17th Meeting of the 48th SRC

5:00 pm, Sunday, March 20, 2022

Via Zoom (Online)

**Attendance Record**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Position | Name | Present | Regrets | Absent |
| President | Tyler MaGee | X |  |  |
| Vice President Administration | Alex Nguyen | X |  |  |
| Vice President Education | Sydona Chandon | X |  |  |
| Vice President Student Life | Victoria Young | X |  |  |
| Off-Campus Representative | Carol Alvarez | X |  |  |
| Off-Campus Representative  | Gregory Robinson | X |  |  |
| Off-Campus Representative | Lindsey Graham | X |  |  |
| Harrington Hall Representative | Lauren Hayes | X |  |  |
| Social Inclusion Representative | Manvi Walter |  |  | X |
| Indigenous Representative | Stevie DeMerchant |  |  | X |
| International Student Representative | Sony Phung | X |  |  |
| Member at Large Representative | Julia Evans | X |  |  |
| Grad Class President | Tory Desroche | X |  |  |

**Staff Present:** Kryssonia Wedderburn (Chair), Minahil Fatima (Recording Secretary)

**AQ Representatives:** Jessica Saulnier

**Guests Present:** David Eno, Precious Obiora, Ashley Thornton, Emma Walker, Katie Squires, Kenzie Acheson, Layne Olscamp, Muchaneta Nyambuya, Natalia Rodriguez, Oliver Larson, Orion Tsehai, Patrice Cammarano, Valeria Boquin, Jessie-Lynn Cross, Roxanne Knight, Victoria Garner, Cindy A, Maria Cari, Emily Dowdell-Martin.

**Land Acknowledgement**

St. Thomas University Students’ Union recognizes and respectfully acknowledges that it carries out its work on the traditional unceded territories of the Wolastoqiyik, and Mi’kmaq peoples. This territory is covered by the “Treaties of Peace and Friendship” which these nations first signed with the British Crown in 1726. The treaties did not deal with the surrender of territories, but in fact recognized Mi’kmaq and Wolastoqiyik titles and established the rules for what was to be an ongoing relationship between nations. STUSU members and staff pay respect to the elders, past and present, and descendants of this land.

**Call to Order and Quorum Call**

Meeting was called to order by Kryssonia Wedderburn at 5:00 pm.

Quorum is met with 9 voting members present.

## **Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was presented to council.

It was moved by Victoria Y. to approve agenda.

Seconded by Sydona C.

The agenda was approved.

## **Approval of the Minutes from the 16th Meeting**

The minutes from last meeting were presented to council.

It was moved by Alex N. to approve minutes.

Seconded by Sydona C.

The minutes were approved.

## **Business Arising from Minutes**

## No business arising from the minutes.

## **Executive Reports**

**4.1 President’s Report – Tyler MaGee**

Hello, everyone. And welcome to all of our guests. It's very nice to see so many people here at our meetings. I know it's been very rare, actually, since we've had guests. So, it's nice to see students coming forward. So, for my report this week on Monday, I sat in on the Senate committee for reconciliation. We are currently working on our strategic plan for the year, and it will hopefully be approved by the end of our terms, the start of exams, which is very exciting. They're also discussing the Indigenous Film Festival report which has been moved to the end of October, and this call out will go to everyone that is within the university space as well as some established Indigenous filmmakers. This is very exciting. And STU is looking to make this a reoccurring event. So, it'll be nice to have all these indigenous voices coming forward to our campus. And it will be open for all students as well. So, keep an eye out on the student notices when we return in August, I believe there'll be announcing it right around the time of Welcome Week. Later that day, I had a phone call meeting with some of the students that we have that are in the Master of Social Work and the Bachelor of Social Work program, as STU now has master's programs. Students Union is starting to collaborate and find ways of best representing our masters’ students too. So, it's pretty exciting to be extending expanding into that realm and including more students in in our union. On the 15th, we, the executives had a consultation meeting with the newly struck Presidential Search Committee. As you have all been made aware now, Don Russell's tenure is coming to an end next year. So, the university has started a search for new presidents, and they will be consulting with students and stakeholders of the university as well as some external and internal partners. I'm fairly confident in the committee, they have some really good established voices around the table. And I know that the firm that they're working with has worked with the university in the past. So, it'll be a very thorough process. And we're looking forward to being welcoming the next president of the university starting in 2023. On Wednesday, I attended the CASA’s Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion committee. For those of you who are just joining us today, I will say that I'm the vice chair of that committee. And we're currently working on creating a pathway to establishing EDI, Equity Diversity Inclusion as a core pillar for CASA. And this will include opening up opportunities for further consultation and individual, like caucuses for non-CASA members, but to be able to come in, which is something that's very exciting. And we're also working on an environmental scan right now of other institutions Canada wide, to see what they are doing in the EDI space and how we can adopt and modify them to fit into the CASA framework. Later that day, I caught up on a ton of emails, which is fairly, fairly common. But anyway, I have to add in that I did a whole bunch of that. Thursday, I attended a senate meeting. For those of you who do not know, our Vice President education, Sydona and me both sit on the University Senate. So as voting members, we attended the senate meeting, there wasn't anything too exciting in the senate meeting, we're winding down to the end of the year right now. So, everything's fairly quiet. But there are new classes that are being introduced for next year. And a number of the faculties and all of those are, they sound fairly interesting, too. So, a lot of work is going in at developing and expanding students’ classes for next year. On Friday, we had our executive meeting. These meetings are always fun. I like working with everyone, but nothing too, too exciting coming out of that either. We're just starting to put the groundwork in on the AGM which I'm sure Victoria will be mentioning later. So that's it. For me. I took this weekend off to catch up on some coursework and things because exams are coming right around the corner. So that's everything that I did this past week.

**4.2 Vice-President of Administration’s Report – Alex Nguyen**

On Monday, I did my office hours at the help desk. And our finance committees also passed a recent funding application for STUISA. Throughout the week, I answered a couple emails about Campus Trust and also helped some students with an account log in problem. And then I worked alongside our general manager, Tina, to prepare our budget update since we only have about two SRC meetings left, which means the operating budget for next year will be presented to the SRC by next week for our council to see. On Friday, I attended exec meeting with our executives and also sat on the search committee. I guess that's about it. Thank you.

Jessie-Lynn: I just had a question for Alex. When you're doing your office hours, did you notice that there is still that donation bin about one of the committees, is that still up in the Student Help Desk for the we're here for you campaign? And is that still, like open to all the students?

Alex: I'm not a part of the committee you mentioned. I think the question should be pertained to the chair however, I do not recall seeing a bin.

**4.3 Vice President of Education’s Report – Sydona Chandon**

Hi, everyone. It has been a while I hope you had a great reading break. We are almost at the end of the semester. Give yourselves a pat on the back. We're almost there. My Report for this week is compiled with the week before. So, during the break we had our spring elections where I had to meet with the candidates interested in the position of Vice President education. I also conducted the vice president education debate and was present for the others as we discuss questions, and the set up of the election. This week, I have been mostly working on the cultural competency training, I met with the trainer Pascal on Monday to discuss communications material, and emailed those to Ashlynn, or director of communications here at STU. On Tuesday, I had a consultation for the STU President and Vice Chancellor search with Kyle Steele, along with the rest of the executives. This meeting was productive as I described, characteristics we would like to see in the new president, and that students would love to have more presence and accessibility of the president on campus. On Wednesday, I answered emails and on Thursday, we had a senate meeting. The President was not present as she was meeting with family in Nova Scotia at the time. So, it was pretty much a very short and brief meeting. On a Friday, we had an exec meeting where we discussed some questions that were brought forward about the election and shared on that. Later that day, I led a cultural competency training with faculty, which Ty assisted with as well. The training got great feedback from faculty, and we're looking forward to having a few of a few more of those trainings next year and for the years to come. That is, it for my report today.

**4.4 Vice President of Student Life’s Report – Victoria Young**

Hello, everyone. Hope you all had a great first week back from reading week. So last week, as we know, it was the elections. And I helped out with the debate for next year's executive positions. And I just like to give a big formal congratulations to our next VPSL Anahi. And so, with that I'll now go into this week as usual in chronological order. So, on Monday, I had a meeting bright and early with the Food Bank committee. And in this meeting, these meetings are always very productive, and I really love that group that I work with. At the campus food bank. I discussed the grant that STUSU has received from Greater Fredericton Social Innovation and Agriculture Canada, which they are offering us just over $1,000 to be distributed to the campus food bank in the form of just a donation to the food bank, or to gift cards for students in need for grocery gift cards, or to pay for Community Food smart bags. So, I discussed this with the Food Bank committee, and we've decided that community food smart will be free for the month of April for any students who would like to get community food smart bags. And then with the remaining amount of money because Community Food smart bags are just $15 for fresh produce from local Canadian farmers or farms. So, with the remaining money after that $15 allocated to paying for students Community Food smart bags, the rest of the money will go to grocery gift cards for students in need in our community, and that will be facilitated with Vivian from the campus food bank. Then on Monday, I also went through a few emergency bursary applications, and did that with our emergency bursary Committee, which consists of Tyler our president, as well as Tina, our General Manager. Then on Tuesday, I filled in for someone's shift at the help desk and I had a meeting with the UNBSU VPSL about our ongoing College Hill Good Neighbor program. So, with this, we're just organizing how we're going to get the word out about how to be a good neighbor in the College Hill area. Because a lot of university students it's their first time being in a house by themselves or being an apartment by themselves, without their parents. So, it's just sort of a few tips of how you can be most respectful to the people around you. And we're doing that through magnets and posters and playing cards. So, we're really excited to get that, get that going. And that's in collaboration with the city of Fredericton. And then I also met with Brett from STU healthy campus to discuss the spring carnival, which happened at the end of last week. And I also got the food tickets that were available to students through the help desk for a free meal at meal hall that was completely free until Friday. So, I was really happy to see a lot of students take advantage of that and get a nice warm meal at our meal hall. And then on Wednesday, I had a meeting with the search committee for the next president of the university with my fellow executives, as they mentioned, and I was really happy to be a part of this. The next president, it seems like it's going to be very, very promising. And I'm really glad that the committee that's facilitating organizing the search committee is willing to hear students’ voices, I was really, really happy to be a part of this. And then I also had an interview with the AQ about a check in with where I was with my position this year. So, I'm really excited to see that article from the AQ and read our student journalists work. And then I attended the spring, the spring carnival hot coffee house that our activities coordinator, Valeria as well as to healthy campus and myself put on where we had a local Fredericton folk band performing, who's also an alumnus. And then also some student performances in between their songs. And we had some snacks and some coffee and hot chocolate and a few outdoor activities. So that was very well attended. And I was really happy to see a lot of my fellow students there. Then on Thursday, I of course, had my weekly office hours at the help desk. And I just checked in with the university administration just to see if there's anything they needed from me and from susu as a whole for the long night against procrastination event that happened on Thursday. And then I also answered an email from a student who had a concern about the bus pass. And then on Friday, I just had a little bit of email correspondence with UNBSU about our Chrome event that's happening on March 31. So, keep your eye out for advertising about that. It's going to be very affordable private event with STU and UNB. So that'll be a lot of fun. And then I of course had my weekly executive meeting with my lovely fellow executives, as they all mentioned, and we discussed the upcoming AGM. So that's about it for this week. Thank you.

## **5. Employee Updates**

No employee reports available.

## **6. Representative Reports**

**6.1 Off-Campus Representatives (Carol A./Gregory R./ Lindsey G.)**

Carol: So, hi everyone, basically, the previous last two weeks we did the giveaway. We had a lot of comments and shares, and it was a success. Over the last week we give the winners their gifts, and for this upcoming week, we're gonna plan a movie night in the OC lounge. So, we have a little bonding with all the members. That's it for me.

**6.2 Grad Class President (Tori D.)**

Hi, everyone. So since last time that we met, I received all of the grad class closing orders. And I've been working really hard to make sure that all of those get picked up, I still have a few that are waiting to be picked up. So, if you're here and haven't gotten your order, send me an email. And we also did a bingo on our story this week. So, we had over 30 people who participated, which was really great. And because of the big outcome of people who participated, I did two winners. And I chose those yesterday. And I think, and I reached out to both of them. And we're planning on giving those out earlier or late next week. Hopefully, on campus, I'll meet up with those two winners, they were really excited about what they won. And I have a few things that are here that I'll just put together a couple of gift bags. And I've also been thinking about doing a grad dinner, because the university won't be putting on one this year. So even I talked to Tyler about that a little bit. This weekend, I worked with Wanda, who's the alumni relations person. So, she and I were talking about that. And I reached out to a business today to see if they would be able to hold us, I'm waiting for the manager to get back to me. So, I'll have more updates on that soon. I know a lot of the visitors today are in the grad class. So that's just a little bit of an update, hoping that we'll be able to, you know, get a grad dinner after the long years of not having one. And over the weekend, I did stay pretty updated on like all of the stuff that's going on Facebook. And I tried to make sure that I was listening to what everybody had to say. And I even messaged a few people just to make sure that everybody who was posting and was reacting with everything and knew that the grad class president supported them and wanted to hear what they had to say and made sure that their voices felt heard. So that was mostly it for me this week. It's been a really busy week juggling the clothing orders and everything. So besides that, I've just been up to schoolwork. So that's it for me.

Jessie-Lynn: Hey, Tori. I just wanted to ask about the grad dinner. Would it just be the graduate? Or are people allowed to have a plus one?

Tori: Actually, don't really know what the proper protocol normally is for the dinner. But where this would be like it's normally hosted by Aramark, like the people who run meal Hall. Normally, it's a little bit fancier, kind of like the dinner we would have had in first year if anybody lived in Rez. So, because it won't be like that, this year, I'm hoping like, I'm hoping to get in contact with a STU alumni owned restaurant. And then that way, we could maybe see if we could work out like a discount for all the grads, something like that. So, depending on availability, like not availability, I guess, but the amount of people who can be in a room, it would all depend like, we're hoping that we can do reservation. So, every student would have the opportunity, there'd be a window where you could call and make your reservation. And depending on the capacity that they're able to have, I'm hoping that people would be able to bring up plus one because I think that this would allow for a lot more people to come and feel welcomed. But it will all depend on the capacity limits. I know everywhere right now is back to their number one full capacity. But because of rules, I'd have to look further into that. But I'm hoping that I can have any information come out about that, like by early next week, just because I'm still waiting for managers and stuff to get back to me. But thanks for the question, Jessie.

**6.3 International Student Representative (Sony P.)**

Hello, everyone. So, the past week, I communicated with the international office. And we talked about launching the International Leadership Award for this semester. I made a ton of reference for Carrie to review and got that approved around Wednesday. And then on Thursday and Friday, I contacted the admissions office to get this promoted to other students. Nomination period will be from March 21 to 28th next week, and it will be what will be presented on end of year celebration on April the eighth. On the other hand, I also received the date for a meeting with the specialist award committee that's going to take place in on April 11. In order to review the nominations for faculty who were nominated for awards and that’s it.

**6. 4 At-Large Representative (Julia E.)**

Hi, everyone, I hope you all had a great reading week, and then a great first week back. So, a few things. First, I just wanted to mention, I know Ty briefly mentioned in their report about the Presidential Search Committee, and I'm serving as the STUSU representative on my committee. So, if anyone has any questions, please do ask me. And then there's also many ways for you to get involved. I know there was an email sent out to everyone in the student body saying if you want to be involved and have your input, then to please reach out to the contact. So, I really encourage you if that's something you're interested in to get involved, have your voice heard in the Presidential Search Committee. It's going to be going on for a long time. So, like, even throughout the summer and stuff, I'll be meeting so if you guys think of any questions, please do reach out. Aside from that, I was busy over reading weekend stuff with the election. And then now Sydona and I have an event that we've been working on for the past couple weeks, that's actually this Wednesday. So, you've probably mostly heard us refer to it as the remote learning roundtable. But we switched things up a bit, we didn't want it to be misleading, considering it's like a hybrid model that a lot of us have been immersed in this year. So, you've probably seen the promotions around the STUSU pages, but it's the semester one and two roundtable, it's going to take place in MMH 203. And it's this Wednesday at seven. So basically, what it is, it's just a safe, conversational space that we're all going to discuss our experiences with the hybrid learning model, we'll engage in just small group discussions, you can provide us with your input, and then there won't be any administration or anything there. But then we can take this information and then ensure that the changes and feedback that we get are implemented for the next academic year. So, it's really important to us that everyone feels like they have a space to reflect on their experiences from first semester, academically extracurricular, like everything like that. So, I encourage not only the council members to come, because I think it's really important to have our constituents represented, but also, the guests here today, I really encourage I know you guys are here to give feedback. And I think that this would be another great avenue to provide more feedback and have these constructive conversations. So, mark your calendars this Wednesday, at seven o'clock. And I've been working on like a list of questions and conversation points. But if any of you guys on council or anyone else, if there's anything you think that's really important, that should be discussed, when we're discussing the hybrid learning model, please do reach out to me because we don't want any questions or any issues to be overlooked. So, we want to ensure that everyone's represented. And so please send me any questions that I can add to the list, even if you yourself can't make it. But again, I really think it'd be nice as we haven't got to have this sense of community in this in person setting. So, I really encourage you guys to come out and chat with us. But if you have any questions that come up about the event before Wednesday, please reach out and spread the word share on your all your socials with the event because we really would like a bit of a bit of a turnout. Obviously, we'll be social distancing, and we'll set up the room accordingly. But I'd love to see you guys there. Thank you.

**6.5 Harrington Hall Representative (Lauren** **H.)**

So, for this past week, we were just discussing the possibilities of events for the rest of the year. So hopefully we can get a few events and before exam season, I guess. And we were also talking about just Harrington clothing. But that's all for me.

**7. New Business**

**7.1 Spring Election Queries**

Ty: Okay, so there's just a couple of things that I think should be noted for everyone since, like, this is probably the first time that we've had this number of turnouts. So, two disclaimers that I want to put out there for everybody is first of all, please remember that this meeting is a public meeting which means that all of our minutes are noted, and they are published after the fact. Since it is online, that means that they are there forever, and we are mandated to keep them up on our website. The reason why I bring this up is to just ensure that you are all aware that anything that you say will be public knowledge for the next little while, and this meeting is also recorded. So, the recordings for this meeting, the only thing that is recorded is audio. The audio goes directly to our Recording Secretary who formulates the minutes. And then the recordings are deleted. But the minutes are what is published. So that's what I wanted to give a little disclaimer to everybody, just so you're aware of that before we hop in. And then the second thing that I would like to say, before we dive into this is that I would encourage all SRC members to speak last. That way, we have the floor given to all of our students first, so we can assimilate all of that information forward before we add our comments. So that's just a little piece of advice I have and without further ado, I'll pass it back over to the chair to start the speaker's list.

David: Hello, everybody. My name is David Eno, and all my pronouns are he him. And I'm here because I'm formally appealing the valedictorian election results. Now, I'm going to be using the bylaws to address my points and to basically present my case. So, if every if everybody has access to the bylaws, that would be perfect. But, of course, I'm going to be quoting, and I'm going to be reading verbatim. So first, I would like to give some context. In the just concluded STUSU spring election, I ran for the position of valedictorian, and I and my fellow international students Precious Obiora Roxane Knight and remains to be seen who else were not allowed to vote in the election. This problem was made known to the CRO on the first day of voting, and he did absolutely nothing. Now, according to Article One of the bylaws general election provisions, section two, the chief returning officer shall be charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the following general election procedures are followed and executed. Now if you refer to Section four, you will see that there shall be spring general election which are conformed to the following provisions. And under subsection four, you will see the clause on valedictorian who shall be elected by the graduating Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Applied Arts classes of the following year. Now, this language is very important because in my initial appeal that I sent to Tyler on Monday, he denied my appeal based on my eligibility to vote, and I'm going to read exactly what he said. He said that voter’s eligibility is based on the electrical list provided by the University. It is my understanding that you have satisfied all of your degree requirements at the end of the fall semester. And due to your completion of your course requirements, you are not an eligible voter in selection. This is not stored anywhere in the bylaws. And according to the bylaws. It is members of the graduating class who are to vote for the valedictorian, and according to the register of the university, I and my fellow international students are members of the graduating class, so we were denied our right to vote for no reason. Under Article Five of voting, it is the section four it is the responsibility of the CRO to ensure that the voting link has been distributed to all eligible voters. And according to Article One, which I have already stated, I am an eligible voter as well as my fellow international students. These issues were brought forward on the first day of election, and they were completely ignored by the CRO. This is a gross violation of his duties and grounds to do the election over because it is clear that it was not done fairly. Furthermore, I'm appealing under Chapter Three of the bylaws and that's the appellate board act. And under Section 10, the board consisting of the chief appeal officer, and to associate appeal officer has the jurisdiction to hear appeals by any applicant of decisions rendered by the chief returning officer. On Monday when I gave my appeal to Tyler. They should have brought this forward to the to the appellate board, but to my knowledge, there is no appellate board at all. So, he dismissed my claim and concerns again, and it is evident that this is a cover up. Under Section 11 of the very same chapter, our requests for appeal hearings shall be submitted in accordance with this chapter. No more than three business days following the posting of certified election results. The elections were posted on Friday and the following Monday, I sent out my appeal, it was ignored and so I sent the follow up appeal to the chair of the SRC on Wednesday. Both of those are within the three-day time, the three-business daytime period, for which I need to submit my appeal. Furthermore, subsequent to an appellant initiating a request for an appeal hearing. In accordance with this chapter, the board itself shall set a time, date, and location for a hearing at the earliest convenience of all parties. But a date no greater than 10 working days from the receipt of requests for appeal. My first request was on Monday. So, 10 days is coming soon. That was Monday, March 14, 2022. I would not like this case to drag on because of course, it is not in my interest for that to happen. With April coming up, your meetings are going to not hold any more and it will be much harder for me to get my voice heard. So, I'm appealing the election results due to a wanton case of voter suppression on the part of the CRO, no doubt in your efforts to install your fellow executives in coveted positions. The student union is not a cartel, and it should not be run like that. So, I demand the election redone and I want a public apology, acknowledging the negligence for me and for my fellow international students, because 60 years after Martin Luther King fought for his right to vote, I'm doing the same thing in 2022. You're on the wrong side of history. And this cannot stand up. Tyler cannot get away with this. It is absolutely not fair.

Tori: I just wanted to note, David, I mean, I heard from a student who's graduating in December of 2022, that they were able to vote for the valedictorian, they won't be able to attend the graduation happening in May or July, due to the fact that they won't have enough credits to graduate. And they were able to vote for the valedictorian when they got the email.

David: Thank you. I have all my credits, yet I couldn't vote for the candidates and the election. Thank you for pointing that out.

Jessie-Lynn: I just wanted to say is I was informed that, and it was also posted on the class of 2022. That apparently the vote was only won by two votes. And apparently the CRO did mention that in an email to one of the complainants that apparently the votes no matter what wouldn't have mattered because they would not have made a material difference to the outcome of the election. However, I think two votes especially if people who were not able to vote specifically because they finished their credits in December, were able to vote that would have at least made a tie. If not, it would have changed the outcome of the election and we would see a different winning candidate today. There also, I just want to point out there is nowhere in the Constitution or the bylaws where it specifically says that students that haven't finished their credits, or that have finished their credits in December are no longer eligible to vote in this race, for valedictorian, or in general, and I wonder if they weren't also allowed to vote for other members, such as the president, the VP of education, etc. And if they're not allowed to vote, I just wonder where it says that David would be allowed to run. So, if David is allowed to run, he should also be allowed to vote for himself. And it is important to point out that the other two candidates that were in this race were able to vote for themselves. So that kind of gives David a disadvantage in this election, which kind of seemed a little unfair. Yeah, I just want to point that out.

David: So, when Precious brought the case towards Ty, they dismissed it, saying that it wouldn't make any material difference, because they refused to acknowledge the fact that I am an eligible voter. That is why I keep talking about voter suppression in this situation, it is clear that our votes are being suppressed? For what reason? I do not know.

Jessie-Lynn: I would love to add something else. specifically discussing the winning candidate. I do know that based on the bylaws in a certain section, it does say that in order to be eligible to run in the election, you have to be in good standing with the university. I do know some people that did want to run for the election, and they weren't able to because they were considered not in good standing with the union. And I just want to point out there were there were several items that have happened in private committees, and in public meetings, where the winning candidate had violated the bylaws and the code of conduct.

Ty: I'm going to cite very quickly, a new bylaw that we have put in within the committee's which is the committee confidentiality clause. I'm going to cite that right there before any of this goes further, just as a reminder to committee members.

Jessie-Lynn: Thank you. I'm not going to mention anything particular that was mentioned in these committees. I will say that publicly a lot of things, there was a meeting that was presented to experts of an external body by students who wanted to complain about their voices not being heard, essentially. And this is also for the members of the SRC, something about a video was being mentioned, for a particular Advocacy Committee, and a lot of students voiced their opinion saying they were not comfortable with that video moving forward. And also, I think it will be brought up later, but that video, where a lot of that those students were told that their voices were heard, and that they were going to bring it up in the SRC that this video should be put to a vote on whether it would be done or whether it would not be acceptable with this particular student body. And unfortunately, those were lies because according to the minutes, it was never brought up in this meeting, whether it was a good idea or not. It was simply brought up that the language should be changed. And then students did ask experts to come in and discuss this particular issue. And those experts were laughed at and dismissed. And at that point, the candidate had caused issues with an external body. And so just based on that alone without mentioning anything else, a lot of students do feel that that would violate code of conduct and bylaws and would make them not in good standing with the union. So, a lot of students don't feel, especially the students that were harmed by this particular individual feel like it's not a good representation to have this person share all of our voices at the graduation, and I'll leave it at that.

Ashley: Yeah, I just wanted to quickly jump on and just reiterate everything that Jessie said, I can also corroborate everything she said, as well, as an and I know other people can as well. I know what are the meetings that Jessie was referencing to actually isn't a committee meeting at all. And it was actually completely separate. Definitely a ton of violations to the different bylaws and code of conduct. And I know that a large portion of the student body isn't comfortable with how the election results turned out. In fact, I've even heard some students don't want to attend their own convocation because of it. And I think that speaks for a really large issue.

Alex: I do want to state something before we move forward with discussion is that any form of personal attacks will not be tolerated. Please be mindful of your words and actions. And that comes from both sides.

Patrice: Oh, yeah, my point is about the confidentiality clause. So, David touched a little bit about how there's a lack of transparency. And it seems like we're shutting down voices. So, I'm just concerned that having that and preventing, like people that aren't in those committees from having access to that information, is simply covering up some information. It seems like a lack of transparency. And I personally don't believe that's what the student union should be doing. So, I'm kind of interested in knowing why is that confidentiality clause in place? And what information are we withholding right now?

Ty: Yeah. So, the confidentiality clause is put in specifically for committees that deal in either sensitive or personal topics. It was primarily brought in for the mental health and sexual violence prevention committees. The reason for this is because in those committees, often very personal and like trauma, stories of trauma can come up when dealing with these topics. So, because acknowledging that sensitivity, the confidentiality clause was introduced, what is specifically left confidential is any personal or reasonably identifiable anecdotes towards any person or anything that they had said, what isn't confidential is anything that has been formally voted on. So those are initiatives that are coming forward justification for why those initiatives are coming forward, and the allocation of funds that we have under our committee policies. So that way, what students here is they hear the initiatives that are coming forward, they hear why these initiatives are coming forward, and they can draw a clear one to one line between the money that is within those committee lines and the expenditures that are coming forward. What the students don't hear are the stories that are shared within those committees that could be potentially traumatizing, re traumatizing or, you know, of a personal nature within those committees, so rather than put it in just for two committees, we decided to make it uniform across all committees. That way, we're not singling out one committee or not, however, all of the tangible things that involve the use of student funds that involve the initiatives that are coming forward and the justification for doing so. Those are all brought forward. And I will say that the confidentiality clause has been run through a number of our partners, including our committees, and it was all voted and received favorably.

Kryssonia: I have a question from Cindy A in the chat. When was this bylaw amendment passed by council?

Ty: I believe it was the last SRC meeting before the break, but it might have been the one before it. I don't have the exact date, but it will be reflected in our meeting minutes.

Alex: Yep. I just want to add on that the confidentiality thing is not new. We have imposed that in some of our committees, especially the student advisory committees, where it is full confidentiality where committee members are required to sign NDA concerning the information, they are exposed to is highly confidential and personable.

Ashley: Yeah, I just wanted to add on to the little thing about the confidentiality clause as well, because I think every single person on this call, I can agree that confidentiality clauses are important in the sense of protecting private information. And I know in the committee's I've been in there's really sensitive information that I know people like to be private. And I think we can all respect that. What shouldn't say confidential, however, is utter disrespect to other students within our student body in like, complete, complete disrespect, like, very, very terrible disrespect, that kind of actions. In my opinion, I think the majority of this call could agree that that kind of action should not be hidden from the student body, especially when we're dealing with such important topics.

Tori: Yeah, I just have a quick note, I think it's important to mention when we're talking about confidentiality, and like trying to protect those like, who are sharing something personal, that if somebody is choosing to share something personally, like, say, if I were to choose to share what I would share in a committee with you guys, I think that it totally makes sense to be able to share what you want to share. And I almost feel like if we're having such a strict confidentiality clause, about like this type of situation where, you know, people did share something personal, and it was completely disregarded and completely disrespected. I think that we should totally be able to, you know, say what we say, and somebody should be able to share their story without, you know, going forward and hurting somebody else. But the thing about like, the part about protecting trauma is difficult for me to understand, because if somebody is sharing something like that, and they are completely disrespected, it can almost re traumatize the person. And I think that's a lot of what Ashley and Jessie and even myself are bringing forward is that if somebody did share something personal with you, and it was disrespected, I don't think it should be my responsibility to keep it confidential when I was the person who was hurt in the situation.

Patrice: Like my question is simply, why was it introduced? Like it was briefly mentioned, like the confidentiality clause, like the reason, but like, as noted, it wasn't introduced at the beginning of the year. It came later on so that something happened like I'm just trying to understand like where we're coming from with this, because some people have information, some don't. And at the end of the day, that's not how democracy works. The same point that everyone that is eligible to vote should be able to vote. It's that simple. It's about equality. And if from the start, it's not an equal process. It's just rotten from the bottom and that's not something I want to see.

Jessie-Lynn: I think I can answer your question Patrice, while staying on topic, I think the reason that the confidentiality clause is brought up is because I mentioned in the bylaws that in order for someone to run in this campaign, they need to be in good standing with the union. It is arguable that the winning candidate is not in good standing with the union, whether or not this was brought up to the SRC to be voted on or not simply because of their behavior in committees that they ran. And I will agree with Tori, that, you know, they heard a lot of people and, you know, to kind of mute these voices based on the confidentiality clause kind of goes against what the confidentiality clause was created for. As Ty mentioned, they mentioned that that clause was mentioned specifically to be protective of those stories. But when those stories such as in a meeting like this, where we are trying to shed light on candidates in terms of voting so that people can have an informed vote, it can be very triggering almost a second traumatizing to many students. So, I just want to say that in this election, a lot of people who do have that information on the winning candidate would argue. Yeah, exactly. So, someone said in the text that this discussion is moving from the issue at hand to focusing on protecting the reputation of the member of a STUSU executive, the confidentiality clause was not implemented for that purpose. That is a good point. I know some people who wanted to run in this election, and they were not able to because they're not considered in good standing with the union. And a lot of people would argue that based on this information, the candidate that one I should not be in good standing with the union. But again, that's up for the SRC to vote on. However, I don't also believe it was brought up to the SRC, these violations of the bylaws and code of conduct, which is also against the Constitution and the bylaws. And I just want to make sure that everybody does have an informed vote of who they're voting for. And I do think that it's unfair that one person specifically on the SEC counsel is allowed to have that double standard and is able to run in this election when other people were not based on the same merits. So that hopefully addresses Patrice’s question.

Ty: Thank you very much to everyone for sharing. I did take notes, anonymous notes of what the questions being raised were. So, if there is nothing else, for anyone to add, I will go through and answer these questions one by one. Because I think that you all deserve those answers. So, I'll have one last little call for any questions before I give these answers.

Precious: I do have a question about the position of the chief returning officer. And my question would be addressed to Tyler. I want to know why this position was not advertised before the election if it was vacant. And I also want to know why it was okay for the President to act as the chief returning officer for this election, especially when some of the candidates were already on this board. Like it's very obvious that it should have been viewed as a conflict of interest, an external person should have been hired to take the position. Thank you.

Kryssonia: I see one more question in the chat. I'll read it. Is it not considered a conflict of interest because your co workers is the winning candidate.

Maria: Hello, I just wanted to ask Tyler to expand on what he said to Precious. He said the votes in this election, if counted would not have made a material difference in the outcome of the election. And I just wanted him to expand on that given that as Jessie said there was just a two-vote difference between the winners. And I also wanted you to expand on that based on the values of STUSU for holding elections.

Sydona: Oh, my view on this remains the same as I had already made this known for the rest of my executives. Based on the bylaws mentioned in Section 10 Chapter Three, the Board shall have jurisdiction to hear appeals by any applicant of decisions rendered by the CRO. And I believe in order to honor the students that are putting forward their requests. It is important for us to form an appellate board where their voices are heard. STUSU has always strived on giving voice to student concerns. And I believe in this scenario, there should be no exceptions. I don't believe students should be denied their ability to appeal the results. And that's my views. Thank you.

Jessie-Lynn: I wanted to ask specifically about this part of the election, we see that there were three candidates, and aside from other people who ran, this was the most the, you know, the most candidates we had for one position. And we did see that when for everybody who was able to vote, we did see that there was a ranked ballot. So, for those who voted for one person, they could vote for a second person and then a third person. I just want to know how those votes were counted specifically.

David: I just wanted to know if I would have the opportunity to debunk anything that Tyler may say if I don't agree with them, especially if I have bylaws to back it up.

Kryssonia: Given that the matter has been brought up by you, I will allow for you and the President to go forward however, I'll try to contain the conversation because we aren't being mindful of time, not to silence any voices.

Ashley: I also have a question that I just wanted to address. Since we're kind of making a list of questions. I guess I just don't understand. And since we do go to a school that prioritizes the voices of all students, I'm not sure why some students’ voices are being considered more important than others. I know some individuals have been completely disrespected by individuals running in the election, and their voices are being silenced not to share this. I know some of my graduating students, international students have been allowed to vote in this election. I'm not sure why their votes aren’t being counted. But mine are I don't think that's fair. I don't think that any singular person is more important or their voices any more important than anyone else in the student union or the School and I think that we should be respected as such, those two people's voices are just as important as any of the rest of us.

Patrice: Oh, yeah, my question is just around voter turn around. Because I didn't see anything in the bylaws that we need to meet a certain percentage. But then my question becomes when there's not very many students voting, how is that actually representative of the student that that's who they want to win? And even worse when some students are not allowed to vote? So then in the end, if we're restricting to such a lower number, is there the result actually meaningful? And how can we say it's meaningful? Because was it around 14%? Like globally for all students? And then if we look at the valedictorian, there was about 80 some votes on the graduating class, I will assume is around 400. So, we're not even meeting the 25% mark. So how can we say that these results are meaningful in the end?

Precious: I just wanted to remind everyone of the fact that the executive board was made aware of the problem with the elections during when the elections were happening. So, we, I talked to Victoria, who is VP student life, and I told her I wasn't able to vote. And that was on the first day of the election. So, the board was able to address this issue, but it failed to. So, my actual question is, how is this appeal going to go forward? Because according to the bylaws, we should be held by an appellate board. So, I just want to presidents clarify how this appeals to go forward.

Jessie-Lynn: I was notified right before this meeting of another person who isn't in this meeting that they wanted my opinion on what happened in the election, because they had applied for the CRO job. And apparently, they just weren't a good fit. So, they didn't get it. But I am wondering, in the event that we are hiring someone, and that that post is still up on the website. So, it is still advertised. But as for the CRO position, I'm just wondering if it is considered more beneficial that like the president or a member of the exec team would take on that role, rather than anyone else who applied even if they weren't considered a good fit, because it may come across as like a like a conflict of interest. So, I'm just wanting to be clearer about that for the sake of transparency if that's possible.

Kryssonia: I will read a question from the comments for you. It says, is it a violation of CBA for the President to serve as the car?

Ty: Okay, thank you, everybody, for all these questions. And again, I will do my absolute best to answer them, respecting transparency to the extent that I can and the reason why I specify that is for the hiring process right out of the way. I will say that under hiring processes and under the guidelines of the HR policy, I'm not allowed to discuss specific candidates or any justifications for why we chose one over the other. So, I just want that out of the way. Before I get to that question, I noticed that there was a student who did point out my pronouns. So, I did want to thank them. So now, going in the order that I have, the very first question that was brought forward was the saying that there are multiple students who ineligible were to vote. Unfortunately, I can only determine the number of students who are unable to vote based off of the number of complaints that I receive. So, if a student does not reach out to me themselves stating that they can't do that, or that they were unable to vote, that means that or that's how they get counted. So, I only received the notification from two students specifically, who said that they were unable to vote, which means that I have to consider only two students as unable to vote. The second thing that I'm going to point out too, is that the CRO doesn't have any authority three days after an election is concluded. So that's why it says in the appeals section that in these must be made known to the CRO within the three days. So, after three days, CRO doesn't have any power in the election, for the verification of the grads list under that the bylaws that David had cited, so the verification is based off of the electors list that is given but from the university to the CRO, that electors list is based off of the full-time fee-paying students that are at the university. The Grad list is not sent to the CRO, so the CRO does not receive the grad list, we receive the full-time fee-paying student list. Since that list is deals with personal information of individual students, it means that the CRO does not have modifying powers to that list, the only things that we can do is we can input the passwords that are randomly generated for the simply voting software, that's the only thing that we have the ability to do. Also, since there is no list that we have to compare to, because it is all underneath the university's jurisdiction, the way that we verify the list is based off of the number that is on that list. So, for instance, in this particular election, there are 1636 a full time pay fee paying students, the list that I received versus the list of full-time fee-paying students that we have under the Student Union because it's based off of full-time student union fees. If those numbers match, the list is considered valid. I will also firmly say that this has got nothing to do with my personal views on any of this stuff, I have to go off of what the software and the system itself does. So as long as those two numbers are together, it's deemed and considered to be accurate, because we do not have anything to compare it to as the university is in charge of data holding and data sharing of their students. Next, the simply voting software does not show individual student classifications. So, once it's inputted into simply voting software, I cannot see or determine whether or not a student is in year two, three, or four. So, all I can see is the student number, the email, and the password that I generate. So, because those are all that the CRO is able to see and is required to see. Related to this, under the simply voting software, it uses the emails that are in that electors list to send the email blast with the links to the election. So, the next question is regarding the statement that I made in an email to Precious so I will say that that statement was made prior to the final tally being in so based off of the information that I had available at the time, is when that statement was made. In the event based on the information I had at the time, when it comes to tallying votes, I must include the abstentions and the number of tallying. So that means that the abstention rate is included in the number of votes required, which is four. So, in this instance, it was based on the number of students I received, it is to be based off the number of students under the university electors list that are eligible to vote that number is one, one vote is not enough to sway the issue of four. So based on the information that I had, and the structure of the system that we are working in batches, where that came from, now that the full voting is in and the information that I have has been completed, that statement may or may not be false. I don't know. Because there's no way of knowing right now. So that is the answer to that question. Now, on the question of bylaws, our bylaws only state, what can be controlled by the Students Union. So, under an election, the way that this works, because our entire board is elected, it means that the election process is decentralized. So, the university covers the eligible voting list. And the CRO is the person who goes forward. Okay, so, because of that, the bylaws cite only what the Students Union can control, we cannot control the electors list. We cannot control how the university manages or classifies students within their data. What we can control is what students we allow to run in which students we don't, which is why the nomination section is as clear as it is. So that is what's under our control within the Students Union. Yes, I believe it was section for a that that David had cited as the eligible voting, what it means to be an eligible voter that is the section of that bylaw. And then I also see that there is a question. So, I will repeat that one. Based on the information that I had at the time, when we count votes, abstentions must be counted in the number of votes needed in order to like change an election result. So that means that it's not just the two between the individuals, it's also the two that were abstaining, which is where the number of four comes from. So that's where that four numbers come from. So that's the way that it was explained to me. So based on the information that I had, at the time, abstentions needed to be included in this. So that's where that four comes from, rather than the two between candidates.

Jessie-Lynn: I feel very confused. And I'm sorry, I know you're trying to do such a great job explaining. I'm just getting confused with the math.

Ty: There's always an abstention that is allowed in every position that we have. So, there's always an abstention option, because the abstention option is there that counts towards the total number of voters that were in that because abstaining is counted as an option of voting in simply voting software. So, you can vote yes, you can vote no, or you can vote to abstain. So those are all counted as votes. And because those are all counted when it comes to what as needed to overwrite to change the result, it goes off of all voted like all votes rather than just between two specific classifications. So, under simply voting software, the number that I seen was four as required to overturn a boat. Now that the receipts are forward, the number of votes that's required to change a vote is two. So that's the difference between what the software says versus what the individual receipts say. So, I look at two different screens. One screen shows me the number of people who voted and what numbers go like what that total number is. So, under the screen that I see a CRO, it shows four, under the screen that the voting receipts show, it only shows the two candidates, which is two between the two candidates who won and who, basically, who won and who lost on voting receipts. It shows two people on simply voting that the CRO sees it shows four. So basically, one screen shows one number, the other screen shows the other number. At the time of the statement, I was only seeing the number on simply voting. I wasn't seeing the number in the voting receipt. Alex can summarize this better than I can for sure.

Alex: So, I will share my screen. So, for the sake of transparency, if you have received a link to vote, you can still access the past ballots using the same link. Every student can see the result. And every student can see how we count our vote using our simple voting software. So, to answer your questions how round one round two works, this is how it works. Anyone can see it. There are two abstentions, in total 86 people voted.

Ty: Yeah. So, I'll break this down. Round One shows 32 30 22. These are ranked ballots, which means that in the next round, it goes off of the order that they were ranked. So, for the 22 people who voted for Patrice in the first round, they would have listed these 11 votes that you see as their number two. So, for everyone that was in there, half of them ranked David as number one, the other half ranked Victoria as number one. So that's why you see the plus 11 plus 11 is added to those like to the 32 and the 30. That gives you your total, that is where the election comes through. And the exhausted votes are none because there are two abstaining. What simply voting shows me is they show me the total of what one, so I see the two between here, plus the two here. So simply voting shows me four as the difference. It doesn't show me that the two were abstained. The voting receipts show me that the two were abstained. So, I'll lump the hiring ones all into one go. So as previously stated, I can't go into detail about individual, like candidates that we've seen or the justification for why they did not receive a position under HR policy. So, our CRO resigned way too close to the election for us to be able to fully advertise and go through a hiring process. That is point blank the answer. And the reason why I was selected to be CRO is because I oversee directly, supervise the CRO during the time of an election, the President calls the election, the CRO runs the election. So, because of that, I have access to the CRO transition document, and as their supervisor on the one that they would answer to in the event that they weren't there. So, I took on the hat of CRO. So, I cannot disclose when the CRO resigned specifically because that is a personal matter for themselves. So, it is also reflected the generalized date as reflected in previous meeting minutes. So, because of when the CRO resigned versus when the start of the election was the timeline was simply too short to be able to go through a hiring process. Now, the second part of that is in the event that I were to take on and fulfill the role of CRO I had to step away as President to do so, under the duties charge to the Vice President administration. This means that the Vice President administration takes on the role of president in the event that the President needs to be or isn't in a position where they cannot fulfill their role. So, because I was acting as CRO it means that Alex was fulfilling the role of president. Under the CRO contract, I am to have no direct contact with any of the candidates who are running in the election except to answer election specific questions. It's also noted explicitly in our meeting minutes that I stated that I would not be answering any campaign questions or assisting anyone in the election in any way shape or form beyond the duties typically charged to the CRO. To answer the CBA question, the CBA question states that we must fill the position through all possible avenues, but in the event that it is not filled, there is no specific indication about what can and cannot happen in that role. I will also say that in taking this position, I did not accept any form of wage that the CRO typically would have gotten. So, I did not sign on to become an employee of the Students Union beyond the role of president. So, because of that the CBA does not specify or indicate that I cannot fulfill that role. So that answers that those questions there. The next thing that I want to bring up is the idea of conflict of interest. I think that I stated that. When in that previous example, I did recuse myself from meeting and working with the candidates. I also explicitly stated that I'll be following to a tee what the CRO guidelines show. So, the only other thing that I was saying about conflict of interest, just in full transparency for everyone here is that I would like to remind you that you have no idea who or where I voted. So as a grad class, or as a person who is graduating, I am eligible to vote, I did vote in this election, and you don't know who or where I voted for. So, because of that you cannot make assumptions over who I voted to. I will only say that in regard to something that allegation that has been brought up against me as far as conflict of interest has concerned. Now, when it comes to prioritizing one voice over another, we are constrained by the relationship between the university’s list and our ability to cooperate it and work around that. So, it's in relationship between the university's policies and our ability to work around those. So as unfortunate as it is, we do not have any access or control over what the university does, or how they classify their students. So, because of that we have to work with the list that we are given. So that's the answer to that question. The next question that I will answer is the one that Patrice had raised about the percentage of people that we have voting in our elections. The answer to that is another unfortunate one for us as the Students Union, which is as an elected board, we have to rely on our elections, results and the election results are based off of how involved or interested the students are in the Students Union. So, we use the number of people that turn up at our elections as a way of gauging how we need to reach out to students what outreach we need, what further things we can do to engage with students, those results show us directly, who is interested in the SRC and who fills those slots. So, because of that, we can't put a cap or a minimum requirement or run an election, because if we did, then there's the potential that we wouldn't have seats filled in any capacity. And we can't run on appointments because appointments require an SRC in order to do so because of that we cannot set a minimum requirement for how many students need to vote in our elections to have an elected board. It's simply not possible given that the entire Students Union are elected. For the appeal and recall, since the three days have passed, the CRO has concluded. And because the CRO has concluded, there's no power or authority or anything that that position has over it, which means we are dealing with recall and appeal. And recall, under the appeal and recall section, we need 20% of all eligible voters to sign on to have a recall go forward. And I have the numbers already made for you. So, you know which numbers you need to hit. There's 1636 eligible voting members in this institution. 20% of that is 327. So that's the number of students that need to sign on to this in order for it to go forward. Now, this will need to be put to a vote before we can say that this is final. I will highlight that as needed within three weeks, which is the end of March. And the bylaws are under the recall section of our bylaws, which is directly following campaigning. So those are the numbers that you need to hit, and it needs to be hit by the end of March. So, this will need to be put to a vote of the SRC. In order for this to happen, and I'm specifying this not on the recall itself. But on a proposal that I have, which is that because the CRO contract has lapsed, that we waive the three-day requirement and have it put to the same as recall, that's a motion that must be made to the SRC which means that the appeal, the date specified for the appeal pushes from three days to the same as the recall date. So that means that rather than have three days to submit your appeal, you have until the end of March to submit your appeal, and that appeal will be submitted to the chair of the SRC because the CRO is not operational right now. So that is a proposal that I have to make once this discussion has concluded and the SRC has to vote in favor of it. Because no one person has the power to overturn what this election section says. Since the CRO is not there, that that means that we need to go through the SRC to make that extension.

Kryssonia: Ashley asked, could the position still not have been posted the CRO position?

Ty: So, the CRO position as it's been pointed out has been openly advertised this entire period of time.

Jessie-Lynn: Who decided that the President could just take over and not postpone the election?

Ty: Alex again, can you make sure that my citation of the bylaws is correct, but when an election needs to be called, it needs to happen within the first two weeks of March. So, again, Alex can drop in the specific, like citation of where that is. But it does mean that we have to have we are mandated to have our elections within the first two weeks of March. So, because of that, there is that time crunch that needs to happen based off of where it is in relation to where exam period starts. So that is where we have to have our elections. And the vote basically to become CRO is an exec matter. So, the executives were agreed that if I gave up my role of president for the period of the election, and followed the confidentiality, the conflicts of interests, clauses, and the specifications within the CRO contract, that I'd be able to fulfill it given us a tight timeline that we had to work with.

Ashely: I asked the question you were talking about your duties as CRO and your ability to do so would mean excusing yourself from working with the other members of the SEC. And so, I was just confirming when that have not been met, given that you are still in contact, not only with the SEC, but with a member who actually ran for valedictorian.

Ty: The answer to that is on all topics concerning the election. I did maintain that separation.

Precious: Are you allowed to vote as CRO?

Ty: The CRO is a full-time fee-paying member of the Students Union. So, the answer is yes.

Precious: Can you elaborate on why you were ruling the appeal void?

Ty: The CRO email is closed after the election. So, I did not have access to the CRO email after the election. The appeal appeared in my president inbox and my president inbox I accessed three days after the election. So, because the three days were not satisfied based on what was in my president inbox, that is where the appeal was deemed void. So okay, that's why.

Sydona: Can you cite the bylaws verbatim to see why an appeal does not apply to this and why you chose to refer to recall that instead?

Ty: So, the reason why it wasn't the appeal is because in my president inbox, which is where the appeal was sent to or where I saw the appeal was in the president inbox, it was past the three-day period. So that's why it flipped to recall instead.

Natalia: You did not answer my question regarding your statements to Precious, based on the values on democracy and how her vote would not be significant. Regardless of results, why would you say that to a student?

Ty: I'll give you two answers. I'll give you the answer that is based off of the way that our system works and then I will give you my personal answer. So based off of the system that we are working in, I do not have the ability to challenge or verify the voting list and under that system, it disqualifies that vote. My personal opinion is that this system clearly does not work, and amendments need to be made. Now how those amendments are made and when they are made by is based off of our SRC. And it's based off of where we are in the year. It's also based off of when elections are run. So, I don't know, when if or how these, these amendments can come through. But I do know that clearly there are places for improvements to be made.

Precious: So, I just have a question for Tyler. Again, he mentioned that the appeal was sent after three businesses days. Can you elaborate on that? Also, it doesn't say anywhere in the bylaws that the appeal has to be sent to him specifically, it has to be sent to the chair of the SRC. And the appellate board, which, as David mentioned, does not exist. So can they clarify on what basis he's really in this appeal void.

Ty: First of all, I'm gonna thank you Precious for correcting the pronoun use there. I really do appreciate it. The first part of that question is, again, the CRO email is closed after the election is finished. So, I had to go off of my president email. And under the president email, I did not receive notice of the appeal until like the time had lapsed basically. So, because of that, that's where it was rendered void. And whether or not it appeared in the CRO email or not, that is a different question. And I will need to basically get access to that email. So that is where that came from. If there was more to that question because I think there was probably a second part of that question, too. But I can only operate off of one thing at a time. So, if I did miss anything, please. Ask the second part of your question.

Precious: My second part was that it doesn't say anywhere in the bylaws that the appeal has to be sent to you as president. So according to the information I have, the chair of the SRC did receive the appeal on time. So, your point on the appeal, not coming in on time doesn't seem to hold?

Ty: So, the appeal, I believe it says CRO and org chair is where it goes. So, because it was operating on CRO that was where that comment came from. But I'll need to verify with our chair following the meeting when that was brought forward. And we will go off of when they received that email.

Ashely: I was just wondering why certain individuals were allowed to run despite blatant disrespect to other members of the student body. I was just wondering if you could address kind of my code of conduct question and why certain individuals were permitted to run for valedictorian, and despite blatant disrespect and in like, same thing with a confidentiality clause why that's allowing to hide disrespectful people on the union.

Ty: Okay, so the answer that question to the extent that I can answer it is that those concerns that were brought forward by those students were followed up with an HR proceeding, through a full HR committee process and it as deemed as like, I guess, addressed and fulfilled and because that process was followed through there is nothing through the Students Union that would prevent a good standing verdict, because the those procedures were followed. To answer the follow up question that I can foresee coming based off of an earlier comment, which was that there, there is an awareness of some people who are not in good standing with the Students Union that chose not to run, I am not aware of any of these students, nor were they brought to our attention through the nomination period. So, like in the event that there were additional people who would like to run for that, I would say that that was largely due to personal choice rather than a specific reference from the current board of the Students Union. I will say forward as well, anybody who had a question that was not answered during this time that you would like answered, please send me an email. And I will be happy to release a written statement to all of you at the conclusion of this meeting, answering the questions to the extent that I can. So that just in the efforts to keep within the time frame of us, please send your questions to my email, which is su\_president@su.ca. And I will answer them via a written statement.

Kryssonia: I have a question for Ty on behalf of the Aquinian. Yesterday in your interview with the Editor in Chief, you were asked about the material difference statement. You said you could only look at the numbers I knew stood by that statement. But in this meeting, you said that statement could be false. Why has this answer changed in the last 24 hours?

Ty: The answer to that is following this meeting, I decided to review the numbers once more. And look at not just the simply voting software, but also in in the voting receipts. So yeah, I would just say that I decided to go back through and do some due diligence and digging and that's where that answer has changed.

David: Hello, everybody. I would like to make a note on the recall section. The recall section is different from the appellate board section, and it is to challenge decisions, bylaws, and appointments of the SRC. I am challenging the decisions of the CRO, based on their negligence of duty, and conducting a fair election. Now, at no point when they were answering my questions did, they point out in the bylaws where it says only full-time students can vote. I have referred to the bylaws where it says that all members of the graduating class are responsible to vote for their valedictorian. Ty has said that it is not the responsibility of the university to conduct the elections. It is the CRO that runs the elections. Therefore, the burden is on the CRO to ensure that the burden lift is correct. Regardless of what the university gave to them, they should have done their due diligence in ensuring that the list was correct. Ty just pointed out that their statement changed because they did some due diligence, that that speaks that more due diligence needs to be done. In the case of this election. Ty also pointed out that as the person who is graduating that is eligible to vote, but apparently this is not the case for everybody who is graduating this year. And they also pointed out the general level of apathy. And this further indicates that if potential problems with the grad list, were there, it would very easily go under the radar for people who don't get these things in your email. And this speaks to a much bigger problem and this election.

Sydona: How was the appeal deemed void if it was not confirmed with the Chair of the time when it was sent? So that's my question.

Ty: Yeah, so the answer to that question is essentially that verification is needed. Further.

Victoria: I want the minutes to reflect my voice. I put my name forward. And I do not have control over who runs. I do not have control over who votes. And I do not have control over the outcome of the election. What is unfair is the bullying that I have endured over Facebook. The slander, and the personal attacks against me on social media is beyond unfair. The statements are not true. And they do not define who I am.

Kryssonia: I'm going to read a comment the comment that I missed before. It says if Roxanne, Precious and David No all voted that would have given David the edge in the race. So that clearly demonstrates the election was completely unfair.

Maria: I just wanted to note that in as I was saying, like Precious, asked Tyler to have her vote counted. And what I want to know Tyler, why haven't you shown any sympathy to that student. I believe that every vote counts, and you even directed the get out to vote campaign through the STUSU So why is suddenly the narrative changing when her vote suddenly doesn't matter. And I don't mean this in the sense of like counting votes and the results of the election but are actually like having her voice heard. And other students, I'm just choosing Precious because you told her that statement. And I don't mean this in a way to attack you because I truly thank you for the good that you've provided to the university. And I know that you've done some good, but I just, I just want to see some sympathy towards that student because her voice matters. And I am a firm believer of that. Thank you.

Ty: Thank you, Maria. So, the hardest part about this job is that I have students in one hand, and I have procedures in the other. When it comes to an election, the only thing really that I'm able to do is go off of procedure. And procedures very cold systems are very cold, they do not care who was in them. And they don't look beyond what the written word is. And in the case of STU, because it is such a small university what precedent states. Why I've chosen to operate on the like, what could be described as apathetic is that I'm based off of the fiduciary duty to the system and the bylaws. That's where that sense of empathy is coming from. As a student, as somebody who has been in a representative position for four years as someone who has, as you pointed out, participated in votes, like get out the vote campaigns, and has worked to serve students over my tenure here on campus. There's not one thing that everybody has said on this call that I don't disagree with. It's just my ability as a student and my opinions as a student does not and cannot change the way that that system works when you are charged with the ability with a duty to uphold it. It can't be pointed out that procedure is violated while also asking to violate procedure. Right? That's the dilemma that is being faced here. So where yes, the upholding of these systems is apathetic. And I apologize for that apathy. It's designed in such a way that the sympathy side of things does not necessarily have any grounds.

David: And I would also like to point out, because Ty said the appeal did not get to their email on time. According to the bylaws, it says three business days after the publishing of the election results. And I sent my appeal to their email on Monday. And I received a reply on Tuesday. Both of these are within the three business days time period. Therefore, the initial claim that the appeal was outside the stated time was false. I just wanted to point that out.

Ty: I don't like the word assimilate. But as a way of bringing all of these concerns kind of into one. Like, I guess conclusive or decisive motion forward. The action items that I see coming out of this will be, first of all to review when the appeal was submitted. That will be the first thing that happens. And that can happen by tomorrow. So, by tomorrow, that review will have taken place. In the event that that is satisfied, then obviously we will be following the bylaws, and we'll proceed through the appeals process. So that that's what will happen. In the event that that appeal has been satisfied. In the event that that appeal hasn't been satisfied, I will move the motion, that the date tied to the appeal of three business days be extended to the week, which means that you will have until I believe that right now, we are on the 20th. So, you'll have until the 25th to resubmit an appeal claim if this motion is carried. So that is the motion that I will raise for the SRC.

Sydona: I believe there can be a motion to extend the meeting for those who want to stay.

Ty: Yeah, I'll move this motion first. And then we'll have it passed. And then Syd you can move that motion afterwards, just to keep us on track.

Sydona: I do have a question. And it was also stated in the chat. Why is this motion being moved when he already satisfied the three-day requirement? I don't think it would be necessary.

Ty: So, the reason why I'm doing this is because I need to verify with our chair when that date was and that's happening after this meeting. So, in the event that that date wasn't satisfied, then as the seven days, if it has been verified, then this motion is there, just so that in the event that that didn't happen, it's extended.

**Motion has been moved by the President that it be resolved that the appeal process be extended from three business days to seven full days.**

**Seconded by Sydona C.**

**That motion has been approved by 9 present voting members of council.**

**Motion has been moved by the Vice President Education that it be resolved that the current meeting be extended for another hour and a half.**

**Seconded by Tyler M.**

**That motion has been approved by 7 present voting members of council with 1 abstention.**

Ashley: I just want to say kind of response to some things that have been said and whatnot. Obviously, I can only speak for myself. So, I'm not going to speak for anyone else. Right now. This is just my words for myself. I do want to say anything I've said in this meeting or publicly in any other way, I do have proof for the statements that I made. So please if anyone requires that for STUSU, or anything like that, I'm happy to provide. But of course, I also want to recognize that I don't I know I don't mean anything as a personal attack against anyone. And I just want to make sure that's very, very clear. Anyone in this meeting, or anyone not included in this meeting, I don't want any of my words be taken harshly against anyone. So, I just wanted to clarify that.

Jessie-Lynn: Hi. Like Ashley, I just want to point out that anything I've said in this meeting or in any other platform, I also do not mean to have personal attacks, I simply want to see all aspects of this election done fairly. And seeing the inaccuracies that we've seen in this election; I just want to shed light so that everybody knows kind of what's going on and being as transparent as possible so that we can have better results. And no voters vote kind of left unchecked. And they're all equal. And they all have information that can give them an informed vote as well. But also, if anybody were to need anything from me as well, for STUSU purposes, I also can provide statements.

Ashley: I was just wondering if anyone could clarify. I'm not sure who the best person would be for this. If it were to be determined that we were to have a re election, I was just wondering if anyone could clarify when that would be announced to the student body. And like, we have like a timeline for that. Like is there a time where which it would have to be announced by or anything? I hope that makes sense.

Ty: Alex. Please keep me in line if this is correct or not, I believe the appellant board is a two-week process. I think it's a two-week process, it might be one, I'm pretty sure it's two. So, if that happens, then once the decision of the appellant is made, then we are mandated to call the election. And that will follow the elections sequence of the bylaws. So, it will be right back to a reset. So, it will follow the election section of when the election needs to be called, how long nomination period will be all of that stuff. And I'll pass the floor to Alex to verify that length of time just for the record.

Sydona: Can we just confirm when the chair received the appeal letter now, and then begin the appeal process, because this is a very time sensitive matter. And if we continue to prolong it for too long, a lot can be lost, as we're really going close to the university being closed for the semester. So please, if that is able to be done, I would love to see that happen.

Ty: So, communication between staff and supervisor are confidential than the Students Union. But I will confirm that we will be verifying this at the conclusion of this meeting. So, an announcement will go out to the to the student who has raised this appeal by tomorrow morning.

Kryssonia: So, from the chat: so, can the President confirm that they dismissed the initial appeal without fully checking the facts first?

Ty: So, what I will say is that at the time of doing so the facts were as stated, but facts are subject to change. So as of right now, I suppose I will redact that statement until the verification happens later tonight.

Ashley: Just to clarify, are we are we trying to see when David's initial email was sent? Is that what we're looking at? And if so, would that also be confidential? I know how you mentioned that between staff and STUSU is confidential. But if David gives consent, are you able to check right now, when his email was sent? Again, I may have misunderstood so please correct me.

Ty: If the email is in a staff email and not sent to me, then my previous statement still stands. So, because it was sent to a staff email and not a representative email, then that's where my statement comes through.

Cindy: So, the President has to approve the appeal?

Ty: Yeah. It's not a question of who has to approve the appeal. It's a question of under the HR policy, I supervise the chair. So that's where that comes from? So, to answer that question, the President doesn't need to approve the appeal. But as the direct supervisor of the chair, it's a conversation that happens between staff and supervisor.

Precious: Wouldn't the conflict of interest come into play here? You're the president of the STUSU, and you acted as a CRO. And you just mentioned, you're the direct supervisor of the chair? Who hears Yep, you? Wouldn't the conflict of interests come into play here? And how are you going to address that?

Ty: So, conflicts of interest are typically, the way that those work is it's typically at the discretion of the individual. And then it's also at the discretion of the representative body. So, when at the time of the appellant board is struck, it will be that board's decision as to whether or not there is a conflict of interest, present. And I will state that the appellant board is also laid out in the bylaws of who the chair and co chairs are of that committee. So, in those proceedings, I do not believe that I would have any power or oversight and what the decisions of that would be.

Ashley: Yeah, um, just knowing that this is a time sensitive matter, I know the minutes will be posted. But I also know that there's a lag time between when they're actually posted. And as I do check them and they're usually like over a month old. So, it's usually like a month after the fact when we actually get to see them and given the time sensitive nature of this, it might happen after the re-election takes place. So, I was just wondering if we could answer it.

Alex: Seeing that we're going to get nowhere without information being verified. And due to our constraint with the CBA, I will now move a motion for in camera session to verify the appeal date.

Ty: So, what an in camera session is the opportunity to discuss and or like to discuss any topic without the presence of non SRC members, that includes the media, no motions or boats can be made while in camera and at the point that an in camera session is completed all those who are non SRC members are able to rejoin that meeting and a justification or summary of what happened in that meeting or in that in camera session is read. So, in the instance of a verification of a time, the exact time will not be specified but whether or not the bylaw is satisfied that will be given so it will be a satisfied or not satisfied verification.

Precious: I just wanted to kind of confirm something. Ty, you mentioned that you were the supervisor of the chair of the SRC. So, I just wanted to make it known that according to chapter four, the bylaws section two the supervisor of the SRC would be the VP admin, which is Alex, so she would have to confirm the time the email was sent, and not the president.

Alex: So, the direct supervisor of the CRO and the Chair is VP admin. However, as I was a candidate in this election, I could not be direct supervisor. Obviously, we have our GM Tina, in case we need an emergency supervisor.

Sydona: I wanted to know since David is the one submitting the appeal if he's able to stay within the in-camera session.

Alex: In camera sessions only allow SRC voting members and nonvoting members to be on board because we will not be moving any motions.

Precious: I would ask to clarify why an in-camera session is needed to decide on the appeal and to confirm the timeframe of the email.

Alex: Because it is needed to protect the confidentiality according to our CBA to protect employees from directly answering any questions that might not pertain to their jobs.

David: The appeal that I'm making is based on their job as the CRO. So, I believe that we should all be privy to that information. There is nothing that is going to be revealed that is going to jeopardize your ability to continue to do their job. And, yeah, I am the one that gave the information. And basically, I'm giving consent for everybody to know. And it seems like it's being hidden.

Alex: Yeah, unfortunately, I can't. But however, because it is a need to verify with our employees’ emails, there's information so characters are only between myself and are employed and to verify the date. So, we need that information with between the in-camera sections in order to protect the highest confidentiality with our employees.

David: I just wanted to ask if the supervisor Tina has been made known about these issues because if she is the one that was supposed to give oversight to the CRO while the VP Admin was a candidate and the CRO was negligent in their duties. I believe it should be made known of this of this issue. And I want to know if that has been the case especially because I've gotten responses about whether or not this should even go forward before this meeting has happened.

**Motion has been moved by the Vice President Administration that be it resolved that we move into an in-camera session to verify the time that the appeal was received.**

**Seconded by Ty M.**

**That motion has been approved by 9 present voting members of council.**

Kryssonia: Thank you for your patience, everyone. So, I'm just gonna give a summary of the in-camera session. So, under the motion for an in-camera session to verify whether the email was sent in the three days that was satisfied. An appellate board will be struck, and then a motion for an appeal will be done. The chair of that board will be our Recording Secretary Minahil Fatima. And the nominated appellate officers are Jason O'Hearn. And our international student representative Sony Phung. The board commences 24 hours after the conclusion of this meeting, and their work will go up for no more than 10 business days. I hope that summarizes what happened during our in-camera session. And on that note, we will go into the vote.

**Motion has been moved by the Vice President Administration that be it resolved that Jason O’Hearn’s nomination for Associate Appeal Officer be approved.**

**Seconded by Ty M.**

**That motion has been approved by 9 present voting members of council.**

**Motion has been moved by the President that be it resolved that Sony Phung’s nomination for Associate Appeal Officer be approved.**

**Seconded by Sydona C.**

**That motion has been approved by 9 present voting members of council.**

Ty: So, in the in-camera session, it was deemed that the appeal was satisfied. The appeal is concerning the result of the election specifically the valedictorian position. So, it goes to the appeal board. And the appeal board will independently decide whether or not the election results shall be voided. In the event that those election results are voided, a nomination period will be called. And we will be running it as though it was a brand-new election.

Kryssonia: And I just like to clarify as to why I am not acting as the chair of the appellate board. I was in David's campaign video. So due to conflict of interest, I'm not fit to assume that role. Just to avoid everything that we've been facing currently. There's a question for Ty; when will this potential election happen?

Ty: So, the election or the nomination period will open on the 28th with the VP Admin position.

Alex: In addressing the CRO and elections procedures since this covers my position. A new CRO will be selected. And this will be notified to the SRC board. I as VP admin will not receive any election procedures from now on.

Kryssonia: Could someone clarify the role of the appellate board? And whether the decision it makes will be made public?

Ty: So, the role of the appellant board is to examine what we have been talking about the topic of discussion today. And to determine whether or not the vote for the valedictorian should be deemed voided. Will it be made public? The answer to that is yes, it needs to in order for a nomination period to be called for a new election.

David: According to the bylaws, it is 10 days from the request of the appeal, not from when the board is made, the board is supposed to have been made in September. So, the fact that this was an oversight, this should not have to drag on longer. So basically, it should be five days left on based on the confirmation that you guys are made for when my appeal came.

Alex: The appeal board will determine the timeline of the election. You will be notified accordingly.

**8. Questions, Announcements & Notices**

Sydona: I would just like to take the time to thank each and everyone of you for attending and sharing their concerns with us. I hear that this election has caused you harm and I want you to know your feelings are valid. I apologise on behalf of my myself and any other SRC member that feels the same way. We are here to represent you and your voices and votes matter. Every single one. This conversation was centered around policies and bylaws and lacked the recognition and understanding of your humanity that must have been afforded. So, your feeling of frustration is valid, and I hope we can rebuild trust throughout the rest of my term.

## **9. Adjournment**

Motion for adjournment was moved by Alex N.

Seconded by ­­Victoria Y.

Motion for adjournment was carried.

Adjournment at 8:40 pm.

**Submission:**

The minutes were respectfully submitted to the Vice-President of Administration on March 22th, 2022.

Minahil Fatima

su\_secretary@stu.ca

Recording Secretary

STUSU Student Representative Council