

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Members Present: Daniah Al-Naseri (left at 6:55 pm), Victoria Bali, Molly Brenzel, Sumana Gupta, Anthony Lenarduzzi (left at 6:45 pm), Emmy Luo (left at 7:40 pm), Josh Moran, Kathleen Nolan, Daniel Ofori-Darko, Ariel Oleynikov, Michael Pacheco (arrived at 6:39 pm), Matteo Raso (left at 6:56 pm), Zachary Rucchin, Lolia Shallouf (left at 6:50 pm), Blakeney Smith, Cameron Stotts, Nicole Traynor (see Item 11.3.1)

Regrets: Jena Lee Ashley (see Item 11.3.1), Anna Canella, Simonne Clout, Briana Green-Ince, Jessica Krawitz, Alan Negrin, Jaskiran Sethi

Executive Present: Dena Van de Coevering, Claudia Idzik, Lindsey Fletcher, Horeen Hassan

Chair: Cameron Olesen

Policy & Transition Manager: Earl Evans

Scribe: Sarah Dias, Pete Wobschall, PTM completed the minutes May 8, 2020.

Guests: Patrick MacCarthy, CRO

Overview of Motions

11.2.1. Approve the Agenda

MOTION AS AMENDED: That the agenda for the CSA Board of Directors Meeting on February 26, 2020, be approved as amended, with the following items withdrawn:

- 11.6.1 Executive Committee Minutes Meeting #29 – February 5, 2020
- 1.11.3 Notice of amendments to Policy G re Nominations

Motion as amended carried

11.3.1. Ratification and De-Ratification of ASA Representative

MOTION: That Jena-Lee Ashley be de-ratified as the Aboriginal Student Association (ASA) representative on the CSA Board of Directors, effective immediately;

RESOLVED that **Nicole Traynor** be ratified as the Aboriginal Student Association representative on the CSA Board of Directors, effective immediately.

Motion carried

11.5. Approval of Past Board Minutes

MOTION: That the Minutes be approved for the following meetings:

11.5.1. Board Meeting # 9 – January 29, 2020

Motion carried

11.5.2. Board Meeting # 10 – February 5, 2020

MOTION AS AMENDED: That the Minutes be approved for the Board Meeting # 10 – February 5, 2020 with the following amendments:

1. On page 6 of 19 can we add the word ‘invoice’ after the words ‘sent out’, and
2. On page 18 to remove the end of the section beside my name of ‘and friends’

Motion as Amended carried

11.7. Executive Updates

MOTION: To receive the following Executive Updates as information:

- 11.7.1 President
- 11.7.2 VP Student Experience
- 11.7.3. VP Academic
- 11.7.4. VP External

Motion carried

11.10. Committee Updates and Reports

11.10.1. PBRC Report

MOTION: That the Policy & Bylaw Review Committee Report from Earl Evans, PBRC Chair, be received as information at the Board of Directors meeting on February 26, 2020.

Motion carried

11.11. Business

11.11.1. Winter 2020 General Election Report – CRO

MOTION: That the Winter 2020 General Election Report from Patrick MacCarthy, Chief Returning Officer, be received as information at the CSA Board Meeting on February 26, 2020.

Motion carried

MOTION: That the results of the CSA Winter 2020 General Election, as reported by the Chief Returning Officer, be ratified and now declared official; and

RESOLVED that the following members be ratified to the 2020-2021 CSA Board of Directors, based on the official results of the Winter 2020 General Election:

Executive

President

Tyler Poirier

VP Student Experience

Sara Kuwatly

VP External

Horeen Hassan

College Representatives

College of Arts

Areej Amer

Bella Harris

College of Biological Sciences

Katy Oada

Maya Persram

College of Social and Applied Human Sciences

Jessica Krawitz

Laura Wilson

Motion carried

11.11.2. Candidates' Package – Winter 2020 By-Election

MOTION AS AMENDED: That the candidate package be referred to Policy and Bylaw Review Committee for review and amendment;

RESOLVED that pages 7 and 8 of the package be used as a non-binding outline until such time as committee is able to produce a recommendation, and that recommendation is approved by the Board of Directors;

RESOLVED that any successful candidates from the Winter 2020 General Election have the option upon approval of the updated package to transfer to the updated package;

RESOLVED the package be amended to remove the "limit outside commitments clause";

RESOLVED the updated candidate package be presented by PBRC to the Board of Directors by April 1, 2020.

Motion as Amended carried

11.11.5. Teacher Excellence Award – Selection Committee

MOTION: That one College representative, one student organization representative, and one additional non-Executive Board member be appointed to the TEA Selection Committee;

RESOLVED that the following CSA Board members be appointed to the Committee:

- Kathleen Nolan
- Zachary Rucchin
- Daniel Ofori-Darko

Motion carried

11.11.6. Solidarity Statement

MOTION: That the CSA host a student walk-out in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en on Wednesday, March 4, 2020 at 3:00 pm EST;

RESOLVED that the CSA write a statement in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en.

Motion carried

11.14. In Camera Session

MOTION: to approve the in-camera minutes from February 5, 2020.

Motion carried

11.15. Adjournment

MOTION: To adjourn the CSA Board of Directors Meeting of February 26, 2020 at 8:58 pm.

Motion carried

Agenda # 11 – February 26, 2020

11.0. Call to Order

11.1. Land Acknowledgement

11.2. Adoption of the Agenda

11.2.1. Approve the Agenda

11.2.2. (New) Declarations of Conflicts (Bylaw 1, Section 10.2)

11.3. Ratifications and De-Ratifications

11.3.1. ASA Representative

11.4. Comments from the Chair

11.4.1. Introductions and Pronouns

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



11.5. Approval of Past Board Minutes

- 11.5.1. Meeting # 9 – January 29, 2020
- 11.5.2. Meeting # 10 – February 5, 2020

11.6. Executive Committee Minutes

- 11.6.1. Meeting # 29 – February 5, 2020

11.7. Executive Updates

- 11.7.1. President
- 11.7.2. VP Student Experience
- 11.7.3. VP Academic
- 11.7.4. VP External

11.8. Director Reports

11.9. CSA Services Update and Report

11.10. Committee Updates and Reports

- 11.10.1. PBRC Report

11.11. Business

- 11.11.1. Winter 2020 General Election Report – CRO
- 11.11.2. Candidates' Package – Winter 2020 By-Election
- 11.11.3. NOTICE – Amendments to Policy Appendix G re Nominations
- 11.11.4. NOTICE – Amendment to Policy Appendix C re Ext. Staff Contracts
- 11.11.5. Teacher Excellence Award – Selection Committee
- 11.11.6. Solidarity Statement

11.12. New Business

- 11.12.1.

11.13. Announcements

11.14. *In Camera* Session

- 11.14.1. In Camera Minutes – February 5, 2020

11.15. Adjournment

Minutes # 11 – February 26, 2020

11.0. Call to Order

Chair Cameron Oleson called the meeting to order at 6:12 pm.

11.1. Land Acknowledgement

Land Acknowledgement by Josh Moran

In keeping with Indigenous protocols across Turtle Island, it is appropriate to acknowledge and pay respect to ancestral and traditional territories and local Indigenous communities. Acknowledging the territory in which we learn and work honours the relationship between the land and the Indigenous ancestors or stewards of the land.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



To be meaningful and respectful, a territorial acknowledgement needs to be intentional. This is a time to give thanks, and to consider our role in the stewardship of Mother Earth and in building relationships with Indigenous people and communities.

11.2. Adoption of the Agenda

11.2.1. Approve the Agenda

MOTION: That the agenda for the CSA Board of Directors Meeting on February 26, 2020, be approved as printed and distributed.

Moved: Dena Van de Coevering

Seconded: Anthony Lenarduzzi

MOTION TO AMEND:

Withdraw item 11.6.1 as the Chair will revise the Executive Committee Minutes Meeting #29 – February 5, 2020 and present at future Board of Directors meeting to be received.

Dena Van de Coevering:

I would like to amend the agenda by removing item 11.6.1. as these minutes need to return to the Executive Committee for one more round of approvals to amend a section of the contents before it's approved by the Board.

Cameron Olesen:

If I may make a recommendation, during 11.6.1. rather than having a motion to receive as information you can have it in the minutes that that item is still there and the update is that it needs to go back for approval. You don't need to remove it from the agenda necessarily.

Dena Van de Coevering:

We need to do more than just approve it, there needs to be some amendments to the minutes.

Cameron Olesen:

Yes. The item would remain but the update would be that the minutes need to return to the Executive for amendment before they can be received by the Board as information.

Lindsey Fletcher:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Based on everything we discussed [at Executive] the idea was that they would not be discussed at the meeting tonight. That's why there was an amendment to strike them from the agenda.

Cameron Olesen:

Very well then. There is a motion to remove item 11.6.1. from the agenda.

Moved: Dena Van de Coevering

Seconded: Sumana Gupta

Vote on Motion to Amend

Motion carried

Withdraw item 11.11.3. NOTICE – Amendments to Policy Appendix G re Nominations and add to a future Board Meeting agenda.

Moved: Dena Van de Coevering

Seconded: Lolia Shallouf

Vote on Motion to Amend

Motion carried

MOTION AS AMENDED: That the agenda for the CSA Board of Directors Meeting on February 26, 2020, be approved as amended, with the following items withdrawn:

- 11.6.1
- 11.11.3.

Vote on Motion as Amended

Motion carried

11.2.2. (New) Declarations of Conflicts (Bylaw 1, Section 10.2)

No declarations received.

11.3. Ratifications and De-Ratifications

11.3.1. Ratification and De-Ratification of ASA Representative

WHEREAS Jena-Lee Ashley has resigned as CSA Board member in an email to the PTM;

MOTION: That Jena-Lee Ashley be de-ratified as the Aboriginal Student Association (ASA) representative on the CSA Board of Directors, effective immediately;

RESOLVED that **Nicole Traynor** be ratified as the Aboriginal Student Association representative on the CSA Board of Directors, effective immediately.

Moved: Matteo Raso
Seconded: Emmy Luo

Vote on Motion
Motion carried

11.4. Comments from the Chair

Chair:

Good evening everyone. I'd like to thank you for being here for this special Board Meeting, with that being said and for the benefit of all the members remember to raise your placard if you wish to be added to the speakers list for an item, or for voting purposes and raise your hand for a point of information, point of parliamentary procedure, point of personal privilege, or a point of order.

11.4.1. Introductions and Pronouns

Those present introduced themselves and stated the pronouns they wish to use.

11.5. Approval of Past Board Minutes

MOTION: That the Minutes be approved for the following meetings:

11.5.1. Board Meeting # 9 – January 29, 2020

Moved: Lolia Shallouf
Seconded: Anthony Lenarduzzi

Vote on Motion
Motion carried

11.5.2. Board Meeting # 10 – February 5, 2020

Moved: Anthony Lenarduzzi
Seconded: Blakeney Smith

MOTION TO AMEND:

Dena Van de Coevering:

I'd like to make an amendment to two sections of the minutes:

1. On page 6 of 19 can we add the word 'invoice' after the words 'sent out', and

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



2. On page 18 to remove the end of the section beside my name 'and friends'

Moved: Dena Van de Coevering

Seconded: Anthony Lenarduzzi

MOTION AS AMENDED: That the Minutes be approved for the Board Meeting # 10 – February 5, 2020 with the following amendments:

3. On page 6 of 19 can we add the word 'invoice' after the words 'sent out', and

4. On page 18 to remove the end of the section beside my name of 'and friends'

Vote on Motion as Amended

Motion carried

~~11.6. Executive Committee Minutes - **Withdrawn**~~

11.7. Executive Updates

11.7.1. President

Dena Van de Coevering:

Good evening folks. Welcome back from reading week. It's good to see familiar faces around our table and some new faces as well. I do want to highlight that this evening is our PTM's last Board Meeting [inaudible].

As for more business-related items since we met as a Board we've been pretty busy as the CSA and a lot of you folks were involved in parts of that as well.

So our AGM being involved we are very ecstatic to see that we made quorum and kept for the entire evening and were able to complete the business we needed to complete and inform our student body of the ongoings of the CSA in our Annual Meeting. I wanted to extend a very big thank you to you folks for being a part of advertising for it and promoting it and being active during the meeting there.

The other item that I wanted to raise this evening as part of my update is that we have a By-election coming up. So, for our VP Academic position we are hosting our nominations open today until the 3rd. So if you have a friend who near graduation that enjoys policy, accessibility, I recommend they either reach out to our current VPA or myself, or one of our other VPAs to discuss the position and encourage them to apply because we are encouraged to have some nominations. Beyond that we are also looking to our Board of Directors for support during the voting week, so that we can get quorum in the position and ensure we have a full Executive starting for May 1st.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Those are the main updates I wanted to share. If you had other questions from my report, I am happy to hear them.

10.7.2. VP Student Experience

Claudia Idzik:

For March there are big events happening, Sexy Bingo is tomorrow, and another Sexy Bingo is on March 26th. These are the last two Sexy Bingos.

It's not in my minutes or update, we are going to host a Sexual Violence Panel towards the end of March and it will also include a documentary screening. It will be really cool and it will be a nice day for it. I think this is a really good group for that.

There is also the Guelph Student Market, so if you have anyone that makes signs, or makes merch, music, or sells CDs, I encourage them to fill out the form that I posted on the Facebook page.

There is the first time I can say on the record, we got Bill Nye. If you folks didn't get a ticket today, because it sold out in 20 minutes again, then there are volunteer opportunities and I think everyone emailed everyone on the Board. That's all for me.

10.7.3. VP Academic

Lindsey Fletcher:

One thing I would like to highlight from my report is that there are a lot of changes coming forward this time of the semester when Executive implementation and [inaudible] 2020, so the majority of those that I am working on are course changes that I am working with a couple different committees for. There will also be changes to the co-curricular transcript and the evaluation system. I will have more updates later on and the changes will come into effect in Fall 2020.

I am having an event next Tuesday from 1pm to 3pm in the Library lobby. There will be free coffee and treats, so come out and tell us what you know about open education, why it's important to you, and how we can continue spreading this message across campus to your faculty.

Speaking of faculty, the Teaching Teacher Excellence Award nominations deadline is Friday at 4pm, so please get those nominations into me as soon as possible. You will see later on the agenda that we are getting a selection committee for that, and there are 64 days left for me.

11.7.4. VP External

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Horeen Hassan:

Hi everyone – welcome back. I hope your reading week went well and you had the time or chance to actually do some readings. I know that every year during my undergrad I was like ‘Reading Week; it’s going to be super productive’ and then I end up doing nothing. So hopefully you are a lot more disciplined than I am.

I was awesome to see that we had quorum with the AGM consistently; nobody ever left and we never had to pause the meeting, so that is a huge thank you to all the Board Members that actually came out to table with myself for a good chunk of the time. It was fun, so thank you so much for that.

Other than that, the news has been keeping me down, so now is the time to start mobilizing, so I am really excited to see what we are going to do for the upcoming few months and see how we can organize better.

A few things I would like to highlight from my update is that the Guelph District Labour Council the Ontario Federation of Labour actually hosted a rally against all the cuts the Conservative Government has been making. On February 22nd at the Scotiabank Convention Centre in Niagara Falls. So that’s where the PC Government was hosting their policy convention. We greeted them with our signs and reminded them that we are angry with all these cuts that are really impacting a lot people from across Ontario. Thank you to the folks that attended with me.

Another thing I would like to highlight is that I am currently working on a late night service campaign. I don’t know how many students are actually aware, but we actually have late night service, and we have Sunday service, so you can actually not take an Uber after 6 or 7 o’clock on Sundays, but can take the Sunday service and bus it. If anybody has questions around Sunday Service or late night service, feel free to reach out to me. I am trying to work on a campaign, so I can get all of this information out to students, because currently ridership for late night service and Sunday service is a bit low; so I want to try and enhance that because I know that students are in need of rides, but they end up taking Ubers because they are unaware of these services. My personal goal is to get more people to use that.

Another thing I would like to highlight is the Racialized Students Constituency that I have been talking about. That group has been meeting consistently for a while now every single week on Thursdays from 4 o’clock until 5:30pm. The students that come out to these meetings see a lot of value in it and appreciate that that space exists. So it would be awesome to get more racialized students to come out because it is a space that is needed on campus that is acting. So get the message out to your coloured friends that there is a space for you to come join us.

The other thing I would like to point out is that the Fairness for International Students is a campaign that I’m working on right now this semester as well

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



because the University has announced that tuition fees are going up for international students. The fee increase is anywhere between 10% and 15% depending on program, so this is a very heavy hit for our international students who are already paying the highest fees in the country. It becomes super difficult to budget as an international student coming into this thinking that you have this much money that it will take to get your post-secondary education, but every single year the tuition hikes keep going up because the international students' fees are unregulated, so universities can jack them up as much as they like. So basically that's what's happening. A bit of it has to do with the 10% tuition reductions, so universities are having a big revenue loss, so Canada tried to attempt to make up for that, so that's why you are seeing a lot of cuts to classes and the strictness around parking because the strategy is either to cut costs or generate income or revenue, so part of that is charging these fees onto international students who are relying on whatever...

Chair:

I am sorry but I am going to have to cut you off right there. Unless another member of the Board would like to extend Member Hassan's time.

MOTION: to extend the speakers time by 3 minutes.

Moved: Daniel Ofori-Darko

Seconded: Ariel Oleynikov

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

Horeen Hassan: [continued]

That is the case with international students so we are also looking for domestic allies, so domestic students can speak up on matters that international students might not be comfortable speaking up on. It would be nice to get more allies or anyone that is interested in issues around international students and wanted to organize around that to reach out to me.

The other thing I wanted to highlight our Tap In campaign / Water is a Human Right. On February 14th I was tabling and we had an event called Save Water Break Up with Plastic. This Valentines Day event targeted at Ed Townsley from Hospitality Services. We made him cute little notes with little hearts on it saying 'Hey Ed, I love water, so you should break up with plastic and our campus should be bottled water-free', so that is something we are working on. Currently the group's organizing around World Water Day. If you are interested in any world water initiatives, or just issues around campus regarding plastic, then reach out to

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



myself and I can get you hooked with the group, so you can do some really good work.

The last thing I wanted to highlight was the CFS lobby week was over Reading Week, so the National Lobby Week was from February 17th to the 21st. Currently the Ontario Lobby Week is taking place right now and it's from February 24th to the 27th. There is a delegate from Guelph who has attended. I attended the national one and some of the issues that we were stressing was free education, student debt, indigenous rights, and that post-secondary education is a human right, fairness to international students, climate action, and student housing conditions that our students are currently facing.

If you have any questions about anything or my update, please feel free to reach out to me.

Chair:

Any questions for Member Hassan?

Ariel Oleynikov:

I want to confirm where the racialized group meets?

Horeen Hassan:

They meet in the CSA Boardroom.

MOTION: That the following Executive Updates be received as information:

- 11.7.1. President
- 11.7.2. VP Student Experience
- 11.7.3. VP Academic
- 11.7.4. VP External

Moved: Anthony Lenarduzzi

Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

11.8. Director Reports

Chair:

For the benefit of everyone here, 11.8. Director Reports is the time to update everyone on your activities as a member of the Board of Directors. Those that are sitting on committees, or things directly related to the organization. Any announcements that you have to make in regards to your individual organizations,

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



such as Student Unions, or anything outside of that, be saved for the Announcement Section at 11.13.

[name inaudible]

Safewalk Coordinator hiring happened today and it's very exciting to get someone hired.

[name inaudible]

My name is [inaudible]...I tabled [inaudible] the GM and I also founded the Heath and Dental Plan Committee and I sat on the Jack and [inaudible].

I was also fortunate enough to attend our AGM and I am currently sitting on SHAC Assistant Coordinator hiring committee for our VP Academic. We just scheduled our meeting and I am excited to get things rolling with our hiring process.

I am also sitting on our Clubs Programming Hiring Interview Committee and have already scheduled interviews and have already reviewed and screened our applicants. I am super excited to be [inaudible].

[2? members waived]

[name not mentioned]

Today I sat on the Clubs [inaudible Fuel?] meeting, [inaudible].

[2+? members waived]

11.9. CSA Service Updates and Reports

Nothing reported.

11.10. Committee Updates and Reports

11.10.1. PBRC Report

MOTION: That the Policy & Bylaw Review Committee Report from Earl Evans, PBRC Chair, be received as information at the Board of Directors meeting on February 26, 2020.

Moved: Matteo Raso

Seconded: Emmy Luo

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

11.11. Business

11.11.1. Winter 2020 General Election Report – CRO

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



MOTION: To extend speaking rights to the CRO (Patrick MacCarthy).

Moved: Blakeney Smith

Seconded: Lolia Shallouf

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

Patrick MacCarthy (CSA Chief Returning Officer – CRO):

You would have all seen my election report as it is an agenda item and I would like to highlight a few things.

Overall we were very excited to reach quorum for the Executive Candidates and most of the Colleges however, the College of Physical Engineering and Sciences as well as Lang School of Business did not receive quorum. So when you the candidates tonight, you will only be ratifying three Executive Candidates and six Board Members.

I would like to highlight that we had no campaign infractions reported and no appeals regarding any decisions that we made. The appeals period closed earlier this week. Overall we had 20 students run for positions, which was a lot more higher than last years, so we are very happy about that. Essentially what our office does is that once the nominations are received, we verify the signatures against a list with the Registrars Office and then we support eh candidates with answering any questions ensuring policies are complied with, promoting the election, and organizing the Executive Candidate's form and stuff like that.

Candidates were able to campaign at the AGM, which was really great, and as someone mentioned before, it was great to see so many Board members there.

As recommended by pervious CRO's the previous voting period was five days, you will notice in the graphic provided in my report that the days in the middle of the voting period did not was not substantiated by more students voting, so we are looking at ways to try and increase student engagement., so I guess you can see on the Wednesday and Thursday that there were very few votes; like on Thursday we only got 57 folks vote, so that was a bit of a challenge. Polls closed Thursday at the end of the day on the 14th, and the results were announced to the candidates on the 17th, and were posted on our website by the 18th.

Finally looking to the recommendations section, mostly trying to increase more engagement for voter turnout. We're thinking about revamping the Executive Candidate Form, maybe doing some work to base things more online, and there

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



were also questions to having folks run on a bit more of a substantive platform, so that might be something we look at doing. These are all recommendations and your thoughts are always welcomed as you have been through this experience before.

If folks have any questions about the report, I invite them now.

Chair:

Are there any questions regarding the CRO report?

[no questions posed]

MOTION: That the Winter 2020 General Election Report from Patrick MacCarthy, Chief Returning Officer, be received as information at the CSA Board Meeting on February 26, 2020.

Moved: Blakeney Smith

Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

MOTION: That the results of the CSA Winter 2020 General Election, as reported by the Chief Returning Officer, be ratified and now declared official; and

RESOLVED that the following members be ratified to the 2020-2021 CSA Board of Directors, based on the official results of the Winter 2020 General Election:

Executive

President

Tyler Poirier

VP Student Experience

Sara Kuwatly

VP External

Horeen Hassan

College Representatives

College of Arts

Areej Amer

Bella Harris

College of Biological Sciences

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Katy Oada
Maya Persram

College of Social and Applied Human Sciences

Jessica Krawitz
Laura Wilson

Moved: Lolita Shallouf

Seconded: Matteo Raso

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

11.11.2. Candidates' Package – Winter 2020 By-Election

MOTION: That the **Candidates' Package: Executive Positions** for the Winter 2020 By-Election be approved at the CSA Board Meeting on February 26, 2020.

Moved: Lolita Shallouf

Seconded: Anthony Lenarduzzi

Lindsey Fletcher:

This was a discussion that happened between Exec and Core Staff that when then asked that it be brought to the Board to be discussed. Recognizing that in the Candidate's Package there are commitments for the Executives to sign off on that are not aligned with those that are in the Bylaws. As such I see that as a concern that we're making candidates sign commitments that are not in policy or bylaws. So, there should be discussion on that.

Dena Van de Coevering:

To speak to the VP's concern, the item that was actually withdrawn from the agenda this evening is actually the motion to place the requirement in relation to secondary employment outside the CSA in policy. However a decision was made to send to the PBRC before final review before it comes to the Board. So there is intention to bring those items into policy.

Lindsey Fletcher:

In the Candidate's Package the only item it said was under review was limiting enrolment to 1.0 credits, not secondary employment. For me I perceive limiting secondary employment as a barrier to those from lower socio-economic [inaudible] because [inaudible] to take on additional employment opportunities as a means to meet their basic necessities. That's where my concern stems with having that commitment there. Especially since it is not grounded in any specific policy yet. If it is in the future, then that is a discussion when it goes to being

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



enacted in policy, but as it is not now, I would like to see it removed from the Candidate's Package.

Claudia Idzik:

I would also agree with Member Fletcher. If this is a measure of accountability, there are other ways to keep Executive and other members and staff accountable such as the Executive Evaluation Committee. We also do other things like Activity Logs, some of us keep log hours. As some of you may know, I have a second job; I love it. It's not just a barrier for wealth and money, it also is sometimes important for other reasons such as mental health.

Emmy Luo:

I would like to clarify. Were the candidates aware of the secondary employment restriction when they were running, or [inaudible]?

Dena Van de Coevering:

Two items. The Candidate's Package is something that is reviewed with the candidates at the All Candidate's Meeting essentially during the election period; it's after nominations; which this will be available after our elections on the website throughout that time. It's reviewed with them, so they are aware when they sign the commitment pending the election results; that this is what they would be committing to.

Blakeney Smith:

So, these concerns being raised...is this a different Candidate's Package than the one that was used in the General Election?

Dena Van de Coevering:

No. Can I motion to extend speaker rights to our CRO?

Chair:

Speaking rights were previous provided to the CRO [during his report above]

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

Thanks folks for all your concerns around this. As the President mentioned previously, the Candidate's Package that is available for the by-election is identical to the Candidate's Package that was provided in the General Election. This was available to candidates prior to their nominations on our website and discussed at the All Candidates Meeting. I understand that there are concerns with this, but the idea behind this commitment form is that we want to ensure that your Executive role is your first priority and that we are aligning this with other commitments that we have within the CSA. For example: As a staff member I cannot work more than 15 hours per week, because I am a full-time student, so we recognize that being a full-time student is a full-time job and that having other

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



commitments outside of that is probably not good for folks mental health, and is probably not good for job performance either. This is another way to align those things together. It goes along with our class limit; we are looking at having a limit of one class while you are in an Executive position. The University suggests that you spend 12-15 hours per week on one class, so that aligns with the commitment of limiting that one other part-time job to 15 hours per week.

I understand that there is some economic concerns, however I have done some research on that. The Executive positions pay \$36,000 per year before taxes, Statistics Canada low income cut-off line for cities that are Guelph-sized for a single person is \$22,000 per year. So, \$36K per year is significantly higher than that and the salaries are published and available to folks before they chose to apply for this position, so they are well aware of the constraints that may come with that. Overall, as an Elections Office we feel that this is an important document to have, and it aligns with what previous candidates had, so it's something we would like to see put into the Candidate's Package for all future elections.

Cameron Stotts:

May I ask a question first and then comment on the answer after that? I would like to ask a question first, then comment on it after.

Chair:

This would be a great time to mention that if you do have questions, a Point of Information is a good way to jump into a conversation before your time on the Speaking List. In this instance, it would just be your question, then I will add you back onto the Speakers List as a second time speaker.

Cameron Stotts:

I am looking for confirmation, verification first, that you did have a meeting with all the candidates and that is when you discussed this current package that we are looking at right now? However the changes that are in the package are not in the bylaws? So, you gave a package to the candidates that are not in the official bylaws for the Executive staff?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

Bylaws are a guiding policy that shape the organization. Many of the details in the Candidate's Package are not included in the policies and not included in the bylaws and that is specific and quite common across many organizations. The goal that the individual details change constantly. For example, we are looking at updating social media; it doesn't list social media in our bylaws. That's something that as the Elections Office and the Elections Team, we have discretion to make changes to. So, while it's not explicitly in bylaw, it doesn't have to be to be included in this.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Lolia Shallouf:

I think this is a really important topic and I know that I agree with Member Fletcher and Member Idzik. It's not just financial, it's mental health. In addition, I love research and I love numbers (I am in accounting), but some people make means for other things. There are people that make money for other people; there are guardians for other people. So maybe they are making money for other [inaudible]. I think if it has a limit to school, then that makes sense, but in terms of their job, then I don't think it's necessarily fair.

Lindsey Fletcher:

I want to echo my [inaudible] comments. There are other means for accountability. Perhaps better wording would be to prioritize the job of the CSA, but to limit outside commitments to the CSA; that it is very very big, and that could mean a whole number of things. For example some people spend time with their family. I don't get to do that because I am away at school, so if I turn to second employment then that job becomes my family. I'd like to spend time there. I don't think that one job can defeat what I do outside of my own free time. That's not something that a job should be doing in my opinion. I echo Member Shallouf's comments that \$36,000 is the salary for Executives before taxes; recognizing there are taxes, a lot of us will be paying rent here; basic living expenses as well because many of the people that come into these roles are either recent students or recently graduated. There is the potential that student loans will start to be needed to pay back and that expenses will need to be paid back regardless of whether Guelph says that \$22,000 is the low-income cut-off. That doesn't necessarily mean that on \$22K per year that everyone can provide for all of their living expenses or what the average person requires for those. I think that's something to keep in mind and there are a lot of reasons for outside employment, or other commitments that people make that need to be made friendly consideration that it's on our own free time.

Kathleen Nolan:

I wanted to speak in support of Member Fletcher and Member Shallouf. I think that limiting people's free time is silly and it already says that they are required to work 37 hours per week. I don't see how having external employment outside of that would affect their performance during those 37 hours.

Claudia Idzik:

Echoing what Lindsey said, my student loans are literally double my rent. So, every month I pay double my rent plus my rent. I would encourage individuals to amend the package at this point; if anyone feels free to do so.

Blakeney Smith:

Point of Information

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Chair:
Yes

Blakeney Smith:
Is this document legally binding for the Executives that sign it?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:
Yes. That's the point of it; to be contractually binding. So you are aware; all the Executive positions that you have ratified have this contract.

Cameron Stotts:
Things that everyone else has said, I won't repeat it for the sake of time. One thing I would love to motion is just to strike this from the agenda. Can we strike this or table it?

Chair:
For the benefit of the Board, you can table a motion to a specific time, or you can postpone indefinitely and bring it back at a future meeting. Those would be the two options for delaying. You can vote it down, to reject the package. You can vote it for approval to accept the package. Does the Board have rights to amend this package given that its something produced by the Elections Office?

Earl Evans:
I would say no as they have not approved this document in the past. I have two concerns. One is that it would be nice to have PBRC to review this as was stated right at the beginning of this conversation. And secondly, you have three members of Executive that have signed the Candidate Commitment Form and right now we're talking about the fourth, so you would have a Executives at different signing levels.

Kathleen Nolan:
Is it required that this package be approved by the Board before the candidates sign this package this semester?

Chair:
I believe that the CRO stated that this has never been approved by the Board before.

Kathleen Nolan:
Is it required though?

Chair:
In that sense, no.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

It is not. The only reason we are discussing this tonight because at a previous Board meeting we were requested to have this specific package for this by-election approved. It has not, in my memory or the PTM's memory, ever been approved. That's part of the concern we have is that the idea is that you should be aware of this for your information, but it's not at the discretion of the Board to amend.

Chair:

One further thing for the purpose of the Board is that you could send this to committee; in this case I believe PBRC would be the appropriate avenue. At which point the committee can review this and bring it back to the Board with their findings and recommendations for the Board to discuss and approve. So those are the options in front of the Board because this is something that has not been done with the Board previously.

MOTION AS AMENDED: to table this [the Candidate's Package] document until such a time that it has been reviewed by the PBRC;

Moved: Blakeney Smith

Seconded: Emmy Luo

Blakeney Smith:

I think that there is no basis for a contract between our Executive Members and the organization that has not been approved by the Board of the organization or it's general membership. As such I think that this definitely needs to be reviewed by the PBRC before we should consider accepting it as a Board of Directors.

Lindsey Fletcher:

I would like to see this coming forward with a specific deadline at a future Board Meeting of this term. This issue was opened when it came to my attention that the candidate's package at the beginning of the Winter General Election and has come to the Board for discussion. So to keep this one moving, I would like to see an amendment to the motion, so we can have a set deadline and I am open for suggestions for when that would be a reasonable timeline.

Dena Van de Coevering:

So unfortunately this document has a quick turnaround. I don't know what the Board would like to do, but our nominations opens today, and this is our candidate's package for that nomination period, which is closed next Tuesday. So I don't know what a realistic timeline will be to better move this document into the eyes of the Board; but just be mindful of the timelines for the by-election and this document needing to be present with or without the amendments.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Cameron Stotts:

I can totally understand there is a time constraint to this, but I personally feel uncomfortable passing a policy for the only reason that there is a time constraint. So for me, I don't feel comfortable voting on this and approving of it yet, so I don't want it going out into the general public. That's why for me, I wouldn't vote in favour of passing it now and I do want to see it being reviewed further.

Emmy Luo:

I totally agree. With Cameron's sentiments because I recognize that while there is a need for this kind of a package, I was wondering if there was a way we could let them know that a certain part of it has not been approved and I'd let them know what is being under review and making them aware of that.

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

Thank you folks for your interest in this; it's great to see you so engaged in the conversation. A couple of things I am noticing; this is not policy and this is not bylaw. It's meant to accompany that. A lot of the things in here aren't in policy or bylaw and being without a Candidate's Package during an election period will be challenging. I understand that time is never a reason to rush things, however I would say that this package was used in the General Election and no concerns were brought to me or the Election Office. Member Fletcher did ask me about it, but other than just asking me if this was in the package, this was the only conversation we had.

I'd also remind folks that this allows for outside employment of up to 15 hours per week, which I think is quite reasonable and the goal of this is not to limit people's ability to do stuff outside of work. The reason this was brought forward was that it was noticed within the organization that in previous years there have been challenges with people working during business hours and not being available for minutes and this is something to rectify that.

Ariel Oleynikov:

I know there are a lot of folks that feel uncomfortable with what we said, but I am wondering...I sit on the Senate and I sometimes we send out electronic letters and I know that's a way to combat the time constraints...if that's something that is possible if folks want to go and have conversations about this.

Chair:

I don't believe that as an organization we do electronic voting for items for the Board of Directors. That's something that perhaps in the future could be amended into bylaw and policy, but it's not something we are currently at liberty to do within our current rules structure.

Claudia Idzik:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



If someone could clear it up for me; I am not really understanding why this Board cannot amend this package because the Board oversees the Elections Office. So if anyone here can explain to me why we can't amend this as it's technically legally binding for this candidate and it's the VP Academic that understands the constraints of mental health and academic matters on campus

Earl Evans, PTM:

I am a little uncomfortable with the Board of Directors affecting practices in the Elections Office when the candidates are subject to those rules and those practices. Generally speaking, an elected Board does not affect decisions made in an elections office, whether it's municipal or other places. I am a little uncomfortable with that if the Board is affecting what happens in the Elections Office. The Elections Office should have the ability to make rules that would affect people running for office.

[unidentified speaker]:

So right now, this was unapproved given to the candidates through the General Election and now it needs to be approved because it's by-election specifically?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

As mentioned before, it is not policy for the package to be approved. As any other election document approved by my office, it didn't need approval. The only reason we are approving this tonight, is because I am required to present it to you, because you voting that I present it to you at a Board Meeting. So, the reason it is here is that you asked it as a Board to be here, not because it should be presented, or because it had been, but because you wanted it.

Josh Moran:

You said one of the issues coming forward was that people are working within their office hours and participating in their second job that way. I was wondering if it would be better to have a sworn commitment to not work on a second job within office hours, rather than [limiting outside activities].

Lindsey Fletcher:

I completely understand your point. Given what is outlined in policy and bylaws right now and the nature of the Executive roles there's no set hours of when we need to be at work. I think we make our own hours and are responsible for doing so with the only guideline a minimum of 37 hours a week. But again, that might be something that PBRC would look into is set hours with some flexibility as Board meeting and other meetings are not set within regular working hours is one thing of concern. I understand that concern of not amending at the Board because it's a document of the Elections Office, but in the interest of a tight timeline, can we not approve it as amended for the purpose of this by-election and then refer it to PBRC for further review and then it can return forward, because the motion from

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



the last Board meeting was for approval, and if we're not willing to approve this, it can't be used in the election that is happening right now. Should there not be some flexibility that we cannot approve this with amendments based on the direction of the Board, for the purpose of this by-election, but that it be referred to PBRC for review.

Earl Evans, PTM:

I suppose there is the hope that the Board will say that this should be in the domain of the CRO to approve this, again stressing that we have three members of the Executive who have signed this commitment form and right now were are talking about one Executive position that would be subject to what we are talking about tonight. The staff that worked with this, the CRO and PTM, are hoping the Board will say that this is up to the CRO to administer the elections and the Board should not be involved in making rules that affect themselves.

Chair:

We seemed to have strayed a little bit. Right now we are discussing the motion to send this to committee. Try to keep the discussion focused. I know it's related to the discussion, but we need to be focused on just the motion to submit this to committee.

Blakeney Smith:

I find it unacceptable and even insubordinate that the Elections Office should draft what is essentially an employment contract for Executive positions stipulating responsibilities outside of those in our policies and bylaws. That is not the Election Office's purview. If it had to do with the election and behaviour during the election, I think that's perfectly acceptable, but I think they are talking about limiting the freedoms of our Executive members after they have been elected and once they are employed by the CSA and that's not the Elections Office job.

In terms of the upcoming election, I think it's fine if this document is used as an outline and not a legally binding contract, because I don't think that this organization should let this document be a legally binding contract without the approval of the Board of the general membership. And that's my concern. I feel strongly that this needs to be sent to PBRC. If there are articles in this document that should be incorporated into policy and bylaw, it should be incorporated into policy and bylaw, not by a contract, written by a [inaudible] office, without approval by the Board or the membership.

Cameron Stotts:

My question was answered previously.

Claudia Idzik:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



I would vote against this motion to send this to PBRC because of the timeline of the discussions that we have had. I would be wary of the wording that the PTM is using, that the Board does not directly affect the Elections, however from my understanding you have the power to direct and amend these packages.

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

I would be concerned by the Board amending an election package produced by the Elections Office because it's a very challenging precedent. At that point the Board could amend the package to basically include or exclude anything it wants to. A lot of the information within the document is not in policy and bylaw and that is intentional of policy and bylaw. Policy and bylaw is not meant to contain every piece of information because that would be far too onerous, but it wouldn't allow for the freedom of an organization to adapt to the climate that it is in. I understand that folks find this a bit challenging; I would like to reiterate that there is no malicious intent in producing this and that the goal here is very much in the benefit of the organization as whole. I think as an organization and an employer we are very flexible with both full-time and part-time employees and that the flexibility that is provided within this organization is not provided within other organizations and even in codifying some of these changes it still remains very flexible. This is not to limit folks sense of freedoms, but it is meant to emphasize the importance that this is an important and major commitment that should always be the number one priority of the person that holds the position.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Point of privilege: If we can get the motion on the board, that would be most appreciated, so I can read what I am talking about.

Earl Evans, PTM:

Would you like to take a recess while we do it as we don't have the ability to do it instantly.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Can you do it while I speak, or if you prefer a recess then that is OK?

Chair:

If a Member prefers a recess, [then] it's not our choice to make.

[unidentified speaker]:

Point of information: During a recess, are we allowed to casually discuss this?

Chair:

A recess would essentially be outside of the normal Board Meeting so you can discuss freely outside of the Board Meeting. It's not an in-camera item or anything.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Cameron Stotts:

I have a question for the CRO. So if we pass this, you said at the beginning of this discussion that it is legally binding, so if you do have another job, then they could lose their Executive job, but we have also stipulated that it is not legally binding, so I am wondering: which one is it? If we pass this, and we find out that they have another job, could they lose their Executive Position, or is it flexible?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

It's only legally binding in the sense that, in the Candidate's Package, there is a commitment here. It says that 'a copy of this document will be provided as a requirement of the nominations package. When they sign it, that's when it becomes legally binding. Just including in the Candidate's Package doesn't make it legally binding, it just means its information for them when they sign the nomination form, they legally bind it. I hope that it wouldn't ever come to that point, and the goal isn't to come to that point. The goal is to have the availability for the organization to have recourse when it is found that folks aren't living up to their job requirements: it's 15 hours per week, not no job at all.

Lindsey Fletcher:

If they are not living up to their job requirements that shouldn't automatically be reflected on their free time. It should be focused on the workplace and there's a distinction in that, but this is blurring the line of...

Zachary Rucchin:

You mention that it's not necessarily about limiting the agreements, but I think defining as 15 hours per week as outside your role as an Executive; as opposed to emphasizing and fulfilling those responsibilities. I think it could be reworked a little bit, not...definitely as is it is a limiting statement.

Chair:

Refocusing the discussion a little bit: this is to send this to PBRC, not the motion in full.

Dena Van de Coevering:

Being mindful that this package; it's not traditionally approved by the Board of Directors. I would suggest that instead of sending this package to the Board of Directors, that we work through the policy at the PBRC and not this package. And therefore based on policy amendments by the PBRC, we can then reflect that back into the Candidate's Package with the Elections Office controlling that. Because this is their entity to control.

Emmy Luo:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



So kind of what you're saying is that we should leave the package as it is, approve it for now; and then go back and maybe talk about policy and then implement the policy; [inaudible] so that [inaudible]?

Dena Van de Coevering:

I am not necessarily saying that we...I really don't know how to move forward from this position, because I do agree that this document should be edited by our Elections Office. So potentially it's a recommendation by the Board to the Elections Office to put either under review, with the limiting secondary employment options as it's shown here of that it's under review here in relation to the 1 credit per semester. So putting that recommendation that under adding 'under review' to the Elections Office that line in the Candidate's Package, so that we can then use this package for our upcoming by-election. And then secondary to that, bringing policy amendment in policy conversations to the PBRC. And then based on those conversations what that looks like having that brought to the Board for approval then from there having that reflected back into the Candidate's Package for Board review.

Claudia Idzik:

I don't know who to direct this to...but if we approve this motion of bringing it to PBRC, does that mean, because I don't know when PBRC is meeting next, so it goes to PBRC, then policy, then to the Board, does that mean that this potential VP Academic would sign the package as is? And is an Academic, or is any candidate allowed to run without signing this? Because if it is legally binding, then can they sign the package, or can they have all the nomination signatures, not send the package, so that this is technically not legally binding, but still run without signing this package?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO

I think you have two questions there, so I will try to answer both. The first one is, the next Board Meeting is on the 11th, and the idea was to have the election results ratified on the 25th, so as mentioned before that timeline is challenging. I don't think that PBRC has a standing meeting at this time. That's why we received this PBRC report earlier, so a special meeting for PBRC would have to be called.

I echo the President's statements about that, but right now the nominations package includes this commitment form and as I see it, the nominations package without the signature...I don't think it would make much sense to have the commitment form there and have some folks sign it and some folks not, there has to be consistency. It would either be in the package or wouldn't be in the package otherwise depending on who would get elected, then one person would adhere to this because they signed it, and another person wouldn't adhere to it, because they didn't sign it. I think that causes some confusion. So it's either there or it's not.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Claudia Idzik:

Point of clarification: So if someone signs this, they have to agree to everything in here, otherwise they can't technically run as a candidate?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

That is how it stands currently.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Bylaw number 1, Section 4.2.8. The Board shall have the ability to inspect and audit any activities of the CSA. Does this not include the Elections Office? Would that not cover the Elections Package?

Earl Evans, PTM:

Depends on how you look at inspecting an audit. I don't think you're inspecting an audit...

Lindsey Fletcher:

Inspections AND audit.

Earl Evans, PTM:

The Elections Audit you are directing it to make a decision I am wondering about.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Inspecting the activity of the Elections Office.

[unidentified speaker]

Who is the PBRC composed of?

Earl Evans, PTM:

Members of the Board, I am, the PTM is the Chair, and there is one membership member, if you know what I mean. And there are two or three members of the Executive; three members of the Executive.

Blakeney Smith:

Point of information: Earl, can we conceivably have a PBRC meeting between now and the next Board meeting?

Earl Evans, PTM:

Yes, if the members are available. That's two weeks, right?

Blakeney Smith:

I wish to amend this motion. I've got it on paper here if you would like that.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Chair:
Yes please. That would be quite useful.

Lindsey Fletcher:
Point of privilege: Can I get it put onto the screen?

Chair:
The amendment reads, ‘Motion to move that the document...’

Blakeney Smith:
Would you like me to read it? I have terrible handwriting.

Chair:
Yes, please.

Blakeney Smith:

MOTION: to move the document to committee to determine whether the document is within the Election’s Office’s purview,

RESOLVED that the package be used in a non-binding manner until such a time that PBRC recommendation is approved by the Board.

RESOLVED that the Executive members be held to their responsibilities as outlined in the CSA’s existing policy and bylaws until that time.

Chair:
As for that final clause, I would rule that out of order because that’s already...by being in policy and bylaws they are already doing what is expected of them.

Blakeney Smith:
I will amend that to a Whereas then, whereas Executive members be held to...

Chair:
Yes, that would be perfect as a whereas clause.

MOTION:

WHEREAS the Executive members be held to their responsibilities as outlined in the CSA’s existing policy and bylaws until that time.

RESOLVED to move the document to committee to determine whether the document is within the Election’s Office’s purview,

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



RESOLVED that the package be used in a non-binding manner until such a time that PBRC recommendation is approved by the Board.

Moved: Blakeney Smith

Seconded: Lindsey Fletcher

Blakeney Smith:

I've been saying that [inaudible] the Elections Office should not be determining the terms of employment of our Elected Executives, and members outside of their work hours. I think that is unacceptable of any employer, particularly of a Student Union.

MOTION: to take a three minute recess so the PTM can get the motion up on the screen please.

Moved: Lindsey Fletcher

Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Emmy Luo:

Point of information: how many members do we need to make quorum?

Earl Evans, PTM:

Twelve.

Chair:

Is there any amendments to the time to take for the recess?

Ariel Oleynikov:

I would like to amend it to 5 minutes.

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION: to take a five minute recess, so the PTM can get the motion up on the screen.

Moved: Ariel Oleynikov

Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Vote on the Amendment

Motion carried

Vote on Amended Motion

Motion carried

Chair:

Please be back at 7:28[pm].

Chair: We'll call the meeting back into order now.

AMMENDED MOTION:

WHEREAS the Executive members are clearly held to standards and responsibilities as outlined in CSA Bylaws and policy

RESOLVED that the Winter 2020 By-Election Candidate's Package be moved to committee to determine whether the terms are within the purview of the Elections Office.

RESOLVED that the package be used as a non-binding outline until such a time that committee is able to produce a recommendation.

RESOLVED that that recommendation is approved by the Board of Directors.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Appendix G, Section 2.1. 'The role of the CSA Elections Office shall be to conduct CSA elections and by-elections in accordance with CSA Bylaws and Policies and any relevant directives as may from time to time be given by resolution of the Board of Directors;' Does that mean that the Board of Directors can provide a resolution to the Elections Office to conduct the by-election in a certain manner relevant to this package?

Earl Evans, PTM:

I am just hearing it, so I will leave that to the Board to decide.

Chair:

Is there any more discussion on this amendment?

Emmy Luo:

Point of information: 'the committee' is the?

Chair:

Policy and Bylaw Review Committee

[unidentified speaker]:

Can we have it amended to state the name of the committee?

Chair:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Is there any member opposed to using the full name of the committee? If there is no member opposed, then that amendment can be made with unanimous decision.

Lindsey Fletcher:

I go back to my question about the policy. Does that [policy] not answer what this motion is asking? That is the Board of Directors, by resolution, sent directive to the Elections Office, on how to conduct the Elections would that not answer what the motion is trying to resolve?

Earl Evans, PTM:

I don't know how to answer that, we're trying to find the best instruction tonight for the Board to interact with the Elections Office and to make a policy package that will help the organization and not limit the Executive members as was mentioned.

Claudia Idzik:

Given that the policy that the VPA clearly outlined, I would suggest an amendment to the motion, to allow the Board to make an amendment to the package if they see fit and then bring it to the BPRC.

Chair:

Currently we have the initial amendment which was to send this to committee and the second amendment proposed by Member Smith which was to add the resolved clause, that it be non-binding until such a time that the committee can produce a recommendation, so that is out of order as you can only have an amendment to the amendment, and not an amendment to the amendment, to the amendment.

In regards to add the amendment to add the Resolved clause, I have member Smith next on the speakers list.

Blakeney Smith:

You are a member of the PBRC? No. I would give consent to the participate in the PBRC and I personally would like this to go to PBRC, because I am very tied and don't want to make a bad decision right now. And I am also not well read on the bylaws to make a decision on this particular matter. However, that's me, you guys can do whatever you like.

Dena Van de Coevering:

Recognizing that there are issues with this particular package, I still see validity in allowing the Elections Office, essentially owns the package itself, but I see the value in PBRC talking about the policy in relation to the package and then having the Elections Office reflecting that. As for the concerns for tonight, I don't know if it is possible to add in, as I mentioned before, under review in the section that there

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



is issue with the Board, so the package can continue. We'll be mindful of the non-binding outline, but then we're still mindful that the package stays within the autonomy of the Elections Office.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Point of order: would the original motion be out of order due to the policy 2.1?

Chair:

No.

Lindsey Fletcher:

If the motion is to determine whether it's in the purview of the Elections Office, but it's outlined in the Electoral policies that the Elections can conduct elections and bylaws would be added with relevant directives by the Board of Directors. Does that not invalidate what this motion is?

Chair:

It doesn't make it out of order, because if that is the only thing that the committee is tasked with reviewing, then they still would be able to review it and come back with the answer you have already presented. Even if it's a repetition of what has been determined at this Board. So it's not out of order, but that is a statement you can certainly make in regards to this. Once again, we are just discussing the resolved clause adding this is an amendment to the amendment.

Earl Evans, PTM:

Excuse me. Mr. Chair, do I see 11 members? Oh, I couldn't see Molly.

Blakeney Smith:

I want to address what Member Van Coevering said. Mabey, I misunderstood what you said, but using a contract under review is essentially meaningless because that the signatory is signing something that may or may not come into play and they can just choose not to accept the additional terms, because they have already signed the contract. I think that would cause more problems than it would solve. And that just using it as an outline and saying that these are probably what is going to be expected of you, but they are under review, and we're not going to make you sign anything right now, but you will have to follow these bylaws; that makes the most sense to me.

Claudia Idzik:

I know that our amendment, to the amendment, to the amendment, is out of order, but I would suggest getting a timeline in here given that PBRC has had difficulty meeting, given that we only have a couple of Board meetings left in the year, and given that we don't have summer, I don't know if we have [inaudible] or not, then

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



the next selection might have this current copy; I would give a deadline whatever order that would work in.

Chair:

That could be proposed as an amendment, after this amendment to the amendment is either approved or rejected.

Is there any further discussion to the amendment of the amendment to add the resolved clause.

All in favour of adding just the resolved clause to the motion.

Amendment to the Amendment Carried

Lindsey Fletcher:

I would like to Motion for an amendment. Motion to approve the candidate's package with the amendment to remove the outside commitment clause.

Resolve that the candidate's package be referred to the PBRC for review and recommendations.

Resolve that the updated Candidates Package be presented by the PBRC to the Board of Directors prior to April 1st, 2020.

[wording presented to the PTM so it can be projected].

And also including that last resolve clause that was in the amendment.

Chair reads the amended motion:

MOTION: that the Candidate's Package be referred to the PBRC for review and amendment. (changing it from the motion to review whether or not the Board is allowed to make changes to it).

RESOLVED that the Candidate's Package be approved with the limit to outside commitments clause removed;

RESOLVED that the updated Candidate's Package be presented by the PBRC to the Board of Directors by April 1st, 2020.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Point of information: why can't that last resolved not be deleted?

Chair:

Because if you are approving the package, you would not be approving it as a non-binding outline, would you not?

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Lindsey Fletcher:

Can we not approve it as a non-binding outline?

Chair:

I suppose you can do that. So it would be approved as a non-binding outline with the limit outside commitment clause removed.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Or should the second clause say amended to remove the outside commitments clause? And then it can proceed with the fourth resolve?

Chair:

That it be used as a non-binding outline? This is your amendment, so yes we can make that change to it.

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

Point of information: Member Fletcher, can you explain your reasoning to include that final resolve clause?

Lindsey Fletcher:

Recommended by Member Smith in a previous amendment is that it can be included as a guiding document as it's intended to be right now. But until it's reviewed and reflective of policy, whether [inaudible] it's current following this review by the PBRC that it not be a fully legally binding contract signed by candidates.

Chair:

So, this is the amendment to the amendment...[referring to projected image on screen?]

Yes, Member MacCarthy.

Patrick MacCarthy:

[inaudible]

Chair:

I need a seconder to the amendment to the amendment.

SECOND: Blakeney Smith

Chair:

Member Fletcher, would you like to motivate?

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Lindsey Fletcher:

I'm hoping that this can be a temporary solution to some of the discussion that occurred tonight. It gives us the opportunity to [inaudible] with the by-elections that are currently ongoing, however it also gives us the flexibility that a Candidate's Package and the commitments within it that may be noticed by PBRC reviewed and brought back to the board for discussion for future elections.

Dena Van de Coevering:

I'm concerned about it becoming a non-binding outline if the line of concern regarding the outside limits is being removed. To my knowledge, that is the only item that is not reflected in policy already. So I am concerned about creating a non-binding contract when there is only one item that's of concern and everything else is reflective of policy.

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

Just to speak to the President's point, if we make the entire package non-binding that means that I cannot enforce anything within it. So, I cannot say that posters are not in the right place so I am going to fine you. I cannot say you didn't submit this for approval and you have to take it down. So if we want to remove that line, that's fine, but the final result of that clause is it renders this package useless because there is no point to a candidate obeying something that is non-binding because I can't enforce it.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion to the amendment to the amendment?

[unidentified]:

Can I add another amendment, to this amendment of this amendment?

Chair:

No but if this amendment to the amendment is approved or rejected, then you could amend the amendment. There is a limit to how many layers you can have, but once one layer is resolved, you can add another layer back on.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Just to clarify that the Electoral Office would run the elections in accordance to CSA bylaws and policies, so even though this nomination package will be used as a non-binding outline there are policies in Appendix G that outline the process of elections would that not solve the issue that you are raising?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

So while there are regarding that for example the entire fine section is not listed in policy; that's only in the candidate's commitment package: which social medias

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



are acceptable to use; that's only listed in the candidate's package; exact postering locations; only listed in the candidate's package; Again, as I mentioned before, the point of policy isn't for it to have all the details; the document should have all the details. So, while some things could be followed, the point of this package would be useless if it's not binding.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion on the amendment to the amendment? Member Smith.

Blakeney Smith:

I wanted to speak to Member Fletcher's question. Because the package will not be used as a binding contract we will have no authority to fine any candidates, or any such discipline like that...I think this is good.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion to the amendment to the amendment? Member Nolan.

Kathleen Nolan:

I am confused between the legally-binding aspect and the ability of the CRO to uphold the...like firing somebody versus it being legally binding and being able to take them to court are two very different things. So, what are we actually talking about here when we say that it's legally-binding contract?

Patrick MacCarthy, CRO:

I will attempt to explain this. I understand that this is confusing. Within the candidate's package, there is a section entitled Candidate Commitment Form. It is currently duplicated in the nominations package, which the candidate signs. By signing it, it becomes a contract. We're not necessarily talking about firing it, but we're talking about using that as part of the purview of the folks in the executive positions with the HR Committee. It would never ever be the Elections Office that would have any sort of authority to remove people from the position. It would always go back to the HR process and stuff like that. So that's the legally-binding part. But I also at the All Candidates Meeting have folks sign something saying they agree to what's in this package and if this package is non-binding then it doesn't matter whether if they agreed to what's in it or not, they can kind of do whatever they want. So those are the distinctions, but what we have had the most issue with is that some of the lines in the candidate commitment form, but the candidate commitment form is but a small part of the candidates package and it is the entire package, which is what is requested for approval.

Chair:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Is there any further discussion on this amendment to the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favour of just the lines in red?

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED.

Chair reads the amendment [refers to screen].

Blakeney Smith:

Motion to amend the motion such that another clause is added.

RESOLVED: that any signatories to the Winter 2020 General Elections Candidate's Package have the option, upon the approval of the updated package, to transfer their contract to said package.

Earl Evans, PTM:

Do you mean the Winter By-election, because you said any candidates in the Winter General Election?

Blakeney Smith:

I meant the General Election, was that in winter?

Earl Evans, PTM:

The election just past?

Blakeney Smith:

Yeah. If I may...Member MacCarthy shows a concern that this would result in different Executive Members having different stipulations placed upon them, I believe that this should resolve them.

Chair:

One last time starting from 'Candidate's Package'.

Blakeney Smith:

I'll start from the beginning.

RESOLVED: that any signatories to the Winter 2020 General Election Candidate's Package have the option, upon the approval of the updated package, to transfer their contract to said package....or however you would say that in legalese.

Chair:

Thank you for bearing with me...does that look right?

Blakeney Smith:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Yes.

Chair:

Is there a seconder for this motion to amend the amendment? Seeing Member Stotts...just a moment. Member Smith, would you like to speak to your amendment?

Blakeney Smith:

CRO MacCarthy, sorry is that your name? [yes] brought up the concern that this motion would result in certain members of the Executive Committee having different stipulations on them than other members. Mainly, the VP Academic would not be bound to the same terms as the other VPs and the President. I believe that this amendment to the motion will eliminate that concern.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion to just the amendment to the amendment? Seeing Member Pacheco.

Michael Pacheco:

Point of information: Can this amendment be explained to me in layman's terms? Because I am very lost?

Chair:

Member Smith.

Blakeney Smith:

So, it is my understanding and once I'm finished speaking I would be happy if CRO MacCarthy could interpret what I say. To my understanding as part of the elections process is that candidates sign a Candidate Consideration Form, or [commitment] Candidate Commitment Form, which amounts to a contract, binding candidates to certain terms; including during the election period and during their employment period should they win the election and become an Executive of the CSA. The stated issue with the latter, and I chose...am attempting to amend the package attempting to take measures such as the upcoming by-election, the upcoming VP Academic, who stands to be elected, will not be bound to certain terms that currently exist in the package. CRO MacCarthy rose concerns that should we go through with this, three members of the Executive Committee would be bound to terms that one member is not, it would be unequal. I introduced this amendment to the amendment, such that the ratified executive members from the 2020-2021 Academic year should have the option to be employed on the same terms as the VP Academic that is elected in this upcoming by-election.

Patrick MacCarthy:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Point of information: I'm wondering if that's out of order, because the original intention of the motion is to approve this package and not to relate anything outside...[we're not discussing the package] ...but we're amending an amendment to a motion, when the whole point of this motion was to approve this package, not retroactively affect things that have already happened. So to me, we can talk about this package as much as we want, but I don't think it's in the spirit of the motion to change what's already happened.

Blakeney Smith:

If I may, the motion that is being amended...the motion that's amendment is being amended is not the motion to approve the package, it was the motion to move the package to committee.

Patrick MacCarthy:

OK. I still think that...

Chair:

So, to speak to CRO MacCarthy's concern, the overall motion that is being discussed underneath this amendment to the amendment, is an amendment to the original motion, which is to approve the package. So the concern is if this is the...if this is added to it, as an amendment to the amendment, and that amendment is approved to the original motion, is the amendment in order with this stipulation added on to the approval or disapproval of the original motion? One moment please...[~one minute silence]...while I am reviewing this, is there any further discussion on the amendment to the amendment? Yes, Madam President.

Dena Van de Coevering:

It might be worth amending it to reflect on to the candidates that were ratified this evening as opposed to any signatories. Just because this is now the package that it would actually impact those signatories...the three elected individuals coming into office...opposed to all the candidates that ran in the...that ran in the Executive election.

Patrick MacCarthy:

Point of clarification: Also, this would be the approved package, so candidates could not switch their signatures until PBRC has reviewed it and it has been approved by the Board at one of their meetings....correct? Because this motion now does not approve anything.

Chair:

So, the motion is that it be sent to PBRC for review and amendment, and that the package be amended to remove the 'limit outside commitments' clause...[inaudible]...this is true, so it would have to be after it is approved, after the PBRC has reviewed it and presented their findings for the board to approve.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



There is not currently a line in this to approve the package only to use it as a non-binding outline...that is correct. [minute or so of silence] So as far as I can see, there is nothing stipulating that you couldn't add another paragraph to it to bind them to it, that would extend the reach of the motion. As far as I can tell, this is in order as it is presented. My apologies for the wait on that. That being said, is there any further discussion on the amendment to the amendment to add the resolved clause? Seeing none...all in favour of the amendment to the amendment? All those opposed?

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED

One moment....[silence]...so this is the amendment as it now reads...is there any further discussion...back to my original speakers list...is there any further discussion of the amendment to the main motion?

Patrick MacCarthy:

As indicated by the President earlier I think it would be wise for someone to amend that first resolved clause, because right now I would have to ask any candidate whether they ran and succeed...whether they ran and were elected, or whether then ran or not, and whether they ran for an Executive position, or a Board position, all 20 people would need to be presented the option to change their signature and that doesn't seem reasonable. Especially considering that by the time it gets approved, by the time it gets to the Board it will be well past the winter term. So I think an amendment needs to happen for it, and I think it still reflects the spirit of what you folks are trying to do.

Chair:

Alright, next on my speakers list I have Member Nolan, and then [inaudible]...

Kathleen Nolan:

I would like to move to amend the first resolved clause to say successful candidate in the winter 2020 general election, rather than any signatories to.

Chair:

Is there a seconder for this amendment to the amendment? Seeing Member Stotts.

SECONDED BY STOTTS

Would you like to motivate Member Nolan?

Kathleen Nolan:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Based on previous discussion, this is a good call as we will all have to ask every single candidate with the previous amendment, as we will not have to ask every single candidate with this amendment.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion on the amendment to the amendment? One second...small grammatical change to be made to make it correct. There you go....is there any further discussion? Seeing none.

All those in favour of the amendment to the amendment? All opposed?

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED

Back to the original discussion, Madam President

Dena Van de Coevering:

Am I able to make an amendment to the last resolve? Or suggest an amendment to the last resolve item?

Chair:

You're allowed to make an amendment. Or at least a motion for an amendment.

Dena Van de Coevering:

Seeing CRO's comments in relation to concerns about fines and posting locations and other things like that if we make this whole package non-binding that limits the ability of the Elections Office to uphold the process of just the election itself. I think based on conversations here that it's reasonable to say that candidate commitment form, pages 7 and 8, would be non-binding. But allowing the other pages throughout the document that reflect in [inaudible] and posting locations and social media and things like that, still binding, so we can carry on with an elections as normally as possible.

Lindsey Fletcher:

There are parts of the policy that they would still be bound by when running this election. And that includes that the CAO and the CRO are empowered to levy fines and or disqualifying the candidates or referendum teams, or infractions in campaigning and or failure to meet prescribed deadlines as stipulated in this policy and the improved all candidate's package. So they are still bound by policies and our policies will allow them to proceed with the fines that are outlined in there.

Patrick MacCarthy:

I would disagree with that. I think the point of this being binding, is so that it is explicitly clear, and obvious to candidates, what they are doing. I think if we say

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



oh yeah, we can fine you, and then we don't lay out any sort of binding fines, that does not create the transparency that we are looking for; I think it should be very clear and explicit to candidates, what the requirements are, and having that in a binding package; I think is the most straightforward thing. So yes, they are still bound by policy, but that policy is not explicit enough to run the election in a fair and transparent way. That is why we have this package to begin with.

Chair:

Can you read that policy again, one more time?

Lindsey Fletcher:

Absolutely. For reference it is policy Appendix G, Section 18.2, The CRO and ARO are empowered to levy fines, and or disqualify any candidates or referendum teams [inaudible] practicing campaigning, and or failure to meet the prescribed deadlines as stipulated in this policy and the improved all candidates package.

Chair:

It says approved all candidate's package. That package will not be approved tonight, which means that anything stipulated in it would not be subject to that, because it wouldn't be approved. If I understand that correctly. Is that right PTM?

Earl Evans, PTM:

Yes.

Chair:

Member Stotts.

Cameron Stotts:

Can you possibly repeat what you are saying [inaudible]

Dena Van de Coevering:

So I would like to bring a motion to the board and amend the last resolve that is on this screen currently to say, instead of the package be used as a non-binding outline, it will reflect that pages 7 and 8 in the package will be non-binding. Essentially that is the candidate's package form will be non-binding, but everything else will be business as usual.

Chair:

Member Stotts?

Cameron Stotts:

Can I motion for that?

Chair:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Yes. You can motion to amend. The only reason that that hasn't happened yet is because you can't speak to the items and then motion. You have to motion as you're speaking...if that makes sense?

[silence]

So you said 7 and 8?

Dena Van de Coevering:
Let me triple check, so we're right. Yes.

Chair:
OK. So I am going to move that clause up, just so it's easier to read on the board. Don't be alarmed when you see that it is in a different place. So the

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT: that pages 7 and 8 of the package be used as a non-binding outline until such a time that the committee is able to produce a recommendation and that recommendation is approved by the board of directors.

SECONDED: Kathleen Nolan

Chair:
Would you like to motivate Member Stotts?

Cameron Stotts:
Yeah, I will say something quickly. So we've already talked a lot about why we believe that this should be non-binding, but I also believe as well that the CRO should have some power in this election to enforce fines/penalties to anyone that isn't following the contract, so I believe in that. So I think that this amendment is kind of like a win win situation in my eyes. It incorporates what we've been talking about in our concerns at the board, but it also helps out the CRO during the election.

Chair:
Is there any further discussion of the amendment to the amendment? Seeing none, all of those in favour of the amendment to the amendment? All opposed?

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT CARRIED

Returning to the speakers list, just changing the colour of the text. Is there any further discussion as I don't have anyone on my speakers list.

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



The amendment to the motion...any further discussion to the amendment to the motion? For everyone's benefit, I will read it one last time.

MOTION: that the Candidate's Package be referred to PBRC for review and amendment.

RESOLVED that pages 7 and 8 of the package be used as a non-binding outline until such a time that the committee is able to produce a recommendation, and that recommendation is approved by the Board of Directors.

RESOLVED that any successful candidates from the Winter 2020 general election have the option upon approval of the updated package to transfer to the updated package;

RESOLVED: that the package be amended to remove the 'limit outside commitments clause'

RESOLVED that the updated Candidate's Package be presented by PBRC to the Board of Directors by April 1st, 2020.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion with that said?

Blakeney Smith:

I just wanted to speak to this motion. Just one last time to explain why I spent so much effort in the last hour while we've been at this. I think it's clearly wrong that an office of the organization should be trying to dictate employment terms to our elected representatives outside of those dictated in our democratically decided bylaws and policies. I hope that members of PBRC will be able to check every term in this package for accordance with those policies and bylaws and if there are any terms in there that are not in accordance, we'll have to decide whether or not they should be added to the bylaw or the policy. Otherwise, they should not be in the package. That's my take.

Chair:

Alright. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none. All those in favour of the amendment? All opposed?

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

With this now added to the motion as the amendment, is there any further discussion on the motion itself? [inaudible discussion between PTM and Chair] It's a motion to approve the package with these amendments to it. Including removing

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



the limiting outside commitments clause and making pages 7 and 8 of the package non-binding.

Patrick MacCarthy:

Point of [inaudible]: It is not a motion to approve the package. Right? It is not, they are not approving the package tonight? Not according to what's there.

Chair:

Fair enough. So this is now the motion as it reads. Is there any discussion on the motion itself? Seeing none....all in favour of the motion as it is amended? All opposed?

Vote on Motion as Amended

Motion carried

With that, we will return to the agenda at 11.11.4.

~~11.11.3. NOTICE – Amendments to Policy Appendix G re Nominations~~

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

11.11.4. NOTICE – Amendment to Policy Appendix C re Extension of Staff Contracts

WHEREAS the CSA Volunteer Policy is being revised under the direction of the CSA External HR Consultant, into a standardized and comprehensive volunteer policy;

WHEREAS the knowledge base of the current volunteer coordinators will be instrumental in the development of this revised policy;

MOTION: That **CSA Policy Appendix C, Section 8.1: Extension of Specific Positions**, be amended with the addition of two positions to assist with these revisions during the 2020-2021 academic year:

- FoodBank Volunteer Coordinator
- Bike Centre Volunteer Coordinator

Notice of this item was provided, for consideration at the next meeting.

Chair:

Is there any discussion on item 11.11.4? Yes, Madam President.

Dena Van de Coevering:

I just want to highlight that I speak in favour of this motion. I see the value in having returning staff over a period of several years, as this one being two. To be able to improve our policies and improve our work environment for our volunteers

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



that spend time with us and give their energy during their time at school. Being able to further develop the coordinators knowledge they're able to further develop our policies and further improve the experience of volunteers in the CSA only making it a better environment.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, well move to 11.11.5.

11.11.5. Teacher Excellence Award – Selection Committee

WHEREAS the Teaching Excellence Award (TEA) has been coordinated by the Vice President Academic, as per CSA Policy Appendix A, Section 14.5.4;

WHEREAS a selection committee must be formed to review nominations and choose the recipient(s) of the 2020 Teaching Excellence Award;

WHEREAS the Selection Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 4, 2020 from 9:30 to 11:30 am;

MOTION: That one College representative, one student organization representative, and one additional non-Executive Board member be appointed to the TEA Selection Committee;

RESOLVED that the following CSA Board members be appointed to the Committee:

- [blank]

Moved: Lindsey Fletcher

Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Chair:

Would you like to motivate Member Fletcher.

Lindsey Fletcher:

Absolutely. So, as I've said in probably all my board reports, the Teaching Excellence Awards is an annual awards given out by the CSA; coordinated by the Vice President Academic. There's currently nothing in policy that states the coordination of a selection committee; Personally I believe that I should not be making that decision by myself, I really want the input of the undergraduate students who may have had interactions, or have more broader community knowledge, which a faculty that has been nominated. As such, I am forming a committee and then, pending how this goes this year, I will be making recommendations to PBRC for a policy, for it to go into policy that a selection committee be struck on an annual basis to report this award. So for this time, we do have a meeting scheduled from 9:30 until 11:30; I don't expect it to take the whole two hours, but just allowing that time as it is a quite a quick turnaround to select the faculty that is going to be awarded this. It does need to go to student

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



experience the week following, [inaudible] however, would like to be appointed to this if you can be available starting that time.

Chair:

That being said, is there any discussion or volunteers for the committee? Member Nolan.

Kathleen Nolan:

I wanted to ask Member Fletcher if there is any flexibility in that time to reschedule possibly?

Lindsey Fletcher:

There certainly could be. I could book that time with the boardroom and I do have some flexibility in my schedule [inaudible]

Kathleen Nolan:

I would like to volunteer for that committee.

Chair:

So, you are a college representative correct? [yes]. Alright, thank you. So, then one student organization representative is also needed for the committee. Yes, Member Rucchin?

Zachary Rucchin:

I'll volunteer as a student organization representative.

Earl Evans, PTM:

Aren't you a college rep?

Zachary Rucchin:

Ah no, student organization.

Earl Evans, PTM:

Sorry.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, I have Member Ofori-Darko.

Daniel Ofori-Darko:

For the one additional rep, I would like to as well do it.

Chair:

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, I have Member Nolan, Member

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Rucchin, and Member Ofori-Darko. All those in favour of striking the committee and approving them as members? All opposed?

Members

- Kathleen Nolan
- Zachary Rucchin
- Daniel Ofori-Darko

Vote on Motion

Motion carried

Next we'll move to the last item of business, which is 11.11.6.

11.11.6. Solidarity Statement

WHEREAS the RCMP have unlawfully entered unceded territory and arrested peaceful land protectors;

WHEREAS the CSA has previously expressed solidarity with Indigenous nations;

MOTION: That the CSA host a student walk-out in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en on Wednesday, March 4, 2020 at 3:00 pm EST;

RESOLVED that the CSA write a statement in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en.

Moved: Ariel Oleynikov

Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Chair:

Would you like to motive Member Oleynikov?

Ariel Oleynikov:

Yes. So the RCMP have been [inaudible] land for a really long time now. There were some peaceful protesters that were arrested back on January 7th and they still haven't left. So the peaceful protesters as well as the [inaudible] were arrested unlawfully and the rampant racism is still prevalent in society including on social media; it's really not hard to find it. If we want to continue to consider ourselves as people that care about the environment, and an organization that cares about the environment, and cares about justice, mostly about indigenous people who have been here long before us and will continue to be here long after us, we have to speak and put our money where our mouth is. It's our duty as people in privileged positions to stand up for folks who don't have our privilege, and make a space for underprivileged voices. So, the University of Victoria has sent out a national callout for all students to walkout on Wednesday March 4th, 12pm their time, which is Pacific Standard Time, so 3pm our time. Some of you may have seen

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



that fossil-free Guelph has already created an official event online for the walkout, so I would also like to amend the motion to say that we will co-host the walkout with Fossil-Free Guelph, which I am pretty sure that that would be alright.

Chair:

So, that's been previously discussed with Fossil-Free Guelph as an option? Because otherwise I don't believe it's in the power of the organization to make the decision to co-host it, unless we have expressed approval from Fossil-free Guelph [yes]...OK, I would still be somewhat hesitant to that, I would say that you could host it....would perhaps better wording be that it would be hosted at the same time as Fossil-free Guelph is hosting theirs? It's just because you can only approve a motion that you have the power to actually enact. Member Smith?

Blakeney Smith:

Can I amend the motion at this point?

Chair:

Yes, you can move to amend.

Blakeney Smith:

I wish to amend the motion such that the first clause reads the CSA hosts a student walkout in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en on Wednesday March the 4th, 2020 at 3:00pm EST in conjunction with the walkout hosted by Fossil-free Guelph.

[silence]

Chair:

Alright, does this look good for your amendment?

Blakeney Smith:

It's in the wrong spot.

Chair:

Oh is it? Goodness gracious. [laughter] Order. Thank you for catching that Member Smith. Alright, is that the amendment as intended? Is there a seconder for this amendment? Ok, seeing Member [inaudible]. Would you like to motivate Member Smith? [no]. Alright, is there any discussion on the amendment to the motion? Seeing none. All in favour of the amendment? All opposed?

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

Which brings us back to discussion about the original motion. One moment while I just change some text colour. Alright, back to the original discussion. I currently have no one on my speakers list....Member Hassan?

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Horeen Hassan:

I would like to propose another amendment. I would like to add another be it further resolved clause that states BIFR that a workgroup be struck to work on Wet'suwet'en's solidarity initiatives

Chair:

Alright. Tell me if this matches what you were looking for Member Hassan? [yes]
Alright. Is there a seconder for that amendment? Seeing Member Oleynikov.

SECONDED BY: Ariel Oleynikov.

Would you like to motivate Member Hassan?

Horeen Hassan:

I know that a lot of people around the table are invested in what's happening with Wet'suwet'en and I know that there's like a need to want to get involved with this issue and I think it would be best to um...like even if could write a statement I want more input from Board members and I want like input from Board members when it comes to any particular initiative that I try to organize or host. Um, when it comes to Wet'suwet'en solidarity. So, I know there's a lot of passion around the table and um, you know, I want their input and think it would be really really great if a workgroup can be struck. I do have a side question: could the workgroup be struck as soon as we vote on this?

Chair:

Oh, like you would want to determine the members for the working group? Or...

Horeen Hasan:

Yes, after we vote on this.

Chair:

Yes, so after you approve this amendment, or you could amend the amendment, you could add in that section to do it to approve members for it. [ok] Is there any further discussion? Member Smith?

Blakeney Smith:

Member Hassan, I wonder, like we have already got many active groups in Guelph and on University campus, specifically, working on the Wet'suwet'en solidarity initiatives. I wonder if you feel we should have one specifically for the CSA?

Horeen Hasan:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



So the reason why I feel we need to have a CSA group is that as an organization, if we are being told by our membership to make a statement on behalf of the organization, it's important that we have those voices who are on the board be part of a working group that helps to put that content together. When it comes to other initiatives, there's always going to be different capacities of different organizations to do different work. We will still be working in conjunction with, like working collaboratively with other groups as well. But doing what we can do as the CSA, but doing it meaningfully where we are doing it in consultation with Board members and our membership in general. So it's great to work with other organizations, who are already doing the work. Once a workgroup is struck, this group that is then struck, will determine how they would like to go about doing solidarity work, whether it would be in collaboration with other groups who are already doing that work, or whether its doing something in the name of like with the organization's name attached to it and doing other things just on their own. Um, so I think that's to the discretion of the working group and yeah.

Chair:
Member Smith.

Blakeney Smith:
I just wanted to remind Member Hassan [inaudible].

Chair:
Is there any further discussion of the amendment? Member Moran?

Josh Moran:
Just to speak as I agree there's a lot of people that are super passionate about it. I just think that support for it is sometimes smaller as of right now, I think that in order to give more people an opportunity to be involved, we should maybe hold off on selecting those [inaudible].

Chair:
Member Fletcher.

Lindsey Fletcher:
Just to clarify, a working group is defined as a committee of no set membership with an interest in a specific issue and [inaudible] gathering information. So we don't have to ratify members or anything. In accordance with CSA policy, Section A, Section 2.6.7. for your reference, so it could be just a call out for those that are interested, could send their information to Horeen to be added into that working group, but it's not defining that only those present here will be members of the working group.

Chair:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Alright. Member Oleynikov.

Ariel Oleynikov:

Also, the walkout is next Wednesday and our next meeting is not until the meeting after, so the linear time doesn't work like that.

Chair:

Member Moran.

Josh Moran:

Pardon my ignorance. [laughter] [laughs too].

Chair:

Is there any further discussion on the amendment to the motion?

Horeen Hasan:

Could we actually strike the group now? Or is that like a separate thing?

Chair:

So, no. Striking the group is the creation of it. [ok] And because it's ah, as per our policies, because it's a committee with no set membership it would be...ah..

Horeen Hasan:

We could just like reach out [inaudible].

Chair:

Yes. [ok] So, with that being said, is there any further discussion on the amendment? Seeing none, all those in favour to add an amendment to add a working group to be struck? All opposed?

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION CARRIED.

Back to discussion of the original motion. Is there...do I have anything...[papers shuffle]...is there any further discussion of item 11.11.6.? Member Smith.

Blakeney Smith:

I just want to speak in favour of the motion. I want to speak to the Board before you vote. There's been a lot of discourse, particularly online and I assume in legacy media as well, concerning the idea of the rule of law around this issue. I'd just like to state that the educated opinion on this matter is that Canada, the RCMP, are, in their invasion of Wet'suwet'en lands in violation of both international law, as well as, the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada, circa ruling, by a ruling circa 1997. So, if that is your concern, then I encourage you to

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



do additional research on the matter and hopefully come to a more educated opinion.

Chair:
Member Traynor.

Nicole Traynor:
If also we do wish to get more information, you can reach out to the Aboriginal Student Association, or the Aboriginal Research Centre and we'd be happy to help you.

Chair:
Is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none. All those in favour of item 11.11.6. the solidarity statement? All opposed?

Vote on Motion
MOTION CARRIED.

Next...that exhausts our business items for tonight. So we'll move to item 11.12. New Business, of which there is none for tonight. We will move to item 11.13. Announcements, starting on my left.

11.12. New Business
No new business.

11.13. Announcements

Earl Evans, PTM.
This is my last Board Meeting. Thank you everyone; enjoyed it. [clapping] Have some more cake. Thank you.

Dena Van de Coevering,
I want to extend a very big thank you to our PTM, for his time and energy given to this organization over the past several years and making it a very nice place to be. As for more organizational things, looking to you folks for support in getting folks out to be nominated for our VPA position, and also getting folks out to vote when it comes, because quorum is very difficult to get as you can see from our General Election we got quorum by 50 votes, which is terrifying, because this is an election for one person, there's one position, which will be even harder to get, so I'm strongly urging you folks to be involved with this election to help out your CSA, so we can get a full Executive. Thanks.

Claudia Idzik:

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Bye Earl. 248 days until Halloween and...going to grad school next year....bye.
[clapping]

Horeen Hasan:

That was the saddest applause ever. [laughter] It's cool....you're tired...I get it. I just want to say, thank you so much Ariel for bringing forth this motion. I'd like to encourage other Board members to like, you know, cause I know that there's things that you're interested in, and passionate about. I want you to bring those things to this space. If there's something that the CSA is lacking on, that you really want to see more initiative on, bring it forward. This is your Board. This is...you get to decide, and you get to direct this organization. And if you need help writing a motion, or understanding the jargon of how to write a motion, Cameron's available, or anyone else is available, I'm available, anyone's available to help you with that process of helping you do what you want to do. So feel free to reach out whenever, and you know, keep us accountable and get us to do the work you want to see done, because that's what we're here for, we're here to take direction from you folks, so don't forget that this is your student union.

Nicole Traynor?: [unidentified speaker]

That was a very entertaining first meeting. Um

Lindsey Fletcher:

Thank you all for being engaged and patient with the discussions tonight, it is very much appreciated. There are 64 days left of me as Vice President Academic, and just over 6 months until I start grad school, so enjoy these last 64 days with me.

[unidentified speaker]:

[inaudible] Tickets will go on sale on Monday March the 2nd, starting out at 10am. They can be purchased from uogwis.com. Tickets will be \$15 and that will include admittance into the actual venue. Of course the event itself: refreshments, a catered lunch, and social at Prescott's afterwards. We plan to sell about 600 tickets, so they start go by pretty fast. [Is it students only?] Yes, students....[interrupted inaudible...well I can't come]...alumni are also [great].

Michael Pacheco:

This is the first meeting where I stayed for the entire thing before, so that was something. But I don't really have whole too much, but just a kind of update on what I am doing. I'm going to plug my own election, because I am going to be running for the Board of Governors. So you get two votes; there's some other candidate there, so I encourage you to read the other profiles and give that second vote to somebody else; also give the other one to me. Voting closes Monday, so definitely vote on that.

[unidentified speaker]

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



[inaudible low voice] Thanks Earl again.

[unidentified speaker]

Same thing, just sending thanks to Earl. Enjoy retirement.

[unidentified speaker]

[inaudible]. Its only 303 days until Christmas.[laughter]. Also thank you Earl, we are going to miss you. Kazoo has, well we are running an event with people [inaudible] association until the end of March, March 25th. Its Movies for Mental Health. This one is more focused on the black community. So, there's going to be a really great panel and we're also showing two movies. I think we're also trying to get popcorn and also [inaudible]. So, mental health...good event. Yeah, I'll have more info on that shortly.

[unidentified speaker]

I just want to mention that the Canadian Federation of Students is currently standing in solidarity with the striking teachers in Ontario. So, if you guys get a chance, go out and picket with your favourite teachers if you're from the area; that was what the Niagara Convention was all about last Saturday. Also it is, Islam Awareness Week. The Muslim Students Association have all sorts of cool events going on. I went to a really awesome film screening right before this meeting. Also tomorrow night there is a free dinner from 7 to 9pm in the UC courtyard 2, from the Muslim Students Association, and they have a really cool keynote speaker named Dr. Mistufiq [sp?] so, check it out if you have time.

Blakeney Smith:

Thanks Earl. It's been great having you support us here at the board and it's been great talking to you regarding a number of things. It's a very very busy period for OPIRG. We've got our Rebel Knowledge Symposium 2020 Edition coming out this weekend. We've got workshops all...sorry we've got [inaudible] Saturday and we've got workshops; specifically geared towards local organizers on Sunday. We're going to be talking about stuff like the relationship between forced migration and climate change, Canada's roles and responsibilities to climate change, colonization, and environmental racism. Tactics and strategies for action and lessons learned from past movements and how they might apply today. Additionally, OPIRG is having their AGM sometime soon and we are also hiring the Chief Returning Officer for our elections and you can also run in our elections to be on our board, so if any of you are into environmental and social justice, please do check that out at, I think it's opirgguelph.org. Personally, I am trying to start a reading group focused on anarchism and anarchist theory, so if any of you are into that, please get in touch with me. [where is the symposium?] The symposium is here.

[unidentified speaker]

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



Thanks Earl. So, Interhall Council has our formal next Friday March 6th, and it's \$25; there's a three-course meal, there's a dance, for anyone that lives in residence. [inaudible].

Josh Moran:

Sticking with this theme, there's officially one day until February 27th. [laughter] Last week UofG Food Talk who is part of us had their ag day; down in UC. So thank you everyone that stopped by and asked awesome questions. We love running that event and we love to hear what people's views are on agriculture; thank you very much. And today we had our Brewniversity – which is a play on brew and university...for those of you that didn't know that. [inaudible] We also just had our MCC speaker event recently and talked about economic analysis and land crisis readjusting and ag commodities, so [inaudible] And also tonight's pub night is a Night in Panama pub. So, with all that being said, I'd like to wish you best of luck in this next stage of your life Earl [thank you] it's been very nice working with you. And I hope everyone had a great reading week and is preparing well for the rest of midterms.

Chair:

Member Hassan.

Horeen Hassan:

Since [name?] is not here today, I would like to say Miss Jay Alexander is coming March 2nd, so if you have not gotten your ticket, you should definitely do so immediately. Bring all your friends because it's gonna be a good talk to be a part of. And for folks who don't know who Miss Jay is, can you see the conversation happening over there, Miss Jay is from America's Next Top Model, you know if you ever...if you see the face you'll know it, so look for the face. [laughter]

Claudia Idzik:

It's only \$5.

Horeen Hassan:

It's only \$5, so bring all your friends.

Chair:

Alright. Thank you everyone for being here tonight. It's not that time yet, oh goodness, there was something I was going to say. Nope...I can't remember it, so instead we will move to 11.14. the in-camera session. Don't forget to remember that that exists.

11.14. *In Camera Session*

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



MOTION: to move in-camera to discuss the in-camera minutes from February 5, 2020.

Moved: Ariel Oleynikov
Seconded: Kathleen Nolan

Vote on Motion
Motion carried

MOTION: to approve the in-camera minutes from February 5, 2020.

Moved: Daniel Ofori-Darko
Seconded: Zachary Rucchin

Vote on Motion
Motion carried

11.15. Adjournment

MOTION: To adjourn the CSA Board of Directors Meeting of February 26, 2020 at 8:58 pm.

Moved: Lindsey Fletcher
Seconded: Josh Moran


Vote on Motion
Motion carried

Approved by the Board of Directors	September 3, 2020
Cameron Olesen , Board Chair	
Signature 	Date October 10, 2020
Pete Wobschall , Policy and Transition Manager	

MINUTES

Board of Directors Meeting # 11
February 26, 2020 – 6:00 pm – UC 442



<p>Signature</p>  A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.	<p>Date</p> <p>October 6, 2020</p>
--	------------------------------------