Oct 31st BoD meeting

The meeting was called to order at 5:03

Appointment of Meeting Chair:

Amir M. called for a vote to appoint Sandhya Mylabathula as the meeting's chair.

All board members voted in favor of Sandhya Mylabathula.

In-Camera Discussion Motion:

Chris R. raised his hand and motioned to move in-camera.

Sandhya M. suggested reading out the equity statement and rules before proceeding with the in-camera discussion.

Reading of Equity Statement and Rules:

Sandhya M. reminded attendees of meeting expectations, including respecting colleagues and adhering to time constraints.

Sandhya M. interpreted the bylaws and mentioned the option to challenge the chair if someone disagrees with rulings.

The meeting has a timed agenda, and extra time may be added in exceptional cases.

A 2-strike system will be used for behavior contrary to the equity statement, leading to removal after two strikes.

Gadfly S. was appointed as the equity officer.

Responsibilities of directors under Canada not-for-profit corporations were read.

Volunteers read the equity statement, and all attendees raised their hands to indicate agreement.

Chris R. motioned to move in-camera immediately, bypassing the agenda. Sandhya M. suggested following the agenda, but Chris R., invoking owner's rights, insisted on an immediate in-camera session.

Sandhya M. reminded everyone of the 5-minute time limit for each motion, whether in-camera or not.

Amir M. inquired about the goal of going in-camera according to Robert’s Rules. Chris R. stated the need to discuss sensitive issues with directors and executives involving confidential details.

Sabeen sought clarification on the goal, and Chris R. explained it related to conduct, disciplinary matters, financial contracts, and confidential details.

Sandhya M. declared the motion out of order, citing the need for adequate time for disciplinary matters and asked for a seconder. Sabeen seconded.

Neelofar A. and Friedemann K. seconded Chris R.’s motion. Sandhya M. asked Chris R. to clarify the goal in less than 45 seconds, and he outlined issues such as allegations, disciplinary matters, and financial contracts.
Sandhya M. declared the **motion out of order**, as per the need for time for subjects related to discipline. **Chris R. challenged the chair.**

Amir M. asked for a board **vote on upholding the chair’s decision**. Two hands were raised for going in-camera, and none for upholding the chair’s rule.

Amir M. called for a **5-minute breakout room for the board to discuss the matter privately.**

Discussion on Timed Agenda:

Friedemann K. questioned the recent implementation of the timed agenda, expressing that it differed from the last two meetings. Sandhya M. explained she made the decision to address agenda-following issues and noted its success in the previous year.

**Chris R.’s Allegations Regarding VP External and Neelofar A:**

Chris R. addressed recent allegations about the conduct of the VP external and Neelofar A. He mentioned issues with emails related to the ED hiring process and raised concerns about confidentiality and silencing of the assembly.

Sandhya M. added that timing adheres to people’s expectations based on the agenda.

Neelofar A. clarified her comments on meeting minutes and received a notice of a special board meeting for an impeachment motion against her. She questioned the board’s actions and requested an investigation instead.

Friedemann K. urged caution in sending confidential emails and emphasized the need for official motions to discuss matters.

**Extension of In-Camera Discussion:**

Sandhya M. added two minutes to the discussion due to its importance.

**Neelofar A’s Response to Allegations:**

Neelofar A. asserted that she had not breached any confidentiality or protocols. She followed the necessary protocols by reaching out to authorities for guidance, stating that discussions should start with the executive team and escalate to the board if needed.

Board’s Decision on Investigation:

Jady L. announced that the board of directors had agreed to conduct an investigation into the allegations raised by the VP of external. The investigation will be comprehensive and impartial.

**Concerns about Safety:**

Amir M. began asking Neelofar A. about her concerns regarding her and her children’s safety, but Sandhya M. stopped him, indicating that a separate meeting would be held to address that matter. Amir M. agreed.

**Return to Regular Meeting Room:**

After Neelofar A. deleted her messages in the chat box and with a unanimous vote, the meeting returned to the regular meeting room.
**Agenda Adoption:**

Sandhya M. asked for a 3-minute motion to adopt the agenda.

Friedemann K. raised a point of order, requesting a discussion on the agenda. Sandhya M. clarified that agenda discussion would occur only after a procedural motion was on the floor.

**Discussion on Agenda Amendments:**

Neelofar A. inquired about the possibility of amending the agenda, and Sandhya M. responded that discussing and modifying the agenda would only be possible after a motion was on the floor.

Sandhya M. designated Neelofar A. as the mover and Amir M. as the seconder for the motion to adopt the agenda.

Attendees were invited to provide comments or questions on the current agenda motion.

**Motion to Remove Agenda Items:**

Friedemann K. proposed a motion to remove the items related to the adjustment of course unions, members in bad standing, removal of policies, and board approval for contracts from the agenda.

Motivation: The assembly meeting on Friday requested that the board refrain from making major bylaws, policies, or significant financial decisions, and the mentioned items fall into this category.

**Sandhya M.’s Suggestion for Amendment:**

Sandhya M. suggested that Friedemann K. could make an amendment to the current motion rather than presenting a new motion.

Friedemann K. sought clarification on the process.

Sandhya M. explained that he could either wait for the current motion to finish and then present his own motion or amend the current motion to modify the discussion.

**Amendment to Accept the Agenda with Removed Items:**

Friedemann K. amended the motion to accept the agenda with the specified items removed.

Sandhya M. confirmed with Neelofar A. and Amir M., who moved and seconded the motion, that they accepted this as a friendly amendment.

**Amendment to Agenda for Discussion on ED Appointment:**

Neelofar A. proposed an amendment to the agenda to include a discussion on the ED appointment.

Chris R. initially seconded but clarified his intention to second Friedemann K.n, not Neelofar A.

Sandhya M. clarified that Friedemann K.n's amendment was friendly and didn't need a second. Friedemann K. then seconded Neelofar A's amendment.

**Directors-Only Vote for Amended Agenda:**

A directors-only vote for the agenda, as amended, was conducted, and the motion carried.
Motion to Remove Parts of Agenda (3 A and B):

Chris R. raised concerns about parts 3 A and B, stating that according to Canada not-for-profit rules, members cannot be banned from attending future meetings. He made a motion to remove those parts.

Sandhya M. assured him that she would address the matter in due time.

**Guests and Media Seating:**

Sandhya M. moved on to the next agenda item, guests and media. Friedemann K. moved, and Amir M. seconded a motion to seat the guests in media.

A vote was conducted, and the motion carried.

Motion to Extend Meeting Time:

Friedemann K. made a motion to extend the meeting until 7:30. Chris R. seconded, and the motion was accepted.

Discussion on Agenda Item 2A - BOD Appointments:

Sandhya M. asked for someone to move agenda item 2A. Amir M. moved it, emphasizing that it's a discussion, not a decision. Sandhya M. pointed out that it was listed as a motion in the agenda and gave Amir M. two minutes to discuss the item.

Amir M. provided an update on the need to appoint BOD positions for first-year master’s, PhD, Mississauga campus, and Scarborough campus representatives. He proposed that the executive committee advertise the positions, collect applications, and conduct a vote in the next BOD meeting.

Questions on BOD Appointments:

Chris R. asked about the status of nominations and whether the applications met notice requirements.

Amir M. clarified that applications received so far did not meet notice requirements and were submitted in October instead of September.

Amir M. explained that for the first-year master’s and PhD representatives, the student does not have to be in their first year, and campus representatives need to be appointed and elected by campus residents.

Executive Committee Report:

Sandhya M. moved along to regular business B, the executive committee report and housekeeping. She mentioned that the reports had been distributed, and there was up to 5 minutes to address this agenda item.

Friedemann K. expressed that although he is not an executive member, he has reviewed the reports. He noted that many of them consist of lengthy lists of meetings attended, and he requested explanations from the executive members regarding their activities and meeting contents.
VP Academics Report - Amir M.:

Amir M., introduced as the VP Academics overseeing engineering and health sciences, clarified that his portfolio mainly covers advocacy work for students in these divisions. However, due to the absence of a VP for other academic areas, he also advocates for arts, business, politics, etc.

In the past months, he attended a meeting with the SGS team and gathered student concerns, which he detailed in his report Available on the website.

He had discussions with the OPS Office about funding issues and worked on advocacy initiatives.

Amir M. also mentioned his ongoing feedback initiative.

Zoya T.’s Report:

Zoya T. added that she attended a meeting with the dean alongside Amir M. They discussed the renewal of the BGSCB award, a black graduate student excellence bursary done in partnership with the SGS office.

Zoya T. has an upcoming meeting with the dean's office and held a finance committee meeting to discuss doNat K.ion requests, with one request submitted so far.

Multiple meetings with finance administration staff took place regarding budget preparation for the upcoming year and the ongoing audit. Zoya T. has been introduced to the auditor.

Additionally, 4 student awards were dispersed to those who couldn't receive them during the summer, and follow-ups were made to ensure recipients received their awards.

VP External Report - Neelofar A:

Neelofar A, the VP External, introduced herself, stating that her portfolio focuses on external and internal partnerships and communication with stakeholders.

She emphasized that the past month has been busy, not just in terms of her usual work, but also due to issues within the executive team and UTGSU operations. Much of her time is spent on communication and ensuring alignment with UTGSU bylaws and policies.

Neelofar A. has represented UTGSU at the Canadian Federation for Students (CFS) in multiple meetings and serves on various committees such as Hart House Student Life and COSS office.

Announcement of Agenda Item 3A - Censorship of a Member:

Sandhya M. announced the next agenda item, 3.A, which involved the censorship of a member. Since the motion was already in the agenda, she asked the mover to identify themselves and the seconder's name.

Censorship Motion 3A - No Seconder:

Neelofar A. moved the motion, but as there was no seconder, the motion was removed from the agenda.

Censorship Motion 3B - No Seconder:

The next agenda item, 3B, also involved censorship. However, as there was no seconder for the motion, it was removed from the agenda.
Agenda Item 3C – OISE GSA Findings:

Sandhya M. moved to agenda item 3C, OISE GSA Findings, which concerns the board of directors allowing the executive team to make the findings public that led OISEGSA to disaffiliate from the UTGSU.

Neelofar A. moved the motion, and Amir M. seconded it with the intention of discussing the matter.

Neelofar A’s Motion and Motivation:

Neelofar A, as an OISE graduate student and a former part of the DSA, expressed her concern about misinformation spreading through various campaigns and communications. She sought the board of directors' approval to make the information public to correct the narrative, stating that students, especially at OISE, feel that UTGSU is at fault for the disaffiliation.

Chris R.’s Request for Detail:

Chris R. mentioned that the information he brought for his later motion might contain some inaccuracies, and he requested proponents speaking in detail. He suggested making the information public for transparency and avoiding false information.

Sandhya M.’s Response:

Sandhya M. stated that detailed discussions could happen if there was time at the end.

Motion to Stop Timing:

Friedemann K. proposed a motion to ask the chair to stop the timing, citing the importance of discussing agenda items. Sandhya M. responded that she would add 5 more minutes but would still be timing to adhere to the agenda.

Amir M.’s Perspective:

Amir M. expressed support for transparency but suggested that the findings and documents leading to the dissociation were public. He proposed discussing them within a committee of the UTGSU board of directors and executives, and then having a vote in the next board meeting for transparency.

Guest Input:

Since no one else from the board of directors spoke on the matter, Sandhya M. asked if any guests had anything to add.

Henry S., President of OISE-LAHE-DSA:

Henry S., the president of OISE-LAHE-DSA, clarified that he was not present at the GSA when it lost funding. He corrected a misrepresentation by the VP External, stating that the GSA was never dissolved. Instead, most executive members resigned, and an election couldn't be organized, resulting in a lack of funding from the UTGSU due to the absence of an executive. He emphasized that the GSA is now back and should automatically be a member of the UTGSU. He expressed confusion about the changes in the UTGSU structure and election processes.

Henry's Perspective on OISE Students' Inclusion:
Henry highlighted the importance of OISE students being included in the UTGSU, not as an opposition but as equitable members. He urged for a fair and open conversation, requesting to avoid misrepresentations.

Neelofar A’s Response:

Neelofar A. expressed confusion about the OISE GSA seeking affiliation when OISE department associations are already funded by the UTGSU. She emphasized the technicalities and the UTGSU's desire for OISE GSA affiliation.

Lynne A.’s Input:

Lynne A. introduced herself in the chat and commented on the OISE GSA issue. She emphasized the need for fairness, creativity, and responsibility in assigning and reorganizing structures within the union. She noted missed opportunities to engage with the executive committee and the suspended president, and she suggested exploring creative solutions that comply with bylaws and fulfill the participatory tradition of the union. She expressed openness to discussions and provided contact information.

Jacqueline B. B.’s Input:

Jacqueline B. B. from LHAE at OISE, who has been an OISE PhD student, shared the impact of OISE GSA's absence on students. OISE GSA facilitated support and community building through events and conferences. She also raised questions about transparency in ancillary fees, expressing uncertainty about the portion normally allocated to OISE GSA and its current use.

Neelofar A’s Response:

Neelofar A. acknowledged the importance of hearing voices and suggested that someone explain the finances, addressing Jacqueline B.’s concerns.

Amir M.’s Point of Order:

Amir M. raised a point of order, emphasizing that the discussion should focus on releasing the report that led to OISE GSA's dissociation and not its current status. He called to question.

Sandhya M.’s Response:

Sandhya M. clarified that calling to question cannot be part of a point of order.

Henry's Clarification:

Henry clarified that it wasn't Justin Horia alone who called for reaffiliation but the previous executive. He mentioned disagreements over percentages that delayed reaffiliation and highlighted the violation of the memorandum of understanding by a UTGSU executive.

Focus on Motion Relevance:

Sandhya M. emphasized the importance of focusing on the motion's relevance and suggested calling the question if more information was not pertinent.

Calling the Question:

Henry called the question, and Friedemann K. seconded. The motion was voted on and carried.
Friday Assembly Meeting Occurrences:

Based on the amended agenda, the next item was about occurrences at the Friday assembly meeting. Sandhya M. asked for a motion to accept the motions passed.

Friedemann K.n's Point of Order - Voting:

Friedemann K. raised a point of order about the need to vote, and Sandhya M. agreed.

Voting on OISE GSA Funding (3.C):

There was a vote on agenda item 3.C, OISE GSA funding.

Vote on Releasing GSA Findings (3.C):

Neelofar A. inquired about the vote, and Sandhya M. clarified that the vote was about releasing the GSA findings. The motion carried.

Proposed Motions by Amir M.:

Sandhya M. asked Amir M. to share the proposed motions. Friedemann K. raised a point of order, questioning the inclusion of this discussion on the agenda without a vote. Chris R. also raised a point of order, stating that amending the agenda requires a two-thirds majority and suggested moving it to the next meeting.

Challenge to the Chair by Chris R.:

Chris R. challenged the chair, arguing that the agenda had already been adopted, and amendments require a two-thirds majority.

Amir M.’s Response:

Amir M. stated that according to the bylaws and policies, when the assembly passes motions, the next Board of Directors has to vote and discuss them. He contested Chris R.’s challenge, stating that the bylaws don't mention a two-week notice for such discussions.

Chair's Ground of Ruling:

The chair acknowledged that she could still be challenged but suggested addressing the motions from Friday's general meeting. She stated that members might be present to see the decisions from the Friday meeting addressed.

Vote on Challenging the Chair:

Amir M. called for a vote, resulting in an equal number of votes. Amir M. announced that the motion would lay on the floor.

Neelofar A's Point of Information:

Neelofar A. provided a point of information, explaining that she voted in favor because she believed that whatever is approved by the members in the General Assembly would be in effect.

Amir M.’s ExplaNat K.ion:
Amir M. clarified that when the assembly passes motions, they are proposed to the board for discussion and voting. The recent vote was to decide whether to add the motions passed by the assembly to the current meeting’s agenda. This process aligns with their bylaws.

Chris R.’s Clarification:

Chris R. quickly apologized for the interruption in the previous discussion. She clarified that her concern was not against discussing the assembly motions at a later meeting but questioned the appropriateness of doing it in the current meeting with only four days’ notice. She suggested it might make more sense to address it in the next meeting.

Amir M.’s Response to Chris R.:

Amir M. acknowledged Chris R.’s clarification and emphasized that the current decision is whether to include the assembly motions in the present meeting or not.

Chris R.’s Inquiry:

Chris R. asked whether they were still in the voting process or if there was another step.

Amir M.’s Further Explanation:

Amir M. confirmed that they were currently deciding whether to include the assembly motions in the current meeting. He asked Neelofar A. if she wanted to change her vote.

Amir M.’s Clarification:

Amir M. sought clarification, asking Neelofar A. if she was voting in favor of adding the motions to the discussion today.

Neelofar A’s Response:

Neelofar A. expressed her desire for the approved motions from the General Assembly to be discussed and acted upon in the current meeting.

Vote Count and Motion Outcome:

Amir M. tallied the votes, noting Neelofar A’s clarification. With three people in favor and one against, the motion carried. The board upheld the chair’s ruling, allowing the motions from the General Assembly to be discussed in the meeting.

Chair’s Instruction:

Sandhya M. thanked everyone and returned to the agenda. She requested Amir M. to display the motions for clarity, as they were voted on by the General Assembly on Friday.

**Motion to Adopt the Motions:**

Sandhya M. asked for a motion from the directors to adopt the motions presented by the General Assembly.

Friedemann K.’s Inquiry:

Friedemann K. sought information about what adopting the motions would mean in this case.

Chair’s Explanation:
Sandhya M. clarified that adopting the motions would mean accepting whatever recommendations were put forward by the General Assembly.

Friedemann K.'s Follow-up Question:
Friedemann K. asked for clarification on whether adopting the motions is legally binding or a mere acceptance.

Chair's Explanation on Legally Binding:
Sandhya M. clarified that adopting the motions would mean agreeing to whatever resolutions were put forward by the General Assembly. She provided an example of a resolution related to large-scale bylaw or financial changes.

Example Resolution:
Sandhya M. mentioned a specific resolution: "Be resolved that the board does not enact any large-scale bylaw or financial changes until the next meeting of the members and by-elections." Voting yes on this would mean agreeing to this resolution.

Clarification to Directors:
Sandhya M. emphasized that directors voting yes would be expressing agreement with the motions passed by the General Assembly.

Chris R.' Point of Order:
Chris R. raised a point of order, expressing confusion about whether they were voting on all four motions at once or individually. She suggested procedural clarity on voting for each motion separately.

Chair's Response:
Sandhya M. acknowledged the three motions and offered to go through them separately. She sought a motion to adopt the first motion passed by the General Assembly.

Motion for Adoption:
Sandhya M. requested a motion and seconder to adopt the first motion from the General Assembly. Friedemann K. moved, and Chris R. seconded.

Discussion and Time Limit:
Sandhya M. imposed a two-minute discussion limit on the motion. She encouraged everyone to refer to the chat for details. Seeing no directors' hands raised, she opened the floor to guests, starting with Julian K..

Guest's Brief Input - Julian K.:
Julian K., involved in drafting the motions, expressed that the board was already acting in the spirit of the motion. He suggested it would be beneficial for the board to officially adopt the position of avoiding significant changes until more representatives are elected.

Additional Discussion:
Sandhya M. invited additional comments or opinions on the second motion passed by the General Assembly. She acknowledged the limited time and encouraged participants to express their thoughts.

Call for Speakers:

Seeing no immediate responses, Sandhya M. suggested moving to the vote on the second motion. She clarified that the vote was to adopt the second motion passed by the General Assembly. Directors were asked to participate in the vote.

Voting Process:

Sandhya M. initiated the voting process, limiting directors to 30 seconds to cast their votes. She announced the motion's passage with some opposition.

Third Motion Adoption:

Sandhya M. then called for a motion to adopt the third motion passed by the General Assembly. Amir M. moved the motion, and Neelofar A. seconded it. Sandhya M. asked for any discussions on this item before proceeding with the vote.

Discussion - Julian K.'s Input:

Julian K. shared his perspective, suggesting that the board might consider encouraging more people to register for meetings rather than necessarily implementing the proposed motion. He mentioned the potential consideration of granting speaking rights to course union representatives.

Advertising and Policies:

Julian K. emphasized that the motion might not be necessary considering the present attendance. He recommended exploring alternative solutions, such as increased advertising for meeting registrations or formulating a policy for course union reps.

Miriam N. K.’s Clarification:

Miriam N. K. sought clarification on whether the second motion aimed to eliminate the three specific items mentioned in the motion.

Meeting Time Constraints:

Sandhya M. acknowledged the limited time and the need to proceed with the discussion. She allowed for additional comments if time permitted.

Sandhya M.’s Update:

Confirmed the proposal to remove Hamas condemnation from the motion.

Miriam N. K.’s Clarification:

Emphasized the need for clarity, suggesting the removal of double negatives.

Sandhya M.’s Context:

Provided background, stating that the decision was influenced by a prior statement, and motion three would replace motion two.
Julian K.’s Point of Information:
Sought clarification on the split of motion one into three parts. Sandhya M. clarified the split among motions one, two, and three.

Sandhya M.’s Clarification:
Reiterated that the current focus was on motion one.

Julian K.’s Query:
Mentioned a previous plan to split motions one and two into three parts. Sandhya M. affirmed the board's decision to address motions one, two, and three separately.

Sandhya M.’s Update:
Corrected a statement and provided an update on the ongoing discussion.

Sandhya M.’s Update:
Acknowledged Julian's comment and redirected the discussion to Miriam N. K.’s point. Explained that Motion 2.3 is proposed for removal since Motion 3 is its intended replacement.

Miriam N. K.’s Clarification:
Sought confirmation that discussion on Motion 3 would be postponed until its designated time. Sandhya M. affirmed that was the case.

Friedemann K.’s Point of Information:
Raised a query regarding Motion 2.3 and its relation to an upcoming Board of Directors meeting. Inquired if passing Motion 2.3 now would automatically reject the condemnation of Hamas motion scheduled for the later meeting.

Sandhya M.’s Response:
Addressed Friedemann K.’s question, explaining that since the General Assembly already voted on Motion 2 as a whole, it wouldn't make sense for the board to dissect it. Clarified that the intention of Motion 2.3’s removal was tied to Motion 3 serving as its replacement. Emphasized that members were free to vote based on their discretion.

Friedemann K.’s Clarification:
Sought confirmation on the impact of passing Motion 2.3 on Agenda Item 3N, specifically regarding the condemnation of Hamas.

Sandhya M.’s Response:
Clarified that passing Motion 2.3 would indeed affect Agenda Item 3N. Explained that Motion 3 was intended to replace the statement associated with 3N. Motion 3 had already been voted on by the general assembly on the previous Friday.

Sandhya M.’s Clarification:
Emphasized the ongoing discussion on Motion 2 and the importance of clarity before the vote.
Chris R.'s Inquiry:
Sought confirmation on whether the discussion was still centered on Motion 2. Sandhya M. affirmed.

Amir M.'s Point of Information:
Provided information on Robert's Rules of Order, stating that if two motions are contradictory and the first one passes, the second one would be considered out of order.

Sandhya M.'s Acknowledgment:
Thanked Amir M. for the clarification and acknowledged the time limit on the current item.

Nat K.'s Intervention:
Requested clarification on the potential contradiction between Motion 2 and Motion 3, expressing a plea to break down the discussion for better understanding.

Sandhya M.'s Response:
Agreed with Nat K.'s concern and acknowledged the need for clarity. Allowed Nat K. 30 seconds to speak.

Nat K.'s Clarification:
Raised concerns about the contradiction between Motion 2 condemning Hamas and Motion 3. Requested a clear explanation on how a vote for Motion 2 would impact Motion 3 and the original agenda item 3.

Sandhya M.'s Clarification:
Acknowledged Nat K.'s input, reinforced the use of the chat for speakers list only, and addressed procedural issues. Clarified her understanding that Motion 2 would remove 3N, but Motion 3 would introduce a new aspect for consideration. Requested confirmation, receiving nods from participants.

Henry's Point of Information:
Raised concerns about procedural errors, stating that new motions were introduced during the meeting instead of at the beginning. Highlighted a voting stalemate and a subsequent change in vote, suggesting procedural errors.

Sandhya M.'s Response:
Thanked Henry and addressed the points raised. Explained that adding motions during the meeting, if voted upon, was within the understanding. Discussed the chair at the time handling the voting stalemate and vote changes. Acknowledged the decisions made and noted Henry's concerns.

Nat K.'s Inquiry:
Sought clarification on the procedure after the passage of Motion 2. Inquired whether there would be discussion or voting on Motion 3 or if it would automatically be accepted.
Sandhya M.’s Response:

Explained that if Motion 2 passes, the items on the agenda associated with Motion 2 are removed, and the board moves to consider Motion 3 separately. Clarified the process of adopting or not adopting Motion 3.

Nat K.’s Confirmation:

Acknowledged understanding and expressed gratitude for the clarification.

Henry's Point of Information:

Raised concerns about procedural errors during the voting stalemate and subsequent re-vote. Suggested that a re-vote after initial voting might have legal implications for the union.

Sandhya M.’s Response:

Acknowledged Henry's concerns and clarified her limited role in the previous chairing. Stated that decisions made during the meeting would be carried forward. Encouraged further discussion on procedural matters.

Sandhya M.’s Response to Henry:

Clarified her understanding of the chair’s actions during the vote, stating that it was meant to clarify the intention of the vote. Encouraged moving forward but acknowledged the option to challenge the chair in the future.

Amir M.’s Clarification:

Explained the allowance of changing votes until the chair announces the results, addressing the procedural concerns raised by Henry.

Sandhya M.’s Acknowledgment:

Thanked Amir M. for the clarification and discouraged further reactions.

Sandhya M.’s Instruction to Move Forward:

Announced the intention to move forward from the discussion and requested adherence to the established procedures.

Speaker's List - Lynn's Comments:

Lynn provided a detailed clarification on the UDGSU Assembly's role, interpretation of Motion 2, and pointed out procedural issues related to the notice period for certain motions. Shared thoughts on the condemnation of Hamas and emphasized the importance of considering both sides for long-term peace.

Sandhya M.’s Announcement:

Informed the participants that the vote was now taking place to adopt Motion 2, which had been previously voted on by the General Assembly on Friday. Clarified the voting process for board members.

Neelofar A's Request for Clarification:
Sought clarification on the motion being voted on. Sandhya M. reiterated that the vote was to adopt Motion 2 as presented in the chat.

**Voting Process:**

Conducted the vote, providing a 30-second window for board members to cast their votes. Announced the results with seven in favor, abstentions, and no opposition.

Friedemann K.’s Point of Information:

Asked for confirmation that the adoption of Motion 2 resulted in the removal of Agenda Item 3N, the condemnation of Hamas.

Sandhya M.’s Confirmation:

Confirmed Friedemann K.’s understanding, stating that 3N had been removed from the agenda.

Chris R.’s Point of Order:

Raised a point of order, clarifying that the motion only recommended voting against and did not explicitly state the removal of motions, requiring an amendment to the agenda.

Sandhya M.’s Acknowledgment:

Acknowledged Chris R.’s point of order and confirmed that the motion only recommended voting against, not explicitly stating the removal of motions.

Lynne’s Point of Order:

Raised a point of order to clarify the implications of the vote, expressing her interpretation that voting as per the Assembly motion meant voting against further motions on the agenda.

Sandhya M.’s Confirmation:

Confirmed Lynne’s understanding, stating that the intention was to remove items from the agenda, but there might be differing opinions. Acknowledged that motion three might also address this.

**Introduction of Motion 3:**

The Chair announced the move to motion 3, which had also been passed by the General Assembly on Friday. Called for a mover and seconder to adopt motion three, noting that speakers were already on the list.

Amir M. moved to adopt Motion Three, which had been passed by the General Assembly on Friday. Sandhya M. requested a seconder.

Discussion Opening:

Announced the start of the discussion on Motion Three, allowing each speaker three minutes. Noted the speakers on the list: Sabeen, Miriam N. K., and Sarah.

Sabeen’s Request for Extra Time:

Sabeen requested additional time due to a concussion, and Sandhya M. granted a minute and a half.
Sabeen's Statement:

Shared distress over the suffering in Palestine, expressed gratitude for extra time. Recalled the establishment of the BDS committee in 2012, emphasized the endorsement of the 2005 call for boycott, divestment, and sanctions. Criticized opportunism and called for an understanding of positionality, referencing the equity statement.

Sandhya M.'s Time Reminder:

Sandhya M. acknowledged the importance of the ongoing discussion but reminded the speaker about the time constraints, considering the meeting scheduled to end at 7:30 PM.

Sabeen's Additional Remarks:

Sabeen reiterated the union's commitments to human rights and the need to uphold these commitments in decision-making. Emphasized avoiding harm through decisions related to the ongoing conflict.

Miriam N. K.'s Statement:

Miriam N. K. addressed the motion to adopt UT MSU's motion and expressed concerns about inflammatory language and the settler colonial perspective in the UT MSU's statement. Highlighted the impact on Jewish students, making them feel unsafe and scared on campus. Stressed the importance of sensitivity and understanding the emotional impact on individuals regardless of political association.

Sarah's Turn:

Sarah began her statement, and the minutes did not capture the full content of her remarks. She requested an extension to potentially two and a half minutes. Sandhya M. questioned the need for an extension since it was initially granted due to an accessibility issue related to a concussion.

Sarah's Response:

Sarah clarified that she did not have an accessibility issue but expressed gratitude and confirmed she would keep her statement within a minute.

Sarah's Statement:

Addressed the ongoing crisis in Palestine, emphasizing the urgent need to recognize the situation as more than genocide or ethnic cleansing. Criticized the University of Toronto's neutrality and silence. Highlighted reports from various organizations categorizing Israel as an apartheid force and an illegal occupier responsible for genocide. Cited the devastating impact on children in Gaza and the number of Palestinians killed. Mentioned calls to action from the Academic Alliance against anti-Semitism, racism, colonialism, and censorship in Canada.

Joshua B.'s Point of Clarification:

Questioned why earlier it was deemed that motion three would be found in contradiction with point three. Expressed confusion about the interpretation of nuance and argued that condemning Hamas and Israeli war crimes are not contradictory.

Chairperson's Remarks:
Sandhya M. acknowledged Joshua B.’s note, clarifying that there was no official chair ruling on a particular matter discussed in the meeting. Rulings in the meeting are emphasized to be procedural, not content-based.

Recognizing the importance of the ongoing discussion, Sandhya M. allowed further time for participants to express their thoughts.

Neelofar A. proposed a motion to extend the meeting by 7:45, but the motion was not seconded and was therefore not carried.

Ava F. urged the board to take a democratic approach, citing overwhelming support from the General Assembly for a particular statement. She emphasized the duty of the board to align with the expressed views of graduate students.

Speaker's Contributions:

Ava F. emphasized the need for the board to take a clear stance, expressing that neutrality is a cowardly stance. She urged members to consider the historical and scholarly approach, stating that scholars, even in Israel, agree that a genocide is taking place.

Sandhya M. intervened, reminding participants not to approach or refer to any member in the meeting.

Ava F. clarified her reference was not to specific members but to people affected on both sides and the rise of antisemitism.

Ava F. continued, asserting that labeling a country as a settler colonial state does not target its citizens, drawing parallels with terms like settler colonial state for America or Canada.

Sandhya M., respecting time constraints, asked Ava F. to wrap up. Ava F. concluded by stating that using such terms doesn't encourage hate.

Chris R. called for the question, and Sandhya M. acknowledged, bringing the focus back to Motion 3 passed by the General Assembly on Friday.

Voting Procedure:

Friedemann K. clarified the need to vote on calling the question first before voting on the motion.

Breven seconded the motion to call the question.

Sandhya M. explained the voting process, specifying that the current vote is on calling the question, not on the motion.

Vida apologized for misunderstanding and clarified her vote to adopt the motion.

Chairperson's Clarifications:

Sandhya M. clarified that the current vote is not for adopting Motion Three but for calling the question.

Vida and Friedemann K. affirmed their understanding, clarifying that they are voting on calling the question.

Voting on Calling the Question:
Friedemann K. raised a point of information, inquiring about the anonymity of the Zoom poll results.

Sandhya M. confirmed that the vote is anonymous, and the names of directors will not be revealed in the protocol.

The vote on calling the question passed, and Sandhya M. moved on to voting on the adoption of Motion Three.

**Anonymous Poll Results:**

Sandhya M. conducted a Zoom poll for the adoption of Motion Three, emphasizing that only directors should participate.

After the poll, Sandhya M. shared the results: one abstention, four opposed, and three in favor in the poll, with an additional one in favor in the chat.

Friedemann K. raised a point of order, questioning the discrepancy in the number of votes (nine) when there are only eight board members.

Chris R. echoed the confusion and sought clarification if non-directors were voting.

**Resolution and Redoing the Vote:**

Sandhya M. acknowledged the error, stating that she wasn't sure who the directors were and agreed to redo the vote.

Friedemann K. requested a repeat vote, suggesting that each director sends their vote directly to Sandhya M.

Chris R. requested the chair to post a message in the chat for directors to send their votes.

Sandhya M. agreed to the redo, instructing directors to send their votes to her directly.

**Closing Remarks:**

Chris R. found the chair in the chat and expressed readiness to participate in the vote.

Sandhya M. thanked everyone for their cooperation and announced the redo of the vote, with directors sending their votes directly.

**Voting Results Recap:**

Sandhya M. conducted a private vote with directors sending their votes directly. The results were three votes in favor, four votes opposed, and one abstention. The motion to adopt did not carry.

**Post-Vote Questions and Comments:**

Nat K. raised concerns about speakers being skipped before the vote and questioned why Friedemann K. and Chris R. jumped ahead in the queue.

Sandhya M. explained that calling the question means proceeding immediately to a vote without further discussion. Apologies were offered for any missed points, and Sandhya M. encouraged participants to raise their points again if necessary.

**Clarification and Points of Information:**
Sabeen sought clarification on the status of Motion 2, which was adopted earlier, and whether it affects a similar agenda item (Item N). Sandhya M. clarified that Motion 2, having been adopted, reflected the board's agreement with the text. She indicated a willingness to discuss Item N if members wished.

Nafeesaa A. pointed out that it was past the extended meeting time of 7:30 PM and suggested considering another extension.

Meeting Extension:

Nafeesaa A. brought attention to the current time, indicating that it was already 7:29 PM and the meeting had been extended until 7:30 PM.

Closing Remarks:

Sandhya M. acknowledged Nafeesaa A.'s point about the meeting extension and thanked everyone for their participation in the discussion and voting.

Meeting Extension Motion:

Nafeesaa A. moved a motion to extend the meeting time until 7:40 PM. Sandhya M. seconded the motion, and a vote was called for.

Meeting Extension Vote:

Friedemann K. raised a point of order, stating that it was already 7:30 PM, the designated end time for the meeting. Sandhya M. acknowledged this fact but recommended finishing the ongoing vote since it had started before 7:30 PM.

The vote on the extension motion took place through a Zoom poll, but due to technical issues, participants were asked to send their votes privately to Sandhya M..

Vote Results:

Sandhya M. counted the votes privately received. The results were four yeses, three noes, and one abstention, allowing the extension until 7:40 PM.

Post-Vote Discussion:

Sandhya M. addressed questions and comments related to the voting process and acknowledged that the two-strike policy for chat violations might be enacted if such behavior continued.

Agenda Item: Three Motions from Friday's General Assembly:

Sandhya M. opened the floor for questions or comments regarding the three motions discussed and voted on during Friday's General Assembly meeting.

Nafeesaa A. clarified the rule about posting in the chat and raised concerns about excessive chat postings by one participant.

Sandhya M. acknowledged the issue and warned about the possibility of implementing the two-strike policy for chat violations.

Moving to the Next Agenda Item: Board of Directors Contact Sheet on the Website:
Amir M. moved the agenda item, and it was seconded by an unidentified participant.

Amir M. briefly motivated the motion, emphasizing the importance of having the Board of Directors' contact information readily available on the website for members to reach out.

Member Comments:

Neil raised a point of information, and Sabeen also sought to provide information or ask a question.

Member Queries and Concerns:

Sabeen inquired about the elected member for social sciences and raised concerns about potentially vacant seats. She questioned the democratic process if certain positions were not filled.

Amir M. confirmed that there is no elected member for social sciences.

Sabeen continued to express concern about the lack of representation and questioned the legitimacy of the democratic process when certain positions remain unfilled.

Response from the Chair:

Sandhya M. acknowledged Sabeen's concerns and encouraged active participation during elections to fill vacant positions.

Julian K. provided a brief response, affirming the lack of an elected member for social sciences and emphasizing that individuals need to run for positions during the election period.

Point of Information and Clarification:

Sabeen sought clarification on the democratic process and representation when positions are vacant.

Sandhya M. explained that elections are the opportunity for members to run for positions and encouraged continued discussion outside the current meeting.

Member Concerns and Clarification:

Neelofar A. clarified her confusion about the agenda items and mentioned a missing agenda item she had requested.

Sandhya M. explained the challenges in managing the agenda due to numerous points of information and clarification, extending the meeting duration.

Board of Directors' Perspective:

Jady L. provided a point of information, stating that the Board of Directors followed all appropriate procedures during elections and submitted their interest within the specified deadline.

Jady L. emphasized that the responsibility lies with members to participate in elections and run for positions, highlighting that the Board of Directors is committed to representing the students.

Chair's Response:
Sandhya M. thanked Jady L. for the information and reiterated the importance of members running for positions during the designated election period.

Sandhya M. acknowledged the challenges with vacant positions and expressed the intention to provide information on filling vacant positions.

Continuation of Agenda Item: **Board of Directors Contact Sheet on the Website:**

Sandhya M. noted that the discussion on the agenda item had not started yet and invited further comments on the specific item.

Member Point of Information:

Zoya T. raised a point of information regarding the confidentiality of email addresses for Board of Directors members. She inquired whether personal or official UFT email addresses would be shared on the website.

Chair's Response:

Sandhya M. acknowledged Zoya T.'s concern about confidentiality and noted that while names may not be an issue, the inclusion of email addresses poses a confidentiality concern. Sandhya M. proposed to discuss this point further before proceeding with the vote.

Request for Discussion in the Chat:

Amir M. requested that the discussion continue in the chat before proceeding with the vote.

Member Inquiry:

Neelofar A. sought clarification on the current motion being voted on.

Chair's Explanation:

Sandhya M. clarified that the current motion (Item H) proposes publishing the names and email addresses of all Board of Director members on the UTGSU website.

Meeting Closure:

Neelofar A. pointed out that the meeting had reached its scheduled end time at 7:40 PM.

Sandhya M. acknowledged the time and stated that the meeting was officially over. She announced that the results of the vote on the current motion would be announced shortly.

**Vote Results:**

Sandhya M. later announced the vote results: four in favor, two opposed, and two abstentions. The motion to publish the names and email addresses of Board of Directors members on the website carried.

Meeting Adjournment:

Sandhya M. thanked everyone for their participation and despite advancing through most of it, expressed regret for not completing the entire agenda. The meeting was officially adjourned at 7:43.
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