

Students Nova Scotia	Board of Directors	students 
	<i>Meeting Minutes</i>	

Meeting Name:	Board Meeting		
Meeting Date:	June 18/20, 2013		
Meeting Time:	3:00 PM, AST		
Venue:	Call-in	City:	Halifax, NS
Attendees			
Primary and Secondary Delegates:	Ben Gunn-Doerge (SFXUSU), Aaron Beale (DSU), Matthew Rios (Vice Chair/ASU), Jared Perry (SMUSA), Kyle Power (Chair), Mike MacDonell (SMUSA), Darcy Shea (ASU)		
Other attendees:	Jonathan Williams (Executive Director), Alexis Zederayko (Volunteer Recorder)		
Absent:	Anne Hoganson (ASTSU) (regrets), Amy Brierley (regrets), Sagar Jha (regrets), Brennan Boudreau, Matthew Latimer (regrets)		
Quorum (50% of Members represented?): Yes			

1) Call to order

2) Roll call

3) Approval of Agenda

JW (ED): Suggested insertion of agenda item: discussion of the Mend the Gap campaign.

KP (Chair): Requested input from Board regarding ED's suggested amendment.

Amendment passed by general consent.

Amended agenda **approved by general consent.**

4) Approval of April 19-20, 2013 Minutes

KP (Chair): Noted that minutes were only received by many members today, as they were sent out late.

JP (SMUSA): Proposed that the minutes be tabled until the next meeting so that all Board members have time to read them.

Minutes tabled until next Board meeting **by general consent.**

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

5) Discussion of proposed sexual assault prevention project and alcohol practices and policy review

JW (ED): The province approached us (following the events of the Rehtaeh Parsons tragedy) indicating an interest in projects surrounding training of bar staff. It would be a pilot program, and would include sexual assault training, as is a common problem on university campuses and near hospitals. ED has prepared a proposal. \$30,000 ballpark, although ED would like general approval before moving forward and hammering out more specifics. The first component is training: bartenders, safewalk, RAs, SU staff, and volunteers, immediately prior to orientation. ED has been in touch with Antigonish Women's Resource Centre to collaborate on how to be most effective; for example, do we bring in experts to train, what are reasonable costs, etc. Our priority is that we are not just setting up something for this year, but on an ongoing basis. We can potentially find a professor or two who can train at participating campuses. The second component involves reopening the consultation with Anne regarding alcohol consumption, but linked to sexual assault on campus. We are getting the estimates on adding this component. ED had conversations with SUs regarding this project, and most were enthusiastic, with the exception of Dal, who expressed that the cost was too high.

KP (Chair): Can we go through the features of the proposals first, then come back?

JW (ED): Yes. The third component is that we would look at hosting a conference like the Mental Health Conference, but on sexual assault. The fourth is a centralizing design of materials to raise awareness of sexual assault, to be deployed on campus. We way want to leave this one open, and leave money to fund initiatives that come out of conferences.

KP (Chair): Requested clarification regarding the budget: have we been offered the \$30,000 for this project?

JW (ED): We were advised that funding is available, and told that it would ideally be offered for SU initiatives. The overall cost for this project will probably be higher than that quoted on this proposal, since costs vary for many of these items. We know that conferences cost around \$8,000 to host, because we have hosted one in the past, but the \$4.5K budgeted here for campaigns could easily go to \$5K, or even higher. Training will depend on how much we allow it to cost. We could easily spend \$20K.

KP (Chair): Called for questions.

JP (SMUSA): Who all is trained?

JW (ED): Bar staff, orientation staff, safewalk staff, RAs, SU members and staff, and volunteers. It will vary by campus, but the idea is for one session per campus. The time that the training takes depends on the Board; perhaps between three to five hours. We will want to set a standard.

KP (Chair): What is the timeline for the application?

JW (ED): Deadline is the end of June. We have 1.5 weeks to get the proposal done. No other groups are applying for this funding, to my knowledge.

KP (Chair): So what are the next steps?

JW (ED): If possible, approval of project in spirit so that we can move ahead on it. We will want an advisory committee of Board members so that we're not using too much staff resources, especially since they are already busy. Staff also do not have legitimacy or expertise to supervise all aspects of this project, while SU members do.

KP (Chair): We can't commit people who aren't here today. Perhaps one person can dedicate themselves, and we can build a team from there.

AB (DSU): Is the committee coordinating training and the whole thing?

JW (ED): That is a good question. I had originally thought that they would just handle the campaign element, but now that you mention it, it is probably best that they handle the whole things, except maybe the study component.

AB (DSU): Noted that a good deal of the DSU's training is free through their Women's Centre. AB likes the idea of a conference, but does not want to put emphasis on projects that might stifle conversations. It may not be helpful.

JW (ED): I'm comfortable to keep the campaign piece, and that makes sense to me. Also, ED would like to see more of the Board's feedback on designing materials for campaign and messaging. If we did buttons and posters, it could be covered by the individual SUs.

AB (DSU): Yes, if we have funding. My support is contingent on the messaging being good.

MR (ASU): Requested clarification: what is 'good'? The problem is that 'good' is very perception-based, and we won't satisfy all people. Instead, can we agree on a process?

JW (ED): That is why we wanted a Board committee to organize this project; as one way to ensure quality.

(Meeting temporarily adjourned by general consent due to technical difficulties. Reconvened on June 20th, at 11:00am. In attendance: Darcy Shea (ASU), Aaron Beale (DSU), Mike MacDonell (SMUSA), Jared Perry (SMUSA), Jonathan Williams (Executive Director), Alexis Zederayko (Volunteer Recorder))

MEND THE GAP DISCUSSION

JW (ED): The decision to be made at this point is whether or not we go ahead with hiring a co-op student, even if we do not have the funding at the point from D250. I feel that there is a 99% chance that we will get this funding. As per conversations immediately prior to this meeting, I am prepared to give up my salary bonus for half the cost of the co-op's salary in the very unlikely event that we do not receive funding.

Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **moved** and Darcy Shea (ASU) **seconded the motion: be it resolved** that Students NS move forward with hiring a co-op student.

Vote:

ASU - Yes

DSU - Yes

SMUSA - Yes

SFXSU - Yes

Motion passed unanimously.

- 5) Discussion of proposed sexual assault prevention project and alcohol practices and policy review (Continued)

MM (SMUSA): Agrees with AB's previous comment regarding training already in place. Is very comfortable with what SMUSA already has, so wants funding put into the campaign element, not training.

AB (DSU): I respect that the training element may be key to our receiving funding from the government, though.

JW (ED): Maybe we can shift it so that we have \$8K-\$10K in campaigns. Requested clarification from MM regarding what kinds of training is offered at SMUSA.

MM (SMUSA): Via SMU, there are programs of training for staff and students already. The addition of another would make three training programs for SMUSA.

JW (ED): Is there training for bar staff?

MM (SMUSA): No, but they are trained in situational problems. Ultimately, it is not in our best interest to spend \$8K-\$10K doing it.

JW (ED): But this money could cover the costs of that training.

DS (ASU): The admin officer at Acadia just purchased a training package here, too. Centralized training would be better, but maybe not offered like this, and it is not necessarily something that StudentsNS should be taking on.

JW (ED): One part of this project was the consultant study, in conjunction with the alcohol study. What if we asked the government to find gaps in how universities are preventing sexual assault, then we would help fund implementation of those recommendations?

MM (SMUSA): What is the cost of her study?

JW (ED): \$9,000. The DSU is not going to participate, so the SUs so far on board with the study are: SFXUSU, ASU, SMUSA, CBUSU (maybe), and hopefully MSVUSU. We're in discussion with the government to make sure it happens. Despite citing cost as the original objection, DSU is out, no matter the cost. The sexual assault prevention piece can be built onto the original study. We can take money out of the training piece.

MM (SMUSA): Noted that there may not be enough strong financial details for a vote today.

JW (ED): Then staff will be unable to move forward and figure out more specific details. It is a project involving a short period of time, lots of money, and a limited opportunity.

MM (SMUSA): SMUSA is not going to approve this project without funding.

JW (ED): StudentsNS would not implement this project without funding.

MM (SMUSA): Does not want a re-occurrence of a situation such as the alcohol study, where some schools withdrew, and SMUSA's costs went up.

JW (ED): Here, there are no costs to SUs. The government is responsible for the costs from the outset. Staff is asking for approval in spirit to move forward.

MM (SMUSA): Will approve only if guaranteed funding. SMUSA will not be paying for any of it.

JW (ED): Is there any other feedback?

AB (DSU): Proposes implementing self-defence training.

Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **moved** and Aaron Beale (DSU) **seconded the motion to adjourn.**

Motion passed by general consent.

ADJOURNMENT