

AGENDA – 16th UNBSU Council Meeting

UNB Student Union 2019/20

April 5, 2020; 7:00 via Google Meet

Not Present: Adarshna Chhetri



1. Call to Order

1.1 Roll Call

Chair Gill performs roll call.

Chair Gill calls the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mover: Lutes

Seconder: McMillan

Vote passes unanimously.

3. Chair's Remarks

Council Chair, Gill, makes her remarks by saying "this is our last meeting and it was great working with everybody this term! It was a great experience and I hope everyone had a good time!"

4. Approval of Previous Minutes

Fazio: "In 5.2, we spoke about the reasoning for not releasing the unredacted version, at that point. I think it is important to include that information in the minutes."

Motion to amend the previous minutes and add the discussion regarding not releasing the unredacted report, in section 5.2.

Mover: Mangusso

Seconder: Jefferies

Vote passes unanimously.

Gill: "The reason why the Appeal Board called for confidentiality and to not release the unredacted report, which included the complainants names, was because, at the time that the decision was made, the Board did not know who the complainants were and if they were currently on council or

coming on council next year. It was in the best interest to keep the names and the unredacted report private, to prevent a potential conflict of interest on next year's council."

Brimicombe: "In section 5.2, when I had made my statements about the Instagram stories, there is a piece missing about what I said about trying to keep in mind that we are not all directly involved in the situation and some biases were started to come out, so I would like to ensure that is included in the minutes to reflect what I said."

Motion to amend the previous minutes and add Brimicombe's full comment, in section 5.2.

Mover: Brimicombe

Secunder: Mangusso

Vote passes unanimously.

Motion to amend the previous minutes and change the word prosperity to posterity in section 5.2.

Mover: Lutes

Secunder: Mangusso

Vote passes unanimously.

Motion to approve the amended minutes.

Mover: Brimicombe

Secunder: Lutes

Vote passes unanimously. Sean Mackenzie and Kelsi Evans abstain.

5. Substantive Business

5.1 Faculty Councillor Updates

Science Councillor, Mackenzie Brimicombe will be posting the application for the Science Society executive team. She will post in the council group and asks that people share the link.

Law Councillor, Chris Lutes updates that Policy Committee met for last time. Almost at the end of the semester!

Computer Science Councillor, Sean Mackenzie, has been keeping students up to date with the university's decisions and answering questions. He has also been transitioning with Craig Fernandez.

Renaissance College Councillor, Olivia Penney, updates that the RCS elections are complete, and she has been in contact with Xiuming Shi, who is filling her position next year.

Nursing Councillor, Emily McMillan saw a post on the 4th year nursing page that they are not getting much explanation or direction regarding COVID-19. They are looking to get their license, which they cannot do until they have received a certificate of graduation. Additionally, the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX), which are required to become a registered nurse, are done in person and are postponed. Not much direction from the Dean or faculty members regarding how to proceed, so she will reach out and try to gain clarity for the 4th year nursing students.

Fernandez: “This topic came to senate and everyone was under the understanding that you will get your certificate of graduation as soon as possible and hopefully be able to enter the workforce.”

McMillan: “We have heard of that, but it has been more hearsay, as they have not reached out to us about that. UNBSJ students have already been given their temporary license because their leadership class was last semester. The NCLEX are not too important because we can practice as a Graduated Nurse for up to two years legally. I will reach out to have that information given to us. The best thing UNB can do would be to get us that early graduation, which I think we should get it by the time exams are done.”

5.2 Chris Lutes: Debrief of Last Week’s Appeal

Fernandez: “On behalf of the union, I want to apologize for how poorly this all went. It could have been handled better and things could have been changed. It was not an ideal situation for anyone involved. I truly believe that everyone did their best, worked to the best of their ability, and did what they thought was right. A number of other factors, such as the global pandemic and the fact that people are working remotely, did not help the situation. I want to apologize, on behalf of the union, to Kelsi Evans. You have gone through a lot in the last month and your resilience has been very impressive and something that we are proud of, in one of our councillors. I also apologize to everyone else involved, including the complainants, and I apologize for the confusion you have been put through. I have spoken to everyone involved and I trust that everyone was doing what they thought was within their right and what was best for the advancement of the union. I think some people ended up in worse situations than

others, in spite of that. There is potential to look at this and point fingers and accuse some bad actors, but I truly believe that everyone was acting in the best interest of the union, and I thank them all for doing that. We had some long conversations on the same topic last week and it is not typical to debrief a topic which has already been voted on and discussed, so I would like to bring up a few reminders. The decision has already been made, we have already voted, and you are not going to change any decisions, so please do not have that as a goal in this conversation. Be kind and respectful of one another. There is potential for finger pointing but I want this to be a productive conversation. We are in a global pandemic, so people are stressed, people are losing money, people have loved ones who are sick, so do not attack people. Please be productive. If you are going to say something, have an outcome for it and the end goals should be correcting some areas of this process which have gone poorly, as well as supporting the incoming executive as they try to get through this and transition into a successful year. The last thing is to please respect the thirty-minute time limit. We have had some really long conversations since we have transitioned to online, so please respect that we only have thirty minutes for conversations and I likely will not be voting in favor of any extensions on this conversation.”

Lutes: “I am not particularly close with anyone in this dispute. My primary concern is the longevity and integrity of the union. The reason I got involved with council was that I truly believe that we are all more powerful together than we are separately. We all share a common interest as students and, if we put our resources together, we can achieve things that are far greater than the ambitions of any single person. We all joined council out of a feeling of some higher responsibility to some of the people in our life. As we move through this conversation, we cannot lose sight of that. I say this because I think some of us might have lost sight of that. I want to lay out the situation the way I see it. Kelsi Evans, who is running for the VP Advocacy position, posted an Instagram story after the campaign period ended, telling people to go vote. I am not going to weigh in on whether or not it was campaigning because the Appeals Board has already covered that. Even if it was, the standard practice has always been to ask the candidate to take it down. However, in this case, all four complainants waited until after the unofficial results of the election were released to say anything. This seems to me, and I would love to the proven

wrong, like some people were unhappy with the outcome of the election and wanted to change it. Otherwise, why would they not report the infraction as soon as they saw it, rather than wait until after voting ended, when Kelsi could not do anything about it. Regardless, the appeal happened, and a couple of things became clear. It was clear that the CRO felt she made a mistake and went as far as changing her position to recommend that Kelsi be ratified. The Appeals Board ruled that there was no campaign violation and that Kelsi should be ratified in the position. Even though the CRO, the Appeals Board, and the electorate all came to the conclusion that Kelsi should be ratified, seven people on council last week voted against that happening and I want to know why. The CRO and the Appeals Board are the only impartial bodies that we have on the union and their word should be trusted. Seven votes against ratifying is seven votes against the procedure we follow. It is anti-democratic, and it needs to be addressed. It makes all of us look bad and our processes less legitimate. It shifts focus from what is important, to help our fellow students through the global health crisis we are all dealing with. It makes us all look petty and juvenile in the process. I bring this up, not to point fingers, but to figure out how to prevent something like this from happening in the future and how we can work together next year and beyond. I feel like the only way to move forward is to address what happened out in the open, with transparency, and try to talk things through.”

Fazio: “I was involved with the complaint report with the CRO. My reasoning for putting this report through after the election results had come out was that I found out, after the election results, that this incident had occurred. I spoke to Ella and she explained that this had happened previously but there was also information that she was not aware of, at the time. I also was not aware of any of the factors going on with Kelsi. To me, I saw that there might have been a complication with the election and that is why I brought it up myself. I was not looking for any malice, I just did not know that this had happened previously. I found out after the election, which is why I filed the report.”

Jefferies: “I would like to sponsor the CRO because I feel like this is a good time to get some insight from their perspective. I am lending speaking rights to the DCRO, Rachel Bensler, who is representing the CRO.”

Bensler: “The CRO, Ella Wiggins, was unable to be here so I am speaking on behalf of both of us. When it comes to people submitting complaints afterwards, we did get complaints during as well, by people messaging to say that they saw it. People were aware, they just did not send formal complaints until afterwards. I do not think it was malicious or petty, it was just people saying that they heard about it and, from their perspective or knowledge, they were not okay with it. That decision has been made and we have seen the evidence, so regardless of that, it was people submitting complaints from what they could see of the situation. I do not think that the timing of when someone submits a complaint is indicative of someone being malicious.”

Jefferies: “I was one of the seven people who voted against. First, thank you for bringing this up. It is important to have this discussion, and have it recorded for any future elections so, if an issue comes up, we can look back at this and make decisions based off of precedent from this election. The reason I voted no was in no way a form of personally attacking Kelsi. I think she is awesome, and we have spent much time talking about the role and transitioning. The reason I voted no was because of my interpretation of the bylaws. I respect the Appeals Board’s decision, but I disagreed with the result, which is the only reason why I voted no. For democracy, I think disagreement is necessary and I think it only comes out and gets the best result. Council voted and came to a result, so I am happy that council was able to voice differing opinions. I think it is great that we have a community and space where people can disagree with one another and still respect people’s decisions and opinions. For me, that was the only reason why I voted no, and I wanted that to be reflected in the minutes and in the entirety of this issue. I think the issue now is not whether the bylaws were broken or not, but the actual interpretation of the bylaws, since they are not clear on this matter. I am happy we had this discussion, I am happy we had this vote, I am happy with the result, and hopefully from this, we are able to change to bylaws to make it more clear moving forward with elections.”

S Mackenzie: “I was one of the complainants. My main reasoning was that, the evening after the fact, I had known about the post that Kelsi had made, and her and I have already discussed all of this. I knew about the post and advised her to remove it and notify the CRO and I believe the DCRO had

reached out before she had the opportunity. I was not considering submitting a complaint until I had received contact from the CRO asking if I could call them. I spoke with Ella, who said that if I could provide screenshots and stuff, that would aid quite a bit. I sent that and realized what I thought was some severity, which based on our decision, was not as severe as I had anticipated. Originally it was not my thought, but I did do it so that everything was legitimate, and we had all the facts and the CRO would have my end of it because I had the most information. Coming back and seeing that it was approved, there is no area that it would be questioned in the future. I have spoken with Kelsi and we are going to work to ensure that this does not impact the union in a negative way next year and that the team will continue the great work that has been done this year.”

Evans: “I have refrained from speaking about the matter in council because I did not want to sway any votes. The DCRO was correct in stating that none of the complaints were in a malicious manner. After the Appeals Board meeting, there was sufficient evidence and people willing to come forward saying that one of the complaints was a personal attack and there was a lot of evidence toward cyberstalking and harassment. That has been dealt with and has nothing to do with anyone on the incoming or current council. If you read the appeal that I had written, which is public, you can understand the full extent to what was happening during the day and all the technical issues. I want to say thank you to everyone in council who has taken the time to read it, the Appeals Board, the CRO and DCRO for their patience and time working on this.”

Lukings: “I was pulled into the process to work on the Appeals Board. I have been involved in various forms of governance for eleven years. I found this experience to be particularly frustrating because of the way it all unfolded. Now that we all have all of the information, I think it is pretty clear that there is some behind the scenes collusion or something going on. There is something not entirely okay happening here. Allegations of harassment are one thing, but when we are talking about accountability and people who are choosing to make decisions and take over the decision-making process, that is not an okay form of governance. The point of an Appeals Board is to look at the decision and the evidence and do an investigation, then make a decision. To have the entire council discuss the decision

and pick it apart is incredibly disrespectful. We spent hours working on this and discussing this in a time of global crisis. I am sorry if this comes off as rude, but with a lot of years of experience, it was really petty, and you cannot treat each other this way. When you look at all the information that was brought forward, the things that were done were unnecessarily harsh, there was for sure behind the scenes communicating, I would wager collusion, and this is not the way the process is supposed to go. If you are going to undermine the Appeals Board decision, do not have an Appeals Board. I do not mean any offence by this but, had I known the disrespectful nature this was going to take, I would not have agreed to be on the Appeals Board because I feel like my time was wasted. It was not taken seriously, we were questioned, we were asked why we did not release this, and then when we decided to talk it over, look at it, and get people's opinions, and then release it. Then we have people coming to us to say that we should not release it, and it is very frustrating and has left a bad, bitter taste in my mouth about the UNBSU. I am sorry, I think you are all great people, but the way this unfolded is embarrassing and I am not going to be involved with any more appeal decisions.”

Gill: “Thanks Melissa, I am sorry I drug you into this.”

Lukings: “It is not your fault. You were incredibly helpful and supportive through all of this. This is by far not your fault. I will absolutely work with you again. I am not holding anything against anyone personally, I am just saying that this system and the way it unfolded is not okay, unprofessional, super petty, super sketchy, and not accountable. I think we did a great job as the Appeals Board; it is all the things leading up to it and after it that are not okay.”

Fernandez: “We have already had the people involved say they were okay with one another, that it was a misunderstanding and a lack of communication. I personally do not want to accuse anyone of collusion or some sort of insider dealing. I am really uncomfortable with that and with someone coming in and accusing our councillors of that, so I do not appreciate those comments being made, especially on assumption. I think there was perhaps a lack of communication and we have never dealt with an appeal before with these kinds of complaints. The majority of us are undergraduates volunteering our time to look after this. I trust that everyone involved did their job to the best of their ability, including the CRO

and DCRO and the Appeals Board. Melissa, thank you so much for coming on at the last minute, we really appreciate your work. Gyan, you and I spent many hours on the phone trying to figure this out. Everyone worked as hard as they could. Some people saw some things that concerned them, and they brought those forwards, which is really all that happened. I do not feel that anyone did anything wrong or malicious in this and I do not want anyone leaving this meeting feeling that they are a bad actor or did something evil. People were looking out for the best of the union, using a process they were not familiar with, and we recognized that there are some holes in the bylaws. For the debate afterward, it is a separate matter, but if you look in the bylaws pertaining to elections, it says that the councillors need to ratify the process of elections, so we need to discuss and vote. Perhaps the debate went on for too long, perhaps we should have just put faith in the appeals process, but that is a conversation of democracy and governance. That debate is built into the process and it happened, and we did get the correct outcome at the end of the day. We should be proud that, regardless of all these curveballs and the global pandemic, at the end of the day, we reached the right conclusion and I am proud of everyone involved.”

Lutes: “I have a question for Mick and, by extension, the people who voted no. Do you see the reason why some people, myself included, have issue with the no votes? I personally disagree with parts of the appeal decision and I do not think every element of it was completely decided, but at the end of the day, I agree with it in principle. I think that the fact that the CRO and the Appeals Board came to the same conclusion is important to recognize. Even more so, it is important to think about how this was a decision on whether or not to overturn the will of the people, who voted for us in a democratically legitimate process. Do you think it was appropriate for you to vote against that process?”

Jefferies: “I am sorry if I gave the message that I do not trust the students or the process of the election, that is not what my intentions were by voting no. I do not want to speak for anyone else who voted no, but I am sure that was not the case of the people who voted no. I think it comes down to the misunderstanding of the bylaws and of the process itself, since everyone was fairly new to it. In my understanding, I was voting no to the decisions being made that would set precedent for future years. I did not want to de-ratify or delegitimize the UNBSU election. The students are the same students that voted

me into office. I did not want to do that, and I hope that is not how it came across. It was my understanding that I had the option to vote yes or no and this would uphold decisions for future years looking back. Maybe that was incorrect of me to do that and maybe there is a better way for me to go about it, but that was the reason that I made my vote. I am really happy that the final decision was made, and I think that council made the right decision for them. I stick by what I said last week. Maybe if we fully understood the process better, there could be another step that I could have taken, rather than saying no completely, because it is not just black or white. You said there are some parts of the decision that you did not agree with, but in principal you agree with it all. Maybe my understanding was a little bit different, but that was the only reason I voted no, and I hope you and other people on council can see that. My intentions were not malicious or to not grant someone a role that they worked very hard for. It was just based on my understanding of what would happen with the bylaws and the interpretation of them.”

Lutes: “Do you understand that this was not a decision on whether or not to accept the appeal as valid or invalid, but whether or not to ratify the result of the VP Advocacy position, and that your vote on that would have no bearing on whether or not the appeal remained the precedent going forward?”

Jefferies: “I believed that, when we voted, we were upholding the Appeals Board decision and what the Appeals Board reported. That was my understanding with ratifying this. If we did not ratify the results based off the decision of the Appeals Board, it was my understanding that Kelsi was still eligible to put her name forward for VP Advocacy because then it would go to councillors putting their name forward to fill in the role temporarily until the by-election. My understanding was that I was voting no based off of not ratifying the results based off the Appeals Board’s decisions and their reasoning. It had nothing to do with Kelsi or approving her as a whole. It was me trying to grasp my understanding of the bylaws and to not allow this process moving forward. I agree with Melissa that this has all been very messy, at no fault of anyone, I just think the bylaws are not clear. I voted no because I was hoping that, from my vote and council’s votes, we could change the way the bylaws were written to reflect a more clear and true understanding. It was my understanding that Kelsi was able to put her name forward and

we could still vote to put Kelsi in the position if council disagreed with the ratification of her election, based off the results of the bylaws.”

Motion to extend the conversation by 10 minutes.

Mover: Lutes

Seconder: Jefferies

Vote passes. Dissenters: Zundel, Penney, McMillan, Smith, Archibald, Bennett, Brimicombe, Thibodeau, and Pefang.

Fazio: “Having sat on council for three years, I wanted to bring some context for everyone because I think what Melissa spoke to, from her perspective, was very concerning. I would like to remind everyone on council that, when we talk about ratifying election results, it is the role of council not to ratify whether or not we accept the results, but that we approve that the process was done properly. The conversation that took place in the motion with the vote was not whether or not we agree with the Appeals Board and whether or not we approve this position, but whether council thought the due process had been undertaken. I think that is the reason why we had so much discussion and that there were varying opinions, because councillors had the right to decide whether they thought the correct process was followed. It was not directly associated with the appeals report or with the elected role, but about the process. We say at every ratification meeting that council is ratifying if we think the right process was undertaken. That is a conversation that is important for us to have and it has always been done, so I do not think it meant any offense to the Appeals Board. We appreciate that so much work has gone into it and it has not been an easy time for us. This is the process that council has always done. We take it upon ourselves to have a discussion about whether or not we thought the correct process was followed, and I do not think it was meant in any offense.”

5.3 Craig Fernandez: Discussion of Campaigning

President, Craig Fernandez, presents that Policy Committee looked into the campaigning guidelines and discussed if campaigning should be permitted during voting. Voting is online; therefore, it may add interesting layers to allow campaigning during voting. It could also increase voter turnout,

which has historically been low. Campaigning is mentally taxing, so an option would be to change the timeline to allow campaigning for one week before voting, followed by a week of campaigning during voting. The bylaws have reached their third reading, so no changes will occur immediately, however, it may be a possibility for next year.

S Mackenzie: “I do see the benefits because it would lead to a voter increase. My main concern is that there are student lounges where students would encourage students to vote. We do not want a situation where students feel pressured to vote because the person is in the room and I know that is something we would not encourage. I would want to look at feedback from council because it is something that I would definitely consider bringing to Policy Committee next year. St. Thomas takes the approach where all campaigning material needs to be removed during their voting period, which is an option which would remove any confusion. These are all options we could explore.”

Fazio: “I see potential concerns with allowing campaigning to continue. In the past, I have sat on committees where we have had to disqualify individuals because they were leading people directly to vote while on eservices. There would need to be some kind of assurance where there is a separation and removal in allowing students to make decisions on their own. I wonder if following the lead of St. Thomas might be the best process in that everything would be removed and we would avoid conflicts, such as this situation. That being said, we do have a relatively low voter turnout and I do not know if that would have a negative impact.”

Evans: “I know the week that everyone is voting is extremely busy with midterms. The week after, when we have to take down our posters, I remember going around campus and every building was locked except for Tilley, which was very unfortunate. I know that Ella received a lot of emails about that and it was messy, and it happened the year before as well, when I ran for Inclusion representative. I could not find it in the bylaws, so I was wondering if anyone knew why it is that particular week, when that week is busy because a lot of people are packing for March break.”

Arseneau: “I understand the concerns in regard to individuals almost soliciting votes during the voting period. I see that as a separate issue to campaigning. I think that if campaigning is done correctly,

then it would be an extension of the regular campaign period. I think it is more of an issue of individuals knowing the boundaries, and those rules could be put into place. I think it would increase voter turnout and be beneficial because, if people are not informed by the beginning of voting, it is because they do not want to be. I do not think that adding an extra week would give anyone an unfair advantage, but it would promote the election more than it already is.”

Fazio: “I think a lot of the issues that arose with the election this year were in the confusion of boundaries and how to not communicate in a way that could potentially be forcing other people to vote. I wonder how that process would look in terms of policing individuals. If we do allow campaigning to continue, how do we set restrictions for individual interactions?”

Arseneau: “I am not going to pretend like I have all the answers. There is a large difference between campaigning online and posting your campaigning materials versus approaching individuals and asking them to vote right there. I think there is enough room within that range that there could be a limit set by Policy Committee. I do not know what that is, maybe it is that you can put up new campaign materials and post online, but not approach groups of students. I am not sure what that would look like, as that would be up to Policy Committee and council to decide. I think there is enough wiggle room within that spectrum, that it could be defined.”

Evans: “One way that I see people being able to have an advantage over others is that, I know we have limits on how much we can spend, but that does not limit the number of posters we can buy. Say I find a really good deal where it is only five cents per poster compared to everyone else who has to pay more than that. Say I put up fifteen next to someone who has one, that is an unfair advantage and I think that is something that could be looked at. There are a lot of other factors about how to take advantage of that situation, which is something Policy Committee could look at.”

Arseneau: “There are currently limits on the number of promotional materials that individuals can put up.”

Evans: “I meant posters, not the small promotional items.”

Arseneau: “There is a limit on small promotional items, but there is also a limit on posters as well.”

5.4 Craig Fernandez: Third Reading of UNBSU Bylaws

President, Craig Fernandez, presents that Policy Committee met and discussed changes to the Indigenous Councillor position and how it is elected. A process has not been determined yet, so it will remain the same in the bylaws for now.

Motion to approve the UNBSU bylaws through the third reading of council.

Mover: Fernandez

Secunder: Lutes

Vote passes unanimously.

5.5 Sam Arseneau: 2020-2021 Preliminary Budget Presentation

Vice President Finance & Operations, Sam Arseneau, presents the 2020-2021 preliminary budget, which has been made conservatively due to the current global pandemic. Significant changes include a decrease in the sponsorship and entertainment revenues, increase in the NBSA fee, the active campus fund and campus service grant were combined and reduced due to limited use. Councillor projects were reduced, orientation was reduced in assumption that there will not be unexpected costs, and councilor honorariums were adjusted to reflect commitment levels of various positions. Entertainment was decreased due to uncertainty regarding events in the fall as well as opportunities for future sponsorships, and Saferide increased due to gas prices and expenses for purchasing a new van.

McMillan: “Did the councillor funds solely decrease because people wanted to do their larger events in the second half of the semester, and they did not go through because of COVID-19? Are you taking into consideration the lack of money spent because events were cancelled due to the pandemic?”

Arseneau: “Yes, we did take it into consideration. A lot of councilor projects fall within a club or society as well. For example, with the arts formal, the arts society and faculty teamed up, so the money came out of the clubs and societies funding as well. This is a grey area because if a councillor is involved in the faculty club or society, it will usually come out of that pool instead, so there is a limited number of

projects that come out of the councillor funds. The decrease is not trying to discourage anyone's efforts to put on good projects.”

Motion to approve the 2020-2021 preliminary budget draft.

Mover: Arseneau

Secunder: S Mackenzie

Vote passes unanimously.

5.6 Sam Arseneau: Ratification of Motionball Club

Vice President Finance & Operations, Sam Arseneau, presents the Motionball Club, who's objective is to host sporting events to raise funds and awareness for the Special Olympics Foundation.

Motion to ratify the Motionball Club.

Mover: Arseneau

Secunder: Fernandez

Vote passes unanimously.

6. Reports to Council

6.1 Vice President – Communications

- Finishing the action plan 2023, with the executive, which will be shared at the AGM.
- Posted the “how to tips and guides” for mental health, fitness, nutrition, studying, and finance – each had a very good reach!
- Finished posting the VP Communications job posting.
- Creating summaries of information sent by Paul Mazerolle.
- Posting relevant resources and has been in contact with Student Services to determine how students can reach the services.

6.2 Vice President – Student Life

- Hired a new Garden Coordinator and trying to figure out how they can work in the garden this summer. Possibly harvesting vegetables and giving them to community members over the summer.
- Helping plan an online version of the Student Union Recognition Awards (SURA).

- Fresh Food Bag program is unable to happen this month.
- Will do the UNBSU Food executive positions in the fall.
- Working on her section of the AGM.
- Attended the last Associate Alumni Council meeting. They are donating \$15,000 to the COVID-19 relief fund. That money has been matched, so they are donating \$30,000.
- Online transition with Vishnu this week and working on the full transition reports.
- Spoke with Karen, Craig, and Sam about the future of the Director of Campus Events position.

6.3 Vice President – Finance & Operations

- Hired the Garden Coordinator and currently hiring the new VP Communications.
- Worked on the budget with Craig, Adriana, and Sean.
- Last Policy Committee meeting.
- Ensured that all clubs received the funding which had been previously approved.
- Revamping the Director of Campus Events role.
- Working on the transition reports.

6.4 Vice President – Internal

- Please send councillor honoraria forms if you have not already and fill out the transition reports.
- Last senate meeting for the winter 2020 term.
- VP Academic, George MacLean's position term is done next summer. They are striking a review search committee, which Grace Pelkey will sit on. He is reapplying for the position.
- Strategic Plan launch was cancelled and they looking to do an alternative method.
- The May SOAR will be online.
- The summer term will be online.
- The UNB Instagram templates were launched.
- SURA will be online April 25th at 7pm. Planning to do a zoom meeting – dress up if you wish! Will be fun and exciting!
- Started the transition with Grace Pelkey.

- Working on the full executive transition and AGM.

6.5 Vice President - Advocacy

- Met with Kelsi twice to transition the role.
- The five “how to” posters went really well and had a lot of traction!
- Meeting with Sula Levesque to finalize the resource finder. Instead of getting resources from every province, they included the HR person from a major university in every province.

6.6 President

- The SU typically gives \$50,000/year to the Financial Aid Office for emergency bursaries. There was about \$33,000 left in the account as well as about \$6000 in other funds which will go to the COVID-19 student relief fund!
- Worked on alternative ways of delivering the AGM and SURA.
- Working on transition documents for Sean.
- Working on the action plan with Chantelle.
- Policy Committee had their last meeting.
- Hiring a new VP Communications.
- Worked on the budget.
- Meeting about the Director of Campus Events position.

7. Announcements

Fazio: “Regarding the student financial aid situation. I have been reached out to by a lot of people who have been worried and concerned. It was announced today that the federal government is looking into long-term support for students because any students who had a summer job last year is not eligible for the Canadian Response Benefit. Also, I know of summer internships for law students so hit me up for more information.”

Jefferies: “Ensure that you are still checking in with the NBSA and CASA social media. They are doing a lot of work advocating to the provincial and federal government for more coverage of students

during COVID-19. If you want to continue relaying information to students, you can check out their social media pages for updates.”

8. Question Period

9. Other Business

Fazio: “I would like to welcome all of the incoming executive who have been present in this meeting as well as thank everyone on council. This has been an incredible year and thank you Gyan for being our strong Chair! I have had a wonderful time working with everyone and I cannot wait to see what you all go on to accomplish in the future!”

10. Adjournment

Mover: Zundel

Secunder: Wilson

Meeting adjourned at 8:35pm.