**Arts Undergraduate Society of McGill University**

**Legislative Council**

**February 23h, 2021, 6:00 PM**

1. Call to Order
* 6:08 PM EST
1. Territorial Acknowledgement
* AUS would like to acknowledge that we are situated on the traditional territory of the Kanien'keha:ka people, keepers of the Eastern Door of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. This is a place that has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst nations. AUS recognizes and respects the Kanien'keha:ka as the traditional keepers of these lands and waters on which we meet today.
1. Roll Call
	1. [Winter 2021 AUS Attendance Record](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1O-JmkvrWkuCtzN03AEFIZBy-qRXgxl9RDffoGbv6Mw8/edit?usp=sharing)
2. Meeting Minutes for Approval
	1. [February 9th Meeting Minutes](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QhmkOECaAnCfrpJuN9jjStvgqMYIpD0O/view?usp=sharing)
* Senator Darshan: Will we move the agenda, approve it as it is?
	+ Speaker: We'll discuss that after I'll walk you guys through a couple of things. We're just going to want to get this one out of the way and then we'll approve the agenda unless I'm, yeah, no apparently approving the agenda will come after approving the many minutes from last time. But yeah, I'll walk you through how that will look.
* Rep Chip: Motion to move by unanimous consent
	+ Rep Paige: 2nd
* **Passed**
1. Approval of the Agenda
* Speaker: Okay, so for the approval of the agenda for today for February 23. There are quite a few motions that got submitted late. Again, nobody's fault. We're very busy right now, I know a lot of people have a lot of midterms, it's all right. So we just need to decide as a council then if we're going to adjust the agenda. So that would be including the motions, three of them on the floor at this time. So numbers two, three, and four that were submitted late, if you guys would like to see all of them. And you can make an amendment to that. If you would like to see only one of them or two of them out of not all of them. You're also allowed to make that.
* Senator Darshan: Motion to move the agenda with the late motions but move motion number 4 motion to number 1.
	+ Rep Chip: 2nd
* **Passed**
1. Announcements
* Rep Chip: Two announcements concerning everyone's favourite thing elections pertaining to SSMU. So the first thing is that SSMU executive elections are currently ongoing the nomination period for three positions which are the VP Finance, the VP Internal and the VP External has been extended, you can find information on the extension nominations on the Facebook page in the kits. As well nomination packs are going around. If someone asks you to sign up, you guys can sign, you can sign for multiple positions or multiple candidates for the same position. One of the things you might have seen in your inbox yesterday that an election or referendum was sent around. For the Constitution of SSMU, anything that's passed at a general assembly as a general assembly needs to be approved by the membership. And that includes two things every year, which is the nomination board directors and the nomination of the auditor. According to Quebec corporate law, shareholders of a corporation have to prove two things, both of those and it's time to prove the auditors the one that we picked was for lenders who we usually go with. So please fulfill your duties to the corporation and vote to approve the auditor. If you guys have any questions on any of that, please let me know or let the other arts reps know. We'll be happy to help.
* CSAUS: I just want to let everyone know that the journal for Canadian Studies Canadian content is now accepting artistic submissions, photography, sketches, anything that your heart desires that you would might want to see published. Those interested can contact me outside of council, shoot the CSAUS Facebook page message or email CSAUS at CSAUS.exec@gmail.com with your art.
* Rep Chip: Point of personal privilege, would it be possible to mute this slack mode? Like the sound?
	+ Speaker: Does anybody have? Does anybody know where to mute it? Otherwise, I just have to mute myself, which I can also do.
	+ Rep Chip: There is a way to do it. I'll send you a notification.
1. Unfinished Business
2. New Business
* Speaker: So just a reminder of how we did council last time, just with the new adjustments with Robert's Rules as well. So every motion, even though that they're being approved on the agenda still needs to be recognized. So we still need somebody to essentially make a motion to have the motion presented. So you can just say, “ I move the question for number one, or I move the motion, which is the motion formerly requiring the arts representatives to SSMU to vote in favour of the diverse human rights policy at the Legislative Council”. And then you also need to specify that you would like to have it be presented and then debated on immediately after. So that's just a quick reminder.
	1. [Motion Formally Requiring the Arts Representatives to SSMU to vote in favour of the “Divest for Human Rights Policy” at SSMU Legislative Council – Late](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SK7cYdHckg__cY1qTYTg6ImBrOpDs0b6/view?usp=sharing)
* Rep Chip: Motion to move previous question
	+ VP External: 2nd
* Senator Darshan: Point of order, could you explain what is happening? Are we moving to voting for this motion?
	+ Speaker: I think you missed the first part of last council. So I'll walk you through. So I had a meeting with a parliamentarian in the States. And he walked me through the very specific stuff with Robert's Rules. And one of those specific things that we kind of need to do is, even though we have like motions on the floor for the agenda that's been approved, they still need to be brought forth by counsel for them to actually be like, presented. So even though that they're on the agenda doesn't necessarily mean that counsellors want to debate it or want to talk about it or have it be presented. So we still need to have them be brought forth via motion. It's one of those very specific nuances.
* WIMESSA: Reem is sitting in for me during this council
	+ Speaker: No worries, would you like to present at least?
	+ WIMESSA: Like read out the motion?
	+ Speaker: You can either read it or provide a quick summary.
	+ WIMESSA: This motion is regarding the vote on Tuesday, February 16 for the SSMU General Assembly, where 90% of students voted in favour of the divest for human rights policy. This motion is just regarding the arts rep to vote in favour of ratifying this in the Legislative Council.
* MUGS: I think probably most of us know that this motion passed, like 90% of students approved at the General Assembly, but quorum was unfortunately undermined. And there's just sort of mass exit of people right before voting. So it is really important, we believe that the arts reps vote in favour of this to reflect the views of art students, as this, you know, passed the consultative General Assembly and our students seem to be largely in favour of divesting for human rights.
* WIMESSA President Reem: This is just mandating that the AUS reps to SSMU basically, are responsible for voting in favour of this motion, as we can see is what most art students are supporting.
* Rep Chip: Looking for a kind of clarification on the last section without unfriendly amendments. I'm just wanting to clarify exactly what you're meaning by that as in us bringing amendments which I don't think you would find us doing or if unfriendly ones are brought what happens there.
	+ MUGS: So I actually meant to send in an updated version of this. But then the day just got away from me. We have an updated version of this actually where we have added another clause and kind of edited the phrasing of this, basically to say, we would like that the AUS council officially require all four arts representatives to vote in favour of the divest for human rights policy when or if it is brought forward for voting at this new Legislative Council, without unfriendly amendments, and above all adopt and defend all the stances contained in the document and presence. So the intention behind unfriendly amendments in the policy is basically, you know, to preserve the spirit of the policy.
* PSSA: I was wondering if you could explain the reasoning behind mandating three arts reps specifically. So why that specific number. And moreover, I'm just wondering if you guys have access to the numbers of arts constituents that voted in favour of the motion and the number of arts constituents that also dropped out after like, dropped out of the call.
* Senator Darshan: Point of order, given that MUGS just reread a different clause and suggested to update the motion. I think it would be best if we take a recess for a second where the motion can be updated before we continue debate so that it best reflects what is meant by this motion.
	+ Speaker: That could be entertained for sure. I just have a quick question for let's go with the sponsors, so for MUGS and WIMESSA, you guys send it over to the speaker email? I was just wondering where the most recent one is located.
	+ MUGS: I just now sent it into slack and all-staff channel.
	+ Senator Darshan: Moton for 30 seconds recess
	+ Speaker: That is an order. I'm just going to rule that dilatory. Yeah, not really a dilatory. It's an order. Yes, we can have a quick recess.
* Senator Darshan: I'd like to take that question (PSSA’s question) since I’m next anyways. Given that the motion at hand has currently changed to four arts representatives, the rationale behind this as that a petition has been going around, moved by the Divest for Human Rights Coalition that is calling on all four arts representatives to vote in favour. The rationale behind this is that there is no opposition that seems to be bringing out a difference in the motion itself. The motion clearly is going against McGill’s policy for divestment. It's an extension of what is already going on in school as a moratorium. And this will best represent what arts reps should do, to best represent the society as well. The current petition that has gone around has received over 300 signatures, and over 165 of them are from the Faculty of Arts with regards to the PSSA’s point on the exact numbers of how many people left the GA. Since everyone at the GA were SSMU members, there is no conclusion as to how many were specifically from the Faculty of Arts. But given that arts is the biggest faculty, and also has overwhelmingly supported the motion. It seems that this is what is the best call. So I urge everyone on council to vote in favour, for to best represent the voices of our students.
* VP External: Point of Order, I'm a little confused as to why this updated version wasn't brought up when we passed the agenda and voted on the updated version to be added rather than this version.
	+ MUGS: Yeah. it’s you know, entirely my mistake. The day got away from me, and I meant to send it in and it totally slipped my mind that I hadn't sent an updated version to the speaker. So yeah, it's totally just my bad, you know, slipped my mind.
	+ Speaker: Just as a question for the council, are we just okay to move forward, even though this wasn't technically the motion that was on the floor at this time when we approve the agenda? Is that fine with everybody? If you have any concerns, just kind of speak up now. Otherwise, then I'll just assume that the silence is we're okay with this being brought forward as the official motion that we'll be voting on.
	+ Rep Alex: As was said, I do have concerns this was brought last minute, not the motion itself but this amendment. Especially because Legislative Council does have the ability to bind our votes. They do not have the legal ability to force us to adopt and defend any stances though. So like, regardless of whether we will or not like that isn't legally something this motion can do.
	+ WIMESSA: Yeah so it's in the AUS Constitution under Article 6.1, as we have listed on the motion, that it allows for the Legislative Council, I'm just going to read off of this. So it allows for the Legislative Council as its governing body to have the power to mandate any of its representatives to adopt and defend a specific stats, taking in the overwhelming majority and the most of those that were Arts students. I do believe that we should be able to have a say in how our representatives vote on behalf of the majority.
* CSAUS: It seems a little disingenuous that people keep claiming that 90% of students in the General Assembly voted for a motion it gives this aurora that the motion somehow wasn't controversial and that it should be a foregone conclusion that the council should allow the reps to be binded. I think the reps being bound by it as another issue. I just take issue kind of with the semantics of it. I think that, you know, if people were walking out of a meeting, you know, I think that's cause for concern as for our council, but maybe there's something we should look into here, especially given the last minute amendment. That seems a little bit as they say in among us ‘SUS’ I'm not making reference to the science undergraduate society, their council meetings are surprisingly underwhelming. Sorry, Ethan, except neon day was great. But I would move to strike number four and insert three.
	+ Senator Darshan: Point of order I do not believe that it is possible to state a point and move a motion and the same speech. So I think that would be have to have to be brought up separately as a motion.
	+ CSAUS: You can I was motivating my motion to amend.
	+ Speaker: This is something I did talk with the parliamentarian. I asked them not because we've had this issue come up a few times in Council in the last year. And apparently this is allowed. So if somebody finishes their speech with making a motion, that is an order. What's not in order is like, for example, if they're wanting to put the motion forward to, for example, like, strike everything out of the entire thing. So if they want to say, oh, we're just going to strike this entire motion that's not an order, but they wanted to make something to say, Oh, I'm wanting to adjust this that’s entirely in order. Otherwise, sorry, Canadian Studies, what was the motion that you were making at the end of the speech?
	+ CSAUS: Amending, whereas having all four be bound, going back to the original, three out of four.
		- Senator Darshan: It’s a friendly amendment
		- Speaker: We again, something that we got clarified on there's no such thing as friendly amendments in Robert's Rules. This is where MUN and Robert's Rules don't like each other. I would like to just say that this is a friendly amendment, but apparently, it's nothing. So we actually have to vote on any motions, amendments, motions, luckily, that they are all simple majority. So we just need 50% of the council to pass that.
		- PSSA: 2nd
		- Senator Darshan: Motion to move by unanimous consent.
	+ **Amendment Passed**
* Senator Darshan: I just like to clarify that my interjections are mainly points of orders, so they are allowed to interrupt debate. Nonetheless, the point that I'd like to address is regarding the point brought up by CSAUS regarding the use of democratic voice in a general assembly, as we all know that there was a general assembly which allowed for registration and attendance that met quorum up to 390 students, which means to say this is something that is very close and dear to many students. Clearly students care about this motion like this clearly we are against, like all the stuff that we're against as like liberal students at McGill, and studying at McGill against genocide and human rights abuses, and so on and so forth. What I'd like to address as the use of your democratic voice at a general assembly on why a walkout is symbolic or the drop off quorum is symbolic. It doesn't remove the fact that lots of students did vote in favor, 90 students of those who remained remained and voted in favor, there was no nothing stopping from students to stay back and actually will present their voices in the vote. While I do agree that there was some sentiments brought about, the general idea of the GA was a little messy, where a lot of questions were raised on whether or not something is J boarded and whether or not that can be debated or not. So I think it's hard to conclude as well that there is a sentiment against it. Nonetheless, as a secondary of the motion, we are willing to make the compromise to better represent all our students by only a mandating three out of four to vote in favor.
* Speaker: I just also wanted to bring up something really quickly, just so all council members can know, this was something that was talked about last time. So from the meeting with the parliamentarian as well, according to Robert's Rules, counsellors, slash anybody who's a member of Legislative Council is only allowed to speak twice per motion. So if you see your name listed twice on there, I'm not allowed to call on you again to speak slash debate on the motion, you're allowed to make, like a motion and bring up points and privileges that you're allowed to do. But actually, like speaking, debating, we're not allowed to do apparently more than twice, that's just something that's in Robert's Rules, again, a nuance thing.
* MESS: In terms of the stipulation that the arts reps must like it per the terms of this motion, would then have to support the policy passing at LC without unfriendly amendments. First of all, speakers just brought up that technically unfriendly amendments don't necessarily exist. I'm not going to get into that, because I understand that SSMU like, on a technicality probably have different standing rules, and I don't really care to figure that out. But I just meant to say, what would happen if an unfriendly unfriendly amendment were pushed through would then, like, would then they'd be forced to vote against the policy and like, what are the movers and like motivators and the, I guess, members of the gallery who have like, stronger opinions and like, want and have an idea of how they want this to pass what they would like done in that situation? I think that's important to know. Because I'm someone who has gone to a few SSMU meetings, things rarely get through without attempts at amendments. So that is like a reality that I hope someone can inform me of their thoughts on that.
	+ Speaker: So we don't have friendly amendments, but unfriendly amendments are technically a thing. They're just essentially amendments as a whole for Robert's Rules. So that's only needing a simple majority to pass. So if people would like to make amendments, we're more than welcome to propose them for any motion that's on the floor. Likewise, Michael, your point about gallery members, I think that's really important to recognize that if there are some gallery members in attendance specifically for this motion on the floor, and again, I know normally they're not allowed to debate it, but would like to pass on some thoughts or concerns. That's just again, if this is something that the council would like to see, we could entertain that there. It just depends on if there's anybody who would like to speak slash what's the urgency of it, but that's something that the council will need to describe a need to decide on.
	+ MESS: Point of parliamentary inquiry, can councilors yield their time to gallery members like you can in SSMU?
	+ Speaker: That's not actually addressed in the standing rules but you know, what if again, to chair’s discretion if you guys would like to I think that's a great way to go about it, but I'm not opposed to that.
	+ Senator Darshan: So, based on my experience, as senate caucus rep on SSMU, unfriendly and friendly amendments are a thing. And at SSMU these are defined as whether or not the movers and secondaries of the motion agreed to the amendment. So it is in reference to SSMU standing rules, rather than a AUS standing rules. So, yeah, it would depend on whether or not the mover and seconder of the motion on SSMU Legislative Council can deem that friendly or unfriendly.
	+ MESS:I just wanted to say, with all due respect, that doesn't answer my question at all. My question was, like, specifically with the matter of the motion at hand. So I don't think you'd be able to answer my question without making reference to it. I'm specifically asking what the movers of this motion and I guess, as AUS LC, if we work to adopt this policy, what would they like to see done in a situation where the policy submitted to this motion, gets amended at LC and gets put to a vote with the amendments? Would they like the arts reps be bound to no longer? Like be bound to vote against the policy with an amendment? Or would they be bound to still support it or abstain? Like, I think that's just unclear with the provisions currently inside this motion.
	+ Speaker: That is a good point. And that's something that should be discussed as well. So in that case, because this is specifically dealing with the arts representatives, as the Chair, I would encourage any of the arts representatives that either have or have not spoken yet to share their thoughts and concerns. And likewise, if there's any gallery members that would like to share their thoughts or concerns on this, they're more than welcome to as well this time, just because this could possibly concern some of them.
	+ Dalton (Observer): I'm not officially involved with the motion at all. I just have some experience with like, Rules of Procedure and such and just to help out. Perhaps what I think the how I interpreted the document was, when I read it, like, when I saw it on the agenda was that perhaps , it could be clarified that the arts representatives are to vote no on the amendment itself, but still, always vote yes, on the document, so long as it reflects the spirit of the document and precedent. By that meaning, the motion would mandate them to vote no on all amendments, but still vote yes, on the document, so long as it in their judgment reflects the contents of the document as it exists. Now, I don't want to speak for the motion, though, because I did not motion this motion. But I feel like that would just be a logical procedural solution to the problem identified by the representative
* Rep Alex: Yeah, I was gonna ask if I can kind of verging off with Dalton has said, like, specify, the specific text that I think might work for this and if the movers or secondaries can let me know if it's if it's bad or not. But basically to say to oppose all amendments, friendly or unfriendly that would, that would take away from the intent of motion itself.
* Senator Darshan: I'd like to motion for a 30 sec recess before the amendment and a seconder for the amendment is found.
	+ SLUM: 2nd
* Speaker: Just wondering, Alex, was that motion or that amendment that you had submitted to Sierra? Did you want to see that added at the end right now and then have a second voted on it? Or do you just want a second right now to see it be brought forth?
	+ Rep Alex: I'd like to have like the original people for the motion. The movers and secondaries let me know if there's any issues with it first. Then change that if needed.
	+ Senator Darshan: Madam Speaker, given that they're gallery members present at the meeting, I think it would be best that the motion to have the text contained on it before instead of the Slack channel.
	+ WIMESSA: I’m just wondering who decides an amendment that would take away from the original intent of the motion. I guess it seems a bit tract to me. Perhaps I would change the wording a bit over there. I'm just wondering who decides the question. Maybe adding the intent of the motion based on the motion or the secondaries or something like that a different kind of wording.
	+ Rep Alex: That could work if we had the intent of the motion as defined by the movers.
	+ WIMESSA: Maybe perhaps based on consultation with the movers, um, something like that?
	+ Rep Alex: I don't know how feasible that would really be though, to consult with, like, have all of us consult with the movers during the voting that's going on? Because like, there's not that much time when an amendment comes to when it's voted. So it's just like a procedurally I'm not sure how feasible would be.
	+ WIMESSA: I'm okay with how it's written right now. Unless we're able to figure out a way that maybe we have a representative or someone who would be able to discuss with people at the Legislative Council, but I think it's fine the way it is, if it really isn't feasible.
	+ Rep Chip: 2nd the amendment brought forward by Arts Rep Alex
	+ Senator Darshan: Point of Order, I think that the current clause is redundant, it says without unfriendly amendments twice. So if this is friendly with Arts Rep Alex, I recommend to remove the first phrase that says without unfriendly amendments.
	+ Rep Alex: That’s fine
	+ Senator Darshan: I have another suggestion. The second bit would be to actually split the two clauses. It's a little confusing at the moment to where it says and additionally, to make that a second bit further resolve clause.
	+ Rep Alex: That’s Perfect
	+ Sierra: Was it still all? Or were we going with the three out of four?
	+ Senator Darshan: All
	+ Rep Alex: Would you be willing to change that from all our representatives to? Those arts reps who are bound, because it doesn't make sense to bind someone? Not on their vote, but on what they're saying.
	+ Senator Darshan: Yeah that makes sense.
	+ Speaker: So in that case, we're just going to vote on this as it currently stands. So it has been proposed by Arts representative Alex. Second by Arts representative Chip Smith.
	+ **Amendment Passed**
* Senator Darshan: Point of Information, I know this is another one, but it's a question. So I do not think the motion specifies what mode of communication will be used by the arts rep. So I think if that can be just decided, would it be Facebook? Would it be on slack?
	+ Rep Chip: I've literally started drafting a note to everyone that literally will have the names of the three so we can post that in the Facebook channel and the Slack channel.
	+ Senator Darshan: Yeah, that's fine. I think it's just best that everyone on council knows.
* Rep Alex: Motion to move the question
	+ Rep Paige: 2nd
	+ CSAUS: Opposed
	+ Speaker: Thank you, CSAUS so in that case, we're going to take this to vote by roll call. Just because we have to with gallery members in attendance. I can't just kind of take approximation. Okay, so if 40 in attendance. That's just need simple majority to pass. Okay. So we need at least 20 in favour.
	+ SLUM: Point of Order, we need the majority of voters to be in favor not the majority of members present.
* Roll Call
	+ N: 3, Y:19, A: 14
* **Motion Passed**
	1. [Motion to Ratify FMC Decisions](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Am47U484bqUcF8dAgw263kv89u_FaU5n/view?usp=sharing)
* Rep Chip: Motion to have it presented
	+ VP External: 2nd
* VP Finance: Just a standard motion to approve the decisions of the FMC. There is one funding application to approve and two budget amendments.
* Senator Darshan: Motion to vote by unanimous consent
	+ VP Finance: 2nd
* **Passed**
	1. [Motion to Create and Levy the Arts Undergraduate Society (AUS) Administration and Operations Fee – Late](https://ausmcgill.com/vp-finance-motion-20-13-aus-administration-fee-referendum/)
* VP Finance: Motion to have it presented
	+ Arts Rep Chip: 2nd
* VP Finance: I'll speak for generally about the motion. Of course, it's there in more detail. But the primary objective of this motion is to address the fact that the vast majority of employees and executives that work in the undergrad in the AUS don't stay in their positions for longer than one year. Very rarely do we have a situation where people stay on for two years. And clearly this is a very high sort of turnover rate. Well, this is great. I think for new ideas in terms of policy, new proposals from the constituent body. It presents a great deal of inefficiency when it comes to administrative matters, a couple of core areas that I listed here in the motion, which there is no reason why those areas need to be subjected to the potential changes and uncertainties related to transition, again, high rates of turnover, and so on. The objective of this motion is in short to give the AUS the financial means to hire a financial manager and possibly some non-financial manager, General Manager and possibly some additional full time staff who would be responsible for handling these roles, administrative functions of the AUS, year over year, and responsible for maintaining that kind of institutional memory. And again, in addition to sort of giving consistency in some of the core areas of operation that are listed above in the motion, it also gives elected student representatives the ability to focus on policy discussions, the general direction of the organization. At the moment, it is my opinion that we wouldn't have the financial means to implement this without negatively affecting other areas of a AUS operation. And by this, I mean, when I presume when we return to normal operations sometime in Fall 2021, maybe a little bit later. But in any case, eventually, hopefully, we'll get there. I would want to make sure we can do this position sustainably, well into the future that we have the ability to provide competitive compensation for potential people who would fill this role. And, you know, basically, we feel the best way to do that is to let the new opt out double fee, which would allow us to go forward with this. In effect, this is a fee to help reduce turnover and improve institutional memory and improve the efficiency and of administrative parts of the AUS operations and the delivery of certain services. I am happy to take any questions about this fee about this motion. And that's it for me.
* Senator Darshan: I'd just like to thank the hard work of the VP finance and the president and bring forward this motion. I think such infrastructural change to the organization will bring lots of sustainability to the operations and institutional knowledge that is often lacking.
* VP Finance: If I might add something, Madam Speaker, we also consult with the EUS and with a student society with I don't remember exactly which one from Concordia and our model is very similar to what they're doing particularly as society in Concordia, this has been tried, and it is effective, at least with those people.
* Rep Chip: Move to vote by unanimous consent
	+ VP Finance: 2nd
* **Passed**

5 minute recess

Reconvene at 7:36 PM EEST

* 1. [Motion to Amend AUS Constitution – Late](https://docs.google.com/document/d/183xpQaQKdQPGKK6pbaje49o1_0NcEPgrvghdor_jF0c/edit?usp=sharing)
* Rep Chip: Move that the motion be brought forward
	+ VP Finance: 2nd
* VP Finance: As part of the work that CBRC has undertaken this year. This is another great work. This is one of the items which was to sort of clean up the Constitution, the changes that you have before you, I can sort of be grouped into three different categories. The first category is adding some committees and sort of changing minor internal practices around meeting attendance, committee memberships, and so on. The second change is the removal of the VP services as a position in the interest of hiring a general manager to replace that function. And in addition to many other things, but just feeling that VP Services in light of a general manager position is redundant and sort of distributing the rules of the VP services accordingly to reflect that. And finally, which is perhaps the most delicate item is the removal of the J-board as the final decision making body and interpretive body of the AUS. And I'm happy to take any questions, better reasoning behind some of these proposed changes. And I look forward to the discussion. I will just say regarding the J board piece. I won't speak for everyone on CBRC. For the most part, there seems to be a degree of relative agreement. I'm happy to take any questions once again.
* CSAUS: I agree that the AUS Constitution does need some urgent, urgent modifications. I just wish CBRC would have brought their report to council so that councilors could have had a chance to comment on it and not just roll on through. I think because that there would have been, some valuable input given by councilors. I feel like striking the judicial board. Particularly because the judicial board is one of the only student government entities on the McGill's campus that is kind of not politically influenced that there could that that we're losing some value here, by striking them as the ability to render rulings or give judgments in relation to a AUS it's one of the things that ties us in with SSMU and gives us affiliation with SSMU. And there's really no, there's no, like replacement. There's nothing like that at AUS, it would be one thing, you know, to make your own AUS judicial board. But that hasn't been done. So I'm very, very, very anxious about this motion. Thank you.
* Rep Chip: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I don't mean to take away from Stefan and Stefan, if you want to correct me, please go after this. I just want to speak to something that CSAUS mentioned, which is regards to the judicial board, as most councilors are aware, SSMU comprehensive governance review committee, is currently in the process of updating these new constitution and it's looking like sections will be added to the Constitution preventing which will prevent appeals to j-board by faculty association. So this is effectively something that we're going to have to deal with anyway. If I recall from the last CBRC meeting, something that we had discussed was the create was having ex com as the board of directors of the AUS as a corporation dealing with a dispute matters. These are the end of the day, all j board decisions do have to be ratified by SSMU board of directors. But that's we had a bit of a discussion on but eventually this is something that we're going to have to deal with anyway.
* VP Finance: I really do appreciate Councilor James's point. I think, you know, I understand the situation but to build on Counselor Smith's discussion, I think it's just we do have a lot of internal AUS accountability mechanisms. We have the Secretary General, we have FMC accountability committee, the Executive Council Legislative Council, which perform a lot of the functions anyway and are actually accountable to AUS voters. The law gives boards final decision making power over just about any area of operations. And, you know, I just I feel that and again, I think I can speak for CBRC on this matter is that it is disingenuous to suggest that the judicial board could somehow bind the organization, it could say we didn't interpret a bylaw correctly, but we could easily change that bylaw, we could or simply ignore the ruling of the judicial board sort of to no effect. I think this is a great opportunity to sort of say, okay, let us refine our internal accountability mechanisms. But let us not tell people that they can rely on something that sort of effectively, they really can't. And sort of be clear with people about that, and constituents about that.
* Rep Paige: Yeah, I agree with that, with both Arts representative Chip Smith, as well as VP finance, Stefan. Just with regards to that we have our own accountability mechanisms within the AUS. And to me, it doesn't really make sense that we should be accountable to SSMU when we have nothing to do with SSMU. I think that that is sort of a problem with regards to like our autonomy and our sovereignty as our own governing body and as our own Faculty Association. something that the science undergraduate society is doing, which is another option that we could maybe look into, I don't think it would work. I think it's too late. I think we missed the boat for this year on this sort of thing. But um, they're going to basically, when accountability issues come up, they're going to create an ad hoc appeals Committee, which will have members of council sit on it. So then that's another option as well. But I think the accountability mechanisms that we have in place at AUS, such as the Secretary General, the accountability committee, and so on, and so forth, really do the job for us. And it shouldn't be up to SSMU to have that kind of power over us. And I like SSMU, but we really shouldn't have power over us like that. It's just bad governance. So yeah, thank you.
* VP Finance: I just want to say I really do appreciate the comments, I will add another thing just as just sort of, to discuss the sort of the ability of the AUS to implement accountability mechanisms, which is the IRP process. It is administered sort of internally, though, it's connected to other parts of the other parts of the Faculty Association throughout the university, it does show that we can be objective, impartial, and, sort of treat matters of accountability and, you know, with the requisite respect that they deserve, and the requisite professionalism and impartiality that they do deserve. Otherwise, I have nothing else to say about this motion.
* SLUM: These amendments seem to remove the SSMU representatives from the Legislative Council. I don't remember discussing that at all CBRC.
	+ VP Finance: Unless I made a mistake. I believe the only amendment that discusses the arts representatives is allowing them to sit in on confidential sessions of the executive committee. They should not be removed from the Legislative Council. This is not the intention.
	+ Speaker: If you know, the clause in question just so that we could find it on the doc. That would be something that would definitely need to be brought up. Thank you for bringing that to our attention.
	+ SLUM: Bottom of page 6, 7.1 c
	+ VP Finance: I personally didn't include this specific amendment. I think the intention is that SSMU, it doesn't determine the number of arts representatives or people with that title that can sit on the AUS Council, but I would pass that on to art representative Chip Smith, who I think made this specific change.
	+ SLUM: I'm sorry, I just realized I figured it out. They're members of the executive committee.
	+ Rep Chip: Yeah, I was also just going to add to that. I don't think the constitution of SSMU specifically states there has to be four arts representatives. I think it actually technically doesn't state anything about faculty representation on Council.
* VP Finance: Motion to move motion by unanimous consent
	+ Rep Chip: 2nd
* **Passed**
1. Executive Officer Reports
	1. President
	2. [VP Academic](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1TJ8pcpBNSVd4ldbLx4Se8OyaWOJW3Klm/view?usp=sharing)
	3. [VP Communications](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IM_JbNOfmtXiyu276y26iacYJCZzQR4I/view?usp=sharing)
* So not much to report. We had our event with the Francophone commission last Friday, and we're planning to do more game events like that in the future. So Ananya and I were speaking and she said that we need more translators for the bylaws and other legal documents. And I'm currently in the hiring process. And I had a couple interviews today. And they'll be finalized by the end of the week. And I'm also working on my exit report. And that's it for me.
* Point of Personal Privilege: I have to go now, so I will be going
	1. [VP External](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wGFanLuXuf2izztVFZhdXN5-d7HlcWB1/view?usp=sharing)
* So in regards to the career portion of my portfolio, that's pretty much done for the year, except for helping CAPS promote events and work your BA went super well. So thank you guys, if you attended, I hope you all enjoyed it. The Mental Health Commission met on February 19 and we're planning a mental health scavenger hunt kind of thing. So I'll keep you guys updated on that and hope you can all participate. We also created like an Instagram posting schedule. So that's nice, ACE met on February 21. And we have embrace week all planned. I hope everyone's really excited for it. The dates are March fifth to the ninth I believe there are five super, super cool events and more about that will be coming on Monday. And then spin is planning an escape room. That's all I have, I stand for questions.
	1. [VP Finance](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DSBtrXkXOs4n8ciOpu6d5NqUTg8KvL77/view?usp=sharing)
* The biggest item that I'd like to provide an update on is the release of the AUIF applications. This is an excellent opportunity for departments faculties, that say academic departments within the faculty of arts can use to apply for large capital improvements in their classrooms, in their departmental lounges, and so forth. This is a fund that disperses approximately $250,000 a year. So the financial resources are really ample, and they provide an excellent opportunity for departments to either individually or collaborate with their departmental chairs and so on to create projects that improve the spaces that students learn in. The fund has been used to great effect in previous years and I'm confident and can be this year as well. There are no problems carrying over funding and allocation. So irrespective of the fact that you may not be able to finish everything this year, or even maybe next fall, the funding will continue to be available for whenever you are ready to do that. So again, I really encourage you to apply. There have been other priorities, the general manager position with the president and finalizing the memorandum of agreement with the university that's ongoing. Those are, those are the three main areas that we're trying to try and move forward with. To areas of delay in my portfolio, the budget updating system has fallen significantly behind schedule as far as the ethical business practices guidelines implementation. Hopefully, we'll be able to bring that back on track and get some results by the end of the year. Otherwise FMC meeting schedule is there for those who wish to attend. And I'm happy to take any questions.
* IDSSA: Wondering where AUIF applications was distributed to
	+ VP Finance: It was sent by email to the VP finances of each department. And if there was no VP financing, that would have gone to the President, I believe. If you'd like I can also forward it to you. If you just shoot me an email.
	1. [VP Internal](https://drive.google.com/file/d/17zGtAKvDVfXPZl3lQzUFnwYt00OoPRRE/view?usp=sharing)
* The biggest updates for me is I met with the equity commissioners. And we came up with a concrete plan on how we want to do the religious dates and holidays to make it more accessible. And so we're gonna be rolling out an interfaith calendar. That will be for all of next year. So the new VP Internal will have that to their disposal and it will be disseminated along with like, various other things like the departmental package, and then we'll make a statement about if there is problems with it, how people can go about addressing it within the AUS to ensure transparency. And then beside that, I've been working on trend to transitioning the internal portfolio and working on the exit report. And then the aUS Environmental Council, we're thinking about making the collaboration of sustainable campus partners. That's all
	1. VP Services
	2. [VP Social](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FWO69UboRrNd2ZfejKAYkjx_DpEPUEzS/view?usp=sharing)
1. Reports of the Arts Representatives and Senators
	1. [Arts Representatives](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1OciEiFkYoCSrKtq5xT3T1fg1_HE25pgz/view?usp=sharing)
* Rep Paige: So the biggest thing that we kind of have on the table for Council on Thursday is the motion to Divest for human rights. So yeah, come on out and be a member of the gallery if you'd like just send an email to Speaker of council Lauren Hill, speaker@ssmu.ca and she will add you to the call. We've got a few old few motions from old businesses as well, coming up and our very own Councilor Williamson will be giving her report to Council. So that's really exciting as well. So board directors met on Thursday, February 18. So Alex, Chip and I are on board. I'm on nominating committee. And we're currently in the process of hiring a new justice for judicial board and we're conducting interviews this week. Mental Health Committee had their roundtable on February 11. The mental health fee will be up for renewal on SSMU’s online referendum. So make sure to vote in that. Today as well, I had my office hours and I was able to listen to some individuals from the arts community come and speak about the motion that's been voted on and on Thursday. So that was pretty cool. And I also met with Chip as well as the arts rep elect, so both Yara and Ghania. Yes, that was really nice as well, we had a good chat. And that's about it for me. I know that Chip has some updates from a couple committees. So chip, if you'd like to jump in feel free.
* Rep Chip: Thank you so much. Paige, I have two updates from curriculum committee and Faculty Council. Faculty council met on the 16th from three to four. We technically didn't have quorum, though we did have quorum, it was a whole other mess. So official business was conducted, we did get a few updates one of those with regard to fall 2021, how that's gonna look. What we were told, I know many of you probably saw the email that went up today, particularly those who are in McGill University pool party might have also seen something but that the Faculty of Arts is looking at doing a hybrid system. So anything over 150 will have in person components, but not necessarily be fully in person, or anything under 150 will be fully in person. One of the things I raised to associate Dean Locke and Associate Dean Fronda would be the possibility of having student consultation similar to what we did in the fall for remote delivery this semester, both seemed quite acceptable to that. And the PGSS is also trying to do something like that. And we have it in the minutes that they do want to do it. So I've been reaching out to the two of them. And I'm waiting for response on that other thing from faculty council, which is that McGill Writing Center will eventually be taken over by the Faculty of Arts, McGill Writing Center currently is a branch of the School of Continuing Studies. And there's been some talk for a few years, it was expected to be done last year, but not didn't happen because of you know, what, and the justification really is that a lot of courses are done, like are taught through the school or taught through the Writing Center, kind of on Creative Writing, and on academic ranks, etc. And this would be a way to bring that into a possible undergraduate program. I'm not 100% certain, and Alex or Senator Loftus, if you remember this, please jump in, whether it has been officially sent to Dipsle for their approval or whether it's going to be approved at the next Council. But that is eventually gonna happen. It's not going to affect access to the center so all students be able to use it. And then curriculum committee met yesterday. A few very minor changes to some programs. The big thing was a discussion on the two tracks system. So as all of you would know, in the Faculty of Arts you have to do either a major or a minor or double major, etc, etc. And Professor Fronda who chairs so to speak, the curriculum committee has said this is something that he wants to personally get rid of. And to look at other options for that a lot of the justification being kind of the coursework and how that would affect smaller departments. This got into a bit of a spicy conversation about the two track system as well as on possibly upgrading or possibly upping the number of credits for major and minor and as well as the freshmen program. I'm happy to go into more detail if councils would like but if councils you have thoughts with that Professor Fronda wants us to kind of to use his word “chew over it for a few days”, so just let me know and I'll happily forward those along.
	+ VP Finance: I know we briefly spoke about this when we saw each other yesterday, but when is this decision like kind of going to be made? Like it's actually a reasonably important decision in terms of in terms of student experience going into the future? Like, is this like something that's going to be made in the next two, three weeks? Or is this kind of like an item that's, that's more down the line than that?
	+ Rep Chip: I would say it's, it's kind of half down the line half in the next few weeks. I don't know whether it's been submitted to Dipsel. So if Senator Loftus or Alex, remember this please like jump in. If it hasn't submitted a Dipsel so it'll be voted on next faculty council, if it has been, if it was submitted to Dipsel already. We're within their process, which could be months out. Stefan, I'll send you the official proposal if you'd like. You can take a look at that.
	1. Arts Senators - TABLED
		1. [Mary-Lynne Loftus](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NMgKPxDrCgNSVDBMfdqIUW64I-b965Ag/view?usp=sharing)
		2. [Darshan Daryanani](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1M_8FkLCZgT6IDeFEWzTqNRXiZ73PlOAN/view?usp=sharing)
* Rep Chip: Point of order, motion to suspend the rules to have them present at the next legislative council first thing after approval of the agenda.
* Speaker: Oh, cuz they missed last week as well
* Rep Chip: I don't think they reported all this year.
* Rep Chip: Yes. I'd like to propose those be that'd be a motion be tabled to be presented after agenda after the approve the agenda for next legislative council.
	+ VP External: 2nd
1. Reports of Departmental Associations (not required for first meeting)
	1. HSA
* HSA has merch with a very fancy website. So if you go onto our Facebook page, and you're interested in getting HSA merch, it's definitely there. Next, we have our February historical figure of the month question. We do historical figure of the month everyone and it's receiving a lot of great engagement. You got a gift card, so definitely look at that. I went to the accountability committee last Thursday. We have our tutoring services going strong. We have an online games night for March 10. So if you're looking to study and then maybe engage in some conversation and some games, check that out. We have a podcast series called a piece of work. It's a spotlight on student research. So undergrad, Masters, PhD candidates, so definitely look at that. It'll be on our Instagram and also our Facebook page or VP comms putting a lot of effort into that. So that's really cool. Last but not least, please spread the word that the HSA has a bursary, so it is to $250 bursaries available for HSA Members affected by financial hardships during COVID-19. They have to submit an application and it is chosen anonymously. So an HSA members, anybody who is enrolled in a major, minor, joint honours, honours, and then also any U0 who is enrolled in at least one history class. So that is available on Facebook. And please spread the word because we don't have a lot of people who've applied it. I'm sure there are a lot of people that could benefit from this.
* Rep Chip: Why are those been historical figures of the month so hard?
	+ HSA: I do not choose them personally, you will have to ask our president who was actually in attendance today. He chooses most of them.
	1. [IDSSA](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kbYsZxKNDPWO4rDXJBjx9TSgfV14JMJb/view?usp=sharing)
* In terms of general updates, we are meeting with ISID professors of practice, to discuss a roundtable discussion for careers in development. We're also coordinating with ISID to implement the new curriculum structure that's slowly being transitioned to sort of help minimize confusion with the undergrad students. We're also all working on our exit reports to complete them over spring break. And lastly, in terms of event updates, the Case Competition that we are doing in collaboration with the McGill policy Association is on its way to ending with the second and final round happening this Friday. And I encourage you all to attend and see the wonderful presentations. Yeah, let's stand for questions.
	1. [JSSA](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jpQUBGn9ifPF924BuHwCUlUiErYu7xZR/view?usp=sharing)
* I'm not very much to report. tutoring is ongoing for the Hebrew language courses that are offered by the Jewish Studies Department. We're currently in the process of determining the demand to see if we can put on a virtual wine and cheese event. We normally have an in-person wine and cheese event and sweaters that were ordered and paid for last year before the pandemic happened have now all been distributed to students.
1. Question Period
2. Adjournment
	1. Next meeting: March 9th, 2021 at 6 pm (EST)
* VP Finance: Motion to adjourn
	+ MESS: 2nd
* **Passed**

[Appendix A](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QJ95qpg9zWRTVscZJ3jH5ZP-ydjUCmTz/view?usp=sharing)

[Appendix B](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1v6fVLXCnTPmDyTDr0oE7Qj0NrALQTwRi/view?usp=sharing)