**Arts Undergraduate Society of McGill University**

**Legislative Council**

**January 27th, 2016, 6 PM**

**AGENDA**

1. Call to order at 6:08PM
	1. Territorial Acknowledgment: AUS would like to acknowledge that McGill University is situated on the traditional territory of the Kanien’kehá:ka, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst nations. AUS recognizes and respects the Kanien’kehá:ka as the traditional custodians of the lands and water on which we meet today.
2. Roll Call
	1. Absent: Equity, EPIC, ASSA, CSAUS, ESA, IDSSA, MESSA, MUGS, NASSA
	2. Came late:
	3. Left early:
3. Motion to approve Photography from Daily
	1. All those in favour? All. None against
4. Approval of Minutes from January 13th 2016 Council
	1. No amendments
	2. All those in favour? All. None against
	3. Minutes are approved
5. Approval of Agenda
	1. Arts Rep. Templer: Motion to amend item 6 to allow presentation from SSMU “Yes” Committee on referendum questions. Seconded. Amendment added.
	2. Motion to add item 6a – for AUS to formally endorse “yes” vote on SSMU campaign for base fee increase. Seconded. Amendment added.
	3. Agenda is approved.
6. Announcements
	1. VP External Goldberg: For the folks who are giving departmental reports, if you want to stay and present where you are, it’s okay. So you don’t have to take five minutes to walk all the way to the front.
	2. Senator Hennessy: Tomorrow there’s a panel at 6pm on academia at Arts 360. Will be four Profs speaking about their experiences, plus SSMU researchers speaking on employment equity at McGill.
	3. GSA: German Students Association having I-week event next week, having German speakers coming. It’s in Arts 360 on Feb. 4th at 6pm.
7. New Business
	1. SSMU “Yes” Campaign Committee Presentation:
		1. Emily Boytinck: We’re members of the Vote “Yes” Committee for the SSMU referendum. SSMU President Ibrahim: In brief, SSMU has expanded vastly –we’re responding to student demands, dozens of new staff, new food demands, etc. The budget can’t support all this based on what’s been identified as important. It’s been eight years since the last fee increase back in 2007 when things were very different. Need to respond to department changes and there have been numerous areas in virtually every portfolio that don’t get the attention they deserve. We’re hoping to increase it by $5.50/student each semester.
		2. Emily: This pie chart depicts three main areas where base fee is going. First is to create financial sustainability because this year has been a special year for SSMU. We saved 50k in salaries because of resignations and cuts from reserve funds. We want to make long term purchases like building improvements, happy lights, building a mental health space, etc. But we’re not financially stable right now. Need to find 100k to make our organization financially sustainable, or make 100k of cuts for next year if base fee is not approved.
		3. Emily: Second area is support staff. SSMU Execs work 85-90 hours/week, but students still complain we’re not accessible or not fulfilling campaign promises, which is true. We want to create more student jobs because they’re a win-win, while the other half is going towards additional executive or support staff positions. There will be a separate referendum going on to deal with that, but if it doesn’t pass, will only be part-time staff members.
		4. Emily: Part three is student-identified priorities. SSMU had a student survey that identified where they want resources going to – mental health, more accessible events at Gerts, better public spaces, etc.
		5. Kareem: If this fee increase were not to pass, we would have to cut even more student staff positions and full-time staff, and cut building hours. This not ideal. Even SSMU building, which is virtually the only space on campus that can host a large amount of students, is becoming increasingly less accessible. Also, we’d have to reduce number of projects we’d put out, like shrinking the Happy Lights project, mental health program would shrink, and SSMU building maintenance would suffer.
		6. Discussion:
			1. VP Academic Q: Won’t the fee increase take on services, like mental health, that McGill *should* be taking on in the first place? I feel like in the long run, that’ll create a bad that SSMU is taking on stuff that McGill should take on in the first place. Is there a parallel plan to push McGill administration for this? Kareem Response: SSMU VP Affairs and I meet with McGill Admin regularly, there’s been on emphasis on this – like the cyclical unit review for Student Life and Learning is also happening and this is something we’re piloting right now. But mental health was top priority on survey, so we identified it as important. Emily Response: And the building fee is a great example of McGill offloading costs on students. Moving forward, SSMU reps will be more transparent in negotiations.
			2. AUS President Q: Similar vein to VP Academic. Given that SSMU doesn’t own Shatner building and is leasing it, shouldn’t some of the building costs of it crumbling be on the landlord and not the person leasing it? Emily Response: McGill owns the *outside* of the building. They renovated the ramp this year but waited until last possible second. If a meeting room has chairs that are broken or has no functionality, McGill won’t pay for this this. So functionality and use of *inside* the building isn’t something that McGill has interest in supporting. For example, we didn’t have money to update student lounge, but had to replace couches, etc. McGill doesn’t help.
			3. RSUS Q: I think one of the biggest problems is that people have low confidence in SSMU, but that’s more about legacy that SSMU has. What are you going to do to change this, and will this fee fail because of this? Kareem Response: Last semester we didn’t have a VP Internal, but still tried to engage with students. But having that stretched so thin, we didn’t have the human capital. With the fee passing, we’ll have renewed capacity to hire staff and improve student engagement. Every year this is a discussion. We’re not doing magical things with the fee increase, but hoping it will inspire students and show that we’re trying. Emily Response: Blanket SSMU hate has existed for it’s 100-year existence, it’s not going to go away. But I’m in my fifth year, and I find the SSMU hate is lower than we’ve seen it. We do think that every year in Exit Reports to increase the base fee, so while we do recognize that SSMU doesn’t have the most social capital on campus, we don’t have to let it hold us back.
			4. Senator Hennessy Q: What’s the difference in funds that will be allocated to your program vs. McGill student health? Emily Response: The 2% is there because it’s going towards the year-to-year operating budget in the mental health program. A large percent of what mental health support entails is mental health space, happy lights, etc. None of our fees will be towards counselling service, but a peer support space.
			5. ASA Q: If this was made in response to student needs, can you really make any difference with 2%? Emily Response: It looks so low because that’s just the programming. You can make a solid difference with awareness, and that’s what the programming budget is going towards. A lot is towards capital expenditure funds. One big upcoming project is creating space in building for support centres. A substantial amount of SURF will be going towards mental health programming. Kareem Response: 21% is just the ballpark right now. It’s in the works, can be more or less expensive.
			6. Senator Sobat Q: How much will this $5.50 work out to a year in total? Kareem Response: 242k.
			7. Arts Rep. Templar Q: To clarify, when 15% is going towards better support for student groups, is it more related to student clubs and services? Emily Response: There are 2-3 main aspects of student support. Adding 25k to club fund, the most popular fund, and decreasing rent in building for independent student groups. Also would help departments hire staff dedicated to room booking, which is at risk right now. Want to rehire someone to do room booking fulltime, it’s something that we previously did. Daily requests are enormous.
			8. RSUS Q: What is your measure of success? When will the job be done? Right now, the metric of success isn’t catastrophic. When are we getting to positive place in SSMU? Kareem Response: Having resources to fulfill campaign resources and promote those endeavours to the student body will make it better. When we can poll students and get positive results we’ll know. Will also do consultation, there are areas in every portfolio that we need to solve. Emily Response: Also the proportion of students engaging with us increases each year, which is a strong metric. Hope it’s a trend that will continue.
			9. VP Finance Q: How many new student jobs are you creating and what’s the wage structure? Emily Response: Student jobs portion is going towards increased hours. Some new positions, but increasing hours for existing staff. Amount of jobs to be created hasn’t been decided, it’s flexible. For example, this year we had a bunch of administrative needs, but other years we have more project needs. As far as wages, it’s complicated. We work on pay equity scale that works with all of Student Services. If we adopt higher wages so would they, which might not fit their budget. We *do* want to increase our wages; our staff works very independently and work very hard, so there’s talk of increasing the wages. But don’t have set number on how’d we get to 15%.
			10. VP Internal Q: What about affordable food on campus? Emily Response: What we mean by affordable Gerts is that we want Gerts and cafes to break-even. So once it becomes a more financially stable operation, we would translate it into lower food costs, but wouldn’t be immediate. Once we hit break-even, we wouldn’t move towards a profit-generating organization, we’d keep it at break-even.
		7. No more points of discussion.
	2. Motion to Endorse “Yes” Vote for SSMU Base Fee
		1. Arts Rep. Templer: After that presentation, this is the motion going forward for AUS to formally endorse a “yes” vote for the SSMU base fee referendum question. I want to clarify that a “no” vote would mean a neutral stance on the issue. See published motion for “Whereas” statements – read aloud. I hope after that presentation your questions will have been answered, particularly to AUS and why it’s something to be endorsed. Also want to add that some of you may not agree with SSMU or increase to base fee, but you’re voting on what’s best for your constituents.
		2. Q: Is the vote opt-out able? Response: You can, but then you’re not a part of SSMU. Templer Response: Quebec law says you can’t opt out of SSMU base fee.
		3. VP External Becky: Did you upload motion to the website? Response: Yes.
		4. RSUS Q: My concern is that it lightens burden on SSMU that we think it’s a good idea. It’s their case to make for the student body and it falls on them. I don’t think AUS should be taking a stake in this; it’s someone’s personal choice rather than us to make SSMU’s case for them. Senator Hennessy: Point of Personal Privilege – is this question period? Response: No.
		5. Arts Rep. Templer: Clarification, if people have questions but are uncomfortable voicing it, you can go on Facebook page or submit it anonymously online.
		6. VP Internal Maria Q: This is a pretty large increase, would it be better going towards AUS and not SSMU? In the sense that a lot of it is going towards building repairs, is there a distinction from putting that money going towards SSMU rather than our own undergrad society? Templer Response: If the AUS needed it, we’d be moving forward to get it. But currently, we don’t need it, so it’s a little hard to answer. SSMU is bringing this forward. It’s our student society and it provides different resources that AUS doesn’t provide.
		7. VP Academic Gabriel Q: Has there been consultation with different departments on how they feel about SSMU fee increase? Elaine Response: I haven’t reached out, but think it’s beneficial. Would reduce fee to book Gerts or room bookings for other student groups on campus, and would benefit departmental associations and committees I sit on. DESA Response: Agree with Gerts point, and mental health is a concern with our constituents too.
		8. Discussion:
			1. FEARC: Our constituents are already representing themselves in their own selection, why lobby to one side? This is a situation where we don’t need to represent their interests since they’re going to do that on their own. Arts Rep. Michaud Response: Students will see SSMU and shut down base fee, period. We wanted, as Reps, to show exactly where fee was going. Not trying to impose vote on students, but most people don’t have a good understanding about it unless they sat through the presentation we just sat through.
			2. RSUS: To repeat what I said earlier, I think it’s important for SSMU to reach out and make its own case. They said they engage with students themselves, but SSMU execs are mandated to come and speak, to be on the “yes” committee. It’s up to them to go out there and present, important for them to take leadership role.
			3. VP Academic: Arts Reps to SSMU are the vehicles by which they operate, that’s their way of reaching out to different constituencies. Here, they’re just using that direct link.
			4. Senator Hennessy: Want to echo that, I think this is SSMU reaching out. SSMU often criticized for it’s inability to communicate, but this is a direct reaction to student questionnaire. They are responding to reality of student services, and it’s a minor increase.
			5. Arts Rep. Templer: Wanted to echo sentiment that Execs have been doing a lot to reach out to students – class announcements, events, etc. I don’t think it’s solely up to them if we think it will benefit our constituents. So we should.
			6. Arts Rep. Michaud: They’ve also been tabling in SSMU since Tuesday. And SSMU never asked us to bring this forward, it’s what’s right.
			7. Senator Sobat: SSMU couldn’t use resources directly, and it’s above 70hrs a week that they’re working. They’re working very hard, even I tabled for 3hrs today. To clarify for mental health – SSMU does programming around it like yoga and therapy dogs, while the other part is capital stuff like happy lights program. All can be cut off.
			8. Arts Rep. Templer: Wanted to finish from before. Motion would be encouraging students, but not mandating students, to vote. It’s not without precedence, MUS already announced its endorsement of base fee. We wouldn’t be breaking out on our own.
			9. VP Academic Gabe: Point of parliamentary procedure to increase speaking time to a minute and half? Passes.
			10. Senator Sobat: Goal not to replace McGill services on mental health side, but want to decrease wait time for appointments, create spaces, free up time for execs to advocate to McGill for things like our medical note policy. And there’s restructuring around mental health that’s going on that we’re working with.
			11. Arts Rep. Michaud: Those of us who are on “yes” campaign will be abstaining from vote.
			12. FEARC: Concerned, why shouldn’t we provide arguments for both sides instead of “yes?” VP Comms Response: Informing students that AUS will be supporting base fee will give them the resources to learn about the base fee through Facebook page, next week’s listserv, etc.
			13. ASA: Confused, if you guys think it’s in Arts’ best interest, why would you guys abstain from your own motion? Lexi Response: Because it’s a conflict of interest, we’re campaigning for this. Templer Response: To clarify, two of four members who are on “yes” committee and not abstaining, so it’s not everyone that has conflict of interest.
			14. HSA: Idea that we’re here to be one student body and not a partisan organization, but we’re meant to represent our students best interests. This is part of our historical legacy.
		9. No more points of discussion.
		10. Voting: All those in favour? 13 For, 11 Against, and 12 Abstaining – Arts Rep. Michaud abstains due to conflict of interest. Motion is approved.
	3. Amend ASEF bylaws
		1. VP Academic: It’s a pretty straightforward motion. Every year the AUS, with the Dean of Arts office, fund different positions, like RA positions, through Arts Student Employment Fund. Profs hire students through their funds, and whatever’s leftover is allocated to different units that apply. When students are hired through ASEF funding we ask them to write up a report, but there’s never been a binding requirement to do so – this will do that.
		2. Report will include: overview of project, student’s role in project, impact project has particularly to other arts students, and how the student was paid, either lump sum or hourly wage. This is important because there have been problems with tracking how that money was given out. Given that it’s from student fees, want to make sure everything is formalized.
		3. Discussion:
			1. PSA Q: Why isn’t it the Prof’s responsibility instead of the student’s? Response: Professors are unlikely to do it. When I came into the job, I tried. When you look at other McGill services like McGill Internship Office, they do this too. Jacob Response: Arts Internship Office also requires brief report on internship, not the person who hires them.
			2. Senator Hennessy Q: How to ensure compliance when it’s due a month after the project? Response: We have their contact info, but it’s up to the VP Academic to reach out to the students. But a month is a long enough time to write a 20-minute report.
		4. No more points of discussion.
		5. Voting: All those in favour? All. Motion is approved.
	4. Motion to Change Reporting of AUS Council Motions
		1. FEARC: Purpose of motion to foster accountability since we’d be recording our amendments in way that’s easier to read from our constituents’ perspective. This would show motions as it was done, and would be uploaded within 48hrs. It’s marked in bold and underlined, so don’t have to pay for color printing.
		2. Senator Sobat: One thing we do for SSMU motions is to have date of submission and date of approval included on the page. Response: This is a friendly amendment. Passes.
		3. No points of discussion.
		4. Voting: All those in favour? All. Motion is approved.
	5. Motion to Amend Electoral Bylaws for VP Finance Screening
		1. AUS President: One amendment, if you checked the website before 5pm today. For background, this is one of the final steps of this process that we started in September or October for screening of VP Finance. This is following up from consultations we had, the bodies are listed there. This is according to the constitutional amendment that students approved. What this doesn’t include are specific questions that will be asked in the interview, since we don’t want people to see the question before as that doesn’t prove that they’re qualified if they just pay attention to AUS minutes. This is all in Article 8 of Electoral Bylaws. Article 8.2 describes questions, which we went into more detail about at last council.
		2. Notice that we talked about summer issue at last council, and narrowed it down to specific tasks they need to be here for. Will include AUS audit in May, which lasts a few weeks, and at least a week before frosh starts. Had a lot of concerns that we were being too restrictive, so this is bare minimum.
		3. Article 8.2 and 8.3 says that screening committee will set the questions each year, important to have that flexibility. This year, the meeting will be on Feb. 9th. Ideally we’d have it before the nomination period, that wasn’t possible this year. Evaluation sheets that people are filling out for each candidate will be available during case of an appeal. Candidates have to have a passing grade for the questions.
		4. VP Finance Shakir: Article 8.4 is the composition of the committee. Change to departmental executives only, in light of fact that people don’t exactly have VP Finance or maybe VP Finance coordinator positions. Jacob: These people are going to be vetted, but a lot more flexibility just in case someone’s specific title isn’t VP Finance exactly. Like this year we have an accounting prof, in future years we may have a CPA, etc.
		5. Senator Hennessy: Does Latin word mean they don’t have a vote themselves? Jacob Response: Yeah, we can add that or change it so it’s not Latin. Approved.
			1. Article 8.4 sub-article i: changed to “non-voting.”
		6. RSUS: What measures are put in place in case incumbent VP Finance wants to run for re-election? Jacob Response: Council wouldn’t approve them as member of the screening committee. RSUS: Can we make this more explicit? Have a motion to amend it? Jacob: It’s already pretty clear.
		7. FEARC: What’s the process for accommodating religious holidays? Shakir Response: Article 1.7 in electoral bylaws, so it’s only on days that classes are.
		8. Senator Sobat: If this committee met before the nomination period, would you, as President, make a recommendation to the committee next year? Jacob Response: Sure, I’ll bold it in next report.
		9. VP Social Christine: To VP Finance and the being here all summer issue, do you think that it would have detrimental impact on VP Finance’s performance? Given that over the summer there needs to be lots of cheques written, and we don’t have a credit card. And seven days before frosh is when registration starts, it’s hectic for everyone and you’re dealing with tens of thousands of dollars in cash. VP Finance Response: Strongly recommend for VP Finance to be there in the summer because there’s a learning curve. But we wanted position to be as accessible as possible, didn’t want barriers. Maybe hire a student bookkeeper for the summer? Something we had in the past.
		10. Discussion:
			1. ASA: Disagreed at last council of having VP Finance here all summer, but agree to changes made to this and think it’s a fair compromise given the purpose it fulfilled. Christine Response: I just wanted VP Finance’s opinion on the record.
			2. RSUS: To note that it’s a job to be taken pretty seriously, AUS has an operating budget of almost a million dollars. It’s not too much to ask for people to be there more than a week before. If you have an event that’s a quarter of your operating budget, I don’t think it’s a huge thing to ask. Yes, we should allow for some flexibility, but not this much.
			3. VP Internal Maria: Would someone’s qualifications outweigh whether they’re here for the entire summer? VP Finance Response: Someone who is here for the summer is learning their job for four months, so you’d have someone who is already screened based on qualifications and extra experience. Jacob Response: Have to have at least half marks anyways on the test. But it’s up to voters to decide. Shakir: With AUS work-study in place, it’s also a paid position, so can’t argue he wouldn’t have work in the summer.
			4. Arts Rep. Templer: Propose amendment to Article 8.2.1.1, dates are unclear. Senator Hennessy: Maybe strike the months and include “audit” and “fourteen days” instead? Approved.
			5. VP Social Christine: Think it’s problematic to view frosh as VP Social’s sole responsibility. It’s extremely relevant to VP Finance’s portfolio too, since can reach up to 200k in spending. VP Finance Response: Yeah, true. Besides frosh, audits depend on each year. One year lasted 7hrs, this year it took the entire summer. Auditors come to your office for an initial week, follow-up done by emails.
			6. FEARC: Are you not preventing candidates if they won’t be there in the summer? Sobat Response: Turning this into a campaign point, which is interesting. And summer part isn’t scored during screening process, just flagging it. Jacob Response: I think when we say it’s not scored, it’s because it’s not percentage. But they do get yes/no.
			7. VP External Becky: Does a student bookkeeper have signing authority? Does there need to be two signing authorities? Jacob Response: Yes, that’s doable. Shakir: Exec has signing authority on all cheques, so they’re quite interchangeable. And bookkeeper could have signing authority.
			8. VP Academic Gabriel: What happens in case of a resignation at any point? Like if they resign in September, is it according to old rules or is there a by-election? Jacob Response: According to constitution, council votes on whether to appoint a replacement or to vote for a by-election. If we’re striking the dates down, it’s more likely a by-election going into a screening.
		11. No more points of discussion.
		12. Voting: All those in favour? Majority. 1 Abstention. Motion is approved.
	6. Motion to Approve VP Finance Screening Committee
		1. Jacob: Pretty straightforward and follows from last motion. Has been topic of discussion for a long time. Addition of potential counsellors on screening committee extended to departmental committees, perhaps those that have accounting knowledge. Committee criteria are listed.
		2. Shakir: To clarify assessment structure, we’ll have more open-ended questions. Will be questions that I’ve worked on in my portfolio. Second part of finance and accounting questions will be textbook, just have one answer.
		3. The summer availability question will just be to disqualify a candidate if he’s not available during the times we just decided on.
		4. Will be conducted on February 9th at 2pm, confirmed with all the committee members.
		5. Senator Sobat Q: So it would be friendly to change Article 3.3 to “pass/fail?” Amended.
		6. FEARC: Missing the word “council” in section 4. Amended.
		7. No points of discussion.
		8. Voting: All those in favour? All. Motion is approved.
	7. Motion to approve MOA and SNAX Letter of Permission
		1. Jacob: Before we talk about this motion, which is pretty simple, this is the MOA and what’s been happening with negotiations. Let’s talk about MOA itself. There are three documents that have been attached. MOA defines AUS’ legal document to the university, has a 5-year term. Past MOA was signed in 2010 and expired in May 2013. We’ve been negotiating with McGill to resign. Most points in document are non-issues.
		2. Bigger issue is what SNAX can and can’t sell, since they didn’t let us sell sandwiches, but we informally did it. But then McGill said formally that we couldn’t do it. So we want it to legally be allowed in the MOA. Have the main body, the MOA, and a separate document, the Letter of Permission that allows SNAX to sell these products. The letter of permission expires in Dec. 2016, so has a shorter timeline than MOA. As long as we accord to these guidelines, it’ll later shift to the MOA.
		3. Changes included: Looked at by AUS lawyer, “legal scrubbing.” Article 6.3, 6.4 and 6.6 talk about use of McGill name, no changes for us. It’s something they’re adding in for all associations, it’s more important to SSMU. It’s not a change for AUS. All our names approved in Appendix G anyways. Article 10.2.IV says we have to update them on Appendix G.
		4. Article 14.6 says all costs – like taxes, fees – that occur from uses of space like SNAX are AUS responsibility. We’re on the hook for this. This results from provincial administration; only city of Montreal or Government of Quebec can really regulate it then.
		5. Appendix B has increased in fees, which reflects that the cap has changed. Not happy with this, but it’s something they’re doing for all associations. Not main point of discussion at our negotiations. Not that far off from inflation either.
		6. SNAX rent in Appendix E is also increasing, but at a constant rate, $1 per square foot, which is about inflation.
		7. Letter of Permission: want to highlight a couple things, talked about most of these provisions at previous councils. Liminal trial period, SNAX can only sell food from certain providers, changed it so the supplier is legally registered and adheres to health and safety rules, which all of ours are.
		8. Section 2 talks about regulations we have to comply with and provincial, municipal, and federal laws and building codes. But these were too ambiguous, so asked them clearly what we have to be following.
		9. Section 3 says we can’t be cooking or preparing food. Also said we couldn’t have seating opposite SNAX, which we weren’t happy about. Some plans in the past were to add 20 seats to SNAX, which isn’t really possible now.
		10. SNAX is subject to ad-hoc inspections to make sure we’re complying with terms of agreement and health and safety. But only people who are legally registered are able to give us health and safety inspections. And AUS would have 15 working days to face that violation.
		11. If we agree with entire Letter of Permission, it will be extended to MOA after it expires.
		12. Discussion:
			1. Senator Sobat: When we approve this, when can we open SNAX again? Jacob Response: Doesn’t have to be ratified by Board of Governors, so maybe one or two weeks? Have to contact old suppliers. VP Finance Response: We have a supplier for sandwiches, so maybe next week?
			2. Senator Hennessy: Theoretically, if we comply with this, they still cut off permission after December, is that correct? Jacob Response: Unfortunately, it’s true. But they’d have to make a very good case against us to revoke this Letter of Permission, although this does open the door for that. Wanted us to demonstrate some trust before they signed on for the 5-year MOA.
			3. FMC: With regards to proposed changes to MOA, have there been impact studies on the bottom-line for SNAX finances? Clarification on what we can or can’t sell? Shakir Response: Introduction of sandwiches increases our revenue by 20k, so it just looks profitable for SNAX to have sandwiches. It will only improve our financial situation after signing MOA. Jacob Response: When SNAX was selling sandwiches, it was 20% of their revenue.
			4. VP External Becky: After you sign MOA, is there a circumstance where you can reopen negotiations in that 5-year period? Jacob Response: Not for the MOA, but could renegotiate the Letter of Permission after December. Becky: So what we’re voting on is to approve Letter of Permission and approve MOA? So after December we can’t sell sandwiches for 5 years? Jacob: No, it’s just shifted into MOA, incorporated into the body of that. It’s written in the letter. Becky: Sounds to me like it’s not definite that if we comply with these conditions, it’s more up to the university’s discretion. Jacob: Legally, yes. We tried changing that, but it’s a non-mover for them. But politically, no, especially given the demonstrations last year.
			5. FEARC: But if they were so opposed to changing it legally, wouldn’t that imply they’re unwilling to do this? Jacob Response: I think it’s the element of trust, since we were selling sandwiches and going against old MOA. I think it will be very hard for them not to allow us to extend Letter of Permission after that period.
			6. VP Academic Gabriel: In event that Letter of Permission isn’t renewed and integrated in the MOA, are there contingency plans that can be put in place to renegotiate? Jacob Response: It expires in Dec. 2016, I trust whoever is in charge of these negotiations in AUS will be dealing with it well before. SNAX wouldn’t shut down, it would just operate that way it is now – just not optimal.
			7. VP External Becky: We need something more concrete in wording for when it expires. Jacob Response: Recognize concerns, but it’s the best agreement that we can get. Issue is going to keep dying down, there’s been a lot of work with the sit-ins, and didn’t just want to throw that away.
			8. Senator Hennessy: Echo Becky’s point, it’s not about sandwiches, but larger trend of taking autonomy away from student organizations. Something we should remain concerned about going in the future.
			9. RSUS: We have to take the small victories where we can, need to continue talks with future AUS President and VP Finance so we don’t lose this administrative knowledge.
			10. President Jacob: Need to acknowledge how far we’ve come. Fact that biggest issue is we have to comply with this agreement for next nine months is okay. Have to ask for confidence.
			11. VP Finance: Clarify that all the points that McGill’s asking us to do *are* what falls under AUS jurisdiction or SNAX jurisdiction. Nothing here that McGill should be supervising, it’s what SNAX should be doing anyways.
			12. VP Social Christine: Think it’s the best deal we’re going to get. Don’t want to lessen what Hennessy said, but if it gets to the point where McGill wants to take away sandwiches at end of 2016, it will be easy for AUS to rise together and protest.
		13. No more points of discussion.
		14. Voting: All those in favour? All, except VP External abstains. Motion is approved.
8. Reports of the Executive Officers
	1. Report of the President
		1. Still looking for someone to join AIO committee, meeting later in semester.
		2. MOA presented for approval – signing sometime soon.
		3. Voted on evaluation criteria for AUS VP Finance, meeting on Feb. 9th
		4. Nominations for AUS elections begin on Feb. 4th. Working to figure out how to increase turnout.
		5. HR Review Committee meeting tomorrow morning, centralized hiring platform next month?
		6. Work Your BA going on until Friday.
		7. Met with Arts Admin IT services to discuss changes in Arts computer labs and Arts lounge.
		8. Sign up for grad photos as they’re getting filled up.
		9. Office hours now up.
	2. Report of the VP Academic
		1. Essay Center will be open next Monday onwards. Hours are the same as last semester.
		2. Peer-to-Peer Symposium to be held on week of Feb. 15th.
		3. Peer Tutoring: all applications received, all solid.
		4. ASEF applications have been communicated to units at McGill. Deadline is Feb. 19th.
		5. Academic Affairs Committee: working on advising platform, will be emailing departmental VP Academics to compile advising rules for their departments.
		6. Curriculum Committee met on Monday.
		7. Had Faculty of Arts on Tuesday, had presentation on the budget. Roundtable next week.
		8. AUS Teaching Awards applications are out, found here or on the listserv.
		9. Office hours listed here.
	3. Report of the VP Communications
		1. Fine Arts Council ran into issues with SSMU room bookings, we’re clearing up issues. Dance workshop went well.
		2. Francophone Commission started today. Conversation circles are from Monday to Thursday, and open to everyone at every level of French.
		3. Marketing Committee putting together logistics for next week.
		4. Coffee in Ferrier sometime between Feb. 15th to 19th.
		5. Prof Talk happened last Thursday with Prof. Hans Beck. Had good attendance. Now in contact with two Profs from Women’s Studies, hope to do a double feature where you hear two sides, happening at end of Feb.
		6. Misc.: Working with Becky to contact Leacock’s people. Also working to plan Art’s Lounge Wine and Cheese event to hear feedback from students on how to improve the space.
	4. Report of the VP External
		1. ACE: Spent this week and last scheduling for embrACE in mid-March. Pairing with different groups, planning an indigenous perspectives workshop, collaborating with Fridge Door Gallery, etc. Have graphic for it once rooms are confirmed.
		2. Sex Trivia night is on Feb. 11th
		3. McGill Eating Disorders Association reached out to us about doing event in the next week since it’s their awareness week. Have two rooms booked for movie screening, one in SSMU building and one in theatre room on Peel.
		4. Another free waffle breakfast on Feb. 23rd, it’s a huge hit.
		5. Working on mental health video, to be screened during embrACE.
		6. If you missed out on Work Your BA, I can send you resources.
	5. Report of the VP Finance
		1. Majority of work revolving around AUIF. Have around 10 applications, still looking for some reps to sit on the committee.
		2. Financial Management Committee met on Jan. 2nd for first time. 8 applications were tabled and 10 were approved. Don’t really reject applications, just table them until you get more info. Still have 3k left of the fund, so please apply.
		3. Discussed timelines for coming audit with AUS President. Accounting tasks as usual.
	6. Report of the VP Internal
		1. If you have any exec turnovers, please email me. Jacob needs them for next Presidents’ Roundtable on Feb. 3rd.
		2. All my pre-booked table dates and liquor permits have been processed.
		3. Sent out application for new couches in the Arts Lounge.
		4. If you book spaces in Leacock 232 or Arts 360, please clean up after events. Room bookings are getting filled, so please be patient and lenient with dates.
		5. Senator Hennessey Q: What’s the plan for AUS awards? Response: No idea yet, restaurant venue and Sleeman sponsorship?
		6. VP Comms Q: Are departments allowed to book on behalf of external groups on campus? Response: SSMU has been having issues, I cannot book for external groups, and room bookings are super tight.
	7. Report of the VP Social
		1. BDA: Mimosas and Samosas theme this week. Had meeting with other faculty VP Internals – Gerts Manager and SSMU VP Internal and VP Finance. Found out we’re locked into contract with Sleeman, so we’re creating an internal contract to distribute responsibilities. But AUS won’t have problems fulfilling it.
		2. EPIC: Ideas for sponsors for Arts Attack?
		3. Grad Ball: Decided on a meeting time, doing a tiered ticket system. Think we’re running a smaller deficit than last year, which is okay, we always do.
		4. If you want to be featured as showcase for BDA, go to Facebook page.
		5. Senator Hennessey Q: Tier pricing for Grad Ball? Early bird or VIP ticket? Response: No VIP ticket, just first 150 tickets will cost this much, next 150 cost that much, etc.
9. Reports of the Arts Representatives and Senators
	1. Report of the Arts Representatives to SSMU
		1. Arts Rep. Templer: At SSMU on the 28th, confederations will be presenting. Encourage people to come out and listen to them to decide which student federation will be best.
		2. Office hours are set. Mine are changed as Wednesdays are eliminated. – Booking issue resolved for tabling on Tuesdays.
		3. SSMU Accountability Committee: Parliamentarian revised document yesterday.
		4. Health and Dental Review Committee: Meeting with VP Finance to draft survey.
		5. SSMU Electoral Reform Committee: Sent out to committee directors, made public shortly. Review Commissioners met to figure out what can be made into resolutions.
		6. McGill Allied Against Sexual Harassment group close to getting off ground.
		7. Equity Committee: Members at large to get involved in event planning. Working with SSMU president on it.
		8. Board of Directors have meeting for Jan. 25th, meeting for tomorrow cancelled.
		9. Info under Lexi: External Affairs Committee abolished
		10. Jacob Q: Why did they abolish it? Lexi Response: I was the only one on it, along with Emily’s staff who chairs it. Wasn’t serving the right purpose. Was in the past VP External’s wishes to abolish it – want to create new kind of committee.
	2. Report of the Arts Senators
		1. Senator Hennessy: Panel on Diversity in Academia on Thursday. Have four Profs scheduled, there’s more info on the Facebook event.
		2. Collecting info on courses that have diversity and equity components as potential program requirements. Please pass on to your VP Academics. Also sharing questionnaire on course syllabi.
		3. Senator Sobat: Talked about Equity Agreement with Deputy Provost. Undergoing cyclical review next week to review what the structure of that unit looks like and to make recommendations. Pass on general thoughts to me.
		4. If you’re interested in my Senator position, talk to us. Nominations start this Friday. Next Thursday in Leacock 26 we’ll be having an info session, there will be a Facebook event soon.
		5. Smoking Harm Reductions Policy and Smoke-Free Campus: meeting with admin and creating a working group for that. Asked question during SSMU referendum in March to get broader feedback and meeting with smokers’ groups. Town Hall on Feb. 9th to get their thoughts, open to all members.
10. Reports of Committees and Departmental Associations (AGELF-WSSA)
	* 1. CLASHA: Our journal, Voces, is accepting submissions.
		2. Roundtable discussion happening Feb. 16th, hoping to incorporate different departments on discussion about Latin America.
		3. Still trying to organize a Languages, Literatures, and Cultures apartment crawl, TBD.
		4. Documentary screening on culture in Mexico, trying to arrange it.
		5. CSA: Classics apparel is in, can pick it up in Leacock 817.
		6. Thinking of rearranging Classics lounge.
		7. Thinking of hiring a new Archaeology prof, getting feedback from students who would be best.
		8. Classics play was this weekend.
		9. CSUS: Seeing if we’re able to replace chairs in Trottier third floor, they’re wooden and have staples. See if we can get funding for that and talk to building admin.
		10. Events with STEM, planning a Wine and Cheese, and have a formal we’re starting to organize.
		11. Planning on doing amendments to our constitution.
11. Question Period
	* 1. VP Comms: Isn’t a question, but announcement. Listserv went to junk mail again, I will get into contact with McGill IT.
		2. VP Academic: Notified that link I put into report and listserv for Teaching Awards went to junk and isn’t valid. Go onto Facebook page instead.
12. Next Meeting Time and Date (**February 10th, 2016 at** **6:00pm in LEA 232**)
13. Adjournment at 8:32PM

**Membership of AUS Council**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Name** | **Present?** | **Late / leave early?** |
| **AUS President** | Jacob Greenspon | Yes |  |
| **AUS VP Communications** | Elaine Patterson | Yes |  |
| **AUS VP Internal** | Maria Vedeshkina | Yes |  |
| **AUS VP Social** | Christine Koppenaal | Yes |  |
| **AUS VP Academic** | Gabriel Gilling | Yes |  |
| **AUS VP Finance** | Mirza Ali Shakir | Yes |  |
| **AUS VP External** | Becky Goldberg | Yes |  |
| **Arts Representative to SSMU** | Adam Templer | Yes |  |
| **Arts Representative to SSMU** | Lexi Michaud | Yes |  |
| **Arts Representative to SSMU** | Gabriel Ning | Yes |  |
| **Arts Senator** | Erin Sobat | Yes |  |
| **Arts Senator** | Alex Kpeglo-Hennessy | Yes |  |
| **FEARC** | Erik Partridge | Yes |  |
| **AUS Environmental Council** |  | Yes |  |
| **AUS Equity Committee** |  | No |  |
| **EPIC** |  | No |  |
| **AGELF** |  | Yes |  |
| **AHCSSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **ASA** |  | Yes |  |
| **ASSA** |  | No |  |
| **BASiC** |  | Yes |  |
| **CLASHSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **CSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **CSAUS** |  | No |  |
| **CSUS** |  | Yes |  |
| **DESA** |  | Yes |  |
| **EASSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **ESA** |  | Yes |  |
| **GSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **HSA**  |  | Yes |  |
| **IDSSA** |  | Yes | Late |
| **MESS** |  | Yes |  |
| **MESSA** |  | No |  |
| **MIRA** |  | Yes |  |
| **MPSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **MUGS** |  | No |  |
| **NASSA** |  | No |  |
| **PSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **PSSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **RSUS** |  | Yes |  |
| **RUSS** |  | Yes |  |
| **SLUM** |  | Yes |  |
| **SSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **SUMS** |  | Yes |  |
| **WSSA** |  | Yes |  |
| **Speaker of Council** | Priya Dube |  |  |
| **Recording Secretary** | Amylea Doiron |  |  |