



Social Science Students' Council Meeting
UCC 37
February 28th, 2017
5:30pm

1. Call to Order
 - 5:30pm
2. Roll Call
3. Adoption of the Agenda
 - Passed.
4. Council Business
5. Members' Announcements
 - Robyn Anthro rep: undergrad conference presentations, combining 4-5, spoke after
 - Sommer Psych: Psych and Dan this Thursday, Somerville 3317, free entry, donations going to Youth Unlimited Opportunities
 - Arman CRO: AIR is having Peter Fragiskatos (MP) coming to talk 2-3
 - Selina Geo Rep: Sweater sales for geo students, you can try them on in Angelica's office (main office), payments due Friday
 - Wellness breakfast 8:30-10:30 SSC 104
6. Executive Report
 - President's Report
 - Reading Room Updates:
 - No food policy being violated in council office, food debris left over
 - Office Hours: walk through push in chairs, make sure nothing is out of place
 - Pay attention to noise, record time, room booked can send a targeted message
 - Police are saying no to 24/7; security guards are expensive, constituent feedback before next meeting; SDF request to new fire door
 - Kate: access to Weldon volume? If it would be inaccessible for people

- Andrea: fan of pushing it to 1am; around 2am its not very busy; most students who stay late do stay at that time – extending until 1 am will be sustainable in the future
 - Lauren: good idea to push it back, Weldon being open 24/7 does not promote wellbeing; prioritizes taking care of yourself if it closes at 1am.
 - In favour of 24 hr: 1 vote
 - Regular Hours extended: Majority;
 - All alcoves will be done by MBOH
 - Annual General Meeting: March 19th at 12; discussing applications this week
 - Austin POI: how will it work? like any other bi-election commission, opening statements, closing statements
 - Sommer: refreshments provided;
- Chantal, Academics:
 - MBOH: March 11th 9-2
 - Please make sure you have signed up to volunteer
 - Sending to soph team right after I finish this presentation so go sign up now
 - Need to email
 - ITR: March 15th 10-4
 - Dep reps need to have something figured out by now
 - Soph team members should have contacted you, let them help!!
 - Dep rep team meeting next Tuesday (March 7th 5:30, location TBD)
 - Ideas: dep rep club sets something up, ask department for materials from open houses, ask them for degree checklists (if those exist for your department or equivalent)
 - Have a volunteer list – ask soph team members to help you if you need more, but UTILIZE department clubs; contacted club presidents today so get in touch with them!
 - Dep Rep Meeting March 7th, 5:30
 - Question:
 - Carolyn ITR: if you have class, how does this work? Chantal: ask for volunteers or ask people in your program
 - Jacqueline: sweaters for MBOH/ITR? Should arrive on time, if not wear western clothing/soph uniform
- Cortney, Events:
 - Council Bonding:
 - Interfaculty Council Pub Night; Saturday March 4th, 8:30-11:30pm @ wave
 - Can we bring friends not on council? Yes.
 - Charity

- Charity Bar Night, Friday March 10th @ Ceeps, \$5 wristbands, line bypass until 11pm
 - Concert
 - List of potential artists, google form, who would be the best to select to have more pull when talking, can indicate none
 - Events meeting next Tuesday, 1051B
- Communications
 - Nothing to add!
- Finance
 - Will be having a finance meeting

7. Senate Report

- Fall Reading Week, 2 Year Pilot
 - Culmination of student advocacy; definitely tangible
- Congratulate incoming councilors
 - Chris POI: Fall reading week, does it amend 15% of marks in?
 - A lot of profs were disregarding it, will be reformed, continuing to review the policy
 - Arman: pushing drop deadline by a week, and the 15% deadline by a week as well
 - Owen POI: what does it mean for it being a 2-week pilot?
 - Shuffling days around, full 5 days to take off, temporary part of it is just a term, will become affirmative in a few years' time

8. USC Report

- Corrine:
 - Main discussion about budgets tomorrow:
 - CHRW presented, any questions, let them know

9. Council Business

- Motion #1 – Elections
 - Problematic: structure did not line up with higher political positions; the USC changed roles through a formal hiring process, changing to be non-voting
 - Good example would be Andreea providing information about security guard costs and budget for 24/7 hours
 - Austin: Question, how would the hiring process involve, on the application they move to interview, would have to be worked out by Chief of Staff
 - Mitch: VP Finance hired through aptitude tests, interviews, etc.
 - Austin: who is in charge of this process, Andreea: aptitude test makes sense, especially for VP Communications
 - Trevor: could reach out to USC on how they pick people

- Chris: would this set precedent. Trevor: non-elected roles are hired, exception is first year reps, accounted for in a different document
- Suganya: how would you judge this? A lot of communications is marketing and advertising, wouldn't that be better to hold to a vote? Mitch: it is subjective, but you need certain skills to do so. Trevor: also about interaction with other portfolios
- Suganya: VP finance is objective. Trevor: using behavioural questions to differentiate them based on these factors
- Kate: behavioural based questions, when you only have a few students, very hard to say you won't choose your friend. There are no numbers attached with it, would like to see more people added to this committee. Trevor: conflicts of interest would be necessary to declare, add in a conflict of interest clause, 5 people (previous and current exec)
 - Rebecca: amendments (5 people on the panel)
- Ean: VP events doesn't advocate for all things? Mitch: motivation behind this is that Communications and Finance are not political; Events and Academics need to be
- Arman: conflicts of interest, if someone declares a conflict of interest,
 - Rebecca: would entail a declaration and removal, or potentially removal of voting rights
- Zach: moderate debate, 10-minute debate 30 second speaking time on VP Communications as a hired position
 - Passed.
- Trevor: looking on abroad constitutional change, if you agree with the idea, then support it; but we can look into specifics and making it sound logistically
- Ean: speaking for, fundamentally agree with rationale behind the position, all VPs on residence council are selected; their role is more about having a technical skill rather than being liked in council
- Kate: speaking against this, we should not add VP communications if we aren't going to do all of them, no reason that 6 people would make a better decision than 50, if not they would have other ways to see them, the reason that we do have them is for their knowledge
- Austin: speaking for this motion, positions that require a hard skill, make sure that it runs smoothly, application process rather than election process, good motion overall
- Chris: speaking for this motion, agree with Ean, 2 VP positions, I don't think anyone would argue that any of these positions require some specific skills, possibly introduce someone who is removed from the situation

- Trevor: for example, SPO is elected, Academics elected, distinct vision, give council the choice of which ones they pursue. Visions come from events/conference, mirroring the USC, that's why academics/events
- Chantal: for the motion, different VP positions do take a certain skill, but they do not need a specific skillset just requires a vision, needs to be more trust in 6 people
- Andreea: speaking for, do need to trust those people, work in a team, 5 people better than the 6th, even split rather than one being able to have 3 outgoing, 2 incoming. Anastasia's position is more technical
- Arman: would caution against making these hired, politics of this, people that take these positions are taking them to learn;
- Zach: speaking for this motion, makes a distinction between VP's that have a mandate (Academics/events) as opposed to finance and comms but they have different roles, different environments would be better than a short AGM
- Anastasia: speaking for this motion, very hesitant, in an interview setting you are able to ask certain types of questions which are more indicative about what we are looking for; does understand concerns about panel; need to have a little more faith in the incoming executive, are choosing someone who will be doing a lot of work in the future
- Chris: introduce an amendment; all hiring procedure, independent 3rd party (not directly affiliated with council, i.e. academic professional), just for VP hiring.
 - Just for interview process for final decision, not for reading applications.
 - POI: what is the difference between impartial actor and CRO
 - Language is not communicating what Chris intends, the way we structured SDF was with senators are represented and elected and large, they do not have a specific constituency, it is possible to substitute this language with someone; wouldn't necessarily make sense to have someone who is not completely impartial
 - Elazar: what does it entail?
 - Chris: meant an HR professional for piece of mind as a method of checks and balances
 - Kate: would we have to include this in our budget? USC would task them to us most likely,

- Mitch: speaking against the motion in its current form, currently broad, requesting it is further researched, spirit behind adding HR representative would be fair.
- Zach: speaking against amendment in current form, mandate that 3rd party from USC has to come into selection process, if a position isn't named, trying to ensure that someone from our council ensures that someone comes, we might be left empty handed.
- Suganya: speak in favour of this motion, hiring USC HR representative, important
- Chris: friendly amendment to the wording, by all means present it
 - Austin: better way to do this is to select a random USC councillor and SSSC councillor, low chance for them both to know someone very well; ensures they would be impartial;
 - Ean: debating amendment
 - Trevor: amendment to amendment, high understanding of conflict of interest in order to ensure that there is a neutral member, and an ordinary council member would not be able to do that
 - Elazar: speaking against amendment to amendment, could be the case where that person knows both people, what would be the purpose of a third policy, this needs to be clarified
 - Chris: regarding spirit of his amendment, just proposing checks and balances; unfriendly amendment
- Rebecca: no other faculty council that requires a hired professional, we can easily accomplish this with an individual who is unaffiliated, the associate dean could also do this, this has not hindered anyone's ability to do this for the hiring process including if this is what the committee so chooses, we do not a hired professional to select this person. Best way to approach this would be to looking at the type of structure we want. Unaffiliated party is not appealing to what council is looking to achieve. However, many

incoming and outgoing, and make it an odd number.

- Trevor: in favour of motion, against amendment, head soph selection is a good example, we should evaluate options before we put it in writing. We can create a term of reference would be suited a lot better for the entire.
- Rebecca POI: 1 week after AGM, within IRC to look into feasibility and hiring panel structure?
 - Keaton: yes.
- Austin: having someone within council or senator, would not create more conflict of interest, supposed to reflect interest of Social Science, this is their job.
- Kate: motion to move to IRC, considering we can't all to come to consensus, to decide who would be sitting on the committee, with pros/cons of each one.
- Carolyn: POI do we all have to vote yes? No. it's constitutional.
- Mitch: strike amendment and add as additional motion; maintain debate about original motion
 - Motion is struck down for now.
- Mitch: speaking for the motion as it stands, consensus stands, productive debate and concerns have been raised... general consensus of council. Put forth voting on motion.
 - Motion passes.
- Motion #2 – Honoraria
 - *purpose is to address accountability and democracy, review this process, decide if the current people receiving it were democratic and accountability, set out to create a standardized and formal conflict of interest procedure, had to change numbers in accordance with budget (subject to change with budget increases/decreases). Looking for feedback. Principle that honoraria is allowed to give out is the maximum value permitted. In the interest of time, splitting them up clause by clause.*
 - 1) Constitution Recommendation:
 - Speaker provide opportunity to explain conflict of interest and would be removed from the proceedings if they were included.
 - Mitch: main issue was that people having conflict of interests would be beneficial, people may not realize that they have a personal conflict of interest.
 - Passes unanimously.

- Positions that will not receive honoraria: CRO, DRO, Charity, Wellness, Student Donation Fund (2)
 - Not practical, have not had to provide a service
 - Commissioners would not be eligible for honoraria as their roles and responsibilities are equivalent to currently unpaid positions on Council
 - POI: Roles and responsibilities of CRO? Document pulled up detailing this information.
 - POI: looking at highlighted clause.
 - Passes unanimously.
- Reductions in Reward:
 - Speaker and Secretary: \$100 a reduction from the 2012 Policy as the Speaker's role has reduced in responsibilities
 - POI: secretary roles and responsibility
 - Anastasia: requesting table this clause, Anastasia put forth a document discussing roles and responsibilities for the Secretary to move under Communications portfolio in charge of internal communications in October.
 - Coco: speaking against this tabling... revoking this statement.
 - Clause Tabled unanimously.
- Resolving Numbers:
 - CRO and DRO passed
 - Commissioner passed
 - Internet, Graphic Design, Photography, Videography, set amount of \$400 to be set aside and rewarded a maximum \$100 each upon review of performance and written reports
 - These amounts are subject to change. Maximum now is less than what it was before.
 - Austin: question, I didn't know honoraria until this meeting, Daniel: anyone who is eligible receives that information when they are applying for the job. Chantal: written on the application.
 - Kaitlyn: how are the honoraria changing? 50-150 range. What is the reasoning for changing the honoraria? the roles and responsibilities document sets out exactly what these positions do, what they are looking at is portfolio work, should have been illustrated in the document. Commissioners awarded based on the work that they have done. Maximum of \$100 set.
 - Sommer: POI, question about secretary amounts, is it equivalent to AVP? AVP is continuous throughout the

year, fluctuates. Roles and responsibilities as it stands, may reflect what was done in 2012. Sommer: so currently now, do you think that work is equivalent to AVP communications. Anastasia: it could be.

- Honoraria policy constitutional amendment: passes.
- Final Reports & Process: used to help one's successor transition into the position and aid the Honoraria Committee in determining the awarding of an honoraria
 -
- Chantal Point of Information: performance reports, who conducts them and who are they conducted on? Honoria committee would be responsible for distributing these reports. Honoraria gives report (evaluations). VP's give reports.
 - 2.00 and 3.00 both passes.
 - 4.00 has not changed, automatically passes.
- Motion #3 - Hybrid Programs
 - Reiterating the IRC Subcommittee responsibilities for the Hybrid Program Representation.
 - Departments that fall under hybrid programs would be responsible for passing along information. Already represented by two representatives, redundant to introduce another interest group.
 - On 5.03:
 - Hybrid programs (IR, Aviation, Linguistics would not be given formal positions) with the exception of Transitional Justice which would have speaking rights only, one elected represented. Looking to add a major, currently only a minor.
 - There will be one department representative with the exception of DAN. Rationale: many dep reps have communication issues, maybe some does more work than the other. This year, the work has reduced. The idea is that different faculties, the way they structure their council entails only one dep rep. This could encourage people to get more involved in council. Majority agreed they can function.
 - Carolyn: for this motion, speaking as dep rep, too many cooks in the kitchen, very easy to communicate as an individual. Other than attending meetings, there is not too much else to do.
 - Sam: point of information, if I am president of my club, and a dep rep, what if one is busy. Sommer: valid point, may just take

- Elazar: what if two dep reps, one/both on the club, someone will be elected and not be involved. Sommer: that is part of your role, to be apart of that club.
- Kate: what about making an amendment, not selecting an individual that is president of the club unless they are the only person applying. Understands with small departments this may not be able. Cierra: we do not have jurisdiction over clubs for us to be able to request that they do this.
- Andreea: against this, understands the spirit, but practicality, office hours, hate the idea of taking away a position. Does not see the problem in providing an opportunity. Possible that we could change the office hours, it would also increase transitional justice representation.
- Carolyn: you should know your roles and responsibilities, and you shouldn't apply if you can't handle it; overdoing it on your CV. A lot of the issues brought up, already issues prevalent.
- Coco: as much as we try to encourage people to join, depends on individual, within someone's jurisdiction. Overreach to say someone can't get involved.
- Suganya: speaking against, limiting the amount of people who have a say in what happens within a department, and yeah maybe its only 2 or 3 people writing, important to have this opportunity open. Flawed argument to say that people aren't doing it anyway, if I was returning, with the overload more likely not to do, than the opposite. Does not see the logic in getting rid of the position.
- Mitch: man-power concern alleviated; primary concern is limiting the diverseness of opinion, hesitant to strike down 11 positions. Always talk about involvement being exclusive, keeping these positions brings these.
- Chantal: POI would be 9 positions cut. Addition of TJ rep, and maintenance of MOS would be 8 positions cut.
- Rebecca: from organizational and bureaucratic standpoint, difficult to manage 22 dep reps, not here to make personal attacks, and no one is free of fault, but if the USC is able to represent all students, then we could do the same by reducing; role of department rep is to be an advocate; we should focus on building student leadership in other ways.

- Cierra: one dep rep for every department in different faculties, a couple of departments have two in science; also larger than all affiliate councils.
- Austin: there are 10 USC councillors, no department reps contact them to contact USC reps to represent them as well.
- Michelle: POI role is to liaise between SSSC and Departments, not under responsibility to liaise with councillors.
- Chantal: not all departments are represented by council
- Amira: question is how did you make the decision to make MOS represented of 2 representatives
- Chris: needs of different MOS students would serve to be more effective, especially for advocacy and point of reference.
- Elazar: speaking against, increases in general, pushing back. What is the exact number by which would declare a department eligible to have?
- Rebecca: growing departments, are MOS, PoliSci, and Psychology; not necessary to increase representation
 - Elazar why 2 for MOS? Sommer: one person dealing with half of social science would be too
- Kaitlyn: fairly involved, if you make the priority to do it, and it is your choice, one person is sufficient (based on her current experience). Once again, what is the difference between us and USC? Would ensure more cohesiveness. Our job to advocate. Too many people to go through too many message boards.
- Owen: speaking for this motion, not in favour of having two for MOS, not convinced that the size of the department changes the responsibility. This means that the department has access to more people. The idea that they need more representation. Proposes this as an amendment.
 - Kate: speaking against, with making up half of social science, we have more events than any other club, as a department representative, you should be able to ask someone else to take some responsibility. Expected to be an executive member, attend events, look at SOGS and DOGS, also fair to ask another person concerning this matter. Maybe add finance/accounting rep and HR/Marketing rep. Need two people to take care of 3000 students.

- Austin: speaking against amendment, DAN management is 4 small departments on its own. Not going to work. Some other departments might not understand needs specific to those programs.
- Andreea: against this amendment, more beneficial to have two separate positions both to represent 3000 students.
- Chris: all departments have a degree of diversity between them
- Chantal: a lot of other departments have different streams that differ. Yes, they do have different needs.
- Cierra: uncertain if they are responsible to answer specific questions about what courses a person should take.
- Chantal: answer certain questions at Meet and Greets,
- Zach: understand different majors despite not being in a specific program within a program.
- Mitch: call into question amendment
 - Passes.
- Amendment does not pass.
- Splitting the clause, worrying about TJ later.
- Andreea: reason to split is so that one can't slack off. If you have two, then its much harder for one to slack off. For pure volume wise, its easy to separate. Exact amendment is two have two department reps for MOS, consisting of one (1) consumer behaviour/human resources/public administration and one (1) accounting/finance representative
- Arman: speaking against the friendly amendment, saying that the two streams are different enough, more people in DAN; not the same (IR, director is a history professor, history program puts up the money)
- Kate: will still work together, they will still talk, if its about specific courses, profs, having those two representatives, 100% represents our program.
- Amira: majority of questions come from MBOH and Fall Preview day, lots of representation; not necessary to make this distinction
- Elazar: most of rationale is for MOS to
- Coco: with a lot of other faculties split happens in 2nd/3rd/4th year when pre-reqs happen. Someone may have taken entirely different courses. The reason why

are we are in favour of it, seek out other options. Why not split the department reps halfway?

- Chantal: already voted on BMOS having two. Cut the option for MOS to have 1.
- Zach: clarifying that this voting against this motion would mean it would return to its original form.
- Suganya: scope of the job is able to be done by one person, has little to do with the size of the population. That was the original reason for cutting it down. Inconsistent with this motion, rationale for having two.
- Trevor: volume of work that people are doing as dep reps. When we are doing academic conference committee, too many people. Making work more meaningful by having smaller committees. More willing you are to contribute, more questions, easier to delegate. Is it menial or would you rather know that your position is more?
- Cierra: clarification, Andreea's motion is moved to be unfriendly, voting on this unfriendly amendment. Andreea: makes sense for it to be split.
- Zach moves to call this into question: passes.
- Voting on the amendment, affirmative will be two distinct DAN reps, passes.
- Chris: motion to call to question on this motion
 - Passes.
- Voting in favour of having one TJ dep rep to have speaking rights
 - Called to question.
 - Passed.
- Motion #4 - Textbook Fund
 - Essentially a year long process to approve a \$100,000 investment in the social science students' council textbook endowment fund
 - POI: how many available. Rebecca: hopefully 25, for two years, \$200 for 25. Reviewing
 - Called to Question
 - Motion passes.
- Roles and Responsibilities will be discussed next meeting.

10. Roll Call

11. Adjournment

- 8:55pm