**VUSAC Meeting Minutes**

October 14, 2016 at 5 PM in the Goldring Student Center

MINUTES

**In Attendance**

**VUSAC**

**Judiciary**

PRESIDENTS: Stuart Norton and Rahul Christoffersen

VP STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS: Hannah Brennen

VP EXTERNAL: Stephen Warner

VP INTERNAL: Golda Greenspoon

**Assessor Members**

CHAIR: Saambavi Mano

CHIEF RETURNING OFFICER: Taylor Cenac

SECRETARY: Artimes Ghahremani

COMMUNICATIONS: Shailee Koranne

FINANCE: Nicole Gumapac

**Commissioners & Councillors**

SCARLET AND GOLD: Zahavah Kay

SUSTAINABILITY : Jamil Fiorino-Habib

COMMUTER: Co-Chair Karen Indraatmadja/ Commissionner Isaac Khouzam

ARTS AND CULTURE : Olivia Klasios

EQUITY : Co-Chair Zoe Kwan / Commissionner Yasmine Hassan

**COUNCILLORS**

Tyler Biswurm

Alexa Breininger

Melinda Hector

Peter Huycke

**LEVIES**

**GUESTS**

Mira El Hussein (UC)

Auni Ahsan

Thomas Lynch

Zayneb Ragheai

Alisha Talpur

Hamboluhle Moyo

**REGRETS**

ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT : Nina Christianson (vote proxied to Zahavah)

Milliene Xu

**ABSENT**

ARTS AND CULTURE : Olivia Klasios

Land Recognition: Yasmine

Motion: Stuart moves to approve the minutes from the last meeting. Zahavah seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:

\*Stuart clarifies that in the last set of minutes, commuter commission members were listed as commissioners, wants to make note of this error.

Motion: Hannah moves to approve the agenda as it stands. Zahavah seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:

*\*UTSU Update Moved up*

*\*Rahul moves to add 3 minutes for a Cat’s Eye Update. Hannah seconds.*

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:

*\*Rahul moves to extend Nicole’s discussion of partnership by 17 minutes. Stuart seconds.*

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:

**PRESSING ITEMS**

*UTSU Update - Stephanie*

Stephanie wants to let you know that as the Victoria College directors, she and Garnet will be hosting office hours. Any VCU students with questions about the UTSU, student politics, their money and student fees, involvement opportunities, or UTSU campaigns are encouraged to attend. Office hours are going to be held twice a week, once with Stephanie on Wednesday and once with Garnet on Thursday. They will be held weekly, probably in the atrium, if not, the Cat’s Eye. If anyone has any questions, you can ask Stephanie or go to their office hours.

\*Stephanie exits

Stuart moves to ratify the 2016 Fall Election results. Hannah seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:
  + Steve absent

**EX-OFFICIO REPORTS AND UPDATES**

*CLC - Emily Gilbert*

**Minding Our Minds Conference**

Emily distributes information sheets about the Minding Our Minds Conference, which is happening on October 27th. It is the fifth annual conference. For students it is free to attend, and they must register ahead of time. The keynote speaker will be Sandy Welsh, the Vice Provost. Another topic will be the impact of social media on self-perception. Lunch and breakfast will be provided. If you register, they ask that you come for at least half of the day. The event will be from 8:30 - 5:00pm. Emily encourages those interested to attend, and asks VUSAC members to encourage other students to register as well.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**Alcohol Procedures Reform and Alcohol on Campus**

Stuart says this is topic is brought to council because last meeting, they were talking about reform. There are two documents related to alcohol, one of them is the policy, which is legally compliant and holds Vic accountable to the government. They are not looking to change that, but are looking at reforming the procedures document. In theory, it is about 6 pages of do’s, don’ts, and recommendations. It is typically brought in during risk assessment. If you are hosting an event, during risk assessment you would go through the proposal with a member of the Dean’s Office and compare it to the guidelines of the document. It can be found on the event planning Vic websites, on the bottom of the page. It is to be reformed, but most of it is fine with students. As the Scarlet and Gold commissioner last year, Stuart says he worked heavily with the document, as did residence presidents. There are issues, the biggest being the food requirement. A lot of times, in compliance with the law, there is a need for a substantial amount of food in order to minimize the risk of over-consumption. In the past, students have been told that in order for their event to be approved, they must spend X amount on food, which typically resulted in money being spent on food consumed by a small group of people at the event, and $450 worth of food only went to 20 guests – this doesn’t even meet the regulations. It is also a waste of student money. This resulted in organizations being afraid to host events. In his first year, here were a higher volume of events where the bar was open because people felt inclined to do so, and now there is a fear of losing money and not covering the cost of the event. There is a lack of events that contribute to campus structure, and also a question of what is meeting the law and what is arbitrary. The other issue is the document says there has to be safety education available to every student, and this currently doesn’t happen. In residence, dons go through this protocol, but residence is only 20% of the Vic population. 80% are not receiving alcohol training and education. The document isn’t binding, and we are not breaking any laws or rules. Another thing is that the policy and document are used to stifle the names of events and what is appropriate. There is a discussion of not letting pub nights happen. He leaves this as it is, but does not know what the issue is. Those are the things he has looked at reforming, and there has been consultation. Regarding event planning, he and Rahul have given feedback and they made a new on-campus risk assessment form. The response has been improved, but now it is about having a formal meeting with the stakeholders – Stuart, Bill McFadden of events Victoria, and Dean Castle. The stakeholders affected are coming together to talk. Dean Castle is enthusiastic about re-examining the food amount. Stuart brings this up as a discussion item for feedback, asks for opinions on safety and education for on and off campus events, as well as general thoughts.

Hannah starts the discussion by drawing attention to fact between that Vic Pub Nights are an environment in which students are surrounded by their friends, the only difference between the pub nights and just going out is that the event has Vic's name on it. It stigmatizes people who participate when it’s controversial to have the word ‘pub’ in ‘pub night’. You are going to a bar, there will be alcohol and it would be unrealistic and dishonest to exclude it, and stigmatizes those who want to drink and be involved in alcohol. If these words are banned, you will see on them on the street anyway – why bother?

Stuart clarifies that it currently doesn’t forbid these words, but prohibits drink promotions in advertising. There have been hints to regulation of language in advertising. There have been cases where this has happened.

Hannah clarifies that she speaks to an example of a general sentiment, regarding pub nights and overall with Vic event planning.

Tyler asks Stuart if he has any tentative suggestions for how alcohol education would be implemented – through VUSAC or the Dean’s Office. Stuart responds that in the policy, it says alcohol policy is the purview of everyone on campus. Those with licences and the Dean’s Office have a legitimized claim. They are open to exploring this, as it is currently listed in the document but not executed.

Zahavah says in reference to food, she agrees and says our job is to host events for Vic students, and the money is to be spent on the students’ experience. At the Back to School Pub Night, money was spent on food, and people said it didn’t come out. It did, but most didn’t see it, and it is irresponsible to spend money this way. She is not sure if this falls under our purview or the Dean’s Office.

Jamil suggests a collaborative campaign with the Dean’s Office, using this as a middle ground. VUSAC could write a campaign for them to approve. That is the better way to get outreach to commuter students. Hosting an informative session wouldn’t draw the audience necessary.

Hannah responds that it’s a good idea, maybe having alongside advertising some reminders of how to drink safely and take care, as opposed to spending money on food, which just dodges the problem.

Thomas says regarding food, he heard they were told all food has to come from Vic catering, which is more expensive. Especially for specialized food. Looking into that policy would be useful at the same time.

Stuart moves to extend the discussion time by 10 minutes. Peter seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:

Isaac mentions this wasn’t an issue years ago - and asks if the document changed or its implementation and focus on the dollar amount did. Stuart says it used to be what legally needed to happen and a list of procedures. In spring of 2014, a new policy was released, and split that document into two, one of which is a list of procedures that are more thorough and lengthy. It was supposed to be reviewed a year ago, but changes in management in the bursar got in the way of this.

Alexa asks if this document is more concerned with safety or liability, because in terms of safety, pushing events off campus makes it more unsafe. It is fair to say being in an environment with people you know is more safe than going to a frat party. Stuart responds that this is the biggest flaw if it becomes restrictive. He thinks we shouldn’t be stifling conversations and allowing people to host events. The document is more concerned with safety and liability to a certain regard, but not practical in effect. It is better on paper.

Zahavah says regarding a lot of these stipulations, VUSAC are not the people affected, as we have a good budget. It’s mostly the smaller groups, who are affected and discouraged. This leads to a bottleneck of VUSAC events, which is not a message we want to send. Making it more accessible for all students is important as currently, it is feasible for us but discouraging the greater community from hosting event.

Emily says this is something that has come up in Dean’s Office, that there have been fewer pub nights. In terms of money, there is no amount that is set. Often there is a fear that the event will be rejected if a certain amount is not spent. If you are expecting people, you must offer food and you must offer enough. To speak to things being held in the Cat’s Eye, technically any events at Vic should be catered through Vic, and this is not new. For O-Week, they were pressured to cater though Vic. They are currently working on a student menu with reduced prices. There has to be food bought in some way with alcohol per laws in Toronto. It is expensive with Events Victoria, but this is being worked on and will be rolled out soon.

Hannah says the procedures document says ‘reasonable’, and this is ambiguous. People sometimes only spend $100. She doesn’t think having less expensive food is the solution – because not enough people get to have it. It’s not the solution, we need to make more than adjustments, rehash and develop the policy into something people will want to adhere to.

Emily responds that most events being held have food, and though she can’t speak to the exact wording, this is a challenge to any event hosted. Food will always be eaten by a small amount of people. The challenge is the direct link to alcohol. With people spending on food, this is not the case.

Stu responds that the wording is where most of the discrepancies have occurred. He has met with Bill, and discussed the cost of the Cat’s Eye. The downside to being federated is having to operate under certain policies. The Bursar’s Office has a monopoly on food and beverage services. You have to have them on the food and bar, and can’t use central service which other non-federated divisions use. We must work within the limitations of Vic structure. Bill is working on making a new menu, putting aside a pool of money for student organizers to use and covering those costs. Another thing is that there is a difference between meeting requirements of the law. For example, they could use a bar fixture, it’s that the patrons of the event would have to pay for them. It’s nice to have food at events- who doesn’t love free pizza? Any other comments can be emailed to Stuart.

**Motion on endorsing You Decide**

Stephen hopes that today, having brought up this discussion multiple times, everyone has enough knowledge to keep away from general questions about the CFS. He wants to keep discussion to the substance of what is being proposed as a motion. There are to be two clauses – the first is to endorse You Decide, and is just a statement. The second clause says that we are willing to support the campaign during office hours by collecting signatures, which puts something with the statement. He opens the discussion to thoughts about these motions, and questions about the CFS in general.

Hannah asks when the deadline is for the signatures. Stephen says there isn’t one, it is to be done ASAP. The campaign hasn’t been fiery like last year, that is why it is quieter. Realistically, the end of February, or around the late early beginning of second semester.

Point of Information: Tyler asks if You Decide’s end goal is for a referendum or in place of one. Stephen says it’s the first step of a referendum. It is not a change.org petition, as per CFS bylaws the first step is to hold a petition, meet the threshold, then hold a referendum.

Golda asks about the second motion and office hours. She asks for thoughts on how we would conduct this in a productive way without being aggressive. Mira says UC already does this, and if there are questions she can answer. At UC, when a student enters the office, they start by asking if they’ve heard about the CFS, and tell them about it. Then they let them know the petition is available to be signed at any time.

Auni says he was on the board and is helping at Vic. He says we have already been exposed to this, but makes the broad point that it is important. The petitioning has to do with controversies in the UTSU, which has been corrupt with scandals, and we are past this but there is a risk of influence seeping back in. This is different from past campaigns, and many have been annoyed. We have to get to the figures or give up. Considering how much money goes in to this and the effect it has on students and lobbying, giving up is not a good outcome. In the past, there has been lots of Vic support. He mentions that he is looking for new volunteers.

Hannah says using office hours is a good idea, as we can make the petition available to printing traffic. She suggests we wait until after by-elections, so students are not bombarded by requests. This way we can reach out to students not engaged.

Jamil agrees that it is a good way to get signatures, but worries that having a speech to read off will not be sufficient – it will either result in ignorant signatures or no response. As VUSAC, we should understand the issue and reach a position, so that we can answer these questions.

Auni thinks what is happening is leaving the sheet, while advertising You Decide. It is important to inform, and the meeting format isn’t enough, they should talk about this in the future.

Saambavi says VUSAC members themselves won’t be collecting signatures. Steve responds this was deliberately left to interpretation, as there are different ways to approach this. Mira describes a more engaged way, Auni a more passive option. Steve prefers the passive option, but left it vague to coordinate more internally with Golda and Artimes.

Tyler asks if there is a precedent for the 9000 signatures - is this optimistic? This would determine how aggressive to be. Auni says nothing to this scale has been done before, other than in a BC school. Vic went from 50 signatures to 400 in the last two weeks. This is an all-in effort across campus, and we want to make a contribution with our engaged student body.

Stuart says there is beauty in VUSAC engaging. In our discussion about making VUSAC more relevant and friendly, he doesn’t know if us encouraging people to sign on our office hours is the best move. If you have an 11:00 – 3:00, for example, it gets busy with printing. If there is a cue, there is no time to recite this speech. We do have a table outside, and volunteers can hang out there, but being that intense in the office is not the best thing right now for VUSAC. It would place too much pressure on the 20 folks running office hours.

Steve replies that he is happy to entertain an amendment on collection, if this is more palatable. If there is a motion, he will outline that the petition is outside as opposed to collecting in VUSAC. That said, he suggests there be something substantive in what we do, otherwise there is no point in endorsing.

Melinda asks how far along they are in numbers for all of U of T. Steve says they wouldn’t want to put a number in written minutes. It is a realistic goal.

Rahul says it is good to leave the wording open to interpretation for comfort, but for VUSAC members to endorse, outside the office or in the atrium would be best. It can be discussed separately. Auni suggests not to expect VUSAC to bombard students, but rather leave the sheet for people to sign if they know about it. If VUSAC members want to talk about it individually, that is helpful. For the campaign to be run by VUSAC is not feasible to have the sheet lying around.

Rahul says this is not an issue, it’s not about VUSAC bombarding printing students, it’s about it being in the office itself. No more than one member is to be at the front desk, as it gets too crowded. If there is a sheet, it should be right outside.

Zahavah says there is a problem with sheet in the office. If the focus is on making VUSAC space more welcoming, we can’t separate VUSAC from being political, but it is a student space. Students who don’t know what this is may be intimidated into signing, or intimidated out of coming into the office at all, and we don’t want to do that. Zahavah suggests we have the sheet outside, but not in the office, as it makes VUSAC more intimidating.

Tyler voices his personal stance. He says the best option is to keep the endorsement flexible, and those comfortable can raise it in a friendly matter. The subject is characterized as political. Members should approach the movement how they want to. There is no need for a provision on how we ask, but flexibility is positive in this case.

Auni says the wording is vague now, but it’s not feasible to have a form outside unattended. He wants to talk about the Fight the Fees campaign. The UTSU has been a member of the CFS for 14 years, and in that time Ontario tuition has risen. There is a tuition cap of 3% on undergrad tuition every year, but this is expiring next year. The UTSU exec held a meeting with the ministry of education, asked for a collaboration with the CFS. While they claim to be lobbying, they met with 2 MP’s, both of which were deposed. The effects are seen in the tuition raising.

Jamil moves to extend discussion time by 7 minutes. Peter seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:
  + Zahavah absent (Nina’s proxy)

Point of Clarification: Nicole says there are two clauses, and asks if they are voting on the motion as a whole or getting a vote on the first clause, then amending the second clause on the suggestions of council. Steve says it is one motion. There is a procedure if someone wants to divide the clauses. Steve adds there is a text prepared for an amendment.

Steve prefaces by saying that Auni is correct in the idea that the leaving sheet is logistically difficult because of monitoring it. In response to concerns about the office space being seen as not a good place for students, Steve agrees, but suggests that having a petition sheet in the office is less of a big deal in terms of welcoming than the decorum of the people in the office. Having a sheet is not a bad thing, but if people are aggressive this can be a bad thing. If VUSAC people treat the office like their house, that is a bad thing.

Proposed amendment; *Be it further resolved that VUSAC allow petition signatures to be collected inside the VUSAC office.*

Jamil says there will be times where it is opportune, and other times where it is not. He mentions that he was speaking to another council member about exclusionary language. Throwing around abbreviations makes it seem exclusive, and beyond people’s reach. Jamil suggests unpacking them in a reasonable sense to facilitate action. Steve says that’s why he amended the motion, so that those less familiar with the terminology don’t have to do that. He hopes this alleviates some concerns.

Point of Information: Auni asks if the second clause is VUSAC will collect signatures or that its ok for VUSAC to collect signatures. Steve responds the original text says be it resolved to ‘allow’. Auni responds that what VUSAC does is unrelated to the motion.

Rahul says he has more issue with the amended clause, and is not comfortable having students who aren’t members collecting signatures and explaining. He doesn’t like us sharing space in that way, in the same way of having slates. It is not what the space is for. As Zahavah mentioned, the space itself, in order to be welcoming, is neutral. He has no issue with collecting signatures, just with using the space itself. Steve clarifies that he doesn’t suggest Johnathan Webb will show up in the office, more that they go with the passive option.

Golda says as long as people are not constantly promoting, because there will be a ton of people in the office. Artimes and Golda see to managing mostly VUSAC people in office, but external people are trickier and can lead to issues.

Peter says the second part is not forced, but that if we don’t have that stipulation it seems like we are not allowed to ask people in the office. It’s ok to talk to people about it, and it does make sense to have it on the table in a passive way. If there is student interest, it’s there if needed and not in your face.

Point of Information: Steve asks if he must amend though a vote, due to the diversion of opinions. Saambavi says he can.

Original motion: Be it resolved that VUSAC endorse the You Decide campaign regarding the UTSU's membership in the Canadian Federation of Students.

Be it further resolved that VUSAC allow council members to collect petition signatures during their office hours.

Motion: Stephen moves to amend to read "be it further resolved that VUSAC allow petition signatures to be collected inside the VUSAC office." Peter seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL OTHERS
* Abstained: Rahul
* Opposed:

Motion: Rahul moves to vote by clause. Hannah seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: Rahul Stuart Golda Yasmine Zahavah Nina Jamil Melinda Alexa
* Abstained:
* Opposed: Stephen Peter Isaac Tyler

Motion: Stephen moves to endorse the You Decide campaign regarding the UTSU's membership in the Canadian Federation of Students. Peter seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL
* Abstained:
* Opposed:

Motion: Stephen moves to allow petition signatures to be collected inside the VUSAC office. Peter seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: Steve Stuart Isaac Hannah Peter Melinda Jamil Tyler Yasmine Golda
* Abstained:
* Opposed: Rahul Alexa Nina Zahavah

**VUSAC Partnership**

Nicole asks Mira to speak on their behalf. Mira says UC is trying to partner with folks to have a “Week Against Hatred”. This is in response to events on campus, the swastikas, the rally for free speech which ended in transphobic and racist things. The intention is to oppose transphobia and hatred. There are various other things that have drawn attention to issues of generally terrible behaviour. UC is planning a Week Against Hatred – name up for discussion. It will be a week of equity talks, town halls, collectives, trying to center the voices of marginalized students, channel energies and angers in workshops on equity, things like trans and non-binary erasure, and anti-blackness. This is something important to UC, and they are excited to get it off the ground and partner with Vic. Mira notes that there will letter writing to admin, movie nights, social mobilization organization workshops, speakers, ally-ship, and focusing on centering the voices of marginalized voices. It is a week-long event, and they have secured funding from UCLIT. Mira asks for backing and help from VUSAC.

Thomas asks if this would be happening in the next 2-3 weeks. Mira responds that yes, and they would ideally be meeting in the next week. UC people are ready to have a meeting on Sunday. If we endorse, another meeting with folks on this end can be held. They are ready to go, and are hoping to be set up for 2 weeks from now - subject to change. Thomas says this falls around the same time as XAO, and asks if there will be a relation to the UTSU? Mira says the UTSU has come under fire recently, and this could be a good alternative as well as a complimentary set of events. Some folks are intimidated by the UTSU, so folks might feel more comfortable there.

Tyler asks what they were expecting for VUSAC to contribute, and about how the campaign is being run, and if there is targeted programming regarding last week’s events. Mira responds in terms of expectation, they are expecting funding from us and planning logistical work, some venues here for accessibility. They ask for support with names and advertisement. As for the second question, Mira says it is in response to last week, primarily focusing on trans and non-binary erasure and issues of ant-blackness. This is the overarching theme they hope to tackle. The environment has been hostile and volatile for those students, and they want to make them feel welcome. Those not in these communities can be cognisant of this. They are trying to get people to process in a productive way, getting them to understand in a way they couldn’t before.

Tyler asks if any other student bodies are being asked for partnership, and recognizes the intent of the campaign, but says there is a risk of this campaign becoming politicized against the wishes of the organizers. Mira responds that they were going to, but saw a vested interest from Vic, and felt the councils had well-aligned values. They may seek out other collaborations. Mira asks for elaboration on ‘politicized’, not in reference to specific events. Tyler recognizes the intent in not making it political, as well as this risk. Making it general makes it more constructive, but the event could evolve into someone taking over the narrative. Mira mentions the existence of these students is politicized to begin with, and to dismiss the politics of belonging is part of the erasure. They must deal with it inevitably. That is something that they don’t want, but it is political. Everything is political, and by making it general and dismissing what’s been happening, they are feeding into and perpetuating the struggle.

Golda echoes this point. Yasmine elaborates that there is no reason not to support them, as safety is important. We claim to be inclusive, so there should be no issues with supporting. Mira responds it will be political, and this is OK.

Point of Information: Nicole says this is listed as a discussion, and there is no formal vote. They are wondering how to change this. Saambavi says someone can put forth a motion to partner with UC.

Steve asks if this needs to be passed through council, or if it can be done through equity. Hannah responds that it would be nice to have the support of all council.

Peter says regarding politicizing, despite intentions, there is a good chance it could become politicized. Something slightly similar happened, and it is a good idea to have council support to avoid issues of what to do if something happens. Something that explicitly says we support it would leave no wiggle room. Mira responds that they agree, and that is why UCLIT is behind it. They haven’t had an official meeting, but in groups they are all in agreement. She reminds everyone there will be negative responses, but they are not looking to pay more attention to Peterson, instead centering the voices affected by this. Not accusations of free speech.

Stuart says for cohesion, Nicole messaged many people and he thinks it’s a fantastic opportunity. As council we should be engaging, showing solidarity and support. This week will be about the safety of those most affected, and requires a strong commitment. There could be backlash, but priorities are concrete. He says we should do what needs to be done no matter what happens, and encourages engagement.

Yasmine says even if it does become political, the goal is not a face off, it’s about telling people and making people know what they’re going through is valid and supported, and it is a safe place for them. The views of those who don’t agree will be voiced, but they have nothing to do with this. We can’t let this affect the concern of helping people.

Tyler clarifies his stance – he is in favour of the endorsement. He thinks politicization is potentially unwise, and he may have used the wrong term. More clearly: he doesn’t want it to devolve into a yelling session. When we partner, we have to make provisions in case something like that does come up, we can handle the situation appropriately to avoid a repeat of previous inflammatory events on campus. Mira says they will be having town hall to voice concerns, having a moderator who is trans or non-binary. The focus is on actual problems of actual students, and she doesn’t think the forum will be there for it to become a yelling match. It is not a ‘hunger games’ type thing.

Rahul moves to partner with UC on the Week Against Hatred. Hannah seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: ALL others
* Abstained: Steve
* Opposed:

**ASSESSOR MEMBER REPORTS AND UPDATES**

*Cat’s Eye*

Zayneb introduces herself as the co-manager. Today, they got their Halloween social approved. It will be on Saturday, October 29th. It is a risk, throwing an event on Saturday, and brings it to our attention for attendance of us and friends. It is a collaborative effort with Scarlet and Gold, Vic Records, VicXposure, and Werewolf. It is a costume party, better than ‘mean girls’. It will be from 5:00-12:00. Students can drop in and out, and bar service will be open from 9:00-12:00. Zayneb encourages us to come and tell friends, like, share, and subscribe on Facebook.

*\*Mira exits*

*Chief Returning Officer – Taylor*

**By-Elections**

Taylor talks about by-elections, asks council to advertise nomination packages in hopes that these elections will be more competitive. Questions can be directed to cro@vusac.ca. In addition, in case anyone is looking to vote, the polling stations have been moved. There is now one in VUSAC, no longer at EJ Pratt. The nomination packages have changed; you now only need 2 poll clerks.

Melinda asks if the conditions are the same for VUSAC members to sign. Taylor responds that for the purpose of minimizing confusion, any VCU can sign as a nominator, and this includes us. VUSAC members are not allowed to be a poll clerk.

Zoe asks if now that everyone that applying will have two poll clerks, assuming only 3 people apply, if 6 poll clerks will be enough. Taylor responds the hours have changed, in addition to moving, the hours are now 12:00 – 4:00, which is 2 less hours. She also will allow only 1 clerk to serve on a shift, as this happened a lot last election. If she needs extra clerks, she will be asking VUSAC as well, but because of allocations made to changes, she hope this will not happen.

*Finance – Nicole*

**General Finance Updates**

Nicole updates regarding the bursar. The 60% installment has arrived and has been deposited, but the levy installments have been written out. For anyone asking, these can be picked up from the finance mailbox. Also, the term two budgets call has been out for the past two weeks, and is due next week at 5:00 PM. In order to ensure accuracy, all receipts for May-October spending are due October 28. The budget steering committee now has a levy representative, and is waiting for a councillor representative. Anyone interested should email Golda. They are hoping for a complete committee before reviewing budgets.

**COMMISSION REPORTS AND UPDATES**

*Commuter – Isaac and Karen*

**First Year VOCA Ratifications**

Motion: Isaac moves to ratify Veroknika Korchagina and Carol Le as the two VOCA first year execs. Zahavah seconds. Motion passes.

* Favour: All others
* Abstained: Isaac
* Opposed:

*Scarlet and Gold – Zahavah*

**Winterfest and Semi Formal**

Zahavah says winterfest co-chair and committee applications are now available on the resources table. There will be social media advertising, and information is available on the website. There are different due dates, and we should mention this to people in the office. If you have any questions, ask Zahavah.

Also, the semi-formal will be on November 4th, which Zahavah is stressed about. The theme is changing, so she is not going to tell us. Advertising will start soon, and ticket selling information through the office will be updated. She needs volunteers at the event, so asks members to keep the date open from 9:00 – 1:00.

Taylor asks if VUSAC members can be on the winterfest committee. Zahavah says yes.

**JUDICIARY REPORTS AND UPDATES**

*Presidents – Stuart and Rahul*

**Travel and Conference Fund**

Stuart and Nina have been working on a fund that was started last year, VUSAC members applied to Student Projects to create a fund for travel and conferences within Canada. Any Vic student can receive funding depending on how much is needed. Last year, they were given $5000 with conditions. That is the extent. It was loosely created, and they weren’t transitioned on it, Student Projects doesn’t know either. The registrar’s office was advertising this over the summer. People would come in on summer office hours, or call from outside the country- but they didn’t know about it. $1000 was given to 3 applicants last year. This is negligent and inappropriate. Nina has taken over, consulted and met with people. Peter was roped into dealing with this, and is looking at reforming. There is still $4000, with no other conditions, and Nina and the presidents are looking to legitimize it. Any questions can be directed to Nina, or the presidents.

Emily asks if students want to apply, who they should go through. Stuart says they got rid of all advertisements which were referring students to VUSAC. It technically has not relaunched, so they are not advertising it. Peter clarifies that the point of the fund was to create an amount that was self-sufficient, and for VUSAC to have more control over the fund. It was negotiated in rewriting, but it was the end of the year, and they were not transitioned on this situation. Stu says the fund will exist, it has not been struck.

**Provost Undergraduate Advisory Committee**

Stuart and Rahul, along with other student heads, have been invited to sit on the Provost Undergraduate Advisory Committee, which meets four times per fiscal year. It includes the student societies from Saint George and Scarborough and UTM, and they are called to meet with the provost and talk about issues of mutual concern, and things they’re working on for student feedback. The first meeting was two weeks ago. This meeting was about sexual violence response, and they presented an action plan in the form of a pie chart. What has happened is there are factors of concern to Vic as a federated college/university, but also as artsci members at U of T. We are covered under this proposed sex violence policy and response. Legally, it has to be implement by January 1st. They are looking into response, and physical presence on each campus, but the center will exist online as well. It is similar to council line, which provides resources online. They are looking for an executive director by next year. Every university in Ontario has to have a sexual violence response policy by January 1st. When Rahul and Stuart spoke to President Robins, he seemed to be strictly relying on the central policy, but since Vic is separate, they are not sure if there is a plan for Vic to have a separate policy.

Some good concerns were brought up about drafting. The provost let everyone know no matter the experience, the policy is there to act whether it was on/off campus, before or after. This is a step forward, but tricky where you have to involve legal steps – one’s status as a student – specifically in being full time but not taking summer courses. There are specifics on who is covered and when. They are hoping for more updates soon. If you have anything you would like to be raised, you can send it to Rahul or Stuart.

Motion: Zahavah moves to adjourn the meeting. Isaac seconds. Motion passes.

Meeting is adjourned.

* Favour: All
* Abstained:
* Opposed: