Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the 2010/2011 University Students’ Council of the University of Western Ontario held on November 24, 2010 in Council Chambers, Room 315, University Community Centre

Note: This meeting can be viewed in full or in part via streaming video at http://www.usc.uwo.ca/government/council/meetings/index.asp.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Speaker called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

2. O CANADA

3. WESTERN SCHOOL SONG

4. ATTENDANCE

Present

Atwal, Harman    Green, Matt    Santucci, Jeremy
Axford, Taylor   He, Tara      Searle, Patrick
Bice, Jessica    Jarvis, Emily  Shaw, Andrew
Bigioni, Steven  Jivraj, Naim   Silver, Jon
Bionda, Cait     Kim, Jennifer Ye Won Silverstein, Billy
Brown, Spencer   Kobayashi, Kevin Sousa, Brandon
Buccella, Jonathan Leung, Vivian    St. Aubin, Emily
Canas, Carlos    Li, Alysha     Sugar, Stephanie
Casupanan, Erika Logan, Stephen  Tamse, Jennifer
Chandra, Arjun   Machado, Melissa The, Danielle
Chartash, David  Madhavji, Sasha Thomas, Toby
Collins, Kevin   Marani, Husayn  Tithecott, Emerson
Cousins, Allan   Matthyssen, Jenna Tithecott, Mike
Dang, Susan      McGuire, Ashley Tyndall, Nate
Duncan, Brent    Milde, Clara   Uberg, Erin
Farnum, Samantha Montes, Julie    Vaiay, Alexandra
Fearnall, Adam   Morrone, Loren  Wageman, Jeremy
Felice, Marino    Nicholas, Christine Wagner, Paige
Ferris, Dan      Nicholson, Christine Watson, Rebecca
Forgione, Andrew Nurmohamed, Sabrina Whelan, Patrick
Fraser, Shauna   Patodia, Divya   Whincop, Cailin
Gautier, Jennifer Postalian, Adam  Wood, Brad
Godfrey, Alex    Rodrigues, Darren
Goodman, Chris   Rowland, Andrew
Absent With Regrets

Latosinszky, Caitlin  Matthies, Meghan

Absent Without Regrets

Notkin, Harrison  Pegus, Cimone  Wall, Kevin

Non-Voting Members and Observers

David Ulbrych, Chair Student Caucus on Governance, Senator
Adam Smith, Chief Returning Coordinator (CRO)
Holly-Lynne Elash, V-Day Commissioner
Nicole Fassina, Communications Officer
Justin Mackie, Vice-President Student Events
Scott Kerr, Vice-President Campus Issues
Meaghan Coker, Vice-President Campus Issues
Ely Rygier, Vice-President Finance
Cathy Clarke, USC General Manager
Scott Courtice, Senior Manager Government Services
Paul Tomlinson, Senior Manager Facilities and Operations
Mark Wellington, Manager Student Life

Speaker: Omid Salari  Deputy Speaker: Nathan Caldwell
Recording Secretary: Sandi Roddy

5. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted as presented.

6. RATIFICATION OF MINUTES OF PAST MEETINGS

The minutes of meeting #5 September 29, 2010 and meeting #6 October 27, 2010 were ratified.

7. SPEAKER’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Salari advised that printed guides to the basic motions of Robert’s Rules would be provided during Council Business for Councillors to fasten to their voting cards.

8. MEMBERS’ ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members announced various upcoming social and charity events.
9. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE WESTERN COMMUNITY

There were no comments or questions from the Western community.

10. PRESENTATIONS TO COUNCIL

10.1 Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest.

(See Appendix 1 for full presentation.)

Courtice outlined the details of the USC policies on Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality and advised Council on what would constitute an actual, a potential or a perceived conflict of interest; their responsibilities and the possible consequences of not declaring a conflict. He also outlined the guidelines under which Council or a committee of Council could hold an “in camera” session.

11. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

(All Standing Committee reports can be viewed in full at http://www.usc.uwo.ca/page.asp?id=20)

Finance

Felice presented the report from the Finance Standing Committee and advised that discussion had focused on setting the terms of reference for sub-committees; further information presented by the World University Service Canada Club (WUSC); and recommendations regarding the unclaimed bus pass refund money.

Communications

Green presented the report from the Communications Standing Committee and advised that Casupanan had been elected as vice-chair of the committee. He advised that the former Communications Committee in the portfolio of the Communications Officer would now become a feedback committee.

Campus Issues

Jarvis presented the report from the Campus Issues Standing Committee and advised that the Committee would be bringing forward a motion regarding funding for the “I Know Someone” campaign. She advised that the Committee had also discussed the social responsibility audit of the USC; the Coca-Cola alternatives promotion campaign; and updating the helpline resource cards on campus.

University Affairs

He presented the report of the University Affairs Committee and advised that the funding from the University Administration for the 24/7 Weldon Library hours would include increased security. She noted that the Committee was also review the USC Standing Policies.

Student Life
Sousa presented the report of the Student Life Standing Committee and advised that their next meeting would be held on December 1st at 7:00 p.m. He noted that the Committee would be bringing forward motions addressing access of information for charitable organizations on campus and a proposed name change for the Committee.

**Agenda and Operations**

Salari presented the report of the Agenda and Operation Standing Committee and advised that the Committee was in the process of conducting a review of the composition of Council as directed by By-law #1. He noted that the Committee was also bringing forward a motion regarding a proposed name change.

The Deputy Speaker opened the meeting to questions relating to the reports.

Will the University Affairs Standing Committee be working with the Commissioners and Coordinators on the policy statements?

He responded that the Committee would be consulting Commissioners and Coordinators.

Why has the USC created a YouTube intern position?

Fassina responded that the USC is exploring new ways to communicate with students and is always looking for employment opportunities for students.

Will the videos posted be informational or entertaining?

Fassina advised that this would be left up to the interns. She added that the program will start with a fun video and move into including more informational videos.

Are non-members of the Committee able to help the Campus Issues Standing Committee with the Social Responsibility Audit?

Jarvis responded that anyone who wishes to volunteer to help with this project will be welcomed.

How extensively will the Campus Issues Standing Committee be looking into the water bottle issue?

Jarvis responded that they will be looking into all water bottle usage on campus.

12. **POSTED MOTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Motion #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Whereas</em>, at the October 27, 2010 meeting of the full Council the Elections Committee was tasked to develop a referendum question to determine if part-time students want to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
added to the USC’s health plan coverage;

**Be it resolved that**, the University Students’ Council permit the following referendum question to be included on the ballot of the 2011 USC Spring Elections:

Do you support the University Students’ Council implementing health plan coverage for part-time students that would cost $99.89 per year (for 12 months of coverage), and would come into effect September 1, 2011? There may be adjustments to this fee annually to cover premium and administrative cost adjustments and adjustments to the program design.

Students taking 3.0 or fewer course credits at one time would be eligible for coverage.

Students with outside coverage could opt-out of the health plan and be refunded the applicable health fee. Students may add their family (spouse and dependents) for an additional fee.

YES __________ NO __________

**POSTALIAN/Santucci/Carried. C10/11.7.1**

Postalian spoke for the motion and reminded Council that their role was to approve the proposed question only.

Points against the motion:
- The wording of the question will mislead students into thinking that the health plan fee will increase for all students when it is only an increase to part-time students.

Point of information – Who will be able to vote in this referendum?

Postalian responded that only part-time students would be able to vote in the referendum.

There was no further debate. Posted Motion #1 was carried.

**Posted Motion #2**

**Whereas**, Section 8.00 of By-Law #2 of the University Students’ Council of the University of Western Ontario reads:

**8.00 INFORMATION-BASED CAMPAIGN**
Whereas, the Spring Referendum is a Council-initiated referendum;

Whereas, the Election Committee wishes Council to consider whether the USC has an interest in the outcome of the referendum, and subsequently what type of referendum campaign should take place;

Be it resolved that, the USC does not have an interest in the outcome of the referendum;

Be it further resolved that, an Information-Based campaign take place during the referendum.

POSTALIAN/Santucci/Carried. C10/11.7.2

Postalian spoke in favour of the motion and noted that it was important to inform all of the relevant students what the referendum was about.

Points in favour:
- An information based campaign is the most economical way to go as the USC would not have to reimburse two sides of a campaign.
- The USC has no interest in the outcome of this referendum as the health plan is self-funded; therefore, an information campaign is the correct choice.

There was no further debate. Posted Motion #2 was carried.

Posted Motion #3 – Registered Interested Party Campaign

POSTALIAN/Santucci/Withdrawn. C10/11.7.3
Posted Motion #4

Whereas, WUSC (Western) has requested a student levy of $0.52 be added to student fees on behalf of their organization to support their mandate of entirely subsidizing the cost of an education at Western for a student refugee starting in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years; this amount is to be increased to $0.68 in the 2013-2014 academic year, and increased to $0.83 in the 2014-2015 academic year, in perpetuity.

Whereas, WUSC (Western) is a USC ratified club;

Whereas, the Finance Committee reviewed the presentation and request at the meeting on November 10, 2010;

Whereas, the USC cannot impose an additional student fee on students without permission of the students by way of referendum;

Be it resolved, the Elections Committee be tasked with developing a referendum question for the ballot in the February 2011 elections to determine if students wish for an additional student fee of $— to subsidize the mandate of WUSC (Western);

Felice/Ferris/Carried as amended. C10/11.7.4

Motion to amend Posted Motion #4 to insert in the first whereas statement the following:
    “student levy of $0.52”
    “starting in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years; this amount is to be increased to $0.68 in the 2013-2014 academic year, and increased to $0.83 in the 2014-2015 academic year, in perpetuity”

Felice/Carried. C10/11.7.4.1

Point of information – what fee for this program is being charged to students at other universities?

The average fee at other universities of this size is approximately $2.00 per student. The maximum is $20.00 per student.

Point of information - What is the cost of the program per year per refugee student?

The cost per student per year, including airfare, contribution to the WUSC organization, tuition and living expenses, is approximately $7 – 8,000 per year.

Point of information – What other USC clubs have a student levy?
There are no other USC clubs that have a student levy.

Point of information - What is being done “in perpetuity” as stated in the motion?

The student fee of $0.83 will begin in the 2014/15 year and continue in perpetuity.

Points of information – How much money would the levy generate and what will be done with any overage?

The organization wants to increase their program to sponsor one student per year from the current program of one student every four years.

Point of information – Why has the current funding from the USC ended?

The funding from the USC was granted for a four year term to be reviewed at the end of that term.

Point of information – Would the current funding only need to be adjusted if the increase is not over $4.00?

This would only apply to an existing levy. This levy comes to an end this year and must be reinstated. The Finance Standing Committee felt that it would be best to give students the choice of what club they wish to support.

Point of information – Would this levy expire after the 2014/15 year?

If the proposed referendum is successful the levy would remain at $0.83 forever. The Ministry of Colleges, Training and Universities issued a memo that all non-tuition based fees must go to referendum. If the new fee is imposed, WUSC could come to Council after the 2014/15 year to ask for an increase of up to $4.00 and Council could approve up to that amount without going to referendum.

There was no further debate. The motion to amend was carried. Debate continued on Posted Motion #4 as amended.

Point of information – If this motion is carried, could any club now come to Council to request a referendum to add a levy?

Any such request would be possible; however, it would go through the Finance Standing Committee before coming to Council.

Points in favour:

- If this motion is not passed WUSC Western would lose most of their funding. It is best to let students decide this question.
- A referendum such as this is a great way to get more students engaged in the democratic process.

**Call the previous question.**
Felice/Shaw/Carried.

The Speaker called for a vote on the motion. Posted Motion #4 carried as amended.

**Posted Motion #5**

*Whereas,* the USC Grants Committee is currently separate from the Finance Standing Committee;

*Whereas,* the USC Grants Committee is chaired, ex officio, by the Vice-President Finance;

**Be it resolved,** the USC Grants Committee be established as a sub-committee of the Finance Standing committee, name unchanged;

**Be it further resolved,** the Vice President Finance, as chair of the committee, report results of Grant Committee meetings to the USC Finance Standing Committee

**Be it further resolved,** the by-laws and terms of reference be updated to reflect this change.

Felice/Ferris/Carried. C10/11.7.5

Felice spoke in favour of the motion stating that the goal is to ensure that all committee work under the former governance structure is included in the new structure.

Points in favour:
- The Grants Committee will not be influenced by the members of the Finance Standing Committee as the decision of the Grants Sub-committee will be reported by the Vice-President Finance to the Standing Committee for information only.

There was no further debate. Posted Motion #5 was carried.

**Posted Motion #6**

*Whereas,* the USC Finance Committee is underutilized and replicable of the USC Finance Standing Committee since the governance structure changes;

*Whereas,* USC Finance Committee requires a sub-committee to focus explicitly on the budget process,
Be it resolved, the USC Finance Committee be established as a sub-committee of the Finance Standing Committee, to be known as the Budget Committee

Felice/Ferris/Carried. C10/11.7.6

Felice spoke in favour of the motion stating that this motion was also tying up loose-ends from the former governance structure.

There was no further debate. Posted Motion #6 was carried.

Posted Motion #7

Whereas, the USC contracts with the London Transit Commission (LTC) to provide students with an eight month bus pass each year for a nominal fee;

Whereas, the LTC did not provide service to students from November 16th 2009 until December 14th 2009 as a result of a labour strike;

Whereas, the terms of the USC-LTC contract specify that the USC will receive a refund for each student in the event of a disruption in service. The amount of this refund in 2009 was $0.56 per student per day;

Whereas, the USC and USC Executive were determined to return the refunded money to the affected students by launching a campaign in February 2010 to return cheques in the amount of $18.93 to all FTE students;

Whereas, the USC exhibited due diligence in all efforts made to communicate with students;

Whereas, approximately $175,000 in bus pass cheque refunds has still not been collected by the affected students at this point in time;

Whereas, the cheques have now stale dated and there is an additional cost to reissuing these cheques;

Be it resolved, the USC council establish an ad hoc committee to determine how this money should be allocated;

Be it further resolved, the ad hoc committee be comprised of any interested USC councillor;

Be it further resolved, the ad hoc committee be chosen at the 7th meeting of council on Wednesday, November 24th 2010;

Be it further resolved, the USC executive be invited to ad hoc committee meetings to
inform deliberations of the ad hoc committee;

**Be it further resolved**, the ad hoc committee meet at least once before the end of the semester to establish the method for determining how the bus pass cheque refund money be allocated, and to elect a chair;

**Be it further resolved**, any current Western student (full-time and part-time) as well as the USC executive be able to make an application for this money in the month of January. The application process to be determined by the ad hoc committee;

**Be it further resolved**, the ad hoc committee be responsible for communication with students to inform them of the opportunity to make a presentation before the committee;

**Be it further resolved**, the ad hoc committee return to the council during the final meeting in January with final recommendations for the allocation of the bus pass cheque refunds for final approval by the USC council as a whole.

**Felice/Ferris/Carried. C10/11.7.7**

Felice spoke for the motion stating that the Finance Standing Committee felt that this would allow Council and students to be involved in the decision of how this money would be allocated.

Point of information – Why is there a difference in the amount originally posted for this fund?

The amount was originally posted as $197,000. The difference between this amount and the $175,000 fund is the amount of the cheques that were picked up by students and, although these cheques have not been cashed, this money cannot be included in the fund.

Point of information – Will the Ad Hoc Committee be open to non-voting members of Council?

The Ad Hoc Committee will be open to all members as the process should be as transparent as possible because this is student money.

Point of information – What is the timeline for this committee and will there be enough time?

There is a limited time for this Council to deal with this matter so it is important to get this process going as soon as possible. It will be totally up to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee how much time they will need.

The Speaker suggested that a cap be put on the number of members on the Ad Hoc as the committee will not be efficient if it is too big.
There was no further debate. Posted Motion #7 was carried.

**Posted Motion #8**

*Whereas*, the AOC (Advertising Oversight Committee) decided that students should not have to provide anything more than their name or email address to any third party on campus.

*Whereas*, a number of non-profit fundraisers on campus require the collection of information beyond name and email address for proper administration of their activities.

*Whereas*, there is no explicit USC policy prohibiting the collection of personal information by non-profit organizations operating on campus by USC associated student groups.

*Be it resolved that*, an approved USC affiliated fundraiser may collect student information beyond name and email address if they meet the following requirements:

1. they are a registered non-profit under the Canada Revenue Agency Charity Listings,
2. they must provide written assurances that the collected information remains private and is not sold or distributed to another party,
3. And, they must provide the ability to prevent any further contact from the organization outside the stated purpose for which they provide the initial information.

**SOUZA/Axford/Carried. C10/11.7.8**

Sousa spoke for the motion and noted that, without this motion, organizations like the Terry Fox Foundation would not be able to come on campus.

Point of information – How much information would the organizations be collecting?

The most information that would be requested would be name, address, telephone number and email address.

Point of information – Why does the USC have a policy restricting information collecting?

This policy was put in place to prevent third party groups from collecting student information.

Point of information – Why would students not be given the choice on whether to provide their information?
This was done to protect students’ privacy and prevent students from being harassed and lobbied by outside groups. Mackie added that the AOC had put this policy in place to prevent groups and companies such as credit card companies from coming on campus to solicit student information. This motion will ensure that groups collecting student information are registered, approved charities only and will protect students from the peer pressure used by credit card companies and others.

Point of information – There is concern about the lines of jurisdiction between the USC, the University and students. How do I, as a student, know that a company or charity is a USC approved third party?

Mackie advised that all space in the UCC and on the Concrete Beach is rented by the USC and controlled by the USC and during Orientation Week the USC controls all of campus. Courtice added that USC policy requires that any corporation must follow guidelines as to why they are collecting student information and how that information will be used. He noted that the University also has a Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA) policy in place. Fassina also added that the USC rents out space in the UCC and on the Concrete Beach through its Reservations Department and earlier this year there was an outside, unapproved group present and they were asked to leave.

Point of information – Vendors are allowed to collect information; therefore, how will this be enforced?

Fassina responded that this could be looked at more closely. Currently vendors are under the jurisdiction of USC Reservations Department.

There was no further debate. Posted Motion #8 was carried.

**Posted Motion #9**

*Whereas*, the current committee name is the Student Life Standing Committee,

*Whereas*, the role of the committee is to monitor the activity of the Student Events portfolio,

*Be it resolved that*, the committee changes its name from the Student Life Standing Committee to Student Events Standing Committee.

**AXFORD/Sousa/Carried. C10/11.7.9**

Axford spoke for the motion stating that the Committee members felt the Committee should have the same name as the Vice-President portfolio.
There was no debate. Posted Motion #9 was carried.

Posted Motion #10

*Whereas* the Agenda and Operations Committee shares its initials with the Advertising Oversight Committee,

*Whereas* the Agenda and Operations Committee would like to be more approachable,

*Whereas* by rearranging the order of words in the name, the desired changes are accomplished without losing clarity,

*Be it resolved that* the AOC be changed to the Committee of Council Operations and Agenda (COCOA).

KIM/Santucci/Carried. C10/11.7.10

Kim spoke for the motion stating that this name change would avoid confusion with the Advertising Oversight Committee.

There was no debate. Posted Motion #10 was carried.

Posted Motion #11

*Whereas* Council mandated that the Agenda and Operations Committee bring back a review of the new council schedule on the December 8th meeting;

*Whereas* the new schedule has not been in place for that long;

*Whereas* a bit more time would allow for a better understanding of the challenges faced by the new schedule and would produce more conclusive results;

*Be it resolved that* the scheduled review be moved to the first Duly Called Meeting of Council in January.

KIM/Santucci/Carried. C10/11.7.11

Kim spoke for the motion stating that, although Council had mandated that the Agenda and Operations Committee (AOC) provide this review at the December 8th meeting of Council, the AOC felt that, as some of the Standing Committees will have met only once by that time they were not comfortable doing the review at this time. The members of the AOC felt they would have a better assessment and understanding of how the schedule was working after one more complete cycle of meetings.
There was no debate. Posted Motion #11 was carried.

**Posted Motion #12**

*Whereas* the USC has been tasked with completing the Governance Review started last year;

*Whereas* the review that started last year was not completed;

*Whereas* effective corporations and governments have clearly defined roles for their executive and their management;

*Whereas* the USC aspires to being effective;

*Whereas* any change to the Executive Council must be enacted prior to the Spring Election period;

**Be it resolved that** Council elects an ad hoc Committee to finish the Governance Review;

**Be it further resolved that** the Committee have the following mandated goals to accomplish, quoted from the Governance Review:

1. Review and recommend a clear division of labour between the Executive portfolios, and also review portfolio mandates to improve productivity, job satisfaction and governance.
2. Review and define the role of the Executive Council in their role as the corporation’s Board of Directors, and the General Manager in the day-to-day management of the corporation.
3. Review and recommend policies to enhance the accountability of the Executive Officers and Speaker of Council, which may include the accountability of their reporting relationships, method of election/selection, and removal from office.

- 6 members of Council (selected by Council, 1 member from each standing committee and the Agenda and Operations Committee)
- 2 members of the Executive (to be selected by the Executive Council)

**Be it further resolved that** the Chair and Vice-Chair shall be selected by the committee during their first meeting;

**Be it further resolved that** the recommendations of the committee be brought to council no later than February 16th, 2011

KIM/Santucci/Carried. C10/11.7.12
Kim spoke for the motion stating that the second part of the Governance Review Implementation calls for a review of the Executive portfolios as the terms of reference and job descriptions are very vague and out of date. She pointed out that anyone considering running for an Executive position for the 2011/12 year should not be on this committee as it would be a conflict of interest.

Point of information – Would the members of the current Executive on the Ad Hoc Committee be voting members of the Committee?

Courtice responded that all members of the Ad Hoc Committee would be voting members.

There was no further debate. Posted Motion #12 was carried.

13. COUNCIL BUSINESS

13.1 Election of Bus Pass Refund Review Ad Hoc Committee

Motion to cap membership of the Bus Pass Refund Review Ad Hoc Committee at fifteen (15) members.
Postalian/Canas/Defeated.

Points against the motion:
- The Committee could be very large without the cap; however, to be able to present a recommendation to Council in January they will need a large number of members to get the amount of input needed.
- It was not the intention of the Finance Standing Committee to control this Committee and with no cap on the membership it would be open to everyone who is interested.

Points in favour of the motion:
- Having a cap on the number of members would not prevent others from having input on the decision process.

There was no further debate. The motion was defeated.

Motion to extend the parameters of the Ad Hoc Committee to allow non-voting members to be members of the Committee.
Searle/Ferris/Defeated.

Points against the motion:
- Councillors are democratically elected representatives of students; however, Commissioners and Coordinators are selected to their positions. Voting members of Council, as elected representatives, have a higher owness of responsibility.
There was no further debate. The motion was defeated.

It was decided that interested Council members would sign-up for Bus Pass Refund Review Ad Hoc Committee and Council would adopt the list of members.

13.2 Election of Governance Review Implementation Ad Hoc Committee

The following representatives from each Standing Committee of Council were nominated and elected:

Agenda and Operations Committee:
Adam Postalian – nominated – acclaimed

Student Life Standing Committee:
Steve Bigioni – nominated – acclaimed

Communications Standing Committee:
Matt Green – nominated – acclaimed

University Affairs Standing Committee:
Clara Milde – nominated
Patrick Whelan – nominated
Adam Fearnall – nominated – elected

Campus Issues Standing Committee:
Jennifer Tamse – nominated – acclaimed

Finance Standing Committee:
Billy Silverstein – nominated – elected
Andrew Shaw – nominated

13.3 Glue-Stick-A-Rama

The Speaker declared a five (5) minute recess to allow Council members to attach a summary of Robert’s Rules of Order to their voting cards.

The results of the election of members to the Governance Review Implementation Ad Hoc Committee were announced by Adam Smith, Chief Returning Coordinator.

Motion to destroy the ballots from the Ad Hoc Committee election. Kim/Duncan/Carried.

14. EXECUTIVE COUNCIL SUMMARY
(http://www.usc.uwo.ca/page.asp?id=20)
Tithecott presented his report to Council and provided the highlights of his month’s activities and updates of the progress of his platform initiatives including the laptop rental program; the USC blog; installation of the bus shelter; key to Western; and the Board of Regents nomination process.

15. QUESTIONS ARISING FROM REPORTS

Will the USC be purchasing more laptops for the rental program?

This will be reviewed after the end of first semester and if it can be afforded, more laptops will be purchased.

Why is there no more two-ply toilet paper in the washrooms in The Spoke?

Clarke advised that Tithecott had provided a strong directive to the USC staff to complete this initiative and it has been investigated by Jeff Armour, Food and Beverage Manager. The head of UWO Maintenance and Caretaking has given the USC permission to use the key that provides access to the toilet paper in our washrooms and, as of January, two-ply tissue purchased from Costco will be provided by the USC in The Spoke washrooms.

How many laptops are available in the rental program?

There are currently ten laptops available to rent which is felt to be a good start-up for this program.

Is there an update available on the OUSA General Assembly?

Coker advised that she would present on the General Assembly at the University Affairs Standing Committee meeting on December 1st.

Has someone new been added to Council?

Mackie advised that Aleigha Schurman has been selected as the 2011 Orientation Coordinator.

Could Costco provide post-consumer waste two-ply toilet paper as The Spoke tries to promote green priorities?

Tithecott responded that this would be done.

In regards to the article in the Gazette on the new London Mayor proposing cuts to the London Transit Commission (LTC) to fund tax freezes. What can students do to ensure service to the University is not reduced?
Coker responded that the LTC has proposed an increase of 6.7 percent to London City Council and is responsible to lobby for this increase. She added that a relationship between the USC and the new Mayor and new City Council would be developed and this issue would be a major priority. She recommended that anyone interested in this issue speak with the Chair of the University Affairs Standing Committee to request they develop a directive for herself and Tithecott to address this matter or see her with any ideas on what the USC should do.

Is the USC also willing to provide sanitary items for women in its washrooms?

Tithecott responded that this would be a matter of installing the required dispensers. He advised that the USC has eight dispensers ready to be installed.

Are a large number of people attending the Business after Five events?

Tithecott advised that, as of two days ago, approximately one hundred and sixty people had responded; however, the hope is for two hundred and fifty participants. He noted that the cost to attend this event is only $10.00 for students.

Will the Royal Bank be doing a presentation to students on financial preparedness?

Rygier responded that he needs to know what students want from this type of presentation. He noted that he would ask the members of the Presidents’ Roundtable to solicit input from their constituents.

Will there be representatives from business sectors other than banks at the Business after Five event?

Tithecott responded that participation in this event is open to any Chamber of Commerce member.

16. MATTERS ARISING FROM EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

There were no matters arising from Executive Council minutes.

17. QUESTION PERIOD

What is the budget and timeline for the new website?

Fassina responded that the capital request for the website has been approved for a budget of $20,000. She noted that a Twitter request for input has gone out; however, she still hopes to get more feedback from the general student population before design is done.

The website has been redesigned several times. Who decides when the USC needs a new design for the website?
Fassina advised that the current design was done as a temporary measure for Orientation Week; however, the overall website needs a major overhaul and an update every couple of years to keep it relevant.

Is there an update available on the soph database?

Mackie advised that they were hoping to have the soph database completed for the new year. Fassina added that the infrastructure is in place for the database however more time is needed for completion.

Will there be a skating rink on the Concrete Beach this winter?

Mackie advised that there would be a skating rink this year if weather permits.

Will students need to complete a USC waiver when they use the skating rink?

Mackie advised that students should not have to complete a waiver every time they use the skating rink.

18. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business for discussion.

19. ADJOURNMENT

The Speaker declared the meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

______________________________
President

______________________________
Recording Secretary

Approved on: ____________________

Sign In/Sign Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time In</th>
<th>Time Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sousa, Brandon</td>
<td>7:07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Time In</td>
<td>Time Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver, Jon</td>
<td>7:07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buccella, Jonathan</td>
<td>7:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Kevin</td>
<td>7:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bice, Jessica</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Paige</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>9:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>