**Student Representative Assembly Meeting 19P**

**Sunday, February 9, 2020 at 5:00pm**

**Council Chambers, GH111**

**Called to Order at 5:05pm**

**CALL OF THE ROLL**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Alam, Belliveau, Dawdy, Della-Vedova, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Hankins, Homsi, Jangra, Johnston, Kampman, Kaur, Lee, McDermott, Mohamed, Pagniello, Reddy, Sinnige, Thind, Zhang |
| **Absent Excused:**  |  |
| **Absent** | Alkashef, Enuiyin, Grewal, Hassan, Li, Marando, Mesic, Sarhan, Singh |
| **Late**  | Au-Yeung, Hu, Zheng |
| **Others Present:**  | Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Anita Spasov (Spark Coordfinator), Stephanie Dephoure (DRO), Adeola E (MSU Member), Ryan Tse (AVP (Municipal Affairs), Justine Becker (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjun (OPIRG), Ursula Sitarz (MSU Member), V. Scott (Recording Secretary) |
| **Chair** | Sarah Figueiredo  |

**TERRITORY RECOGNITION**

* The SRA would like to recognize today that we are situated on traditional Haudenosaunee and Anishnaabe territories through the ‘Dish with One Spoon Wampum Treaty’.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**Moved** by Lee, seconded by Sinnige that the Assembly adopt the agenda, as presented.

**Amendment**

**Moved** by Hackett, **seconded** by Johnston to amend the agenda to add ‘OUSA Delegate Ratification’ as Business Item #7

* Hackett stated that they need to approve the delegates

**Vote on Amendment**

**Passes Unanimously**

**Amendment**

**Moved** by Alam, **seconded** by Homsi to amend the agenda to include ‘Elections – SRA Seat Allocation’ to Report Period.

**Vote on Amendment**

**Passes Unanimously**

**Vote to Adopt**

**Passes Unanimously**

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

**Moved** by Alam, **seconded** by Homsi to adopt the meeting minutes of SRA 19M – December 8, 2019, and 19N – January 12, 2020, as circulated.

**Vote to Adopt**

**Passes Unanimously**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**

**DELEGATION FROM THE FLOOR**

**Set Parameters**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Hackett to set parameters for delegation from the floor to be 10 minutes for presentation and 10 minutes for questions.

**Passes Unanimously**

**1. OPIRG – Ryan Tse, Justine Becker, Surun Balaranjun, and Mateo Orrantia presented**

* The members of OPIRG went over the presentation with the Assembly.

**Moved** by Panigello, **seconded** by De Fazio to extend the presentation time by five minutes.

* Pagniello stated that they would like to hear the rest of the presentation.

**Vote to Extend**

**Passes Unanimously**

**Questions**

* Sinnige asked OPIRG if they have an external auditor come in. Orrantia responded that they have one come in once every couple of years.
* Sinnige asked if OPIRG had their financial information on the website. Orrantia responded that they had it from the last year.
* Reddy asked how many part-time and full-time staff does OPIRG have. Orrantia responded that they cut full-time staff from three to zero with SCI and then realized it was untenable and re-hired one part-time.
* Au-Yeung stated that OPIRG spoke about the importance of community partnership and asked them to confirm the seven partners listed on the website. Becker responded that that if they included all of the organizations they worked with the list would be long. They explained that the partnership list might be a bit outdating online, but it was a long list.
* Reddy asked what the big impacts were of not having staff this year. Orrantia responded that a big part of it was not having the community partnerships to help students out and them not having the knowledge to help. They explained that there was compliance and backend things that they didn’t know how to do or have the time for it. Becker added that since they didn’t have staff OPIRG has fallen out of compliance as it’s not possible to run an NGO without staff.
* Hu asked how big of an impact would it be to get rid of the fee. Becker responded that without the fee they would have to lay off all of the staff, all public student run projects would immediately lose their funding, and the support wouldn’t be there. Orrantia responded that after the SCI they lost their budget surplus. They added that they would have enough surplus to run for six to eight months but that would be it.
* Pagniello asked OPIRG to speak to their alliances with other research groups across the country. Becker responded that OPIRG was an Ontario wide group, but there are others in Canada. They explained that they do meet and engage, and support each other in solidarity across the province.
* Homsi asked OPIRG to speak to the steps taken to fill the Bylaw mandates. Orrantia responded that when they were told items weren’t posted on the website, they made sure it was. Orrantia added that OPIRG found out that meeting minutes weren’t being posted so they have been taken that step to be as transparent as possible. They explained that they have been putting less money into staff and more into students.

**REPORT PERIOD**

**1. Arts and Science Caucus – Hu presented**

* Hu summarized the report.

**2. Business Caucus – Hankins presented**

* Hankins summarized the report.

**3. Engineering Caucus – McDermott presented**

* McDermott summarized the report.

**4. Internal Governance Committee Report – report attached**

* De Fazio summarized the report.

**5. Services Report – report circulated**

**6. Executive Board –** **Figueiredo presented**

* Figueiredo summarized the report.

**7. Vice-President (Administration) – Figueiredo presented**

* Figueiredo summarized the report.

**8. Elections – SRA Seat Allocation – report circulated**

* The DRO went over the report.

**INFORMATION PERIOD**

* Johnston informed the Assembly that voting for the name of the SAB ends tonight and asked them to please share with their constituents.
* Hackett informed the Assembly the AVP applications are now online and that the graphic will be circulated soon. Hackett reported that the OUSA Summer Research position has been released and that the successful candidate will be working downtown Toronto for the summer. Hackett stated that there will be an advocacy event in TwelvEighty at 1:30pm on Tuesday.

**QUESTION PERIOD**

* Pagniello asked the Vice-President (Education) to speak to evaluating the MSU’s role in OUSA. Hackett responded that this was going to come to this meeting but decided to push it back. They stated that as of right now there are a lot of conversations happening with the steering committee and Executive Director on what everyone would like to see. Hackett stated that they felt that it would be appropriate to leave at this moment as the conversations have been fruitful and that as long as OUSA was still working with the MSU, they were willing to wait.

**BUSINESS**

**1. Open one MSU seat on Services Committee**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Hackett that the Assembly open one (1) MSU Seat on the MSU Services Committee.

**Passes Unanimously**

**2. Close on MSU seat on Services Committee**

**Moved** by Hackett, **seconded** by Johnston that the Assembly close one (1) MSU Seat on the MSU Services Committee

**Nominations**

* Xavier Figueroa

**Vote on Motion**

**Passes Unanimously**

**3. Open one seat on Executive Board**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Homsi that the Assembly open one (1) seat on the Executive Board.

* Johnston explained that EB meets Thursday mornings at 9:30 and goes until 11:30am if anyone was interested in joining.
* Homsi stated that it was a great experience and fun.

**Vote on Motion**

**Passes Unanimously**

**4. Close one seat on Executive Board**

**Moved** by Hackett, **seconded** by Sinnige that the Assembly close one (1) seat on the Executive Board.

**Nominations**

* Sinnige nominated themselves

**Vote on Motion**

**Passes Unanimously**

* The Assembly voted by secret ballot.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidate** | **Confidence** | **No Confidence** |
| Sinnige | 18 | 6 |
| Spoiled |  |  |
| Abstained |  |  |

* Sinnige was acclaimed with confidence.

**Moved** by Hackett, **seconded** by Pagniello that the Assembly recess for 10 minutes.

* Hackett explained that that the next part might be long, so why not have a little break.

**Vote on Motion**

**In Favour: 15 Opposed: 3 Abstentions: 3**

**Opposed: De Fazio, Della-Vedova, Belliveau**

**Abstained: Sinnige, Dawdy, Hu**

**Motion Passes**

**Recessed at 5:54pm**

**Called to Order at 6:09pm**

**CALL OF THE ROLL**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Alam, Au-Yeung, Belliveau, Dawdy, Della-Vedova, Enuiyin, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Hankins, Homsi, Hu, Jangra, Johnston, Kampman, Lee, McDermott, Mohamed, Pagniello, Reddy, Sinnige, Thind, Zhang, Zheng |
| **Absent Excused:**  |  |
| **Absent** | Alkashef, Grewal, Li, Marando, Mesic, Sarhan, Singh |
| **Late**  | Hassan, Kaur |
| **Others Present:**  | Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Anita Spasov (Spark Coordfinator), Stephanie Dephoure (DRO), Adeola E (MSU Member), Ryan Tse (AVP (Municipal Affairs), Justine Becker (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjun (OPIRG), Ursula Sitarz (MSU Member), V. Scott (Recording Secretary) |
| **Chair** | Sarah Figueiredo  |

**5. OPIRG Referendum**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Hackett that the Assembly send the OPRIG fee to referendum during the SRA General Election 2020, and to give the option of keep the fee of $5.50 or eliminate the fee entirely.

* Johnston stated that they hoped everyone had a chance to go over the memo and summarized the memo quickly. Johnston stated that it was evident that the group violated the Bylaw requirements, and that it wasn’t the Assembly’s job to debate the merits of OPIRG but to debate whether they violated the merits and standards set out in Bylaw 5.

**Moved** by Sinnige, **seconded** by Dawdy that the Assembly move into Committee of the Whole.

* Sinnige felt that this would be a lot of information and was confusing for some of the Assembly. They felt that this was the best way to clarify everything.
* Johnston stated that when putting this on the agenda they discussed putting Committee of the Whole but that the motion itself encourages discussion and debate. They stated that this will also ensure that they are not asking someone to thoroughly do a rise and report about everything discussed.

**Vote on Motion**

**In Favour: 7 Opposed: 13 Abstentions: 5**

**Opposed: Johnston, Hackett, Enuiyin, Ganesalingan, McDermott, Belliveau, Kaur, Homsi, Alam, Jangra, Thind, Dawdy, Hankins**

**Abstained: Della-Vedova, Reddy, Kampman, Zheng, Mohamed**

**Motion Fails**

**Back to Main Motion**

* Hankins stated that they’ve spent the last two months at Finance Committee looking this over and fully believes that this should be sent to referendum.
* Sinnige noted inconsistences in the memo. They stated that all of the issues pointed out have now been resolved.
* Johnston stated that the allocation of the staff budget was in 2018 before the previous OPIRG referendum. They stated that in terms of easily financial online reporting, the memo came from the AVP Finance on December 8 and at that time the Finance Committee couldn’t find anything online. Johnston ceded their time to Mateo Orrantia.
* Orrantia stated that it was unfortunate that the Finance Committee couldn’t find the budget online but it has been there since August. They explained that has been the same with meeting minutes.
* Hankins pointed out that everything brought forward was looking at the budget submitred from OPIRG, and that 87% of the budget was allocated to staff and admin. They stated that this wasn’t based off of last year’s recommendations. Hankins ceded the rest of their time to Jess Anderson, AVP Finance.
* Anderson stated that when they initially reviewed the budget it was the preliminary budget that was given to them, and then another one was sent.
* Hu stated that they were confused what the current issue was as OPIRG has addressed everything. Hu ceded the rest of their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that they apologize for the percentage on the memo. As for what the current issue was; Johnston explained that there has been a long history over the past six years of not being able to get accurate or current information. They stated that OPIRG even said there was a preliminary budget and then it was adjusted. Johnston explained that it was important that organizations remain transparent to the students which is why the Finance Committee is to look over them. Johnston stated that it was great that OPIRG made the changes they did, but in the presentation they said themselves that OPIRG hasn’t been transparent and that they were fixing it. Johnston stated that while a great step in the right direction this was history repeating themselves. They explained that they need campus groups to remain transparent with their fees and that OPIRG has such along history of this continuously happening and SRA constantly putting recommendations forward and not being adopted. Johnston stated that OPIRG was not being transparent with their students and they were now four months into their term with violations.
* Reddy stated that it’s hard to keep the same group accountable when so many people are turning over within the group. They stated that one Board chose not to be transparent and this group is choosing to do so. Reddy stated that it was hard to label the whole group as not being transparent with this, and students had the outright option to opt-out through SCI. Reddy ceded the rest of their time to Ryan Tse.
* Tse stated that seven of their nine board members were new. They stated that it wasn’t fair to say that OPIRG wasn’t being transparent as SCI was unprecedented. Tse explained that it even took the MSU awhile to get their numbers on who opted out, and it took awhile for OPIRG to sort it out without staff. Tse stated that they have listened to the SRA’s concerns, but it was unfair to send to referendum based on the work they have done.
* Au-Yeung stated that OPIRG has made more of an effort to be transparent, and understood what was done in the past, but this was a different Board of Directors. Au-Yeung felt that this was something that the new Board couldn’t control. They asked if there was any other way to keep OPIRG accountable but continue with their efforts. Au-Yeung ceded the rest of their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that they would like to speak first to the issue of turnover. They explained that turnover is the nature of student environments and that the Assembly had four other groups come in and were able to abide by the Bylaw. Johnston stated that OPIRG was unique because they have a Board of Directors, but just because seven were new doesn’t mean that two others have sat before and weren’t able to figure it out. Johnston explained that turnover was an issue, but the MSU does it too and it doesn’t inhibit them being as transparent as possible. Johnston added that while the MSU wasn’t able to talk about the numbers with SCI, the budget has been up since March and the MSU was open that they wouldn’t be changing it. Johnston explained that SCI has been put on hold until further notice so this should be going to students to give them the right to decide about the fee. They stated that yes, OPIRG was trying to make things better but if the Assembly looked at the minutes from 2014 the same conversation was had that they are now. Johnston pointed out that recommendations in the past haven’t been accounted for, and in terms of what else the MSU can do they are doing it right now as the Bylaw was passed in 2014.
* Pagniello stated that the Assembly should be taking in the long history of OPIRG and should adjust the framing and consider what’s at stake. They explained that OPIRG could lose their entire service and that the Assembly should be looking at them as an essential service in terms of research and social justice. Pagniello stated that this was what was at stake by having a referendum. Pagniello ceded the rest of their time to Justine Becker.
* Becker stated that the current Board at OPIRG has taken the steps they needed to. They stated that speaking about the opt-out not being transparent enough, it was online and advertised on social media. Becker stated as for budget information there was a wrench thrown in because of the layout of staff. They explained that they didn’t get training this year because they didn’t have staff, and that they did everything they could. Becker stated that they have been looking at how to make the information available year to year and felt that all of this was a valid reason to believe that OPIRG won’t stop the positive trajectory.
* De Fazio stated that OPIRG was sent to referendum in January 2018, and students already made the decision to hold them accountable. They stated that they have seen a lot of progress in the past few months alone and if holding OPIRG accountable to the bylaw they have definitely done it. De Fazio stated that OPIRG has made an impact on people’s lives in the community. De Fazio felt that sending them to a risky referendum was an undue punishment and that the MSU should be supporting OPIRG as OPIRG supports the community.
* Homsi asked OPIRG what more will they do to ensure that this information will be given during turnover. Homsi ceded the rest of their time to Mateo Orrantia.
* Orrantia responded that one of the things that OPIRG was in the process of doing is having a budget tracker online and the internal and external audit. Orrantia explained that they will be establishing a clear set of guidelines for their Board to carry forward to ensure smooth transition.
* Johnston re-iterated that the conversation wasn’t about the value of the group. They explained that it was the Assembly’s job to uphold the bylaws and standards holding everyone was accountable to. Johnston stated that the other groups were able to maintain everything with turnover. They explained that while they do understand turnover and that the Board was a new group it wasn’t a fair argument based on the fact that it will be a new group every year. Johnston stated that this wasn’t a discussion on the merit of the group, but on the fact that the Finance Committee recommended that they go to referendum based on the fact that OPIRG didn’t uphold the bylaw.
* Hankins felt that there was a misconception that this year’s OPIRG was better and more transparent than other years. They explained that they had to defer this conversation so many times, and it was now February. They stated that the Committee had to nag OPIRG to get their information. Hankins felt that OPIRG has not been transparent this year or in previous years. Hankins stated that they got elected on to the Finance Committee on financial transparency and that if they didn’t do their job properly then they would fail as an SRA member, which is why they were in favour of sending this to referendum.
* Tse stated that OPIRG didn’t believe that they haven’t upheld the bylaw, but it was up to the Assembly to decide whether or not OPIRG did. They explained that they understood that it was the Assembly’s job to uphold the bylaws but that they also had the responsibility to have greater understanding of discussions about MSU affairs. Tse asked the Assembly to look at the context of having the SCI and only being two years out since the last referendum.
* Pangiello felt that this was a punishment for lack of communication, and that the Assembly for the information at the end. They added that OPIRG stated that they wanted to make a more concerted effort in being transparent and didn’t think it was appropriate to reduce OPIRG down to just finances. Pagniello stated that the MSU could work with OPIRG in the future and support students and contribute to environments on campus.
* Hackett stated that should the fee be sent to referendum anyone was welcome to set up a campaign team to keep the OPIRG fee. They added that the Assembly could also make an official stance as well.
* De Fazio asked why there was a gap in communication and what steps did OPIRG take. De Fazio ceded the rest of their time to Justine Becker.
* Becker responded that it sounds bad that OPIRG didn’t respond to emails and explained that there were times that they didn’t have access to the email so there was a gap in communication. They explained that the email they are now using is being regularly updated and the issue has been resolved.
* Reddy asked about the surplus and saying that it was allocated for severance. Reddy stated that they weren’t sure if they heard that correctly about something being 87% of the budget, and that there was still back and forth about that being correct. Reddy ceded the rest of their time to Hankins.
* Hankins responded that the 87% was still in their budget for this year for salaries with a very small percentage to help with groups.
* Homsi ceded to Mateo Orrantia. Orrantia stated that they wanted to clear up a couple of points in that the 87% wasn’t in the updated budget as once OPIRG received the optout numbers, they were reworked and reflected. They explained that they put staffing costs in at 40% for that and admin. Orrantia stated that they were confused as they thought going to referendum was based on their staffing issues in September and that Bylaw 5 wasn’t part of the original discussion. They added that it has now been recommended based on lack of transparency, but it was never brought up a concern and the MSU never said that they were mad about this.
* Johnston stated that Bylaw 5 is the reason why OPIRG has to come and present, and was the reason why staffing was brought up, for financials. Johnston explained that transparency was outlined in the bylaw and it took two months to get any information from OPIRG. They stated that OPIRG has been accountable to Bylaw 5 since 2014 and that the MSU has been very flexible in routinely pushing back to what is fair. Johnston explained that they, the AVP Finance, and the Finance Committee has been available to be a resource to answer any questions and that the Bylaw was online on the website. Johnston added that the comment made by Orrantia was worrisome. They explained that the Assembly shouldn’t be afraid to send something to the students, and that there was funding in place for those who would like to take a side in the referendum. Johnston added that they had four other groups present and if any of them broke the bylaw they would be holding them accountable as well.
* Dawdy stated that they were in favour of sending this back to the students, if OPIRG was a good organization in the community they shouldn’t have anything to worry about as they should show the students how great they are.
* Reddy asked Anderson about the surplus. They stated that the initial memo’s rational was that OPIRG was unable to answer questions in regard to staffing and the large surplus, but they just heard from OPIRG that there wasn’t a surplus. Reddy ceded their time to Anderson.
* Anderson responded that they put this in the memo as additional information about the potential idea of sending OPIRG to referendum, so that everyone could have the full picture of what was going on. They added that they receive more information at the December 8 meeting, and found more ways of OPIRG violating Bylaw 5. Anderson stated that this may not necessarily be the primary concern now as OPIRG updated their budget, but they are addressing the issues now.
* Jangra asked if there was something they could do instead of this being ‘all or nothing’. They stated that the bylaw was broken but that they had an issue with how the referendum was being put forward. Jangra ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that this goes back to the requirements of OPIRG having at least one staff member, and the allocation of funds towards staff, students, and community events. Johnston stated that it was ‘yes or no’ as OPIRG must have staff, and if the Assembly chooses to send a question reducing the fee then it would just be going towards staffing. They added anything different wasn’t fair to the group.
* De Fazio stated that the Assembly should support OPIRG and vote ‘no’ to sending to referendum.

**Figueiredo declined the chair.**

**Oketch assumed the chair.**

* Reddy stated that with SCI it cut OPIRG’s funding and couldn’t have staff, but they’re now using the allocation of funds to hire someone. Reddy asked if it would be possible to reduce the fee with this logic. Reddy ceded their time to Justin Becker.
* Becker responded that theoretically they don’t know who would be looking into the negotiations, and the possibility would be that they couldn’t afford someone. They felt that it wasn’t simple to reduce the fee to be another amount. Becker stated that OPIRG would be severely disabled if this fee goes to referendum.
* Figueiredo stated that OPIRG broke Bylaw 5 regardless of what the Assembly morally stands on. They stated that the Assembly has a duty to put the vote to students. Figueiredo commended OPIRG for coming to the meeting. They explained that OPIRG has passion, but this vote wasn’t about having passion; it was about breaking the bylaw.

**Moved** by Sinnige, **seconded** by Zheng to Call to Question

**In Favour: 6 Opposed: 13 Abstentions: 5**

**Opposed: Johnston, Ganesalingan, McDermott, Della-Vedova, Au-Yueng, Reddy, Kaur, Homsi, Alam, Thind, Hankins, Hassan, Pagniello**

**Abstained: Figueiredo, Jangra, Dawdy, Lee, Kampman**

**Motion Fails**

**Back to Main Motion**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Hackett that the Assembly send the OPRIG fee to referendum during the SRA General Election 2020, and to give the option of keep the fee of $5.50 or eliminate the fee entirely.

* Homsi felt that OPIRG didn’t break the bylaw as everything from the memo had been rectified. They explained that lack of communication wasn’t in the Bylaw, and that they don’t see how OPIRG was still in violation. Homsi asked what this year’s group could have done and why were the Assembly holding OPIRG accountable for previous years. Homsi ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston explained that OPIRG didn’t have their budget easily accessible or have an updated budget until they came to speak at the meeting on December 8. They explained that while the budget was updated, it wasn’t out for five months. Johnston added that it was stated by OPIRG that it was posted in the summer but mentioned that it wasn’t the current budget, but that the Finance Committee didn’t even receive a budget until November 19. Johnston stated that an explanation wasn’t posted on the website that the budget may be changing as a result of SCI. They explained that OPIRG could have it posted online like every other group.
* Della-Vedova asked if the statements were submitted by November 15. Della-Vedova ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston stated that OPIRG didn’t send in their final budget until November 19, and therefore; broke that section of the Bylaw as well. They stated that the Finance Committee did receive something towards the end of October, but it was the first draft and wasn’t finalized.
* Au-Yeung ceded to Justin Becker. Becker stated that they didn’t received their opt-out rates until October 19, and they submitted the revised budget 10 days later. They explained that it was re-calculated and based on they money they had. Becker stated that OPIRG was trying to be transparent. They explained that they don’t want to be putting their time in worrying about putting together another referendum. Becker felt that it was inevitable that they will get defunded.
* McDermott asked if there were screenshots supporting that the budget was on the website in August, because as of right now the Finance Committee is saying it wasn’t online and they would like to know what happened. McDermott ceded their time to Mateo Orrantia.
* Orrantia responded that they didn’t take screenshots when it was uploaded but had email confirmation saying it was online from staff.
* Reddy asked if it was possible to amend with the fees reduced, and if this was an option. Reddy ceded their time to Anderson.
* Anderson responded that the meeting with the Union reps from OPIRG stated that OPIRG wasn’t allowed to exist on campus without a staff member and by decreasing the fee option to even half wouldn’t support having staff, and wouldn’t be allowed.
* Pagniello asked how they could keep OPIRG accountable without sending them to referendum.
* The Assembly asked for the Speaker to make a ruling on the Bylaw.
* The Speaker made a ruling on Bylaw 5, section 3.4 as follows:
The bylaw states: If the SRA Standing Committee on Finance determines that an organization has failed to meet the requirements outlined in Section 3.1 of this bylaw, a motion for referendum for that fee must be submitted to the SRA for consideration.
The way that I interpret this bylaw is that if the Finance committee comes to the conclusion that an organization has not met all of the requirements of section 3.1, they will submit a motion for that organization to go to referendum. It is up to the Finance Committee to determine if they have met the expectations, and if the Finance Committee does not think that the expectations were met, they will submit a motion for the organization to go to referendum.
* Hackett ceded their time to Figueiredo. Figueiredo stated that OPIRG was in clear violation of not submitting their budget on time, and the Chair agreed with the Finance Committee’s interpretation of the bylaw. Figueiredo stated that they shouldn’t be afraid to send this to referendum because students might say no and that students get to pick what they pay for. Figueredo stated that the Assembly was here to uphold the voice of students and didn’t know why the Assembly was trying to control the outcome of this. They added that the Assembly was here to speak for their constituents, and if the constituents say no then the Assembly says no.
* Hankins ceded to Dawdy. Dawdy stated that they didn’t like the uncomfortable implication from some Assembly members that students were incapable of making their own decisions. They stated that in the HSR referendum only nine per cent of those who voted, voted to get rid of the bud pass. Dawdy explained that this was representative of those who voted and it reflects that the rest of the student body saw the value in the bus pass, and why people voted in favour of it.
* Alam stated that they were confused on how OPIRG broke the bylaw if they had their budget posted before opt-out numbers and then updated it. Alam ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that in line with the Speaker’s ruling the motion was put on the floor because Finance Committee is to bring forward a motion if they felt a group broke the bylaw.
* Della-Vedova stated that this was becoming a big issue if the Assembly felt okay with bending the bylaws and rules. They stated that it sets precedent. Della-Vedova understood the need for OPIRG, but the Assembly needs to remember that they are setting a precedent if they are not sent to referendum.
* Johnston stated that the motion after this one was about taking a stance and explained that the Assembly does not have to vote in favour of it.
* Pagniello stated that they should be working with OPIRG and have an alliance. They stated that the Assembly shouldn’t be sending OPIRG to referendum as they will be putting them under existential threat.
* De Fazio stated that they’ve done their duty by discussion the motion and told the Assembly to vote it down. They felt that every point was refuted with objective or subjective data.
* Homsi stated that they were still not comfortable sending OPIRG to referendum, and that there were conflicting narratives between Finance Committee and OPIRG. They stated that they don’t have a clear picture of what was happening and wasn’t comfortable making a decision without having a clear timeline of when everything happened.
* Alam asked if there was any way to put OPIRG on watch for next year, and then push to referendum then. Alam ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that the Finance Committee could put forward recommendations and if OPIRG doesn’t follow them then it will add to the narrative. They explained that this was something they spoke at length to se if it made sense. Johnston stated that they gave recommendations last year and items weren’t incorporated, and they are now here.

**Moved** by Jangra, **seconded** by Sinnige to Call to Question

**In Favour: 16 Opposed: 5 Abstentions: 4**

**Opposed: Della-Vedova, Au-Yeung, Reddy, Hankins, Hassan**

**Abstained: Figueiredo, Johnston, Kaur, Homsi**

**Motion Fails**

**Back to Main Motion**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Hackett that the Assembly send the OPRIG fee to referendum during the SRA General Election 2020, and to give the option of keep the fee of $5.50 or eliminate the fee entirely.

* Della-Vedova stated that if OPIRG followed the guidelines and stayed on top of things would there be any way that the Assembly could give OPIRG that grace moving forward, and then go to referendum if breaking the rules. Della-Vedova ceded their time to Figueiredo.
* Figueiredo stated that there were recommendations made last year, some were followed, and some were not. They stated that there has been a pattern of not fixing things every year.
* De Fazio asked that if they brought bylaw to Internal Governance Committee to look into changing the bylaw to have supports in place, would that not be in line with the Committee’s capacity. De Fazio ceded to Figueiredo.
* Figueiredo stated that they didn’t see how it would be different from the current recommendations in place now.

**Moved** by Au-Yeung, **seconded** by Sinnige that the Assembly recess for 10 minutes.

* Au-Yeung stated that if they had a recess, they could collect more evidence to create a clear timeline to make a decision.
* Homsi asked if this was something that could be done within this timeframe. Homsi ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that they only have their communications and didn’t think it would help. Johnston explained that what they have was the AVP Finance’s communication and that they have already read it out to the Assembly.
* De Fazio was not in favour of a recess. They stated that there was concrete evidence that the budget was online in August.
* Johnston asked if it would help if it was read out once more.
* Alam felt that it would help to read it but having OPIRG having a say.
* Au-Yeung felt that they need a back and forth with OPIRG and going to recess will allow this to happen.

**Vote on Motion**

**In Favour: 17 Opposed: 5 Abstentions: 5**

**Opposed: De Fazio, Homsi, Thind, Zheng, Mohamed**

**Abstained: Figueiredo, Johnston, Hackett, Sinnige, Hu**

**Motion Passes**

**Recessed at 8:27pm**

**Called to Order at 8:38pm**

**CALL OF THE ROLL**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Alam, Au-Yeung, Belliveau, Dawdy, Della-Vedova, Enuiyin, Figueiredo, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Hankins, Hassan, Homsi, Hu, Johnston, Kampman, Kaur, Lee, McDermott, Mohamed, Pagniello, Reddy, Sinnige, Thind, Zhang |
| **Absent Excused:**  |  |
| **Absent** | Alkashef, Grewal, Li, Marando, Mesic, Sarhan, Singh, Zheng |
| **Late**  | Jangra  |
| **Others Present:**  | Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Anita Spasov (Spark Coordfinator), Stephanie Dephoure (DRO), Adeola E (MSU Member), Ryan Tse (AVP (Municipal Affairs), Justine Becker (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjun (OPIRG), Ursula Sitarz (MSU Member), V. Scott (Recording Secretary) |
| **Chair** | Maryanne Oketch  |

* Della-Vedova wanted to address what was said earlier about past chances. They felt that this was a valid point, like a lot of victims of circumstances it would be good, to some degree, to give another chance on a stricter diet of what has to be met. They stated that it seemed like there were complex issues, but they do understand that OPIRG broke the rules, so they weren’t sure where to stand. Della-Vedova ceded their time to Hackett.
* Hackett responded that this was their third time on the Assembly and having this discussion. They know that everyone feels uncomfortable moving forward. They stated that they always give a few recommendations and then have an organization present the next year but it’s just not happening this year.
* De Fazio stated that having the bylaw go to Internal Governance Committee could make the Finance Committee do something by taking a streamlined approach and eliminate potential disturbances of personal opinion.
* Belliveau asked if OPIRG would be able to re-apply for a fee in the future if this goes to referendum and loses funding. Belliveau ceded their time to Johnston.
* Johnston responded that stated that OPIRG also has a chance to register a side and depending on the outcome of the referendum, OPIRG they could bring it back for referendum by student petition or the SRA or go to General Assembly.
* Figueiredo stated that they didn’t think sending this bylaw to Internal Governance to change it based on a certain situation was fair. They stated that OPIRG had an onus to operate under the Bylaw and that their staff was there in the summer. Figueiredo stated that the situation wasn’t great but the bylaws and expectations are clearly outlined and shouldn’t be changed based on situations coming up.

**Vote on Motion**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by Figueiredo that the Assembly send the OPRIG fee to referendum during the SRA General Election 2020, and to give the option of keep the fee of $5.50 or eliminate the fee entirely.

**In Favour: 12 Opposed: 10 Abstentions: 3**

**Opposed: Sinnige, Hu, De Fazio, Reddy, Kaur, Zhang, Homsi, Lee, Pagniello, Mohamed**

**Abstained: Della-Vedova, Kampman, Au-Yeung**

**Motion Passes**

**6. SRA Recommendation for OPIRG Referendum**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by McDermott that the Assembly recommend students vote ‘no’ in the upcoming OPRIG referendum.

* Johnston stated that this motion was added because the SRA could take a stance or be neutral. They explained that the Finance Committee wanted the Assembly to take a stance.
* Della-Vedova stated that they shouldn’t have a stance as students should make up their own minds.
* Homsi stated that they would be deeply uncomfortable with putting something out for students guiding them how to vote.
* Reddy asked what the thought behind the Finance Committee was having this added as an option.
* Johnston responded that to their knowledge there was a motion in 2018 that was successful, and history shows that it wouldn’t be a bad call to take a stance.

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by De Fazio to Call to Question

**In Favour: 21 Opposed: 0 Abstentions: 2**

**Abstained: Figueiredo, Sinnige**

**Motion Passes**

**Vote on Motion**

**Moved** by Johnston, **seconded** by McDermott that the Assembly recommend students vote ‘no’ in the upcoming OPRIG referendum.

**Fails Unanimously**

**7. OUSA Delegate Ratification**

**Moved** by Hackett, **seconded** by Johnston that the Assembly approve the following delegates for OUSA General Assembly: Joshua Marando, Angel Huang, Muhammadhasan Nasser, Giancarlo Da-Re, Simranjeet Singh, Maanvi Dhillion, Fawziyah Isah, Sneha Wadhani and Ryan Tse.

* Hackett explained that they need to approve the delegates.

**Vote on Motion**

**In Favour: 24 Opposed: 1 Abstentions: 0**

**Opposed: Hankins**

**Motion Passes**

**TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

**Sunday, February 23, 2020**

**5:00pm**

**Council Chambers, GH 111**

**CALL OF THE ROLL**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Alam, Au-Yeung, Belliveau, Dawdy, Della-Vedova, Figueiredo, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Hankins, Hassan, Homsi, Hu, Johnston, Kampman, Kaur, Lee, McDermott, Mohamed, Pagniello, Reddy, Sinnige, Thind, Zhang |
| **Absent Excused:**  |  |
| **Absent** | Alkashef, Enuiyin, Grewal, Jangra, Li, Marando, Mesic, Sarhan, Singh, Zheng |
| **Late**  |  |
| **Others Present:**  | Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Anita Spasov (Spark Coordfinator), Stephanie Dephoure (DRO), Adeola E (MSU Member), Ryan Tse (AVP (Municipal Affairs), Justine Becker (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjun (OPIRG), Ursula Sitarz (MSU Member), V. Scott (Recording Secretary) |
| **Chair** | Maryanne Oketch  |

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Moved** by Lee, **seconded** by De Fazio that the meeting be adjourned.

**Motion Passes by General Consent**

**Adjourned at 8:59pm**

/vs