

---

**Present:** Nick DeSumma, Nick Molkoski, Stephanie Bellotto, Matt DeSumma, Faraz Iftekharuddin, Kevin Jang, Shannon Kelly, Hubert Lee, Genelle Martin, Tarique Plummer, Ryan Price, Jonathan Ricci, Colin Aitchison, Marley Wildish, Kaitlin Brown,

**Regrets:**

**Guests:** Ian Muller, Zemar Hakim, Kevin Bonnell, Joseph Small, Ricky Liu, Idris Omar H, Michael Del Bono, Ron Bauman, Talha Naeem, Kanwar Brar

---

## **1. Call to Order & Land Acknowledgement**

The meeting is called to order at 4:02pm on Friday, March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017 on the second floor of the Student's Union Board Room, Brantford.

We acknowledge that we are on the traditional territory of the Neutral, Anishnawbe, and Haudenosaunee peoples.

## **2. Adoption of Agenda**

**Motion 1** (Ricci/ M. DeSumma): **Motion to adopt the Agenda as presented**

**Vote: 11-0-0**

**Result: Motion Passes Unanimously**

## **3. Adoption of Minutes: March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

**Motion 2** (Iftekharuddin/ Jang): **Motion to approve the minutes from the March 10<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting Minutes as presented**

**Vote: 11-0-0**

**Result: Motion Passes Unanimously**

## **4. Regrets and Absences**

Everyone is here #noregrets

## **5. Conflict of Interest**

No conflicts of interest to declare

## **6. Comments from Chair of the Board and CGO**

**Chair DeSumma**

1. The Student Life Levy meetings have mostly finished. The multi campus and Waterloo meeting was Wednesday and Thursday, Brantford is taking place on Tuesday. I will report on the success rates following completion
2. Tarique's transition continues to progress and we only have two more sessions. Board training is right after, please stay because they will learn from your experiences, it is beneficial to them

## **7. Comments from the Acting President and CEO**

**VP Wildish**

1. President VanHerzele sent out updates and the one thing he wanted to highlight was St. Patrick's Day was last Friday. We wanted to say thank you to city partners,

Special Constables and everyone who positively represented Laurier. There will be a debrief and hopefully Kanwar's team will provide an update

2. For Finance and Administrative we have re-opened some of our summer positions, due Monday or next Wednesday- check those positions out

### **Director Ricci**

Due to the recent suicide at UW, did the University or Student's Union discuss ways to improve mental health?

### **VP Wildish**

We out of respect to the family send our sincere regards and take the time to recognize that we do have supports on campus and promote that to Laurier. Students here at Laurier could be triggered by the event so we want to remind everyone that we do have those services on campus. If you want further info, President VanHerzele will follow up.

### **VP Aitchison**

We have been lobbying for increased funding from services and the province to increase funding for services such as councilors and front line staff. We have been actively participating to increase the resources available across Ontario to address mental health concerns.

## **8. Committee Updates:**

### **Ownership Linkage Committee- Director DeSumma**

Going off what I said two weeks ago, our final event is Wednesday, March 29<sup>th</sup> 7-10pm in the Concourse called Student's Union Year at a Glance, thanks to Chair DeSumma. Only 3 directors need to be there so I anticipate that happening to ensure compliance, spread the word, and I look forward to a great event!

### **Chair DeSumma**

Please do that because some of you may have already went still come out

### **Director Iftexharuddin**

Will there be any presentations?

### **Director DeSumma**

Our work is behind the scenes, so I hope Directors show up and to explain what we did. It is easier to see physical representation.

### **Chair Elect Plummer**

What is the format?

### **Director DeSumma**

It is the same format as our event back in November with the elections.

### **Chair Elect Plummer**

Will there be video conferencing to Brantford?

**Director DeSumma**

It is a Waterloo event

**9. Ownership Linkage Committee Final Report**

**Motion 3** (Lee/ Molkoski): **Motion to approve the Ownership Linkage Committee Final Report as presented**

**Vote: 10-0-1**

**Result: Motion Passes**

**Chair DeSumma**

I sent this late because we wanted to finish a few things

**Director DeSumma**

What we accomplished and did as a Board. A few things to note, as mentioned very successful in director participation so I am happy to maintain this success and hope that it continues in years to come. A recommendation from last year's report that I chose to reiterate is we remained equitable when planning events on both campuses. Logically as a committee based on the schedule we decided it would be harder to organize an event for all of you to come to Brantford, so it was practical to have events in Waterloo and that was my logic. Something for the next committee to work on.

**10. Discussion: Chief Returning Officer**

**Motion 4** (Ricci/ Plummer): **Motion to shift the position of CRO to the ACRO and amend the current ACRO role into CRO.**

**Vote: 11-0-0**

**Result: Motion Passes Unanimously**

**Chair DeSumma**

Before the meeting Mayor Friel sent his regrets, he is on a leave approved by council so we send our best to him. I put some other discussions in the agenda package. First is to go back on the discussion regarding the Chief Returning Officer. Earlier in the year we appointed Colin as CRO so now we are bringing that back. We are going to see what the board wants with that position, DPRA Muller has a recommendation

**DPRA Muller**

I suggested to the elections review committee that in the past the DPRA role has taken on the CRO position in support of hiring ACRO and DCRO. My recommendation to the committee was that I was confident I could still provide full support and guidance to the students hired into those roles. We would hire directly a CRO as I don't need to hold that position in order to support the elections process. My recommendation was a shifting of the titles and that the student hired be a CRO and that my position as it exists incorporates the support. That is why I presented it as a recommendation

**Chair DeSumma**

It is ultimately your decision, what we decide to move forward with. We could still have one and appoint Ian if that is who the board chooses or it could shift. I am wanting to hear what you think

**Director Martin**

What are all the options?

**Chair DeSumma**

We are considering if we want to do that shift as suggested where we just take A off ACRO and hire the Chief Returning Officer. Then we would take the title from the support that the DPRA would give. The other option is to continue that support with the same title and having Ian be appointed as Chief Returning Officer. Basically we appoint or get rid of it and shift the title.

**DPRA Muller**

In my perspective it is a matter of enhancing the profile of the role the student is hired to. From a resume and experience perspective having CRO has a different heft. There is no need for me to have that roll as part of my current job. The support from the DPRA would be the same but providing students with opportunity to hold that position title.

**Director Martin**

Would we be hiring Ian?

**Chair DeSumma**

In the past we appointed the CRO and the Assistant Chief Returning Officer would still report to the Chair but the CRO would be the staff support for them. Colin was the staff support to Liz, the recommendation is to continue and appoint someone as that staff support or they would still have the staff support but there be no titles associated.

**Director Plummer**

Are there any disadvantages?

**Chair DeSumma**

Mostly a title switch, support is still there

**Director Lee**

No change in responsibility regardless?

**Chair DeSumma**

No

**Director Kelly**

It doesn't change from operations and is mirrored from other schools and good to move forward with.

**Director Lee**

Would the DPRO be affected in any way on Brantford campus?

**Chair DeSumma**

The DRO would still report to the CRO there is no title switches there.

**11. Discussion: Police Checks**

**Chair DeSumma**

What was brought to the Board a few meetings ago was the idea of the volunteer Police Check Policy. Having that discussion with for things like Foot Patrol and O-Week, I thought what if Board members were responsible for getting Police Checks as well. Although, you don't deal with criminal matters you do deal with confidential information and other non-profit Boards are required to have Police Checks.

**Director Ricci**

If this were to pass would they need it before May 1<sup>st</sup>?

**Chair DeSumma**

That would be up to the current Board we could have it the year after. It is up to you; it is short notice so there is a better starting point.

**Director Plummer**

Say it is implemented, who would the check be submitted to and what would be the process?

**Chair DeSumma**

Currently submitted to Marley

**Director Plummer**

Would they be removed if they have a record?

**Chair DeSumma**

It is hard to think with elected representatives whether they need police checks or not. I would look into that, no decision today.

**Director Bellotto**

Would the management team need Police Checks as well?

**Chair DeSumma**

No authority over management team, up to President and operations

**Director Martin**

Is this coming up because of the shift towards having Orientation leaders submit checks?

**Chair DeSumma**

Completely separate, that is where the idea came from. If volunteers in those capacities require Police checks then do our Board members who are also volunteers and exposed to confidential materials need one as well? That is the motivation, should we require our volunteers?

**Director DeSumma**

Bouncing off Director Plummer's point regarding elected representatives. If we elect a representative, then find they have a background we don't feel appropriate with

needing to remove them and reopen. Would it make more sense to make a pre-condition before running altogether rather than waiting?

**Chair DeSumma**

Part of research and hasn't been well researched yet we will figure it out

**Director DeSumma**

We are effectively making these volunteers pay for a Police check off the grounds they may not get the position they are running for. This could be deterring

**Director Lee**

Funding, would this be reimbursed? In this case how will this be implemented and who is responsible?

**Chair DeSumma**

My idea would be for it to align with the Student's Union volunteers. Is there a plan yet?

**VP Wildish**

We approached the Police checks with policies and procedures first by seeing if there is a need for it. Procedure would be after including who does it get given to and who is paying for it. We are still in the planning stage

**Chair DeSumma**

This is preliminary and an idea seeing if the Board feels comfortable needing to do

**Director Lee**

Marley, can you elaborate what the volunteer process is for Foot Patrol? It was different as it wasn't a criminal record, but a yes/no?

**DPRM Muller**

Sometimes Police checks imply that if something is returned then it is automatically that the opportunity is lost, that is not the approach. We have identified with volunteers dealing with vulnerable populations. Process to successfully take on a position if it comes back with positive results we develop a committee to assess and have conversations of implications. We would identify if there are different volunteer roles they could be in and then the President would meet with the volunteer and the HR generalists to inform that particular student what other opportunities remain open. It is a bit different as you are looking from a transparency perspective so perhaps something to consider is not implications but rather is transparency in that regard a value. In order to keep the governance and operation separate exploring Police checks they could be submitted directly to the Chair.

**Director Plummer**

Would the document and time frame be taken into account? For example, if Kevin stole something at 13 or 14 years old and it is the past, does that mean he can't run because he stole a candy bar 7 years ago? Do we value based on management as well? Also do we limit the information we reveal as confidentiality is a big issue

**Chair DeSumma**

That is a good point

**DPRA Muller**

We revert back the volunteer process, the idea there is that the small group would factor what the crime and does it violate trust so that would be considered. You factor in that you are all elected members so it may not be about disqualification but providing that transparency. There are two different examples but any review of positive results of a check would be most prudent to factor in while making a decision.

**Director Elect Omar**

You mentioned that the staff doesn't have a police check. That might be a big concern and the second as a volunteer at Mohawk we decided to do Police checks. There was minor stuff sitting down and what to do next and it was confusing but sometimes it was drinking and driving which is criminal. It was getting too much so there was no need for it. Knowing that we are dealing with different parties and we mess up. I am surprised that the full time staff doesn't have to do as they are the full time and handling sensitive information and that should be focused on. Before now we didn't have the check was there a particular reason?

**Chair DeSumma**

Reason is because there will be checks for volunteers, this is something that Board members should do and that is where the idea came from. No decision today, I want to know what you think so let's assess this after could result in something. As for prior that is good feedback and that is great so thank you.

**Director Kelly**

Urge that as a Board look at how this impacts the entire organization as we see many people in charge of vulnerable sectors like Foot Patrol. As an organization we don't want to have responsibility if something goes wrong, so we need to look at how this impacts the organization not the small stuff right now.

**Director Ricci**

I think it would be beneficial, just what do we define as big vs small crime? Only concern I have

**Chair DeSumma**

That goes with assessment checks

**Director Bellotto**

This comes up because we hold confidential information, at the beginning we signed agreements

**Chair DeSumma**

Nothing wrong with being too sure, there could be instances where I wouldn't want someone on the Board who has experience with treason or bankruptcy. We want to be sure cause we deal with different subject matter

**VP Aitchison**

Just so that you are aware provincial laws regulating Board membership for example if someone has declared bankruptcy they can't hold a position anyways. There are a lot of laws in place if you want to save eliminating students from running. Then your confidentiality agreement, the organization can always sue for violation.

**Director Plummer**

Question for consideration, do we have the time and resources or is there another place we can spend our time on. Since nothing is broken should we fix it? This requires attention and could be proactive but we should be cautious.

**Director Lee**

If you follow other Universities, that is a case in Guelph it sways the vote and if they had have known earlier the drama wouldn't have happened. We don't want to be the next school saying this person running for President with a yes/no vote actually has a strong criminal record, learning from their mistakes is very important. From a financial, feasible and responsible risk we don't want to ruin our reputation. You are looking at current students, alumni and future students.

**Director Kelly**

This is the safety of our students, I don't think it is too much time or resources making sure our students are safe should be a priority.

**Chair DeSumma**

It is in the mandate of the Boards role to assess risk and to have oversight. While proactive there is a thing as being too proactive, the Board's role is to be proactive to prevent risks before it happens.

**Director Plummer**

Is the President required to submit a Police check and are there different categories?

**Chair DeSumma**

Difference between vulnerable and criminal record check

**DPRA Muller**

There are 3 levels of Police checks and they all canvas different criteria. For volunteers we decided on a vulnerable sector check because when looking at provincial and federal legislation it is something that fit such as Foot Patrol. For us that meant there is only one check as vulnerable returns most information. There are specific missions around mental health that have been added in recent years. There are three levels

**Director Martin**

If we are planning on going forward it should be consistent for everyone to be transparent

**Director Bellotto**

Question, would the students be paying?

**Chair DeSumma**

That is another part of the conversation

**Director Plummer**

It is hard to use a blanket statement to generalize what happened in Guelph will happen here. Someone told me you can't use someone's past to define their future, to have a committee to go through and say no. We are going to say no to you even though you have the confidence?

**Chair DeSumma**

It is the student's choice so they can decide if they don't want someone. That is information that is important, if I knew Kanwar had a past and I was a regular student voting that was criminally inclined then I have my right to not vote for him. I cannot confirm if the President has a background check. It is important for the students voting to know that information. I do believe someone's past does not define their future but in the case of the Laurier Student's Union that is 17000 potentially voting.

**Director Lee**

I am not talking full on discrimination for your chance of employment but the reputation risk. If you are a high school student and you want to get involved, this is stuff you will avoid and will deter you no matter how much PR work you do to safe. Everyone is capable but it is the non financially tangible things we need to consider as well.

**Director Iffekharuddin**

Doesn't have to be you are cut the moment something comes up in a check. We can have the same review committee which we have in place for volunteers and the time of it deliberating would be deliberated no straight yes or no.

**Director DeSumma**

Not related to safety overall across the table is a good idea, shouldn't be for everyone but definitely the Board and if the President decides to have it for management. That said it would be more important to look at how implementing this effects operations as a whole, for example cost, and how to modify the elections process. If we want to cover some of the cost would that be modifying assuming that we might have to take some of the funds student might have to cover Police checks and different scopes. We don't want to cause more problems than we solve. There are risks both ways.

**Director Ricci**

I'm pretty sure the Criminal Code says you can't legally discriminate based on criminal record

**Director Elect Omar**

I finished the highest 3 for an application for RCMP. Going back, it is important and I support 100%. Knowing who you are working with is critical. We are going to select 5 students and then let them decide and call it a committee. This contains stuff we don't understand, that is risk for me and confusing. Idea should be very serious and smart but I recommend for the entire organization to have criminal check, not only specific. When I was Chair of African Council for the City of London everybody had to have a check

and if I saw a volunteer that didn't go through the check it was a red flag. I am not saying it will be decided by a committee or the chair that is not a professional. It should be the entire organization

### **President Elect Brar**

The conversation is circling that students would be doing the follow up. I would like to remind you that there are professionals including at Laurier how we have the academic non student code of conduct through the Deans office and an Officer to go through the conduct process. It wouldn't be 5 random students and I would recommend that we don't circle around it because that is not based on evidence and we do have people who deal with conduct matters. It is a cohesive committee that deals with this.

### **Chair DeSumma**

This is not a deciding factor it will be researched and it will be looked at. Great discussion

## **12. New Business and Announcements**

### **Chair DeSumma**

Training is after for incoming Directors

### **Director Ricci**

Elections Review Committee is meeting April 10<sup>th</sup> at 1:30pm in the Boardroom.

### **Director Plummer**

Board refresher budget training Wednesday at noon, open to all

### **VP Wildish**

I hope to see everyone at volunteer appreciation next Sunday, would be nice to see you there. It might still be opened just send me an email if it isn't

## **13. Incamera: Final Reviews**

**Motion 5** (Martin/ Bellotto): **Motion to enter incamera with Board Secretary Brown**

**Vote: 11-0-0**

**Result: Motion Passes Unanimously**

*\*Director Price left the meeting at 5:59pm via Skype*

## **16. Adjournment**

**Motion 8** (Iftexharuddin/ Ricci): **Motion to adjourn the meeting.**

**Vote: 9-0-0**

**Result: Motion Passes Unanimously**

*Meeting adjourned at 6:07pm*

*Next Meeting Wednesday April 5<sup>th</sup> at 4:00pm Waterloo*

---

*fi, For Information*

*fd*, For Discussion  
*D*, Decision required  
*adm*, Administrative task

The preceding reflects an accurate and complete record of the proceedings at the aforementioned meeting of the WLUSU Board of Directors.

Date Signed: March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017



---

Nick De Summa  
Chair of the Board & Chief Governance Officer  
2016-17 Students' Union BoD

Date Signed: March 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017



---

Nick Molkoski  
Vice Chair of the Board  
2016-17 Students' Union BoD