Thursday October 8, 2015
4:00 pm
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jared Burton (Chair)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wang</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Dejong</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Kwan</td>
<td>Cody Bondarchuk</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Schlamp</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Hanwell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahim Rahman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Angus</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES (PC 2015-07)

2015-07/1 INTRODUCTION

2015-07/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 16:02.

2015-07/1b Approval of Agenda

WANG J./ANGUS move to approve the agenda.

6/0/0
CARRIED
2015-07/1c  Approval of Minutes
RAHMAN/BONDARCHUK move to approve the minutes.

7/0/0
CARRIED

2015-07/1d  Chair’s Business
BURTON reported on the doodle poll that he will find a time when people are free to attend the meetings.

2015-07/2  QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2015-07/3  COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2015-07/3a  BONDARCHUK presented the first principles of Safe Spaces policy to the committee and asked the committee for recommendations. The idea of this policy to balance freedom of express and safety of students on campus. Since there is legislation for freedom of expression, he feels there is a need of a policy to protect students’ from harmful materials. And he thinks this policy is gentle.

HANWELL asked for the clarity of the idea of consent in point 6 and 7. He thinks that active consent is not possible. BONDARCHUK thinks that since one cannot obtain consent from every student, potential harmful material cannot appear on QUAD. FLAMAN thinks that if students do not avoid harmful materials, they are giving their consent. HANWELL concerns how to balance two sides of a debate without taking away the ability of one side to protect themselves from harmful materials.

On point 3, RAHMAN thinks that the SU should not police on the content of public advertising on campus as the SU and university administration are not qualified to do that. But he agrees to the principles. BONDARCHUK clarified that the principles do not call out a specific person to do this job but there should be a guide line for students.

ANGUS asked about “reasonable person.” BONDARCHUK explained it means an average person in university community. ANGUS concerns that it is hard to regulate what reasonable person think as acceptable.
WANG J. pointed out that the wording of point 7 implies that there will always be harmful materials on campus and the SU is allowing that. He thinks that they should address the materials themselves.

HANWELL thinks that potential harmful materials should be confined in a separate space, such as a lecture hall. But it is still a public space and students have a right to enter it anytime. BONDARCHUK thinks that the policy should not deal with privacy. It is about the consent of students. And it is something not regulated.

ANGUS thinks that it is tricky to regulate as there is a potential that the bias of the majority will determine what is reasonable and he also worries that the policy cannot protect the rights and freedom of those who fall into the category of minority. BURTON also concerns how to protect people who voice their opinion according to regulations. BONDARCHUK does not want the policy to push too hard and regulation is also a big issue to deal with.

On point 3, HANWELL asked for clarity whether it also includes academic programming, BONDARCHUK it has the potential as he wants instructors to be mindful for the content of their course. But HANWELL thinks that it is weak to enforce. And he thinks it is better to make it general for public advertising. BURTON questioned the need of regulation as instructors always gives heads up for harmful materials. ANGUS thinks that students should have a certain degree of open-mindedness in class.

On point 7, RAHMAN concerns that the definition of “potentially harmful material” is very broad and it would be hard to enforce when put in the second principles. On point 5, HANWELL thinks that the word “speech” is not appropriate a better candidate is “expression.” He also concerns with the word “harmful” as it is subjective, and he thinks that “hateful” is a better choice. BURTON agrees.

BONDARCHUK wants to amend the Students’ Space policy to Public Space and blending the policy with some of the elements in this policy. This way it is dealing more with the space instead of opinion.

HANWELL suggested that medium is worth discussing. He gave an example that some medium is not hateful but triggering. ANGUS wondered how much should one compromise.
BONDARCHUK’s another reason for public space policy is that QUAD is a special area that needs to be addressed.

RAHMAN agrees with point 8 but he thinks it is impossible to carry out. BONDARCHUK argued that it is not a resolution but it is a principle that strengthens other points in resolution.

BURTON commented that point 2 and 4 are straightforward. BONDARCHUK thinks that point 1 and 2 can be combined. BURTON agreed to blend these principles into Public Space policy.

BONDARCHUK withdrew his motion.

2015-07/4 INFORMATION ITEMS
2015-07/5 ADJOURNMENT
2015-07/5a Next Meeting: To be decided.

WANG J./RAHMAN move to adjourn.

6/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 16:58.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WANG J./ANGUS move to approve the agenda.</td>
<td>6/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAHMAN/BONDARCHUK move to approve the minutes.</td>
<td>7/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG J./RAHMAN move to adjourn.</td>
<td>6/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>