CALL TO ORDER at 5:11 PM

1. ROLL CALL

Quorum was determined to be present.

2. CHAIR’S REMARKS

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

   MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: A01
   
   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be amended to discuss a motion to establish solidarity with sexual assault survivors.

   Moved: Corey Seconded: Kaitlynne

   MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: A01 CARRIED

   MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: A02
   
   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be amended to limit debate to 2 minutes, and to allow 3 people for and 3 people against for discussion in each motion.

   Moved: Dan Seconded: Corey

   Dan: There’s a lot to cover in the agenda, anything that can be done can be done in a 2 minute span of time and limits rambling.

   MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: A02 CARRIED

3. COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

   MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: M01
   
   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of the October 23, 2014 Special General Meeting be accepted.

   Moved: Rhiannon Seconded: Corey

   MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: M01 CARRIED
MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: M02

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of the February 25, 2015 Special General Meeting be accepted.

Moved: Kaitlynne Seconded: Kasey

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: M02 CARRIED

5. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

The Executive Committee reviewed some of the activities of the Union for the 2015-16 term.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: E01

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the powerpoint is circulated instead of executive presentations, and executive members will take questions later in the interest of time.

Moved: Kathleen 2nd: Corey

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: E02 CARRIED

6. MOTIONS SERVED WITH NOTICE

A. Motion to Amend the Union Bylaws

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM N01

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the current Union bylaws be repealed and replaced by the draft bylaws as circulated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT for the 2016-2017 year, the following process be used to fill Councillor positions:

- The following Councillors shall be appointed by the Faculty or Community Society representing that particular group:
- Twelve Faculty Representatives, with one representative from each of the following faculties:
  - Faculty of Agriculture
  - Faculty of Architecture and Planning
  - Faculty of Arts and Social Science
  - Faculty of Computer Science
Seven Community Representatives, with one representative from each of the following Communities:
  - Aboriginal students;
  - Black students;
  - International students;
  - Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer students;
  - Students with disabilities;
  - Students living in residence; and
  - Women students.

In the event that there are multiple societies representing a constituency, the societies shall jointly appoint a representative. Where agreement cannot be made, each society will be permitted to recommend a representative and Council will appoint someone from the Society nominees.

If there is not a society currently representing that community, the Nominating Committee shall recommend a representative to be ratified by Council.

Moved: Nicholson Seconded: Dylan

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N02

Whereas any appeal process deals with extremely sensitive information;

Whereas members on appeal committees will be discussing potentially controversial matters;

Whereas committee meetings should be a safe place for committee members;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 9.6.h be amended to read:

“The Elections Appeals Committee shall, at the request of any candidate in an election or campaign team in an election, review a decision of the Elections Committee to determine if it is in line with the DSU Act, Bylaws, and Policies. Deliberations on questions related to any such request shall be held in camera.”

Moved: Corey DeGagné Seconded: Kathleen

Corey: I think this is a great idea for this committee. There is one year that there was a heated election and everyone who was on council was split, and there was a lot of appeal sent to this board. And if that happened, the members on the committee should feel as though they can express themselves. The amendment
is that the discussions should be held in camera, so you can feel like you’re in a safe place when discussing controversial subjects.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N02 CARRIED

Dylan: We are doing this to keep it transparent and engaging all students.
Dan: We went out and we found out a law firm to do a comprehensive sweep of our bylaws and they found things that we needed to change or weren’t of our best standards. We created a committee of students to look over the comments over the year by the law firm and create a comprehensive set of bylaws by what the law firm suggested. Those bylaws went back to the law firm for review, then they came back and our council referred them to our Board of Operations who had an opportunity to make reviews, make edits, and went back to the committee and the law firm for another review. It was brought back to the Board of Operations where it was said that it looked good. They were referred back to our council and we decided that it’s okay to refer it to our AGM. Our process has been just under a year in total. One thing is to limit our council size, put representatives to representative committees, redistributed Senate members to a Senate caucus.

Motion to extend speaking time: Moved by Kaitlynne, Second: Aaron, motion to extend speaking time carried

Dan: Often times there’s only a small group of students that make high level decisions, we decided to disseminate their responsibilities to various committees. The judicial board was a 3 student committee that we went to for rulings or if there was a challenge on our bylaw, which is not proper practice since they are not actual lawyers but students. What we’ve done is created an elections appeals committee who will be appointed at the start of the year to avoid biases, and there will be law students as part of that process. That outlines the major changes; there were other changes to make bylaws more readable since they were tough to navigate. These are much more comprehensive and flow a lot better.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N03

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the motions are accepted in an omnibus.

Moved: Corlyn Seconded: Bart S.

Bart: Would like to pull section 6

Corlyn: 4.1 is pulled out.

Bart: I don’t know if we can go through and approve everything without talking about the changes, but I think we can discuss it in the omnibus.
Corlyn: I don’t understand how this works right now; how will we approve the
bylaws without approving all the things we’ve pulled out?
Greg: We approve everything except what we’ve pulled out
Kathleen: It’s to prevent everything from not passing if the assembly disagrees
with one of the changes. Everything that people agree with will be passed in
omnibus while things that are pulled out will be subject to a vote.
Corlyn: Everything that is pulled out will be approved individually?
Greg: Yes
Dan: Any changes will take effect on May 1st.

Corlyn: wishes to pull out 4.2.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N03 CARRIED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N04

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws and the agenda as a whole be approved at
the same time.

Moved: Jeremy Banks  Second: Aaron Prosper

Dan: The pieces that you pull out, you can put them back in with a resolution to
whatever is pulled out.

Corlyn: I’d like to speak against voting all in one and then going through the
amendments, we wouldn’t vote to pass it. I’d like to vote for the omnibus.

Jeremy: If we passed the omnibus parts without approving the other pieces, we
might have two section 7s that overlap or contradict each other, or two section
6’s that overlap or contradict each other. We should approve the whole thing.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N04 FAILED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N05

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws are approved, minus the amendments that
have been pulled out (all of 6, 4.1 and 4.2) pulled out and the second BE IT
RESOLVED clause.

Moved: Dan  Second: Andrew

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N05 CARRIED
Katie Douglas: wishes to pull out Section 9. Section is pulled from the omnibus by unanimous consent.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N06

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws are amended by adding section 4.1.i reading “program representatives from any program levied society that wishes to have faculty representation split by program”

Moved: Corlyn  Seconded: Bart

Corlyn: A lot of faculties have programs that can’t be represented by just one person, for example Management and Commerce. As a program levied society, it is responsible to have a seat on council as well.

Bart: How many more people will be added if every program wants to be represented?

Corlyn: Based on this list, I saw that there is 19 levy’d program societies, however in terms of which faculties these would impact, there would be Faculties of Architecture and Planning, Graduate Studies, Health Professions, Science, and Management.

Name inaudible: Even though there’d be 19 more, which would double Council membership, this would allow for things like chemical engineering and industrial engineering, materials engineering, mining engineering, and mechanical engineering to all become levied societies and deserve a seat on council. This could become a real disaster.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N06 FAILED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N07

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 6.5 be amended by adding “j. Committee meetings may be held in person or via teleconference at the discretion of the chair.”

Moved:Bart  Seconded: Dan

Bart: This would make it easier for committees to meet more frequently and to do the work assigned to them.

Name inaudible: this should state that members can attend in person or via teleconference.
John: We don’t need to record how people are attending, it’s fine if they are teleconferencing or in person as long as they are attending.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N07 CARRIED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N08

BE IT RESOLVED THAT section 4.1 be amended to include mention of proportional representation for faculties and communities.

Moved: Amr

Amr: Section 4.1H. My problem is that this setup, there’s over 15% international students and will soon be 20% but we only have 5% of the vote. We need to have fair representation. With This setup, we only have one international student on council and we need to work on that. As well as aboriginal students, etc. We need to address this and have a system where we address this. I would like to make the amendment that these seats will be given in according to representation in the student population.

Chair requests specific wording for the amendment. The motion is tabled until after the next order of business to allow the mover time to prepare the language of the amendment.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N09

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws be further amended by adding a bylaw 12, reading:

Bylaw 12: External Groups

12.1 The Union shall not join any external advocacy group, that proposes to charge fees to either the union or its members, if the group’s by-laws, policies, constitution, or any governing documents would prevent the union from ceasing membership through a process outlined in the Union’s own constitution.

12.2 The Union shall be able to terminate membership in any external organization through a majority vote at a General Meeting

Moved: Bart Seconded: Corlyn

Bart: This prevents the DSU from joining an external advocacy group such as CFS, Students NS, or CASA if we are not able to leave at a general meeting. Recently we were able to leave Students NS when we discovered that that there were corrupted things happening. This language is important to maintain so we
don’t get locked into an organization in the long term when its not doing good work.

Kit Moran: By adopting this, my concern is that it would unallow us to make contract commitments with external groups/contracts that the DSU has outside the university and certain contract laws have predetermined times.

Corlyn: Would like to support the motion, it’s not smart to get caught in anything if the student body decides to leave, based on other bylaws in the group. It allows students to be part of associations and allows us to leave when we don’t want to pay fees to a society.

John: The way the Societies Act works is that once you’re an organizational member of another organization you’re bound by those bylaws. As the DSU is an independent organization, it’s not bound by anything else so we only follow our own policies. But once you’re in, regardless of the organization, you have to follow your own bylaws and the bylaws of an external organization. If we wanted to join any other coalition such as the Nova Scotia Post Secondary Education Coalition or CCPA, these bylaws would apply. I’m not sure it’d prevent us from joining them, but it’s better resolved through policy. We could create a bylaw mandating a certain policy to exist. It wouldn’t prevent us from joining, so I don’t see the point of the amendment.

Aaron: I’d like to speak for the motion, mainly because I’d like to remind everyone of the case that happened at Cape Breton University. Their student union had issues in their bylaws when they were part of an external advocacy group. The student membership voted to leave the group, but because of the process went against the union’s own constitution. A bylaw like this would protect us from what happened at CBU. They got billed for a $3 million dollar lawsuit.

Jasper: My concern is that external advocacy can be beneficial….I’m concerned about a body representing a school of this size. Making a decision without insufficient oversight.

Member against: This won’t protect the union from what people think it will. Not sure that this will help our union.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N09 CARRIED

Return to debate on MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N08

Language of the proposed bylaw amendment is amended by the mover to read:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 4.1.g be amended to read “a minimum of 12 faculty representatives with additional members be allocated by proportion of enrollment with a cap of 2 per faculty.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 4.1.h be amended to read “a minimum of 7 community representatives, with 1 from each of the following communities and additional representatives by proportion of student enrollment, with a cap of 2 per community group”

Moved: Amr  Seconded: Kasey

Amr: The reason why I proposed this is that there’s some faculties not represented, like management and commerce, there’s no commerce rep even though they’re much bigger than management. Same with the international students – not enough representation. A student group that has more students should have more votes.

Rhiannon: I’m against this. It undoes the work of trying to make council concise in general. The point of management and commerce, it’s that it’s Faculty of Management which includes Commerce, and a commerce student could get that. I think this is backtracking from what we’re trying to accomplish with council.

Alexandra: Same thoughts as Rhiannon: this doubles council and we’re working hard to minimize the position. I think it’s important not to make the council bigger.

Michael: I’d like to be for this because the system will be more represented for, but unfortunately this is not logistically possible. How many international students consider themselves black? That way you’ve combined two sections, what point would you use to use your membrane – there’s too much crossover and overlap and can’t function properly.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N10

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the speakers list on the motion at hand is extended by 2 more speakers each for for and against.

Moved: Callahan  Second: Aaron

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N10 CARRIED

Corlyn: Point of information: in terms of faculty representation being allocated by proportion of enrollment, what faculties would this impact by current enrolment levels?
John: These are estimates we would have one 1 rep per faculty and equity constituency and the following would have two: Arts and Social Sciences, Engineering, Graduate Studies, Health Professions, Management, Science, International Students, Residence Students, and Women. This would be 35 in total roughly.
Reah: Difficulty with logistics of organizing this. Rounding up to 2 and rounding down to 1 is hard. Law students is a small faculty and we have one representation, don’t know how much more we’d achieve with this.

Angela: I understand that this does increase council, but it only adds 9 people. I think there’s a lot of disappointment from people who represent larger faculties because we make up a significant proportion of the population at dal, and that means that we should be allowed a stronger voice/more amplified voice and with the situation of community reps: I don’t think adding people would not be as big an issue here. The specific number needs to be reached.

Kasey: Angela just said everything I was going to say. To reiterate that, the faculties like Science are big but it wouldn’t seem right that we’d have the same representation as Law. Could we vote separately on the two, or will it be joined?

Chair says that it is possible to vote on them separately.

Callahan: in terms of selection of the DSU council members is different for faculty, I believe with the faculty of arts I was wondering how the process works here – commerce and management select theirs individually, how would the selection of this occur?

Dylan: For selection, every program faculty puts their reps forward and council decides. Next year, every student in the faculty of management votes directly through elections for that representative.

Amr: To answer Michael’s point: we already have overlap in representatives, it depends on what your job is on council that determines what you do there. I don’t think that will be a problem. We are only adding 9 seats, and a lot of universities are using this proportion of enrolment. I don’t think it’s a big problem to add about 9 more representatives to make it fair.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N11

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the motion is divided into the amendment on 4.1.G and the amendment on 4.1.H.

Moved: Bart Second: Aaron

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N11 FAILED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N10 FAILED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N12
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws be amended so that 4.1 reflects the composition of council as it was in the previous constitution.

Moved: Jeremy

Point of order by Bart: You should put down 4.1 and then vote on it.

Corey: the motion we just passed stated that the previous constitution is no longer in place, if we vote no to 4.1, we have no composition of council.

Chair requests specific wording of motion. MOTION N12 is tabled until after the next order of business to allow the mover to formulate the amendment.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N13

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 9.b be amended to read: “the Chief Returning Officer shall not be an Executive Officer, Councillor, committee member, or employee, of the union for the duration of their term, except for sitting on the elections committee.

Moved: Katie Seconded: Rhiannon

Katie: It’s important to have the Chief Returning officer to have them sit on the elections committee because they can oversee everything.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N13 CARRIED

Chair rules any further amendments out of order, stating that a year-long process was followed to arrive at this package and there are other avenues for amendments to be proposed, and time is limited.

Debate resumes on MOTION 2016-04-06: N12

MOTION 2016-04-06: N12

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 4.1 be amended to read:

“4.1 Council shall include the following people, who must be members of the Union at the time of their election and during their term in office, and who shall be elected by the membership at large:

(a) the President;
(b) the Vice President (Academic and External);

(c) the Vice President (Internal);

(d) the Vice President (Student Life);

(e) the Vice President (Finance and Operations);

(f) two (2) student members of the Board of Governors; Council shall also include the following people, who must be members of the Union, whom are paying the Union fee at the time of their election and during their term of office, who shall be elected by, and be members of existing and operating Societies:

(a) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Architecture and Planning;

(b) two (2) representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences;

(c) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Computer Science;

(d) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Dentistry;

(e) two (2) representatives from the Faculty of Graduate Studies;

(f) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Engineering from Studley Campus;

(g) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Engineering from Sexton Campus;

(h) two (2) representatives from the Faculty of Health Professions;

(i) one (1) representative from the Schulich School of Law;

(j) two (2) representatives from the Rowe School of Business; one of whom shall represent the Faculty of Management and one whom shall represent the Faculty of Commerce

(k) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Medicine;

(l) two (2) representatives from the Faculty of Science;

(m) one (1) representative from the Aboriginal Students' Community;

(n) one (1) representative from the Black Students’ Community;

(o) two (2) representatives from the International Students’ Community;

(p) one (1) representative from the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Queer Students’ Community;
(q) two (2) representatives from the Residence Students’ Community;

(r) one (1) representative from the Women Students’ Community; and

(s) one (1) representative from the Faculty of Agriculture

(t) one (1) representative from the Students with Disabilities Community”

Moved: Jeremy Seconded: Corlyn

Jeremy: this big text is our composition of council as it existed in 2014 composition aside from the Senate representatives who are now appointed by faculties. The reason I mention this is because we’re not satisfied with the representation, but this has been working effectively and a key part is that we don’t have an assessment review of an appropriate representation process. Despite governance look at the most effective processes, it doesn’t look at the most representational processes. My motion is to return to the representation we had of council currently so that we can review this in more depth.

Point of information: Does this conflict with the bylaw 9 we have passed?

Kaley: I think that it would be fine in the case of where commerce and management would be considered faculty level societies, even though they don’t represent everyone in their faculty. It could be challenged but its not out of order.

Dan: I’m speaking against. I take the points that Jeremy brought forward, I’d like to say that the council is not effective, the main reason we wanted a difference – it took years to show that council meetings were large and dragged on. The old way was poor and non-functional.

Corlyn: I think the way that council is made up is good and effective. If in previous years it didn’t work then the solution is hiring a better chair – I don’t think the way to make more people heard is to cut down on people.

Michael: You get rid of the disability chair; that has been fully lacking of the school. It’s not functional for people with disabilities. The way it was set up last year, puts it back to a heavy board with 2 or 3 people representing one group and 1 person representing one group. Everything we said no for to that other amendment, we have to say no to this one too.

Bart: I am speaking against this motion. I see why faculty of commerce want more representation, but as someone who reps a smaller organization, when it comes to DSU as a whole, we talk about high-level things. So if you’re a rep you can represent a different variety of groups who have different ideals and needs, going back to the way the board was wasn’t effective – we went overtime, people aren’t engaged and the vote doesn’t count for as much.

Amr: I think we can add a chair for a disability student group, we can amend to add one chair from the disability representative.
MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N13

BE IT RESOLVED THAT amendment from motion N12 be amended, by adding one representative from the disability community.

Moved: Amr Seconded: Corlyn

Michael: I support disability representation but not within this structure. This Council is too big.

Amr: The reason I brought this up, is a point that was brought up is that the council last year didn’t represent the disability group on campus. This isn’t a perfect setup but I hope people like this.

Aaron: I will agree with Michael, this motion as it stands, there’s no proportional of representation, there’s no voice for people with disability, LGBTQ, aboriginal, the only equity seats that do have a voice because in that motion have 2 seats are international community and people with residency. I think the aboriginal community has the lowest % of aboriginal people – 2% - across the country. Why aren’t aboriginal people coming to our school? There’s no representation, no voice, so I think the new amendment would give that voice and make it more appealing to aboriginal students and bring our population up to the national average – 4-5%. This amendment will push people away like aboriginal people.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N13 CARRIED

Point of information: what does this motion state on members at large? Answer: it keeps them.

Point of information: would this motion make it so that Council appoints members at large, which was identified as a major governance issue? Answer: yes

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N12 FAILED

Corlyn: Point of order: don’t think that we should cut off amendments, a lot of people are unhappy with the proposed council structure. I don’t know why we would disallow people to make changes.

Chair: The ruling was made on the basis of the timing.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N14

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the ruling of the chair is challenged and further amendments can be made.
Moved: Corlyn  Second: Callahan

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N14 FAILED

Call for quorum count. Quorum is not currently met. Recess for 15 minutes to re-establish quorum. Meeting back to order 7:16 pm

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N15

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the assembly accept the bylaws as amended in this meeting.

Moved: Dylan  Second: Kathlen

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N15 CARRIED

Motion to amend previously adopted MOTION 2016-04-06: N01. Unanimous consent to consider an amendment; mover and seconder of original motion retained.

Bart: Who is appointing equity seats for this term?
Kaley: if a society that represents those equity groups, they will be the ones who appoint that person. If it’s multiple societies, the societies have to agree and if there’s no agreement – they’ll each appoint one. Any society that represents a subsection of that group will not be considered in the multiple societies. For example, South House appoints the rep for Women’s Students, anyone in Women in Engineering can go to a south House meeting to vote for Women’s students – wouldn’t be conflicting. If it was non society like students with disabilities or Black students, it would be through the nominating committee.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N16

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the motion be amended to read “if there’s not a society representing that community, the DSU shall be responsible for organizing a community meeting where members of the community will nominate their representative.”

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this transition process be the process for electing members of council up until there’s a new process approved through a GM

Moved: Katie  Second: Corey
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Katie: Speaking from the experience as a student with a disability, a woman, and a queer student – if there’s no society representing that community, the DSU can organize a committee to represent that student. It’s bad to arbitrarily assign someone to represent someone, it should be doing that at organized community meetings. We don’t have policies for electing people for council, so if we weren’t to make the second part of that amendment, we wouldn’t have something for next year potentially.

Michael: I don’t agree with this because there are several Black groups and when we elected, those groups got together and chose. We got together and voted for people that are our peers. As far as the disability one, because it’s a new one, there might be a process to that.

Kati George-Jim: I am in favour. This facilitates an area which groups can hold a meeting whether or not they have the capacity to do it themselves, like aboriginal students don’t have the capacity necessarily to hold it on their own so this encourages students to meet. So this is not just a group of white students voting in favor to elect a black student, disabled, aboriginal student etc; an area where people can meet and vote for their reps and I like that idea.

Kit: Is this just for this upcoming year?
Clarification: Yes.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N16 CARRIED

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Motion on Faculty of Arts and Social Science Budget Cuts

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R01

WHEREAS the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is facing significant funding cuts due to the Enrollment-Based Budget Allocations (ERBA); and

WHEREAS the result of funding cuts have included required courses being cut, fewer Teaching Assistants being hired, and faculty not being replaced when they retire; and

WHEREAS many students in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences are unable to graduate because of cuts to their programs and are forced to switch majors and minors to fulfill degree requirements; and

WHEREAS the current ERBA funding model forces faculties to fight for resources rather than promoting collegiality and collaboration; and
WHEREAS the current ERBA funding model is not sustainable and will negatively impact all Faculties in the long run, not just the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Dalhousie Student Union oppose the current funding cuts being faces by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Dalhousie Student Union sign the attached letter in support of investment in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.

Moved: Angela Hou Seconded: Kaitlynne

Angela: We have a letter, it came out with the other info for this meeting. What is basically going on is that there’s been funding cuts and public funding cuts, were losing the ability to operate and the university refuses to basically change the system in which funds are allocated and not just the faculty of arts and social sciences, enrollment based budget allocations will affect other faculties that have previously benefited for it. We want to get support from the general membership of the DSU to stop cutting cuts to academia.

Point of order by Katie: I had two amendments. When will we return to deal with the second amendment.

Chair: after this motion

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R01 CARRIED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R02

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be amended to discuss motion N01 again.

Moved: Katie Seconded: Corey

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R02 CARRIED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R03

BE IT RESOLVED THAT that the motion is amended by adding “that this transition policy exists until there is a new representation policy passed through the AGM.”

Moved: Katie Seconded: Corey

Katie: the reason I’m proposing this: in the election and referenda bylaws, there’s a bylaw 9.2C and D it says voting for a faculty rep will be as determined by
applicable policies. Those haven’t been developed yet, we should have this transition policy.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R04

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the amendment be amended by striking out “passed through the AGM” and inserting “ratified through the council.”

Moved: Dan Seconded: Rhiannon

Dan: Policies are ratified through the council.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R04 CARRIED

Michael: I’m concerned about how this interacts with groups that do want to appoint their own representative. What if the processes conflict? Kaley: It would be at the discretion of Council. The society would have the right to impeach their representative.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R03 CARRIED

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R04

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the AGM adjourn and the remainder of the agenda is referred to Council.

Moved: Dylan. Seconded: Inaudible

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R04 FAILED

B. Motion for DSU Support of LSS Convocation Date Change

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R05

WHEREAS the Law Students’ Society (LSS) is a part of the Dalhousie Student Union (DSU); AND WHEREAS Dalhousie Schulich School of Law is a national law school with students from across the country

AND WHEREAS prior to the 2014-2015 academic year the Law Students’ Society (LSS) convocation date took place on or about the third week in May;
AND WHEREAS convocation was scheduled on or about the third week in May to accommodate law students who were writing the bar exam or beginning their articling job;

AND WHEREAS in the 2014-2015 academic year the University condensed convocation for the entire university into one week;

AND WHEREAS the convocation week scheduled by the University is for the final week in May;

AND WHEREAS the British Columbia bar course and Nova Scotia articling job both begin the final week in May;

AND WHEREAS some students may not attend convocation because of the scheduling conflict;

AND WHEREAS the University should try to accommodate all students to attend convocation as it is an important ceremony;

AND WHEREAS there was no scheduling conflict between convocation and any provinces bar exam prior to the changes made in the 2014-2015 academic year;

AND WHEREAS the Law Students' Society is seeking support from the DSU on this convocation scheduling issue;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the DSU declare a formal resolution in support of the LSS’ efforts to schedule a convocation date that accommodates all law students.

Moved: Jennifer Hand Seconded: Kaitlynne

Jennifer: As of last year, the university condensed all the LSS’s convocations date to the third week of May forces students to decide whether they should come to convocation, take time off work, etc. What we want here is to get support from the DSU and have conversations with the president of Dalhousie.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R05 CARRIED

C. Discussion on the Dalhousie Association of Graduate Students

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R06

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this discussion is tabled.

Moved: Dan Second: Corey
Desouza not present.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R06 CARRIED

D. Discussion on solidarity with sexual assault survivors

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R07

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda is amended to allow for a motion on sexual violence to be added.

Moved: Kaitlynne Second: Colleen

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R07 PASSES

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R08

WHEREAS The Brandon University has been in the news recently regarding silencing sexual assault victims;

WHEREAS The DSU advocates for the safety of everyone, and supports all sexual assault survivors;

WHEREAS sexual assault survivors should never be forced to sign a ‘gag order.’

Be it resolved that the DSU stand in solidarity with sexual assault survivors.

Be it further resolved that the DSU write an open letter expressing their solidarity and support with sexual assault survivors.

Moved: Corey Second: Colleen

Corey: At Brandon University, if you are sexually assaulted you are subject to sign a gag order and you can’t talk about it to anyone except to councillors or you may be expelled. I wanted to raise a motion to show solidarity and write a letter to support sexual assault survivors.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: R08 CARRIED

8. QUESTION AND ANSWER

No questions.

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS
Dalhousie Student Union - Annual General Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, April 6, 2016 – Dalhousie Student Union Building, McInnis Room

John: executive reports are available in paper form and will be online.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: A04

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Annual General Meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Danielle Seconded: Hassen

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: A04 CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7:43 PM
Notes on Bylaw Amendments Made at April 6, 2016 Annual General Meeting

Context
The DSU convened an Annual General Meeting on April 6, 2016 and approved a revised set of bylaws. A number of amendments to the proposed bylaws were made within the meeting, some of which were out of order under the governing documents of the organization. This document outlines the applicable bylaw and Robert’s Rules sections in order to identify which amendments were out of order and are therefore not reflected in the bylaws approved at the AGM, despite being passed within the meeting.

Governing Documents
At the 2016 AGM, the DSU was operating under the Constitution that was approved in 2014. The constitution included the following sections concerning amendments to the bylaws served at a General Meeting (emphasis added).

Bylaw IX – General Meetings
General Meetings regarding Amendment and Revision

5. Where the General Meeting is called to consider business arising out of By-law XI, notice of the General Meeting and copies of the text of any proposed amendments or revisions to these By-laws shall be published at least two (2) weeks before the General Meeting is convened. The Executive and Council shall make every reasonable attempt to publicize the time, date and location of the General Meeting.

Bylaw XI – Amendment and Revision
By-laws

1. A General Meeting may amend or revise these By-laws, by a majority vote of those present, subject to procedures set down in these By-laws.

Proposed amendments from Council

2. Proposed amendments or revisions to these By-laws originating from Council shall not be considered by a General Meeting until:

(a) notice of motion of such proposed amendments or revisions has been given at a meeting of Council;
(b) Council has referred such proposed amendments or revisions for the consideration of the Board, which shall consider the amendments or revisions within two (2) weeks of the original notice of motion; and

(c) Council has received and reviewed a report from the Board, and by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of those present at least two weeks (2) subsequent to the original notice of motion, voted to refer the proposed amendments or revisions to these By-laws for the consideration of a General Meeting, in accordance with By-law IX.

Proposed amendments by petition

3. Proposed amendments or revisions of these By-laws that do not originate from Council, shall not be considered by a General Meeting until a bona fide petition signed by 10% of the members of the Union proposing such an amendment or revision is presented to the President; where after, they shall refer such amendment or revision for the consideration of a General Meeting in accordance with By-law IX.

The Constitution and Policies of the Union at the time also recognized the use of Robert’s Rules of Order. In the absence of additional detail within the constitution on the possibility for bylaw amendments to be amended during a meeting, we can refer to this resource for additional regulations. Robert’s Rules states (emphasis added):

(Section 57, p.594-595) Amending a Proposed Amendment to the Bylaws

While amendments to the proposed bylaw amendment can be made in both the first and second degrees (as applicable) and can be adopted by a majority vote without notice, they are subject to restrictions on the extent of the changes they propose. If the bylaws require previous notice for their amendment (as they should) [...] no amendment to a bylaw amendment is in order that increases the modification of the article or provision to be amended [...]. This restriction prevents members from proposing a slight change and then taking advantage of absent members by moving a greater one as an amendment to the amendment.

Permissibility of Amendments to Proposed Amendments Passed at 2016 AGM

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N02
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bylaw 9.6.h be amended to read:
“The Elections Appeals Committee shall, at the request of any candidate in an election or campaign team in an election, review a decision of the Elections Committee to determine if it is in line with the DSU Act, Bylaws, and Policies. Deliberations on questions related to any such request shall be held in camera.”
OUT OF ORDER. This amendment added additional language that required Elections Appeals Committee to discuss decisions by the Elections Committee in camera. This is beyond the scope of the original amendment.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N07
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 6.5 be amended by adding “j. Committee meetings may be held in person or via teleconference at the discretion of the chair.”

OUT OF ORDER. This amendment stipulated that meetings of standing committees could be held via teleconference or in person at the discretion of the chair. This is beyond the scope of the original amendment.

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N08
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws be further amended by adding a bylaw 12, reading:
Bylaw 12: External Groups
12.1 The Union shall not join any external advocacy group, that proposes to charge fees to either the union or its members, if the group’s by­laws, policies, constitution, or any governing documents would prevent the union from ceasing membership through a process outlined in the Union’s own constitution.
12.2 The Union shall be able to terminate membership in any external organization through a majority vote at a General Meeting

OUT OF ORDER. This amendment inserted a new section into the proposed bylaws. There had been a section on External Advocacy Groups in the 2014 bylaws, but this amendment contained different stipulations and language and was therefore out of order in the process by which it was approved. This is covered under section 57 (p. 595-596) of Robert’s Rules of Order, which reads (emphasis added):
“Amendments to strike out a sentence, paragraph, or section deserve special care. In such cases, the existing bylaw is not itself open to consideration, but only the amendment. If notice is given to strike out a provision of the bylaws and some members feel it should be retained with certain changes whose substance would be outside the scope of that notice those members should immediately give notice of the amendments to the existing provisions which they think are advisable.”

MOTION 2016-04-06-GM: N13
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the bylaws section 9.b be amended to read: “the Chief Returning Officer shall not be an Executive Officer, Councillor, committee member, or employee, of the union for the duration of their term, except for sitting on the elections committee.

IN ORDER. This amendment stipulated that the Chief Returning Officer will sit on the Elections Committee. Under the 2014 Constitution, the CRO was a member of the Elections Committee, and thus this amendment is within the scope of the original amendment.