



commerce
undergraduate
society

CUS Board of Directors Minutes

Oct 17th, 2011

Start Time: 5:35pm

Present: Johannes, Jackie, Sara, Andrea, Dylan, Jacky, Emmet, Armin, Aldora, (Riley), Mandy, Lilian, DavidH, Chris

Late: Klazina, (DavidL), Tim

Regrets: Anna, Enzo

Call to order and adoption of the agenda

- Attendance
- Approval of Minutes

Voting Phase

BIRT the CUS Board of Directors approve the minutes from the previous meeting of the Board of Directors.

For: Unanimous

Minutes are approved.

- **Adoption of the Agenda**

Introduction- New Ombuds and First Year Reps!

Updates

- Chris: The marketing side of the CUS is going well; we currently are working on our second edition of the Cavalier, it's great to have Riley here to see what's going on in the CUS. The edition will be out next week. Everything is going well
- Johannes: myself, Sara, and Michael Kingsmill had a meeting with Dean Dan today, this meeting ended off better than expected. Not only did we get support in principle of the Commerce Student Centre, we were given \$10,000 in funding and the name of an architect who he wishes to use for the project. We also have some drawings started for the building. Dean Dan was able to save a significant amount in surplus, contributing

\$1.2M to our project, meaning that a \$2.5M contribution for students is now potentially down to \$500,000 from students in increased funding. He's thinking of extending the mortgage a few more years; I wrote a memorandum of understanding today and sent that off, we'll be forming a joint committee with the Dean's office, campus community planning, etc.

- I've been doing a lot of work with the GRTF, I've met up with a number of people in the last week to get the policy wording down for our board structure, and we'll bring it back to the GRTF to discuss; I also wrote an article for The Cavalier, I'm now a staff writer for them
- Mandy: I've been updating the Facebook page a lot, Lilian and I started brainstorming for things we want to do for third years. We were thinking of having an event and going to a lounge
- Jacky: on the Senate side, I just received an email that I'll be going to my first convocation ceremony; the Policy Committee is also dividing the current policies up and we're going to make a motion to treat several. Enzo is doing elections policy, I'm clubs policy, etc
- Academic Committee- we've been working on the supplemental application, we've asked a prospective first year to pay the fee and download the app for us to take a look
- Lilian: I've been updating the Facebook page and brainstorming with Mandy, for the Budget Oversight Committee I've been hoping to meet up with everyone about a project I've been working on
- Emmet: Armin and I had dinner with Johannes to discuss the CUS, I have been thinking about committees I'd like to be on
- Armin: I met up with Johannes, I also met up with Riki and we discussed what we'd like to accomplish in the CUS
- DavidH: I've been working with CSSEC, looking forward to the first town hall meeting on Wednesday
- Andrea: I've been getting the CR team up to speed, I just set up SoCo's RezGo stuff, I've been taking care of my portfolio- Chasing Sustainability, Top 40 Under 40 Breakfast, etc are coming up, November 3rd is the Enterprize workshop
- Sara: SoCo has a great marketing campaign coming up for their ski trip, POITS is having a great Halloween party on the 28th, and the rest of my portfolio is doing really well. I'm trying to set up a stress ball-making station for the Health and Wellness Committee
- Aldora: I met with Riki today and we talked about the hiring processes that are going on, I'm going to be sitting in on the First Year Committee hiring this week. I want to start a "Candy for Complaints" initiative

- Dylan: I'm waiting on the BCC to send me a proposal so that we can fund them; I've been talking a lot with ExCo, we've been getting a lot of interest in external conferences; JDC West had their fundraiser at Joe's Apartment, and it raised \$1500
- Tim: On the AMS side, we didn't have an AMS meeting last week, the last meeting was September 28th, for those who haven't seen the report, they've decided to open several collegiums; we're looking at getting lounges on campus to cater to commuters, they saw that a large portion of people who were dissatisfied or felt unconnected to the campus were commuters. You can have a membership, and it'll maintain a context where you can relax and study; there will be different faculty-specific things, I see this adding a lot of value. In addition, with regards to the executive wage increases, there will be open houses discussing the wage increases, there will be one tomorrow.
- I've also been involved with leading the project for opening the SUB 24/7 during the final exam period. I have a lot of positive feedback from the stakeholders and I'm confident it will be happening in December
- There have been concerns about the status of the building and lounge, I've been in touch with Tom Ross and the architects politely asking them to do things a little bit faster, I'll be meeting up with them later this week and will report back
- For the status of UBCSecure, the ball is in their court in getting 24 hour access to Henry Angus, I'll be following up with them.

Endowment Discussion- Johannes and DavidL

- Johannes: we have \$400K in contributed surplus in our accounts, currently it's generating no interest as it's sitting in the AMS accounts that's generating interest itself but they're taking the 3-4%, what do we do- do we either spend on capital expenditures, do we add it to the building, or we can lock it up into bonds where you'd be making interest off of all or a portion of the \$400K. The discussion is what to do with the money
- AMS management themselves isn't interested, we will have to create a separate entity altogether (Non-AMS) to facilitate this procedure if we go through with it; Elin is going to be in touch with David about this
- Tim: the AMS wants to take a cut from it, I know that was the biggest concern
- David: the CUS has over \$350,000 in surplus, that means that every year we operate on 1.2__ dollars, and after that's allocated we have around \$350,000. The problem is that we'd assume it'd generate some interest for the CUS but it's not, the interest is going to the AMS. Some students were thinking maybe we should try and make some money. The idea is to put it in an endowment fund, you lock up the money forever, and you can't redeem it. That money just constantly generates 3.5% in interest for us. I think everyone was keen on making an investment, but there may be some worries about not being able to redeem it because we may have budget overruns that need to be fixed
- Johannes: The AMS itself isn't willing to do it, you'd have to start up your own separate entity
- David: The CUS contributes a certain amount to the endowment, and in return it's a signed agreement that the CUS will be gifted with the endowment payment. It could go up to 5% as well; we might have a contract to sign, but we'll be getting a contribution

from the school for 3.5% or the floating interest rate. We make a donation on the behalf of the CUS and that donation gets us the contract saying we're entitled to this amount of money every year

Questions/ Discussion

- Tim: what are your (*DavidL's*) thoughts?
 - I think it's good to put away some amount of money, apparently the EUS has done it, but that's not confirmed. If the board's interested I'll look more into it. That being said, it's being locked up forever. The next board may have deficits
- Johannes: We were discussing this earlier, I'm personally in favor of using this to foot the capital expenditures for the potential CSC, when we're looking at the returns, we could be giving this endowment, when you give \$100,000 to the CSSEC, you're saving future students having to foot that bill
- DavidL: but aren't future students dealing with the payments and not past?
- Johannes: Exactly, we could have extra cash flow for the future, or we could use it to subsidize student fees, and I think the return there is much greater
- DavidL: if you amortize at 25-30 years, you're only saving \$0.50 or \$1 in the end (I'd have to do the math). Would that be a significant impact? If we took away the referendum, if you're making only \$1-2
- Sara: what would be the difference? Were we considering putting the full sum into the endowment?
 - You can add money you just can't take it out
- Sara: could we put in part of the money?
 - Yes, it doesn't have to be all of it
- Tim: I know we talked about this before, and I don't know if it's an optimistic route to take, but at the end of the day, the idea is to put money in an account that will generate money and is redeemable, but we don't have that second option. I feel we'd be compromising too much, I think the redeemable part is very important. If we can't take the money out I feel like we're missing the point of investing the money in the first place. I don't know if it's possible to maybe look for outside companies who'd be interested in making a deal with us?
 - It's risky
- Tim: it's 100% not redeemable?
 - Yes
- DavidL: the option of redeeming at a lower rate was never presented to us, if you're putting in redeemables you're getting less than a point on it
- Sara: one of our biggest issues is that interest is being made but we weren't keeping the interest
- Sara: we're not losing money
- Johannes: to what extent do we have liquidity problems?
 - I don't foresee liquidity problems, but you never know

BCC Funding Proposal (and Conclusion)- Dylan

- I want to have more jobs available for undergraduate students on COOL, whatever is proposed is a workstudy position for an undergrad student to look for and add jobs to COOL for Sauder students. There aren't a lot of jobs for a lot of people on there, for the amount of people we have in Sauder there aren't a lot of jobs there, I would like to add this to the proposed funding and am interested in your thoughts (\$4-\$8000)

Questions/ Discussion

- *Consensus: We need to take this to the BOC and discuss further*

CSSEC Budget Discussion- Sara and Johannes (Update)

- At our last exec meeting, we voted on moving and spending \$5000 for a CSSEC model, it'll help with marketing it and visualizing the space
- Now we have \$10,000, it'll help with funding

Board Committee Discussion- Tim

- I think we need to see how the committees are doing, and see what committees we have and who's chairing which ones, for the sake of our own knowledge and our new members:
- *Governance Review Task Force: Johannes (chair), Jackie, Tim, Chris, Klazina, Jacky, Riki, Alex Monegro, Chad Embree as alumni*
- *Budget Oversight Committee: Lilian (chair), David Lam, Tim, Mandy, Klazina, (Cindy)*
- *Building Committee: Tim (chair), Julie, DavidH, Lilian, Tom Ross (associate dean), Alex Percy*
- *CSSEC: Sara (chair), David Huynh, David Lam, Graham, Tyler, Chris, Michael Kingsmill (will be restructuring soon)*
- *Policy Committee: Jacky (chair), Cole Rotenberg, Enzo, Johannes*
- *Academic Committee: Jacky (chair), Tim, David H, Johannes, Dylan, Enzo*
- I think as a board we should ask if there are better ways to integrate the committees, see how our committees are doing, are things getting done, and is there something that we can change to make it better

Questions/ Discussion

- Johannes: we'll need at least one person on the GRTF, otherwise the first year reps can be on however many committees they want to be on
- Tim: One of the things that Lilian is doing is working on how to evaluate how well a conference did
- *Deliverable: by next meeting, Armin and Emmet will have their decisions made about*

which committees they'd like to be on

Five Year Plan/ Outlook for the BOD (Why are we here?)- Dylan

- Something to table for the next meeting; just wondering, five years from now we've changed the board quite a few times and it's solidified into something that's useful, what do we want all of the board to be doing five year from now, especially perhaps with a new building. What do we want the responsibilities of board to be?

MBTI Follow Up (Internal Goal Setting)

In-Camera Discussion

Motion to move in camera: 6:48

Motion to move out camera: 7:10

Next Meeting: October 31st, 5:30pm

Adjournment

BIRT the meeting is adjourned

End time: 7:11

<u>Students</u>		<u>Professionals not from UBC/ Alum (External)</u>	<u>Faculty</u>
President		10	1 faculty member NV
Two execs voted in by execs			
2 MAL			

Committees we want to Keep

- Policy
- BoC
- Nominating

Ad Hoc Committees

- CSSEC
- Building Committee



commerce
undergraduate
society

CUS GRT Force Minutes

Sept 5th, 2011

Start Time: 12:43pm

Present: Jackie, Graham, Johannes, Julie, Riki, Tim

Late: -

Regrets: Chris, Jacky, Klazina

Minutes Approval

- For future meetings, the board will approve the minutes for the GRTF meetings and then attached to the regular board meeting minutes
- *Previous minutes are approved*

Updates

- Riki: I completed five interviews- four board members, one exec, and the rest are Frosh members. I've been sending emails and then calling them. I highlighted significant items. Many were unimpressed with the effectiveness of the current board. Some people wrote about what they think the board is. Most feel the board is very operational and a board consisting of alumni and faculty members would work if explained properly to the student body. Some said the board isn't a confident one and doesn't enhance value. Due to annual changes it is difficult for the board to be effective. There were a few surprises in the interviews, some did think that this board was strategic, more hands-on involvement from board members and more connection between the board and executive council would be a positive thing. The board needs more operational guidance
- Graham: when we have elections, students aren't given in-depth training about how to be on this board
- Julie: I remember when we had a CUS executive retreat and we had transitional events, did we have that for board?
- Johannes: we did for some, it was very poorly done
- Graham: Not everyone said the board wasn't functional in the interviews; I don't know if there's a clear consensus amongst board members that this structure needs to be fixed
- Johannes: I've seen this for the last few years and I made a presentation to the board with my thoughts on this matter and the consensus was to put this committee together.

It was feeling like there was lack of task identity and purpose- some people clearly think we're operational versus structural

- Johannes: we have an elected executive and appointed board, this is what is similar to what there used to be a few years ago. I was talking with alumni for feedback. I talked to Connor and he said the board isn't functioning and it's vital we bring alumni on and have an appointed board and elected executive. Same votes for Connor Topley and Alex Monegro and Lucas Ramanowitz.
- Tim: Would they suggest having an exec council and no student representatives?
- Johannes: the president and one of the elected executives on the board
- Graham: I wonder if it's the people on the board or the board structure itself that isn't functioning- this year's board structure is a little bit different
- Tim: if it is the people, we can still step up and say what can we change in the structure so that despite the elected individuals, there still will be consistency. I think it's unavoidable, you'll always have students who don't know as much and are elected but that's the nature of democracy. We're trying to create a structure where it's easier to turn over positions. If we have a lot of experienced people on the board, it would work very well and we might be a bit stretched for committees but it'd still work. We need to have a structure where ten years of work doesn't get thrown away. I'm very much in support of having experience long-term people with two-year terms
- Johannes: I mentioned this to the alumni affairs crew and they're very excited for this; our first priority however is the students
- Tim: I talked to past board members as well as will be talking to Chad within the next week
- Graham: I was going to talk to Cole and Conor but they were a bit busy this weekend
- Johannes: so we still want to finish the assignments that we have, what are the next steps? I think it'd be valuable to read the old constitution and be asking ourselves if this makes sense. An ideal way to do this is take a blueprint and integrate the changes so we have something to work with.
- Riki: one thing about doing the interviews and giving the surveys out, I had to wonder how we were going to summarize it, there are so many different answers
- Johannes: I think this is a good start, now that we have a general idea of what some people are saying. I think as a committee we can propose the alumni idea and discuss different models. Maybe we can come up with a good list of questions
- Tim: my original take on this process was this was an informal overview of what peoples' view on this is; I don't think collecting quantitative data fits with what we're doing. I think we should propose an actual draft and a questionnaire to deliver to people. I think for the purposes of consultation you want to make it as concrete as possible. If the model doesn't work, we can tweak it.
- Johannes: what are the most important things we need to focus on?
- Tim: we have the board, then the execs and service council
- Johannes: for the board, we're looking at their size, membership, term, how they get onto the board (elections/ being appointed), their power, financial and policy power versus operational and strategic power
- Tim: I don't know about policy

- Graham: I wonder how different the power will be; right now the board isn't fulfilling its power as a board, it's not what the board has the ability to do or what the board approves
- Johannes: I would disagree to be honest, I think mainly the operation versus the strategic spectrum is an issue at hand and we're more operational right now; this is because of the makeup and the policy power that they have (what they can and cannot approve); many things go back and fourth between execs and board in terms of what can be approved
- Tim: I think it wouldn't hurt to review how the board's power plays a role in their overall effectiveness
- Riki: I was reading the constitution, and on paper it looks like the framework is there, the people inside it aren't executing however
- Tim: there will be committees on the board, how do we decide where those fit- how the committees are structured, meeting times, etc
- Johannes: in terms of size, the board seems to be almost too small. We cut the size of the board because we thought it wasn't working, and perhaps we misdiagnosed this as the key problem
- Tim: it could've been the chemistry of the people as well
- Johannes: this is just a smaller sample of the same people; we went from 22 to 11; now it's hard to meet quorum
- Tim: and one person can affect the entire voting process; if we have two people that don't know what's going on making decisions, it could be a problem. I think the committees aren't delivering, not just because of commitment of the people, but the sizes
- Graham: what if we determined who we want to have on the board (the president, at least one exec, one elected rep, etc)
- Johannes: we could look at the committee sizes
- Riki: how important are the committees? Can we not delegate these tasks to people on the service council? Shouldn't committees be made based on strong demand?
- Graham: *(writes on the board- see attached)*
- Tim: I think we need freedom to add people onto the board so we have some power over who goes in
- Graham: I think we need a member at large
- Johannes: we could have this service council member voted in at the service council meeting and a MAL
- Tim: I feel like the service council and MAL are very much the same thing; what is the added benefit of separating alum and professionals?
- Johannes: different perspectives
- Tim: will there be any non-voting positions? I think faculty should be non-voting
- Tim: how many non-UBC professionals do you need?
- Graham: one?
- Johannes: most boards are around 15-16 people; I'd err for smaller and you can make it bigger if it becomes necessary- we need to ensure there are enough people to have interest in this. Are there any other areas we're not covering yet?

- Graham: the more people we add, the more complicated appointments and elections will be
- Tim: lets say these ideas go through, alumni will have power over the executives, etc. What do we as students do IF the alumni are doing things that aren't in the interest of the students?
- Graham: lets say the students don't feel like they're being represented
- Johannes: the executives are representing the students I think
- Graham: but what about things like CSSEC? What if alumni didn't see the need for CSSEC?
- Tim: what if the alumni just don't understand the need for things? Would it be less attractive to the alumni and professionals if we make it a majority of students?
- Johannes: they want to have some control
- Tim: what would be the difference between us doing a board of advisors and a board of directors? A board of advisors would still have oversight; my concern is we're throwing a position with a lot of work onto alumni
- Johannes: I think they're fine with that
- Graham: what happens if I'm alumni and I have to suddenly leave and can't commit to the board anymore?
- Johannes: then there are going to be measures in place to fix this
- Tim: we need to consider what the board currently does that we can throw onto the exec's portfolio. I think the alumni will meet maybe once a month, every two weeks is too operational
- Johannes: I'd say once a month, every two weeks there'd be a board or service council meeting
- Graham: I'm not sure how efficient it'd be to have a service council meeting that often
- Riki: we have to decide what the execs can approve; the board doesn't want to have say, six presentations every month
- Johannes: If the request is over a certain amount of money, the execs can approve this
- Johannes: for committees, what should be kept and what shouldn't be?
- Tim: Policy, BoC, and then CSSEC and Building Committee are ad hoc
- Johannes: what about strategic committees? In terms of strategy, who manages the strategic outlook?
- Graham: I'd say that's the board's job in general; lets say we have six committees, how many in each committee?
- Tim: do we want them to be mixed (not just board)?
- Graham: yes
- Tim: we could have all students, then 1-2 board members per committee
- Graham: I'd say we should have more alumni than professionals
- Tim: we should have 10 non-students; we should give ourselves flexibility
- Julie: does once a month work for meeting times?
- Johannes: I think so
- Tim: 12 meetings a year is doable
- Graham: all students are on a one-year term for this
- Tim: what would stop us keeping alumni for say, 10 years?
- Graham: nothing

- Johannes: for terms, we can have a staggered turnover. There's also usually a contingency plan to extend peoples' terms. There's also a maximum term length
- Tim: How should we nominate the first group of alumni? That'll be different than how everyone else is nominated. The students should have the majority of power to control who is nominated
- Johannes: we need to make sure whoever is interviewing has a greater intuition of how this is run

Next Action Items

- Term length research (draft policy from other board constitutions)- Johannes
- Regurgitating everything that we talked about into a summary for the board- Tim
- Research on initial board startup- Graham

- *Tim will be chairing the next meeting in Johannes' absence*

End Time: 2:07pm



commerce
undergraduate
society

CUS GRT Force Minutes

October 20th, 2011

Start Time: 5:10pm

Present: Riki, Jackie, Chad, Armin, Emmet, Johannes, Chris, Jacky (skype), (Eunice)

Late: Tim

Regrets: Klazina, Graham, Alex

Most Recent Structural Proposal- Johannes

- Where are we currently standing with the recommendations for the constitutional change? What's it going to look like?

Board → Exec → Student Council → Student Body

- What is the function of the board really supposed to be? To have strategic guidance, accountability, and the long-term perspective. This is what we've come up with up to this point.
- What we've come up with: The board has alumni, then business professionals and faculty members, then students at large. The board would be appointed via a nominating committee, this is standard practice from nonprofit organizations. The nominating committee is probably 75% student, 25% non-student mix, they'll select board members, and once a roster is put forward, the student body at an AGM ratifies whomever the board chooses. This allows the board to directly represent the students and have that sort of relationship
- Other committees that would be on here would be Policy, Internal Audit (measuring how well the functions of the CUS are doing, keeping the metrics of the CUS, Budget Oversight, etc).
- With this, where do we have the student representation? I think an elected exec is probably the best way to go forward. Why this is bad, first:
 - 1. There's a different pool of candidates that go through an election vs. people being hired. When you do electoral, you eliminate people who just wouldn't go through that process. You're limiting the candidate pool. However, the elections process itself brings out another level of passion for the CUS- being committed enough to want to go through an electoral process. It's a good makeshift week

or two that emulates what the toughest weeks during the executive process actually could look like. It all develops a good relationship between the exec and the students

- 2. You can get a “bad apple”. There have been instances in the past where that has happened. However, you could have a majority vote from student representatives on the board to remove this person. It creates a reporting structure where the execs are directly accountable to the board but they’re still representing the students. With the exec being directly accountable to the board, it gives the exec incentive to develop relationships with the board.
- I think there’s confusion over long-term perspectives since the terms are 1-year. Before the board meeting the execs will send out updates on what they’ve done at this point, and the board will be asking why they’re making these decisions.
- The locus of control on decisions would come from the execs, and the board makes sure nothing gets out of hand
- With that, Chad has put together what we need to do operationally to emulate this structure
- Half of the alumni would be appointed in 2012 on a one-year term, half would be elected for a two-year term. Students would be on a one-year term

Questions/Discussion

- Emmet: what makes the faculty or professionals want to be on the board?
 - Working with a non-profit organization and contributing outside their community
- Eunice: would the number of people on the board stay the same?
 - We’re looking at closer to 15 or 16 people
- Chris: I like your point on long-term perspectives. When we talked to Tom Dvorak, he brought up things that were brought up 2 years ago in terms of agreements. If someone doesn’t tell the next sitting individuals what happens, they don’t know to implement these agreements
- Chad: yes, having a good continuity system is important as well
- Tim: at the end of the day it’s good to have a board with continuity and alumni involvement, it’s important that at the end of the day the students have the say. Having a 50/50 board, how would we ensure that moving forward in the future it’s still the students who get the final say? We have to understand that as a board right now, we’ll be giving away potential authority, from a student’s equity perspective. I see a lot of value in that, but I want to make sure we’re not throwing it away

Key Changes and How they Reflect in a Drafted Constitution- Chad (see powerpoint)

- I truly believe we have something here, and it’ll really propel the board into effective changes in the future
- This presentation essentially will go through, article by article, the constitution and the revisions that would have to happen

- Article 2: we'd have to have honorary memberships for the CUS. In order for board members to have decision-making power, they have to have membership. The engineering faculty does this. As honorary members they wouldn't be able to vote, and there are some other limitations
- Article 4: we'll now have introductions of alumni on the Board of Directors; we'll now be looking out for the greater good of the CUS, which includes the students. There is now a chairperson of the board instead of the speaker, as well as a vice-chair. These positions fulfill the same duties as the speaker currently does, but more formalized
- Terms are now 2 years or 1 year for students

Chad's proposal:

- Total 15 members: elected president, 6 student reps who are nominated, 1 Sauder faculty/ staff member (nominated), 6 members of the Sauder BCom Convocation (nominated); 1 chairperson of the board

Questions/ Discussion

- Tim: my personal inclination is to have student reps elected, we want representation on the highest level
- Johannes: we're selecting the best people to give us advice; if you were interested in being a part of the board, you'd put forward a vision statement, etc and you'd be nominated by the nominating committee
- Johannes: the students are using the board to help the organization. This is where the students approve the board removal process, if we don't like someone on the board, then the referendum could be held. We're putting together a board of the best advisors to make sure we're operating as effectively as we can. We need the best people in the room to help us with the tough decisions
- Jacky: how would the alumni board members be elected?
 - Through nominations, I don't think alumni would submit a cover letter and resume, they'd be more head-hunted by the nomination committee/ executive council.
- Jacky: and who's part of that nominating committee?
 - A composition of 75 students, 25% other (alumni, business professionals, etc). The first year will be tricky because we'll be transitioning into this structure
- Jacky: VanCity has a nominating committee, and I think they have a majority of non-board members being members at large for nominating, maybe we'd want to consider that.
- Johannes: a composition of execs, students, board members, students at large, alumni, etc. The nominating committee will also be in the constitution

Presentation by Chad cont'd- see powerpoint

- Structure: elected executive council, the rebirth of the VP 1st year, VP 2nd year, Current VPs, President, Senator, AMS Rep

Questions/ Discussion

- Tim: what do VPs 1st and 2nd years do?
 - They run events for first year and second year students. The reason they're on the executive council is to give them a holistic POV of the CUS. I'm questioning if we want a VP Second Year. I'm wondering if one should be for first years, and one for transfer students. The purpose at the end of the day is to engage them in their first year of Sauder
- Jacky: if you have a VP transfer, you risk segregating the students
- Riki: what's the purpose though if we already have a VP Engagement? I think the First Year Coordinator can do a lot, but the Second Year Coordinator doesn't have as much to do
- Johannes: it really makes the representation visible
- Emmet: If you have a first year-position, it makes the first years feel like they're included in the CUS, and that's important if you want them to continue involvement in the future years

Presentation by Chad cont'd- see powerpoint

- Student Council: I want to change it back to "Service Council" in the constitution
- Article 11: Committees- we'd have constitutionalized standing committees- Internal Audit, Policy and Procedures, and the nominating committee would stay. I'm not sure if you want to keep the Building Committee, it's an executive director committee technically
- Tim: it was a very ad hoc meeting committee when we made it
- Chad: maybe it should go into "policy"
- Johannes: it's based on the integration into the new building
- Chris: in 10 years' time, what's the relevance of it?
- Chad: it might not be much at all
- Election turnover will be completely deleted and rewritten in the constitution. Turnover will be before reading break, this will change the turnover and annum policy
- New article that we'd have about the AGMs- the purpose is to ratify the BoD nominations. AGMs were dropped because it was mostly service council and people weren't going. Now, without an AGM we can never ratify the president, AMS, etc positions. We need to vote according to Roberts' Rules to get them into the office. The AGM also helps to ratify the honorary membership. It's also a good time to do the mid-year report. They can also force an referendum if need be
- Article 15: no changes, however we were looking into a discipline policy. If you want to do it, it needs to go in the constitution.
 - Johannes: I think we were thinking of working on a volunteer contract with regards to this
- Chad: look at Queen's policy, it's well written
- Chad: the discipline policy would discuss what steps the CUS would take if someone needed to be reprimanded. For an appointed individual, depending on the severity you'd have your budget cut, your position revoked, etc. The article would have

examples of what things would happen (derogating the name of the CUS, financial issues, not fulfilling your duties, etc). The problem with the CUS is that we're like a giant web, and if one part breaks, the whole thing falls apart. The thing with this policy is it changes the culture of the population

- Article 18: Considering a clause for auto-compliance- having the board and execs sign the constitution, you can say if you're ratified at the AGM you automatically comply.
- Article 19- Referendums: with a normal constitution, it's accepted with 15% voting and 50% majority, but for a constitution, it's easier to do acceptance with 10% voting, 66.6% super majority
- Article 20 will be rewritten
- Overall, there's not that much that needs to be changed, the only challenge is getting it in there. It will look like a lot, but it's not

Questions/ Discussion

- Riki: Armin and Emmet, how do you feel about the 6 student reps?
- Armin: if first years were excluded, they'd feel disconnected
- Emmet: I'd feel better if there's a position on the exec board
- Tim: the thing is, once you have a board that meets monthly, the first years wouldn't want that kind of position where all members are people who have extensive CUS experience. I think it wouldn't be a desirable position
- Johannes: there would be other board committees with memberships where they could be included.
- Chad: the main concern, is what happens if the chair is alum, what happens if they're a student?
- Tim: my biggest concern was about the representation of the six student reps, but hearing your explanation, I'm pleased with the outcome
- Chris: I like the two-year term for students, but I'd like to see something longer for alumni. 2-5 years
- Chad: Senate does 3-year terms, they're considering revising that.
- Johannes: there's an opportunity for people to extend their terms, if someone wants to do this, there'd have to be a majority approval from the board. Essentially they just reapply, but the board itself could approve the extension honestly, then there could be a super majority to continue their term, over 66.66% approval. I think it's necessary to limit the number of terms to two, after a four-year commitment you're losing out on the vitality of thought. You can extend for one more term upon super majority, what do you guys think?
- Chad: you only need 66%
- Emmet: why can they not reapply for the position?
- Chad: they could just do that, it makes it more anonymous
- Jacky: I don't think alumni should be able to reapply, maximum one term
- Chris: aren't we trying to get long-term perspective?
- Jacky: you want to leave room for more changes, the major risk is that people who don't want to make any new changes, there are people have very high interest in

- the CUS and they're not likely to be willing to make any drastic changes to what we're doing right now
- Johannes: where do you get the data for that?
 - Jacky: there are a lot of organizations where alumni stick around, I've seen a lot of organizations where they don't want to make any changes
 - Emmet: if they're capped at maybe two terms, that shouldn't necessarily be a problem
 - Riki: yes vitality, yes new ideas, but I think two terms is a good balance
 - Chris: if we get a VP of some big company to sit on our board, we shouldn't kick them out after two years, especially when a lot of these alumni were never connected to the CUS in their day, and they can be totally objective
 - Jacky: two terms is four years, from a students' perspective, that's their whole degree, you have to consider that you're a student organization
 - Riki: the difference is that the executives are going to be elected
 - Johannes: as long as there is a super majority to extend your term
 - Chad: the Vancouver Board of Trade's term is maximum 8 years, 4 years isn't a long time
 - Jacky: but we're students, here for maybe max 4-5 years. You have to put that into perspective
 - Chris: there's an implicit assumption that the alumni will be recent graduates, shouldn't the nominating committee be looking at people from the industry? A combination of both is necessary
 - Jacky: a nominating committee will be looking for people who want to sit on the board, the nominating committee should be receiving interest, not looking for people
 - Johannes: nominating committees are very active in finding people, there's still a screening process but you try to get as many applicants as possible; it would be detrimental to the society if we just sat there and waited for people to come to us
 - Riki: yes, you could make it open and fair, but nobody's going to voluntarily apply
 - Jacky: they shouldn't be head-hunting or trying to find good candidates, the economics of this is just wrong. You'll have people controlling the structure because they'll be looking for people who *they* want to see sitting on the board
 - Chris: the Sauder Business Club of Vancouver just threw that event, lets say the nominating committee did some talking and networking and picked out people that would be interested in doing this, I think there'd be a lot of interest to do that
 - Johannes: if we could convince really experienced people to apply, that'd be great
 - Chris: if it's a passive approach it'll just be people who have recently graduated and want to stay involved
 - Riki: I see where Jacky's coming from, but right now if the board is going to approve every action of the CUS, then this political head-hunting wouldn't be too fair or effective, but in the bigger picture I don't see there being a problem
 - Armin: I don't think it'd be corrupt, if we take a passive approach we wont get as many experienced people, I don't think that would contribute to corruption

- Johannes: I really care about the CUS a lot, hypothetically I'm going to make sure I have the best presidential candidate for next year and I'll start talking to people who I think would be great; they still have to go through the election process however
- Jacky: you're creating a system where insiders have the upper hand in the application process
- Johannes: is this not the same in the current election process?
- Jacky: no, anyone can vote, but if they're unable to become elected because they didn't get enough votes it's a nominating committee; the majority has to be members at large, there can't be execs, it has to be completely independent so you don't have insiders having the upper hand
- Johannes: so you'd rather have outsiders picking our elects?
- Chad: I don't know if that's the best approach, if they're mostly members at large and they may not know much about the CUS
- Chris: execs and board members are still students, so they still have the right to have a say
- Jacky: they are, but you need independence in the nominating committee. They need to have no affiliation with the service council
- Chad: the Board of Trade of Vancouver isn't completely independent
- Johannes: I think that's only fair, if the committee knows how the CUS works
- Chad: I think the breakdown in the dispute is that we're having issues with the fact that most people need to be members at large; Jacky's making the point that execs and board will shift the vote and there's not enough independence at 75%
- Johannes: execs will be nominated by the students anyway
- Chris: out of the 75 students, you'd want to see 40 members at large?
- Jacky: lets say there are 10 people, you need 51% members at large (6/10)
- Chris: if we had this structure, there'd be at least 51 MAL that are students, then 24 students who are not MAL
- Johannes: I think the execs represent more members at large; lets say you have 10 people: 3 execs, 3 members at large, 2 student board members, and the ombudsperson that's 60% majority
- Jacky: my argument was that 6 have to be students at large
- Chad: given that the executives were elected, they have the trust of the students already and they're supposed to be acting on the best interest of the CUS
- Chad: these members at large could be the newer students who want to be involved in the CUS
- Riki: at the end of the day, what's the purpose?
- Johannes: what is the source of corruption? I think corrupt people will find their way into the process one way or another
- Jacky: are there going to be more opportunities to discuss the structure?
- Johannes: next meeting we'll have the constitution written up and discuss how to consult students about it

Marketing of Referendum- Riki

- We were looking at the last week of November, the 28th; we can't do referendums when there are elections
- Consultation: focus groups for getting feedback: general individuals, service council (November 3rd), club presidents (which can be at the service council meeting), student body groups (we can have info sessions and the board can talk to people about this)
- For the campaign, we can have a slogan, themes, designs (like the UPass); posters, t-shirts, online marketing, volunteers actively campaigning
- Week of October 20th: we need marketing, we need 50 t-shirts that people can wear
- Week of Oct 31st: service council meeting, we'll need a booth
- Chris: are we telling them how to vote or asking for feedback? There's two parts to this- the first part, the best thing to do would use the online channels and a booth, hit people with questions: what they think about the referendum, etc. The second part we can get t-shirts, "vote yes", slogans, posters. The things that jumped out at me with the AMS is they had a big "vote yes" sign. We need to go big for this, everything else CUSunday, online, get people engaged in the focus group sessions, how many do you want to have?
 - One at the service council meeting, 1-2 more the week of November 7th, what's feasible
- Johannes: we could have dedicated focus groups, two during the week of Nov 7th, then during the 14th have info
- Chris: you could logistically have it before a board meeting, that'd be great
- Chris: the most efficient way of marketing is online channels, booths, focus groups
- Johannes: Nov 14th we have to have our referendum submitted by then, so it's better to have focus groups the week of the 7th. We need to do as much consulting as possible. Who do we need to consult? We can get David Huynh and Enzo to lead the second year discussions with student bodies, etc
- Emmet: we could book classrooms and discuss this and have class speeches; we could get food out there
- Johannes: lets get a referendum budget together
- Chris: I'll get Graham to design some t-shirts by next week. I like a "yes" campaign, something very simple
- Johannes: what's our marketing pitch?
- Armin: I like the idea of keeping it simple
- Chris: could we have "yes" with the CUS logo in the CUS colors?
- Johannes: vote "Yes" on the CUS Reform from November 28th to December 2nd; because policy change/ reform is sexy
- Chris: could we have a big sign at the front of Birmingham? Bigger than the one for Japan
- Johannes: with the consultation, Riki will have something together about how to put together those info sessions, we'll have a t-shirt design next week, a poster, and if we can have a date or two for the first year info groups, that'd be good, and at some point we'll have to recruit volunteers

Student Council Removal

- There are two clauses in the constitution saying both board and exec members can remove student council members. Needs to be changed.

End Time: 6:48pm