

SASSH November Board Meeting Minutes

Ciara Rahming (**CR**), Natasha Noto (**NN**), Alexander Zaleski (**AZ**), Thomas Nguyen (**TN**), Ellis Park (**EP**), Marium Khan (**MK**), Melody Schroecker (**MS**), Aisha Zubair (**AIZ**), Sani Bediako (**SB**), Harjas Toor (**HT**), Meia Mathura (**MM**), Angus Li (**AL**), Kashaf Alvi (**KA**), Andrii Shumilin (**AS**), Lucas Paliouras-Loureiro (**LPL**), Sara Xhango (**SX**), Ricardo Valderrama (**RV**)

Late Arrival(s):

Regrets: Sani Bediako (**SB**), Harjas Toor (**HT**), Marium Khan (**MK**), Ricardo Valderrama (**RV**)

Chair: Claire Cornacchia (**CC**)

Manager: Josel Angelica Gerardo (**JAG**)

Secretary: Sara Xhango (**SX**)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item 0.0 - Associate Dean's Remarks

Item 1.0 - Call to Order

Item 2.0 - Approval of the Agenda

Item 3.0 - TMU Plants Executive Members Composition Appeal [**Presentation**]

Item 3.1 - TMU Plants Executive Members Composition Appeal [**Question and Discussion Period**]

Item 3.2 - TMU Plants Executive Members Composition Appeal [**Voting Period**]

Item 4.0 - TMU Plants Funding Pitch [**Presentation**]

Item 4.1 - TMU Plants Funding Pitch [**Question and Discussion Period**]

Item 4.2 - TMU Plants Funding Pitch [**Voting Period**]

Item 5.0 - TMU Plants Retroactive Funding [**Presentation**]

Item 5.1 - TMU Plants Retroactive Funding [**Question and Discussion Period**]

Item 5.2 - TMU Plants Retroactive Funding [**Voting Period**]

Item 6.0 - TMU Plants Retroactively Funding Tip [**Presentation**]

Item 6.1 - TMU Plants Retroactively Funding Tip [**Voting Period**]

Item 7.0 - Financial Updates [**Presentation**]

Item 7.1 - Financial Updates [**Question and Discussion Period**]

Item 8.0 - Board Updates

Item 9.0 - Action Items

Item 10.0 - Adjournment

Item 0.0 - Associate Dean's Remarks (6:05PM)

CC: Okay folks. We are going to, just for the sake of time, bypass **Anne Marie's** remarks for now until she is able to join us. **JAG** is getting in contact with her. We will just go ahead and call the meeting to order because **Kiana** from TMU Plants is here and we don't want to keep her waiting too long.

Item 1.0 - Call to Order (6:06PM)

CC: Our first presentation today is from TMU Plants and it is an appeal of their Executive Member composition. There are some links in the Agenda to their presentation and there is a point of information piece about the Course Union and Student Groups under SASSH. When you look at the slideshow, you will see that TMU Plants has 2 presentations in 1 slide. I have let them know that we are still going to be doing them separately because they are 2 separate motions in the Agenda. We will take a pause once they finish their presentation on the Executive Member composition, we will discuss, vote, then we will continue with their second piece on the Agenda and their presentation just for clarity's sake and so we don't have to make too many changes to the Agenda and we are voting on things that we are well aware of what we are voting on. With that, I will invite **Kiana** into the room and then we can get started.

Item 2.0 - Approval of the Agenda (6:08PM)

Motioned by: CC

In Favour: 14 Against: 0 Abstentions: 0

Item 3.0 - TMU Plants Executive Members Composition Appeal [Presentation] (6:10PM)

CC: Hello **Kiana**. My name is **CC**. I'm the Chair of the SASSH Board. I'm just here to make sure that you are treated fairly during this presentation and that the Board is treated fairly during this presentation. You will have about 10 minutes to present which will be followed by a question period from the Board. Then we will awkwardly ask you to leave the room while we discuss and vote, then it's only awkward because we will invite you back into the room for the second motion that you have on the Agenda tonight. With that, the floor is yours so go ahead, and just as a reminder, we are going to start with the Executive Slate appeal and then we will move into the budget next.

Kiana Hoang: Hi, I am **Kiana**. I'm here to present an Executive Slate appeal for our team here. Basically, our Constitution is laid out like this. It's a policy that the appeal is centered around. It states that the Executive Committee must consist of at least 51% Faculty of Arts students and the screenshot is taken directly from the 2022 Student Group Policy. In our case in our Constitution, the Executive Committee refers to our President and Vice President roles. There are currently only 5 positions under that Committee. All our Deputies are considered numbers. As I mentioned, currently all of the positions are filled based on our election results. Last year, the reason the ratio changed a lot was because last year, our Executive Committee replaced a Faculty of Arts member who resigned from their position and nominated someone who was not in the Faculty of Arts to be the successor of the role. This singular switch flipped our Executive ratio from 60-40 to the opposite. Last year, we did the same presentation where we received an exception for this ratio after presenting the same appeal. This year, **Nathaniel** left our previous VP of Events where we filled the role of VP Operations, and as a result, our Senior Deputy of Events, **Jazz**, succeeded the role of VP Events. Moving things around made the ratio the same as last year. In terms of elections, they state that if an

Executive spot is vacant, a nomination is permitted where only 1 nomination is required. It's different from nominations for non-vacant positions. It also states that general non-Executive members must be nominated by at least 2 Executives to be considered for an Executive role. In our case, **Jazz** received 5 nominations for the VP of Events role and this included all of the Executive members at the time and our other Events Deputy. As mentioned previously, we prioritized hiring based on ability. We try to prevent biases by only hiring SASSH students because this allows a more diverse team with various backgrounds and perspectives, this creates better events overall. We still hire people with the understanding that our content and events are geared towards students in the Faculty of Arts. We usually compensate by often collaborating with other SASSH Course Unions and Student Groups for events. In general, we thought **Jazz** would be the best fit considering her own efforts and experience in the Student Group. To ensure we can continue the best performance, we want to continue this ratio and be allowed a pass for another year.

Item 3.1 - TMU Plants Executive Members Composition Appeal [Question and Discussion Period] (6:15PM)

CC: Thank you for the presentation **Kiana**. Folks on the board, this is your opportunity to ask **Kiana** questions about the executive slate makeup for TMU Plants. So if anyone has any questions for her, please raise your hand.

TN: Who were the people that are eligible for submitting nominations?

Kiana: We have all of our Executives and Deputies but according to the Constitution, you need at least 1 Executive Member to nominate we we had all of our Executive Members.

LPL: Was SASSH involved in any of the outreach processes for nominations?

Kiana: No.

AL: Is there any internal ways or any mechanisms either stated by your Constitution or by word that you want to make sure that your slate consists of 51% Faculty of Arts, as per the Student Group policy? Were there any initiatives to ensure that you stayed at 51% or just a free for all?

Kiana: Our Constitution is based on the SASSH Student Group Policy. It's basically an exact template and was amended by SASSH every year. It does state that we usually prioritize hiring students based on ability which is why we rather present this every year than having it solely based on Faculty of Arts students.

MM: Is there any reason that you do the hiring internally instead of reaching out to new students to fill the positions?

Kiana: We usually do external hiring for our Deputy positions but for VPs, we usually tend to have people that already have previous experience in the Student Group because it has more responsibility and it makes more sense to have people who have worked as Deputies before. As she was a Deputy for a year before, it made sense. There is a lot more administrative stuff she has to deal with.

EP: I know this pitch is for an Executive Slate appeal, but if you had to guess, what percent of your team for TMU Plants as a whole is not Faculty of Arts?

Kiana: I actually don't really remember. We have a pretty big team this year. I do think there are quite a lot of them. I remember a lot of Criminology students.

CC: EP, there might be information about that in the additional link in the Agenda. There is a Course Union and Student Group Registry, let's call it, that I think includes that type of information that you are looking for.

TN: Since having 5 positions to make up that Executive Committee and having 1 person basically flip the ratio, have you considered maybe having co-VPs or even including Senior Deputies as part of the Executive Slate so that there isn't a lot of swing when it comes to overturns? Have you considered that option in the past?

Kiana: No, I haven't. But that is a good point. Maybe I'll try to do that for next year.

MM: Just a point of information. Um, there's nine Faculty of Arts students in TMU Plants out of 23 total members, so that's about 39%.

CC: We'll just have you step into the hall for a couple minutes while we chat, and then when we're ready for the next motion, I'll come and grab you, okay? Thank you. Before I call for a seconder, because in my experience as a SASSH Member and Chair, I don't think I've ever had someone give back to back presentations and also be in person, I just don't think that's happened before. Whatever the result of this first vote is, I'm not going to announce it to Kiana when she arrives back in the room. It will be shared via email as we do with all of our motion results. That being said, do we have a seconder who wants to start a discussion? **AL.**

AL: Considering the fact that Community Relations, Course Unions and Student Groups fall under my areas, I am a bit concerned that there is kind of a lack of initiative to ensure that Faculty of Arts students are prioritized. I understand the merit in that their ability to become part of the membership, I like that idea, but at the same time, if a Student Group wants to be under SASSH, they have to represent Faculty of Arts values because we are the ones that are giving them the resources and ability to carry out their mission. In some ways, they also should have some minor, whenever it might be an initiative, to also prioritize Faculty of Arts in their membership in some ways.

MS: Realistically, I think that if all 5 other VPs nominated this 1 person, then there is some real merit there and she kind of deserves it. I also know that in my very limited time on SASSH, I have seen them at very many events. I think there is a real effort to prioritize SASSH Course Unions and Student Groups. I think this flip from 60-40 to 40-60 is irrelevant and I think we should pass it.

MM: I think that not only 40% of their Executive Slate is Faculty of Arts, but 39% is general Faculty of Arts students. There is a kind of disregard for our policy in that way as **AL** mentioned. If it happened one time last year, we were able to excuse it because it was too late for them to have an election too late in the year, it's the middle of the year now. There's not that time constraint or concern that they cannot find someone to fill it for the next semester. Because all of those factors are missing from this, that's why I'm less inclined to it. Yes, they are at a lot of our events, but if the team is planning for those events, how are they going to prioritize Faculty of Arts students if most of them aren't Arts students? 9 out of 23 is a very low number. That's my opinion.

LPL: I was going to say that the fact that they didn't use our channels at all to try and promote this Executive position shows that it's almost like they don't want to be associated with us and they want to be their own standalone group, which is fine. That's a fine addition but to turn around and come to us and ask us to approve this slate without doing

the necessary steps to try and appease our Bylaws which are there to support Faculty of Arts students, I don't really think that is appropriate for us to give a pass to this one Student Group as it kind of sets a precedent for others. If we want to seriously look into accepting this, we might need to look at changing our Bylaws and things, which is a road that I frankly don't want to go down.

MM: This is a direct response. I also want to flag that they said that they are just going to keep doing this every year if need be. I don't think that is really appropriate either because it's almost directly disrespecting our Bylaws. If you don't want to have a majority of Faculty of Arts students, then maybe not be under the Faculty of Arts at all.

TN: I was going to say that not only was 9/23 Faculty of Arts for the whale team, even if they include their Senior Deputies in the Executive Slate, it's still 40%. For me, there hasn't been any kind of effort made. We allow Student Groups to structure however they need so that it matches the 51%, allowing them to have Senior Deputies count as their Executive composition for that. 4/10 is still low for me in the amount of 23. It doesn't show the same efforts that we would want and when it comes to SASSH values. I think they have done a lot for the Faculty of Arts Course Unions and Students Groups, but the composition for me. It's the second time they are coming back and not taking the advice we brought up last year. That is something we should consider.

BR: I think I'm concerned a bit with the ethics behind the spending of student levy fees because we on the Board are all paying student levy fees and that is one of the criterias for us to make decisions about Student Groups and essentially in them planning their events and all of that. If it isn't majority of Faculty of Arts students that are making that decision, it feels like an ethical conflict. Merit is one thing and I think that is important but it's also out of a Board of 23. I feel like having the Executive Board be that 51% majority is not that big of an ask for a Board of 23 because we didn't say it has to be your entire Board, just the Executive team.

EP: I agree with everything you guys said, the numbers don't lie and it's not looking favourable for Faculty of Arts students who are paying their levy fees. At the same time, I agree with the challenge of one person making this flip. I'm not sure, if they want to propose a change to the Bylaws, I know you brought it up as something that might be worth it so that's an option. I don't think we should resist that just for the sake of it being more work. If they want to come and show us a revision or something different, I think we should be open to that. It wouldn't be fair to them either, the same way I wouldn't be fair to Faculty of Arts students, and it was, if they felt their levy fees would not be used appropriately.

AL: I was also going to question how TMU Plants is aligning to empowering the Arts. I'm trying to understand how TMU Plants is benefitting Arts students in many ways. What are their goals in benefitting the Arts? I'm trying to wrap my head around it because I understand that there could be Geographic Analysis or Environment and Urban Sustainability, but at the same time, how are they aligning with Faculty of Arts goals and SASSH goals in general? At the same time, if they have a diminished number of people who are in the Faculty of Arts on their Board, how are they going to express Faculty of Arts values or desired goals? Empowering the Arts and fostering leadership for the new generation.

AZ: Quickly to **EP's** point. I know unfortunately that caused the percentage switch, but you need to keep in mind that they only have 9 Faculty of Arts members out of 27. They've already said that they have been catering to the Faculty of Arts and they did that percentage in the first place so it's not really fair to have the Faculty of Arts. It seems like they are just a general group now which is to go under TMSU unfortunately.

LPL: My point was going to be similar to **AZ's**, that's to say that sure there is a small sect of TMU that do enjoy this group, there's no doubt about, but to say that it is majority orienting SASSH to be the primary funding for this, I don't think it is fiscally responsible because it doesn't support a majority Arts student base and two they don't seem to make any effort to promote it specifically towards Arts students. They make every effort to promote it as its own Student Group, which is again fine, there is nothing wrong with being your own Student Group, but when you are under the SASSH umbrella, your objective is to promote your Group and Faculty of Arts students, which I don't think they make any effort to do at this current moment.

BR: I have more of a question. Hypothetically, this motion does not pass. How does this go towards affecting the rest of the Agenda for their proposal and things? I feel like it makes no sense to let them stay if it doesn't pass, are we really going to? I feel like it would be a bit cruel to let them go through this whole funding pitch, I feel like it's a bit disrespectful of their time, which might go against the typical etiquette of how we go about these things.

CC: Yes, that is a great question. Again, today is a bit different of circumstances as we are dealing with a couple different motions from the same group. I did ask **JAG** the same question so I am going to turn to you for the answer.

JAG: Yes. Understanding that she is a full-time Faculty of Arts Undergraduate student, she can apply as a full-time Undergraduate student for the funding, so you will have to assess her based on that.

LPL: She would be pitching for the funding as an individual and not her group? Are we going to get this har

JAG: Yes.

LPL: That is a whole layer of bad acting waiting to happen.

TN: We can treat it as just a group coming to SASSH for funding. In the past, we have allowed Student Groups that weren't part of the Faculty of Arts or under the SASSH umbrella. We did it with MetHacks and MetMun as well, and one of the theatre groups a few years ago.

CC: Yes, I remember that presentation, it happens. Groups that are not under the SASSH umbrella come to SASSH to seek funding, not unheard of and it would not be in violation of any existing rules of the Board. Does that answer your question?

BR: Yes, I would just feel a bit bad if it was going to go that way.

MS: Just out of curiosity, does anyone know how much we can possibly spend on them? Does anyone know how much we gave them last year?

MM: In total, it would amount to several thousand or at least over \$2,000. Yes, that is the baseline from what we spent last year but it could have gone to another Course Union, another Student Group, could have left room on the PCard for groups that respected our Bylaws. Even though it may seem minuscule in comparison to how much money we have as a whole, it's still a significant amount of money to just be throwing at a group that doesn't respect the Bylaws that we run ourselves by.

MS: Not completely unrelated but TMSU is a mess right now and I don't think we should deny this and subsequently deny them funding. If there is a way to conditionally approve it saying that we will give it to you now but we are not going to give it to you next year as that gives some time for them to either sort things out internally or for TMSU to become functioning again.

CC: First, the motion that we are talking about right now is the approval of their slate/ I know they are asking for some funding next but that will be a separate presentation, separate discussion, and SASSH can vote however they want for that. To the question about the conditional approval, you can add that but that would be an amendment. If anyone in this room wanted to add a condition to approve the motion, you can, that is an amendment and becomes what we discuss, then what we vote on. If that amendment does not carry, we go back to the original motion.

MS: I am proposing that we conditionally approve this, they do the appropriate advertising to the Faculty of Arts, and that they won't ask again next year or something.

CC: Perhaps SASSH wants to approve the Executive Member composition appeal on the condition that perhaps they work with the Board to effectively recruit members to abide by the Bylaws, I'm just phrasing words here and if people hate that please tell me.

LPL: Can I propose some clarity on that?

CC: You totally can.

LPL: What if we make it so they have to open another Executive position and hire a Faculty of Arts student? We accept this on the provision that they open up another Executive position via an EVP or something like that and then open it up to a student. Can we do that or not?

CC: To open another Executive position on the Student Group, the Student Group would have to go through an AGM?

SX: No, Student Groups don't have AGMs, they do it in their meetings.

CC: I understand what you mean, **LPL**, I am just trying to figure out the logistics of that before we making it a voting place.

MM: Instead of adding a new Executive position, because that would be a whole process, maybe we could make it so that the Vice President of Events, which is the position that they are recruiting for is opened up to the Faculty of Arts, instead of just giving it to someone that is not part of the Faculty of Arts. Have them run a by-election for this one position or a recruitment form of some sort.

LPL: The way I understand this is I think the person they have slotted into this role already thinks that they are there. We are going to have to actively remove them.

CC: Yes, I don't think they are recruiting. They have their slate as less than 50% and they're asking SASSH to approve that so the position has been filled, technically.

MM: We are approving whether they stay under us?

LPL: Skirting the rules?

CC: I wouldn't call it skirting the rules because Student Groups do have the right to come and ask for this just as SASSH has the right whether to vote for it or not. They aren't going against the rules, they are doing what they are entitled to do by coming to ask for this and you folks are doing what you are entitled to do by discussing it and however you choose to vote for it. Everyone is following policy. Just wanted to clarify that.

AL: MS, I know you mentioned something about next year, the thing is we cannot determine anything for next year because we will be gone and that is the next Board's decision. How do we officially phrase this because our term technically ends on May 1st therefore we have no barring on what happens next.

CC: Do the student group elections take place alongside SASSH?

JAG: They do it on their own. I think right now the best option for the motion, unless **AS** has a different option to present, is currently **LPL's** because I think it is okay to request to add another Executive Member to make up for the missing Faculty of Arts member.

AS: I was going to say to your point and the motion, by adding one more person to that, we went to 5 which would make it 50%, not 51%.

LPL: That's semantical though, the 51% is to say majority or even.

AS: You're saying that we just add another person but according to the violation, they are still not going to meet the threshold of 51%.

LPL: I will work on my wording to say and strive for the majority of Faculty of Arts students.

MM: AS is right in that adding an extra person still wouldn't fix the problem because they are still going to be breaking the rules.

LPL: Full transparency, I am going to be voting no to my own amendment. I'm just putting this amendment out here because I think it makes sense as the only compromise. I still don't think that it's a good compromise because I think that they have lately disregarded our rules that we put in place so that Faculty of Arts students can properly have access to the levy fees that they pay. We have an Instagram of over 5,000 student followers and they did not use our social media channels. They chose to not do any kind of promotion through it, just not to do anything. There was no sort of effort to engage back to our students whatsoever in this process.

AL: We cannot fully micromanage when it comes to their decision on their slate because yes we do fund them but we are not their superior in any way. In some ways there is some sense of autonomy of that group and SASSH. Yes, they have to follow the rules and certain guidelines but we cannot just put someone or put a situation where they have to do something because there is that unspoken idea of autonomy of a Student Group and SASSH, finicky gray zone.

CC: With what you just said **LPL**, appreciate the transparency, nobody has to bring forward a condition if you don't feel like you are in agreement with the condition. **MS**, I know you initially brought up the idea of the condition and we started wordplaying it so **LPL**, do you wish to bring forward a condition?

LPL: I think the wording is there but I will not bring it forward, if anyone else wants to.

CC: We'll go back to **MS**, not to put you on the spot, but because the idea started here. Do you wish to present the condition as an amendment?

MS: Yes.

LPL: We conditionally approve their slate as presented on the condition that within the end of the academic year, there is a new Executive position that is housed by a Faculty of Arts student.

CC: Okay, fantastic. That is what we're discussing, and that is what we will vote on first. If that does not carry, we go back to the initial motion.

CR: I would like to say that the point was brought up that they would only have to go to TMSU for funding but there are other funding options, they can go to SIF as well. There is a chance where she comes to us by herself and a certain amount of money is given to her. Maybe you have the full \$600 but we can look at getting her something so we don't leave them dry.

BR: Even if we say to add 1 more student, it is still not going to meet the majority. It would make more sense to say to add 2 more students but even if you do do that, it would speak to **AL's** point of us trying to micromanage in a way. It's more like looking at the list of Course Unions and Student Groups and stuff. They quite frankly are the only one who isn't meeting this requirement and based on the verbiage that **Kiana** used they will just keep doing this. Whether it carries or not, they'll have to either abide by that decision or try to make the changes themselves. They have to decide whether they actually want to really be under us in the future. If that makes sense. Because I also can't see a future right now where TMSU is going to give them the amount of support that we have given them. So I think they need to make a decision of whether or not they still want to keep that support.

CC: Just as a reminder, we will still have to vote on the amended motion first.

BR: Yeah no, I was just giving that opinion.

CC: Yes. Just as a reminder, we will have to vote on the first and then see where we have to go from there. **JAS** has a point of information and we will perhaps move to a vote on the amendment. Unless someone has a pressing, brand new, never before heard information this evening.

AZ: It is newer but TMSU is under SCC, as we know with TMSU and Study Groups are getting funding that they needed at a very quick pace due to a bunch of hiring. It is newer but TMSU is under SCC, as we know with TMSU, and study groups are getting funding that they need at a very quick pace due to a bunch of hiring. I would like for it to be known that they are funding Student Groups that are really doing great right now, no matter what happens with the election, they will still continue to fund Student Groups.

JAG: Quick point of information, If this motion fails, including the first one, **SX** will be sending them an email about the result of this and then that puts them on probation where they will have to present at the next Board Meeting about their Student Group status. Then in the meantime, this allows them an opportunity if they would like to change their membership and perhaps in consultation with the Vice President of Operations and Vice President of Community Relations so this is not the end for them, they do have another opportunity.

LPL: If they do have to come back, they will come back in January right? Would people stall until the January Board Meeting to allow them to bring?

CC: I suppose they could choose if they are ready to come back in December. They can discuss that and if they prefer to come back in January.

LPL: That's at their own discretion?

CC: Right. The option is there if they are prepared in time. If not, they are welcome to come back in January.

LPL: If we reject this, can we give them funding?

CC: Yes. It would not be a Student Group under SASSH as SASSH has done for other Student Groups in the past.

CR: Just to clarify, if the amendment does not pass?

CC: Then we go vote on the original motion. Right now, we are voting on that condition. If that fails, we go back to the original motion and whatever that decision is, is the decision.

SX: Do they go on probation? I'm looking at the Student Group Policy and the only thing that denies them of their status is summer training, maintaining all documents, big unaccordance with all of our policies, and then maintaining status.

LPL: They are technically violating our policies.

SX: Got it, that's true.

TN: Point of information. Last year, we gave TMU Plants \$7,589 compared to an average of \$5,000.

CC: All right, we're gonna move to a vote on this amendment. Does anyone have any final pressing things to share about the original motion? Okay, then we're going to move to vote on the original motion.

Item 3.2 - TMU Plants Executive Members Composition Appeal [Voting Period] (6:49PM)

**CONDITIONALLY APPROVE EXEC COMPOSITION WITH NEW EXEC POSITION
RESERVED FOR FOA STUDENT**

Motioned by: CC Seconded by: AL

In Favour: 0 Against: 12 Abstentions: 1

ORIGINAL MOTION

Motioned by: CC Seconded by: AL

In Favour: 0 Against: 10 Abstentions: 3

[Motion Does Not Carry]

CC: This is all to say that they are still eligible to come for this funding pitch that is next. I'm going to invite **Kiana** back in. Of course, she will not be aware of the status change so let's try and listen to this as a funding pitch because that is what it is. We will do the same process where we will discuss, you will ask your questions, all the same things.

CR: Are they on probation technically?

CC: Technically as of this moment they are on probation because of the ratio violation. But they are still able to come to you with a funding request as a Student Group.

Item 4.0 - TMU Plants Funding Pitch [Presentation] (6:51PM)

CC: All right so we are now hearing a funding pitch from TMU Plants. It's the same slides, so if you have them open on your computer, you don't need to close the tab. Then we will bid you farewell for the evening. Go ahead whenever you are ready.

Kiana Hoang: The event lineup for this present is first going to be the Arts Lounge Destressor and then the Winter Social. These are the total budgets we are going to be talking about now. First of all, the Arts Lounge Destressor. The venue is going to be in POD60, tentatively on December 1st, and it's in collaboration with the Health Program and Student Success Navigator for the Faculty of Arts. It is going to be based on pre-registration and planned based on the team's availability. The activities that we will be hosting are pot painting, arts and crafts, and plant giveaways. The benefits are that it is a much needed break period. Students get to meet with **Joanna** for health and guidance. They also get to meet with the Health Promotions Program for mental health support. This is our budget, it's \$810 and it's just the plants, pots, and soil needed for the event. Then next is our Winter Social. We are still looking into booking a venue. Hopefully, Thomas Lounge or possibly Pod260 depending on the new availability and the data is also being determined. It would be based on RSVPs for early sign-ins, but mostly runs on a drop-in basis. The activity is on a first come first serve basis too. The activities will be hosting our painting, plants giveaway, beading workshop, bouquet workshop, and we will be giving away little plants and shrubs. Some benefits are that small businesses win our giveaway sponsorships, we usually collaborate with a lot of small businesses that have a lot of TMU students. It promotes more knowledge on sustainability and also promotes wellness with fun crafts. As you may know, we have our Annual Spring Socials, bringing in attendance of about 100 people each year and it's our most popular event. It's a great opportunity to de-stress from finals before winter break too. We wanted to bring it to the Winter Social. This is our material list for that. Just to break down, most of the money is going towards food and decoration, rental costs, then we have our activities, external activities are highlighted in yellow. That's it.

Item 4.1 - TMU Plants Funding Pitch [Question and Discussion Period] (6:55PM)

CC: Any questions?

AL: Thank you for your presentation. This sounds like a lovely event here. I know you mentioned an Arts Lounge event, but it's at POD60?

Kiana: It's not in the Arts Lounge. We did not come up with the name, it was the Health Promotions Program but it's because it's a lounge-like event promoted towards Faculty of Arts students.

AL: That clarifies it, thank you so much.

LPL: For the Winter Social, what is your expected attendance? I know for the previous events, you said the Winter Social had over 100 attendees, but looking into your budget here, you have about 75 plants?

Kiana: Because we have a split between like a bunch of different activities. We didn't want to budget 100 per person. But I do think the way we allocate it is based on the popularity of events. For example, the beading workshop, we only budgeted for about 16 people because that's something new that we've never done before. But at our pot painting events, there's so many people that want to do it and we always run out, which is why more of the budget is allocated towards that.

LPL: My follow up question is for the Spring Social. Were you able to get attendance figures on that? I know you said you had an event targeted towards Faculty of Arts students. What was the Faculty of Arts student attendance rate for the Spring?

Kiana: For the Faculty of Arts, I don't think I calculated it, I just did a general sign in.

MS: Is there a reason the Winter Social needs to be in the Thomas Lounge in SCC?

Kiana: Yes. It is just based on vibes and what would accommodate the size, but if we can get a venue at all, then, yeah, it's just ideally that.

MS: Have you looked into others? How many seats do you ideally need?

Kiana: It's hard to tell because our events are usually a drop in, so we don't know how many people are gonna be in the room at a time. So we usually say, like, maybe about 50 people at a time in the room.

MS: You could be able to look into like either using classrooms in the ENG building or TRSS, because they have, say 50-60 seats with tables that you can like easily move around in, and it's like free if you book through ExploreTMU as opposed to Thomas Lounge which may be about \$900.

Kiana: Yeah I could look into that.

BR: Have you actually looked into any of the bookings? Is Thomas Lounge bookable, what does that look like? How long are they booked out until? Because the date for this event is still up in the air and I know you do have large attendance numbers but depending on the time of the year, if it's in the middle of finals, how it's actually gonna play out once you buy all this material.

Kiana: Yeah we're concerned too. We're still looking for a venue. Again, we are in contact with them. We almost would have secured a booking for the 28th. However, our budget pitch kept getting moved so we couldn't secure the deposit in time.

MM: For the bead workshop materials, you're working with Crystal Lee Jewellery. Is that a student?

Kiana: Yeah.

MM: Are they in the Faculty of Arts?

Kiana: I don't know. We don't really think of vendors as students, we consider them more of a business but I could ask.

MM: Did you look at maybe Amazon to see if the prices would be different? Because I'm sure you could get beads for cheaper than \$300 for that quantity.

Kiana: The cost that I listed there is based on prices for running the workshop, not based on the materials. The materials she said that she brings us as much as they want to use, and then the cost is for actually running the workshop per person.

LPL: Bit of a follow up to that, just purely out of concerns for fiscal responsibility. Is Crystal Lee Jewellery a registered company or are we just going to be paying a student?

Kiana: I don't know, I could look into that.

LPL: Just for context, TMSU is going through a lot of problems with their forensic accounting right now, because there's a lot of corporations on their transactions that appear to just be like paper corporations that don't have any, like, actual corporate presence in, like, taxation and things like that. So when it comes to university finances, it's really hard to pay people for services.

Kiana: If you send me the forms or something I can fill it out.

LPL: Yeah, it's more just registering yourself as a business.

CC: Any other questions? Thanks so much for joining us this evening Kiana. You're welcome to be on your merry way and enjoy the rest of your Tuesday. Um, and SASSH will be in touch with you with the decisions on the various motions this evening. Take care. Do I have a seconder who wants to discuss? **AZ.**

AZ: Just figuring out that something like this has never happened before where a person has to go out there and then come back. I feel like you can all tell that she totally heard everything and knew, you could just tell by the way that she was presenting and overheard the conversation. Some advice for if this happens again, we can maybe organize a third space where the person could be and that's why her presentation might not have been seen as enthusiastic.

CC: The idea of a third space is valid, that has never happened before. You folks have to vote on what you saw, what you heard, the answers to your questions, and the information you've got in your Agenda and such. Um, what folks choose to do with their vote is up to them.

LPL: I do think one event is completely unrealistic, the Winter Social. The fact that they don't have a date lined up by now and they are wanting to book out the Thomas Lounge, it's a bit iffy. I know for my events planning right now, I'm reaching out to Thomas Lounge to book in February, even then let's see. I don't think that giving them \$600 for a venue that might already be booked in the Winter is something that I think is very wise. That being said, the Arts Lounge Destressor, I personally like the breakdown of it. The plants could be cheaper, that is something that I think you should just go to Canadian Tire for everything and spend a little less money, they may not be the best, plant quality wise. I don't want to propose an amendment just yet, but conditionally approve at least the Arts Lounge Destressor to an extent because I think that this one could be targeted at Faculty of Arts students if we host in the Arts Lounge.

CC: I'll just remind the Board that you folks can do conditions and amendments to funding as well. If you think that TMU Plants lowballed their budget and they need some more money to host the event, you can increase the funding. If you think they inflated their prices, you can choose to decrease the funding. I will maybe ask JAG to clarify on how this works for Student Groups and things like this. So they wouldn't get the money until they've spent the money. With the uncertainty about the venue space, you wouldn't just be sending them the \$600 for it unless they booked it and can prove to you that they've booked it and paid for it. So just sharing that information.

LPL: If we approve them for the funding, does that then show in their balance sheet as available for spending or is it just for specifically that item line?

TN: Yes.

AL: I'm hesitant to approve this motion just because there's a lot of I don't know when a lot of things, and that is really concerning considering how we need to be very judicious in our spending and if we don't know what they're doing per se, if it is a registered business under BOBIA or if it other things we need more information about so that we can exactly know where to trace that money. It's really concerning.

MM: The Arts Lounge has a 60 person capacity and we have tables and chairs so they don't really need to be spending \$830 on a TMSU space when they could just use the Arts Lounge. With classrooms and things, because it's a painting event, they might be charged damage fees for getting paint on things and we would have to look into potentially reimbursing them for that as well. So it just opens up a can of worms that we may not want to get into. Also, the Thomas lounge is carpeted. So, there's a chance that it could damage the carpet, you know? So, like, having them in a faculty of art space that we run, like, the art lounge, I think that's the most appropriate for the type of event that they're trying to do. And also, this is way more minor, but \$100 on decorations for an event that's been done before, like where did your decorations go before this? Those are my comments.

AZ: Mine was just quick. Anything in SCC when it comes to damage or any type of cleanup is covered, that's why it's so expensive because they cover the damages.

CC: That is included in the rental fee?

AZ: Yes.

LPL: I will say there are a lot of what ifs when it comes to this, like **AL** said. I also think that everything is pretty overinflated. The plants on the Winter Social are \$10, but for the Arts Lounge Destressor, they are \$8 also from Jomo. It's like they are changing unit prices for no reason. I don't know if they are choosing different plants or things like that, I think there are a lot of opportunities to save money here, I think the current budget that they present is pretty over ambitious for what they are trying to do. \$3,000 for a Winter Social that is happening on campus. I am not going to spend that much money on my events happening at the Thomas Lounge so I don't see that being a necessary expenditure.

KA: In terms of their date not being chosen, as they mentioned in the presentation, they were looking to fund this earlier but they didn't get a chance because they were also at this Board Meeting. Because of that confusion, they didn't get a chance to actually book it because they wanted to wait until they received the approval before they actually go ahead and book it. It makes sense why their prices for their plants are super high. A number I want to throw out there, we don't have to make an amendment just yet but a number I wanted to throw out is \$2,690. That would include the whole Arts Lounge Destressor because it's very Faculty of Arts oriented. For Winter Social, it would only include their plants, so it would include the venue, the food, or the decor because I think that is something that they could not include the bead workshop. That's a number that I would like to throw out for a temperature check.

CC: I know that you're not throwing that out there as an amendment yet for the temperature check, but because the word amendment has flown around a couple times and I'll use your specific example. For anyone who may want to present the amendment and is thinking about wording, if you present it as we want to approve \$2000 for TMU Plants, TMU Plants can allocate that money to whatever line items they would want. If you want to say, we will fund Event A, and these parts of event B, It's more specific. You can do either option, just putting that out there for a temperature check as well.

LPL: I would like to say that I was a little concerned that they were not able to give me a rough estimate or even a number of Faculty of Arts students that did attend their Spring Social last year. They said it was one of their most popular events and they claimed that they have tried to target Faculty of Arts students, but again like we saw in the pitch for their slate and as we have been kind of seeing, they kind of don't make exactly the right effort to target Faculty of Arts students that they should be doing. I'm wondering, while the events are feasible to give them the capital to do so, is it actually worth it to give them \$2,000? Will we get \$2,000 worth of Faculty of Arts engagement out of it? There's no doubt that student engagement will occur out of this but I'm not sure if the Faculty of Arts engagement will be there as much as we wish it to be.

MM: I'd like to formally propose an amendment to the existing motion that we will fully fund the Arts Lounge Destressor for \$810 and fund up to \$2,500 of the Winter Social.

CC: This is what we are now discussing and what we will vote on first. Questions?

LPL: Where would this funding rank in terms of amounts that we have given to Student Groups already? Because I know we have given EUSSA a good chunk for their Montreal trip. We gave POGSA a good chunk, but I think that that will still add up to be over \$3000, which I think is a significant chunk to give to a Student Group that is currently struggling to build their Faculty of Arts presence.

KA: It very much depends group to group, I feel like a good average from what I see is yearly, it's about \$4-5,000 in terms of how much is for events but then this does depend on things like if they're a bigger group then they will request more, if they are smaller they will request less. From what I have been seeing so far from the group pitches, it's usually like \$3,500-5000 for a year's worth of events.

MM: One of the times that I remember we funded something that was kind of an extravagant amount, was the Met History Society. They came to us for 5 semester events for the Fall and we approved \$4,249.52, but that was for 5 events and this is for one. It just kind of doesn't line up. We did fund them for 3 events before for \$1,655.86. So around \$1,650 for 3 events. So \$2,500 for 1 event is more expensive than we funded in the past. We can adjust that number to make it maybe \$1,500 or \$2,000. But I think \$2,500 is reasonable looking at the quantities that they're trying to hit, it just omits the decorations, the space, and some of the food. But if you want to make it lower, that's always an option.

CC: It is always an option but it would be a second amendment on the motion.

MM: Since I proposed it, can I not just adjust it to something lower? It's not a second amendment, it's something lower.

LPL: Perhaps it could be reflected to the percentage of their Board that is Faculty of Arts?

CC: You can think about what you want to present as your amendment and then if others have an amendment to the amendment. That can happen as well.

BR: I have a question and it was more for **AZ** if she has more information on it. For Thomas Lounge, EUSSA had an event last academic year and the fee was waived. Are they able to waive the fee for them?

AZ: Do you know why it was waived?

MM: EUSSA is a Course Union that is also sort of under the TMSU, so you guys have the spaces for free. TMU Plants are under us and not under the TMSU, so they don't have the same grace, I guess.

BR: All right. Just trying to think of ways in which we could possibly lower the amount so they could do more with what we're giving them.

MM: They can get the Arts Lounge for free. So they do have a space that they could potentially book for free. They just don't want it.

BR: I have an answer to that. What I'm thinking of, of all the TMU Plants events I have seen, they tend to want large table spaces and be able to walk around. I feel like with Arts Lounge, we would possibly have to move out a lot of seating and then bring in tables to achieve that layout. I don't think that is the first option they are thinking of but I do understand your point.

MM: There's also POD250 which I know for sure won't cost \$900. So there are other space options on campus that are cheaper, but it's a preference thing.

AS: My point is to what you were saying. If you are worried about them not hitting a certain amount of Faculty of Arts students, you can just tell them the decision through the email after our decision to just come to us, come to me, and I can promote their graphics. That way, everyone in the Faculty of Arts gets to see them. It's a win-win. They will get more Faculty of Arts students and more students in general.

EP: POD250 is that big room with a bunch of tables and chairs right? Opens with 2 separate doors and right off the LLC Department? They closed it so it is not accessible anymore. They are changing it to an All Faith Prayer Room.

BR: Just a small question. Based on experiences, the FAISA Instagram and things, SASSH essentially has a group chat on Instagram where all the groups should be there and can send messages and ask people to repost all the time. Can you look at that and see whether or not they are part of that? Because I feel like reaching out to them for something that they're all already part of won't work if they're part of it and choosing not to use it.

MM: **LPL**, the number that you wanted was \$1,681 so I would say we can fund them for up to \$2,000 instead of \$2,500.

LPL: I think it sends a message if we do a percentage though.

MM: The reason that we would not do a 1-1 in that way is because the Arts Lounge Destressor is already \$810 so if we fund them up to \$1,860 for example, they would only have \$1,000 for the other event, which would not give them anything.

LPL: They can seek other funding options for it.

CC: **MM**, is \$2,000 your amendment?

AL: I am just going to react when it comes to the whole sending a message part. We already put them into probation, I think that is a good enough message. Unless you somehow want to do some other thing, I think putting them into probation is a really strong message. It's not like they violated some heinous crime, they just did some messing up in their policy. Judicious.

AS: This is just to answer **BR's** question. They are in the group chats but they have sent personal messages to the SASSH Instagram to promote their events.

Item 4.2 - TMU Plants Funding Pitch [Voting Period] (7:20PM)

Motioned by: CC Seconded by: AZ
In Favour: 7 Against: 2 Abstentions: 6

Item 5.0 - TMU Plants Retroactive Funding [Presentation] (7:22PM)

CC: We are not done with TMU Plants yet. Our next motion is presented by our money queen at the end of the table for some retroactive funding for them. KA, are you going to join us at this end of the table? I believe there are some supporting documents in the Agenda for folks. So take a second to get those out.

KA: This is the situation. On September 18th, TMU Plants had made a pitch for \$2,000 for their team social and we can see the breakdown here. The SASSH Funding Committee had approved them for \$865 on September 18th for their team social. The issue here is that the TMU Plants had their team social on September 14th which is 4 days before they were approved funding and they did not receive a confirmation that they were approved yet. This was a purchase made by a student out of pocket. Because the way they're social is split up, they wanted to go bowling and they wanted to do food. This unfortunately goes against SASSH Financial Policy 4.1.3, which I have copied there and is that they must be approved of the funding prior to spending money. It's okay with having the remaining funds come out of their chit account. This is an image from the reimbursement request that they made, so they were okay. As of this Board Meeting though, they don't have access to their Chit Account so if they were going to go ahead and fund them up to the amount for this reimbursement, this would have to come out of project funding instead of their Chit Account. The final motion that we will be discussing here is to approve TMU Plants for retroactive funding of \$1,492.74. So in the sense of do we approve them of this reimbursement even though they had made this purchase before they had received the funding right before?

Item 5.1 - TMU Plants Retroactive Funding [Question and Discussion Period] (7:25PM)

CC: We are still going to do them separately, that is my bad. We are talking about the \$1,492.74. Because you are in the room with us and can contribute to the discussion and a voting member on the Board. I am just going to ask if there is a seconder who would like to start a discussion. Usually, if you are seconding, you have a question or comment or something about the presentation. I don't need one if the Board feels as though they have all the information they need to vote, then we don't need a seconder.

MM: My question is with the \$1,492.74. We approved them for up to \$2,000, is that extra to that \$2,000 or within it?

KA: They pitched for \$2,000, we approved \$865, now assuming that this was after they received funding, they would have taken the rest of the amount out of their Chit Account. They have only been approved of \$865 from the SASSH Board if that makes sense.

CC: They are now on probation. As per SASSH Policies related to probation, they don't have access to their Chit Account.

EP: Can I just ask for a point of clarification? They were told that SASSH is going to give you \$865 and they went ahead and spent more?

KA: The issue isn't necessarily that they spent more. The issue is more so that they have made those purchases before they had received approval from us. SASSH funding requires us to approve them of that amount and then they go out and make the purchases. The issue here is that, according to our Constitution, we might not be able to fund them of that amount because they spent that money before we funded them.

TN: Is there an updated motion because we can't withdraw a part of that?

CC: The motion as it stands is to approve retroactive funding in the amount of \$1,492.74 which was the total amount that they spent without approval. The actual motion has nothing to do with the Chit Account. So the motion itself does not necessarily need to be amended with the new context of their probation.

MM: Because it was Kiana, it was the same person that made both purchases, according to the receipts. We would be directly reimbursing her instead of the Student Group itself, this amount? So this would just be one student's reimbursement?

KA: Yes.

MM: Should the motion reflect that and not say TMU Plants?

TN: It would just be that person made the purchase on behalf of TMU Plants. We never specify a specific person when it comes to funding or reimbursements.

BR: Point of information, as someone that was in the funding pitch meeting deciding on this. In real time, we were able to look up Instagram posts and see that they went ahead and did the social and only to look at these numbers and like our funding decision was based on the fact that, essentially for a team social, this is an exorbitant amount. Based on the prior history of Course Unions and what they do for their socials, this is quite a big amount. I understand that they are quite a big team, however typically for socials students try to essentially hold back and not ask for this much on food and other items. Based on the prices that they were asking for and based on my memory, don't take my exact word for it, but based on my memory at the time, the prices that they were asking for were a bit more expensive than what we were finding on the company's website as well. I'm just wanting the Board to understand this in making their decision on this amount.

LPL: Would it be possible for us to reimburse the Faculty of Arts students who attended? In some regards, I understand that there's a bit of a responsibility for us to make sure that groups have a team social and retroactively funding them if they were to make this kind of stick makes somewhat sense. But it is exorbitant. If we probably should have funded the whole amount, do we know how many people attended?

MM: 18.

LPL: So at \$50 per person which is the standard social appreciation for the SASSH, that should have been about \$900. Maybe we can reimburse them that, the standard rate?

CC: Are you presenting that as an amendment or are you giving it a temperature check?

LPL: Temperature check, see how folks feel.

JAG: Point of information on the budget. **LPL** said that typically \$50 per person for Committee appreciation. Let's say that applies to the \$41, which is the bowling, and on top of that there is the food amount which we do have a limit on spending based on the policy which they also have access to. Think about that \$50 which can be appreciation plus the food. The \$50 typically includes food but if you apply to the situation, then it's way more than that.

MM: I was probably going to say something similar to **JAG**, I think that they did exceed the threshold, a decent amount. For 18 people to go bowling, first of all there are different options for bowling. They don't need to go to Ballroom, prices are exorbitant, everyone knows that. There are other bowling places around Toronto that they could have gone to, especially for the mini-type bowling that they offer. It's close to campus so maybe that is why but they had other options that they could have looked at. They just chose the most expensive one. To **LPL's** point, **Kiana** is a Faculty of Arts student. She is the one that made both of these purchases. If we are looking at it, we are just paying a Faculty of Arts student back for her contribution to a Student Group. I think we should not restrict, we shouldn't give her back her money because at that time, it was a Faculty of Arts Student Group. It was performing really well, and so she should get her money back, in my opinion, but that's obviously up to a group vote.

AZ: KA, question for you. If they do not get the money here from us, would they just split it amongst their team members and it would just all go back in that way? Do you know how they would pay her back?

KA: If we are not reimbursing them, then they will be incurring the cost and then it will be up to them and their team to figure out what they do about it. If they want to split it between the team, that would be up to them, but we just have to let them know that we unfortunately cannot reimburse them.

EP: As someone on a Student Society and someone part of the Course Union, I am not sure people do social events with other SASSH members, technically it's team building. There is no expectation of reimbursement, especially with the fact that there are social media proofs of them going ahead of doing this without getting approval and coming here now. I would feel horrible if she had to pay for all of that out of pocket, especially if people were told that it would be a free event for them. But at the same time, it doesn't seem fair to other people.

CR: I had a similar point to **EP**, essentially. I think it is a bit risky asking them to split in-between themselves because it's a very good chance people will ignore her or they won't pay it back. And it's a lot of money.

LPL: I was going to point out just how fiscally irresponsible that this whole move was on behalf of TMU Plants to do this without our approval. This puts us in a handcuff situation, we're damned if we do and we're damned if we don't in the sense that if we choose to reimburse them, we are spending over \$1,000 of student levy fees on who knows how many Faculty of Arts students, could be 50% of them or could be less. We know that there are 9 members on the Board, we could either spend \$1,400 on 9 Faculty of Arts students which in my opinion is a gross overspend of levy fees or we don't and force this student to eat a huge cost potentially which I think is also horrible. I don't think we can fiscally solve irresponsibility with more fiscal irresponsibility. That being said, I think we can come to a middle ground by providing reimbursement of our standard event rate per person which is \$50. I'm going to propose to amend that we refund them \$50 per person, which if they had 18 attendees, that would be \$900.

CC: Question to hopefully support the society in this motion. I think it was **MM** who said there were 18 people at this event? Is that documented somewhere?

MM: Yes. It says bowling by 18 so that would mean 18 people, it's on the receipt. Question for **KA** about whether or not they submitted an attendance list? We could name match by whether there were any Faculty of Arts here at all?

AL: For the tip of \$111.38, is that over 15%

SX: That's the next motion.

CC: We have another motion for this still. Again, we are discussing and starting our vote on the amendment to reimburse at a rate of \$50 per student, there were 18 students in attendance which totals in a \$900 reimbursement.

KA: Point of information, I see no attendance list. But that could be information we request.

LPL: Can I change the wording of my amendment? Upon receiving an attendance list, we will then reimburse \$50 per student based on the attendance list provided. We max it out at 18 because we know there were 18 rounds purchased. They could have purchased two rounds. Then we have no way of seeing how many people attended this if we have an attendance list that says one thing, we can have 9 people who played two, etc. Is it too much to ask for proof of event like photos?

CC: There were Instagram posts apparently. So there's 17 in this photo, plus perhaps a photo taker. That would be 18.

LPL: The photo is one thing. My next point of information would be, do we know if they're all TMU Plants students? Are they all part of TMU Plants? Are they friends of TMU Plants? Are they plus ones and TMU Plants?

CC: I'm going to go with no but we don't have the information.

LPL: We need that attendance list.

CC: Can I suggest some clarity? Because we have got a maximum of \$50 at maximum 18 people, we removed the bit about the \$900 because I am just worried that it could be misconstrued on any side. We've got our 2 thresholds set already, 2 pillars.

AL: To add to **LPL's** point, I am also confused if these attendees are even TMU students to begin with, just because people can bring their friends from other institutions or different places. Based on the photo, I do not know everyone at TMU so I cannot say for certain if these are TMU students so if we could check either by student numbers or some form of validation that they are TMU students.

CC: Okay, an attendance list with student numbers.

BR: Speaking to **AL's** point, we are trying to match a face to a name and thus a student number? Is that what we're trying to do? Because I feel like the list that they send is one thing, but how do we know who it is in the picture? I'm wondering if that's what they were trying to get at.

AL: The thing is, because they are using student funds here to pay for this activity, we know that there were 18 people so I feel like there is a sense that we don't know who went and what is going on. Are they TMU Plants and what is the situation because we cannot put names to faces in a way.

BR: What my point was getting at is that are you going to ask for photographs? How do you ask them for photo evidence that yes this is my face to my name? I feel like going to that extent feels like micromanaging and I'm worried about how that would be phrased to them.

MM: When you take an attendance list, you have to take a student's name, student number, email address, and potentially their program. That's just the template that I think all SASSH events follow. I think when **LPL** gives his events training, it's pretty much the same training that is wash rinse repeat every single year. It tells you a template of how to do an attendance list. I know that because I taught it to my FYC 2 times. When they were learning how to plan an event, that was one of the things that was instilled in them from the beginning. As a Student Group, under the Faculty of Arts, they get events training, I believe. I think you've done that with them.

LPL: At SGLC, it wasn't me but yes.

MM: They got that training. They know that's what we ask for when we ask for an attendance list. Whenever you submit a reimbursement form, I know that attendance list and proof of event are 2 things that are required. The fact that they didn't even send that is already kind of crazy. And then they spent, even if it was 18 individual people, that is \$82.93 per person. And we don't even spend that as a board per person. Like, we got capped at 50 and 75 is the absolute highest that we've ever gone. So \$8,293 a person is still outrageous.

BR: I'm understanding this and that's also one of my concerns. Are we going to ask for pictures of drivers licenses so we know it's them in this photo? I feel like that might be a lot to ask because we are not some government organization verifying things but I also understand that if we need to do that. I'm lost at how we are going to ask them for those specifics. I feel like it's more of they didn't provide it in the first place, we have questions of why you didn't provide it, and then there is the issue of Faculty of Arts percentage here.

CR: To be fair like **MM** said, we did have training on this so I think if anything, we can't do any more communication based on previous SGLC training in order to verify that those students were actually there.

CC: The motion is not putting any weight on this photo. The motion is putting weight on the attendance list that TMU Plants will send to you that SASSH is requesting and includes student numbers. At which point, I believe it's your Manager who puts the student numbers in the system to see what Faculty these students belong to. It's not in this motion that we're gonna take this list and then go look at this photo and try and cross-reference. Just trying to clarify that, we happen to have the photo that the event did take place and there are 17 people in the photo.

LPL: When you look up student numbers in the system, doesn't the photo on their OneCard come up?

JAG: No. It's actually very hard to verify. Because it goes into your entire advisement report.

MS: This may be excessive but what if we just ask them? I don't really think they are in the market to screw us over. If we ask for a breakdown of who is there in the Faculty of Arts, who is a TMU student, and who there is a plus one, they aren't going to lie to us.

CC: The motion as it stands is that SASSH's requesting the attendance list with the student numbers, which would be the ask.

LPL: I was going to say that as much as I want to trust them, they went and spent \$1,400 without getting approved for it. I don't trust them.

TN: Point of information overall and something to bring up. The amount does not constitute their food order receipt but if you calculate it with the gratuity amount on their food order.

CC: The gratuity is actually the next thing on the Agenda. We have one more to go.

Item 5.2 - TMU Plants Retroactive Funding [Voting Period] (7:47PM)

Motioned by: CC Moved by: KA Seconded by: MM

In Favour: 8 Against: 2 Abstentions: 4

Item 6.0 - TMU Plants Retroactively Funding Tip [Presentation] (7:49PM)

CC: Last voting item. TMU Plants retroactive funding for a tip.

KA: Hi everyone, part 2. There is another motion that we have to look at. Of the 2 receipts, we are now going to be focusing on the tipping amount. The first receipt which is the Ballroom Bowl, TMU Plants tipped 15% on their bowling. This one does not really necessarily have an issue but the issue is the one for \$98.25 which is a 25% tip on their food. Unfortunately, this goes against SASSH's Financial Policy which is that there is a limit to tipping which is 20%. The discussion that we will be looking at is to approve the payee to be reimbursed the full \$29.63 which is a 25% tip. Listed here are some possible options. Of course, there might be some other options that we might look into but some possible options might be don't reimburse them at all which would mean the payee does not receive \$209.63 or reimburse them the full amount that is allowed by the SASSH Financial Policy which means they would be out \$19.65. We would also need to see if this is actually logistically possible. Finally, reimburse them for the full amount and just make an exception this one time and then the payee would not have to incur any costs.

CC: The motion that we are starting our discussion on is to approve the full amount. **KA** has listed some additional options for consideration that the Board is entitled to pursue should they wish but those are not already applied to the motion. If someone wants to apply one, we'd have to present that as an amendment. Same thing, because we're all in the same room, on the same team, voting on the same thing, I'll just move to a seconder. You already have your hand up, **LPL**, so go ahead.

LPL: I immediately move to amend to reimburse them up to the full amount that is allowed by the SASSH Financial Policy, which is 20%.

CC: The amount would be \$189.98, leaving whoever paid this \$20 in the hole, and they need to work with your finance people to figure that out. That's what we're talking about and that's what we'll start our vote on. Does anyone have any questions, comments, reactions to that?

MM: It's not necessarily related but more of a curiosity question. When their Chit Account gets taken back because they are no longer a Student Group, what happens to that money, does it just go into a general line on the budget?

CC: Is it a matter of the Chit money being revoked or does it just sit there and they can't touch it?

MM: That's my question.

TN: Technically, they are still a Student Group but just on probation, they just can't touch it.

BR: Maybe we move to table this decision until after they get the chance to reconsider their probation status, that way this can be taken out of their Chit Account because I feel like we've already given them a pass on reimbursing for the amount for the social up to a certain amount. I would say they spent without approval, or giving them that one allowance, but the tip in itself, I feel like we should possibly just wait until they can re-evaluate that status and then take it out of their Chit Account.

CC: Okay, so to table the motion is technically an amendment. Do you want to move forward with that as an amendment?

BR: Yes.

CC: Okay so we are going to start with this amendment to table this motion. If that does not carry, then we go back to our first amendment which was to reimburse them up to the 20% as per SASSH Financial Policy. If that does not carry, we go to the original motion. If none of those carry, then I believe we do have to table the motion because we have gone through so many things. Do people understand that process?

JAG: Just a point of information, this motion technically doesn't have anything to do with the Chit so you are just approving reimbursement or not.

BR: Where would it be coming from if we do reimburse them? Would it come out of their Chit once reinstated?

TN: I think I know where you're getting at, correct me if I'm wrong. Because they're on probation, if we do go forward with this now, it will come out of project funding because we can't take it out of their Chit. What we are proposing, if we do table and if they restore their status, then we get to decide whether, if we do it, reimbursing them, we can either decide our project funding or their chit account when they restore that possibility.

CC: Thank you to whoever wrote it in the Agenda that the amendment that came out of **BR's** question and such is to table this motion until TMU Plants is reinstated as a Student Group under the SASSH. It still avoids that chit-based language but there is the underlying caveat that they will have to come back anyway at which time SASSH could choose to say no use your Chit money.

JAG: 2 points of information actually. The first one is whether TMU Plants chooses to be reinstated as a Student Group, they do not have to.

BR: I understand that as a possibility but I want to have the answer to that first.

CC: Okay. So we are still discussing the amendment to table this until TMU Plants regains their student status. To JAG's point of information, if they never regain their Student Group status, this will not come back to a board meeting. Correct?

JAG: Yes. Unless they choose to present this for you as an individual for retroactive funding.

MM: Just to be clear to everyone, the \$900 that **LPL** was talking about before, these tips are from the total of \$1,492.74 so the \$200 is part of that already. We are funding them \$900 at that amount already. So we're funding them \$900 at that amount already. This \$200 would push that to over \$1,000 which is still over the threshold. So that's also something we can keep in mind. And then tipping 25%, they can incur that tip as a personal expense if they enjoyed the service, and splitting that among the 18 people is not ridiculous. So, just flagging that.

TN: Point of information. Since this was technically approved funding during a funding committee, it will have to go out of project funding if not Chit Account.

JAG: Technically, it's because they used the money before getting approval from the Funding Committee. That is why we are going to use the Chit.

MM: So everyone has the same understanding, that is still around \$1,100, the total with the previous \$900. That would be \$1,089.98, which is still above the allocated amount.

LPL: Just to add onto that point, this total is a tacked total onto the previous funding that we have already discussed. I'm now personally treating this as if we are giving them extra funding off of what we've already approved, which would be a complete violation of our Wellness Policy and what we approve for social gatherings which is \$50.

KA: I was going to say that I would personally consider the tip amount separate just because it is not necessarily part of each team member's allocated amount. It's more just tipping an extra service as a thank you for giving them great amazing bowling stuff. I would not necessarily consider that as part of the allocated \$50 per person.

MM: If you split a tip with this total of \$209.62 among 18 people, that's \$11.64 per person and I feel like being able to foot that expense considering that we are reimbursing so much of the total expense is reasonable for them. I don't think it's insane to ask them to pay \$11 of their own money, especially if it was a tip based on a good experience. So we can also keep that in mind. If we do choose to go forward with this motion, it will be in line with the Policy. Even though **KA** says it's separate, it is an expense that they could incur themselves, it's not ridiculous. I don't think \$11 is crazy.

AL: I was going to say that any amount tacked upon the previous amount we said that we are approving is a grotesque amount, \$900 plus whatever we are approving as of now is going to be a lot. I agree with **MM** that that money spread on 18 people is not bad, it's essentially a matcha at Matcha Matcha, it's not a grotesque amount.

CC: That's fine. I will say, I know there's talk about, just splitting this amount between everyone who was at the event. That's not something SASSH necessarily is deciding here. just looking at if you folks want to reimburse that amount or not? It's up to TMU Plants to then decide if they want to go back to everyone who is at this event to be like, yep, you owe me 10 bucks.

TN: The \$50 amount is a baseline, we work around it. I'm taking into account both tip and tax that we didn't take into account the original 50 for 18 students that we originally planned out. If we add it all onto that, this is just an 11%, whatever it is, on that. But in a way, it kind of leverages out the tax and the grant that they have to make to record how much every day they spend. To be honest, when it comes to social amounts, we are pretty flexible when it comes to if we are staying between the 50, just a little bit above the 50, below the 50s, just to adjust for no tax, and right into the amount.

Item 6.1 - TMU Plants Retroactively Funding Tip [Voting Period] (8:02PM)

TABLING MOTION

Motioned by: CC Moved by: KA Seconded by: LPL

In Favour: 1 Against: 6 Abstentions: 5

REIMBURSE UP TO FULL AMOUNT ALLOWED BY FINANCIAL POLICY

Motioned by: CC Moved by: KA Seconded by: MM

In Favour: 8 Against: 2 Abstentions: 2

[Motion Does Not Carry]

Item 7.0 - Financial Updates [Presentation] (8:04PM)

CC: That concludes voting matters for this evening. You are still in the hot seat, because we have financial updates.

KA: I have a feeling that you guys have already taken a quick peek. Today is National Princess Day so I want to take a moment to commemorate all the princesses on the Board, including **AZ**. We are currently 21% done our total budget. As usual, the blue line represents how much each portfolio spent last year and the green represents how much each portfolio is spending currently, events taking the lead. Funny story guys, I actually messed up the graph last Board Meeting but no one noticed so thank goodness. These are the actual numbers for the rest of the month. We are almost done November, thank goodness, so this number might change. We shall see in the December Board Meeting. Yeah, cool stuff. So there's not been any changes in the president portfolio since the last Board Meeting. In terms of Operations, we have had some costs in terms of software and service subscriptions. The meal expenses have not come in yet but in total, \$974.89 was spent. Finance, of course, has a bunch, so we've had a bunch of project funding, so a lot of funding, funding committee meetings, and Board Meetings have happened, and so there's been a lot of expenses that have been reflected through that. And a lot of Course Unions and Student Groups using their Chit Accounts, so that's really exciting to see. Events, lots of cool things here. In terms of general events, this big number is because of the Argos Takeover so that is really cool to see. Then we've got Kaleidoscope, Kaleidoscope purchases have been starting to be made, so that's really exciting to see. Then we will see what the final number is probably in December or January. Marketing, no changes since the last Board Meeting, Corporate as well but they are in process. Community, just some small increases in terms of student engagement. IDEA, nothing yet. Student engagement, some things for merchandising for Course Unions and Student Groups. Lots of groups have been having merch which is really cool. These numbers are not as drastic as it was last Board Meeting just because we have had a bit of shorter weeks in between. When we come back in December or January, it will probably be some bigger numbers.

Item 7.1 - Financial Updates [Question and Discussion Period] (8:08PM)

Item 8.0 - Board Updates (8:09PM)

CC: Any immediate questions while that information is fresh in people's brains? Okay, great. We'll move to Board Updates. Um, like always, if there's one or two things that are really pressing that you want to verbalize, do so. If not, tell everyone it's in the document.

AZ: Honestly just Kaleidoscope is Friday, it seems like you guys understand that this is a big event, so please don't feel pressured to come for too long, you know. It's the whole day but I am excited to see you guys there, you should come.

AIZ: Our campus cleanup is tomorrow, really excited for that. Thank you to Events, **LPL** and **TN**, for helping with the Black History Month event. Please let us know if the Joni dispensers need to be filled and if anyone wants to help with doing rounds because we may be doing weekly seeing as there was a whole thing with students taking more products.

AS: I want to point out one thing. If you guys are making your own graphics to put on Instagram, please use the graphic template.

MM: There are a few things I want to highlight. Just letting everyone know that we have an Honorary President candidate that will be presented at the next Board Meeting, exciting. Keep an eye out for that. I'll give you more details then about who they are and what they stand for, and we can come to a decision later on. We have confirmed, basically, our venue for the next two Galas. The contracts haven't been signed, but they have been sent to us. We notified the Dean so that we're on a 2 week timeline. So within the next 2 weeks by the December Board Meeting, we will have that ironed out and like 100% done. For **AZ**, the Kaleidoscope Red Bull has been arranged for delivery for Thursday. The day before, if anyone's on campus Thursday, I know the executives were doing the SAGM runthrough. If anyone would like to help me with the Red Bull, we're getting about 168 cans, I believe. I'm not sure how many cases that is, but I know it's definitely more than we were given before. So, um, if at least maybe 3 people can help me out, that would be great. And then, uh, an exciting opportunity to collaborate with the Toronto Football Club. I got a call from one of their liaisons. His name's **Emil**, and he's a completely different person than who we've been working with before, and he originally reached out to **RV**, who then pushed him over to me. We're looking at potentially buying a block of tickets for 40 seats at assorted TFC games. So that's 20 pairs of tickets, and those 20 pairs of tickets will be getting this season, even though we don't hold the season pass, because we're a student group, they would be giving us a season pass rate, which is their cheapest rate for all tickets. Um, if we buy these 40 seats, we break them up into pairs. Um, that can be 20 individual games, or we can do a SASSH TFC takeover similar to the Argos, where all 40 of those seats are placed in one block, and we can have students buy the tickets. That way it's also not as expensive. There are 2 options for pricing. One of them is 40 seats in the 200s, at \$69 a game. And then option 2 is in the 100s and it's row 4. It's pretty close to the field, and that's really exciting, but it is obviously more expensive. So the 1st option is \$69 a game, and the 2nd option is \$93 a game. So we would just have to look at where, where, whose budget that's coming out of. Because originally it would be mine, but if **LPL** wants to do it as a takeover event, it will be his.

LPL: Events would like to talk to you about this after this meeting.

MM: So it's looking like it's coming out of LPL's budget, thank god. As a season seat member, that means that we can allocate those 40 tickets throughout all of the season, which starts in March. If the season starts in March and our term ends in April, then there would have to be a takeover at the end of the semester, which is obviously tricky because it's finals season and it's also right after SPROUT. But, we can talk about that later, just letting everyone know. There's also a bunch of details, I listed them in my updates, as to like what we get as season seat members, even though it's non-renewable. Um, yeah, 15% off merchandise, um, there's payment plan options, so we don't have to make the full

payment upfront. We can make half and then pay off half once everything is said and done. And, yeah, that's pretty much it.

LPL: We are doing a new marketing initiative in February for February events called Career Month. We have a lot of career focused events in February, so I felt it would be kind of fitting, and spoke to **AL** about it as well. **Ozzy** has created a great breakdown for our Black History Month event that is coming up in late February so feel free to check that out, and Celebrating Success. Be sure to look through that alumni database and find someone who would like to attend and maybe even do the panel for a nice honorarium.

JAG: The main thing would be that tomorrow is the last day for the application deadline for the vacant Director positions. We have 5 crim applicants, surprise surprise, 3 GAs, that's a good surprise, and also surprisingly only one from ECON. P-card usage, this will be limited to just the Finance Committee. So Vice President of Finance, Co-Chair, which is the EUS Director and the Finance Assistant, and Vice President of Operations, just to make sure that we don't lose receipts. This is something that is being done across all Student Societies so it's not just your society and it is just to manage everything. For the Vice President of Finance P-Card, that is to be used for individual students and Student Groups and Course Unions while my P-Card is only for SASSH.

SX: Board Members of the month, **AIZ** and **HT!** You guys have been doing, of course, you've been doing so many great initiatives with the cleanup, literally coming tomorrow and helping with the Joni Dispensers, which has been really challenging for all of us. Um, and just bringing these IDEA tenets into reality. Your cupcakes are downstairs.

Item 9.0 - Action Items (8:18PM)

Item 10.0 - Adjournment (8:19PM)