

**Students' Association of Mount Royal College
Students' Council Meeting
November 30, 2009
Students' Council Chambers**

Present:

Travis McIntosh (chair)
Eily Sweeney
Jermyn Voon
Meghan Melynk
Jennifer Langille
Michael Decker
Marcy Fogal (ex-officio)

Robert Jones
Tommy Lieu
Holly Mazur
Kay Asiedu-Nketiah
Keeli Elaschuk
Fadwa Hourieh
Megan Borg (scribe)

Erin Delamont
Troy McLeod (part)
Rance Williams
Sadiq Valliani
Anna Piltingsrud

Regrets: Tegan Smyth

Guests:

Janelle Woo & Liza Worthington (Center Point)
Stewart Scott (Meyers Norris Penny)
Liz Schweizer (Researcher, SAMRU)

1.0 Approval of Agenda

Motion: To approve the November 9, 2009 Students' Council meeting agenda with the following amendments:

- **Remove 7.0 "Generative Governance Discussion"**
- **Add 8.1 "Federal and Provincial Lobbying Update"**

Meghan Melnyk/Jennifer Langille

Carried

2.0 Approval of Consent Agenda

Motion: To approve the consent agenda.

Robert Jones/Holly Mazur

Carried

3.0 Items Removed From Consent Agenda

4.0 Audited Financial Statements

Travis McIntosh explained that Students' Council recommends the audited financial statements to bring forward to the membership at the AGM. He noted that the auditors will present their findings to Council.

Travis noted that there is no fraud to report and management should be applauded for their excellent work.

(Stewart Scott joined the meeting)

Students' Council welcomed Stewart Scott from Meyers Norris Penny.

Michael Decker noted that there are discrepancies between previous years and last year's amortization. Marcy replied that it is because of the new building, furniture and equipment.

Michael noted that there is an increase in management expenses. Marcy replied that a number of new services were introduced, but these specifically are due to the health and dental and u-pass expenses.

Sadiq noted that there is a decreased in investment incomes and asked if these include the building. Marcy replied that the account was decreased because they drew down the funds to pay for the building and paying back the mortgage. Marcy noted that the SA did what they could to shuffle short and long term investments.

Michael asked if there are any discrepancies that should be noted. Stewart Scott replied that the correction on page 3 was a correction that was made this year from last year's audit. He stated that there are no further errors going forward.

Michael asked if there are any concerns or anything that grabbed the auditor's attention during the audit. Stewart replied that there is nothing significant that warrants being brought to the attention of EC and SC.

Eily asked Stewart to give an overview of the audit process. Stewart stated that the SA's financial stability is a strength. He explained that management is hired to run operations of the SA and they produce financial statements. Stewart explained that the auditor's job is to ensure that the statements produced by management are a fair reflection of accuracy according to the Canadian accounting principles and standards. He explained that the auditors are an independent and external group. Stewart noted that the management financial statements are brought to Council on behalf of the membership to ensure that they are up to current standards and that there is nothing to bring to the attention of the members. Stewart noted that the audit occurs about 4 months of each year between June to November. He explained that the auditors job is to do test controls to assess the financial position.

Keeli Elaschuk asked what happens to any budget surplus at the end of the year. Marcy replied that the policy states that residuals are rolled into the reserve fund and Council decides how to spend this in the future.

Michael asked if there is anything that the SA can do better to improve their financial position. Stewart replied that there is nothing this year and noted that the SA is doing well.

(Marcy Fogal and the Executives left the meeting)

Stewart explained that from a process perspective, it is a good practice for management to leave the meeting for a period of time each year that the audit report is presented to give Council an opportunity to ask management questions. Stewart noted that there are no management concerns this year and stated that the audit went well. He stated that it was the first full year with Brian Walters as the finance manager. He noted that there are no management concerns to bring to the attention this year.

Sadiq Valliani asked if we are currently losing money on investments. Stewart replied that this year the market rates and returns are down, but he does not believe that the SA is losing money. He explained that the long term investments are down because money was spent on the expansion.

Troy McLeod asked what the market value is on Wyckham House. Stewart replied that depreciation is based on cost and not market value. He stated that there is no need to find out the market value of the building unless the building is going to be sold or money is going to be borrowed.

Troy asked if we are losing money on international mutual funds. Stewart replied that it would be best to direct specific investment questions to the SA investment managers.

Students' Council thanked Stewart for attending the meeting.

(Stewart Scott left the meeting)

(Marcy Fogal and the Executives returned to the meeting)

Motion: To reinstate the rules.

Sadiq Valliani/Robert Jones

Carried

Motion: To receive and recommend the 2008-09 audited financial statements to the SAMRU membership at the AGM on January 26, 2010.

Meghan Melnyk/Jermyn Voon

Carried

5.0 Strategic Planning Session with Centre Point

Students' Council welcomed Janelle Woo and Liza Worthington from Centre Point and Liz Schweizer from SAMRU.

Motion: To suspend the rules.

Robert Jones/Troy McLeod

Carried

Janelle Woo began the discussion by giving an overview of Centre Point explaining that it is a non-profit organization with lots of experience in the non-profit sector. She noted that Centre Point's expertise is in organizational effectiveness and they provide organizations with business skills in this area to help them succeed.

She explained that the purpose of this session is to provide input in the strategic plan.

Janelle explained that strategic planning is about managing the future and should be done with the organization's purpose in mind, an understanding of the external environment and creativity and foresight.

Janelle noted that successful strategic planning contains input and feedback, active participation, actions and implementation plans and that challenges the status quo. She noted that it will include stakeholder input, shared visions and is future-oriented and forward-looking.

Students' Council met into groups to discuss some of SAMRU's accomplishments and what makes SAMRU successful.

The accomplishments presented were:

- Provide services to students
- Sophistication of operations – high organizational capacity
- Own building
- Involvement of Students' Council
- Variety of services & inclusiveness
- Evolving history in governance and lobbying efforts

- Committed to membership – built on success
- Hand in becoming a University & AUCC status
- Smaller group to make effective decisions

What makes SAMRU successful?:

- Structure in place to advance – uniform consistency
- Operating budget and financial stability
- Energy devoted to strategic plan
- Student involvement
- Autonomy from institution
- Management team and full-time staff
- Aggressive anti-apathy and lots of passion
- Organization within the SA
- Relationship with University and the amount of committee representation
- Highly respected organization within field
- Dr. Wyckham

Michael Decker noted that it is important to look at SAMRU's failures too. Janelle noted that these will be looked at in depth during focus groups and also during the surveys. Michael explained that it is good to know these and how we learned from them.

Liza Worthington went over some of the terminology used during the strategic planning process:

- **Vision:** describes the future work of the organization as if it were happening in the present. It shows where you would like to go and what you will be like when you get there.
- **Mission:** A brief statement that communicates the essence of an organization. It is a broad, high-level statement that articulates the day to day work of the organization. It clearly states the organization's reason for being, defines its existence and motivates volunteers, staff and its membership and the public to support the organization in meeting its objectives.
- **Values:** Provide an overarching framework of guidance for the organization and its members in day to day activities. Values are fundamental shared beliefs for an organization and its membership.
- **Environmental Scan:** Involves analyzing the organization's environment. The organization should consider the impact of change (societal, economic, technological trends and stakeholder expectations).
- **Critical Success Factors:** Determine the success of the organization at meeting its mission and vision.
- **Principal Strategies:** The strategies that we need to pursue in order to attain our vision and mission.
- **Goals and Objectives:** The outcomes that guide the organization – clear targets for specific action. They are achievable, measurable and time constrained.

Janelle gave an overview of the planning process:

- **Outward View:**
 - Stakeholder input/environmental scan
 - Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats
 - Mission, vision, values
 - Critical success factors
- **Strategize:**
 - Key strategies
 - Goals and objectives

- Written report
- Communicate to stakeholders
- **Evaluate & Implement:**
 - Evaluate and measurement methods
 - Prepare to implement
 - Implement
 - Celebrate success

Liza asked Council to discuss their wishes for the strategic plan and what they hope to get out of the plan. Councilors presented their thoughts:

- Sadiq Valliani: Drastically reduce apathy
- Eily Sweeney: Increase the connection between staff, SAMRU and the board and building of relationships.
- Meghan Melnyk: Increase student involvement and awareness
- Keeli Elaschuk: Have Students' Council input in the plan and become aware of the strategic planning.
- Robert Jones: Include mention of digital communications, have satisfaction that people will be working on the strategic plan and hope that future boards are encouraged to see beyond the vision.
- Kay Asiedu-Nketiah: Be the best known country and gain skills in the strategic planning area.
- Michael Decker: See actual results.
- Travis McIntosh: Know what we're already accomplished
- Erin Delamont: Dig deep in the process and seriously address gaps: examine and be critical.
- Troy McLeod: Be in comparison to other well-known SAs.

Janelle explained that the next call of action will be the electronic survey, the focus group on December 7th and then the implementation plan. Janelle noted that the electronic survey will be done with staff, volunteers and Council and an interceptive survey will be done with students, as well as focus groups with students.

Students' Council thanked Janelle and Liza for attending the meeting.

(Janelle Woo, Liza Worthington and Liz Schweizer left the meeting)

6.0 Dinner

7.0 New Business

7.1 Federal and Provincial Lobbying Update

Travis McIntosh stated that Robert Jones and he attended the CASA conference from November 14th to 20th. Travis also noted that he attended the CASA lobby conference last semester with Matt Koczur.

Travis explained that he has provided Council with a written report that voices concern with the structural inefficiency with the conferences and an analysis of CASA provided for information. Travis noted that other institutions have also created their own overviews. Travis explained that he wanted to bring this forward for information and to be discussed if needed. He recommended that the membership be evaluated.

Robert explained that he has provided a written report on ASEC. He noted that the focus of the report was on deliverables and actionables. He noted that all Executives attended

the ASEC progress conference in Olds a few weeks ago. Robert noted a few high-lights that are going on with ASEC currently:

- Trying to change the direction as Council and focus on influence
- Preliminary lobby document approved
- Currently working to rebuild bylaws and internal documents
- Tuition fee regulation event
- Focusing on video-making with a series of short films
- Making all finance digital
- Lobby team stricken
- Hiring committee stricken for Executive Assistance to the Executive Director
- Meeting with the Minister on December 1st
- Holiday reception on December 1st
- Launching campaign on tuition fee regulation in January

In regards to CASA, Robert noted that he believes there are big issues with structure, leadership and communication. He stated that there have been discussions on fixing these issues, but it is hard to evaluate the effectiveness. Robert stated that one positive thing about attending these conferences is that we can gain insights on broken governance. Robert stated that he believes it is time that the SA evaluates our membership with CASA and ask ourselves whether the students are being served properly and look at what we want to get out of the alliance. He stated that in the report they tried to give a holistic view of the alliance.

Meghan Melnyk asked what would happen if we were to go down to observer status within CASA and how long can we remain in observer status. She noted that going down to observer status would give us an opportunity to consider our full membership while still watching what CASA is doing. Robert replied that according to CASA's bylaws, non-voting members still pay 75% of the membership fees and remain in observer status for one year and then have the chance to go back to full membership. Robert suggested that if they decide to go down to observer status, they should create an evaluation mechanism that they can look at to determine at the end of the year whether they go back to full membership or not.

Sadiq Valliani asked what other avenues regarding federal lobbying are available if we leave CASA. Robert replied that the SA can launch their own campaigns and noted that other schools to do, but also noted that it is very expensive to launch independent campaigns.

Michael Decker stated that CASA lobbies on behalf of schools and if we were to start our own campaigns that are in the same direction, it would be hard if CASA were already doing it.

Jennifer Langille asked what the benefit of staying in CASA would be. Robert replied that CASA give prestige, access to parliament hill, updates on lobbying issues, networking opportunities with other Executive Committees in Canada, access to national MPs and the opportunity to be involved in other organizations.

Motion: To go in camera.

Robert Jones/Troy McLeod

Carried

Motion: To go out of camera.

Robert Jones/Meghan Melnyk

Carried

Motion: For the Students' Association of Mount Royal University to go down to associate status in CASA and to outline a criteria for evaluation in one year which includes the indicators of structure, leadership and communication.

Michael Decker/Meghan Melnyk

Keeli Elashuk stated that she has a problem with paying 75% of the membership fees if we are going to be non-voting.

Michael Decker noted that it is a good opportunity to be in observer status for one year and then make the decision whether or not to continue with any membership. He noted that it will save 25% of the fees and then Council can have the opportunity to evaluate the membership next year.

Rance Williams stated that withdrawal from any organization will hinder the SA's ability to make change within those organizations and also results in power loss. Rance agreed that setting some indicators for evaluation is the best way to proceed.

Meghan Melnyk stated that she understands that we do not have a lot of power within CASA as is. She stated that our representatives have made a number of suggestions and comments to CASA that have gone un-answered. She stated that she believes that Robert and Travis would bring forward any reason to stay in CASA if they had it. Meghan noted that she believes we get a lot more out of ASEC than CASA.

Sadiq also agreed that the indicators are a good idea and suggested that it would be appropriate to strike a committee to review this.

Robert explained that the three indicators are the accountability of the officers, communication from the alliance and the structure of CASA. He noted that one negative aspect of leaving CASA is that the SA would be losing out on the power to change the alliance itself, but he believes that if they leave it would send a clear message to CASA about the seriousness of the issues.

Rance noted that he believes these are strong indicators that will hopefully lead to action.

Eily Sweeney also noted that if we leave CASA, it opens the opportunity for the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) to come to us. She noted that it would be good to have a policy or statement that outlines our independence to avoid being approached by CFS.

Troy McLeod stated that if we leave then we are encouraging change. He asked if there are any thoughts on forming a new organization. Robert replied that there is currently no discussion on a third national lobby group.

Jermyn Voon asked how long the CASA structure has been as it is currently. Robert replied it has been in place about 4 years and explained that before they had a board structure, but the rumors are that it changed because CFS had infiltrated the board. He stated that another rumor was that it changed due to lack of accountability.

Anastasia Piltingsrud asked if the SA can still participate in discussions at CASA if they are non-voting. Robert replied that we would still sit at the plenary table.

Erin Delamont stated that she is in favor of associate status because of the costs associated with CASA in both the membership fees and travel costs. She noted that the SA can do a lot better with the \$56,000 that is being spent on CASA.

Jermyn asked if the only things we lose on is voting rights if we go down to associate status. Robert confirmed this.

Anastasia noted that her concern is the affects that this will have on our national voice. Robert replied that this is a legitimate concern. Meghan Melnyk stated that if we go down to associate status, it does not mean that we are out of CASA.

Robert noted that the document has been sent to all CASA employees.

Motion: To table the motion regarding associate status with CASA until the next Students' Council meeting on January 11, 2010.

Troy McLeod/Robert Jones

Carried
Opposed:
Meghan Melnyk
Michael Decker

Troy McLeod stated that Council should take time to consider the motion, as well as give an opportunity to bring a strategy forward.

7.2 Election Policies

Motion: To approve the Elections and Other Campaigns Individual Grievances Policies and Procedures document as amended.

Erin Delamont/Sadiq Valliani

Carried
Abstentions:
Keeli Elaschuk

Erin Delamont explained that the committee discussed a lot of controversial issues, such as slates, but will continue to work on the policies in the New Year to address some of these issues. She noted that most of the amendments that have been made are house keeping.

Erin noted the following amendments:

- **Page 3:** 1.2 Definitions: Bribery – “(a) *Lending or giving, or offering, agreeing or promising to lend or give money or valuable consideration other than allowance campaign materials to an Elector or to a person on behalf of an Elector; and/or (b) giving or procuring, or offering, agreeing or promising to give or procure an office or place of employment to an Elector or to a person on behalf of an Elector.*”
- **Page 4:** 1.2 Definitions: Electronic Campaigning – “*Any attempt to persuade an eligible voter through use of campaign related website(s), email(s), or any other form of electronic communication to cast his/her ballot in favor of or against...*”
- **Page 16:** 4.3.2 Display of Campaign Materials – “(a) *Not exceed eleven by seventeen (11 x 17) inches with the exception of one poster which may be of any size...*”
- **Page 17:** 5.1.5 Ballots – “*In the case of a Referendum or Plebiscite initiated by a Petition or by a motion of Students' Council, the question to be put to the Electors on the ballot shall be the same question called for in the Petition with the words “yes” and “no” located to the right of the question being asked.*”
- **Page 22:** 5.8.4 Official Results – “*The unofficial Election, By-Election, Referendum, Plebiscite, SGM, or AGM results shall be posted in the SAMRU Reception within 24 hours of the announcement of results.*”
- **Page 22:** 6.1.2 Nominee Disqualification – “*A Nominee shall be verbally informed of his or her disqualification by the CRO, after which the nominee shall be served*

her/his notice of disqualification by the CRO in the form of a letter prior to the All Candidates Meeting..."

- Minor house keeping amendments to 5.5.4, 5.5.13, 7.1.2, and 7.3.1.

Travis McIntosh noted that the committee will continue to meet through the next semester and any recommendations can be brought directly to the committee.

7.3 SAMRU Bylaws

Motion: To approve the SAMRU bylaws omnibus and to strike 3.2 regarding the U-pass from the bylaws.

Robert Jones/Fadwa Khourieh

Carried

Robert noted the following amendments to the bylaws:

- 4.2.1 "*Students' Council may convene special general meetings of the Students' Association with 75% board approval*" – Robert noted that there is currently no threshold established at this moment for the board to call a special general meeting.
- 4.2.2 "*Special general meetings will be convened by the Students' Council if a written request of 100 Active members of the Students' Association is received and appropriate notice is given*". Robert noted that this was reduced from 10% of the membership to 100 total signatures.
- 7.4.1 "*The Executive Committee shall meet regularly during the spring and summer semesters and weekly during the fall and winter semesters.*"
- 10.1 "*There shall be an annual election for all members of Students' Council including the Executive Officers, with the exception of the Commissioners*". Robert noted the addition of the exception of the Commissioner positions because they are not elected, but appointed.
- 10.4.1 "*The President of the Students' Association vacates or resigns from office:*
 - *In the spring, summer months and fall semester, a by-election will be held to fill the position*
 - *During the winter semester, a remaining Executive Officer (after nomination) shall be elected President by Students' Council*Robert noted that this was changed to have Council elect the President from the Executive Committee instead of the Executive Committee electing themselves.
- 11.4.8 – Strike completely. Robert noted that these occurrences should be treated on a case-by-case basis. Rance Williams noted that the bylaws also state a pre-paid honorarium, but the committee came to the conclusion that this bylaw is reactionary, and pre-paid honoraria is not a practice anyway.

Marcy Fogal noted that she is concerned about the implications that go along with changing bylaw 4.2.2 from 10% to 100 active members' signatures. She explained that there is no scrutiny by the Executive Committee or Students' Council for things coming forward and those 100 signatures is not difficult to get for a request that may not be appropriate to bring to the membership. She noted that there is also a lot of work involved in SGMs.

Meghan Melnyk noted that this issue was discussed at the committee and the consensus was that SGMs do not happen often; therefore, they wanted to make them as assessable to students as possible.

Troy McLeod noted that SGMs should reflect the student body as whole and it should be a represented amount of all the students on campus. Troy suggested changing it to 5%.

Rance Williams noted the 100 students were based on the quorum requirement.

Tommy Lieu asked what costs are involved in SGMs. Marcy replied that they need to pay for food, chair, incentives and the CRO – along with staff resources.

Kay Asiedu-Nketiah suggested the possibility of commissioners filling the positions of vacant Executives. Robert replied that they keep it within the Executive Committee because there is extensive training and knowledge of Executives, as well as the implications of lack of respect from the VPs. Travis also noted that a lot of board members are full-time students and this would affect the Executive Committee, as well as that students ability to succeed as a student.

Motion: To divide the question and remove 4.2.2 from the original motion.

Robert Jones/Keeli Elaschuk

Carried

Robert stated that the concerns presented have been legitimate and the suggestion has been to change the requirement to 5% of active members.

Sadiq Valliani explained that he is in favor of having a set number of students rather than a percentage and agrees that 100 students are sufficient because it is acceptable as a quorum requirement. He noted that as the campus increases, the percentage amount would increase and would be harder to accomplish.

Kay Asiedu-Nketiah noted that he is also in favor of 100 students being the requirement.

Keeli Elaschuk stated that she believes 5% is a reasonable amount and noted that she feels that obtaining more than 5% of signatures would be easy to accomplish.

Jennifer Langille stated that she agrees with 100 students because she feels that 5% limits a student's ability to fulfill the requirements and would discourage students to even try.

Robert stated that he believes the dangers that Marcy has mentioned are good arguments and he believes that 5% is an appropriate threshold.

Erin Delamont stated that she believes 5% is too high and will be too hard to achieve. She suggested that it may be more appropriate to raise the requirement to 150-200 students. She also explained that it is not the SA's responsibility to recruit the quorum for SGMs, but it would be the responsibility of those requesting the SGM. Travis stated that once a petition is signed, it is the responsibility of the SA to hold the meeting and noted that the SA wants to encourage participation of the members.

Motion: To change the signature requirement in 4.2.2 from 100 students to 200 students.

Erin Delamont/Sadiq Valliani

Carried

Opposed: 6

Tommy Lieu stated that he is in favor of more than 100 students because there is too much potential for issues to occur.

Keeli Elaschuk stated that she believes a percentage would be better because it is in line with the changing population on campus.

Marcy Fogal noted that in the past, there was a lobbying initiative to get tuition fees lower and explained that in 3 days they had collected approximately 6500 signatures simply by posting the petition in the link to the college and at reception.

Anastasia Piltingsrud also stated that she is in favor of a percentage to keep up with the increasing population on campus. She stated that if students are passionate enough about an issue, they will get the required amount of signatures regardless of the amount.

Rance Williams noted that any requirement could not prevent a rogue group of students from bringing something forward, but stated that the members present at the meeting makes the decision.

Jennifer Langille asked how many SGMs have occurred in the past 5 years. Marcy replied that the only reason there has been an SGM while she has been at the SA was because quorum was not achieved at the AGM. She stated that no SGMs have occurred in her experiences that were due to a petition. Marcy stated that she believes if something is brought from the membership that leads to an SGM, it would be because we are not meeting the student's needs.

Motion: To change the signature requirement in 4.2.2 from 200 students to 3%.

Troy McLeod/Eily Sweeney

Carried
Opposed: 3

Sadiq Valliani asked where the original 10% requirement came from. Marcy replied that it was the standard in the Societies Act.

Sadiq stated that he is against 3% because if the population on campus drastically decreases, it would make it more difficult to achieve the requirement. Sadiq stated that if the signature requirement is increased than the quorum requirement should also be increased. Travis replied that there have been no complaints or concerns from the membership regarding the quorum requirement or signature requirement and he is not sure that either would need to be changed.

Call to question.

Erin Delamont explained that the board structure was not changed by the committee. She noted that they are currently not representing all of the faculties, and suggested that they review the possibility of including the faculty of teaching and learning. Erin also noted that there are concerns regarding the continuing education representative because the SA does not represent non-active members.

Robert Jones explained that this has been a contentious issue and recommended that the addition of a Teaching and Learning Faculty representative be addressed, as well as the changing of the Continuing Education representative title. He noted that the committee is currently addressing the size of the board.

Meghan Melnyk noted that the title name changes do not need to occur during an AGM, but can occur at Council.

Marcy asked how many students are in this faculty. Erin replied that the University has a transfer program for these students and the next degree that will be implemented will be the entire teaching and learning degree. Marcy noted that if this change does not go to the AGM, it will not be in place for the next election.

Motion: To add a Teaching and Learning Faculty Representative to Students' Council.

Erin Delamont/Fadwa Khourieh

Carried

Amended Motion: To change the Conservatory and Continuing Education Representative to the Conservatory and Education Representative.

Erin Delamont/Holly Mazur

Carried

Rance Williams suggested that they strike the continuing education from his title and change it to education representative. Rance stated that this will change who he is representing on campus. Travis McIntosh noted that it would not change his responsibilities.

7.4 Bylaw Interpretation by Council

(Travis McIntosh passed the chair role onto Robert Jones)

(Travis McIntosh left the meeting)

Robert Jones explained that this is an interpretation of the bylaw that states the term of a member of the Executive Committee. He noted that there are various ethical and moral considerations and he believes that he is in conflict of interest in participating in the conversation.

(Robert Jones left the meeting)

Motion: To go in camera.

Meghan Melnyk/Troy McLeod

Carried
Opposed:
Jermyn Voon
Kay Asiedu-Nketiah

(Chair role passed to Rance Williams)

(Erin Delamont, Eily Sweeney, Jermyn Voon, Keeli Elaschuk, Marcy Fogal and Megan Borg left the meeting)

(Megan Borg returned to the meeting)

Motion: To interpret bylaw 7.3.1 that any time that is spent in office is considered to be a full term.

Jennifer Langille/Meghan Melnyk

Carried
Opposed:
Holly Mazur
Fadwa Khourieh

Motion: To go out of camera.

Troy McLeod/Jennifer Langille

Carried

(Travis McIntosh, Robert Jones, Eily Sweeney, Erin Delamont, Keeli Elaschuk and Marcy Fogal returned to the meeting)

8.0 Announcements

The following announcements were brought forward:

- Study Space Awareness next Tuesday December 8th and Wednesday December 9th. Contact Eily for more information.
- SAMRU Holiday Party December 12th at SAIT – RSVP by tomorrow – great way to get to know staff.
- H1N1 clinic on campus this week on Thursday and Friday from 9:00-4:00 and next week Monday to Thursday from 9:00-4:00 at EnCana Wellness.
- Montreal Memorial Event Monday, December 7th. Marcy noted that it has been done in Wyckham House for approximately the past 20 years and volunteers, including EC will read a quick biography of a victim, which will take approximately 5 minutes and noted that it is normally an emotionally charged event for the participants.
- Exam Relief December 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th from approximately 9:00AM-noon. Eily noted that Tegan Smyth has volunteered to do the grocery shopping and anyone wanting to help should contact her. Eily stated that it is a great way to help students and they hope to have EnCana wellness contributing massages to students. Eily stated that there will be a sign-up sheet in the governance room. Erin noted that the original dates were changed because more students will be on campus earlier in the exam period.
- Strategic Plan focus group with Students' Council on Monday, December 7th from 4:30-6:00 – RSVP to Megan Borg if able to attend.
- Wish Tree: Holly Mazur has purchased a sweater and a number of gift cards. Eily recommended that all Councilors sign a piece of paper to insert into the card.
- Robert attended a ReBoot conference this past weekend and noted that an internal social networking site is being built for the attendants of the conference in order to stay connected. Robert noted that the high-lights of the conference were recognizing systems problems and gaining a lot of insights regarding advocacy. Robert stated that he will compile his notes into a report and presentation.
- Disabilities Awareness Month: Council is able to participate in a wheelchair event on December 2nd at 9:00am where they will spend the entire day in a wheelchair on campus. If interested contact Stephanie, the Accessibility Coordinator.
- Student Advisory Library Committee: Holly attended and noted that some of the discussion items included the possibility of wireless laptop printing, study space concerns and an upcoming meeting with GFC on January 19, 2010.
- There is now a garbage can in the governance room.
- Classroom visits: Eily noted that 20 visits were done, reaching about 400 students. She stated that it was a great success and is looking forward to the January visits. Travis thanked Eily for working on this project.
- Art Faculty is looking for student representatives and all students are welcome to volunteer.

9.0 Action Items

Action: Council will sign up for exam relief on the calendar in the governance room.

Action: Sadiq Valliani will make a list of priorities from the wish list upon consultation with Council and submit it to the Executive Committee.

10.0 Board Meeting Feedback

11.0 Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the meeting.
Holly Mazur/Keeli Elaschuk

Carried