

## **Annual General Meeting November 12, 2008**

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 5:22 p.m.

**2. Call for Quorum**

Quorum was present

**3. Adoption of the Agenda**

**AGMMotion01:** Kirkland/Lowenberger Carried

**4. President's Report**

President Steeves thanked everyone for attending to make quorum. She reviewed quickly what's been happening at the USSU since the Executive took office. They went through extensive orientation to become familiar with the USSU. VP Dyck has been working extensively on the housing issue with a variety of initiatives. She stated as well they've been working with the U of S Administration to get more residencies on campus. She stated Welcome Week was a huge success this year. There is no secret that Place Riel has been our biggest issue this year and passed an increase to the infrastructure fee of CPI plus \$10.00 to move forward with the renovation and the expansion of Place Riel. She stated the U-Pass passed with 80.12% in favor with a 44% voter turnout. As well, VP Dyck organized a very successful Green Yourself Week and has been nominated for an award. President Steeves stated herself, VP Lowenberger and VP Dyck attended the Edge conference in Halifax, NS and was an excellent opportunity for them to meet other Executive in other Student Unions. As well in May, the entire Executive went to the Annual CFS. Finally, she stated the Federal Election took place and herself and VP Kenney worked very hard on the "Canada's Next Greatest Prime Minister" event.

**5. Auditors Report**

Chair Leisle handed the floor over to the guest speaker from KPMG, Mr. Scott Verity.

Mr. Verity stated the financial statements and the auditors report are contained in the Annual Report and for a few comments, our auditors report is included and states the financial statements as they are presented in the Annual Report. ? stated in terms of operations for the Students' Union in the past year he felt it was fair to say it was a very good year for the operations of your association. Revenues overall increased by about 3% year over year and at the same time the USSU was able to keep your costs fairly stable. In particular he thinks the sales in your various business operations increased quite dramatically by 8% while you've held

your costs back by about a 6% increase. The result of that of increasing the revenue and holding your costs in line is that the USSU has excessive revenue of over expenses or profit for the year of just under \$300,000.00. That leaves the Students' Union in a position at the end of ? for some adjustments and gains on disposable assets so a net income figure of \$293,709.00. He stated the financial position of the Students' Union at the end of April again was quite strong with a net asset position or an unrestricted surplus of just over a million dollars. That is the financial position of the Students' Union and leaves them in a strong financial position to go forward on your future operations. He stated at the end of April there was approximately \$3.3 million dollars invested in short term investments plus another \$720,000.00 in the bank account and that offsets some obligations for some future capital expenditures. He stated those were the highlights of the financial statements for the past year, if there are any questions they can be addressed to the Executive at the end.

VP Ring stated be it resolved that the audited financial statements of the USSU be accepted for the year-end of April 30, 2008 as presented.

**AGMMotion02:** Ring/Steeves Carried

VP Ring stated be it resolved that the auditing firm of KPMG Chartered Accountants be appointed for the 2008 / 2009 audit.

**AGMMotion03:** Ring/Steeves Carried

## **6. Proposed Bylaw Amendments**

### **6.1 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 4: Elections and Referenda**

Chair Leisle stated this is a substantial change to the current Bylaw so please insure all members have the handouts and follow along as they go. He stated anything new being added to the bylaw is in underline, anything deleted has a strike through it and if there is anything being moved, will have the strike through and right behind it, it will say its been moved to somewhere else in the bylaw.

President Steeves moved to approve the new bylaw on #4 Elections and Referenda.

**AGMMotion04:** Steeves/Member Schultz

President Steeves stated as Council can see because we have the new text and the original text side by side, it is quite a substantial change. This was prepared by our CRO of last year and our current CRO to sort of mimic actual legislation. She stated they've had some issues with elections and referendums and what not in the past so with potentially one this year, they thought it was a good idea to make it as strong and to close any loop holes that we could possibly find, and also something that she thinks is really important is that at the end Part 6, they've put a review in, so it's kind of an appeal function. If someone disagrees with a decision made by the Elections Board there is an appeal function put in, which was a problem in the

past, so besides that, there are some substantial changes throughout, a lot of it is simply just making and closing all loopholes. Generally everything is pretty much the same. She let the motion stand for any questions.

Councilor David stated in reviewing this document there is one thing that comes to mind that is particularly concerning. He stated if you go to Part 6 review, section 35, they want to in the event that the Elections Boards decision is called into the question, University Councilor would strike a committee consisting of 3 members to overturn the decision of a 7-person board. He stated he finds this fundamentally flawed and he thinks it should stand that the decision of the Elections Board is final in all matters of election and referenda. Therefore, he'd like to amend the proposed bylaw changes to strike sections 35 subsections 1 through 6 from there and add to section 34, subsection 9, the decisions of the Elections Board are final including declaration of any election invalid.

**AGMMotion05:** David/Member #24

Chair Leisle opened debate on the amendment to the amendment.

President Steeves spoke against this amendment. She stated she thinks its really important to first have a review in something like this and also the review with what it came out as isn't just taken from thin air, this is mimicking a review of actually procedures that are in place for academic dishonesty as well as the standard of student conduct the University already has in its policies and she'd like to also note that the review panel, if you actually read subsection 5 the ways in which the review panel would overturn the decision on the Elections Board is only if it acted without jurisdiction, acted beyond its jurisdiction, refused to exercise its jurisdiction, failed to observe a principle of natural justice ? fairness based on decisions of a ? finding a fact it made in perverse ? manner or without regard for the material before or acted in any other way contrary to law. She stated so the only way that an appeal, if you want to call it that of the review would actually be able to happen is if the Elections Board was running outside of the mandate. So if someone just felt like they weren't, they didn't like the decision, they couldn't just appeal to this review board because it wouldn't actually fulfill the obligations under subsection 5. She would like to speak against this amendment, she thinks in actual justice, and in every single body in the University, there is an ability to appeal a decision and she thinks that this shouldn't be any different.

Councilor David stated he still finds it fundamentally flawed that the decision of the 3 people can overturn the decisions of 7. He stated the Elections Board is non-partisan, non-biased, they should be able to do all this stuff on their own, they shouldn't have to have a big brother watching over them in the event that they mess up solely to be determined by the General Manager of the USSU who is not in fact a member of the Students' Union.

President Steeves stated in regards to the General Manager comment, she'd also like to let everyone know that the University's policy, is the University's Secretary determines whether or not a complaint or an appeal is with warrant and the General Manager would be making that decision based on subsection 5. They couldn't just say no to something, they would have to have a reason behind it and she'd also like to again, every single decision making body almost has some sort of an appeal mechanism behind it, so she thinks that actually according to fundamentally it would be wrong to not have an appeal mechanism just having the Elections Board be the final 100% decision.

Councilor Kirkland stated President Steeves was just mentioning that every other Board happens to have a review process; he stated other Boards shouldn't determine what we do as a USSU. He stated we here should decide what's right and wrong, not based on what other Institutions are doing.

Councilor David stated what this review process does is affectively takes the decision of 5 students, 5 of the 7 members on the Elections Board and puts their decision to be overturned by 2 students on this review panel.

Councilor Umoh stated he'd like to speak against the motion because he doesn't think they should consider this as an appeal, he thinks they should look at it as a means of checking the Board in a sense that while every Board should be as fair as possible there is a chance they could overstep their boundaries. He stated he thinks the reasons put forth in subsection 5, A-D ? to how or why a review panel was the Elections Board decision would be overturned are matters in which either ? jurisdiction or ? to observe natural justice procedural fairness. He doesn't think in terms of making a decision in itself, its just if they overstep their boundaries that's the ? of what is suppose to be doing. So, it's a way of checking the Board to make sure that they are not over exerting a power that they seem to run. He would like to speak against striking it out.

Councilor David stated what he's trying to do here is eliminate redundant process from the proposed bylaw. The CRO for the Elections Board is a practicing lawyer. A practicing lawyer should have good understanding of the laws in front of them in ways they are relating to this referendum and every since the decision of Mowatt vs. the USSU he's pretty sure the Elections Board is very careful in its decisions and does not need a supervisor above them.

President Steeves stated she'd like to remind people that the CRO is only one vote out of 7 and the members on the Elections Board don't actually have to listen to the CRO if they don't feel that they need to. She stated in that saying, the Elections Board is careful now, that is clearly objective, you don't know that, you don't know in five years, ten years, what people are going to do, so she doesn't feel that can be a valid argument. Furthermore, she wants to respond to Councilor Kirkland's comments, this wasn't brought forward because other Institutions have it, but the fact that most Institutions and most Boards such as ours have some sort

of review process. She feels its deemed necessary by a lot of people and she believes its quite necessary to have.

Councilor Tomcala asked what would be the point of having an Elections Board?

President Steeves stated specially the Elections Board is for, the only thing the review board would be doing is to make sure they weren't stepping outside their boundaries. They wouldn't be able to reverse any decisions that the Elections Board has made in good faith according to procedures, so the Elections Board would still hold that power, the only time for example if someone acted in bad faith on the Elections Board or they went above and beyond their actual capabilities according to our Constitution and Bylaws, then the review committee would kick in, not because of the decision made itself, but because of the procedure that went along with it.

Member Shultz asked how these students would be chosen and how do we know that they are going to be impartial because there are only two of them, and that could be anybody.

President Steeves stated it says the University Students' Council shall constitute an ad hock review panel. The USSU solicitors chair and two other panel members appointed by the Appointments Board so it wouldn't be just a vote at USC, the Appointments Board would actually do it.

VP Dyck stated to let everyone know when the USSU was reviewing this with their lawyer, she basically explained that steps like this are made in other Institutions because its to assume that people might not act in accordance with the law and might not act with principles of fairness in mind and this is why things like this exist, its to protect people from those that are in the powerful positions that are not going to act in general fairness. She believes something like an appeal board needs to exist.

Councilor Umoh stated he'd like to restate that this process is not a substantial review in the sense that they are not looking at the decision made, they are looking at the process in which the decision was made. This is a procedure that is ? across labor relations board even in professional boards they have standards of review as well.

Chair Leisle called to vote, he stated the amendment on the floor is to strike part 6, which deals with review, and add back in what was 7.04. All the decisions of the Elections Board are final including declaring an election invalid.

Chair Leisle called to vote. Amendment is defeated. He stated they would continue debate on the motion, which are the whole changes to the elections and referenda bylaw.

VP Ring stated he'd like to make a friendly amendment to the proposed bylaw under section 28 application period and campaigns, he believes there are 2 – 28's, so the first 28. 28, section 4, subsection B, where it states accompanied by a \$500 dollar deposit as shown this year with no yes or no side of the U-Pass referendum. He would like to move that number to a \$100.00 dollars.

VP Ring moved to strike \$500.00 dollars deposit and change it to \$100.00 deposit.

**AGMMotion06:** Ring/Steeves Carried

Councilor Hitchings made a motion to have it in part 6, ? 35, the same thing he was talking about but not have it strike, just have it that the USC decides, not the General Manager decides if an appeal process can be brought to the Board instead of 35, number 3 where the General Manager is of the opinion that the application is not frivolous....., it should be that the USC is of the opinion that the application is not ? can't hear him.

Chair Leisle stated Council would change 35, subsection 1 to be submitting a complaint to ? then a bunch of interruptions.. Chair Leisle stated we'd have to change some wording on that. He stated the General Manager should notify the University Students' Council who will decide whether or not the application is frivolous or vexatious.

**AGMMotion07:** Hitchings/David

Chair Leisle opened debate on that amendment.

Councilor Kirkland stated he'd like to speak in favor of this, University Student Councilors are elected from their perspective colleges to represent the students and so he thinks the most unbiased you can be is to ask all of the students what they think.

President Steeves stated some circumstances where this might be a problem, she asked if someone is running in the election, someone is running a campaign in the election who are members of Student Council will they simply just declare conflict of interest and not vote.

Chair Leisle stated yes, in that case the motion if USC was notified and had a motion to basically be of the opinion that the application was for frivolous of vexatious any Councilors that were running in that election or part of it in some way would be in a conflict of interest. He stated it would also be members of the Elections Board as well that are Councilors seeing as they would obviously in a conflict of interest as well since the complaint is against that Board.

VP Dyck asked if there had been a lot of problems in the past with the USC thinking that they can overturn the Election Board results and wouldn't this give the power back to the USC and therefore void our Elections Board.

Councilor David responded he thinks the way its worded is that the USC would decide whether or not to send the complaint forward to the 3-person board for review.

President Steeves stated she'd like to point out under Bylaw #3 the Code of Ethics, article 3, violations protocol subsection 3.02 it states upon receipt a formal complaint the GM or GMD shall verify the complaints? ?? requirements are met and, she might have a bit of a problem. She stated the idea of the University Student Council holding the power, the GM has a lot more experience with these kinds of issue and elected bodies don't usually do these kinds of things for reason. There is a reason that in most bodies that it's a General Manager or University Secretary or someone like that who is ? to be non partisan. She stated there is a reason that they do this.

Councilor Kirkland asked to clarify the motion on the table is to have the USC send it forward to a 3-person Board?

Chair Leisle stated the motion is basically, that the USC shall decide if it's frivolous or vexatious and not the General Manager.

Chair Leisle asked if there was further debate on the amendment. None made, Councilors were asked to go to vote.

**AGMMotion08:** Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle stated Council would continue debate on the motion as amended.

VP Ring stated he's like to add in, in the same section, point #6 that all complaints must be submitted within 14 days of the Elections Boards final decision.

**AGMMotion09:** Ring/Kirkland

VP Ring stated the reason why he stated this is the USSU General Elections often occur at the end of March and the final decision from the Elections Board often doesn't follow until early April and then at that point everything most students are in finals and if we delay it there is no time table in this so it could be reviewed after the term is finished and it doesn't state anywhere there is a time limit about when somebody can actually argue the fact, it could be within the following Executive and the USC's term.

Chair Leisle asked for further debate; none made. Council went to vote. He stated again the amendment is to add in Clause #7 that all applications must be made within 14 days of the Election Boards final decision.

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle asked for further debate on the motion as amended.

Councilor David stated under Part 6, section 35, subsection 4, he would like it amended to read 5 other panel members rather than 2 panel members.

**AGMMotion10:** David/Hitchings

VP Ring asked Councilor David if this would or could be 5 ?, 5 AL, Members of Student Council, just 5 students in general or would you want to elaborate.

Councilor David stated as it stands, 5 panel members.

President Steeves asked in a hypothetical situation, what if 5 people don't apply?

Chair Leisle stated under his interpretation of it, in that case, then the USSU would then have to reopen and the Appointments Board would have to seek out 5 people to sit on this Board.

President Steeves stated you just can't simply think 5 people will apply, 2 years ago, Student at Large, we couldn't actually fill all the positions and we had to get some people to sit on 4 different Boards.

Member Shultz stated going back to her original question, how are we going to pick them anyway, isn't it going to be by application? Do you apply to be on this Board during the fall or how does that work?

Chair Leisle stated the way there are appointed by the Appointments Board and the Appointments Board has the mandate how to set out how they would be chosen.

Councilor David stated right here it says, where a hearing is required they shall constitute an ad hock review panel, ad hock means, as needed. It wouldn't be something that the Appointments Board would appoint at the beginning of the year just by the literal definition of ad hock. He stated and by the same token as President Steeves mentioned earlier, how do we say that 2 people will even apply to this?

VP Lowenberger asked what the intent is with 2 students vs. 3, vs. 4, vs. 5.

Councilor David stated on the Elections Board there are 5 students to make decisions, so the Board that should overturn any potential decisions made by the Elections Board should have at least the same number of students.

Chair Leisle asked for further debate on the amendment. None made.

Motion is carried.

VP Dyck stated she'd like to amend a previous amendment, in 35, where we had replaced the General Manager with the USC making that decision; she would like to change that to the USSU lawyer.

**AGMMotion11:** Dyck/Steeves

Chair Leisle opened up debate on this motion. None made. Council went to vote.

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle stated the motion is to adopt the Bylaw #4 as proposed to you with the amendments we made today.

Motion is carried.

## **6.2 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 1, Article 6.**

President Steeves moved to make the proposed amendments to Bylaw 1, Article 6.

**AGMMotion12:** Steeves/Dyck

President Steeves spoke to the ones that aren't specific to a portfolios or Boards, she'd leave that to the VP's who are in charge of them. She stated under the Board of College Presidents, Presidents of the Physical Therapy Students' Society was stricken because they are no longer an undergraduate program, they are strictly graduate. President of the Saskatoon Commerce Students' Society was stricken because they are now called the Edwards School of Business. As well, VP Operations & Finance (ex officio).

VP Ring stated the reason for the move of the VP Operations as Vice Chair of the Board of College Presidents is a few years ago when the ? was moved into a direct collation with the USSU, including a budget line it didn't make sense that it wasn't affiliated with the actual expenses and finance of that budget line would be signing cheques and so they felt that in years past its been someone affiliated with the USSU in general, previous to him was the Academic Affairs Officer.

Councilor Laroque stated under the Sustainability Board, the new text, subsection 3, it says that the Sustainability Board shall be responsible for ensuring the USSU sustainability policy is followed. She asked if they actually have that power?

VP Dyck stated the intention behind the change was because some policies were created and not followed and so there wants to be a bigger push creating these policies and following them.

Councilor Laroque asked if one part of the USSU wasn't following that sustainability policy so then would the Board have the power to, I don't know.

VP Dyck stated it would be if something wasn't being followed then they would work towards implementing it.

VP Ring asked to make a friendly amendment to the subsection that Councilor Laroque is referencing. It states ensuring the USSU sustainability policy is followed, include, and ensuring the USSU if the sustainability policy is followed and advising the USSU if it is not and advising on how it can be better followed.

Chair Leisle stated to confirm it will read the following: and advising the USSU on how to better implement the policy if not being followed.

**AGMMotion13:** Ring/Kirkland

Chair Leisle opened debate on the amendment.

Councilor Laroque asked if this would require on the part of operations of the USSU to self-report their sustainability measures?

VP Dyck stated it would be up to the Board.

Councilor Tomcala stated what she thought Councilor Laroque was getting at was how could the Board insure this? What power do they have to insure it?

President Steeves stated the Board shouldn't be interfering in the actual operations of the USSU. The Sustainability Board has no power to insure the policies are actually be implemented. It would be better served to have an advisory role.

Councilor Begbie stated rather than insure, perhaps evaluating.

VP Kenney stated in 2004 there was a Sustainability Coordinator hired part time for the USSU, what they did was implement a campus sustainability assessment and framework plan, so a plan of insuring that the Sustainability Policy already exists.

Councilor Umoh called to question.

Chair Leisle called to vote on the amendment.

Motion is carried.

President Steeves moved to amend this to read to advise the USSU on how to best follow the sustainability policy.

**AGMMotion14:** Steeves/Umoh

VP Dyck stated she'd like to make an amendment to the amendment to say USSU sustainability policy, not just sustainability policy.

Chair Leisle stated it would be a friendly amendment. Council went to vote.

Motion is carried.

Councilor David called to question.

Council went to vote.

Motion is carried.

### **6.3 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 1, Article 10.**

VP Ring stated this change would be moved from the Constitutional Amendments once we get down to 7.6, but because article 10 student fees procedural clause procedural usually aren't contained in the constitution, it's contained in the bylaws. This is moving it to Bylaw 1, creating article 10 and will be further voted on in 7.6

**AGMMotion15:** Ring/Steeves

Councilor David stated he would caution the USSU in moving this from the Constitution to the Bylaws, because a Bylaw can be changed by USC and where it is further approved at an AGM such as this one. So in the future, a USC could potentially change this and get rid of the \$10.00 thing, and approve a student increase fee well in excess of what this article declares and if it is kept in the Constitution it prevent future USC s from going and changing it. He would like to speak against this motion.

President Steeves stated in a situation like that, good luck getting that through the free view committee that the University has, they would not accept that. This is procedural and doesn't belong in the Constitution.

VP Dyck asked Council if in 50 years what is \$10.00 dollars is going to be worth? She is in favor of moving this.

Chair Leisle asked for further debate, Council went to vote.

Motion is carried.

### **6.4 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 2, Article 2.**

VP Dyck stated the role of International Students with WUSC has flip flopped between the VP of External and Student Issues, and the reason its being pulled back in to VP Student Issues is because International Students are Undergraduate

students, they are not external issues or affairs. VP Dyck motioned to make the changes to the Bylaw to article 2.

**AGMMotion16:** Dyck/Steeves

VP Kenney stated she agrees with VP Dyck's statement. To further explain the two roles, as external and internal affairs often overlap, she would like to make a friendly amendment to this motion to include in the portfolio of external affairs, because we're moving the International students from external to internal, she thinks it also should be considered that in the external affairs portfolio it should state be responsible for all external issues in the community, including but not restricted to off campus parking, off campus housing, and sustainability as it relates to matters in the community. The reason for these..

President Steeves called point of order.

Chair Leisle agreed that this motion is out of order, on the basis that we haven't received advance notice of this, it's a substantive change, and it's not simply making a small amendment to what's being proposed here. He stated all substantive amendments like this must be made in advance notice.

VP Kenney stated she believes this is a serious change that everyone should really consider.

Chair Leisle stated again this motion is out of order.

Councilor Adeyemi – can't understand her, something about wanting clarification.

VP Dyck stated there are quire a few boards through University Council, so for example she's on the International Activities of Council Committee. So, in that committee, they are dealing with exchange student processes.

Chair Leisle asked for further debate, Council would go to vote.

Motion is carried.

### **6.5 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 2, Article 5.**

VP Dyck moved to make the changes to Bylaw 2, Article 5.

**AGMMotion17:** Dyck/Steeves

Chair Leisle asked for debate, none made. Council went to vote.

Motion is carried.

## **6.6 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 3, Article 1.**

VP Ring stated there are no significant changes, as shown in the attachments.

**AGMMotion18:** Ring/Dyck Carried

## **7. Proposed Constitutional Amendments**

### **7.1 Proposed Amendment to Article 7**

Councilor David moved to propose the amendment.

**AGMMotion19:** David/Hitchings

Councilor David stated the fact that the USSU is going to make all the policies and things like that accessible to students, which is actually a requirement of the non-profit corporations act this just puts it in the Constitution so students are aware of it and that they can get these policies if they feel so needed.

VP Ring stated he'd like to make an amendment to it; rather than having it in Article 6, Powers Rights and Privileges, putting it into Article 7 Part 2, which is Powers and Duties of the Executive.

**AGMMotion20:** Ring/Kirkland

Chair Leisle stated the amendment is to move this to Part 2, Section A, Subsection 6. He opened the floor for debate; none made.

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle opened up debate ?

President Steeves stated she doesn't disagree with the spirit of this amendment, but she has some concerns regarding HR policies for our staff as well as meeting minutes. What exactly does this mean in regards to all minutes taken?

President Steeves moved to amend it to read, have the USSU be transparent and fully accountable to it's members by making all possible policies, job descriptions, and all governance meeting minutes.

Councilor Kirkland stated point of information and asked about ? minutes and if they will need to be recorded?

**AGMMotion21:** Steeves/Hitchings

VP Ring stated he'd like to make an amendment to the amendment. We've heard from our lawyer and heard there are no policies that are of concern, so the possible part is actually not required to be there. All the policies as reviewed by our lawyer are ok'd to put up.

Chair Leisle stated we're adding the word governance before meeting minutes. He asked for further debate on the word governance.

Motion is carried.

Motion is carried.

## **7.2 Proposed Amendment to Article 7**

President Steeves stated there are a few things. The reason for strike out because they are included under to the restricted to the following, also the School of Physical Therapy no longer exists, and Section B 6, the courts have final authority over our Constitution Bylaws, we don't. President Steeves moved to make the amendments as noted under the proposed amendment to Article 7.

**AGMMotion22:** Steeves/Lowenberger

Councilor Kirkland can't hear him?

President Steeves stated Bylaw ?

Chair Leisle asked for further debate, none made.

Motion is carried.

## **7.3 Proposed Amendment to Article 7**

Councilor Hitchings made a motion to make the amendment to Article 7.

**AGMMotion23:** Hitchings/Adeyemi

Councilor Hitchings stated he believes this should be amended because right now the VP of Student Issues has a lot on their portfolio and is the only Executive member that has two committees. He said there is easily enough work to make it into two positions. He feels the University can be much more sustainable.

VP Dyck stated she agrees with everything that Councilor Hitchings said, but doesn't think the amendment is enough right now to make it stick. She does believe that every individual and home, and organization will need to make changes. Our University has already started to do this, but we need to do more. She feels the USSU needs a sustainability coordinator in the office. She would like to see the USSU become a leader in sustainability.

President Steeves stated she doesn't disagree with the spirit of this amendment and also agrees that all organizations will have to become more sustainable. She cautioned Councilor Hitchings on saying that the VP Student Issues has a huge portfolio, as all VP positions hold very huge portfolios.

Councilor Laroque stated she'd like to speak in favor of this motion. Speaking from indigenous forms of government, we don't have odd numbers of decision makers; purposely we always have even numbers that way people are forced to come to consensus.

Councilor Kirkland stated the spirit is great and sustainability is very important, but disagrees on a few points. He agrees that sustainability is linked to all positions in the USSU; he doesn't think having another governance position is necessary and agrees with President Steeves that perhaps it would be better suited for a higher position. He thinks the currently structure of the USSU accurately represents students and as you had mentioned we had presentation to Council by Margret Asmuss, and she said students said that the movement in the University is by and large a part of the students. He feels students are currently served well by their USSU Executive and that, that motion will continue.

VP Ring stated some people might be interested in what the cost would be; it would be a yearly increase of approximately \$25,000.00, which includes the salary, benefits and the two courses that are paid for and then additional maintenance, like office equipment and computer hardware, which would be approximately \$10,000.00.

VP Kenney stated in fact on the second page of our Annual Report, one of our values following principles shall guide the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union in all of its' endeavours. To speak to this, she stated she is very impressed with Councilor Laroque's comment on building a more like consensus based Executive, she believes it would be really positive as well sustainability is a huge issue, and she knows as her experience as VP Student Issues, she found it very challenging to balance all of the non-academic issues and deal with sustainability.

Councilor Hitchings stated there are other things that need to be changed in order for this to happen. But is this amendment was passed tonight, tomorrow the USSU could pass a motion to pass an SGM, and then we'd be able to amend the Bylaws.

VP Dyck stated she'd like to make an amendment to the amendment and strike and equity and have the Vice President of Sustainability be responsible for sustainability issues pertaining to the USSU. Equity and Equality both would be struck.

**AGMMotion24:** Dyck/Hitchings

Chair Leisle opened debate on this motion, none made. Councilors went to vote.

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle stated they would continue debate on the motion as amended.

President Steeves stated she'd be interested to see what would happen in a 6 member Executive when 3 are dead fast against 3, she's no sure what the mechanism would be to sell that. She'd also like to speak to simply on the monetary issues; we have some tough times ahead with the operations of the USSU in terms of Place Riel. We still have some hurdles to over come in that and \$35,000.00 dollars a year doesn't sound like a lot of money, but it potentially is quite a bit of money in this way. As well, we shouldn't be making a change in hope that further changes will be made in the future.

Member Theeclle stated he'd like to speak about the comment it's a big job, yes, it's a big job, he's taken classes in environmental sustainability, and it's not something that someone who doesn't have a degree or who isn't a professional should be undertaking. He stated sustainability is something that needs to be done between members, and one person working on it can help coordinate, but you don't need a Vice President, you need someone to multiple into always thinking about it as an issue, it's not something that can be solved with just one person.

Councilor Laroque stated on the comment of how a 6 person Executive would operate, just for an example, the entire community of Innovuit operates on a consensus based government and that's how things were done before Europeans came. She doesn't think that's really a problem, people talk to each other and then they compromise.

Councilor Kirkland called to question.

**AGMMotion25:** Kirkland/Tomcala

Chair Leisle stated called to question means go directly to vote. Councilors voted.

Motion is defeated.

Councilor David stated he doesn't believe anybody would argue that the USSU Executive are under equipped to deal with issues as they come up, he doesn't think that the sixth Executive member is an answer to better equipping them for this thing. He thinks the extra costs that would be incurred with adding a sixth Vice President would better be spent just giving that money to the five current members on the USSU Ex, they have a little bit more in their pockets, they would come home with a little bit more than the minimum wage from what they are getting now and it might make them want to stay in the office a little bit longer every day.

Councilor Crosbie stated she'd like to speak a little bit against this and speak a bit to what Scott said. She thinks that sustainability is a current issues that students have voiced and because it's a big issue that students are talking about, then all members of the Executive should be looking in to it. She stated if the Executive are overworked and can't handle and meet the needs of sustainability then they have the opportunity to hire someone and create a new position themselves, and if that need hasn't come up yet, then she doesn't see it necessary to create a new position.

VP Kenney stated she wanted to comment on the 3 against 3 kind of whatever it is, she guesses from her perspective that a 3 against 3 is a lot more democratic than say a 3 against 2. She believes this role is needed, if not more now with the times we face.

Member Flavell stated for both a statement and a question, wouldn't it not be served better for the USSU and the student bodies as a whole to create sustainability assistant, much like the academic affairs have. He asked when next year would the election be held for the Vice President role, or when would it be held?

Councilor Hitchings stated he didn't say that creating a position would solve sustainability on campus, this person would be created to work towards sustainability. Yes it would be better if the person had a degree in it, but that's not the point of the USSU. He feels money should not be an issue, but agrees that the Executive are underpaid, money is part of the problem with sustainability.

Councilor Umoh called to question.

Members went to vote.

Motion is defeated.

#### **7.4 Proposed Amendment to Article 8**

VP Ring stated there are two changes to this Article; the first part is under part 3. The second part is the removal of method of election, which was put in last year it would be batch style instant run off. Because we go through PAWS we had to discuss it with them to see what the potential costs would be. They went back and did their estimate and the way we do it right now is you pick the person you want to elect you. This would be you ranking the candidates and the cost projected would range from \$1000 dollars to \$18,000.00 and the way that the motion is read it would be approximately two points of the costing. The first is the survey software where you can select each candidate more than once. The question numbers would still show up for each question and the order in which the candidates are displayed on the ballot is the same for every single voter. Option 2

is to modify the survey software and then you would rank 1, 2 and 3. This is \$7000.00 and then custom application is when they build a whole new software program would be \$15,000.00. As well there is a cost in the interpretation of the results, counting by hand would be going through excel and insuring everything is there and there would also be a cost associated if you were ranking all candidates from 1 through 4, say would be a \$2000.00 cost. Automatic counting would be the results would be available right after the vote rather than a few days later.

**AGMMotion26:** Ring/Kirkland

Chair Leisle opened debate on the changes.

Member Salmers stated she'd like to speak against this amendment ? laughing, she believes that this ? process would be way better than the one we have now. We haven't even tried it out yet, it was set to be tried out this year. She thinks it would be a better choice as we wouldn't have Presidents elected on 23% of the vote and it would force 50% of the vote. It would also force students to think more about the candidates, she doesn't think money is an issue. She stated that the USSU spends \$8000.00 in conferences and therefore doesn't believe money should be an issue.

VP Ring stated point of information; the counting of the ballots could be a cost each year.

Member Theecl stated is PAWS not an acronym; in reality it should be personal access to on-line services or web services?

VP Ring stated we could identify that and he accepted a friendly amendment.

Member Flavell stated with the instant run off voting, there you would not be forced to chose a second candidate you could default in choosing one candidate and then abstaining from choosing a 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, or 4<sup>th</sup> and so on and so forth.

President Steeves stated she'd like to respond to something that Member Salmers stated \$8000.00 dollars for conferences are extremely important to the Executive portfolio so be careful using that as an example. She stated she'd like to speak against this amendment as well though, she understands \$18,000.00 but as noted we spent \$15,000.00 in plasmas last year.

Councilor David stated as Member Salmers stated, this is a one time shot we should look at it as an investment in to student politics here at the U of S. Himself he's not exactly sure about an instant run off but he thinks that the Students Society as a whole he thinks it's a good thing and he'd like to say, he as an MSC would gladly give up the little bit of reimbursement they give me to see this go forward.

Councilor Umoh stated point of information. Can't hear him at all.

Chair Leisle opened to the option of re adding in point 5.

President Steeves made an amendment to include part 5, method of ? in the entire amendment.

**AGMMotion27:** Steeves/Tomcala

Chair Leisle opened debate on the amendment, part 5 alone.

Chair Leisle asked if there was a second for the call to question.  
Member 13.

Motion is carried

Council went to vote to re-add part 5.

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle stated Council would return to the debate on the amendment about PAWS.

VP Ring stated we denied an amendment because there wasn't enough work put in to a new VP position. When this was put in there was no work done by the proposer in terms of cost therefore this is an unbudgeted amount that would be coming out of the student governance line putting the USSU in more of a deficit. He thinks this should be again moved forward to include a capital expenditure for this year and for the 2009-2010 year.

Chair Leisle stated the motion is out of order as the amendment to the amendment was out of order and returned to debate on the two together.

President Steeves moved to divide the question.

**AGMMotion28:** Steeves/Kirkham

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle stated Council would go the first amendment to add on PAWS. No debate noted, Council went to vote.

Motion is carried.

Chair Leisle opened the floor for debate on removing part 5.

Councilor David called to question.

Council went to vote.

Motion is defeated.

#### **7.5 Proposed Amendment to Article 10**

VP Dyck moved to make the small change to article 10.

**AGMMotion29:** Dyck/Lowenberger

Motion is carried.

#### **7.6 Proposed Amendment to Article 14**

VP Ring stated as they've already done this and moved it to Bylaw #1.

**AGMMotion30:** Ring/Dyck

Motion is carried.

### **8. Questions and Comments for Executive (30 minutes)**

Councilor David stated he thinks its deployable that the only way they could meet quorum tonight was to sit around for an extra 19 minutes and go get people out of the gym. He thinks this is a horrible thing to do, these people didn't even stick around after quorum and then they left. He thinks if the USSU can't garner enough interest in their General Meetings to meet quorum without having to delay the start of the meetings, the USSU isn't doing their job effectively. He would also like to say for the Councilors that aren't here tonight, it's really inexcusable of them to not show up to a meeting like this, where the rest of them sit here and dedicate 2.5 hours of their time tonight. It's simply unacceptable and he thinks the Councilors that weren't here should have to apologize to the rest of us at USC.

VP Dyck stated she also agrees that it's pathetic with the turnout. She's not going to place the blame, but this is why she brought it up to Council a few times what the best ways are to get a hold of their Colleges. She is trying to make this work, but when MSC's don't respond it makes it really hard. She is also working with the USSU Communications Officer to better communicate on campus.

President Steeves thanked Council for bringing fellow students out to the meeting. That is what their jobs are. USSU has only so many resources to get it out to as many students as possible. Many MSC's have very good reasons for not being here, some have contractual obligations that they can't give up, so she recommends that people be careful to point fingers and making them apologizes to Council for not being here when they have legal obligations to be some place else.

VP Lowenberger thanked for all those that attended tonight. She opened up the floor as to how to better reach students, for example the Engineering students.

VP Ring stated it was a great ending to VP Lowenberger's comments, especially as last year we had the AGM at approximately 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon and had about 100 people and correct me if I'm wrong, but he thought the MSC's from last year asking it be delayed to approximately 5:00 p.m. once labs were completed so their students could come to the AGM. He recommends that the AGM next year be held at 2:00 p.m. so the students from all over can come. While we try and appease everything, but perhaps a time for the majority would work best.

Councilor David stated the reason why there aren't more Engineers out tonight is because the Dean of the College of Engineering has scheduled a town hall meeting for entire College tonight at 5:00 p.m. and that's why there are only 3 of us here tonight. We did have 4, but the President of the SESS had to go to the town hall meeting, as that was his obligation. He stated himself and Councilor Kuspira should be there as well, but we were obligated to be here tonight.

Councilor Tomcala stated kudos for getting a room long enough for proceedings. She feels the reason for lack of turnout is because it's at 5:00 p.m, it is after labs, but lots of labs are cancelled this week. If it were at 2:00 p.m., it might have changed things.

Councilor Kirkland stated if you want to get more residencies involved, maybe hold it at Marquis Hall, because we eat from 5:30-7:00.

VP Kenney thanked everyone for sticking it out for the entire time, but also questioned if this meeting should have proceeded in the first place, given we didn't have 50 voting members at the end. This didn't represent our student body very well.

Councilor Begbie stated perhaps bribing would have worked. Free pizza, refreshments etc, may have worked. We're students, you don't want people to come out for the wrong reasons, but you want people to come out.

Councilor Crosbie stated she agrees with her comments, but her and Councilor ? don't believe the timing has anything to do with it. The fact of the matter is not enough people know about the USSU, not enough people know what an AGM is. She stated obviously there are ways to get people excited, and doesn't believe she saw more than two posters advertising the AGM, and it didn't explain what it is and why.

VP Dyck stated this is the gold that she's been looking for. This is what she wants to hear, she can take this back to the Communications Manager and tell them that the posters are in the wrong places, and there aren't enough of them.

**9. Any Other Business**

**10. Adjournment**

**AGM Motion 31:** Tomcala/Kirkland Carried