

NOTICE OF MEETING

There will be a meeting of the

COUNCIL

Thursday, June 21, 2012, 4:30 p.m.

In Room 206, CAW Student Centre,

UWSA Council Chambers

Co201202

Rev2

AGENDA

ITEM DESCRIPTION

1 Call to Order: 4:36

2 Chair's Business:

New summer Chair – Amy – nursing society, work with all of you collaboratively – I am open to whatever comments you have for me.

3 Approval of Agenda:

Natalie Gosselin– I would like to amend the agenda because Priya and Ahmed Farhan would like to do a presentation

Alyssa Atkin– 5.3 moved to 5.1 because we don't want to waste the professors time

Natalie Gosselin 1st Scott Locke 2nd vote - Passed

4 Reports:

4.1 Report of the President:

Kim Orr- We have had a busy couple of weeks, within UWSA

Mohammad Akbar and I attended the Alumni Golf tournament

Mohammad Akbar – Academic Integrity – covers plagiarism – my idea is to re-write the bi-law to make it more student friendly. How many of you knew that if you make up a bibliography it's considered plagiarising. Proposal that we start up an academic integrity organization, we are looking for 4 members

to start this up, along with Danielle and Me (Akbar). Also, we have had a lot of meetings at the Ontario undergraduate student alliance and CFS (osa June 13, cfs June 6), I have attended these meetings. I am working with the Womens' center to work on a campaign against sexual violence.

I have been engaging with students about the solidarity with Quebec, McMasters is doing a tour of Ontario. Monday the 16th, representatives from Quebec will be at U of W to do presentation.

Alyssa Atkins- Council agenda gets sent in on Friday before, and sent out on the Monday

Kim Orr -No float this year, we missed the dead line

Scott Locke – What is the status on the Pub contract

Kim Orr– we are seeking legal advice, prof is offering services pro bono until we can get our own.

Scott Locke – We do you see us getting legal representation

Kim Orr– The process is started, should be in the next 2 weeks before it's finalized

Scott Locke – since the contract has been voided, what is the university doing legally?

Kim Orr – We have to wait for legal advice

Kim Orr – the contract hasn't been officially voided until

Priya – We are thinking of restructuring the contract

Ahmed (Jenn's proxy, but speaking as himself) – The old manager of the Pub, we are considering that as a backup plan. We aren't doing this without due diligence, we did our research and have a back-up plan.

4.2 Presentation by Priya and Ahmed (board) (Jenn's Proxy):

Coming to the counsel about violations of Roberts Rule of Order, by laws that haven't been followed.

Article X: 64: If a quorum is not present at the appointed hour, the chair should wait a few minutes before taking the chair

Article I: 18: The assembly by two thirds vote can postpone the time for taking recess, to the specified hour. When the hour has arrived to which the

Miss conduct – disorderly conduct and outburst – comments that were made were destructive.

– The outburst did not make a positive resolution.

By law 30:1.2C, By law 30:1.1j By-law 20:3.6, by-law 20:3.6

- Chair women has been expressing her opinions during meetings - by-law 20:3.6

- No minutes and inaccurate documentation, the responsibility by-law 30:1.4.1b , by-law 1.4.1C

Lance given speaking rights – VpA Alyssa Atkins verbally attacked a fellow member

Not holding Alyssa accountable for things that happened prior to her instatement in her job

Scott Locke – without the minutes, can you verify this? Could you have a meeting with these people not present?

Mohammad Akbar- without the VPA to be secretary, meeting is over it's in BY-laws

Ahmed Farhan– We are not asking to punish the board, we are asking that counsel hold them accountable.

Scott Locke – since you are coming to us for advice, why don't you guys come to us with a potential solution

Ahmed Farhan– we are financial body, you are the by-law making body.

5. Posted Motions:

5.1 Review of Recent Executive Conduct:

Whereas the executives must uphold UWSA policies, which include the proper adherence to Robert's Rules and our by-laws;

Whereas Robert's Rules explains that "The only business that can be transacted in the

Absence of a quorum is to take measures to obtain a quorum, to fix the time to which to- adjourn, and to adjourn, or to take a recess";

Whereas UWSA by-laws, which supersede Robert's Rules, explain that "No chair shall bring forward a motion, second a motion, express an opinion, or vote on a matter before Board";

Whereas executives are expected to act with maturity, professionalism, and respect at all UWSA meetings;

Whereas abandoning a board meeting is not in the best interests of students, the UWSA, or the relationship between board and the executives;

Whereas executives must be held to account by Council on behalf of the Members;

BIRT Council condemn the decisions of the president as chair of the last board meeting,

BIFRT Council condemns the VPA, the VPFO and the president's decision to leave that meeting;

BIFRT Council be in solidarity with board in the measures it takes in response to the executives' actions.

Mohammad Almoayad 1st 2nd Omar Zghal

Mohammad Almoayad – this motion is just to make it clear that counsels opinion that executives should be held to these by-laws. Maybe this was bad judgement at the time. This motion is not meant to attack the execs in this way; we all just want to say that leaving the meeting was bad judgement on behalf of the execs

Omar Zghal- I agree with this motion, but do not like some of the wording (condemns) whether we go with this wording or a different wording, I think it's important that this behaviour is stopped

Kim Orr- I do understand where the board is coming from, I understand. They speak about who we belittle them, we also feel belittled. Escalating emotions have resulted in a lack of respect on both parts. They also mentioned that board members put things behind them; I have personally tried to enter each meeting with a fresh slate. We are providing them with executive training from a third party, by the united way. I have passed on the chair for the summer to address the issue of me expressing opinion. When I present things, I do have an opinion on them, I have done my best to be neutral on these things. May 17th, the stalling of the vote will not show up in the minutes. When the counsel does not return to a meeting, if no one shows up back to a meeting, it is over. This is in Roberts Rules. I understand why the board is angry, but we are taking action of that. We are getting third party training and an outside chair.

Alyssa Atkins – We shouldn't have left the way we did. What I'd like to address is something's are not true, and some of these assumptions made. The lack of professionalism, board leaving, I asked people to stop talking because even sitting beside Kim, I couldn't hear her. We have been in crisis management; minutes have fallen to the side. We started meetings before the secretary was supposed to start, and before she was even trained. We are being blamed for past executive's mistakes, we have been labeled as corrupt. We should absolutely be accountable for our actions, but that isn't what this motion says. Be careful about the wording on this.

Scott Locke: motion to break this up. – To divide this into three separate votes 2nd

Scott gives Aanush speaking rights – Can this be explained in terms the non-political student can understand

Amy Orr– (Chair) Does everyone understand that the discussion we are having is about breaking this motion up, and to make it in more laymen terms.

Passed motion to divide

Shawn Locke– in light of the presentations that were made today and in light of taking a look at what the motion says. We are staying in solidarity to an action that hasn't taken place. I question the word condemn, is very harsh. Moving forward is more important than moving back

Phil Tremblay – Can we see these minutes.

Kim Orr – We have them, but they are legal minutes, not who debated what.

Mohamed Almoayad – I completely understand that this is not completely the execs problem, both sides are equally to blame about who made bad judgement and how was unprofessional. Because our job is to counsel, please don't take this motion as this is only the exec fault, we have had meetings where corium is lost, they would text and call people and ask them to come back. If they would have waited a few minutes the members can back on form the balcony. I think by-laws were clearly broken. Such as opinion being made by the chair, and leaving. Pointing out mistakes is not productive, but it is to make

people accountable for their actions. Condemn, I could not think of any other word to choose there, Can we say we don't like that they broke the by-laws? We can't be weak on this, we have to say NO that breaking to By-laws are wrong. The last motions, tying us to the board is pretty risky but I trust them to try and fix the relationship between us.

Ahmed Farhan – (Shawn Steven gives speaking rights) – Kim talked about belittling of the exec, as board I do not feel that we over stepped the professional line. “Ahmed, Jamal” was what Alyssa said, Ahmed agreed. The Robert Rules were clearly broken, by them leaving. We would never cut you pay checks, this is a way to put fear into people.

By-law 30. 1.1j –broken by Kim – speaking opinion

By-Law 1.2.1c – ur responsibility to abide by bylaws

By-law 30 1.4.1b – not all meeting min are made available to us.

By-law 30 1.4.1c – insure proper notice – we are not getting agendas. – We are supposed to have these 3 days before meetings.

Mohammed Akbar – I would like to add a new clause

– BIFRT the UWSA board of directors and the executive have an open frank discussion the issues effecting the UWSA Board of Directors and the UWSA executive.

-While this board meeting was happening, I was getting text messages from different people saying the UWSA is collapsing and falling apart, so I called Kim and asked. She said it was nothing like that. Basically that board and execs should have an informal and honest discussion saying we are feeling hurt, but not enough communication.

Kim – I agree with the sentiment of this amendment, if we could talk somewhere, outside of this room where there is not a lot of tension and high stakes.

Scott Locke – Propose an amendment to the amendments – can this discussion be hosted by a third party who will be unbiased. Considering the exec and board are already getting training by the united way, we might have better success with the neutral third party

Natalie – I think the third party is unnecessary, we should be able to just talk it out

Kim- I understand this, By this might remove the open discussion, might turn into trying to prove to someone which side is right. The united way is doing training, it's not an arbitrator

Ahmed (Shaun Steven gives speaking rights to speak as Ahmed) – We seem to be ok, get along ok outside of meetings. I don't think the third party is needed.

Scott Locke – I understand some people don't think this is needed, but considering we are only 2 months into our term. I feel this is nessecary to nip this right now, before it really starts. I feel that this might spin out of control ore than it already has

Mohammad Akbar- When you want to have an open and frank discussion because it removes the openness. Nipping this in the bud should have happened 2 months ago, now there will always have issues. Don't expect by-laws issues to go away, example about the summer proxy.

The question is being called of the amendment to the amendment – “To be hosted by an unbiased third party.” – pass

Voted- Not carried – removed

Calling into question “BIFRT the UWSA board of directors and the Executive have an open frank discussion the issues effecting the UWSA Board of Directors and the UWSA executive. - passes

14-4-0 – passed

Scott Locke – I would like to propose an amendment to the amendment, take out the word condemn and replace it with strongly disagree with. 2nd by Phil

-Given that both parties have done things wrong, I feel that condemn is too harsh of a word

Mohamed Almoayad- It's like accepting it, saying that it's your opinion that breaking the by-law is ok, but we disagree. Board also has probably broken by-laws, the issue again is to hold exec accountable, not the board.

All in favor of calling into question – question's been called 10-9-0

recounting the vote, due to not counting Evan, using computer not green name tag – 11-10-0

Trevor Faillie - I do not want to act as a marriage counselor between board and exec, I feel that they have already made steps to fix this, and there is a willingness on both side, let them act as adults and deal this themselves

Alyssa – both sides did wrongs here, and we guilty of breaking by-laws, maybe not but definitely of making bad decisions. WE are making steps to improve this. No one is perfect in their first month. I feel this is redundant and superfluous.

Shaun Steven -Counsel has repeatedly expressed how important the buy-laws are, but unfortunately this motion doesn't do anything to hold the executive council accountable for these actions. This is more like a slap on the wrists. I don't feel that this motion accomplishes this goal at all.

Kim Orr- I appreciate that the board said they won't cut out salaries. My point in mentioning this was to show the extent to which this motion can be taken. For an example, our compensation was reduced we used to have a cell phone fully paid for, now only some our subsidised. We also lost our technology grant has been **reduced (removed?)**. I've never moved a motion; I've brought up points of information and asked other members to move a motion

Shaun Steven - Poi – does this count as expressing your opinion

Kim Orr– I try to keep my opinion out of it, unless I am asked for it. Finally, I would like to address the by-laws that board said we broke. Most of the by-laws are not about breaking the by-laws.

Caroline Jacobson – Against this motion – I understand that our job is to hold the execs accountable, both sides admit to making a mistake. This might give more power to the other side to bully the other side.

All in favor to call into question – passed

All in favor to call into question with roll call – 10- fail

Mohammad Akbar – speak in favour, this shows who voted yes or who voted no.

Calling into question – passed into question

vote - 6-13 – fail

5.1.1 BIRT Council strongly disagrees with the decisions of the president as chair of the last board meeting,

4-12-5 - fail

5.1.2 BIFRT Council strongly disagrees with the VPA, the VPFO and the president’s decision to leave that meeting;

5- 9 (Eric pigeion) - 5 (Alyssa Atkins, Ahmen(Jenn) Stephen Peters, Mohammad Akbar, Kim Orr) - fail

5.1.3 BIFRT Council be in solidarity with board in the measures it takes in response to the executives’ actions

3- 15- 3 (Jen, Scott) - fail

5.1.4 BIFRT the UWSA board of directors and the Executive have an open frank discussion the issues effecting the UWSA Board of Directors and the UWSA executive. Board of Directors and the UWSA executive.

12-5-3 - passed

Motion for a 5 min recess - failed

5.2 Student Mandated Fee Levy

BIRT the UWSA not increase any fees without approval from students through a referendum.

Kim Orr - Rules out of order, we shouldn’t vote on something we have no control over

Mohammad Akbar – I would like to amendment that they have to ask board for approval. – This is a political issue, board increase a fee without

Kim Orr – I as chair officially rule out this motion.

5.3 In-Council Election of Representatives for Board

BIRT Council nominates and elect by secret ballot two (2) Council members to join Board at this meeting.

Mohammad Akbar – We should set a date on this

Shaun Steven – Motion to make an amendment to the motion. – That we do this at this meeting

Call into Question the amendment

10-2-0 - Passed

Scott Locke – amendment, that we remove the secret ballot

Jordan – this is an election, therefore it needs to be secret.

Scott Locke – with drawn

Calling into question the motion -16-2 passed

Amy – Any nominations?

Ahmad (Jenn) – can I nominated Mohamed Almoayad

Mohammed Almoayad – decline

Alyssa – nominate Scott Locke

Scott Locke - accept

Natalie Gosselin – Shaun Steven

Shaun Gosselin – decline

Mohammad Akbar – no one looks interested –Evan Freeman-Gibb

Evan Freeman-Gibb- accepted

Natalie Gosselin – Trevor Fairlie

Trevor Fairlie– decline

Amy – Since there is no more nominations, the 2 positions are acclaimed by Evan Freeman-Gibbs and Scott Locke

6 Question Period :

Shaun Steven - Were you aware that the university does not recycle the stuff outside

Kim Orr – I have heard about that, it was up to the janitorial staff to sort the garbage, the janitorial staff decided that it wasn't in their collective agreement.

Natalie Gosselin- I am wondering how much discrepancy there is between the actual by-laws and what is posted on the website

Kim Orr- The ones that are online are the 2009 by-laws, this represents poor planning and secession planning on the part of the uwsa, this represents a lack of commitment by previous execs as a lack of commitment to one's job

Amy- 2 min left for questions

Natalie Gosselin – there is no current by-laws

Kim Orr- I have a certain amount of amendments in my own personal record from meetings I attended, by this should be checked against meeting minutes cause my personal note are not official

Ahmad Farhan– Why is the web site so out date?

Kim Orr– it's a brand new web site,

Ahmad Farhan – the contact information is wrong

KimOrr – Jordan has offered to fix this

Mohammad Akbas – web site really really sucks, but we are working on it.

Kim Orr- as counselors, if any of you are opposed to having your email posted on the site, I will not put it up

7 New Business:

7.1 By-Law Revision Approval re: By-Law 60 Part 2.1.6 (Shinerama Coordinator)

Whereas the "Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation" has changed its name to "Cystic Fibrosis Canada";

BIRT the following changes be made to the Official By-Laws for the University of Windsor

Students' Alliance:

2.1.6.1 The Shinerama Co-ordinator shall: ...

- f) Take primary responsibility for regular interaction with the Cystic Fibrosis Canada
- g) Take primary responsibility for submission of funds raised to the Cystic Fibrosis Canada

Nadia Timperio – This is just a technicality, the name should reflect the name of the company we are actually donating to.

Shaun Steven – Motion to make an amendment to the motion

19-0-0 pass

8 Adjournment: 7:19