

UWSA Meeting
Council Chambers
January 7, 2009
4:00pm

Called to order 4:05

Chairs Business:

Chair: We don't have any placards, be patient as I try to remember names. I'm a little under the weather. We are supposed to get a storm tonight. In the interest of safety we hope to get home early

Approval of Agenda

Osterberg: 7.2 parking update

Sasso: I have a point of order, in regards to bylaw 10 part 4 section 1, under counsellors, where it asks at the beginning of each semester where it asks if we're eligible to stay counsellors. I don't know if that's been done. If that hasn't been done I don't think we continue and if we make decisions.

Osterberg: Because of all of the grades have not been released, it's impossible to check. So people are going to appear as part time when they are not. By precedent, we judge by the grades previously. So you are eligible until all the grades are released and everything is finalized. Once that is confirmed I get sent a list.

Chair: Chair is going to rule, makes that unable to determine at this time. I am going to make this meeting legitimate. I'm going to move on with the approval of the agenda.

Connell: I'm going to add a motion.

Chair: I'm going to ask you to do it under new business. I'm going put as 9.1

Woodrich enters 4:08

Osterberg: Just a quick announcement Will Foot resigned and will not be on council.

Sasso: As per bylaw, we have to have an order of council to approve by a resolution.

Chair: No resignations are considered until there are tendered to the chair. So I cannot rule on it because I have not received it yet.

Chair: I will get to that further and bring that back to the next meeting for you.

Approval of Minutes

December 3 2009

All those in favour

McGarragle abstains, otherwise unanimous

6.0 Posted motions

Raza: I really need your feedback on this one, because over the years we have been transitioning to a paperless system. Please do give me your feedback. We've tightened the rules and I think I'm going to get some feedback on a few things. I need to know what you think, so we can tweak before we go out to the public.

First and foremost for the next council meeting, for the minutes, I've stepped into my role as CRO, we are short one EMC member. I was provided a resignation. So uh, that was a student at large position. I request you to bring a student at large for the next meeting. That's for next meeting and we will hopefully have a motion on that. I think everyone received the email about the ongoing by election. We transferred the all electron form. Hopefully by next meeting you will be ratifying that election as well.

So we're kind of doing a one stop shopping. If you go the UWSA page you can see a notice has been posted. If you remember the by election one we've taken a lot of the words out and streamlined it. Both of the elections office and EMC down here, do note that sanctions are only guide and the elections reserves the right to amend the sanctions on a case by case basis. It is going to be much more stringent than the thread we have currently displayed.

McGarragle: It was discussed in a prior meeting instead of monetary sanctions we would do vote sanctions. What was the CRO's thoughts?

Raza: It's not so much of the administration by that, it's the theory behind it. Whose voice do we render mute by the sanction. Therefore we stuck to monetary.

McGarragle: We operate under the theory that everyone's vote is equal we are taking away the votes equally. Do we feel that monetary sanctions are appropriate due the fact people have different amounts.

Raza: To be honest I'm really nervous taking away, I think my job is to provide the electorate a voice. To me to sanction to take away vote is to take away a voice. If council so wishes to make the council vote based, we can have discussion about that.

Chair: If everyone has an opinion on the matter they can say it now.

Kalaci: You are equally all of them away, you are just equallying.

Osterberg: I agree with Raza, when people cast their ballot it's not for anyone to take that vote away. How you set like a cap, where they would be, like creating a threshold, that once you hit that threshold you can't really budge for it.

Raza: No we don't have threshold for it. The only thing we do is give up to three hundred or take it away.

K Orr: You can't say someone vote counts less. I think we are focussing on too much that it has to be votes or money.

Raza: We do put campaigning limits as well. We say you have to take down these posters and other sanctions.

McGarragle: My bringing this up, sanctioning vote wise, this is an idea, we're not limited. I don't know we're allowed to right now, it would be nice to brainstorm right now. In regards to removing on person's vote. This may infringe on that and it's to be decided. However these votes came by campaigning that is illegal.

Lalonde: I know that in the past we have kicked this around a lot, we used to have a point system. I think the answer to this is that there is no perfect way to do this.

Segal: I think we could allow a certain number of votes. Someone who runs a fair campaign will get votes added.

Raza: What I will do is for next council meeting with some scenarios of sanction. I'll come back.

I will just quickly go through the website. The first two tabs are for the current by election. They are covered within the other topics. Then you have the all candidates package. Everything now is in PDF. I hope that works with every kind of platform. If I change anything it's changed live. There is no lag in the change time. Next is the nomination form. We've eliminated all the paper forms. Students were also coming in at 10:01 saying can I hand this in. Now that it's electronic, the form shuts off at ten automatically. There was the issue of having signed and sealed envelope. Previous students have been disqualified, now it's all in one stop. You get all the information and you hit continue. I'll just go through it quickly. If I were a candidate, you have to fill out all the information. It also eliminates when students would forget to fill out different

things. Before when we would transcribe it their would be issues, now this has been eliminated.

Sasso: When I went through it, I hit the no, when agreeing to the rules and it let me go anyways.

Raza: This a perfect question. You have to have the nominator with you. And you hit submit and get the wonderful acknowledgement. And what you see on our end. You'll see at the bottom, we see all the stuff and we receive a time stamp exactly. If you were to submit a no, your nomination would be invalid.

We have four docs currently running. It's myself, Shae and the EMC account who can see these documents. No one else. Since we are on the nomination format. We have two forms. The general and the executive. They are almost identical except you need 102 nominators. Here they have the bare bone forms. We are asking that they get 138 encase some of the signatures are from part time students.

Any questions?

I just want to go over the referendum policy. I received from its auxiliary feed board. It's verbatim as what was received for me, except the italicized parts.

The violation notification form is the exact same one as before.

Now for the All Candidates Package

So the position spread, two council meetings ago we received the new seat allocation. I believe that new formula is in effect. These numbers are fairly effective. But for the most part these will be the numbers you see in the upcoming election.

Miss K Orr: Why is their a question mark beside one of the numbers?

Raza: At the end of my spiel I'll asked the senators who will be continuing on. There was a good point raised why are their positions missing. There are still fluctuations there, those positions will com up in the by-election.

Timeline, nominations open Tuesday Jan 26. Umm the rest everyone can see. It's kind of run of the mill. Everything follows our bylaws. And then voting days. There was a good question raised by voting closes Sunday and opens Tuesday. At first it was an error, but it's become a blessing in disguise because we've always had issues with the Monday. We are going to use the Monday to get the messing out.

Polling stations, we've really gone to bar bones as far as personnel time. So what you're approving today is this package except for polling stations and seat allocations.

Eligibility criteria is run of the mill. It's been amended to make sure the documents are submit, and not handed in person.

There is not campaigning outside of the sanctioned period. We are very harsh at this ruling.

Osterberg: That's good, but are you going to be communicating that to all students. In the past people say I am or I am thinking of campaigning and that could be misconstrued.

Raza: Talking about the election and campaigning are too different things. Talking does not fall within this parameter. If you're hosting a website or a blog, that's campaigning.

Osterberg: Will you be communicating that to students, because they may put it up on their facebook. Maybe we should try to get that out.

Raza: To be honest this all candidates package is the same as another package that's been on the website and its been clear all along no campaigning outside of the sanctioned time period.

Facebook, every since the inception of facebook it have been a pain in the ass for the CRO. So you can do three things, you can update your display picture with a poster of your campaign, you can write about it on your wall or your friends wall. And you can update your status once a day.

There is no emails, no notes, you will be disqualified. If someone else hosts a group to vote for you, they are disqualified, but it goes immediately to the review board. As CRO I couldn't regulate the friend, and the candidate was being unduly advantage. We are clamping down on facebook.

Singh: I have a concern about freedom of speech, naturally. To prove that I ask my friend, you're really, and I know what you're saying that the burden of proof is really hard. If you're putting it out there it will disqualify the candidate. I think that is unfair to the candidate and their friends, might leave up a status. I think its casting the net just a bit too wide.

Raza: And that's great, that's something I've heard a lot already. For the candidate that is nervous with facebook, they can sign a pledge.

Osterberg: My concern is the deviousness of other candidates. I'm running against Mohsin and a friend of mine, or I ask a friend of mine to write vote Mohsin for president and he gets disqualified. I've knocked out my opponent.

Raza: Word always gets out and information is free flowing. I'm not too worried. I recognize there could be malicious use.

K Orr: My concern is if, I'm not allowed to email my friends. I'm not allowed to use an inbox. How I'm supposed to communicate, don't update your status to include that.

Raza: It's valid. To honest you'll be able to ask and tease out this ruling. But I don't know how to rule on facebook. We can either do it two ways. We can use it two ways use facebook and on the other hand if we go harsh we could be potentially hurting candidates. We could eliminate facebook.

K Orr: I agree with all of the other things. I think where you're coming from is a really valid place. I just don't agree with the friend thing

Sasso: POI, the one status update a day.

Singh: I understand how hard this is. I think whatever is feasible with facebook is good. But what about answering the question, when people ask, when someone draws the parallel argument of what's the difference between facebook and msn?

Raza: For msn, that's completely private space and it's not as vast a network as facebook. You can't necessarily msg 1300 during one stop. Mainly with myspace, it's not as popular medium. So that's we're not regulating anything. Just cause it's so powerful. You can win or lose, based on facebook.

Mclean: Does it really make that much of a difference. Do we really need to have our fingers in it?

Raza: It's a really valid question, its online voting now, so that's why it's so key to have our hands in this cookies jar. You can do it online and send it out to all of your friends. The voting is online.

Just from council, is the issue, on the non campaign members. Is their general contention on the ruling.

Chair: Let's do a straw poling.

Mcgarragle: Say if I have 100 people on my campaign, that's allowed as long as they're within my campaign team?

Raza: no

6 say it is non-campaign members

Weiler: The first thing that I was going to say. I think this is unworkable and I don't see anyway to say if people want to harm the candidacy. I would like to see if I could get a copy of these rules.

Raza: It's only available online.

Khan: If I list everyone name on voting day would that disqualify them.

Raza: Yes, if that is the major sticking point I can remove that. I will reserve the right to on a case by case basis.

Khan: There is no firm backing, if you go by that rule

Raza: That's why we have our violation notification form, that's why it needs a witness. In previous elections all we have is hearsay. This is as objective as we can make it.

Osterberg: The point is to make it fair to everyone. Why not, simply remove all the restrictions and let it simply let it be a free medium

Raza: It creates an unfair advantage.

Osterberg: If it's an ambitions candidate they can. I think if we apply small regulations, instead of limited such a massive media.

Raza: I think that council should take into account, what they want is merit or popularity based.

A Orr: For example if I were to write on a friends wall, that would show up on the newsfeed.

Raza: You are allowed to write on your friends walls. Facebook limits.

A Orr: If I wrote on separately 500 friends walls, that would show up on everyone's news feeds.

Raza: Facebook limits that.

Kheul: In terms of everything we've done in the past hour, I guess my question is, what is the point of the black out period. Where is the actual unfair advantage. If you want your facebook to be a private, than that's your choice. Perhaps in your determination to run, maybe you should make more facebook friends. I see less regulation and less problems, to include the elections days. Maybe council wants to consider it. You should be preparing for that. I just feel we are getting into regulations and I think its just getting tremendously complicated.

Sasso: I would be in favour in saying no facebook during this election. It would be a massive relief. I think for everyone who went to the elections meeting last year. Our own time, it's just going to be one massive, mental strain on the matter and in the grand scheme of things.

Wouldn't we prefer our officials to meet face to face. Maybe that's how I view campaigning. I think to make it a fair election we say facebook is not allowed for campaigning.

K Orr: I have a question for clarification. I'm wondering what the rulings are going to be clearly vote.

Raza: It's always been tradition that saying go vote today is allowed.

Koutros: I guess I would have to disagree with everyone who says get rid of it. For savy people not having facebook doesn't really matter. I don't think our council should be regulating. There are so many parallels that you could draw. For the record, I'm in favour for completely deregulating facebook.

Mcleans: In respects for times, could we look at other models and how other universities deal with facebook.

Raza: The nature of online voting is what I'm concern with.

Mcleans: Can we look into what they do. If council approves,

Raza: Instead of making this a lengthier discussion I will .

Chair: The issue of facebook, is under current review, it will be brought back and amended.

That being said, I will go through the speakers list, if it has to do with facebook, please withdrawal.

Weiler: I have few issues.

Chair: If it hasn't been presented on yes.

Weiler: Under the eligibility criteria; I was wondering if you could arrive to the meeting, more than ten minutes "without reason" you will be counted as absent.

Chair: is that a friendly?

Raza: Yes

Lalonde: To change that we would have to change the bylaw specifically.

A Orr: I think any limits with place on facebook, that should be considered with any electronic tool. I think it's really unfair to limit one base of internet based campaigning and not others.

Sasso: There is just a concern with the waiting to our next meeting. Will it push back the next meeting because there will be a major conflict with our next council meeting.

Raza: I would need it until February 11. I can make the tweaks as we go up until the all candidates meeting.

Singh: I think that with reason, it needs to be qualified within the discretion. Because everyone is going to say every kind of excuse. While some are legitimate, we have to remember the CRO has ultimate discretion. That has to be explained. Give certain circumstances. However CRO, should have discretion.

Chair: Is that friendly.

Raza: With valid reason?

Singh: That it shows your discretion.

Raza: Duly noted.

The rest is all standard generally campaigning materials. Media affiliation. You are to avoid media affiliation. If you are employed by media you have to suspend.

Weiler: We have a rule that says candidates have to avoid all media?

Chair: Bylaw 80.1.3.3

Weiler: I would just say that, pretty clearly not, saying people should not affiliate with any media. Candidates would be prohibited from doing an interview with the lance. This should be cleaned up to show that people can do interviews with the lance.

Raza: This means if you're a reporter, your affiliation through that means has to be suspended. Say if you're a writer and your product is relying on that, you are allowed to continue as long as your name is removed. By no means are we stopping communication through the newspaper or radio.

Weiler: I don't think that this paragraph is enhanced by the first sentence at all. I just liked to thank you for organizing that stuff with the lance.

Raza: So mister chair, I find that be a friendly amendment.

Chair: Seeing no objection I see it friendly.

Raza: Our minimum costs are the same as previous election. Assuming right now, it's based on these minimum campaign expenditures.

Weiler: How do we go about amending policies.

Chair: Mr. Osterberg?

Osterberg: For policies I think its only two weeks.

Lalonde: We must seek approval by council to approve such policies.

Raza: Slates it's again the same thing. You can only run a slate with the person on the same level.

Osterberg: Policies may be appealed amended by council. There is no time period. All policies must be approved by IPC prior to coming to council.

Raza: Campaign teams, again this is all coming from our policy, Affiliation, you can have no affiliation with any other organization. We encourage everyone to stay within campus limits. All candidates form. And that's really it.

Singh: I have a question about the violation form, but that when you say that when it won't be looked at, if a student who is not involved in the election and they see something, that might be outside of the rules and they send an email to the CRO's office and they don't know about the form. Do you tell them they should fill out a form.

Raza: We don't ignore any emails. If they say they saw a poster. We'd go look at it, if it's something they saw. We'll ask them to fill out a form.

Wieler: Failure to comply with the spirit and purpose of the election struck me as vague.

Raza: This is our catch all. How is someone supposed to mean, email the CRO to find out.

Wieler: This might be pedantic. Can you explain the spirit and purpose of the election.

Raza: We have four definitions. An election that has integrity, that is accessible to all the electorate and is transparent. That's what I construe as the spirit. The voter is able to be an educated voter.

Kheul: Just to back up a little bit when we were discussing who would be participating. I was wondering why you decided not to allow it. A lot of students are in the position where they wouldn't know for sure if they will be eligible. There is a lot going on right at the beginning of year where no one would be in my position. I was wondering if it would be okay to run the res position so someone would be in place all year long.

Raza: We were running on the position, that things change over the summer. If council so wishes we can run res rep now.

Kheul: This would provide we might have someone for the full year.

Osterberg: That would be my concern that would be denying new students the right to run.

Woodrich: If there is an issue if people want to move in with their friends they can vacate the position.

Raza: If council sees fit I can make that a friendly amendment.

K Orr: I completely agree with the sentiment. How many won't be living in Windsor during the four months prior.

Chair: I guess that fair thing to do, is take a straw pole to see who is for it or

Lalonde abstains, otherwise all for.

Raza: The general election, right after we have the society election run, we're having one stop shopping this year. We're going to be doing the same thing as we did in the by-election. They are going to be running at the same time. We are going to keep adding poles every time a society opts in.

K Orr: So I don't know. I don't think that's fair. I think it gives unfair advantage to campaign towards nurses for example.

Raza: But the actual physical poles are relics of the past. The reason we've selected these three buildings are due to traffic.

K Orr: Can I recommend moving the Toldo one into the bookstore.

Khan: I remember a law student being upset about why there wasn't one in the law school building.

Raza: I can't really regulate on how far people want to walk. To be honest we're voting online and to counter act that we have our campaign teams to pull the vote. We are increasing for campaign, and decreasing for polers.

Khan: what's changed.

Raza: Times changed and our budget was in a far better place.

Sasso: The issue of the societies paying money to create a poll station. I understand it would be your employees. If a head of a society says lets place a poling station, and the president is running how is that fair.

Raza: That's why this is deemed as SSS zone, what we did in the by-election we swallowed the cost. We don't have the budget for it this year. It's a reality. People who are involved will always be involved. It's one of those realities.

Sasso: I think it's a fantastic idea to recover costs. I think in general it serves our students in the best matter.

Raza: We are literally charging them for the personal fee.

McGarragle: Sorry to bring back up to facebook. If we were to eliminate that medium. How many pole stations did we have during the by-election in the fall?

Raza: We had five.

McGarragle: and now we're moving to three?

Raza: yes.

McGarragle: I understand that you're saying these campaign teams make all the difference.

What's to say these booths will make a difference. The facebook would encourage electronic voting. Those stations would be a visual reminder to vote. I think the more there are the better chance to have a fair election.

Raza: The majority come from CAW.

McGarragle: If we have those teams and they don't have those booths, yes you can drag someone 5 feet, but can you drag them to another building. Just as a matter of convenience that would work better.

Raza: Honestly it's very valid but it's a budget thing. There are a lot of other means to access the website.

McGarragle: Do the campaign teams encourage people to use their own laptops?

Raza: Yes.

Woodrich: I agree with mcgarragle because of the polling station I would not have voted.

Raza: you make a valid argument. This section will be left open for amendment. Shae does not have the budget to hire more staff. But it's the human hours that really add up that we can't afford.

Lalonde: back tracking to what you said about society fiscal contributions. In a perfect world everyone would be fiscally responsible. We received a request from a society that is already bankrupt. What would say to them?

Raza: This is a service, it's not a right. If it's the finances we can work with them. So I don't think council should be worried about that. If the budget allows we will try to help out.

Osterberg: In a perfect world we would want polling stations in every building. I don't want people to think polling stations is the only form of advertising. There is going to be a lot of advertising. One poling booth will not make all the difference.

7.1 Academic Integrity Report.

Khan: A lot of these are stats from 2007-2008. It is left blank for you to decide how you felt about it. The original plan was to paraphrase it. However I have certain views that have been echoed her before. I think you need to have your own views. How long was it that we worked on the continuous hammering senate meetings. There has been money set aside. It's come up a regular topic. So, on that note they are just waiting to set the scope of the review to the IO. My view is that it's been focused too much on getting students suspend or expelled. There is the perception the ARIO goes out and actively seeks to get students to report on other students. This morning at ten I had a meeting with President Wildeman that he requested there be a town hall. I encourage you to please come out to this one. Anything you want to talk about. One more thing; the way OSAP distributed changed. I was asked by Sasso, to what students are saying. If you could please ask students so I can give feedback to those distributing OSAP. Woodrich: Could you please email us, more than a night in advanced.

Khan: Wednesday Feb. 24 tentatively.

Koutros: I've noticed that there is a standard of copyright infringement on exams. Any violation would be dealt with the academic integrity office?

Khan: Final exams are the property of the profs.

Lalonde: It is my knowledge that document Koutros is quoting is for the AIO's office.

Koutros: Reads document. I don't know where this is coming from.

Lalonde: I believe that it is departmental specific.

Kalaci: I was told it was the VP academic. I don't know if that means anything.

Khan: we will take this information.

Woodrich: Can we please have legal opinion by next meeting?

Khan: There is nothing (our council) so there is nothing they really can do.

Raza: Can we get an MO and from our intellectual property network.

Chair: any further comments or questions.

7.2 Parking update

Osterberg: I got inundated by students about parking problems. The questions we asked are: how many permits sold for the year 2300 were sold for the year. They have 200 more passes than spots. Which is not quite over the standard over sell. We have 1734 spaces. Lot R, not a lot of spaces, is pay and park, but there are student spots. And the faculty spots are not in use and could potentially be covered up. The price tag associated with for a parking structure is unfeasible. This something we're going to continue to discuss with the administration. Not all the spots were full this morning. All the close spots were full.

Sasso: I just want to echo that this is completely unacceptable. As the student purchased the pass at \$288.00. I am furthered outraged I'm going to have to transfers to the all the way to the St. Dennis centre. I would expect that our council send a letter. It is completely unacceptable that 600 students cannot get a parking spot.

Osterberg: Please don't shoot the messenger. Their second point is that it is not a guarantee of the parking spot. The average overlap is usually 25 to 50 percent. They are saying they are not over because its 32% so they think they are still alright. My goal is to take them small feasible changes. Instead of saying it is all not feasible. Small solutions if you guys come up with them, please pass them up to me.

K Orr: I know that they said that were still spots but some people were parking on the street.

A Orr: Can we look into other faculty and staff lots. Can we look at perhaps making them after three or after five making them, student. About the distance of parking. If you walk to the other side of Campbell avenue. It's a ten minute walk to the HR building, where the other proposed parking is. These are the issues that also need to be looked at.

McGarragle leaves 6:08

If there is a way because after five the lots are empty

Lalonde: As we discussed this morning, we need to make sure they are posting maps or emails. The last email I received from parking was in November. I don't think students received enough warning or specific enough warning. We need better communication.

Osterberg: That email was a result of a meeting I was at. We'll definitely work with them to make sure communication gets out way more advanced.

Weiler: I was going to ask what the level of consultation had been. I think we ought to tell them they've been bad because it's bad. I would like also just like to say that this strikes me as ideal time, to encourage using public transit.

Osterberg: How many councillors would like me to be very strongly worded?

Miss Raza: Is there some initiative to create more parking spots?

Osterberg: They have treated it is a cash cow. I have pointed out that we need a parking structure. They talked about doing shuttle system to a lot. They are looking at alternatives. I am asking if there is anything we can do.

Raza: Would it be possible, if students to buy a parking pass and now decided to carpool. Can they do some sort of refund?

Osterberg: I will ask, I can predict the initial answer will be no, but I will push for it. I think their counter will be there are those lots further out.

Ciccone: If there is ever an event on HK all those spots are filled up by the public, is there a way to maintain those spots for students.

Singh: The discussion about the parking structure being cost prohibitive, if you can expressed to them that's very short sighted, if we're going to wait till enrolment is up till we can only provide for 20 of the students. Everything costs money. Secondly, but does walk safe walk to all the off campus parking lots. We should make sure, that they do walk out there and there are enough people.

Osterberg: About safe walk, yes. Two now to the cost prohibitive situation. The university made it very clear said that they would not do it unless the students would carry the cost. There is no way in hell students are going to vote for a 50 dollar hike in their tuition.

Singh: I think that's all well and good, but I think times are changing. If the university plans on growing at all something has to be done. The city bus system is not going to work. I think times are changed and that outcome might be different now.

Woodrich: There is also a very angry and growing facebook group dealing with our parking.

A Orr: I know a lot of students are angry about parking, can we make it so the town hall meeting isn't exclusive about the parking.

Khan: I think that he will take a few questions and then ask that we move on.

A Orr: My concern is that will only be discussed at the town hall meeting.

Weiler: I just want to note, I totally agree with thinking long term. The price of oil keeps going up, and car ownership at our age range is plummeting. Regardless whether we like it mass transit will be used more.

Raza: I wouldn't argue for a parking structure. I wouldn't want to give the university another excuse to raise our tuition. I think if we do, do it, I think the UWSA should look it being run by us.

Osterberg: We did look at this. We would have to have the facilities to take care of it which the university already has. That is something we did look at. The cost associated with actually owning it is scary. Where it would only be a slight additional cost to them.

Raza: I would argue, for alternate transportation to the university.

K Orr: If you were going to request that if they're still going to keep building new buildings, they should make the basements parking. Alternatively I think we need more bikes rights and they are almost always full.

Khuel: In terms of looking at carpool options. Could we possibly taking one of the closer parking lots, where two or more students come together and that would promote carpooling and vehicular traffic.

Osterberg: That is a really interesting idea. They want us to look at us charge faculty even more.

Woodrich: If anyone knows someone who qualifies for work study to research the universal bus pass.

K Orr: Well I really like the idea I don't know if enforcing it.

Osterberg: For them to set up a little guard house. Having something work that booth. It could be possible.

Chair: Any further comments or concerns.

8.0 Question Period

Khan: How many of you find smoking on the campus disgusting?

They are looking at going to smoke free campus. Those of you would like to serve on that committee please let me know. Is anyone interested serving on a smoking committee?

Weiler: What is the commitment?

Khan: About an hour a week.

A Orr: What would an update of vacation and sick days from the executive.

Khan: I'm still positive

Osterberg: I'm even

Woodrich: Positive

Khan: Campbell is positive.

Woodrich: Can we change the timing of our next meeting, because it will fall when the twelve us will be in Markham.

Woodrich: You are giving notice of any council meeting six days in advance. I gave you a schedule of all the dates and times of the years and you approved them. If you approve the change of date we can change it.

Wieler: Are we sending 12 delegates at 300 bucks a head to CFS?

Woodrich: Basically.

Weiler: I just want to express my opposition.

Sasso: At this specific meeting, each person that attends is given one vote. Going to these meetings is very influential. To have 12 people with 12 votes, we would have the ability to shape a fair portion of this.

Saad leaves 6:30

It increases our changes.

Chair: The question on the table can we move the meeting time. If you Woodrich, can bring that up.

Raza: How did we get twelve people going to the CFS. Are we strategizing something? I was under the impression we were going to remove ourselves.

Woodrich: It's not an easy decision to come to. As a body we don't hate them. Feelings aside; the organization doesn't and I think its in our best interest to have people go. The 3000 it will cost us will give us quite a significant return.

Raza: Didn't we not pay our dues to CFS?

Osterberg: Doesn't have to get approved.

Weiler: I think we should have this added to the budget.

K Orr: If there is anyone would like to help up with the campaign.

Osterberg: who is going to CFS?

Connell: Moving on to another issue I signed onto my clew this morning and I couldn't find any of my information from last semester.

Khan: I had a meeting with the president this morning and he was made aware of the issue. What happens is if you register into the new semester. Your final marks would be on the SIS system

Connell: what happens if I want to contest my marks?

Osterberg: I believe what you're saying clew has removed your grades and you don't have access to it anymore.

Sasso: Could one of the executive, when our timetables would be put up in rough draft. Report back to us.

Khan: I'll get it.

Raza: My understanding we don't use clew. A lot of those contributions are student intellectual property. Where do those go? Students should be able to retain all the information that goes on Clew.

Khan: would you be interested in sitting on the clew committee?

Raza: Yes.

Koutros: Do we have any?

Raza: All listservs we regulate that. We control all of that. And I'm going to construe clew to be part of that framework.

Connell: Just say why it's really problematic about getting the marks and that kind of stuff.

Khan: I can't speak to what they will approve. But I can propose that they leave the marks up into the new semester.

Segal: Regarding clew, do professors have to tell you your final mark before SIS?

Khan: No, you only have to know 20 percent before the drop date.

Segal: Are entitled to know what that percentage was?

Khan: You are and you can go ask the prof.

Sasso: Could the council please ask housekeeping to remove the pictures that have been there for 3.

Connell: One little problem, people often times look by here and they look into the room and they don't know what's going on here. So essentially what I want to do is very simple. Just put a paper up on the door, that says. BIRT put up a sheet on the front of the council door that says a council meeting is in session and you are welcome to come in.

MOTIONED: Connell

SECONDED: Woodrich

Khan: I can put this up right now, do you really want it to be a motion.

Osterberg: It will get lost at the end of this year unless it's put in bylaws.

K Orr: I'm against the motion. I would be a lot more receptive if the general population, is invited.

Sasso: I would like to speak against the motion.

Mclean: I would like to speak against the motion because then you would have to make sure you have enough seating.

Osterberg: But we can include it in student pulse.

Lalonde: I would like to speak in favour of the motion because anyone is welcome in here regardless of the space.

Connell: I don't think that this is too much to ask, because it's only sign. We want to promote people coming in here.

Chair: Are there any further questions?

Kalaci: I want to speak in favour of the motion. I think it's a good idea.

BIRT that council put a sheet on the council door that says a council meeting is in session and you are welcome to come in.

Everyone/0/K Orr and weiler abstain

MOTION CARRIES

Sasso: I'm just wondering if we would be able to, if the meeting will be switched.

Chair: After we will return to new business.

Raza: Does committee as a whole, does it inviting them to say and allowing speaking privileges?

Chair: Roberts are suspended but I'm going to still keep order and keep a speakers order.

Sasso: Are minutes still kept. As part or separate?

Chair: The minutes will reflect that it moved to committee as a whole, unless we enter into information that is confidential.

Committee as a Whole

Weiler: There are two separate issues in my mind that have to be talked about here. The first is the way is the way we've come to talking about this; that we want to move the meeting. I'm a little frustrated that we're finding out by this by accident. I find it anti democratic. And the second thing just in terms in actually doing this. I very much looking forward to what the vice president has to say about why this is being done. Just based on what I've heard so far this is a giant mistake and waste of student money. I've heard discussion about not paying anyone. We are already are not paying our fees. I've never been a big fan of CFS. We may be able to stack committees. I would like to note that if the federation, the federation gets the impression that student committee is trying to blindside a committee. The committee is not a rubber stamp committee. Just because we raised something it would not pass. I'm just wondering why we are not putting money towards our own electoral process.

Woodrich: I will take this opportunity to respond to each point. Council was told of this, council was sent an email at least twice. The other eleven are well aware of whats going on. In response to the charge that it's anti-democratic. What can I do to remedy this. What are my reasons, one I have been given non of the contrary for EPC. There has never been so much interest in our external efforts. Many will be attending this for the first time. In response to the charge there is not enough money. That is my travel budget. I cannot spend that money on anything else.

Osterberg: I did receive those emails. That money could not be used anywhere else. That is it as his discretion. If he over spends he has to go council. I think you do raise the one point. I do

see Woodrich points and I like it. It's the one thing, they have to stick their necks out at, at which point they wouldn't have a budget. They have to evaluate that they have to operate with a budget. Everything would shut down. Either approve a budget they don't like. Or call enough meeting which they have no budget for. The long term ramifications, is they already hate us. They've filed, I can't remember the number of harassment complaints. This organization is the absolute worst possible face for students. I can't think of a more blunt operation. The concern about the number of delegates. The long term effects. At least we're making some kind of effort to make some kind of change.

Sasso: I've been labelled by some unknown stranger as the leader of the anti-CFS movement. I went there and I gave the report. We had some experiences there that were quite striking. I want to see change with our interactions with this organization. But spending my Christmas break reviewing their internal documents. I was unable to find any loopholes to break with the CFS. By coming to this meeting we are going to be educating a number of students. We are able to have discussions. We can go out and talk to other schools and maybe start to reason with some of the other schools and promote the change so we don't mind being part of this organization. When it comes down to money. But that is not an issue for us to be discussing.

Raza: Have we made payments for the delegates and it is refundable.

Woodrich: No and today is the final day to amend.

Raza: The question is, are we going to stay with CFS or not. The executive was elected and we do owe them some deference, whatever the logic is. Do we belong we CFS as oppose to ranting during question period. And I would ask Woodrich to send out an email to council and board to see have we will be with CFS or not.

Weiler: On the topic of communication. I have to disagree. There is a fundamental distinction, between saying do you want to come and saying do you want to engage in this strategy. No one except the delegates were told about the extremely large move we are making. I just got to say it's a cute idea. It's just a cute idea. Everyone comes back talking about all the wacky things they would do. We're in the tank with a really large fish and we can't change that fact by whistling really loud about it. I've read papers in other student newspapers that call delegates childish. This is not a climate where people are going want to have conversations about us. To respond to their budget is going to fail. They can amend. Again it's a great king move where they are either are going have to self destruct. We'll just have wasted all this money. I realized we're not the board of governors. They gave our moneys. I really want to know how much money will be left in the budget afterwards. And should we do that. We can't take money out of the equation. I'm not trying to impute negative moments. I wish we had been given more information.

Singh: What I was going say. The idea of the subcommittees and how they work. The twelve delegates will try to be on the one sub committee? How is that possible and how does that works?

A Orr: Speaking from experience what happened was we went into a meeting and when only 4 other people were present as soon as we walked in they were blackedberry texting people. They broke Roberts rule. Unless they have wind of it before hand. What happens is there are two days of these meetings the first day you talk about what goes and what you do and the second day you pass the motion and you have to attend both meetings to be allowed to vote on it. And attend the second meeting where the actual motion will be passed you have to attend the next meeting. They can't call in 60 other people who did not attend the first meeting.

Singh: Do we know the size of the whole delegation.

Woodrich: I have no way of knowing.

Singh: Do you know who came last year.

Woodrich: 4 from each university 8 from the big Toronto schools

Singh: What are our twelve delegates going to do? Are we going in, to say all these negative things? Do we have a thread of suggestions and recommendations. Otherwise we are just making a ruckus.

Woodrich: What our plan is that until they are given a change to look over everything I can't speak for the delegation. The delegation is only formalized at midnight tonight. Is there a long term plan? No not yet.

Osterberg: CFS is very crafty about not sending out information in advance because they don't want people to have people to have plans in advance. We should maybe give it chance. He was given this budget by the board and he was elected by students. I think we should give him a chance to try the strategy. But at least we've tried something. For the time being we are stuck in this organization. If they are successful and this does work we can set up avenues to make the necessary reforms. And if it doesn't work we have 12 people who have seen it and who would start a council to leave CFS potentially.

Mckisic: I agree with Mr. Weiler that we sent people to CFS and they come back with the horrors stories if we send people to CFS and then they come back and they do something. Those people can continue forward with the motion that we started. What we need now is enough people having a negative experience to implement a movement. We've been having negative experiences since the beginning of the year. Something has go to happen because right now we are just stuck in the mud.

Raza: We haven't paid our dues we made ruckus on the last one. Can we make that decision tonight that the 1200 people we represent we want out of the organization.

Singh: Have we considered the possibility that they might try to bar us entry. That being that we haven't paid our dues; or anything to that effect.

Woodrich: The Montreal delegation had to call their lawyer, we'll have two law students with us, so hopefully we won't have to do this.

Singh: The law students might have to look into preparing something. It is entirely possible.

Sasso: There is something in their bylaws that not paying your dues with make it so you're not admitted.

Singh: It's very late in the game. I think we should try our best that the \$4000 and those peoples time is best used.

Lalonde: Speaking just raw number wise 11 people wanted to go and think that's fantastic that there is so much interest. I'm sure it will cost a lot of money but I think a lot of good work can be done. What you're asking Robbie to do is, cut people under the delegation or cut it completely. There is no criteria laid out for who would or would not be able to go. Perhaps we could take this for a learning experience for next time. I think to cut down our limit at the 11 hour does not work.

Keuhl: I think in order for the delegation to function I think we have to give them some rope on thing. On no point I have felt Woodrich is acting out of line. I don't want to receive a daily email telling me what's going through his heard. I think we need to be careful about what we are suggesting.

Osterberg: It is his budget to use as he wishes to use. I think we have to give him that chance if there is a concern about the money aspect. I think as long as the delegates attend all the meetings I think we've gotten our money's worth. I think its broader coverage.

Wieler: On the issue of communication we're not talking about the size of the delegation. If I understood Miss mckisic statements a moment ago, this a small group of people saying they want to remove us from a federation. Its not about the numbers it's about what we expect. Think about all the random bric-a-brac we hear about. We hear a lot every single meeting. To talk about the initiative of blowing up CFS membership. It is an actual responsible. We have to be diligent how we exercise this power. Yes they have mandate but so do we and we can't shrug that off. I just want to get people into the head space. Let's say we have some weird loop holey rule and they hate us all and they just showed up and they tried this....

Sasso: At this point and I don't want it to be taken as admission of guilt I would like to take my name from the list of the group going. Only because I've had the experience of recently going there. Hopefully that will result in saving money. This is so much bigger than just the one meeting. I never saw the meeting as being a major assassination attempt. I saw it as finding someone who thinks like we do. I want to take my name down from there and do believe what we need to do, I think we do need to at our next meeting discuss what council thinks we need to do at our next meeting. I think we need to as councillors figure out what we want to do. I think at our next meeting we need to start moving forward. Regardless of what happens at this meeting. That's the proper next step.

Khan: One of the things I experienced last year is something similar to what's going on. A school did try something along these lines. I was recruited as another student at large. I applaud the naivety of this. The fact of the matter off the floor motions do happen. They are trying to find a way to rectify what you did. This is a great experience to go and see what they do. I guess its naive to expect CFS will change. When one school stands up takes a shotgun and runs away. While it would be great in one way to leave CFS.

Osterberg: I agree with Sasso's comments. Do we want leave? I have motion from council that say don't pay. I think its time for us to have a real discussion and decide whether CFS is in our Councils best interest. Do we want to hold a referendum? We can't do it this year but we can set it in motion. I think the more students know the more than want out. It's time to educate students.

Lalonde: I don't think that I can make the decision with out going. If 11 or 12 people go we have that many experts.

Mckisic: I am not a member of Council, I feel I can say whatever I want. Honestly every few month we go to CFS, and people want to leave and nothing happens. Walking along the fence doesn't work. It would be excellent. I have no problem, sending everyone here. I don't think that 11 people have ever wanted to go to a conference. There was no interest and now we're having interest and then we're slapping it down. I don't see how that's democratic.

Woodrich: The point that I have some multi year strategic plan, there is no plan other than representing our membership. Regardless of the number that attend we will have that many experts. The fact that there isn't a multi year plan council hasn't approved, that is because it doesn't exist. Should we not monitor them and monitor our investment is ridiculous

Koutros: I question that brashness of the decision. I agree with Mr. Weiler. It would be the same as if we passed a motion on CFS tonight... I think we need to figure out exactly what our

relationship is with CFS. I have no problem with this 12 man delegation. I think we need to be going about this in a rational process.

A Orr: I would like to know about the purpose of discussion at this point. We're talking about leaving,

Singh: What are we seeking to accomplish out of this alter format of this meeting. Can we come to an understanding of what we want to come out of this. The first part of my first question.

Mr. Woodrich is this something in your role, do you plan on it being the deciding factor whether you propose to council if we do leave or we don't leave? Is something going to come out of this meeting?

Woodrich: This is not the first meeting that I've attended, it will be the 8th or 9th, nothing has changed for me, will I change my mind? No. I wanted to provide the maximum representation and I thought the best thing that I can do is expose people to it first hand.

Singh: So if I have student not on council, come to me and say, are we going to leave, what do I say?

Woodrich: I would like to make a motion to council to review our membership. I fully recognize the decision is not up to me.

Singh: What I'm trying to say, what I want to know is we haven't paid our dues, what I want to know is, how are we going to come to the decision to pay.

Osterberg: What board has said is that we withhold payment until the end of year. I would suspect that this isn't going to be the tipping point for robbie's opinion. I suspect that it's finally going to be time to have that discussion. Every year I hear people complain about CFS. And council never discusses. I think its finally time for us to decide if we're in their or not. I think its finally time to make that decision.

Khan: This an appropriate use of the budget. He's spending for travel and conference. We just state a general amount. That is perfectly legitimate. I seen some reports of local 49 being refered to as childish in other media. In fact in this process nothing has been broken. No rule have been broken. Maybe it was not the best of ideas, to leave it the last minute to let us know that council is going.

Weiler: Basically what I was hoping to come out of this discussion what the policy decision is here. Whether or not we endorse it. It seems kind of strange that well CFS is definitely something to behold. I think this experiential torture, it's not really something student union should be doing. The vice president has already said what's going to happen. Everyone is coming back spitting nails. Its foregone conclusion that everyone is going to come back pissed off and ready to de-federate.

Kheul leaves 8:00pm

I think that our plan is to make 11 people sufficiently angry and they are going to vote de-federate. Think that's a plan that I also disagree.

Lalonde: Again to reiterate I do not want to hear the bullshit out of everyone else's mouth. I cannot make a \$180 000 based on hear-say. I want everyone to be able to go see it for themselves and have the evidence for themselves.

Woodrich: In the response to the point about students coming back angry. I can't do the delegates thinking for them. I'm not that good.

Raza: I would motion move out of committee of whole

Osterberg.

It's been over four hours and I think everyone is fully aware

Unanomous.

New business

Weiler: I would like to make a motion

That the VPUA direct the delegation going to CFS not to hijack any of the committees.

MOTIONED: Weiler SECONDED: Singh

Osterberg: I would like to speak against. I don't like the wording, the VPUA has no control the actions is impossible. That's an impossible thing to do. Making a motion he has no power over.

Lalonde: For the motion. I don't give a dam, I just want to go.

Weiler: Well of course Mr. Woodrich does not have the power to control people minds. He does have a mandate and he has the power to select his delegates. I don't think this motion is unreasonable.

Raza: I want speak against the motion, I think there is a greater, either we endorse or we don't.

6/3/6

The motion passes

Woodrich: BIRT that the meeting be held on jan21 be held on 28, same time and place.

I think that in the spirit of democracy we should hold it in a time that isn't during the CFS meeting.

Osterberg: I agree, we will have having problem with quorum.

Motion to amend to cancel the 21

Secoded by Singh

Osterberg: Simply throwing it out there as an option.

Raza: I would like to speak against the motion because of the election. We need the roster finalized.

Sasso: I also wanted to speak against the motion.

1/0 /Abstains Woodrich

Chair: we return to the original.

Khan: I'm going to speak against it, to say benefit 11 people, to people who have schedule things. So someone's losing out. I doubt it is the ones willing to come here.

Lalonde: I would also like to speak against it.

Weiler: What are our options, what has to be done by when.

Raza: Council has to approve the rooster for approval, between the 21 and 26.

Koutros: Senate cocus would be able to meet within that time.

Singh: I think we're more not hear today, the fact that the happens at the same time is unfortunate, either way it's going to cause people to be absent for various reasons. One way or another.

Osterberg: With what Raza has said we definitely have that. You have to send proxies.

Lalonde: Will this count against our attendance.

Osterberg: I will not count it. As long as you guys please send proxies.

Chair: Any further discussion?

Woodrich: Whereas that the meeting be moved...

1/9/Astains sasso and a orr

Motion carries.

Sasso: Be it resolved that Canadian Federation of Council vote on further membership.

Seconded by Woodrich

Khan: may I make a suggestion you direct that to EPC. Let EPC make a recommendation.

Chair: Is that friendly?

Sasso: No.

Wieler: I would like a motion amend that it start at 4:30

Seconded by Lalonde

Weiler: I have to be at a class until 4:30.

Connell Abstains.

Lalonde: can this be disseminated to our regular membership.

Osterberg: Will send it out in the student pulse.

Khan: Were you willing to clarify why?

Sasso: I feel this is a matter that everyone should be their own efforts forward.

Khan: I am for the motion I was just going to say that EPC that it would be doing a more indepth analysis. I'm not asking council not to do their own research.

Osterberg: I think on way or they other it has to come to council. What EPC will do is the more in-depth and will bring a more in-depth review. I don't believe that council would stop that recommendation.

Be it resolved that UWSA council votes on continued CFS membership on the February fourth membership. Be it further resolved the meeting start at 4:30.

Khan: The amendment is to EPC make a recommendation upon further review on the feb. 4 meeting

Seconded by Osterberg

11/4/0

Chair: anymore discussion.

Sasso: BIRT Uwsa council votes on continued CFS...

13/2/0

10.0 Adjournment

Khan

Seconded by Orr

13/2/0

8:30