



Student Representative Assembly Meeting 19Q
Sunday, February 23, 2020 at 5:00pm
Council Chambers, GH111

Called to Order at 5:02pm

CALL OF THE ROLL

Present	Alkashef, Dawdy, Figueiredo, Della-Vedova, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Homs, Hu, Jangra, Johnston, Marando, McDermott, Mesic, Reddy, Sarhan, Singh, Sinnige,
Absent Excused:	
Absent	Belliveau, De Fazio, Grewal, Hankins, Hassan, Kampman, Kaur, Lee, Pagnello, Thind, Zhang
Late	Alam, Au-Yeung, Enuiyin, Mohamed, Zheng
Others Present:	Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Adeola Egbeyumi (MSU Member), Angel Huang (AVP (PFA)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Ryan Tse (OPIRG), Tanya Brkic (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjan (OPIRG), V. Scott (Recording Secretary)
Chair	Maryanne Oketch

TERRITORY RECOGNITION

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

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by Figueiredo, seconded by Homs that the Assembly adopt the agenda, as presented.

Amendment

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Marando to add "Open one (1) Seat on the AVP (Internal Governance) Hiring Committee" to Business.

Vote on Amendment

Passes Unanimously

Amendment

Moved by Marando, **seconded** by Johnston to strike "Open one (1) SRA on MSU Governance and You Committee"

- Marando stated that the committee was inactive this year.

Vote on Amendment

Passes Unanimously

Amendment

Moved by Hu, **seconded** by Sinnige to add "OPIRG" to Delegation from the Floor

- Hu stated that OPIRG approached them and wanted to present some new information and clarify the timeline and bylaw situation.
- Marando asked for clarification on 'bylaw situation'.

- Hu explained that OPIRG would like to show information that shows that OPIRG was actually in compliance with the bylaw.
- Figueiredo stated that as per the ruling by the Speaker, the Finance Committee gets to make the call on if Bylaw 5 has been complied with. She added that any information on how the group did or did not comply wasn't germane to the motion discussed.
- Johnston thought that it wasn't appropriate to amend the agenda last minute with last minute information. They stated that the Speaker already ruled that the Finance Committee did their job correctly and that OPIRG doesn't need a third delegation.
- Hu stated that they were there to represent their constituents and would like to add this to the agenda. They felt it was important to hear what OPIRG had to say.
- Figueiredo appreciated the thought of representing constituents but if there was new information why was it not presented to the Finance Committee when making the decision.
- Hackett agreed with Figueiredo and felt that this wasn't fair to the other groups who presented as OPIRG had their chance to delegate. Hackett added that unless a decision or subsequent motion was to be added to the agenda it didn't make sense to have the delegation.
- Homsí felt that since the group was already at the meeting, why not let them present.
- Marando thought groups were supposed to present all the information they had at the original delegation and that it wasn't about coming back with new information. Marando didn't feel comfortable knowing that and allowing sequential release of new information to come as the process goes on, all the information should have been given at the original delegation.
- Johnston agreed with the Board. They felt that this was inappropriate as nothing was said to the AVP (Finance), Finance Committee, or themselves about what the new information was. Johnston felt that it wasn't right to throw this on the agenda and adding it to the agenda last minutes was bypassing due process.
- Jangra ceded to Suren*. Suren stated that the rationale for the referendum has changed so it would be worthwhile to listen to OPIRG.
- Mesic agreed with Homsí and thought that if OPIRG was already here they should listen to what they have to say.

Vote on Amendment

Moved by Hu, **seconded** by Sinnigie to add "OPIRG" to Delegation from the Floor

In Favour: 9 Opposed: 8 Abstentions: 1

Opposed: Marando, Figueiredo, Hackett, Alkeshef, Ganesalingan, McDermott, Dawdy

Abstained: Sarhan

Motion Passes

Amendment

Moved by Hackett, seconded by Marando to add "Committee of the Whole – OUSA" to Business.

- Hackett stated that this will provide a quick update and shouldn't take long.

Vote on Amendment

Passes Unanimously

Amendment

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Marando to strike Business Item #7

- Marando stated that they can't close a seat that won't be open.

Vote on Amendment

Passes Unanimously

Vote to Adopt

Moved by Figueiredo, seconded by Homsy that the Assembly adopt the agenda, as amended.

Passes Unanimously

ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

- The Speaker welcomed everyone to the meeting. They apologized for being sick. The Speaker reminded the Assembly that when speaking during discussions to speak through the Chair. They asked everyone to clean up after themselves and that guests to please sign the observer's list.

DELEGATION FROM THE FLOOR

Set Parameters

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

- Johnston felt that this would be more than enough time.
- Hackett agreed.

Vote on Parameters

Passes Unanimously

1. **OPIRG – Tanya Brkic, Mateo Orrantia, Sarun Balaranjun, and Ryan Tse presented (presentation circulated)**

- OPIRG went over their presentation with the Assembly.

Questions

- Marando asked why they didn't have access to their McMaster email. Orrantia stated that when the staff was laid off, they didn't give OPIRG the password. Brkic added that it was a process with IT as well trying to get the information.
- Johnston stated that they would like to point out that the only contact on the website was the McMaster email and has since been on there before the meetings. They added that during this process nothing was ever communicated that the MSU was using the wrong email. Johnston asked why OPIRG was just mentioning now that they didn't have access and how was this relevant. Orrantia responded that they didn't know they had to tell the MSU and because they didn't know the MSU was emailing the account. Orrantia asked why would OPIRG bring this up. Brkic added that they only received the MSU's email when Shelley forwarded it. Orrantia added that both emails were online, one was for the Board and the other was for resources.
- Figueiredo asked when speaking about the agenda, why wasn't the Vice-President (Finance) or the Finance Committee notified about this before. Orrantia responded that OPIRG tried emailing the Speaker and didn't know how to get added, and the Speaker said it was okay but then they received another email saying they needed an SRA member to add them.
- Johnston stated that the miscommunication wasn't due to the bylaw infraction, and that OPIRG was misinterpreting what happened to the other groups. They explained that this had to do with the

correspondence, sending over numerous budgets, and nothing current being online. Johnston added that even when OPIRG came in December to present there were items presented that weren't even circulated to the Finance Committee, and that was where the bylaw infraction came from. Johnston explained that by looking at OPIRG's meeting minutes they knew that they had to make a plan to be financially transparent and asked why OPIRG wasn't financially transparent already. Brkic stated that they will be for the future ones. Orrantia stated that they knew they should have sent everything before the meeting, but it was posted online.

- Mesic asked why OPIRG didn't just ask the previous staff what the passwords were for the emails when knowing this would be the main form of communication. Orrantia responded that they did ask the staff, but they weren't responsive.
- Figueiredo asked OPIRG to communicate as to why multiple budgets were sent back and forth. Orrantia responded that the original budget circulated was passed at their last AGM, which had predicated a 50% opt-out rate, and that when they received the actual numbers it was re-done to reflect that.
- Marando asked OPIRG what they felt were the previous violations if not because of financial transparency issues. Orrantia stated that at the December 8 SRA meeting, when Finance Committee gave the recommendations, there was nothing about Bylaw 5 stated and that since then other items have been added. Orrantia added that they felt that those issues were addressed at that first SRA meeting but then another memo came out/
- Sinnige asked if there were office hours for the Finance Committee to come by and contact OPIRG. Orrantia stated that they did have office hours, but they were limited.
- Au-Yeung asked if this information was posted on their website. Orrantia responded that it was.

REPORT PERIOD

- 1. First Year Council – report attached**
- 2. Health Sciences Caucus – Alam presented**
 - Alam summarized the report.
- 3. Humanities Caucus – report not circulated**
 - Humanities Caucus was not present to report.
- 4. Kinesiology Caucus – report circulated**
 - Zheng summarized the report.
- 5. Provincial and Federal Affairs Committee – Huang presented**
 - Huang summarized the report.
- 6. Finance Committee – Anderson presented**
 - Anderson summarized the report.
- 7. Executive Board – Homsy presented**
 - Homsy summarized the report.

8. Vice-President (Finance) – Johnston presented

- Johnston summarized the report.

INFORMATION PERIOD

- Hackett let the Assembly know that AVP hiring was happening soon, and that the deadline to apply was extended to next week, Sunday. Hackett stated that next week was Policy Con and that they will circulate the locations, times, and graphics soon. They stated that this was very important to attend and cannot emphasize it enough.
- Singh updated the Assembly on how their project was going. They stated that Johnston got back to them about the solar panels needing lights and connectors, and that it arrived in the MSU office. Singh stated that they will still need to get batteries but has secured funding for that through an external organization.
- Johnston reminded everyone that special projects funding still has some money and has been allocated for SRA only. Johnston added that if anyone is looking for donations or sponsorships to apply through the Sponsorship & Donations Committee.

QUESTION PERIOD

- No questions were asked.

BUSINESS

1. Recess into MSU Incorporated

Moved by Marando, **seconded** by Hackett that the Assembly recess to move into a meeting of the full members of MSU Incorporated.

Passes Unanimously

Recessed at 6:01pm
Called to Order at 6:13pm

CALL OF THE ROLL

Present	Alam, Alkashef, Au-Yeung, Dawdy, Enuiyin, Figueiredo, Della-Vedova, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Homsj, Hu, Jangra, Johnston, Marando, McDermott, Mesic, Mohamed, Pagniello, Reddy, Sarhan, Singh, Sinnige
Absent Excused:	
Absent	Belliveau, De Fazio, Grewal, Hankins, Hassan, Kampman, Kaur, Lee, Thind, Zhang
Late	Zheng
Others Present:	Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Adeola Egbeyumi (MSU Member), Angel Huang (AVP (PFA)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Ryan Tse (OPIRG), Tanya Brkic (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjun (OPIRG), V. Scott (Recording Secretary)
Chair	Maryanne Oketch

2. Open SRA seat on Municipal Affairs Committee

Moved by Johnston, **seconded** by Hackett that the Assembly open one (1) SRA seat on the Municipal Affairs Committee.

Passes Unanimously

3. Open SRA seat on First Year Council

Moved by Marando, **seconded** by Johnston that the Assembly open one (1) SRA seat on First Year Council.

- Marando stated that there was a seat open and they need to fill it.

Vote on Motion

Passes Unanimously

4. Close SRA seat on Municipal Affairs Committee

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Marando that the Assembly close one (1) SRA seat on the Municipal Affairs Committee.

- Hackett stated that this was a great committee.

Nominations

- Zheng nominated themselves

Vote on Motion

Passes Unanimously

- Zheng won the SRA seat on the Municipal Affairs Committee by acclamation.

5. Close SRA seat on First Year Council

Moved by Figueiredo, **seconded** by Marando that the Assembly close one (1) SRA seat on First Year Council.

- Marando stated that there wasn't an attendance requirement as they were just an observer.

Nominations

- Sarhan nominated themselves

Vote on Motion

Passes Unanimously

- Sarhan won the SRA seat on the First Year Council by acclamation.

6. Rescind Bylaw 7/B – Academic Affairs Council

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Figueiredo that the Assembly rescind Bylaw 7/B – Academic Affairs Council.

- Hackett went over the memo with the Assembly.
- Singh asked if the goal of the council was to allow better communication between the other advocacy bodies of McMaster and the MSU. Singh ceded their time to Hackett.

- Hackett responded that this council meets on a month basis, but the bylaw was vague on the direction. They correct Singh and stated that it was for faculty societies, not McMaster departments. Hackett explained that the AVP University Affairs chairs the meeting, and UA currently has different priorities.
- Marando stated that President's Council will still exist, and it provides a good medium to communicate with faculty societies. They explained that at the Council the Presidents get updated and provide feedback.

Vote on Motion

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Figueiredo that the Assembly rescind Bylaw 7/B – Academic Affairs Council.

Passes Unanimously

7. Rescind Bylaw 7/C – Financial Affairs Council

Moved by Johnston, **seconded** by Figueiredo that the Assembly rescind Bylaw 7/C – Financial Affairs Council.

- Johnston went over the memo with the Assembly. They stated that they did try to work within the parameters of the bylaw this year due to SCI but nothing has come of the meetings.
- Au-Yeung asked if there was a bylaw mandating that they continue to reach out to faculties at the beginning of the school year and continue the mission. Au-Yeung ceded their time to Johnston.
- Johnston responded that their job was to work with students and if someone comes with a question it will be answered. They stated that there wasn't anything mandating the position to reach out.

Vote on Motion

**In Favour: 22 Opposed: 0 Abstentions: 0
Motion Passes**

8. Open SRA seat on AVP (Internal Governance) Hiring Committee

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Figueiredo that the Assembly open one (1) SRA seat on the AVP (Internal Governance) Hiring Committee.

- Figueiredo stated that they need to hire a new AVP, hopefully the beginning of March. They stated that this time commitment will happen between the hours of 9am-5pm.

Vote on Motion

Passes Unanimously

9. Committee of the Whole – OUSA

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Johnston that the Assembly move into Committee of the Whole to discuss OUSA.

Passes Unanimously

Moved by Hackett, **seconded** by Homsy that the Assembly move out of Committee of the Whole and to Rise and Report.

Passes Unanimously

Rise and Report

- Hackett reported that based on the conversation held, the Assembly has a clear direction on whether to leave OUSA or not. Hackett stated that they will be inviting OUSA to the March 22 SRA meeting and will have OUSA present on how they are changing advocacy efforts, other groups, budgeting, and speak to advocacy wins.

NEW BUSINESS

Moved by Au-Yeung, **seconded** by Sinnige that the Assembly consider adding the following motion to New Business: “**Moved** by Au-Yeung, **seconded** by _____ that the Assembly reconsider the motion to send OPIRG McMaster to referendum”

- Au-Yeung stated that based on the presentation the Assembly was given new information and thought that they should add it to the agenda.
- Figueiredo stated that no new information was brought forward, and that the Assembly didn't learn anything new. They stated as per the Speaker's ruling Finance Committee made the decision within the scope of their duties.
- Hackett agreed with Figueiredo and stated that they felt there wasn't enough time to make a decision. They explained that they only just found out about this recently and didn't think it was fair to make a rash decision. They stated that the Assembly should be doing due process.
- Della-Vedova stated that there would be more people at the next meeting.
- Marando stated that they personally liked OPIRG and would like for the fee to stay but felt that Bylaw 5 was clear and that the information presented didn't convince them that there was anything new to be considered. Marando added that they shouldn't be contravening bylaws and felt that the whole premise of reconsidering the original motion was contravening the bylaws of the organization.
- Johnston stated that the Assembly shouldn't be adding this to the agenda and that they've already had a lengthy debate.
- Sinnige stated that they could add this to New Business and then discuss the merits of reconsideration.
- Homsy agreed with Hackett and didn't think it should be rushed. They added that if the Assembly was still interested in this then it should be brought forward to the next meeting for transparency.
- Mesic asked if the promotions for the referendum already been circulated.
- Scott responded that they have been.
- Singh stated that this was the last meeting before the voting process begins and if they were to make a decision it would be good to do so.
- Marando addressed Mesic's question that promotion of the referendum is happening, but campaigning hasn't happened yet.
- Au-Yeung asked what the appeals process would look like for a referendum.
- The Speaker responded that they can't appeal a referendum result.
- Pagnello stated that this is all the more reason to add this to the agenda as it was time sensitive. They stated that the MSU should be considering the position with OPRIG and the relationship with them.
- Mesic stated that since they couldn't speak about this at the next meeting it would be better to address this now.

Vote to Consider

In Favour: 19 Opposed: 0 Abstentions: 3
Abstained: Figueiredo, Johnston, Dawdy
Motion Passes

1. Motion to Reconsider "OPIRG Referendum"

Moved by Au-Yeung, **seconded** by Hu that the Assembly reconsider the motion to send OPIRG McMaster to referendum.

- Hu stated that since there was differing opinions they should re-consider.
- Marando stated that while they would like to keep the fee, they don't think that the Assembly should be reconsidering the motion as it would go against their own bylaws. Marando stated that the ruling was that the Finance Committee got to decide if the bylaw has been broken.
- Johnston stated that they didn't think that the Assembly needs to reconsider this motion. They explained that 4.5 months has been spent on this and there were countless back and forth, and that there was evidence that OPIRG hadn't abided by the bylaw. Johnston explained that this wasn't based off of the email conversations but because OPIRG wasn't being financially transparent with the student at large, and their website didn't have a version of the budget that wasn't current or up to date. Johnston added that OPIRG sent Finance Committee multiple versions of the budgets and hasn't been transparent. They explained that Finance Committee worked very hard on this. Johnston reminded the Assembly that this wasn't based on the merits of OPIRG, as they do great work, but the Assembly were the arbiters of Bylaw 5 and the MSU needs to hold groups accountable and the University was holding the MSU to it. They stated that it was important that the Assembly does their due diligence. Johnston stated that there was no new information to merit reconsideration. They added that the organization has known about this bylaw since 2014 and has gone through the exact process every year.
- Pagniello stated that there were two things at stake, and it depends on what the Assembly valued more. They asked if it was upholding the bylaw or looking at the greater good of OPIRG. They stated that they are the ones with the power and having to understand the collective good and it was still democratic of the Assembly to reconsider the referendum and the effects it will have on student activism.
- Figueiredo stated that the SRA were stewards of the MSU, and part of that role was upholding the bylaws. They stated that being part of a democratic society was allowing students to pick and choose, and that they shouldn't reconsider a motion when no new information has come forward as it goes against the goals as MSU members to ensure that the MSU was operating in accordance. Figueiredo stated that OPIRG does great work and that's on the students' choice.
- Hackett stated that in terms of conversations about democracy and reconsidering, they didn't think the vote should be had right now as the original vote was very close, down to a few members of the SRA. They felt that it would be undemocratic to have the same motion brought forward when they didn't have a full Assembly. Hackett stated that they would feel differently about it if they hadn't already opened up the nomination period for the referendum and told students they would have a choice. Hackett stated that it was undemocratic by voting on it and then two weeks later changing their minds and taking away the right to vote. They explained that anyone was allowed to sign up for a campaign team and impose a value judgement.
- Mesic stated that they didn't think that the Assembly should be going against the bylaw or constitution. They felt that there was evidence that OPIRG has organizational issues. Mesic stated that they had more of an issue of when the referendum was happening and felt that there wouldn't be enough attention. Mesic asked how does the Assembly ensure students are able to see that OPIRG was going to referendum. Mesic ceded their time to Johnston.
- Johnston responded that it will be promoted through Elections, and everyone can share their social media posts. Johnston added that anyone could register for a side and help that way to communicate to the student body at large. Johnston explained that it wasn't up to the Assembly to decide if students want to engage or not.
- Hu ceded to Sarun Balaranjun. Balaranjun felt that there was a lot of talk about violating the bylaw issue when it should be able them fixing it.
- Marando stated that the premise of reconsidering a motion was if there was new information, and they don't have it. They stated that the whole part of the presentation was that OPIRG didn't break the bylaw,

but the conversation wasn't about that. They stated that it's up to Finance Committee to decide if they broke the bylaw and it wasn't up to the Assembly to determine whether it was broken or not. Marando stated that the Assembly can't just change the argument on what fits best and what works. They pointed out that they have spent a lot of time defending the SRA about how they follow the bylaw and constitution, and working with members of the SRA piecing through the bylaws and defending them because decisions made have been in line with that, and Marando doesn't know if this was happening right now. They stated that the Assembly can't assume that they were sending OPIRG off to receive an automatic no, and that they had a referendum about the bus pass that was hundreds of dollars and the most expensive option won. Marando added that it was the responsibility of third-party fees to communicate what they do with students' money, which is why Marando felt that the Assembly shouldn't reconsider the motion. They explained that if SRA members want to be part of a campaign team, they can take their LOA and join the yes side. Marando personally felt that it wasn't appropriate to reconsider and didn't think it was fair that no new information was brought forward. Marando ceded the rest of their time to Johnston.

- Johnston wanted to bring light to the fact that they have had a lengthy debate about this and they need to stick to the bylaws. They agreed that no new information was brought forward, and if there was new information it would be worrisome. Johnston felt that they have done their due diligence.
- Homsy asked about the Finance Committee.
- Marando responded that it was up to the Finance Committee to determine if OPIRG broke the bylaw, and the Speaker interpreted this on request at the last meeting. Marando explained that because OPIRG broke the bylaw it was recommended to go to referendum. They added that the recommendation up for debate was sending them to referendum, not if OPIRG broke the bylaw.
- Reddy ceded to Tanya Brkic. Brkic stated that the items mentioned during the presentation wasn't presented at the last meeting, after reviewing the livestream and during the meeting when the original budget was done.
- Singh stated that they weren't at the last meeting, but they could see the staff at OPIRG having a hard time adjusting but the Finance Committee found relevant information as to why they weren't keeping to the bylaw.
- Reddy stated that they felt that the punishment being handed to them is asking if they should go or stay. They felt that they should discuss reconsidering the motion because it feels uncomfortable because it wasn't transparent.
- The Speaker stated that the discussion as getting circular.
- Au-Yeung thanked everyone for letting the motion pass to add this to the agenda. They stated that OPIRG showed proof that the bylaw wasn't broken, and that the budget was submitted four days late and OPIRG noted there were circumstantial issues, and it doesn't seem like this will be on-going in future years. Ayu-Yeung added that OPIRG mentioned that they had office hours that they could have been contacted through.
- Johnston addressed some of the issues pointed out. They explained that the AVP (Finance) and members of the Finance Committee did try going to the OPIRG office and found no one there. Johnston added that there was nothing to force the Assembly to make this decision, the bylaw says that Finance Committee was to recommend and the SRA to debate sending to referendum. Johnston stated that they talked at length and there were more folks who wanted to send it to referendum than those who didn't.
- Mestic stated that they weren't here at the last meeting, but it seems given the situation they can't go back as the conversation already happened. They felt that their hands were tied as timing wasn't good. They stated that they don't agree that OPIRG should be going to referendum and couldn't share those sentiments at the last meeting, but they have to let students decide this.
- Figueiredo stated that no new information was presented and doesn't warrant a new conversation about sending OPIRG to referendum or not.

Moved by McDermott, **seconded** by Enuiyin to Call to Question

Vote to Call to Question

In Favour: 13 Opposed: 4 Abstentions: 3
Opposed: Marando, Della-Vedova, Hu, Homsi
Abstained: Figueiredo, Johnston, Reddy
Motion Fails

- Hackett stated that there were three things they wanted to discuss. This decision was made at the previous meeting and the motion they agreed upon were the terms. Hackett explained that the decision put forward was having two options of keeping the fee or getting rid of it, and at any point the SRA could have amended the motion. They stated that they wanted to also reference the role of SRA members in terms of committees. Hackett stated that they need to remember that the point was to delegate responsibility to the committees. Hackett wanted to note that Finance Committee was elected by the SRA and that they have an official ruling that the bylaw was broken.
- Johnston stated that OPIRG was aware since November 29 of the recommendation to send to referendum. They explained what took so long was discussing the terms, and having discussions with the union. Johnston pointed out that in terms of being aware of the process OPIRG and the Assembly were aware of the recommendation, and that they had two months notice.
- Della-Vedova asked if OPIRG reached out to ask for an extension. Della-Vedova ceded their time to Johnston.
- Johnston responded that there was nothing received from the AVP (Finance) or Finance Committee. They explained that OPIRG were contacts in October and there was no response or communication.

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

Vote to Call to Question

In Favour: 20 Opposed: 2 Abstentions: 1
Opposed: Marando, Della-Vedova
Abstained: Figueiredo
Motion Passes

Vote to Reconsider

Moved by Au-Yeung, **seconded** by Hu that the Assembly reconsider the motion to send OPIRG McMaster to referendum.

In Favour: 7 Opposed: 9 Abstentions: 6
Opposed: Marando, Figueiredo, Johnston, Hackett, Alkeshaf, Ganesalingan, McDermott, Alam, Dawdy
Abstained: Della-Vedova, Zheng, Mesic, Jandra, Homsi, Mohamed
Motion Fails

TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Sunday, February 23, 2020
5:00pm
Council Chambers, GH 111

CALL OF THE ROLL

Present

Alam, Alkashaf, Au-Yeung, Dawdy, Enuiyin, Figueiredo, Della-Vedova, Ganesalingan, Hackett, Homsi, Hu, Jangra, Johnston, Marando, McDermott, Mesic, Mohamed, Pagnello, Reddy, Sarhan, Singh, Sinnige, Zheng

Absent Excused:

Absent Belliveau, De Fazio, Grewal, Hankins, Hassan, Kampman, Kaur, Lee, Thind, Zhang

Late

Others Present: Jess Anderson (AVP (Finance)), Adeola Egbeyumi (MSU Member), Angel Huang (AVP (PFA)), Mateo Orrantia (OPIRG), Ryan Tse (OPIRG), Tanya Brkic (OPIRG), Sarun Balaranjun (OPIRG), V. Scott (Recording Secretary)

Chair Maryanne Oketch

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Singh, **seconded** by Reddy that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion Passes by General Consent

Adjourned at 8:04pm

/vs

DRAFT