

CASG Executive Meeting  
2010-11-09

Attending: Heather, Guy, Paroma, Taryn, (Alex Golovko, partially)

### General Reports

- Paroma
  - o Just held coordinator meeting
    - Limited turn-out
    - Most have been attending their faculty meetings
    - Minutes from coordinator meeting were approved
  - o Remind reps that group photo will be taken for the website at the next meeting ... camera will be needed for this operation
  - o Spot filling process for empty rep seats has begun
    - Coordinators are recruiting reps through their faculty connections
- Guy
  - o Started academic integrity class talks
    - Delroy kicked it off yesterday
    - Disappointing response from professors re: allowing us to present class talks
  - o Senate meeting report
    - Closed session: approved graduates
    - Open session:
      - Sam Heaton (as CUSA rep, proxying for Alex Sirois), presented emergency motion
      - President Runte, the chair, ruled it out of order
      - Sam challenged her ruling
      - Vote held to either uphold or overturn her ruling: simple majority needed
        - o 24 upholding
        - o 18 overruling
      - Discussion of whether requirements for emergency motion were met
  - o Various reports given
  - o Keeping up on academic issues, to be ready for any necessary campaigns
    - NAVITAS
      - Will be watching to see if it comes up at Senate
      - Will bring it up at next CASG meeting, wants to suggest CASG adopt a mandate of opposing NAVITAS
        - o Doesn't feel a private corporation is best way to improve Carleton's international student portfolio
        - o SFU experience vs. U of Manitoba

- Why the disparity in comparisons with Carleton?
      - Concerned with process of selection of students for the working group
        - Alex Golovko has not yet heard back about why his application was ignored
        - Unhappy with the way students haven't been included in the decisions about the working group formation
- Taryn
  - Working with Meera's help on budget
    - Having some difficulties, because she doesn't have access to all past info, having trouble getting a hold of Matt Dick to get the info she needs
  - Also, trying to get the process started for collecting our levy from the school
  - Contacted Duncan Watt today, he's forwarded her inquiry to someone else, she's hoping to hear back within a day or two
  - Honorariums: assuming budget passes, honorariums will be given out in the following intervals:
    - Execs: 800-600-600
    - Coordinators: 250-250
  - Business cards are in!
  - Waterlife
    - Getting more info on Guy's \$189 payment to Waterlife in the summer so that he can be properly reimbursed, as receipt has been lost
    - Called today, apparently last payment was \$49, so that's how much of it he's been reimbursed for so far, in addition to the other things for which receipts were provided
    - Guy going to call and figure out where the difference is
  - Spending
    - Better to purchase things via than just spending and being reimbursed later
    - Have agreement with GSA to pay by cheques (Paroma will confirm this)
    - Looking into buying bulk printer paper through the school
- Guy: Sidebar
  - Observation about Oct 27<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - Exec were in disagreement, discussion was a bit out of hand, lack of a clear idea of who was in charge at the meeting
  - Notes that at the Senate meeting, all the exec voted in a block, and it showed a clear sense of leadership and consensus
  - Should plan position on motions ahead of time, need to enter meeting with a clear idea of each other's thoughts
  - Execs displayed a lack of leadership

- Also notes that this mostly occurred because of the unexpected emergency motion, which was beyond our control
  - Discussion:
    - In retrospect, we perhaps should've expected some discussion of the issue to come up, should have discussed the issue beforehand to a) come to a consensus, b) have an idea of what to expect in the meeting
    - It's pointed out that if we had done that, Guy's opinion would likely have been lost to exec majority
    - Idea of an exec majority being questioned on an issue this contentious, about an issue, not just policy or procedure
    - All agree that we should have greater discussion on issues before next meeting, develop an approach to issue that is in fitting with CASG mandate
- CASG Meeting – Oct 27<sup>th</sup>, issue of emergency motion
  - Alex notes that a few of his TAs have asked him about the strike and our stance on the issue
  - Quick summary of the issue regarding the motion (including excerpt from email sent to the chair/exec by Guy on Tuesday, November 5<sup>th</sup>):
    - At the meeting, emergency motion introduced to give express CASG formal support for unions CUASA, CUPE 2424 and CUPE 4600 in their bargaining agreement and undertake a campaign to evaluate impact of privatization on the academic experience at Carleton University/pursue academic amnesty for students in the event of a strike.
      - Voted: For: 33 Opposed: 12, include on agenda (2/3 vote required: passed)
      - Long debate
      - Voted: For 21, Against 20 to pass the motion
        - (Chair was misinformed, thought 2/3 vote required to pass, however, only simple majority is required.)
      - Issue: Can chair's ruling be overturned if it was incorrect due to error? Was procedural mistake made in allowing the motion onto the agenda?
    - Summary of Debate:
      - Under Senate rule of order number seven, e) stipulates that a two-thirds majority of those present must vote in favour of waiving the requirement for a ten day notice period for a motion that is given without proper notice (i.e., an emergency motion). It does not, however, specify that a two-thirds majority is required for the motion

to pass once it is debated on the floor, and Brian Mortimer has been quoted in the Charlatan (referring to the motion at senate) saying that only a simple majority is necessary for the motion to pass. Presumably, this means that the motion passed at our last meeting.

- Furthermore, it is pointed out that b) within rule seven also may be unfulfilled. It states that the motion must respond to circumstances that have developed *after* the date for proper notice. Normally this would be ten days prior to the meeting, but the CASG Constitution in section VII.2.1 clearly states that a motion of policy requires two days' notice to be distributed to council. Given that there were no developments relating to the motion within the 48 hours before the meeting, argument is made that a procedural error took place in placing the emergency motion onto the agenda since it did not satisfy this requirement. Therefore, whether the vote passed is irrelevant because it shouldn't have been allowed onto the agenda
- Counter-argument:
  - Because the 2/3 vote passed to allow on the agenda, strict adherence to the other requirements is less relevant
  - Not every requirement under section 7 of senate rules of order was asked about at the meeting. Chair thought it was a relevant issue and told council to vote to decide whether they thought it was an emergency by voting for or against its discussion
  - The vote of whether to pass the motion gives us a stronger mandate for action than a debatable (non-voting) requirement in allowing motion onto agenda
  - Also, argument made that passing of motions re: strike by other student governments, in addition to the ongoing strike vote of CUPE 4600, the union that arguably impacts students most directly
  - Thus, motion should be considered passed, because the nature of the two mistakes made (procedural error in allowing onto agenda, and misruling of fail instead of pass, are

different in that that bear a different aim, one more significant than the other.

- Also argument on whether supporting this issue is something members of the exec should be supporting, argument that CASG has traditionally not taken sides in any administration-related conflict, especially when unions are involved
    - Mentioned that past executives also questioned supporting the motion because it is outside scope of CASG, reverses precedents
    - It's noted the President is aware of the organization's history and likely opposition this motion would've encountered in previous years
    - Argument that the terms being negotiated will potentially impact academics at Carleton University, that academic amnesty is important, making this an academic issue... debated this for a bit
  - Suggestion that we leave the ruling as is, but make a general announcement to students that they can drop by and ask us questions, voice opinions about the strike, take an approach of just making students more informed ... still, a decision on the motion will be asked about by councilors
  - Unable to come to decision, our discussion is hindered because we don't have a copy of the motion question at the meeting with us, and are working off memory and notes from the meeting. Search through CASG policy documents, conclude that the executive committee doesn't have the authority to overrule the chair
  - Decide to contact Emile for his opinion and ask Brian Mortimer (clerk of the Senate) for his opinion, due to his expertise in working with the Senate Rules of Order
    - Will meeting next Tuesday in CASG office at 7pm
- Meeting Adjourned
  - Nov. 11 update:
    - Discussed with Brian Mortimer, ruled that if the if the correct number of votes are received for passing the motion, then regardless of a simply mistaken ruling, the motion is considered passed.