

## **Student Societies Summit**

**Meeting #7 –January 27, 2014, Governing Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall**

### **Attendance:**

**Faculty Summit Members:** Prof. Joe Desloges (Chair), Prof. Donald Ainslie, Prof. Linda White, Prof. Graham White

**Student Participants:** Yolen Bollo-Kamara (UTSU), Anges So (UTSU), Melissa Theodore (UTMSU), Dylan Chavin Smith (ASSU), Mauricio Curbelo (EngSoc), Thomas Santerre (EngSoc), David Bastien (MedSoc), Craig Maniscalco (NCSC), Alex Zappone (SMCSU), Benjamin Crase (TCM), Maha Naqi (TCM), Ryan Phillips (UCLit), Jelena Savic (VUSAC), Rhys Smith (WCSA), Michael Amiraslani (WCSA)

**Administration:** Prof. Jill Matus (Vice-Provost, Students & First-Entry Divisions), David Newman (Director, Student Life), Meredith Strong (Director, Office of the Vice-Provost, Students and Student Policy Advisor)

**Regrets:** Anthony O'Brien (KPEUA), Teresa Maida (STU), Peter Flynn (SLS)

### **Welcome**

Prof. Desloges welcomed all participants to the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Summit. The focus of this, and future meetings, is to get feedback and responses from participants on a series of direct questions formulated by the Faculty Summit Members based on the discussions thus far. The questions were circulated in advance of the meeting, in hopes that representatives would get feedback from their respective constituencies. It is anticipated that it will take the next couple of meetings to get through the series of questions; however discussion will be limited to approximately 10 minutes per item.

### **Summit membership, submissions and consultation process**

The Faculty Summit Members have met with some Summit Representatives offline and continue to make themselves available for these meetings. Participants wishing to meet with the faculty members are asked to make their requests directly to Prof. Desloges. Participants were also reminded that submissions are still welcome and any received will be posted to the Portal. [Note: please send submissions to David Newman at david.newman@utoronto.ca]

### **Introduction to key discussion points**

The following points were discussed, guided by the questions below:

## 1. 3-campus Student Governance Structure and Membership

### a. UTSG, UTM and UTSC

- i. Should each campus host its own student society?
  - There was general agreement that students on each campus should have their own student society; UTSU and UTMSU noted that they are separate organizations and find ways to work together.
  - There was agreement that many services should be provided locally on each campus.
- ii. For a bi-campus structure, what should the membership (voting) structure and fee arrangements be?
  - Participants agreed in principle, that members have a right to vote if they pay fees to a student society.
  - Issues surrounding the fee transfer agreement between UTSU and UTMSU were then discussed. The details of the contract surrounding the fee transfer agreement were unavailable; however several participants expressed concerns that UTM members are given full voting rights for UTSU with fees diverted to UTMSU for operations.
- iii. How can fairness be ensured when two-campus campaigning can be extremely challenging for full-time students?
  - Primary concerns identified by participants include the participation of non-U of T people in supporting campaigns.
- iv. What activities are most efficiently run by a bi-campus group?
  - There was discussion as to what services can be effectively delivered on each campus and what services can be effectively delivered from a central location via the internet or other means.
  - Advocacy on student-related issues was highlighted as something that needs more support than can be delivered at the divisional level.

### b. Second-entry professional students?

- i. Is there a sufficient common interest to allow for interest 'taxation' (mandatory ancillary fees)?
  - There was general acceptance that second-entry professional students have distinct interests that should be considered.

## 2. Electoral processes and Student Society leadership.

- a. What is the appropriate form of oversight (arms-length election overseers)?

- b. What counts as fairness in terms of openness and competition in election?
- c. Should executive or non-executive candidates be allowed (or encouraged) to run in slates?
- d. Should non-U of T students play a role in campaigns?
- e. How should candidates be funded or otherwise supported?
- f. What is an appropriate campaign length?
- g. Should student leaders be actively enrolled in academic programs?
- h. How best to avoid partisanship of a kind that would override other representational concerns?
  - Many student societies shared the processes by which their CROs are selected, including identifying the strategies they use to minimize bias.
  - Some student societies have appeals committees that vary in composition including executives, former leaders, and in some cases, University administrators.
  - Varied opinions were expressed around whether or not slates should be allowed, but all agreed that candidates should be voted as individuals.

The next meeting will continue the discussion on the questions provided.

**Next meeting dates/times (will re-poll membership to assist with maximum participation)**

Monday, February 10, 2:00-4:00pm

Wednesday, March 5, 1:00-3:00pm (tentative)

Thursday, March 13, 10:00-12:00pm (tentative)