



**PLENARY MINUTES:**  
CASA General Meeting  
March 2010

---

**Opening Session – March 7, 2010**

**1. Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 1:52 pm

Chair conducted Roll Call

**Members Present:**

Acadia Students' Union (ASU)

Brock University Students' Union (BUSU)

University of Alberta Students' Union (UASU)

University of Calgary Students' Union (UCSU)

Dalhousie Students' Union (DSU)

Graduate Student Association - University of Waterloo (GSAUW)

Students' Administrative Council, Mount Allison University Student's Union (SACMAUSU)

La Fédération des Étudiantes et Étudiants du Centre Universitaire de Moncton (FÉÉCUM)

Red River College Students' Association (RRCSA)

Saint Mary's University Student Association (SMUSA)

Southern Alberta Institute of Technology Student Association (SAITSA)

St. Francis Xavier University Students' Union (STFXSU)

St. Thomas University Students' Union (STUSU)

University of New Brunswick Students' Union (UNBSU)

University of Waterloo Federation of Students (UWFOS)

University of Fraser Valley Student Union Society (UFVSUS)

University of Prince Edward Island Student Union (UPEISU)

Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union (WLUSU)

University of Lethbridge Students' Union (ULSU)

University of Western Ontario University Student Council (UWOUSC)

**Members Absent:**

University of New Brunswick in Saint John Students' Representative Council (UNBSJ-F)

**Associate Members Present:**

Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia (AMSUBC)

Kwantlen University Students' Association (KSA)

McMaster Students' Union (MSU)

Students' Association of Mount Royal University (SAMRU)

**Associate Members Absent:**

None

**2. Call for Proxy Votes**

No proxy votes received

**3. Appointment of Recording Secretary**

*BIRT Andres Fuentes Martinez be appointed as Recording Secretary for the duration of the Plenary Session at the March 2010 General Meeting of CASA.*

**Moved: UFVSUS**

**Seconded: UPEISU**

**Motion passes**

**4. Appointment of Code of Conduct Officers**

*BIRT Travis McIntosh, Shannon Zimmerman, Rob Lanteigne be appointed as the Code of Conduct Officers for the duration of the March 2010 General Meeting of CASA.*

**Moved: KSA**

**Second: UWFOS**

**Motion passes**

**5. Adoption of Agenda**

*BIRT the agenda for the Plenary Session of the March 2010 General Meeting of CASA be adopted.*

**Moved: ULSU**

**Seconded: MSU**

**1) Motion to approve the minutes from the 2009 AGM; and**

**2) Motion to put the short term investment strategies back on the table for a decision**

**Moved: BUSU**

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**Motion passes**

**BIRT** Mount Allison Students Union Incorporated be approved as a full-member of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations.

**Moved by UCSU**

**Seconded by UPEISU**

**Motion passes**

**Chair:** Calling the question on the main motion to approve the agenda as amended.

**Motion passes**

**6. Approval of Minutes**

***BIRT** the minutes of the Plenary Session proceedings from of the June 2009 and November 2009 General Meeting of CASA be ratified.*

***BIFRT** the minutes of the General Meeting via Conference Call December 2009 of CASA be ratified.*

**Moved: STFXSU**

**Seconded: DSU**

**BIRT** the June 2009 General Meeting Minutes be ratified at the closing plenary session of the March 2010 General Meeting of CASA.

**Moved: STUSU**

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**Motion passes**

**7. Approval of Members and Official Observers**

**BIRT** Mount Allison Students Union Incorporated be approved as a full-member of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations.

**Moved: BUSU**

**Seconded: DSU**

**Motion passes**

**8. Business**

**a) Adoption of CASA Policy Statements and Amendments**

*i. BIRT the policy statement entitled "Part Time Student Access" be adopted as presented.*

**Moved: STUSU**

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**Motion passes**

*ii. BIRT the policy statement entitled "Accessible Quality Child Care" be adopted as presented*

**Moved: STUSU**

**Seconded: GSAUW**

**STU moved to amend the first clause to:**

*"Be it resolved that CASA advocate that the federal government work with the provinces to fund infrastructure for child care centres on Canadian university and college campuses with dedicated spaces for students."*

**Seconded by Moncton**

**Motion to amend passes 13-5**

*iii. BIRT the policy statement entitled "National Teaching Award" be adopted as presented.*

**Moved: UFVSUS**

**Seconded: KSA**

**Motion passes**

*iv. BIRT the policy statement entitled "International Student Visas" be adopted as presented.*

**Moved by UPEI**

**Seconded by SMU**

**ULSU: Move to amended from 3 to 4 months to reflect the application period.**

**Seconded: FÉÉCUM**

**Motion Passes**

**Main motion passes**

*v. BIRT the policy statement entitled "International Branch Campuses"*

**Moved: BUSU**  
**Seconded: MSU**

*vi. BIRT the policy statement entitled "Post-Secondary Student Support Program" be adopted as presented.*

**Moved: DSU**  
**Seconded: MSU**

**UASU moved to amend the first clause to:**

*"CASA recognize post-secondary education as a right for members of treaty nations where a promise of treaty education appears in treaty texts, related documents or oral histories of the parties involved."*

**Seconded: SMUSA**  
**Motion to amend passes**

**Main motion passes**

*vii. BIRT the policy entitled "Tri-Agency Student Representation" be adopted as presented.*

**Main motion passes**

#### **b) Pan-Canadian Accord Motion**

**Whereas** the membership of the Canadian Alliance of Student Association has identified the need for the creation of a Pan-Canadian Accord on Post Secondary Education that contains a national strategy;

**Whereas** a committee was appointed at the 2009 Policy and Strategy Conference to research and develop a national strategy;

**Whereas** the committee sent consultation letters to student, faculty, government, and policy stakeholders to solicit a diverse set of opinions on what a national strategy would entail;

**Whereas** these consultations produced a white paper called the *Roadmap to a Pan-Canadian Accord*, identifying both key themes for future policy development and an advocacy approach that recognizes the diffused responsibility for post-secondary education in Canada; and

**Whereas** the membership of Canadian Alliance of Student Association recognizes that the scope of advocating for a Pan-Canadian Accord necessitates working closely with provincial partners;

Therefore:

***BIRT*** the General Assembly adopt the document named Roadmap to a Pan-Canadian Accord as presented, specifically the policy and advocacy themes of:

- 1.** Aboriginal Education,
- 2.** Accessibility,
- 3.** Data,
- 4.** Funding Stability,
- 5.** Internationalization,
- 6.** Interprovincial Mobility;

***BIFRT*** the General Assembly advise the 2010-2011 CASA membership to develop comprehensive policy and advocacy strategies for each of these themes; and

***BIFRT*** CASA encourage its provincial partners to assist CASA in developing these strategies.

**Moved: MSU**

**Seconded: DSU**

**Motion passes 17-1-1 (FÉÉCUM)**

### **c) Policy Development Procedures Motion**

**Whereas** CASA policy development is one of the recognized strengths of our organization;

**Whereas** the policy development process lacks a defined structure;

**Whereas** the growth in CASA's membership has reduced the informal structures of accountability that previously made the policy development process function; and

**Whereas** the membership of CASA received a presentation about reforming the policy development process at the Annual General Meeting in November 2009;

Therefore:

***BIRT*** that the membership direct the CASA Board of Directors to create policy development procedures, in consultation with the Policy and Graduate Student Issues committees.

**BIFRT** that those procedures reflect the following points:

- That the policy committee be established and elected at the first conference of a given year with approximately 5-7 permanent members, and an open membership with the ability of any member school to participate,
- That there be a chair and a vice-chair,
- That there be three-year sunset clauses for policies,
- That there be a procedure to review member-submitted policies during our conferences, and
- That there be procedures for establishing policy goals and timeframes for policy action.

**BIFRT** that Home Office provide adequate opportunity for the newly elected committee to meet during (or immediately following) the Policy and Strategy Conference, create working groups if deemed necessary and elect, from within its membership (permanent or otherwise), working group chairs, and prepare its work plans for the year.

**Moved: UASU**

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**UNBSU:** POI. What is our definition of board of directors?

**Secretary:** I would view it this way, if we look at 2008 it is this body, if we look at 2007 it isn't there, I would be that worried because we are changing it.

**UNBSU:** Is it more appropriate to table it until after then?

**DSU:** We might be missing a point on policy review. We have a sunset clause but no mention of what to do once it expires. It might be worth adding this.

**SAITA:** Move to amend the third bullet to add in language about reviewing policies under the third point, to be reviewed every three years.

**Seconded: DSU**

**UASU:**, I think that will work but if you go back to the second section this motion is very focused on policy development and not review, so can we add it to that section; that would make policy review subject to the rest of this.

**MSU:** I was going to say the same thing.

**SAMRU:** I'm not sure if this is germane: can I know what motion we are considering?

**Chair:** Rereads amendment.

**BUSU:** POI. Does this amendment include what Alberta said?

**Chair:** No.

**Motion to amend passes 18-0-2**

**SAMRU:** I would pitch the idea of attaching it in line with what UASU said

**DSU:** Move to amend to move the text related to reviewing policies every three years to the second BIFRT statement.

**Seconded by BUSU**

**Motion to amend passes**

**Main motion passes**

**d) Motion to Recess**

*BIRT the Plenary Session of the March 2010 General Meeting of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations be recessed until second session.*

**Moved: UFVSUS**

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**Motion passes**



## **Closing Session – March 11, 2010**

**Chair:** Call to order at 9:25 am

Chair conducted Roll Call

### **Members Present:**

Acadia Students' Union (ASU)  
Brock University Students' Union (BUSU)  
University of Alberta Students' Union (UASU)  
University of Calgary Students' Union (UCSU)  
Dalhousie Students' Union (DSU)  
Graduate Student Association - University of Waterloo (GSAUW)  
Students' Administrative Council, Mount Allison University Student's Union (SACMAUSU)  
La Fédération des Étudiantes et Étudiants du Centre Universitaire de Moncton (FÉÉCUM)  
Red River College Students' Association (RRCSA)  
Saint Mary's University Student Association (SMUSA)  
Southern Alberta Institute of Technology Student Association (SAITSA)  
St. Francis Xavier University Students' Union (STFXSU)  
St. Thomas University Students' Union (STUSU)  
University of New Brunswick Students' Union (UNBSU)  
University of Waterloo Federation of Students (UWFOS)  
University of Fraser Valley Student Union Society (UFVSUS)  
University of Prince Edward Island Student Union (UPEISU)  
Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union (WLUSU)  
University of Lethbridge Students' Union (ULSU)  
University of Western Ontario University Student Council (UWOUSC)

### **Members Absent:**

University of New Brunswick in Saint John Students' Representative Council (UNBSJ)

### **Associate Members Present:**

Alma Mater Society of the University of British Columbia (AMSUBC)  
Kwantlen University Students' Association (KSA)  
McMaster Students' Union (MSU)  
Students' Association of Mount Royal University (SAMRU)

**Associate Members Absent:**

None

**UFV:** Motion to add an item to the agenda at the beginning of 11

**Seconded: FÉÉCUM**

**Motion passes**

**WLUSU:** Motion to add an item to the agenda as a part of motions arising from the reports. I have a motion about fee structure.

**Seconded by SMUSA**

**Motion Passes**

**i. Reports**

a. National Director

**WLUSU:** Motion to go in-camera with everyone currently in the room remaining.

**Seconded by UPEISU**

**Motion passes**

**Chair:** Are there any questions?

**UASU:** Two questions, I don't think we heard about Bishops leaving and I was wondering what the decision was around not informing the membership about them leaving? My second question is that I can't recall getting the document with the travel expenses outlined, has it been sent out and if it hasn't are we getting it?

**National Director:** it should have been in the emails sent out, but I can also put it in Basecamp for all of you. I discussed it with the staff and normally we don't send out an email because we usually don't find out until the leave or change status, bishops we found out about last week and it has been a very busy time with this conference. It has been a very informal time with them, they had not paid their fees for 3 years but they did pay us before they left.

**STUSU:** Just one question;, you are talking about hiring a MRO. I am confused as to why we never hired an MRO this year? I don't remember making a motion not to hire them.

So I was wondering why did it take so long? I also want one thing noted in the minutes, the response to the STUSU grievance was sent yesterday.

**National Director:** The member relations officer hiring was my fault. I did not think we needed one. I wanted to review the position, I thought it needed to be more administrative not just sitting down and having a beer with students. I didn't think we needed one till after AGM and then we decided to be more conservative with the budget. In terms of the grievance we have been discussing it with you. The grievance was about the student survey and the budgetary process surrounding it as well as the methodology. I can send out our response to everyone.

**FÉECUM:** The question is about the campus tours, what I understood is that you are proposing that each school should be visited instead of doing a regional transition, and you provided a financial explanation. I think it'd be more expensive and I was wondering if I understood correctly?

**National Director:** That's a fair question. Spencer did a cost estimation as to how much it would cost and we found it to be cheaper. We have decreased the campus visits line in the budget and it's about \$19,000 and this would cover 2 campus visits per school. It's up to the membership to decide how to do transitions but our staff believes this to be better.

**UASU:** I would like to agree with Simon, I think there is value in the old style of transition, I don't see a motion coming out of this so if we are going to make a change I would assume we need a motion. I have some frustration about doing two campus tours next year and none this year. Also I found value in meeting all the regional members early in the year and start working with them.

**SACMAUSU:** I'm also kind of curious as to what the actual cost would be? You were estimating transitions to cost \$5000 and I was curious to hear how much it would cost to do the campus tour?

**National Director:** The cost is the campus travel line, and transitions cost \$5000 last year. This was just an idea to better communicate with each and every member

**DSU:** I'm really encouraged by how many new things we are trying and talking about it. I thought it was a good idea to trying not having a MRO. Now we see the benefit and can bring them back. I also do see the benefit of regional transitions.

**WLUSU:** I was going to suggest that we can have this discussion and make the amendments when we talk about the budget.

**Chair:** Thank you Arati.

b. Chair of General Assembly

**Chair:** Makes report.

**WLUSU:** I was a little surprised in terms of the actual advocacy the chair did. My questions is do you think its valuable to have a chair that has that internal side to them?

**Chair:** It has been really hard all year because I wasn't sure what my role was and to what extent I needed to be involved. By not being in Ottawa it makes it harder to be an advocate. I thought I could have played a bigger role in the media, especially with the French media. In a perfect world, it be great to have the Chair at every meeting but logistics make that hard.

**WLUSU:** I just wanted to say that maybe with the motions coming up could we review the role of the Chair?

**DSU:** I hope this is taken constructively. One thing that I noticed that frustrated me. It seems like the membership blamed the National Director when things went wrong and I think we needed to also look at the GO's and they should have stepped up to acknowledge their role in all the goings on.

c. Secretary

**Secretary:** Presents report.

**SACMAUSU:** Just a quick question about the potential bylaw change that you are proposing. Is it still possible to go forward without the bylaw motion?

**Secretary:** The way the motion was worded was that we needed a motion to affirm the voting structure after a period. What could happen is that the membership could vote to continue the trial period rather than make it permanent. I would like to say thank you to everyone, it's been an honour to work for everyone.

**Chair:** If everyone is okay with this can we go to the grad chair.

d. Graduate Committee Chair

**Graeme:** Presents report.

**DSU:** Good job to the grad committee; I thought it was a very good start.

**Chair:** Now to the Treasurer report

e. Treasurer

**Treasurer:** Presents report.

**SMUSA:** I have two questions: why did we revised it to only \$22,000 in January and how are we going to pay for it forward?

**National Director:** Ellen and I decided that as we needed money we would take it out of the reserve up to \$40000. So at the end of the year we will make sure it is not above \$40000

**DSU:** I was just wondering if we could get a breakdown on the translation expenses?

**National Director:** Both are almost \$10000 per conference and the documents that come in for each conference are also expensive and the website as well. This conference had a lot of documents so we had a lot of expenses. Allan also has all the detailed transactions. For all the internal documents cost about \$60000. Also the newswire services. We brought this up in the communication strategy and we have been speaking about having some of the conference expenses for translation in the delegate fee. Having a bilingual MRO would be helpful but it's still expensive. We think the delegate fee would have to be \$550.

**UASU:** Just looking at the reserve transfer and wondering, we transferred some money for the survey, is there a need to draw on the reserves because of the change in membership?

**Treasurer:** To the best of my knowledge we should not, but translation is expenses.

**Ellen:** I don't think we need to use the reserves unless something extraordinary happens.

**UWOUSC:** We spent significantly more money in translation than expected; I was wondering when we can have a discussion on the merits of our translation services. When on the agenda is this appropriate?

**Chair:** When we go through next years' budget.

**STUSU:** I just want to say that I am opposed to have the translation money from the conference fees. If we need to increase fees, we should but increasing delegate fees is a sneaky way of increasing fees.

**National Director:** I am going to put up the delegate fee breakdowns, I don't think it's sneaky that cost for conferences come from conference delegate fees.

**UASU:** I would like to half agree with the STUSU delegate. I don't think it's sneaky but I don't think it would be the best practise to add that fee to the delegate fee. Translation to me cost the same amount if we bring 10 or 50 people while food cost or the size of the room do change depending on numbers.

**MSU:** I would like to quickly say that before we talk about raising fees we need to have a discussion about how we do translations.

**WLUSU:** I have a suggestion with our conferences, could we do an after bill? It would address the problem of underspending or overspending. That way we can make sure we are zero budget at all time.

**Ellen:** That is a very good point, we could do that.

**National Director:** How would that affect budgeting to the conference?

Ellen: we always try to keep the cost as low as possible, but the problem is when it is hosted at a host school I have no control over expenses so maybe we should come up with a PO system. As far as billing after, there has to be a limit as to how much we can spend.

#### f. Budget Report

**Treasurer:** Presents budget report.

**SMUSA:** It doesn't sound like people were interested in changing the transition so we might want to consider that.

**Treasurer:** Yes, I have a rough idea where we can take that from.

**SMUSA:** How has Home Office trimmed costs?

**Ellen:** It's hard to cut our Home Office cost because they are static, however there are other items like publications and memberships that we have drastically cut. We have also changes service providers for the telephone and trying our best with the cell phone. We try to get the best deals on everything.

**Chair:** Can I suggest going through the budget line by line?

**National Director:** Can we quickly go through the conference budget? Our transportation cost should be low because we have just used some cabs to go to the further meetings. CASA staff per diems I do think should not be here but they are. We did not have an alumni reception by combining the MP reception and the alumni reception. We budgeted for opening plenary dinner and we are under budget for that,

closing plenary lunch we are doing the same thing. We have nothing planned for the dinner because we are always rushing to it. We also did not do gifts or any social activities. We think it's their duty to meet with us and just held the reception. The lobby document had some graphic design cost as well as the invitation. The meeting room cost \$450 per day for 5 days. We also negotiated that from \$650 and we also got two free rooms. We also budgeted the usual for recording secretary and nothing for the Chair.

**WLUSU:** Billing afterwards would be better because as we can see there are lots of variables and we could come under. So billing after with a cap would be what I would like to see.

**National Director:** We have sent out the operating procedures that have been updated.

**UASA:** If there is a way to do it I would like to make a motion to see this breakdown every year because I have been here for two years and have never seen this before. It allows us to have discussions about the cost of the room.

**National Director:** Ellen broke this down so it's easy to see this year and just because we do things this way doesn't mean we have to do it the same every year.

**DSU:** Somebody can tell me if it's wrong but what we found when organizing the AGM is that delegates take time to register and that influences the budget.

**UNBSU:** Looking at the MP reception in particular it might be more appropriate to have an open bar for the MP's and the senators and make us pay for the drinks.

**BUSU:** We see a potential profit of about \$3000; do the profits start subsidizing the cost of the next conference?

**Ellen:** It's never really been an issue; we have only had a surplus once.

**SAMRU:** We have noticed a similar theme at our council at Mount Royal. Sometimes when we put things into a budget there is a standard of luxury or comfort. If we do this properly conferences can bring in money, for example having speakers.

**National Director:** I think that is a great idea. When we planned this conference in October we thought about a symposium, it would have cost around \$3000 to run one. We have been trying to build signature events and partnerships to sponsor those events.

**Treasurer:** Gives budget breakdown.

**BUSU:** Just a comment before we want to start talking about translation and the transition conference. I wanted to make a quick mention of the format, the word file was very helpful but I would like to see comparables on the same sheet to make it easier to compare.

**Chair:** Can someone move the adoption of the budget?

**UFVSUS:** Motion to approve the budget

**Seconded: KSA**

**UWOUSC:** First of all a point of information for the treasurer, we budgeted 10000 dollars for the budget but the actual cost being 35000, how do you think it's a realistic budget?

**Treasurer:** It's not so we need to discuss it.

**National Director:** In past years it has been an average of \$9000 not including this year, so the membership need to have the discussion of how we are going.

**UWOUSC:** I want to express concern about the rising cost of translation. I have concern when cost increase and we set a precedent for the service level things tend to never be scaled back. So I have a concern about whether the cost is worth the benefit and I am open to the discussion, and I mean no disrespect to those who use the services but there are few of them and we need to see if they can participate without them.

**MSU:** if we budget 10000 for translation it should be every member schools expectation that that is what we spend each year, I am opposed to fee increases for translation or delegate fee increases, so if we budget 10000 I think we expect that much to be spent.

**USCUWO:** Motion to recess.

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**Motion passes 19-1**

Meeting reconvened at 1:35 pm.

**UFVSUS:** Motion to amend the agenda.

**Seconded: BUSU**

**Motion passes**

**UFVSUS:** I would just like to say that in principle we support the full bilingualism, I understand that we are looking at compromises and that it's not fiscally possible to continue however I hope that in the future we will be able to do this.



**FÉÉCUM:** I will repeat what was stated by Fraser Valley. We decided as an organization to be bilingual not for one member, but for the organization. That means that all the paperwork, the website and documents need to be bilingual. Where we have discussion is the direct translation, I think some compromises can be made, but not when it comes to documents but within the direct translation, whether it be a whisperer or something else. I think it can be adjusted depending on our capacity. I do think we need something for plenary but we don't need such an excessive set up. We appreciate it but \$40000 per year is too much.

**RRCSA:** I just wanted to add one point; I don't think we should cut translation. I think we should add more school and as long as we are doing that then it's a worthwhile investment.

**UNBSU:** I guess I take it from another point of view, I think that I am one of the few people around the table who fully needs the translation. In Calgary it was difficult to have a conversation, and for me that was hard. Maybe the booths are too excessive but we do need something.

**UWOUSC:** A few quick points. We need to be realistic about the possibility of growth in Quebec. They are simply not interested in joining CASA. So as much as I recognize their importance, it is not feasible to maintain this level of bilingualism. I am opposed to spending \$40000 dollars for the value we are getting. I agree with my colleague from FÉÉCUM but we need to be realistic of what are cost are going to be for the budget and we stay within that target. So we need to talk about what this would entail.

**STUSU:** I think we need to be realistic about the cost of translation and I don't think \$10000 is enough. We do need to have a bilingual possibility, I don't think that the previously stated \$9000 was adequate based on the Calgary conference. We do need to be as cost effective as possible but I think even then we will need to spend more money.

**AMSUBC:** We have always been a proponent of bilingualism, but we have to recognize that in any Canadian organization bilingualism is not financially friendly, rather it's done on a principle. We can necessarily look at it from a budget perspective it has to be a principled view as well. We should keep it in mind as we talk about fees.

**DSU:** When I looked at the budget for anything that said AGM on it we spent about 11000 for translation alone and even then we had issues. So if this is a priority we might have to cut other things or raise fees or as members schools decide that ist important and put it in the delegate fees. We need to decide what our priorities are and decide accordingly

**FÉÉCUM:** First of i'm fairly bilingual, and around next year so this is a bit excessive. It seems to me that there is a consensus on the value of bilingualism but we are not sure how to go forward. I think the priority is that our text and internal documents are

bilingual, and the rest can happen later, and if ever Quebec schools join we might have the money to afford it. But the first step is regardless what the amount is, is to make sure to have all of our documents available in both languages. I think people are beginning to repeat themselves and we agree on the importance of bilingualism. And when we approach other organizations they can see we value the principle and have our internal documents in French.

**Chair:** We are still on the budget so we can move on or continue talking about this, and amendment can be put forward when we vote on the budget.

**ULSU:** How much would it cost to have all our internal documents translated?

**Chair:** I don't have the specific numbers,

**SMUSA:** The documents are already bilingual right?

**Chair:** Only external documents and conference documents are usually translated; this conference we had more translated because of the last motion. And the internal documents are at request.

**Treasurer:** Historically we spent about \$10000.

**Chair:** Are the press releases included in that?

**Ellen:** Yes. The only way for me to be able to guestimate is to go back and count the number of words in previous years and calculate it from that.

**ULSU:** What is the most expensive document we translated?

**Ellen:** I don't know.

**BUSU:** I don't think we have gone extravagant this year because we tried everything possible to see how it went, but I would hate to go back to plenarys were we don't even have whisper translation.

**UWOUSC:** On the policy and research line it's sitting at \$3000. Is there any interest in undertaking more primary research and is this reflective of that?

**National Director:** Yes. Spencer's next project is polling and that was brought up in a lobby meeting. We did an RFP and we have a lot of great responses but the cost is too much, it was about \$30000 to do the polling. It's a great project but not the right time right now.

**UWOUSC:** I would make a quick point that that is the sort of thing that we should see value in. We have already seen a lot of value this week from our survey. \$30000 doesn't seem that steep specially when we look at how much we spent on bilingualism.

**SAMRU:** Quick comment. We talk about resources, but time is also a resource and we are spending a lot of time on a small portion of the budget so I would like to see discussion on other things. And what i'm hearing is that we can scale back on the in person translation but not the documents. However we do need to be very cognizant of our budget.

**RRCSA:** I want to speak in opposition to the comments from Brock, I don't think we need to have whisper translation every conference. I would like to see it on a need basis.

**UFVSUS:** I wanted to inquire how we move forward with WLU motion.

**Chair:** We would need to table this conversation until after the WLUSU motion.

**USCUWO:** POI. Can't he just introduce the motion? So is it a separate motion?

**Chair:** Yes one that could affect the amount of money we could have.

**WLUSU:** POI. The budget would not change.

**DSU:** WLUSU already knows that I need to table it and take it back the motion to my council.

**UASU:** I thought that we were still on Allan's report and I need to do my report as well.

**Chair:** We changed the agenda, after all the financial aspects we will go back to your report.

**BUSU:** I had indicated that I was going to make an amendment after the fee increase vote, and so I motion to increase the translation line item from \$10000 to \$20000 for the upcoming year. This should provide us with the flexibility to have whisper translation if we need it for all conferences next year, and we don't know what we might need next year.

**MSU:** What research has been done to prove that an extra \$10000 is enough?

**BUSU:** I have no research or numbers on my computer screen, but I recall from Calgary that whisper would be cheaper than booths.

**Treasurer:** Is there anywhere in the budget that we would like to remove \$10000 dollars from? Are we prepared to run a deficit?

**UWOUSC:** I don't think that could have set it better. I am speaking against the motion. I don't think we need an increase and we can accomplish it with the money we have and disagree with a deficit.

**Treasurer:** For membership dues we will see an increase of about \$5000 from Mount A membership.

**BUSU:** In every other plenary debate we talk about one line at a time; my proposal is to increase fees by a little more than inflation to accommodate that.

**MSU:** I think that this is not a \$20000 priority for CASA. We have many other things that could benefit from the money. I believe it is a priority for our organization but not a \$20000 priority.

**UASU:** Would you be able to speak about whether we can run a deficit?

**Treasurer:** I'm not 100% sure.

**Ellen:** We are.

**UFVSUS:** Call the question.

**Motion fails 5-15**

**ULSU:** I have a suggestion for decreasing the staff budget line, and pay the MRO as a part time position.

**Chair:** I think we should stick to the motion we are on right now.

**UWOUSC:** Against. I don't think we need to increase the fee to pay for translation. At \$10000 dollars we should be able to meet our obligations. I don't think we need to increase the fee or cut the budget.

**DSU:** Move to amend to increase the translation line from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

**Seconded: UASU**

**Motion passes**

**UASU:** I would like to move that the budget reflect that we hold the transition retreats as usual and not as school visits.

**Treasurer:** We can reduce campus travel by \$5000 and add it to transition.

**UASU:** So moved.

**Seconded: BUSU**

**Motion passes 17-1-3**

ULSU: I would like to amend the budget to increase membership by \$45000 to reflect Mount A. membership fees.

**Seconded: UWFOS**

**Motion passes**

**Chair:** Still on the motion to adopt the budget.

**UWFOS:** I would recommend that we add a BIRT we approve the fee increase

**ULSU:** I would like to sponsor the treasurer

Treasurer: The budget makes an assumption that we are going to increase the budget by 2.23% (CPI).

**SMUSA:** I want to think around increasing the salary of ND; having worked in the city I'm surprised we get anyone.

**National Director:** The budget right now is budgeted to increase by ranking plus CPI and bonus per review. We budgeted for the highest amount that could happen. We have sat down to talk about our base salary and we also left room for some lieu time to be paid out. So at the end of the year or when they leave we have to pay that out. In terms of the way our workload is we don't have that option. The salary increase all depends on who we get.

**Chair:** I believe there is a \$37,500 start but it is negotiated by experience.

**SMUSA:** We need to be spending \$50000 or \$55000 to get someone that I want, that's why I'm suggesting we put in the extra money.

**National Director:** We don't have the money now.

**SMUSA:** I don't care, this to me is the most important decision we can make and to have the ND to make the least in the office is weird.

**Chair:** Do we have enough to add \$10000?

**Treasurer:** I don't know.

**UFVSUS:** I would like to add an amendment to the motion to increase membership fees by CPI.

**Seconded: BUSU**

**Treasurer:** We are in a situation where we need an increase in revenue and we have lost membership fees and haven't increased fees by CPI in a while.

**National Director:** It's also one of policies to increase membership fees by CPI each year, in the past we have had member influxes to offset that

**BUSU:** In favour but with a caveat, because we haven't done it in several years I do want to add that a portion of the way we do fees they take it from our operating budgets and those do go up by CPI usually so even when we don't increase it they do increase.

**UWOUSC:** POI. I have a concern about raising the membership fee right now because I needed to notify my councils about this.

**Chair:** We are in the middle of a vote.

**UWOUSC:** It's not a question of if I'm in favour, it's whether I can implement it

**STUSU:** POI. Do these have to be ratified by our council?

**National Director:** Based on our policy, CASA is allowed to increase by CPI without voting by councils.

**USCUWO:** POI. I would ask you to delay the vote; our bylaws tell us that we need notification and we missed that deadline so we won't be able to pay the increase.

**Chair:** We were notified of this before hand.

**AMSUBC:** CASA's bylaws stipulates that our rules over rule the councils bylaws.

**BUSU:** POI. Which document is the ND talking about?

**National Director:** Document number 20 the membership fee calculation section "quote".

**Chair:** Okay let's have the debate

**Treasurer:** There is an option of doing this by teleconference in a couple of weeks.

**UWOUSC:** I'm just concerned in terms of timing; this should have been dealt with earlier in the year. It's incredibly late in the year and our bylaws stipulate that we need to

notify council by January 1<sup>st</sup> and we do not sacrifice our bylaws to external organizations.

**SAITSA:** When we signed the membership agreements do we not agree to the increases then?

**RRCSA:** CPI increases are standard in many organizations, if your uncomfortable with it abstain

Chair: I will go to the vote

**Motion passes 18-0-2**

**KSA:** Motion to go in camera with Ellen staying.

**Seconded: UWFOS**

**Motion passes**

**Chair:** Alright back on the main motion.

**DSU:** I don't necessarily agree with the National Director being paid more than everyone else because we want turnover more so than with full time staff. I would look at it as in some of our organizations.

**Chair:** Vote on the main budget motion with amendments.

**Main Motion Passed**

**Opposition to be noted by Acadia and SMUSA**

**WLUSU:** I would like to move the motion that has been circulated to each of you on fee structure.

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**Whereas** the current fee structure of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations makes unfounded assumptions about the financial stability of member associations; and  
**Whereas** the current fee structure of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations does not increase to compensate for inflation; and

**Whereas** the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations is a member driven organization that values equality and democracy, and

**Whereas** the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations relies solely on the fees it collects from the student association members to fund its operations,  
Be it resolved that the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations adopt a strictly per full-time equivalent fee structure; and

***BIRT** that the fee per full-time equivalent be set at \$2.79; and*

***BIFRT** the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations apply a minimum fee of \$3672 and a maximum fee of \$46446; and*

***BIFRT** the per full-time equivalent fee, as well as the minimum and maximum limits of the fee structure of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations increase at the rate of inflation; and*

***BIFRT** this fee structure come into effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year.*

**SAITSA:** POI. Is there some sort of documents that would show what this looks like?

**WLUSU:** Yes, there is. But I would prefer if we had a discussion on the merits before we look at numbers so that we discuss the principle over personal interest. Speaking to the motion when we look at our fee structure in CASA there is an assumption that gross revenues are tied to the student union's wealth. Just because we bring in a lot of revenues does not mean we are in good financial standing. By doing it by FTE's I think we are recognizing that we are a democratic organization that does not expect some students to contribute more because they may run more businesses. I think that's an absurd assumption. I would also like to add that we need to take on a funding model that increases our fee by CPI.

**RRCSA:** I wanted to give my full support to the motion; we should tie it into the numbers that our voting structure uses.

**STUSU:** We are opposed. I think there is merit to our fees being tied to our students and our ability to pay. I do recognize that this might not be perfect but i'm not sure that it's fair for student associations who pay much less than others. Some member associations rely on businesses and some of us have none of that.

**SACMAUSU:** This is bad, very bad. It would be a great model if we were all equal schools. For us we don't have an opportunity to run a business. This puts us at a disadvantage in running services and such. I'm opposed to this and curious why the floor and cap would not be removed. It doesn't add up to the rational provided

**BUSU:** A per student model is the fairest way because of the flow through and negative revenue businesses. Overall we lose money on our businesses and we have fees that flow through our organization. Because we don't fudge our budget we probably pay more than we should.

**National Director:** This is something that we discussed with Mount A's general meeting. I think there are other possibilities we can look at. CASA doesn't include any



reimbursable revenue like health and dental. So we might want to look at all the reimbursable fees at each school as another option.

**WLUSU:** The reason why I think an FTE model works is because we all have that in common, we charge fees and control them. We looked at the model the ND suggested; the problem is where to draw the line. It's hard to determine what income is expendable. The membership fee is something we can all agree on. I think that the schools that argue that it would hurt them, small schools, the only way this hurts you is if you have a small membership fee. When we look at the businesses most student unions run their businesses as services as well like Bomber at Waterloo because they want to provide a low cost service to students.

**SAMRU:** I think the principle behind this is noble, but the discussion bringing it back to CASA's level not the student organization level, one of the things we need to think about is that our membership numbers are going to be lowering as the economy improves and that will hurt us.

**AMSUBC:** Can we change inflation to CPI? I speak as the biggest school but we are capped and so regardless of the fee model it won't matter. In the interest of sustainable financing FTE's is a really easy number to track and I don't think our enrolment will drop by a significant amount. However buy in to an organization like this needs to be recognized individually. I would move to increase the floor and ceiling however to help our finances.

**MSU:** I'm not sure if I missed construed the Mount Royal comments, but I am in charge of ensuring the financial sustainability of our organization. Someone will lose no matter what; right now some members are paying less than others. There is no win-win situation so we need to ask ourselves what is the fairest model, and right now we do not have a fair model. Provincially we have a per FTE and have never debated this.

**UFVSUS:** Students are not directly members of this organization and so I would wonder why we would base our fee as if they were. I think our current funding model works for now and I agree that we need to look down the road.

**RRCSA:** In favour. Right now it is not based on profit but revenue. It would hurt schools that have no profit or does not charge large fees. I want to point out that STU and MTA would still have the lowest fee. And I agree this is the most fair way to do this.

**Treasurer:** I made a review document about 3 fee structures, I was going to move a similar motion and I did not because I felt that it would not have given councils enough time so I think we should table it to the next conference.

**DSU:** we will have to pay the largest increase, I can't speak for my council but when we look at this. And on a side note we did change the voting structure. When you look at it we have the 5<sup>th</sup> largest power but 9<sup>th</sup> largest fee.

**National Director:** Moving from what we have to an FTE's does open us up to criticism about who are members are. If we have to go to referendums at each school we will have to deal with large no sides on campuses. Queens has to go to referendum every 3 years at OUSA.

**WLUSU:** I think that bringing up the Queens example is not fair because it would be the same for Queens in CASA even with our current structure. And to the argument that our students become the members, I agree with Mike that it is just a formula not how its paid. It would be a calculation not a direct fee. The average that each association would contribute is 2.50 cents and right now it is 4 dollars and some that are near the dollar value. This is about fairness. Laurier has a hard time paying their fee every year so the argument that other organization might feel some strain - we are already there. I don't think we can continue to have this battle, but if we would be paying our fair share it would be \$20000 less because of our businesses.

**UFVSUS:** I move to defer to the next meeting of the GA.

**Seconded: ULSU**

**Motion to defer passes 18-1**

*g. Appointment of Auditors*

**Whereas** CASA has contracted Ouseley Hanvey Clipsham Deep LLP, Chartered Accountants, to review CASA's financial practices annually since\_\_\_\_; and

**Whereas** CASA has been fully satisfied with the service provided by Ouseley Hanvey Clipsham Deep LLP, Chartered Accountants;

***BIRT** CASA contract the services of Ouseley Hanvey Clipsham Deep LLP, Chartered Accountants to conduct an audit of CASA's 2009 – 2010 fiscal year.*

**Moved: SAMRU**

**Seconded: UWFOS**

**SAITSA:** When did we start using them? It is accounting best practices to change accountants after several years.

**National Director:** 3 years ago.

**SAITSA:** I'm satisfied with that.

**Motion passes**

**SMUSA:** I motion for a recess.

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**Motion passes**

Meeting reconvenes at 4:03 pm

**i) Report of the Chair of Policy Committee**

Beverly: Since the AGM, the committee has been able to do a lot amount of work in a very short amount of time. We have dealt with a lot of what the committee needed to do on Sunday and talked about how to move forward. And Kay and Jack showed us how individuals can work within the committee to bring their own policy forward. We are also looking at being able to bring it directly though plenary without the policy committee needing to look at it. Basecamp was a very good tool not only for working but for archiving as well. I will also write a report for this purpose and forward it to all your schools. Having a vice chair was also very helpful and having that next year will be good. Lastly one of the changes that helped me was sitting on the governance calls, it really connected me with what was happening with casa and kept me accountable. So I would recommend that that continues.

**ii) Chair of Graduate Committee : Graeme Turner presents report**

**j. Business**

*i. Short term investments*

BUSU: There was a motion from the AGM that we were debating at one point to move 150000 to short term investments. And we deferred. So the motion is on the table.

SMUSA: I will move.

**Failed to gain a second**

*ii. Approval of the minutes from March 2009 Lobby Conference*

**Moved: BUSU**

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**Motion passes 18-0-1**

*iii. Approval of the minutes from June 2009 Policy and Strategy*

**Chair:** We have added in the language on bilingualism requested by STUSU.

**Moved: STUSU**

**Seconded: SAITSA**

**Motion passes 19-0-1**

*iv. A New Federalism for Students*

**Whereas**, CASA has established a productive, collegial partnership with a variety of diverse provincial groups, who organize on behalf of and represent undergraduate and graduate, university and college, Francophone and Anglophone students and institutions from across the country;

**Whereas**, CASA, its members, its partners and fellow travellers are committed to the advancement of student interests and the creation of a comprehensive post-secondary education system best suited to the distinct needs of each province and Canadian students writ large;

**Whereas**, there has been an open letter circulating in which a new concept for the organization of the Canadian student movement has been passionately argued, one which would require constitutional change on the part of CASA, but one, which, if done rightly with a full measure of prudence and consultation could result in a new solidarity amongst all students, from all regions of the country and could give a new, forceful voice to students at the federal level;

**Whereas**, members of our partnership and fellow travellers have considered, are considering, or have endorsed this new concept;

Therefore,

***BIRT** the CASA general assembly endorse, in principle, the concept spoken to in the aforementioned open letter.*

***BIFRT** the general assembly instruct the CASA staff and Chair to enter into discussions with our provincial partners and other interested alliances, without prejudice, about the creation of a new federalism for students, to pursue these discussions in an open, honest, and frank manner, and to report on the progress of these discussions to the general assembly at every opportunity until resolution has been found.*

**Moved: UFVSUS**

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**STUSU:** I would like to speak against this motion. We are being asked to endorse an anonymous letter from a blog and we don't have the background. So I feel uncomfortable endorsing this and I don't think it will be useful in working with other student organizations. It's antagonistic by saying that CFS schools need to fold into a

new organization. I also think we are talking about changing a basic principle that we refer to quite frequently.

**DSU:** I had a question. I was under the understanding that the partnership had agreed that it would not be formalized. Does that preclude this conversation from happening?

**UWOUSC:** The partnership did have a discussion on this issue before the conference surrounding the idea. This is not an idea from this online letter but it has been discussed before, this just gave it a breath of life. The partnership had a hard time to pursue this without knowing the position of CASA but we have partner associations like la FEUQ, OUSA and the CSA that are willing to move forward. This is something that will move forward regardless so I think it's important that we become a part of the discussion and that is why I am in favour of this discussion.

**UPEISU:** Let me just say that I could not disagree more with STUSU. I think the motion is brilliant and I want your brain in me Jack. Anyway to the matter at hand, this is a conversation that will happen whether or not CASA takes part and that is why I think we need to give CASA a mandate to participate in the discussions. And I emphasize participate and the ability to have a discussion surrounding it. So I am in favour.

**BUSU:** As Western stated there are two major partners in the country that we talk about a lot but have not engaged, those being la FEUQ and the CSA. And I think we need to find a way to address some of their concerns. I have many hats and from the BUSU perspective it might reduce Brocks influence in the new partnership. I feel like I have a lot of influence now but the other 3 hats I wear think this is better for the student movement in this country. The additional policy and members that could be gained has the potential to strengthen what we can do.

**UFVSUS:** This is the way forward for the student movement in Canada and I believe it will unite us; simply endorsing the concept does not mean we are endorsing anything specific but to engage in conversation without prejudice. This is about dialogue and unity and the creation of a new federalism.

**GSAUW:** Last year I talked about how to work together with the CFS. National unity is required at some point and I'm sick of seeing the division and animosity. I do endorse finding a way to bring things closer to unity. However I do have some problems; I have a problem with the opening paragraphs. I cannot support anything that says CFS is morally bankrupt, so I would like to see that clause removed. This is not a short term project and it's too soon to endorse it. Also the history of the movement makes me hesitant; I don't know how long an organization can remain together. We have had two splits already. We have different principles and have contentious issues that we disagree on, membership and fees being some of them. We need to be careful and proceed that way.

**SAITSA:** Motion to amend the First BIRT to read “

**Seconded: SMUSA**

ULSU: I wonder if we can participate in these conversations without a binding motion, I would like to move forward with the conversation but I worry about a binding motion?

UWOUSC: I'm concerned that the amendment is too vague; can we still reference the structure?

MSU: I'm not convinced that when we say the concept it is more than in principle rather than word by word.

**Motion to amend passes**

**Main motion passes 20-1** (Opposition from STUSU to be noted)

*v. Adoption of Amended Member Relations Officer Job Description*

*BIRT the recommended amendments to the Member Relations Officer job description be approved as presented.*

**Moved: ULSU**

**Seconded: ASU**

**UWOUSC:** POI. I'm wondering about the necessity of the positions beyond the responsibilities of the National Director. I found this year no need for the positions and could always communicate with the staff or the ND to address my concern.

**National Director:** The diversity of the associations means we require different resources and we have a lot of inquiries from organization wanting to join and this can be a taxing thing to balance along with all the other roles of the ND. This year for example a lot of my time was spent with the UWO SOGs.

**DSU:** As someone who worked on planning a conference, it's challenging to work with the ND because I don't think it needs to be their priority and it would have been better with an MRO. I also think the communication can be improved.

**National Director:** Also a lot of the internal communications have been done by the communication officer and they have taken away from her role of external communication.

**ASU:** I respectfully disagree with Western; we find this role to be essential and I think for us it could have solved a lot of issue that we could have had. So I fully support it

**MSU:** Over the course of the year I have come to recognize the MRO role as important, however we need to find more and better use for this position. We can't get someone who views it as a get a beer with the members' positions. I want to be very careful in terms of expectations because I do sympathise with the criticisms.

**GSAUW:** I have not needed a lot of liaising with HO but there has been a need from other schools and what we need to figure out is if we need a full time staff person, and I think we can play with this throughout the year.

**UWOUSC:** I'm going to object to the motion because I haven't been convinced about the need. Maybe administrative roles but not this. And the job description does not help. If I have a need from HO I would go directly to those responsible not someone who will listen to my feelings. I think we can fill the current outlined need with a part time administrator.

**National Director:** It's not just about checking in but also about the rest of the responsibilities, but sometimes some people aren't good at calling back and our plates are full. Also in terms of part time recruitment it's hard to get someone in terms of recruitment. So that is a concern that I have with a part-time employee.

**SAITSA:** I agree with Western; a part-time administrative support person would be a better role and I feel more comfortable dealing with the ND on a range of issues and seems like a logical thing. And if we are looking at a part time administrator it might not be as hard to recruit.

**ULSU:** I think that the MRO would free up a lot of time and I also agree with the possibility of the part time person or administrator. I think we should pass it with the possibility being open.

**SAMRU:** My main concern is that we are looking at this position as a conference planner so I would move to change the title to MR and Governance Officer. As it has a lot to do with our board and with governance as well as with information and our members. And other staff members have had to step up.

**UWOUSC:** Question to Acadia, can you tell me a specific situation where you felt the lack of the MRO?

**ASU:** A lack of campus visit, we did not get one this year and our council noticed and it hindered our relationship.

**STFXSU:** I think Travis is right and what we are forgetting is the recruitment tool and that the ND was swamped this year and I think that that is the real strength of this organization and more so than typing up minutes and so.

**SMUSA:** I've been pretty involved in CASA and the HO, they need some help and this is why we have been complaining. It comes down to retention; if one more member school has to plan a conference I would freak out. This is the perfect mix of jobs, admin, conference planning and member relation. So I think it would be an incredibly useful position.

**SACMAUSU:** The MRO is something that I have noticed, the lack of it. I was able to talk to him every day and after we lost him it would take weeks to get a hold of someone. Even joining the referendum I did not get a lot of information, it was very stressful to get the proper information. I have seen the difference in having and not having it.

SAITSA: I think we need to look at the job descriptions and not personalities to judge.

**Motion passes 18-2-0**

*vi. Adoption of CASA Strategic Plan*

**BIRT** the recommended Strategic Plan be approved as presented.

**Moved: STFXSU**

**Seconded: SACMAUSU**

**GSAUW: Motion** to table until after Communications Strategy Discussion

**Seconded: FÉÉCUM**

**Motion passes**

*vii. Adoption of Communications Strategy*

**BIRT** CASA adopts the Communications Strategy as presented.

**Moved: DSU**

**Seconded: UWFOS**

**MSU:** I raise the issue that the ND is the key spokesperson of the organization; it's not a student and that is a concern but we also do not elect them every single year. They are elected so I don't think it's the world's biggest problem but we should be aware of it.

**STUSU:** I would like to move to amend that the Chair serve as the official spokesperson for the organization

**Seconded: MSU**

**STUSU:** I think there is an image issue in having a student talking to the media, so I think when its possible we should strive to have our chair who is elected by this body and a student. I understand that that can't happen all the time but whenever possible



**DSU:** I disagree with the motion. Perhaps we should have both but I don't think that we are taking into account the chair's responsibility to their own student union and that this creates some problems. I also think that the ND has better expertise and I think we can use the chair but the ND has more expertise.

**SACMAUSU:** Has it ever hurt our position with the fact that the ND is not a student?

**National Director:** Not in the past year; there are also student execs around the table who are not students as they are doing this.

**UASU:** I'm not certain about changing our main spokesperson, although I do think we should include the chair and maybe adding equal weight. And in press releases we can make anyone sound smart.

**UWOUSC:** First it's important that we elect the ND for this purpose. I like the idea of both being able to speak for the organization. In OUSA we hire the ED so they are not the spokesperson, so it's not impossible but we do have geographic challenges and we do have a different process in hiring.

**National Director:** I think we should add the Chair into the press release but when talking about camera stuff and radio it's nice to have some consistency.

**Motion fails 2-15-2**

**STUSU:** I'm not going to move an amendment on this but I want it noted that I think it's problematic that we send press releases in French days after and it says so in the document that we are okay with that.

**Motion passes 18-0-1 (STUSU)**

**Chair:** Back to the Strategic Plan

**National Director:** It's in your binder, document number 25. These are from the AGM during the consultations.

**WLUSU:** I will motion to remove the core purpose in its entirety, we don't need it and I don't think it speaks to our organization.

**Seconded: BUSU**

**BUSU:** I'm not sure what I was expecting was going to happen, I was hoping for more change of input. And I haven't seen it since then. I don't believe I can support the core value and even the general document.

**UWOUSC:** I do want to speak along the same line about the strat plan. I have concerns, I'm not comfortable with approving this today, and I'm concerned about handing this off

to a new group of student leaders. If it's multi year we need to be explicit and this document is very rough and vague and not something I am comfortable approving today.

**SMUSA:** I don't think it matters what core purpose we have. It's going to be what we decide year in and out. It not in full form and we should not pass or fail this today so it can be improved.

**GSAUW:** I move to refer the plan to the GO's and to have it reviewed at Policy and Strat.  
**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**ULSU:** I disagree with the grammar and the rhetoric of this, mainly also that we are missing consultation from us.

**STFXSU:** I want to disagree with SMUSA about the core value. I think it's important for an organization that changes so much year to year. We have one and it provides a framework with which to work within.

**WLUSU:** We have had a lot of consultation, it's been a year. This has been something we have all been involved with in some way. Other than the core purpose I think the rest of this document is good and ready. I think we have our goals outlined with it and I think referring this to the GO's they will have no idea what to do with it.

**DSU:** I support that the core purposes are not good. I don't think we achieved consensus in Halifax and I think that is being echoed now. I think it also needs to go back to the committee and not the GO's.

**GSAUW:** Call the question.

**Motion passes 18-2-0**

**Main motion to refer passes 13-4-2 (FÉÉCUM)**

*viii. Ratification of CASA Constitution and Governance Structure*

*BIRT the recommended changes to the CASA Constitution resulting from the review by the CASA membership at the 2009 AGM be approved with Board Structure option 2a*

**Moved: UWFOS**

**Seconded: KSA**

**KSA:** Move to go into Committee of the Whole

**Motion passes 17-0-1**

**UFVSUS:** My original proposition we can discard based on the motion passed earlier.

**SMUSA:** I have an issue with the policy chairs being on the committee. I think they are busy with their jobs and I don't think they have the time to be on the board. I don't think there are any benefits besides being informed.

**GSAUW:** It keeps a good coherent flow on a day to day basis. Those who choose to do this are going to know what they are getting themselves into.

**SAMRU:** POI. I thought we were talking about structure not roles?

**BUSU:** To speak against what SMUSA said, I also proposed a model with the policy chair in the board. I think we are choosing someone who has the skills to move CASA ahead and if the policies are actually good enough to lobby on I think we need the policy chair to be on the body to help talk about that in between conferences.

**SMUSA:** A motion was passed unanimously at AGM to invite policy and grad chairs to the board on an as-needed basis but it didn't seem to make sense to be making operational decisions. Are bi-weekly meetings necessary to raise points on policy issues? It seems to make sense to include them for reports and to have a couple of extra people on the board but that isn't cause for the policy and grad chairs specifically.

**WLUSU:** My dream board would strike the policy and grad chairs from the board and have some at-large positions, called the communications and planning people. If I'm not a board member I want a representative at that board to plead my case to and I can call the governance officers but I'd be sceptical that they would represent my interests. So I want a couple of people to represent the members at that table.

**STUSU:** Whatever structure we have, it's important that there be enough people for getting work done and for accountability. I also want to respond to the comments from.

**SMUSA:** I don't think we should get bogged down in the interim measures we put in place why we don't have a board. The chair of the policy committee had asked to be on the board and I amended it so they were not on the board.

**ULSU:** My dream board... I agree there should be a couple more members but not too unwieldy. I think seven people is reasonable – current governance officers, a policy person, a communications person, a graduate student rep, and a member at large.

**UASU:** I do not have strong feelings whether the policy chair sit as voting members of the board but I think they need to be tied into decisions and I would advocate a non-voting board member position. However, I disagree with referencing the motion passed at AGM as that was a temporary solution and not a long term decision being made. It's more work for the policy chair but the chair and the secretary already do a lot of that. Either way I would be happy with voting or non-voting members of the board but I do think they need to sit on the board.

**MSU:** I think this discussion has been inefficient and I think these discussions of dream boards go nowhere. If you have a specific change you want, make a motion.

**BUSU:** Move to remove the chair of the graduate student issues committee and replace with a communications and planning person.

**Seconded: KSA**

**BUSU:** The reason is I don't think the mandate of the grad student issues committee is more than policy right now and so it belongs as a subset of the policy committee. Also, it's one subset of our membership and I don't like dividing up positions based on who represents who; I prefer position-based board members. A communications and planning person would be responsible for complementing the MRO position and bringing ideas to the board as well as organizing meetings.

**SAMRU:** Point of privilege – discussions at the workshop last night do not mean they were endorsed.

**GSAUW:** Graduate students have vastly different issues. The lobby document this week was effectively useless for what we considered to be our major meetings of the week. When I was an undergraduate student I didn't really understand how graduate students work – there's a major divide in the experience of graduate students. Not having graduate students on the board ignores a major direction this membership wants to go in.

**DSU (recognizes Eric Snow):** I think Graeme hit on a key issue, which is that the issues are so different. As a course-based grad student I'm still pretty far off research-based grad students in my experience about their issues. If this body is going to end up doing more than policy development, as we are planning to do, the argument from SMUSA does not quite stand. I see this as being a different scenario with a different type of education issues, which is why a graduate student should be on the board.

**DSU:** I support Eric and think we should set up our graduate students to give and develop good policy recommendations and representation will encourage growth, as ambassadors of CASA to other schools and in graduate student organizations.

**STUSU:** I'm not convinced whether we need a graduate student rep on the board or not but I want to address some of the arguments that suggest that more student representation is bad, why a slippery slope may happen, or that it will be difficult to do.

**MSU:** We had a huge board this year and it didn't work. Graduate issues are not discussed at the board; CASA issues are discussed at the board. People don't make representations to it. I would just really like to have a board.

**GSAUW:** The point isn't to make sure that graduate students are at the board but to make sure that the direction of CASA is good for graduate students.

**MSU:** I think the best way to do that is to elect responsibly at the beginning of the year.

**Secretary:** The thing that I have a really hard time grasping is the fear that if you don't have a specific dedicated seat that the grad student perspective will be lost. Tina is a grad student and you can have a board in the model being discussed that's entirely grad students. The other thing I would be concerned about is having a committee that has only one type of student that can be the head of it. Last year's grad student committee chair thought the committee shouldn't go beyond policy creation. I've personally lobbied on grad student issues and I have felt comfortable doing that.

**BUSU:** The board doesn't, and can't, overturn decisions of the general assembly. I think you need people with a focus or a mandate to work on CASA-wide issues rather than a specific mandate. It's supposed to represent the general assembly between meetings.

**SAMRU:** What are we trying to accomplish as a board? The committee should be creating fully formed proposals to the board and it should only be a place for review. It's better to base it in existing positions and mandates.

**Eric:** First off, I agree that the graduate student committee should not be restricted to graduate students. It's about the specific issues rather than the representation. I don't think representation is needed but it's somebody who is actively looking at graduate student issues and understands the focus of the committee and it could be good enough to have somebody sitting on the board, even if it's not voting. But I think if you have policy you need grad students.

**GSAUW:** I agree with Eric. Also, the graduate student issues committee does not have restricted membership. I'm happy to make the grad and policy chairs as non-voting.

**MSU:** When would the board be dealing with the tri-agencies?

**Eric:** When would the board be dealing with student loans?

**BUSU:** Motion to amend to remove Chair of the Grad Committee

**Seconded: KSA**

**Motion fails**

**SMUSA:** Motion to recess.

**Seconded: SAITSA**

**Motion Passes**

Meeting reconvenes at 7:17 pm.

**UFVSUS:** Motion to leave Committee of the Whole

**Seconded: WLUSU**

**Motion passes 13-0-0**

**GSAUW:** Motion to amend to make the board chair, secretary, treasurer, two at-large members, and have the policy and grad chairs as non-voting members.

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**SMUSA:** I agree with this. We need a board.

**Motion passes 18-0-1 (UWFOS)**

**BUSU:** I'm still uncomfortable with undefined board members.

**UFVSUS:** I recommend we get on to it.

**UWFOS:** If there are specific jobs that merit defined roles, they can be brought forward then.

**DSU:** I see value in having year-to-year people with undefined roles that can work on issues that come up at policy and strategy.

**Motion passes**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend section 2 of the Bylaws to read as follows:

“Until changed in accordance with the Act, the head office of the corporation shall be in the Canadian Capital Region”

**Seconded: (No seconder noted)**

**Motion passes**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend section 9 to read as follows:

“At every annual general meeting, in addition to any other business that may be transacted, the reports of the directors and officers, the financial statement and the report of the auditors shall be presented and auditors shall be appointed for the ensuing year. The members may consider and transact any business either special or general at any meeting of the members. The board of directors or the chair shall have the power to call, a general meeting of the members of the corporation. The board of directors shall call a special general meeting of members on written requisition of not less than 25% of the membership.

Split into 2 sections is a new change Two-Thirds of the registered members present a meeting will constitute a quorum. Proxy votes shall not be counted toward quorum at a meeting or special general meeting. “

**Seconded:**

**Motion passes 19-1 (UASU opposition noted)**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend section 10 to read as follows:

“A proxyholder must be the delegate of a member of the corporation”

**Seconded:**

**Motion passes**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend section 18 to strike the following:

“The Chairs of all standing committees shall act as non-voting members of the board of directors”

**Seconded:**

**Motion passes**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend Section 33 to read as follows:

“There shall be two standing committees of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations: the Policy Committee and the Graduate Student Issues Committee. The Policy Committee shall be an open committee of the General Assembly responsible for preparing policies for approval based on the recommendations of the General Assembly. The Graduate Student Issues Committee shall be an open committee of the General Assembly responsible for presenting policy and other issues for approval based on the concerns of graduate students”

**Seconded:**

**Motion passes**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend the titles of board members - change the following throughout the document:

- Change the name of Chair to President
- Change the name of Secretary to VP Administration
- Change the name of Treasurer to VP Finance

**Seconded: UNBSU**

**Motion fails**

**BUSU:** Motion to create a new section as follows:

“Section entitled: “Special Resolutions”

- A Special Resolution must be passed by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the Full Members representing at least fifty percent (50%) of the full-time equivalent students represented within CASA at a General Meeting. The following categories of motions shall be considered special resolutions:
  - a. Election of a National Director
  - b. Ratification of the members of the Board of Directors
  - c. Ratification of new members of the organization
  - d. Motion to dissolve the organization

**Seconded:**

**Motion passes**

**BUSU:** Motion to amend to create a new section as follows:

Brand new Section 3:

- Title of section: Official Languages
- The Canadian Alliance of Student Associations / Alliance Canadienne des Associations Etudiantes shall be a bilingual organization operating in both official languages of Canada

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

UPEISU: POI. What does this bind us to?

UFVSUS: This reflects that we are bilingual.

**SMUSA:** Motion to amend to strike “operational”:

“CASA shall be a bilingual organization operating in both official languages of Canada”

**Seconded: KSA**

**Motion passes**

**STFXSU:** Motion to remove section 15.

**Seconded: UNBSU**

**Motion passes 18-1-1**

**ULSU:** Motion to add section 15:

“Upon electing their officers, the general assembly shall ..”

**Seconded: SAMRU**



**Chair:** The motion out of order.

UNBSU: Do the bylaws reflect the change to the board structure?

Secretary – Yes. Reminder that these have been approved by a lawyer.

**Main motion passes**

*ix. Adoption of CASA Procedures*

*BIRT the recommended the procedures manual be approved as presented.*

**Moved: UFVSUS**

**Seconded: UNBSU**

**UWFOS:** Amendment to add in sections as presented by the National Director

**Seconded: FÉÉCUM**

**Motion passes 19-0-1 (GSAUW)**

**Main motion passes**

*x. Adoption of CASA Observer Guidelines*

*BIRT the recommended CASA Observer Guidelines be adopted as presented.*

**Moved: UNBSU**

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**Motion Passed**

**k. National Director Review Report**

**Motion to go in-camera moved by SAIT**

**Motion passes**

xi. National Director Review

**UWOUSC:** Motion to go in-camera

**Seconded: UWFOS**

**Motion passes**

**UWOUSC:** Motion to approve the resolutions from the confidential session of the general meeting.

**Seconded: UFVSUS**

**Motion passes 17-2-0 (WLUSU, UPEI opposition to be noted)**

*xii. Selection of Host Member for the 2010 CASA Policy and Strategy Conference*

***BIRT** UPEI serve as the host of the 2010 CASA Policy and Strategy Conference;*

***BIFRT** the 2010 CASA Policy and Strategy Conference be held between June 6th and June 12<sup>th</sup>.*

**Moved by: UPEISU**

**Seconded: SMUSA**

**Motion passes**

**I. Questions and Comments**

UWOUSC: Thank you to Justin for all of his hard work this evening, for not only this evening but to Justin and Allan as well for their hard work and dedication to this job. Also a huge round of applause to Tina Roubichaud for all of the hard work that she's done this year. I don't think there are many of us that would be the heart and work into this job like you've done so congratulations

**m. Any Other Business**

**n. Adjournment**

**Moved: UFVSUS**

**Seconded: BUSU**

**Motion passes**