BTTC by signing the pledge and endorsing the statement below. As a member, you will not be expected to participate in any formal activities, unless specifically asked.

OR

- b) Sign the pledge as an endorsement of support without formal membership in the coalition.

Thank you. Here is the pledge:

“One of the most important decisions facing Metro Vancouver for the next generation is the 2015 Referendum on transit, transportation, and goods and people movement. A positive outcome is a crucial step to expand transportation options, reduce pollution, improve the health of our communities, strengthen our economy, and help make this region a more affordable place to live.”

On behalf of (your organization): _____
(Check one choice below)

- I endorse this pledge and affirm membership in the Better Transit & Transportation Coalition:

OR

- I endorse this pledge but wish to forego membership in the Better Transit & Transportation Coalition until further notice:

Signature

Name

E-Mail

Date

News Release

For Release: December 10, 2014

New Coalition Forms to Support Better Transit and Transportation Investment

Business, labour, environmental, community and other organizations have formed the Better Transit and Transportation Coalition to support the Mayors' Council regional transportation improvement plan for dramatic transit and transportation improvements.

The new Coalition's founding members include the Vancouver Board of Trade; Unifor, Canada's newest and largest private sector union; Tourism Vancouver; Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association; David Suzuki Foundation; Greater Vancouver Gateway Council; and BC Chamber of Commerce.

"Our coalition is quickly gathering momentum," said Iain Black, CEO of the Vancouver Board of Trade. "We're one proud part of a full range of environmental, labour, transportation, tourism, health and other groups, and together we're focused on fighting congestion through transit and transportation improvements."

Ian Bruce, science and policy manager at the David Suzuki Foundation added, "With a million more people moving to the Lower Mainland, investing in a better transit and transportation network is one of the most crucial decisions the region can make to build healthier communities and improve quality of life. Choosing to invest in the region will mean a better environment with less traffic, cleaner air to breathe, and more transportation and transit options for everyone."

"Whether you ride the bus, SkyTrain, SeaBus, West Coast Express or any combination of those, our riders see the urgent need for better transit service just to deal with existing demand, let alone what happens when Metro Vancouver grows by 1 million more people over 30 years," said Unifor BC Area Director Gavin McGarrigle. Unifor represents over 30,000 members in BC, including 5,000 transit operators, mechanics, SeaBus and maintenance workers in Metro Vancouver in Union locals 111 and 2200.

"The Mayors' Council plan not only quickly improves transit service with 25% more buses, it will give those driving to work or school the option to leave the car at home and take transit, which is better for our environment," McGarrigle said, adding that the BC Federation of Labour, representing over 500,000 unionized workers across the province, unanimously supported a resolution Unifor Local 111 introduced to endorse a Yes in the referendum.

"The real enemy here is traffic congestion," said Elizabeth Model, CEO of the Downtown Surrey Business Improvement Association, also a founding member of the Coalition. "The Mayors transit and transportation plan is designed for future generations, with a clear focus on increased goods movement, and it contains plans for managing congestion more effectively over the next 30 years. It starts with a specific 10-year plan that will begin next year if the public approves it in the regional Referendum."

Better Transit + Transportation Coalition

“This is a significant moment in time where Metro residents and businesses can decide between a strong economy and job creation or more congestion and less service,” said John Winter, CEO of the BC Chamber of Commerce, a founding Coalition member. “The Mayors' plan is a proactive opportunity for Metro businesses and residents to get the region's goods and people moving, which in turn will help keep our economy more competitive internationally by keeping traffic congestion costs and impacts down.”

One of the Coalition's first initiatives has been circulating a Pledge for interested citizen groups and organizations to sign. It states:

“One of the most important decisions facing Metro Vancouver for the next generation is the 2015 Referendum on transit, transportation, and goods and people movement. A positive outcome is a crucial step to expand transportation options, strengthen our economy, reduce pollution, improve the health of our communities, and help make this region a more affordable place to live.”

In addition to the diverse collection of organizations who comprise the Better Transit and Transportation Coalition, other groups - including student and educational organizations, medical health officers and others - have also already signed on to its pledge.

The Mayors' Council will be voting on December 11, on whether or not to proceed with the mail-in ballot question and recommended revenue source.

For more information:

Vancouver Board of Trade - Greg Hoekstra, 604-640-5450

David Suzuki Foundation – Ian Bruce, 604-306-5095

Unifor Local 111 –Gavin McGarrigle, cell 778-668-6455; Bill Tieleman, West Star Communications, cell 778-896-0964 or office 604-844-7827

Downtown Surrey BIA – Elizabeth Model, 604-580-2321

BC Chamber of Commerce – John Winter, 604-376-3577