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1. MEETING COMES TO ORDER

The meeting is called to order at 7:15pm.

a. Appointment of Meeting Chair

BIRT the UTGSU Board of Directors appoints Justin Patrick as Chair for this meeting.

Moved: F. Krannich    Seconded: P. Duff    Result: Carried

b. Appointment of Equity Officer

BIRT the UTGSU Board of Directors appoints Gadfly Stratton as Equity Officer for this meeting.

Moved: F. Krannich    Seconded: A. Moghadam    Result: Carried

J. van der Veen asked if the Equity Officer can be present for the meeting in-person.

F. Krannich states that they are not currently in Toronto.

The Equity Officer states that they are currently unable to attend based on personal reasons and will be in contact about whether they can continue to do the role.

P. Duff asks what the duties of the Equity Officer are.

F. Krannich states that the role is set out in the by-laws and that they have roles both in and out of meetings within the entire organization.

P. Duff states that they appreciate that the Equity Officer is online so that any member can discreetly message them.

C. Scott states that the Equity Officer can also be reached at equityofficer@utgsu.ca.

c. Land Acknowledgement and Equity Statement

The Land Acknowledgement and Equity Statement was read.
d. Adoption of Agenda

BIRT the UTGSU Board of Directors adopt the agenda as presented.

Moved: F. Krannich  Seconded: A. Moghadam

Result: Carried as Amended

MOTION TO AMEND AGENDA

To add the following motion to item 3

Whereas the UTGSU Board of Directors do not have enough appointed board members to sit on the Elections and Referenda Committee; and

Whereas a general call was made to the general membership to apply for the vacant positions of the Elections and Referenda Committee; and

Whereas there were no applications for the Elections & Referenda Committee but members of the Chief Returning Officer hiring committee have expressed interest in filling the positions; therefore

Be it resolved that the Board of Directors suspend by-law 9.1.6. to allow the interim appointment of Shannon Giannitsopoulou and Nicholas Silver for the Spring 2024 UTGSU General Elections and Referenda.

9.1.6 No Member shall serve, in a single election cycle, in more than one of the following capacities: as the CRO, as a Deputy CRO, as a CRO Hiring Committee member, or as an Elections Committee member. Further, any Member serving in one of the previous capacities shall be ineligible to run for election to the Executive Committee in an election in which they are serving in said capacity.

Moved: K. Xie  Seconded: A. Moghadam  Result: Carried

e. Adoption of Minutes

i. Board of Directors Meeting October 31, 2023
ii. Board of Directors Meeting November 7, 2023
iii. Board of Directors Meeting November 30, 2023
iv. Special Board of Directors Meeting December 8, 2023
v. Board of Directors Meeting January 19, 2023
Annually General Meeting December 7, 2023

**BIRT** the UTGSU Board of Directors approves the minutes for the Board of Directors meetings as presented in Item 1e of the agenda.

Moved: F. Krannich  
Seconded: A. Hamed Mohamed  
Result: Carried

J. van der Veen states that there are several name errors in the minutes from January 19, 2024. They state that their name was also missing in the Nominating Committee membership.

J. Liang states that the minutes from January 19, 2024 also miswrote that they were the Vice-Chair of the Base Funding Committee. They state that it is A. Moghadam.

C. Scott states that the meeting has implemented name tags, a new conference system and hopefully some of these errors can be caught better. He apologizes for the errors.

K. Josephine Lawton states that their name is repetitively miswritten in the Annual General Meeting.

C. Scott states that there is a note at the bottom of the AGM minutes that many of the names was difficult to catch due to the hybrid format. He apologizes for the errors and encourages members to contact him to update minutes.

F. Krannich states that the AGM Minutes are just a temporary approval to post them as drafts and that they must ultimately be approved at the General Meeting.

**f. Guests and Media**

**BIRT** the UTGSU Board of Directors moves to seat all guests with speaking rights limited to 30 seconds per speech and with a two strike conduct rule to be facilitated by the meeting Chair.

Moved: F. Krannich  
Seconded: J. Nickel  
Result: Carried

F. Krannich states that the thirty second limitation will not apply to legal counsel.

C. Rodgers asks why there are only two strikes and not three strikes.
F. Krannich states that the rule is based off of the AGM rules and that two strikes should be good for the length of the meetings.

J. Nickel states that Board Members also have the rights to give speaking rights to members via Robert’s Rules of Order.

Guests introduce themselves.

- Emma Livingstone, the Varsity
- Keerthana Naniah, Regenesis Canada
- Jennifer Ward, Sexual Education Centre
- Divya Dey, Regenesis
- Yao Yan Huang, Regenesis
- Lynne Alexandrova, Member
- Matthew Joseph, Legal Council
- Devonnia Miller, Chief Returning Officer
- Fateme Eskandary, Minute Taker

2. REFERENDA

a. Process

C. Scott states that the process for the referendums are set out in by-laws and policies. He states that the Board must approve referendum questions by the end of the January and submit questions to the university to capture them in the university governance cycle. He states that two referendum questions have been submitted and have been validated by the UTGSU. He states that the bylaws require the Board to focus questions on the financial feasibility and not the merit of the questions. He states that upon approval, we would need to call for ‘No Committees’ for members to be able to organize with the same level of resources as the organizations seeking fees.

b. Regenesis UofT

We, the undersigned, constituents of the University of Toronto Graduate Students’ Union (UTGSU), call upon UTGSU to approve a referendum to be held in the 2023-2024 school year, asking constituents of UTGSU if they would support the approval of the following proposal go to a referendum vote:

Regenesis is an environmental organization at the University of Toronto.
We are seeking the consent of UTGSU members to help fund Regenesis programs and initiatives. Starting in Fall 2024, each UTGSU member would pay a fee of $7.23 per session and would be able to obtain a refund of said fee through Regenesis.

Regenesis would be required to spend all of the collected fees on its environmental and community-related projects and initiatives. The collected fees would go towards supporting environmental initiatives and programming on/near the three UofT campuses, including:

- Free Stores that provides students free clothes, books and other items while diverting local waste (donations, lost and found, resident move-out)
- Food co-operatives that addresses student food insecurity with programs that provide affordable options for meals and groceries.
- Growing produce at our Dig In! Campus Agriculture community gardens and greenhouse. The produce is provided to students for free.
- Item libraries that lend items to students that might be too expensive, too large, or aren't often used - this would include tools, board games, camping equipment, media equipment, and other items
- Reuse centres that provide free repair, resize and restyle of clothing, repair of electronics, and repair/reuse of other items to reduce waste.
- A Community Bike Centre that provides free and low-cost bike repair, services, and education [Scarborough Only, as similar programs exist at UTSG and UTM already]

Do you agree to a levy of $7.23 per Fall & Winter session for each full-time UTGSU member and $3.62 per Fall & Winter session for each part-time UTGSU member; adjusted annually in accordance with the Ontario Consumer Price Index?

- Yes, I support the funding Regenesis UofT
- No, I do not support funding Regenesis UofT
- Abstain
WHEREAS graduate students at the University of Toronto have submitted the required number of signatures to initiate a UTGSU referendum; therefore

BIRT the UTGSU Board of Directors send the Regenesis referendum question below to the UTGSU membership during the 2023-24 referendum cycle; and

BIRT the UTGSU Elections & Referenda Committee issue a call out for ‘No Committee’ registration.

Moved: F. Krannich Seconded: J. Nickel Result: Carried with friendly amendments

Noted opposition: F. Krannich Noted Abstention: H. Mohamad

Motivators of the referendum presented the Regenesis proposal.

A. Moghadam asked what portion of the services would be used by the graduate students as in the proposal the UTGSU is the second levy paying body suggested.

Regenesis UofT declared that they do not have specific information on what undergraduate and graduate students use. They state that everything is open to all students. They state that they operate on all three campuses and that graduate students have been involved in programs. They state that the presenters are graduate students. They state that Harvest Noon used to operate out of the UTGSU spaces.

H. Mohamad states that they believe the fee request is large based on the services that Regenesis is offering.

Regenesis UofT states that the services students will receive recoup the student fees in savings. They state that a lot of student jobs will come out of the work that Regenesis does and that many jobs will likely be geared towards graduate students due to the experience required. They state that staff are core components to making the programs sustainable and long lasting.

J. Liang asks about the impact of services on graduate students since the organization has been around for more than ten years.

Regenesis UofT states that there are also programming reports made but that it is not done at the moment.
J. Nickel reminds the Board that the role is to not argue the merit of the levy and discuss the financial feasibility. They state that the fees do not seem financially irresponsible.

K. Xie asks about the sustainability of the wage subsidies from government sources.

Regenesis UofT states that they continue to apply for funding which has been sustainable.

F. Krannich states that it is up to the membership to vote on the referendum but that the Board has to ensure the funds will be used responsibly. He states that this is a process that we ask all levy groups. He states that we need to confirm audits and legal structures are set and that money is being tracked appropriately. He asks about the difference between the UofT chapter and the Canadian organization.

Regenesis UofT states that they are a separate entity from the national organization and that they are separate corporate entities. They state that the national organization supports the local chapters. They state that this would be the fourth campus with a fee. They state that their financial year aligns with the academic year.

F. Krannich reconfirms that the audit will be separate from the national organization. He asks for the governing documents of Regenesis.

Regenesis UofT confirms that they can provide the document in the chat.

C. Scott states that the UTGSU has Memorandums of Understanding with all student fee organizations to also ensure that these processes are followed and that we can hold the organization accountable.

Z. Tawhidi asks how programming is divided between campuses. They ask how fees are divided per campus because the five year plan. They ask why rent is only charged in the first year.

Regenesis states that programming is based on feasibility and what is currently present on the campus. They state that they need the UTSU referendum in order to afford a larger space. They state that the current space is smaller. They state that this is mainly just a projection. They state that based on where the fees are collected from, services will be offered in the same proportions. They state that
graduate students at UTM and UTSC will be able to access services at those campuses.

P. Duff asks how fees are refunded if students request a refund.

C. Scott states that the organization runs the refund system and that the students’ union assists in the process as needed. He states that the refund dates align with health and dental refund dates.

A. Zadeh asks how students are going to be informed about the services.

Regenesis UofT states that they use social media and campus partnerships to build networks. They state that they also table, participate in Orientation and farmers markets and other activities. They state that a lot of students already identify sustainability and climate action work with Regenesis. They state that they also work with students’ unions to share in networks like the digest.

P. Duff asks how refunds are issued.

C. Scott states that the levy groups coordinate their refund systems and the students’ union works with the organization to advertise and support. He states it is the same timelines at the Health and Dental Plan.

L. Alexandrova asks how the organization will not overlap with other organizations like Bikechain and UTERN.

Regenesis UofT states that they work with partners but will not be double-dipping funds. They state that Bikechain does not operate at UTSC so Regenesis would operate on that campus for that service.

C. Scott states that there are options on whether to proceed to the vote right now or delay the vote should more time be needed. He states that UTGSU needs to have this figured out by university deadlines and that the motivators should not suffer for the governance delays of the UTGSU.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

Moved: J. Nickel    Seconded: A. Moghadam    Result: Carried

Abstention: H. Mohamad.
c. Sexual Education Centre at the University of Toronto

The University of Toronto Sexual Education Centre (SEC) has operated since 1976 to provide students with access to safer sex supplies and information about sex and sexuality. We offer students and the wider community free condoms, personal lubricant, and menstrual supplies, and provide education about consent, pleasure, contraceptives, and more through in-office peer education and presentations in the community. To continue serving the student body, and to meet current demand for menstrual products and condoms, we request a levy increase from $0.31/semester ($0.62/year) to $0.50/semester ($1.00/year) for part-time graduate students and from $0.62/semester ($1.24/year) to $1.00/semester ($2.00/year) for full-time graduate students, adjusted annually in accordance with the Ontario Consumer Price Index, to come into effect for Fall 2024.

Do you agree to a levy increase for the Sexual Education Centre resulting in $0.5075/semester (part-time student) and $1.00/semester (full-time student) fees for each UTGSU member, adjusted annually for inflation in accordance with the Ontario Consumer Price Index, to come into effect for Fall 2024?

- Yes, I support the levy increase
- No, I do not support the levy increase
- Abstain

WHEREAS graduate students at the University of Toronto have submitted the required number of signatures to initiate a UTGSU referendum; therefore

BIRT the UTGSU Board of Directors send the Sexual Education Centre referendum question below to the UTGSU membership during the 2023-24 referendum cycle; and

BIRT the UTGSU Elections & Referenda Committee issue a call out for ‘No Committee’ registration.

Moved: F. Krannich Seconded: A. Mohamed Result: Carried with friendly amendments

UTSEC explains their presentation and why they are seeking a referendum to increase their current fee.
J. Nickel states that this makes sense as a referendum since the organization is already operating effectively.

F. Krannich states that the revised question can be found in the shared folder.

C. Scott states that the question has been amended to ensure that the part-time fee requirement aligns with the common UTGSU framework, that the implementation year is accurate and that the new fee is replacing an older fee.

G. Schwartz asks if the current fees are tied to cost of living.

UTSEC states that the graduate fees are already tied to inflation.

L. Alexandrova states that the organization does good work.

d. Health & Dental Plan

C. Scott states that this was added to the agenda in the case that a referendum needed to be held to increase the fee above the current limits. He states that after discussion and review with the insurance broker that the health and dental plan looks healthy and this will not be the case. He states that he hopes to bring the renegotiation before future Board Meetings to learn more about the plan.

He states that the UTGSU will need to hold a referendum in the Fall Term to update the Health and Dental Plan question and ensure that it meets the governance standards of other students’ unions and the university. He states that the Elections and Referenda Committee and Governance Committee will need to investigate changes to referendum procedures to allow for a Fall referendum.

L. Alexandrova asks if the Finance Committee should be involved.

C. Scott states that the issue is one of procedure. He states that the Elections & Referenda Committee should generally be the main committee to recommend policies on these matters as they have the clearest lack of conflicts of interest.

3. CRO INTRODUCTION, ELECTION AND REFERENDA TIMELINE

C. Scott states that the CRO had to leave due to a power outage in Toronto. He provides an overview of some of the tasks for the Elections & Referenda Committee to set dates and timelines for elections. He states that the Board will likely need to meet again before nominations open to adopt any elections code changes. He states that the
committee will be reviewing past reports and making appropriate changes to fix ongoing issues but will likely not be looking to greatly change the system given the timeline.

MOTION

Whereas the UTGSU Board of Directors do not have enough appointed board members to sit on the Elections and Referenda Committee; and

Whereas a general call was made to the general membership to apply for the vacant positions of the Elections and Referenda Committee; and

Whereas there were no applications for the Elections & Referenda Committee but members of the Chief Returning Officer hiring committee have expressed interest in filling the positions; therefore

Be it resolved that the Board of Directors suspend by-law 9.1.6. to allow the interim appointment of Shannon Giannitsopoulou and Nicholas Silver for the Spring 2024 UTGSU General Elections and Referenda.

9.1.6 No Member shall serve, in a single election cycle, in more than one of the following capacities: as the CRO, as a Deputy CRO, as a CRO Hiring Committee member, or as an Elections Committee member. Further, any Member serving in one of the previous capacities shall be ineligible to run for election to the Executive Committee in an election in which they are serving in said capacity.

Moved: K. Xie Seconded: G. Schwartz Result: Carried

MOTION TO EXTEND MEETING

BIRT the meeting be extended to 9:45pm

Moved: F. Krannich Seconded: A. Moghadam Result: Carried

J. Nickel states that he agrees with the amendment. He asks if other Board Members who have been voting in opposition can speak to why they might be opposed.

4. PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES

Be it resolved that By-law Four be amended to read:

4.2 EligibilityQualifications
4.2.1 To be deemed eligible as a candidate for a Director position on the Board of Directors, a Member must:

Each Director shall:

4.2.1.1 be 18 or more years of age;

4.2.1.2 be a Member of the UTGSU in accordance with Article 2 of these By-laws; or shall become a Member of the UTGSU within ten (10) days after the Director’s election;

4.2.1.3 not be an undischarged bankrupt nor incapable, as the latter is defined in the Act;

4.2.1.3 be duly elected or appointed in accordance with Article 9 of these By-laws; and

4.2.1.4 execute a consent to act form, as prescribed in the governing policies of the UTGSU.

4.2.2 A Member shall be deemed ineligible for a Director position if they have:

4.2.2.1 the status of an undischarged bankrupt;

4.2.2.2 been deemed incapable by a capacity assessor registered within the province of Ontario;

4.2.2.2 not have a terminated Membership, in accordance with Article 2 of this By-law or section 2.3 of this By-law;

4.2.2.3 failed through their term to meet the above qualifications;

4.2.2.4 been removed as a Director or Officer in accordance with Article 10 of these By-laws;

4.2.2.5 been deemed ineligible to seek election as sanctioned in Section 10.5.3 of this By-law; or

4.2.2.6 previously resigned from their position as a Director or Officer with less than thirty (30)-fourteen (14) days notice; or continue throughout their term to meet the above qualifications.
If a Director ceases to be a Member of the UTGSU or becomes bankrupt or incapable, they then cease to be a Director, and the vacancy 4.2.3 Director vacancies shall be filled in accordance with Section 4.4 herein.

Be it further resolved that By-law Seven be amended to read:

7.2 Qualifications of Officers

7.2.1 All Officers of the UTGSU shall be Members for at least one (1) term before seeking election and shall continue to be Members while in office. Should an Officer of the UTGSU cease to be a Member, she or he shall resign office at the end of his or her term of office.

7.2.2 The Officers of the UTGSU shall hold their respective offices for a period of one (1) year beginning May 01.

7.2.3 The elections of the Officers of the UTGSU shall follow the procedure set out in Article 9.

7.2.4 All Officers are eligible for re-election.

7.2.5 Officers shall be deemed ineligible if they fail to meet the qualifications set out in section 4.2 of these Bylaws.

Be it further resolved that By-law Ten be amended with the additional section 10.5:

10.5 Discipline of a Member by the Board of Directors

10.5.1 the Board of Directors shall have right to discipline any Member on the following grounds:

10.5.1.1 violating any provision of the Articles, Bylaws or written policies of the UTGSU; or

10.5.1.2 carrying out conduct that is harmful, targeted, vexatious, or detrimental to the UTGSU, as determined by the Board in its sole discretion.

10.5.2 Procedure for Discipline

10.5.2.1 The Board of Directors may call a special meeting of the Board of Directors by passing a motion for the purpose of authorizing the disciplinary action set out in section 10.5.1.
10.5.2.2 Fourteen (14) days notice shall be provided to the Member for the special Board of Directors' meeting. The notice shall set out the reasons for the proposed disciplinary action as well as the contact information to send a written submission as per 10.5.2.3.

10.5.2.3 The Member receiving the notice shall be entitled to give the Board of Directors a written submission opposing the disciplinary action no later than five (5) days before the end of the fourteen (14) day period.

10.5.2.4 If written submissions are received, the Board of Directors will consider such submissions in arriving at a final decision and any applicable sanctions. The Board of Directors shall notify the Member concerning the final decision within ten (10) days of the special meeting.

10.5.3 Sanctions

10.5.3.1 The Board of Directors may impose any of the following sanctions on a Member:

10.5.3.1.1 provide a written reprimand;
10.5.3.1.2 require training or workshop participation;
10.5.3.1.3 prohibit the Member from UTGSU spaces, services and programs; or
10.5.3.1.4 deem the Member ineligible to be a candidate for Director and Officer positions, in accordance with section 4.2 of these Bylaws.

10.5.3.2 Sanctions on Members must be approved at the Board of Directors by a two-thirds (%) vote at the special meeting, in accordance with section 10.5.2 of these Bylaws.

10.5.4 Appealing Sanctions

10.5.4.1 Any of the sanctions imposed by the Board of Directors, in accordance with section 10.5.3.1 of these By-laws, may be appealed to the Board of Appeal.
10.5.4.2 All decisions rendered by the Board of Appeal regarding any sanctions by the Board of Directors, in accordance with section 10.5.3.1 of these By-laws, shall be final and binding on the Member, without any further right to appeal.

Be it further resolved that all subsequent renumbering amendments to By-law Ten be made.

Moved: F. Krannich Seconded: A. Moghadam Result: Carried with friendly amendments

Opposition: C. Rodgers

F. Krannich provides a general overview of the by-law proposals to add eligibility criteria to the by-laws and a new process to discipline members. He invites legal counsel to provide additional motivation to the language presented. He states that there are amendments made by the Governance Committee.

Legal counsel provides an in-depth review of the proposals. He states that the governance committee had some back and forth in proposals and amendments.

A. Moghadam asks about how 10.5 applies to members of the Board and if it is a violation of the CNCA.

Legal counsel states that it would be unorthodox because there are discipline procedures explicitly for Board and Officers.

C. Scott states that the language on discipline of members has specific sanctions but that the sanctions are not to remove membership. He states that the language in 4.2 is solely related to eligibility to serve on the Board of Directors.

MOTION

BIRT 4.2.2.4. Be amended to read “twice”

Moved: A. Moghadam Second: Z. Tawhidi Result: Withdrawn

A. Moghadam asks for more information on 4.2.2.4 which allows for members to not be eligible to run for election if they are removed. He suggests changing this to a higher threshold where they have been removed twice so that the Board cannot be misused.
P. Duff asks if misconduct bylaws could be applied for the same situation with both board members and general members discipline. They state that they would not want people being able to mistreat members and their position as a board member and then be allowed to run again. They ask if the members' discipline would also be applied to board members.

C. Scott recommends against having the removal required to happen twice. He states that the CNCA and bylaws make it extremely difficult to remove directors and officers already. He states that if a director is removed it would take a lot of resources to do it once and it would require membership confirmation, not board confirmation.

F. Krannich states that he agrees it should not be amended and that the threshold is high. He states that by-laws should not be drafted with the expectation that they will be misused.

J. Nickel asks if a director or officer has ever been removed twice.

A. Moghadam states that it has.

C. Rodgers states that misuse of by-laws is possible and that the Board needs to plan for misuse.

J. van der Veen raises a point of order around what is being discussed.

A. Moghadam withdraws the amendment

J. van der Veen suggests a friendly amendment to the motion to reorganize the items in 4.2. So that 4.2.2.7 is actually 4.2.2.4.

Legal counsel states that the amendment makes sense.

C. Rodgers makes a motion to remove the requirement of a consent to act until language is clear. He states concerns about being required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. He states it would be undemocratic. His motion fails to get a seconder after several points of information.

P. Duff asks a point of information on what the consent to act would include and what its intent is.
F. Krannich states that the by-law calls for a governance policy which would define the consent to act. He states the Board would determine the conditions of the consent to act.

J. van der Veen states that the content of a consent to act is already required. They state that the consent to act would make those expectations more clear and would receive confirmation from board members.

Legal counsel defines what a consent to act is intended to do. He indicates that it is routine to have a consent to act and that he has produced this for several Board of Directors.

C. Rodgers initiates a motion to amend to remove the term vexatious. After points of information the motion fails to receive a seconder.

P. Duff asks questions relating to the term vexatious and if other language could be used.

Legal counsel states that the term is used commonly in legal proceedings. He suggests that the Governance Committee could look at other language in the future.

**MOTION TO EXTEND MEETING**

BIRT the meeting be extended to 10pm.

Moved: F. Krannich  
Seconded: K. Xie  
Result: Carried

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

Moved: J. van der Veen  
Seconded: A. Moghadam  
Result: Carried

Opposition: C. Rodgers

5. **BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATIONS**

C. Scott asks what the Board would like to do regarding the Board of Appeals because they have been patiently waiting for their interviews but the meeting is running late.

J. Nickel asks if the Board can hear the applications and ask questions and deliberate later.

**MOTION TO MOVE IN-CAMERA**
Moved: F. Krannich Seconded: A. Moghadam Result: Carried

Meeting moves in-camera at 9:43pm

The meeting concluded in-camera. The Board will determine the follow-up process for appointing the Board of Appeals.

6. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

Failed to get to in agenda

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Failed to get to in agenda

8. ADJOURNMENT

Failed to get to in agenda

Meeting Chair: Justin
Patrick

Minute Taker: Fateme Eskandary