

Dear Councilors,

I am issuing this written letter in response to the unjust disciplinary motion launched against me. I ask that you carefully consider the points I make and attentively ask questions of me if needed.

The issues I have regarding this motion are as follows:


1. Student Life Committee (SLC) meetings have occurred over my term making the primary basis of the motion false
2. The motion stipulates an excessive form of discipline without reasonable escalation of other avenues cited in the bylaws (written warning, letter of censure).
3. Insufficient evidence or context has been provided to indicate that false information has been reported.
4. Passing this motion as it stands is harmful to the union and does not act in its best interest
5. Passing this motion is harmful to student life on campus and deprives the incoming VPSL of a transition report

Student Life Committee meetings

The primary basis of the disciplinary motion is entirely incorrect. The motion's primary claim to disciplinary action is as follows "Mazen Brisha in his role as Vice President Student Life has failed to call a meeting of the student life committee". This claim is entirely incorrect as I have called numerous meetings so far during my term with 3 of them successfully achieving quorum. **SLC meeting dates were as follows July 21st, 2021,**

September 23rd, 2021, and October 20th, 2021. I have submitted a collection of SLC meeting agendas and minutes as well as corroborating evidence of correspondence between myself and SLC members that highlights me calling meetings. This documentation was submitted to the DSU chair prior to council but was not circulated under the discretion of the chair. I ask That these documents be circulated in the interest of councilors right to freedom of information as well as this union’s commitment to transparency.

As per the list of reasons stated in Bylaw 4.8.a the only one that is applicable to the motion filed against me relates to the aforementioned SLC meetings claim which I have proved to be false. **Since SLC meetings have been called and hit quorum this claim is unequivocally invalid and hence there is no basis for disciplinary action according to the list of reasons provided by the Bylaw.**



Reporting false information

The motion also stipulated that I have reported false information to council on multiple occasions. This claim is utterly unfounded and extremely misleading. **I have never intentionally attempted to mislead the council or provide false information in reports. Furthermore, no details, explanation or evidence has been provided that can conclusively prove that I have falsified information in my reports.** However, it would be untruthful of me to claim that all reports submitted by during my term have been perfect, however, mistakes and human error is always a factor when typing up reports but what I can confirm is there has never been any intention to submit false information to council. Hence, assuming false information have existed in my reports, which is something I refute, launching a motion to remove an elected student representative on that basis is a gross over-reaction to say the least.

Acting in the union's best interests

I believe the purpose of every councilor in attendance is to act in the best interest of the union. Due to this I implore each of you to explore if passing this motion would truly be in the best interest of the union and its democratic processes. **To pass this motion, when the basis of it is false or lacks sufficient evidence devalues and ridicules the democratic processes of the DSU and furthermore sets a dangerous precedent that could be abused and exploited in the future. To remove an elected representative, I believe the least that should be expected is overwhelming evidence, or an abhorrent breach that requires**

immediate action. The bylaws clearly do not specifically mention any clauses for office removal for that exact purpose. Due to how easy it would be to manipulate and unjustly punish elected representatives and breach the sanctity of elections in the process. Because of this **I find the extreme interpretation of bylaw 4.8.a to include removal to be an extremely dangerous manipulation of policies that jeopardize the notions a student union stands for.**

I implore you to ask yourself, how does removing an executive from office a month before the end of their term really benefit the union? **The passing of this motion would result in VPSL vacancy in the impact awards planning and execution which is rapidly approaching, put a stop to current end of year programming initiatives, suspend the mental health forum for the rest of term and most impactfully prevents me from being able to compile a VPSL transition report which would only negatively influence union operations.** The bulk of the VPSL duties occur in the summer due to the intense amount of work necessary to host a successful Oweek, due to this having an effective and comprehensive transition report is essential for the next VPSL to be able to start their position on the right foot and be successful. Hence **passing this motion would conclusively not be in the unions best interest and as a result all councilors have a duty to vote against it.**

Furthermore, ask yourselves why no other disciplinary actions were discussed? Whether it be verbal warning letter of censure or even pay deduction? I believe the particular form of

disciplinary motion launched is the least constructive and the most harmful to the union's operations and best interests. Alternate disciplinary measures would have far more appropriate while also ensuring VPSL duties are maintained as to not harm union operations.

Excessive severity

while I would wholeheartedly like to believe that this motion and the correspondence I have received was conducted honestly and in good faith, I find certain aspects of these actions to be acrimonious to say the least. **It is pivotal to point out that this motion represents an unprecedented level of escalation from oversight committee for such relatively minor indiscretions or at the very least a first-time offense.** Considering that the bylaw only specifically stipulates “verbal warning, a letter of censure or recall to by-election” to instead opt to directly issue a motion for removal which is not directly referenced in any way WITHOUT first going through alternative disciplinary measures must be seen as excessive discipline, particularly for notions that are false (like not calling an SLC meeting) or severely lack evidence or context (like submitting false information). Furthermore, the passing of this motion opens the union to potential legal ramifications considering the unusual escalation of the situation. I would like to think that to remove a democratically elected student representative, that won an election with 2 thousand student voters, that there would be clear irrefutable evidence rather than conjecture. **I find it extraordinarily unreasonable that no other disciplinary actions were discussed or tabled first, to launch a first motion in the form of removal is excessive, unempathetic and bordering on abusive.**

I strongly question the oversight committee's decision to not explore alternate disciplinary measures first such as official warning, letter of censure or even pay deduction. The particular form of disciplinary motion launched is the least constructive and the most harmful to the union's operations and best interests. Alternate disciplinary measures would have far more appropriate while also ensuring VPSL duties are maintained as to not harm union operations.

Lastly, I would implore you all to remember why you ran for your respective seats on council, the responsibility you hold in upholding the democratic process of the union and the magnitude of passing such an unprecedentedly severe motion. Furthermore, I invite you to consider the timing this motion is being launched in respect to the voting of current ongoing elections and urge you to consider the inconsistencies occurring here that establish an unjust and inequitable pattern of decisions. **I merely ask that you scrutinize the details of the motion, the inaccuracy of it, the timing of it and the lack of evidence provided by it. I ask that unless you're certain that passing this motion is the most reasonable and just outcome you vote vehemently against it.** Lest your enthusiasm and desire for student representation be unintentionally used in a targeted smear campaign that jeopardizes the union's notions of equity and democracy while opening up the DSU to legal action for wrongful dismissal.

I encourage you all to ask questions, I ran to serve students and I am here today to continue doing just that 😊

Best Regards,

Mazen Brisha

Vice President Student Life