

SOGS COUNCIL MEETING APPROVED MINUTES

May 28, 2009
6:09 – 9:30 p.m.

North Campus Building, Room 117

Interim Speaker: Rebecca Feldman

Recording secretary: Olga Sauer

1. Reception and Ratification of Agenda

Ratified

2. Announcements

Speaker elections will be held next month. Anyone interested in becoming speaker should contact Rebecca (sogs.speaker@uwo.ca) or the SOGS office (sogs@uwo.ca). Health and Dental opt out applications for the summer term must be submitted to the SOGS office no later than tomorrow.

3. President's Address

Please see Appendix A

4. Reception and Ratification of the SOGS Council Minutes of April 30, 2009

Page 7 – D. Dechene – any major changes to the budget will be sent back to committee for consideration.

Page 8 – D. Jacques – level of expenditure is a historical anomaly.

Page 11 – J. Meyer – no. I thought it wasn't fiscally responsible...

– D. Jacques – renovations motion was approved before the legal bill came in. Jonathan is being overly cautious – I think the money should be spent.

– J. Meyer – Council decided. ... should not be tight but I wanted to be fiscally responsible.

Page 13 – S. Beasley - what is the President's beer preference? – Strong Bow

– R. vanGalen reported that the UWO budget was passed and that given the circumstances thought the budget was well formulated.

Page 15 – A. Ratcliffe – debate should be rational and not emotional: went too far on both sides, intimidating

Page 18 – Add: Quorum was lost and a motion to adjourn meeting was called.

Abstentions – 2

Ratified

5. Orders of the Day

a. Motions Arising from the President

none

b. Motions Arising from Other Committees

BCC

Whereas the AGM requested that the BCC review the requirements for inclusion in the AGM agenda and council package.

Whereas the BCC recommends that all motions be attributable to a member BIRT the following requirements for inclusion in the AGM agenda be inserted into the Bylaws

15.2.5 Business for a General Meeting must be submitted 7 business days prior to the meeting by a Society Member

- a) electronically, from a UWO e-mail address, or;
- b) by a written, signed submission to the Society Office.

15.2.6 The Society is not bound to circulate any material in a meeting agenda deemed by the Speaker, to be

- a) false; or
- b) pertaining to sensitive legal or fiscal negotiations currently in progress.

Moved: M. Burrell (Computer Science)

Seconded: J. Meyer (VP Finance)

J. Meyer – good motion

R. Telfer – should be a collective decision; doesn't believe Speaker is necessarily a lawyer and therefore doesn't have the necessary knowledge to make these decisions. There is no such thing as neutrality. Decision should be left to the Executive. 15.2.6 is problematic.

J. Meyer – Speaker chairs the meeting. It would be too slow if everything was to be checked with the Executive. He/she can probably detect what could prove to be problematic.

J.R. Caughlin – Point of information – Is the Speaker not supposed to be impartial?
Speaker – yes, I am impartial.

J.R. Caughlin – Speaker's face is showing emotion, should be more poker faced.

A. Ratcliffe – 15.2.6 – considering the past events, decisions shouldn't be made by one person. The Speaker should okay package and then it should go to Executive before being published.

S. Beasley – ultimately one person will be responsible – maybe add "Speaker, in consultation"

S. Feder – would it have to be unanimous?

Amendment -

Moved – J.R. Caughlin (Education)

Seconded – A. Ratcliffe (Geography)

15.2.6 The Society is not bound to circulate any material in a meeting agenda deemed by the Speaker, in consultation with the Executive, to be

D. Jacques – we never had a problem before, doesn't need to be written into the bylaws; there is a separation between Speaker and Executive. The Speaker organizes Council meetings. This was an anomaly. A separation between the two is important. Speaker should be independent.

K. Penev – agree with Duane, perhaps it should also be looked at by someone from the Executive.

A. Ratcliffe – it's not about the past. If it's in the bylaws, it would be a preventative safety measure.

R. Telfer – support for amendment, but isn't strong enough. Prevents Speaker from having undue power. By consulting the broader management group, would ensure accuracy and that it is not malicious.

J. Meyer – Executive would only be consulted when Speaker finds something abnormal.

S. Celetti – agree with Jonathan.

D. Dechene – against motion – keep in mind Agenda isn't binding until ratified.

A. Ratcliffe – Call the question.

Seconded – R. Telfer

Abstentions - 7

Question called

Yes – 12
No – 31
Abstentions – 11 (J. Miller, A. Delong)
Amendment fails

Main motion debate
J. Meyer – Call the question.
Seconded – D. Jacques
 Yes – 50
 No – 4
 Abstentions – 7
 Question called
Main motion as presented
Yes – 40
No – 4
Abstentions – 23 (J. Miller)
Passes

BIRT the following requirements for inclusion in the Council Mail-out be inserted into the Bylaws

15.3.3 Business for a Council Meeting must be submitted 7 business days prior to the meeting by a Department Councilor or Executive of the Society

- a) electronically, from a UWO e-mail address, or;
- b) by a written, signed submission to the Society Office prior to the submission deadline.

15.3.4 Members of the Society wishing to submit business for consideration at council must do so through their department representative or the Society Executive

15.3.5 The Society is not bound to circulate any material in a 'Council Mail-out' deemed by the Speaker to be

- a) false; or
- b) pertaining to sensitive legal or fiscal negotiations currently in progress.

Moved – M. Burrell
Seconded – D. Jacques

K. Pisters – what does “calling the question” mean
Speaker – it means you have heard all sides of the question and nothing new is being presented.
S. Beasley – do you need a majority to is 2/3 required to call the question.
Speaker – a majority is needed to call the question.

BIFRT the appended templates be used as the basis for written submissions to the Society Office and be published

- a) future mail-outs; and
- b) on the SOGS website.

Moved – M. Burrell
Seconded – D. Jacques
M. Burrell – reasonable template
D. Jacques – good companion

R. Telfer – Amendment
Seconded – K. Dunn
 Templates are provided as a guide.

R. Telfer – having gone through bylaws many times, it may be that wording is problematic

D. Dechene – template shows what is required, not necessary to use the paper.

J. Meyer – should not have to use the paper, but it's good to have.

S. Beasley – good to use the templates

A. Ratcliffe – agrees with using templates as a guide

S. Celetti – Call the question

Seconded – A. Ratcliffe

No – 3

Abstentions – 4 (D. Jacques, J. Miller)

Question called.

BIFRT the appended templates be provided as guides for written submissions to the Society Office and be published

No – 5

Abstentions – 11 (D. Jacques, J. Miller)

Amendment passes

Main motion

Abstentions – 6 (J. Miller)

Motion passes

BIFRT the bylaws be renumbered as required.

A. Ratcliffe – what does it mean to renumber bylaws?

Speaker – this allows the BCC to renumber the bylaws for consistency.

Abstentions – 1

Passes

Health Plan

Whereas the current Health Plan Contract with StudentWise expires at the end of the claim year (August 31, 2009),

Whereas the Health Plan Committee has spent the winter term reviewing proposals from four brokers, and,

Whereas the Health Plan Committee has voted to enter into a one-year contract with Student Wise for the 2009-2010 year,

BIRT Council approve the Health Plan Committee's decision.

Moved – J. Jiang

Seconded – J. Meyer

J. Jiang – Health Plan Committee is recommending the continuation of the current health plan. We are hoping to have on line opt outs for September.

J. Meyer – the committee worked hard in making their decision. There was lots of debate over which broker to go with. The majority voted to stay with the current broker.

R. Telfer – supports the decision of HPC. One of two people who had reservations due to the allocation of surplus money at the end of the year. Campbell & Company (C&C) split any surplus 50/50; the other company all surplus stays with us. People wanted continuity.

M. Burrell – what does the StudentWise contract give that the others didn't?

M. Andrighetti – same question

J. Caughlin – will it cost more?

J. Meyer – the cost between the plans is very close with only minor differences in benefits: C&C is the current broker and Morneau (runner up) was the previous broker - profit sharing, non-for-profit/profit. With Morneau, at the end of the year any surplus would come back to SOGS, but if there is a deficit, we must repay. With C&C, surplus is divided 50/50 and any deficit is forgiven. Currently, don't have a good proven model for our plan. Hard to meet everyone's needs, may be better once we have a more stable model; service has gone through the roof, if we run a deficit, it won't cost us any more.

S. Beasley – how much will it actually cost?
J. Meyer – the worst case scenario was budgeted for.
S. Feder – more clarification is needed so that council isn't responsible for the deficit.
R. Telfer – attended all but one meeting, criteria for good plan. No changes to exciting plan.
J. Caughlin –we are not showing HPC confidence by being critical

S. Beasley – Amendment
BIFRT the HPC submit a comprehensive report for discussion to the June Council meeting.

Seconded – J. Meyer

S. Feder – is there a specific deadline that needs to be met?

S. Beasley – Council is agreeing but wants to get more information for next meeting.

A. Ratcliffe – same

No – 1

M. Maika – Amend motion to read “broker” not StudentWise.

R. Telfer – Seconded

S. Celetti – put StudentWise in brackets

Whereas the current Health Plan Contract with StudentWise expires at the end of the claim year (August 31, 2009),

Whereas the Health Plan Committee has spent the winter term reviewing proposals from four brokers, and,

Whereas the Health Plan Committee has voted to enter into a one-year contract with Student Wise for the 2009-2010 year,

BIRT Council approve the Health Plan Committee's decision.

BIFRT the HPC submit a comprehensive report for discussion to the June Council meeting.

No - 0

Abstained – 1

Carries

c. **Other Motions**

Rebecca Feldman

BIRT the Secretary be permitted to record council meetings for the purposes of verifying the minutes.

Moved: M. Burrell

Seconded: J. Meyer

R. Feldman – to ensure accuracy of minutes

J. Meyer – needed t ensure accuracy

M. Kao – can recording be stopped if someone doesn't want to be recorded?

Speaker – yes

M. Burrell – Amendment

BIFRT the audio recording be destroyed afte the minutes have been ratified.

Seconded – J. Meyer

No – 0

Abstained – 1

Main motion

No – 1

Abstained – 2

VP Finance

Whereas Council is aware of the billing error by the Health Insurance Broker, BIRT Council approve the payment of \$9,033.21, as per our agreement.

Moved: J. Meyer

Seconded: S. Beasley

S. Beasley – looked at different scenarios, this was the best.

R. Telfer – opposed to motion, as a matter of principle, but not strongly. This was a consequence of incorrect information provided by broker. Legal advise told us that there was no need to pay for their error. In order to avoid legal action, VP Finance is proposing this motion. Act of good faith in our continuing association.

No – 0

Abstention – 3

6. Executive/Committee/Councillor Reports

a) President

A. Ratcliffe – concern about Ivey students joining SOGS

R. Telfer – our Constitution specifically excludes business administration students. The Constitution will need to be amended in order to accept them.

A. Ratcliffe – why were they excluded?

R. Telfer – TA union was part of SOGS and this didn't sit well with Business students, therefore they created their own association.

ii) VP Academic

M. Davenport sends regrets – any questions, contact her via email.

iii) VP External & Communications

Skills Development Meeting in Toronto – anyone interested in attending should contact S. Chowdhury.

Equity Committee needs members

GSIC – CFS motion is being reviewed

Will call meeting in June

S. Beasley – no trivia contest question in Newsletter – will there be two next month?

J. Caughlin is on Equity committee but has not been contacted.

D. Dechene – November/December only 3 people attended – difficulty with scheduling

K. Penev – who is maintaining website? Chowdhury will be updating next week.

iv) VP Finance

Both committees are working on policies.

S. Beasley – what is the French fry situation at the Grad Club?

J. Meyer – due to UWO regulations, deep fryers can't be used on the patio. Fryers will have to be purchased indoors.

v) VP Student Services

IGSIC is planning a party for international students on June 20 at 5 pm. The dinner will be free. Committee needs more members.

Dayplanner – President is working very hard on editing the dayplanner. It should be ready to go to press in June.

Spring Party is on Saturday.

Health Plan Committee has been meeting and the new plan is ready for implementation in September. Opt outs are due tomorrow.

J. Meyer – welcome to new Executives.

vi) **Disabilities Commissioner**
 K. Hayes reported that there were no meetings this month. She continues to respond to questions/concerns that are directed to her. Will submit a report for next month's package.
 Hayes would encourage anyone interested in running for Commissioner next month to contact her for more information.

v) **Councillor Reports**
 A. Ratcliffe – sits on UWO Parking and Traffic committee – if anyone has concerns, bring them to her attention.

Speaker's Ruling

D. Kanas – are written reports required?

Speaker – no they are not required, they can be presented orally

7. Elections

Candidates presented as block by President

Request was made to separate individuals.

A. Ratcliffe – great to have so many people wanting to get involved

D. Jacques – because BCC has been working together for a while, it would be counterproductive to bring in such a large number of new people at one time. Committee should grow slowly.

R. Telfer – our process is to nominate and ratify candidates to Committees. By adding more people, more can be accomplished.

G. Bardwell – happy that there are people who want to join GSIC, but concerned about a "clubhouse" on some committees

S. Beasley – is there a policy for committee number limits? If not, perhaps BCC can look into it.

J. Meyer – we ratify, but it is up to the Chair to decide who should sit on committee.

People should show up, meet, show interest then be ratified. If adding turn over all at once, productivity will be lost.

R. vanderZanden – How are chairs nominated? (A) currently elected by Committee.

D. Jacques – a review of committees is being formulated already.

A. Ratcliffe – point of order – people have brought in lists all the time.

Speaker – request to separate by committee

Caroline Bennett-AbuAyyash – BCC vanderZanden)	Yes – 11	Abstained – 2 (D. Jacques, R.
Kate Dunn – BCC	Yes – 13	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Ruby Nadler – BCC	Yes – 13	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Danielle Hryniewicz – BCC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 2 (D. Jacques, R. vanderZanden)
Victoria Sit – BCC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 2 (D. Jacques, R. vanderZanden)
Giacomo Degiorgio – GSIC	Yes – 9	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Matthew Hayes – GSIC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Kyle Paul – GSIC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Ryan vanderZanden – GSIC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Dan Dechene – GSIC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Jonathan Meyer – GSIC	Yes – 11	Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)
Shahram Amirnia – IGSIC	Yes – 13	
Kai Pisters – Policy	Yes – 13	

A. Ratcliffe – University Council of Research Ethics – (D. Jacques to check to be sure that G. Keller isn't representing SOGS).

Sauer expressed concern that SOGS nominate candidates for Senate positions, at the request of the University Secretariat, and then other people are elected to the positions and SOGS isn't notified. D. Jacques explained that there is a Senate Nominating Committee that considers names that are put forward and make the appointments.

8. New Business

J. Meyer – Business Administration Ph.D. Students

Whereas the Business PhD's have voted to join with SOGS,
Whereas SOGS's constitution excludes this group from membership,
"Section 1: Full Membership

1. The requirements for full membership of the Society shall be
1. registration in the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies of The University of Western Ontario as a full - time graduate student (excluding those registered in graduate studies in the Faculty of Business Administration)."

Whereas waiting until the AGM will take a long time.

BIRT council direct the BCC to construct the constitutional and bylaw amendments necessary to include Ivey PhD students as members in our constitution,
BIFRT council call a general meeting for August 12th, 2009, with the sole purpose to amend the membership criteria of the constitution upon the release and approval of the BCC's change to the constitution.

(The constitution requires that the BCC respond within 6 weeks, which means a potential delay of 2 council meetings. The August 12th date gives the executive a chance to meet between the July council meeting and the General meeting to plan it.)

Moved: J. Meyer

Seconded: Ryan vanderZanden

R. vanderZanden – there is no reasons to exclude these students, if they want to join SOGS.

K. Penev – how many people will be needed for a General Meeting? – (A) 22

S. Beasley – How many students in the Ph.D. program? – (A) 68 – 2 councillor positions

D. Dechene – quorum for AGM was 39

K. Penev – will this change the number of councillor positions that are assigned to departments now? (A-JM) – there is a formula that is used in calculating the number of councillor positions. The optimum number is 120 positions – take number of students in the department/faculty and calculate the number in proportion to the total number of students.

D. Kanas – why just Ph.D.'s and not MBA's too? (A-JM) – the two groups are very different from each other. PhD's have to do everything for themselves. This would be more efficient for them.

D. Kanas – will it still exclude MBAs from Constitution? (A) – yes

2/3 vote required

Abstentions – 2 (D. Jacques)

Passes

Whereas the Speaker collects agenda items from Councilors, Executive, guests, Graduate Senators, SOGS Commissioners and all other relevant parties, and

Whereas council is chaired by the Speaker and,

Whereas online publication of meeting minutes that have not been ratified may pose liabilities to the Society and certain members,

BIRT the assembly, editing and distribution of the council package/meeting agenda and associated material to councillors be solely the responsibility of the Speaker and the SOGS Office Manager,

BIRT the council package be published online with the approval of the Executive members after the minutes have been ratified.

BIFRT the BCC recommend bylaw amendments to codify these resolutions.

Moved: J. Meyer

Seconded: D. Dechene

D. Dechene – Motion addresses earlier concerns. Recommends adoption.

D. Jacques – already attached 4 times – withdraw for now.

J. Meyer – withdrew motion

No – 1

Abstentions – 1

Motion withdrawn

Whereas in the past several months there has been debate in Council regarding instituting policies surrounding sending of emails to councillors, and

Whereas there is accountability in the process of mass emails when it passes through the Office Manager via approval of all SOGS Executive members.

BIRT Council recommend to the BCC to amend the bylaws pertaining to mass e-mails, with the exception of the council package, to members of council so that they can only come from the Office Manager via approval of the SOGS Executive.

BIFRT the BCC provide a guideline for consequences if these bylaws are violated.

BIFRT the BCC recommend bylaw amendments to codify this resolution.

Moved: J. Meyer

Seconded: G. Keller

D. Jacques – this has already been thought through in Executive meetings.

R. Telfer – wasn't there a motion to BCC

Speaker – hard to draft something when there is little direction

R. Telfer – refer motion to BCC

K. Dunn – seconded

J. Caughlin – consequences are needed if policy not adhered to.

R. Telfer – already a policy – then should be cleaner – refer to committee to define “mass email”

J. Meyer – do we have to vote or debate sending motion to BCC. BCC reacts to Council direction, we are asking BCC to formulate what is already happening.

J. Caughlin – point of information – does this hold enough direction to work?

Speaker – Council should say what they want in general terms, then BCC will codify.

Yes – 0

Abstained – 8 (D. Jacques, S. Celetti)

J. Meyer - Motion to Amend

BIRT Council recommend that the BCC amend the bylaws pertaining to mass e-mails, with the exception of the council package, to members of council so that they can only come from the Office Manager via approval of the SOGS Executive.

Seconded: A. George

No – 0

Abstained – 1 (D. Jacques)

Carried

S. Celetti – will we define mass emails?

Speaker – BCC can be directed to do that.

R. vanderZanden – consequences were not included

Addition to main motion

S. Beasley –

BIFRT the BCC provide a guideline for consequences if these bylaws are violated.

Seconded: J. Meyer

No – 1

Abstained – 7 (J. Miller)

Carried

M. Kao – are email addresses available on line?

S. Celetti - yes, through Western Directory

M. Kao so, if someone wants to look up all emails that can be done?

J. McLachlan - addresses can be removed from Western Directory.

Yes – 31

No – 1

Abstained – 3

Passes

Geoff Bardwell – wanted Council to know about problems with GSIC. He expressed concern with the lack of meetings and important information regarding CFS. If more members join GSIC, then maybe the committee might be able to get things done.

A. Ratcliffe – you nominated yourself to be Chair?

G. Bardwell – Rick Telfer was the Chair, but when he took on his new role, VP External became interim Chair. There have been no meetings since March, so self-nominated as Chair, to take on the responsibility, but still didn't get a response from VP.

Motion to adjourn (9:15)

Moved – J. Meyer

Seconded – K. Pisters