



commerce  
undergraduate  
society

## CUS GRT Force Minutes

October 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 1<sup>st</sup> year, VP 2<sup>nd</sup> year, Current VPs, President, Senator, AMS Rep

### Questions/ Discussion

- Tim: what do VPs 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 28<sup>th</sup>; we can't do referendums when there are elections
- Consultation: focus groups for getting feedback: general individuals, service council (November 3<sup>rd</sup>), 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 20<sup>th</sup>: we need marketing, we need 50 t-shirts that people can wear
- Week of Oct 31<sup>st</sup>: 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 7<sup>th</sup>, what's feasible
- Johannes: we could have dedicated focus groups, two during the week of Nov 7<sup>th</sup>, then during the 14<sup>th</sup> 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 14<sup>th</sup> we have to have our referendum submitted by then, so it's better to have focus groups the week of the 7<sup>th</sup>. 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 28<sup>th</sup> to December 2<sup>nd</sup>; 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**