



Brock University Students' Administrative Council

Meeting: 12

Date: February 28th, 2018, 6:00pm

Speaker: Ian Beaumont

Deputy Speaker: Fiona Purkiss

Recording Secretary: Maddie Staruch

OVERVIEW

Opening Procedures

	Description
1	Call to Order
2	Territorial Recognition
3	Approval of the Agenda
4	Adoption of the Minutes (Meeting 8)
5	Ratification of Election Results
6	Open Question Period
7	Notes from the Speaker

Presentations

8	Student Justice Centre Referendum (Wassink)	Information
9	Zone Expansion Referendum (Hejazi)	Information
10	Business Student Association	Information
11	Verrier Referendum Presentation (Verrier)	Information

New Business

12	Student Justice Centre Referendum Revote (Wassink)	Action Item
13	Zone Expansion Referendum Question and MOU (Hejazi)	Action Item
14	Business Student Association MOU Change	Action Item
15	Brock University Sexual Violence Support Centre Question and MOU	Action Item
16	Approval of Additional BUSAC Meeting (Hibma)	Action Item
17	Verrier Referendum Motion (Verrier)	Action Item

Reports

18	VP Student Services	Information
19	VP External Affairs	Information
20	VP Finance and Administration	Information
20	President	Information

Question Period

21	Close Question Period
22	Information and Reminders

Adjournment

1.0

Call to Order

2.0

Territorial Recognition

3.0

Approval of the Agenda

BIRT BUSAC opens up the agenda to move item 16 to item 12.
--

Mover: Verrier Secunder: Nicoyishakiye

Motion Passed

Yes: 5 No: 0 Abstention: 12

BIRT BUSAC approves the agenda for the February 28 th , 2018 meeting

Mover: Bathish Secunder: Wassink

Yes: No: Abstention:

4.0

Adoption of the Minutes

BIRT BUSAC approves the minutes for the February 7 th , 2018 meeting

Mover: Wassink Secunder: Seliman

Motion Passed

Yes: 16 No: 0 Abstention: 1

5.0

Ratification of Election Results

BIRT BUSAC accepts the results of the 2018 election.
--

Mover: Wassink Secunder: Bathish

Verrier: Due to the fact that the referendum is being discussed, can we separate the ratification of the election and the referendums until after presentations are concluded.

Motion dies due to no second.

<i>Motion Passed</i>

Yes: 16 No: 1 (Verrier) Abstention: 0

6.0

Open Question Period

Gallery: So because the motion for the election results got ratified, this won't affect OPIRG?

Verrier: The way the motion works is that even though we just accepted the results, we would choose to throw out the results entirely.

Ehima: The motion was just passed by council to approve the ratification of the results which means your motion would be invalid.

Hejazi: You tried to give a motion that would include the OPIRG referendum and there was no second, the results have been ratified.

Speaker: The motion to ratify the election results, including OPIRG, has already been passed.

7.0

Notes from Speaker

Welcome back everybody, from what was hopefully a rejuvenating reading week. Some of us didn't get reading week, but that's okay because we get March Break. And also, a reminder just to speak up as it can be hard to hear in this room sometimes.

Total Voting Members = 17

Quorum:

- 50% + 1 = 9.5
- 2/3rds = 11

8.0

Student Justice Centre Referendum (Wassink)

Maddy Wassink presents.

Hejazi: I want to say thank you to Carol for running this phenomenal campaign. As Maddy mentioned, it was expressed in all the marketing material, communication strategies, and in debates. It was also in the MOU and students could see that it was a per credit fee. It was a complete oversight and I'll take responsibility for that, no one noticed that 'per credit' was left out. We need to respect that most students are making their decisions based off of just the question that was offered.

Lillo gives his turn to the Gallery: I was just wondering if you knew the click through rates on the MOU? You should be able to tell with any decent software through emails, to get a good sense of who saw it.

Hejazi: I don't have that information, but regardless I think for transparency we need to redo this referendum. Regardless if every student noticed that or not, we had almost 55% vote for the referendum.

Purkiss: I am the one who deals with the voting system, you don't see that, voting is between the student and their ballot, and we hope that students will do their due-diligence. It's a private email that is sent to them.

Ali gives his turn to the Gallery: In the new proposed MOU, it states that BUSAC will suspend bylaw 401–

Napper: Point of Order - as this isn't being discussed until new business.

9.0

Zone Expansion Referendum (Hejazi)

Faisal Hejazi presents.

BIRT BUSAC extends the presentation period by 5 minutes.
--

Mover: Hibma Secunder: Bathish

Motion Passed

Yes: 17

No: 0

Abstention: 0

Ali: the fee won't be charged to students until it's completed yet, is it fair to plan a referendum where some of the students won't be paying the fee? Is it fair that we decided students to be charge 17/credit, and we who are making the decision are not going to have to pay?

Hejazi: That's something I considered myself. Half of the population of Brock won't be using this, but they'll be voting on it. This is a legacy piece of people who are elected, not just for the students of today, but tomorrow. The bus and health/dental fee, I wasn't there but they voted, and I am paying for it. They voted because it was best for the overall student experience. The one option was to do it this way, the second option was to charge the fee right away. I can guarantee that the university would've liked that more, but I don't think it's ethical to make students pay for a facility they will not use.

Seliman: Is the university fully funding this?

Hejazi: The initial zone was fully funded with the university. They will not be funding in terms of a dollar amount, they are just putting the money up front and interest free. If we did this through a bank over 12-15 years it would cost us 12-13 million dollars in interest. All the universities I visited were student run referendums and were successful.

Napper: Is the zone going to be closed for those two years?

Hejazi: That was also part of the discussion, we wanted to see the Zone closed for as short as possible. They're going to work from the outside in. They're going to start from one end and move to the other. There's a 2-week period of time where they're going to have to shut down the zone, but it's going to be during the summer. They are going to move all the equipment to one of the Ian Beddis gym so students won't lose out.

Nicoyishakiye: In regard to equipment, is the current budget covering equipment?

Hejazi: Yes

Hall: Has there been any internal discussions on who will choose the equipment/design?

Hejazi: There will be a subcommittee that will be deciding what will be in the new zone: studio space, dance space, cardio space, there will probably need to be some kind of survey. The committee will heavily consider the student voice as it is our money that's being used. The new facility is going to have a plaque memorializing the contribution of the students. We also get

some space out of the deal, where the facility is, the space will be in the top corner for BUSU that can help motivate our student body (i.e. a Booster Juice).

Lillo: Who is the contractor?

Hejazi: We have a specific engineering firm that we're working with. They gave us an RFP for the best options, I just don't have the name off the top of my head.

10.0

Business Student Association

Business Student Association presents.

Hejazi: I'm just wondering with the new expansion, is your faculty expecting an increase in enrolment?

BSA: We don't really deal with that so I'm not sure how that budgets.

Napper: Last year you talked about moving to a model that doesn't give your clubs all the same amount of money.

BSA: It saves a lot of paperwork and going back and forth, as long as they can provide proof (i.e. receipts).

11.0

CSORF Referendum Presentation (Verrier)

Concerned Students for Referendum Fairness presents.

Purkiss (CRO): Thank you for coming today, I'm glad you brought those opinions. I Chair the RPOC committee, you said we should've been more specific, the point of an MOU is to be open ended to allow for flexibility. We sent this to RPOC in November, we set in January. As I'm the one who translates the bylaw, I said that it was fine.

CSORF: I'm worried that precedents were set before and that this was set before.

Purkiss (CRO): For the bylaws, the BUSAC councilors did agree to it, everyone was fully aware of what's going on. You said there was no No-Side, you had the opportunity to do that and provide the other narrative.

CSORF: Was that made explicitly made clear to students.

Purkiss (CRO): It was put out over social media.

CSORF: On January 9th, a Brock Press article was put out that said that no referendums were put out this year. The deadline to submit a campaign was January 26th, and then on social media it was posted 1-2 days before the deadline. Is that enough time for students to prepare?

Purkiss (CRO): If you want to submit a campaign, we have a prep week to allow people to prepare themselves. We also have two weeks explicitly to campaign.

CSORF: If you knew the readership of the Brock press, is it mandatory for the Brock student to look at the Brock press, no, but it is mandatory for a student to have an email address, which could have been used.

Purkiss (CRO): The only reason we have those emails is to send out –

Yendt: Point of Information - this isn't the proper time for a debate.

Beaumont (Speaker): Just to clarify what has been said in case you zoned out, the question of the referendum was sent to RRPOC on November 29th, 2017. There was no No Side for this Referendum in particular, the SJC referendum. However are referendums, even this year that did not have a No-Side. This is not the only referendum that's been voted upon that didn't have a No Side. It is also student's responsibility to become informed on the election process, which the Brock Press very explicitly goes over. But, as the presenters have asked for questions from the floor, we will open that up.

Napper: Verrier, you've been on council for a long time, there have been referendums that have been sent to RPOC, the rule is the same, I'm just curious why you came to council to throw out the OPIRG referendum and change the SJC Referendum instead of coming to council and tasking one of our committees to review the bylaws to make things clearer in the future, so the CRO isn't put in a position in the future to have to interpret the bylaw

CSORF: In terms of last year, things went through in January before the March election, that is Bylaw 401 section 5 subsection 12 c which has to do with anything that is approved for a March election has to be approved in January.

Napper: I know we're talking about subsection b, I'm using the example of subsection c, it was sent to RPOC before the January deadline, and both clubs, I know both clubs personally because I was here and Federal Advocacy passed on February 15th, and both went to referendum in March, so that's the exact same situation. I know it's 12c but 12b is the exact same rule it just applies to February elections, so why are you not coming to BUSAC to review the bylaw, as opposed to trying to throw out the referendums and changing the interpretation that has been made of this bylaw.

CSORF: If that's what council deems necessary then that is what happens, I'm here to take ownership for it... Under further investigation of the referendum bylaw and a conversation with concerned students looking for a voice at council, I wanted to comply and give them this voice. I'm coming to council not just for me but for my constituents.

Wassink: It is good to be informed with various bylaws, I do agree that it is up for interpretation. I think it's interesting that 'those in the front need to fight for the ones in the back', that's what the SJC is here for, as well as the executive positions. We speak for the students on a daily basis, and we are speaking for the students. Going back to a revote, we want to go back for transparency states, to clarify for students. It is not going back for referendum, we're clarifying for our students that this is a per credit fee. We're not trying to raise this all up, if we're concerned about the voice of the students, then we want to make sure that the 54% of students who voted yes are knowing. I'm just wondering why we're questioning why this bylaw would be suspended when we're only talking about going to a revote and not a referendum?

CSORF: I actually haven't seen such a great executive team in a while, you guys are doing great stuff this year. What we're looking at is the passion might have gone a little far in suspending bylaw 401. I wanted to do that last year, I wanted to suspend some small sections of bylaws, and when I was confronted about it and the reasons why, I fell back on myself and apologized for it. We're not saying you're not doing a good job, because you are, but in the interest of going to a revote is a great idea, but the logistics of a revote means we'll have to suspend bylaw 401, means correct me if I'm wrong which actually suspends our ability to send a referendum in the first place. Everything with equity, fairness, and transparency with the students would be suspended as there is no ability to run a no campaign.

Purkiss (CRO): Suspending the bylaw, this is a very clear thing that we can do. 2/3 majority of BUSAC have to agree, we are just having a revote. We're just letting them know that a clerical error was made. There is nothing colluded about this, it's just that 2/3 majority have to vote.

Wassink: You're going back to the time that we were discussing last year, for the Marilyn I position, though I do understand that's suspending a by-law, we need to clarify that's a very different situation that is bringing forward something completely new. This is a different situation where voting already happened. I'm wondering how can we draw that line that proposing something new is even related to a referendum revote. We're not bringing it back to referendum, we're bringing it back to a revote to clarify.

CSORF: That's something we should bring back into the bylaw, then we can provide the proper channel to do so. This is surrounding the ethical standards of suspending bylaw 401. SJC, does excellent work, and we're not saying they don't deserve the money, as said by 54% of students. Suspending bylaw 401, the ends don't justify the means.

Johnson: One of the presenters mentioned that suspending the bylaw would be going against the mandates of the bylaw, which are fairness, consistency, transparency, student equity. Idk why allowing students to have more information behind a referendum why that would be going against transparency. Making it a revote and allowing no campaigning, how this would be going against consistency and fairness. You are saying how it's unfair that there wasn't a no side, but it just confuses me and I would like to know why that by restricting campaigning and having it be review only, why that would be against fairness and consistency.

CSORF: Simply because there wouldn't be a voice for the no side. There wasn't before and there might not be one again. I know there wasn't a voice for the yes side in the first place, but the voice of the yes side was already heard. So it's just about having that equality of voice on campus. I understand the spirit of it, but we should be paying attention to what our foundations are and not trying to avoid them.

Purkiss (CRO): Nomination packages were open for a No-Side and was available, I'm sorry you didn't get the information in time, but those option were available.

Hejazi: The first point you spoke about suspending the bylaw. On November 29th when you voted in favour to take it to RRPOC I don't know why this keeps getting brought up. There's a lot of people who have no affiliation with Brock that are influencing the student body. You can clearly see that they're not in. Specifically with OPIRG, do you not think that's an insult to our democracy, and it feels that even though 70+% of students voted to defund, this referendum wants to be thrown away. How is that representing the student body? The second one, for suspending the bylaw: we have the ability, these students and myself have the ability to suspend the bylaw for good reason. What's the harm, and problem, of being more transparent of letting the students vote again with more information? 55% voted in favor of this referendum, all we're doing is putting it to a revote to clarify a clerical error?

CSORF: 55% of 30% of students who voted.

Hejazi: Everyone has the right to vote, but this was a new record of students. We can't be against something if people don't come and vote.

Beaumont (Speaker): We did hit quorum. We can let that go.

CSORF: That's not necessarily true, my stance is keeping with good governance and has already been discussed. What you and I see as transparency seems to be differing, my idea is to make sure our bylaws are in place.

Hejazi: I think we're doing our due-diligence as a council to do this. This was already passed, why would we want to bring this back to the table. It's up to us to be transparent, there will be no Yes-Side and also no No-Side.

BIRT BUSAC ends the question period.
Mover: Hibma Secunder: Wassink

<i>Motion Passed</i>
Yes: 17 No: 0 Abstention: 0

12.0

Verrier Referendum Motion (Verrier)

BIRT the results of the 2018 February referendums cannot be accepted and must be thrown out, because they were in non-compliance with bylaw 401 5.12b; BIF
--

Mover: Verrier

Secunder: NO SECOND. MOTION DIES.
--

17.0

Student Justice Centre Referendum Revote (Wassink)

BIRT BUSAC approves the revised Student Justice Centre Referendum Question
--

Mover: Wassink

Secunder: Bathish

Wassink: I think we need to go to a revote because students need to be clarified with this, we own up to the mistake of not having per-credit on the original question. I think it's important that we go back to the students with this, and that hopefully they will vote yes and see value in the SJC again.

Hibma: That is why I will be voting yes.

Bathish: I would like to second Aidan's sentiments here. I know it was thrown around that we are not within the democratic process, suspending a bylaw doesn't make it undemocratic. We are acting within the constitution.

Johnson: Within the bylaws of BUSU, there are two main things, there are the spirit of it, which are fairness and transparency, and then there are the technical aspects and in the motion, we are simply suspending the technicalities, but it is still upholding the fairness and the mandate of student interest, as it is protecting the idea that when students vote, they have all the information they need to make a proper decision. Again, the bylaws being suspended for the technicalities, but at the same time, the spirit of student fairness is being maintained.

Verrier gives his turn to the Gallery: This is going be the second straight year where a referendum needs to go to a revote, and if this motion passes, SJC is going to go to a revote. What will you guys do to make sure that students won't have to keep revoting.

Beaumont (Speaker): My understanding of the transit bylaw, it didn't go to a revote, it went to a referendum. BUSAC retained the bylaw, in the sense that the referendum was accepted. It did not go to a revote, the same way that this referendum is going to a revote. That was a new referendum.

Gallery: Students still had to vote again for the same topic. What are you going to do to make sure there will not need to be more revotes?

Beaumont (Speaker): Students voted a majority no in the transit referendum. When the second referendum came up, students asked for that because they felt they were not informed on what would happen if the referendum didn't pass. This is different because BUSU is asking for a revote due to a clerical error.

Napper: It's every councilors responsibility, that if they want to put forward a motion to review the bylaw, any councilor could have done that this entire year. Verrier could have brought that forward tonight. As a student go to the councilor that represents you to bring that to light. If the issue is with the bylaw, it needs to be addressed. It shouldn't be lumped in with the OPIRG and SJC referendums. You need to talk to your councillor.

Yendt: So, having the benefit of this being my 6th term of BUSAC I've seen a lot of things come and go. This wouldn't be the first time we've waved/suspended a bylaw. It wouldn't be the first time for a reason such as this. I think that raises questions about why we put certain things in the bylaws. There are things in our bylaws around ethical conduct, around transparency, honesty, and fairness but arbitrary dates that we've set in stone to send out referendum don't necessarily reflect those specific criteria. I think it sets a specific date in our bylaws that we would like to adhere to. As an elected to body, that approves the bylaw, your motions are always higher and more powerful in the standing orders than a bylaw is. If you didn't have that power, you couldn't legislate in the first place. Even this conversation around the validity of it be 2 referendums that just passed because we didn't adhere to a specific bylaw, council motioned to send these 2 things to referendum, it's a nonstarter. The motion council made, superseded the bylaws. Whether it was premediated or not, this was within your power. It makes the entire process legitimate. The second, I guess, I would question why these things are being lumped together the way they are, and I would wonder if this isn't just about pushing something back to the governance committee and asking them to review why certain things are the way they are in the bylaw and not about the excellent conduct of the executives on behalf of BUSU to send this back to a revote when there is that cloud of judgement around it that makes it a little hazy. I think BUSU made the absolute right call to do this. To conflate these two issues as one of the same is not doing us any service at this time, with some heated emotions in the air, and I think it's one that in further review, in likely the end of year reports from certain staff will probably recommend doing something about this. That's the time to have that discussion, but right now it's about giving the students the opportunity to voice their opinion on something they have already voted on and clarifying that opinion.

Wassink gives her turn to the Gallery: I just wanted to offer some clarity, which I think is a great question on why we're having to vote back to back. The two MOUs that were initially proposed for the SJC were an entirely different scope of service for the SJC. These two referendums were back to back, but they are entirely different acts. The first saw a marginal increase to the SJC scope of service, the second referendum asked for a robust OMBUDS service and a substantial increase to the SJC and our student refugee services.

Gallery – My original question was why we had to revote for the same topic in regard to busses, and now if this motion passes why we have to revote for SJC. My question was for councilors in general.

Motion Passed

Yes: 18
No: 1 Verrier
Abstention: 0

13.0

Zone Expansion Referendum Question and MOU (Hejazi)

BIRT BUSAC approves Zone expansion question and MOU and sends it to referendum for the March election period. BIFRT BUSAC tasks BSUAC to run the YES side of the referendum with Faisal Hejazi appointed as campaign manager.

Mover: Hejazi
Secunder: Hibma

Motion Passed

Yes: 17
No: 0
Abstention: 1

15.0

Brock University Sexual Violence Support Centre Question and MOU

BIRT BUSAC approves the Brock Student Sexual Violence Support Centre question and MOU and sends it to referendum for the March election period.

Mover: Bathish
Secunder: Wassink

Napper: Can the execs give an explanation of their differentiation from BUSU?

Bathish: BSSVSC is a third-party fee, Brock Press is a 3PF and so was OPIRG, they are supposed to live up to supporting victims of sexual harassment and violence. They are off campus and separate from BUSU. They have to go to referendum every few years.

Yendt: They were born as an action group in OPIRG Brock and then went to referendum 3 times, not meeting requirements for the first referendum and was thrown out in 2012, they ran in

September and failed, and passed in February. They have an office downtown across from 1 St. Paul.

Ali: Do they already collect the fee?

Beaumont (Speaker): Yes.

Castano: Have we reviewed their budget?

Beaumont (Speaker): SB was having some organization restructuring and have been lacking in getting back to Kayleigh to come back to BUSAC to go over their accounts, and they were not able to come back.

Castano: Can we have them come to BUSAC?

Beaumont (Speaker): Kayleigh is still trying to get them come in. The person who used to run the organization is on a leave of absence. Kayleigh is doing her best and is continuing to try and get them to come in.

<p><i>Motion Passed</i></p> <p>Yes: 14 No: 2 Abstention: 2 (Verrier)</p>

16.0

Approval of Additional BUSAC Meeting (Hibma)

<p>BIRT BUSAC adds an additional meeting day of April 4th at 6:00pm in the 13th Floor Boardroom,</p>
<p>Mover: Hibma Secunder: Verrier</p>

<p><i>Motion Passed</i></p> <p>Yes: 18 No: 0 Abstention: 0</p>

18.0

Report – VP Student Services

VPSS, Ms. Wassink, presents report.

19.0

Report – VP External Affairs

VPFA, Ms. Bathish, presents report.

19.0

Report – VP Finance and Administration

VPFA, Ms. Bathish, presents report.

Lillo: Did you talk about the extended library house shuttle bus?

Hibma: What had to happen at that point in time is I had to make a decision between the shuttle bus and the classroom modernization project. I was under the impression that sr. administration had their own budget line, and I thought that one was going to assist me with his project. I had to make a data driven decision, that last year for our shuttle bus we had an average of about 194 people take this bus and it cost us 5200 to run. The library shuttle bus would cost us the same. The exam shuttle bus, we only had 12 students, the cost analysis didn't stand up> I took that 5200 to move forward with classroom modernization projects because it was data driven. Moving forward that's something our future VPFA can explore.

20.0

Report – President

President, Mr. Hejazi, presents report.

Napper: I was just wondering why the GM posting wasn't posting externally? Is it internal?

Hejazi: It's internal and external, it's actually on Indeed/LinkedIn, we've received a lot of applications.

21.0

Close Question Period

22.0

Information and Reminders

Hejazi: Enjoy the basketball game tonight!

Hibma; Let's go Badgers!

Bathish: Free breakfast tomorrow at 7:30!

Meeting Adjourned: 8:00pm