Monday, November 14, 2016
4:07 PM
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Paches (Chair)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Dejong</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca El Ghossein</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorsa Nahid</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Prochnau</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Hammond</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Larsen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba Al Hammouri</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyah Saif (Presentation)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Scott</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES (FC-2016-09)

2016-09/1  INTRODUCTION

2016-09/1a  Call to Order
Meeting called to order at 4:07 PM.

2016-09/1b Approval of Agenda
LARSEN/DEJONG moved to approve the agenda for November 14, 2016.
6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-09/1c Approval of Minutes
LARSEN/HAMMOND moved to approve the minutes for October 31, 2016 as amended.
6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-09/1d Chair's Business

2016-09/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-09/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-09/3a FACRA DFU Report

Please see FC-09.01
Checked their budget, financial statements, license, and mandate.

PACHES/NAHID move to conditionally approve upon their seat to the lease agreement.
6/0/0
CARRIED
**2016-09/3b**

**Gateway Students’ Society Updated Mandate Document**

PACHES
Updated document is attached. Updated policies are posted online.

DEJONG/HAMMOND move to approve the Gateway Students’ Journalism Society DFU disbursement as presented.
7/0/0
CARRIED

---

**2016-09/3c**

**Presentation by Asyah Saif**

Presentation is shared via Google Docs.

LARSEN
What is the other reason that we’ve been operating under this procedure probably since the committee was made? Why did we decide to change it now?

ASYAH SAIF
Even before I took over in July, this was not the practice. The practice was that they were voting members.

LARSEN
That doesn’t reflect how this is setup then, correct?

ASYAH SAIF
This is an unfortunate reality for a lot of Student Group Services things. In the past, there is very little procedural documentation of things. There are many big projects starting last year and this year. This is one of those things where we don’t have documentation of why. What’s this practice? Did they not give us money before? Is this Engagement Grant new? This makes sense if they don’t give money. If they are giving money, then everyone in the committee says they should be voting members.

LARSEN
I can’t think of any exceptions within our organizations where we would put voting staff members over our process in which we have hand control over this entire time. If we allow them to be voting members, they now sit equal in representation on this committee as do the students as this committee is developed to give funds to student groups.
If they're giving money, great, but why do they want more ability to affect change on how we grant money to student groups?

ASYAH SAIF
They want to have a say on how their money is being spent.

LARSEN
Are we going to allow them to have that control over how we dictate giving to student groups?

DEJONG
I don’t think the 3 staff members would really dominate in the voting. If we have an issue in the future, we can review the situation then.

PACHES/DEJONG move to accept amendments as presented on 13.4 of the Finance Committee Standing Orders. 6/1/0 (LARSEN AGAINST) CARRIED

ASYAH SAIF PRESENTATION SECOND PAGE 1B

Presentation shared via Google Docs.

ASYAH SAIF
Is the previous suggestion made fair for a group that is dissolved, and then a year later another set of individuals pick it up with the group having no assets? This group will not be eligible for the Restart Grant. My suggestion is to include an “or” instead of an “and” in the eligibility requirements.

LARSEN
Why is the lapsed year matter if it is a completely new set of executives? They don't have any assets.

ASYAH SAIF
The number of years is there because this is a norm that we observed.

PACHES
Is there a need to give away a lot of money or is there already high demand for it?
ASYAH SAIF
We normally run out.

PACHES
If we remove “three years” it opens up the ability to abuse the system.

NAHID
She just said that student groups need to state how they spent the money.

ASYAH SAIF
Essentially, you could lie in your applications. We do request receipts.

I agree there can be a higher chance that groups will be taking advantage of this. If three years is a problem, we could change it to 1 or 2. I would recommend 2.

PACHES
I think we should have a year restriction. It provides discipline to groups.

ASYAH SAIF
Make a number of year restriction and replacing “and” with “or”. If a group is even less than a year then they pick it up again, there is that exception to honour that. If they applied, and they were only a year inactive, but they can say they don’t have connections with the previous execs and no assets with sufficient evidence, then the committee can make that call.

HAMMOND
If you put “or” in for number 2 doesn’t that imply that if you’re inactive for 3 years but have assets, you’re eligible for Startup Grant?

ASYAH SAIF
To apply for Startup Grant, you have to be inactive for more than 3 years or you have to prove that you don’t have existing assets. If you’re inactive for more than 4 years and you have assets, you’ll be able to apply.

HAMMOND
Do we want that though? I don’t think that’s good.
ASYAH SAIF
We normally don’t see that.

HAMMOND
I feel like the “or” doesn’t fit because if they have assets then I don’t think they should be getting the grant.

PACHES
I would be more comfortable leaving the “and” and switching it to 2 years.

HAMMOND
What about a student group that have been inactive for less than 2 years and has no assets left over?

PACHES
I’m comfortable to tell them them to wait until they are eligible.

ASYAH SAIF
Some student groups are active for many years, but never bought anything --- no assets. If they become inactive for a year, then reactivate, they can say they don’t have assets. Also, important reminder that this is only for capital stuff that they will get the money.

PACHES/NAHID move to approve the amendments to student group grant categories as presented.
7/0/0
CARRIED

ASYAH SAIF PRESENTATION ACCESS FUND

Presentation shared via Google Docs.

SCOTT
I like the forever ineligible for receiving the fund.

LARSEN
I’m perfectly okay with that. I’m confused with number 7. How would you forever ineligible to opt-out if you can't pay it?

ASYAH SAIF
It’s automatically in your fees.
LARSEN
Let’s say in my first year, I receive a fund from the Access fund. In my fourth year, I don’t want to pay it anymore. You can’t opt-out?

PACHES
The Access Fund is the last resort. The philosophy behind it is if you have benefitted from the program, then you should give back so others can benefit from it just as you did.

LARSEN
I don’t understand why people will forever be ineligible to opt-out.

ASYAH SAIF
The reason is the total maximum amount which is $6000 a year.

PACHES
The whole philosophy of Access Fund is it is an emergency fund for students by students.

PROCHNAU
How many people claim it?

PACHES
Last year, we went 20% over budget.

HAMMOND
Is there a concern if we change it to them only being ineligible in that academic year, that it will it increase the number of opt-outs? In terms of point 6.

ASYAH SAIF
There is no data on that. That’s not the reality.

PACHES/PROCHNAU move to approve the amendments to 19.6 as presented.
7/0/0
CARRIED

PACHES
We will table the amendments of point 7 until holding day of the original referendum. After Discover Governance meeting regarding the clause and the Access Fund, you can bring it back to the committee.
2015-01/4  INFORMATION ITEMS

2015-01/5  ADJOURNMENT

2015-01/5a  Next Meeting: Monday November 28, 2016 at 4:00PM.

2015-01/5b  Meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PACHES/NAHID move to conditionally approve upon their seat to the lease agreement.</td>
<td>6/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEJONG/HAMMOND move to approve the Gateway Students’ Journalism Society DFU disbursement as presented.</td>
<td>7/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHES/DEJONG move to accept amendments as presented on 13.4 of the Finance Committee Standing Orders.</td>
<td>6/1/0 (LARSEN AGAINST) - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHES/NAHID move to approve the amendments to student group grant categories as presented.</td>
<td>7/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHES/PROCHNAU move to approve the amendments to 19.6 as presented.</td>
<td>7/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>