

Canadian Alliance of Student Associations

Alliance canadienne des associations étudiantes

www.casa-acae.com / #casaacae / @casadaily



Closing Plenary Minutes

Friday, November 23rd 2012

Ottawa, Ontario

Lord Elgin, Lady Elgin Room.

1. Call to Order – 9:08 am

2. Roll Call

Present (25)

Acadia Students' Union (**ASU**)

Dalhousie Student Union (**DSU**)

La Fédération des étudiants et des étudiantes du centre universitaire du Moncton (**FÉÉCUM**)

Red River College Students' Association (**RRCSA**)

McMaster University Students' Union (**MSU**)

Saint Mary's University Student Association (**SMUSA**)

St. Francis Xavier Students' Union (**St.FXSU**)

Students Association of Mount Royal University (**SAMRU**)

University of Alberta Students' Union (**UASU**)

University of Calgary Students' Union (**UCSU**)

University of New Brunswick Student Union (Fredericton) (**UNBSUF**)

University Students' Council of the University of Western Ontario (**USCUWO**)

Wilfred Laurier University Students' Union (**WLUSU**)

University of Lethbridge Students' Union (**ULSU**)

Brock University Students' Union (**BUSU**)

University of the Fraser Valley Student Union Society (**UFVUSU**)

University of British Columbia Vancouver Alma Mater Society (**UBCVAMS**)

Athabasca University Graduate Students' Association (**AUGSA**)

Graduate Student Society at UBC Vancouver (**GSSUBC**)

Graduate Student Association at the University of Waterloo (**GSAUW**)

SAIT Students' Association (**SAITSA**)

Kwantlen Student association (**KSA**)

University of New Brunswick Students' Representative Council (Saint John) (**UNBSRC**)

Officer Reports

a. Board Chair

1. Priorities for recruitment, welcoming new employees, addressing issues relating to quorum on committees, etc.

b. Secretary

1. Posted on website – overview, getting minutes and governance in order. Robust discussion notes on meetings. Conference on Open Educational Resources, presenting CASA Open Access work. Need to focus on membership recruitment and membership retention. Newsletter and committee participation.

c. Treasurer

1. Oct 31st represents halfway point of the year, budgets are at halfway. 85% of members have paid membership dues, remaining schools are encouraged to arrange for payment of dues. Report contains details on financial position.

d. National Director

Supporting Documentation

1. Robust overview of activities:
 1. Overall, 2012-2013 advocacy priorities were set earlier: representation, vehicle exemption, etc... and have been brought to the table over this week.
 2. Research side – increasing funding, mental health, Canada summer jobs, entrepreneurial grants, all topics that have been raised. Increased policy focus from this point onward. Looking into opportunities to reach out to students, recruit towards doing research on issues.
 3. Board report – this group has been very constructive and process based. Board structure has been more coordinated with designated reporting responsibilities. IE, Petros on advocacy, Jared on communications, etc. Board has taken communication roles – ensure you have heard from your responsible director.

4. Provincial partners – Partnership is not working very well, there has only been weak communication. Its good to hear what people are doing, but little action results from that discussion. Relationships are positive, but need more shared work priorities and goals. Could there be others around that table? CSA involvement has been fairly successful, from setting up meetings.
5. Home office operations – 50% through financial year. Nothing of concern in budget. Preparing for 2013-2014 fiscal year. Using PSIS numbers for assessing student membership fees. Giving membership the assessments, asking them to identify discrepancies. Keep in mind, data is 2 years old. Welcome to new employee.
6. New Operations – Reserves were depleted 3 years ago, election account had 3\$, since then reserves have been replenished. Budgets have been restructured to reflect actual spending. Travel support fund topped up – special thanks to Brock.
7. Government relations – should have enough meetings by the end of the year to reach the top 20 of lobbying organizations. Thanks to the national advocacy team, good job on local meetings. Many MPs will be doing townhall budget consultations – may send GR officer to community townhall meetings to participate. Success this week, meeting all party leaders/offices. Megan Leslie, recognizing CASA activities. Keep in touch with MPs.
8. Other Activities – National Youth Strategy, CASA wrote the open call for the NYS. There are other pillars to the NYS, but CASA remains focused on the PSE side.
9. Public Relations – Improving, working with Impact public affairs, 100% of content is produced in-office, Impact distributes and polishes that material. Positive relationship so far. Done 13 major press releases. Happy to help local organizations with press releases or media communications. Local issues or national.
10. Stakeholder/Membership relations – Mostly positive. 30-40% range of opening emails for members. The CASA mandate is strictly PSE, but CASA can be a forum for circulating information. Kudos to Micheal for his activities in arranging meetings, groups with PSE interest., Breeding positive

results.

11. Conference Planning – avoiding the need for late registration fees, next year conferences will not have fees unless you are late.
12. Policy and Research – Aiming to grow the shop by one more person eventually, as well as growing the government relations shop by one more person. More staff is allowing a stronger research focus.
13. Committee Work – Attendance is important, sending regrets is important if unable to attend. Discouraging to hear from members about a lack of participation in meetings. In order to feel involved and engaged, communicating is important. Calling in allows meetings to be productive. Secondly, if you're in a meeting, don't divide your attention.
14. Long Term Projects – Updating the policy manual, a matter of investing about a week's worth of work or so. Research reports – new files divided between researchers, updating briefs, and opening new topics, Policy committee working on updating policy. Research team examining large research project RFP, looking at big ideas for research reports. Creating a consistent filing system – ongoing.

2. Questions:

1. Elaborate on member associations – is there a middle ground for facilitating relationships? A: Need to support these relationships, proposed a shared fund for facilitating these meetings and encounters. Identify stakeholders and partners that we can meaningfully engage. National Transition – opportunity for growing partnerships? Generally just keep in touch.
2. For membership recruitment – what is going on? How do we approach schools? A: Office pulled together a full list of alignments provincially and federally. Don't want to engage in a competition with CFS that creates hostility, focusing on unaligned schools, polytechnics, undergrad and graduate schools. Associate membership should be used as a trial membership, not a means of saving money. Ultimately, advocacy work and success will have to drive membership.
3. Sometimes other groups contact CASA for policy and research, what has the feedback been? A: Groups have been positive, polytechnics

have asked about the level of focus, recommendations are generally moderate and reasonable.

Committee Reports

3. Policy Committee

1. Presented new policy on advance polling, continuing research into tri-agency funding, mental health policy has been under development, every committee member has taken responsibility for a toping under the policy diamond, and chair will be involved in updating the policy manual.

2. Questions:

1. Mental Health Policy? A: That casa support the national mental health strategy, and issues facing students.

e. Graduate Council

1. Started by identifying top 4 priorities. Increasing Tri-council funding, Income Threshold for CSLP, Mental Health, and Open access. Looking into the work of other committees, increase to tri-council funding is ongoing as a priority.

f. Strategic Planning Committee

1. Working on research development, collecting metrics on the strategic plan, ie number of press releases, return on investment, surveying member schools on their views. Kudos to Sam Estoesta. Aiming to have a report for AGM.

2. Questions:

1. For the metrics, will they be set as a standard for the year, or will there be judgments on the levels measured? A: This year will mainly be informational and about getting metrics in place, to gain a handle on their utility. Some questions are intentionally redundant to ensure consistency and reliability. Future measurement could be more qualitative, helpful to long term planning. A2: Looking into what we can do in a year, so we can compare and contrast about where we can go realistically.

2. Regarding members, how will self-reporting be handled, measuring effectiveness of policy development? A: Many questions deal with those, asking if they felt confident with

the process, training, etc... and follow up on whether members followed up or asked for additional information if they did not feel confident.

3. Currently metrics are in place without targets? A: In the strategic plan, some metrics are set without targets, want to avoid setting targets arbitrarily. Where are we placing emphasis, etc... so this year will be used as a benchmarking year.

g. Bylaw Committee

1. Having CASA home office look into consistency with the present not for profit act. Also examining associate membership, looking into rights and responsibilities. What are our thoughts on associate and full membership status? That review will be a major focus growing forward.

h. Ad-hoc Committee to Review Policy F05

1. Navigating the issue of the F05 policy – a short report has been attached, encourage all membership to read the policy. Agreed that tax credit and grand policies be separated, about 54% of tax credits are claimed by 20-29 age group. There is some disagreement over how money should be moved by changes in the policy. Some suggested policies should be explored.

2. Questions/Comments:

1. Two days ago attended F05 committee, appreciate the hardwork of the committee.
2. Did the mandate ask for a specific recommendation? A: Timeline was short for getting the facts on the table about the policy. Because the goal is policy intervention, the committee decided it would be more appropriate for the policy committee to take the report from the present stage forward. A2: Committee does recommend scrapping F05.
3. Clarifying: Some aspects of the final vote were not unanimous.

i. Working Group on College and Polytechnic issues

1. Working group was struck at policy and strategy. Hoping to formalize his committee at AGM. Need policy ideas to bring to membership. Created a draft terms of reference. Should be able to finalize those

before winter break. Currently researching colleges and apprenticeships.

2. Questions:

1. How do you define college and polytechnics? A: Focus in this committee is on schools that focus on trades. A2: From the meeting with polytechnics Canada, the difference is whether they issue degrees or certificates, but for the committee main focus is on trades training.

3. National Advocacy Team: Motion From Acadia, Seconded by Western, to allow the National Advocacy group to issue a report. Carried unanimously.

1. Working on a strategy of going out to MPs and bringing MPs on to campuses, to hear from students directly. Tested out organizations pre-budget asks in Sept-August. Committee has been looking at encouraging membership to encourage advocacy weeks on campuses. Working on tagging the policies, harder to decide objectively to decide objectively how to determine where there are opportunities, for the policy diamond.

(5 minute break)

5. Motions & Discussion Rising from Reports – No proxy votes present.

a. Board of Directors

i. Attendance at Committee Meetings

1. Addressed in the report of the national director.
2. ND: Beyond the report, as we go towards AGM, we owe it to the next ND that they are coming into a functioning structure. This has come up before, but needs to be addressed. If times are not working, let the chair know.

ii. Associate Membership (30 minutes)

1. Discussion – movement to go into a committee of the whole, passed unanimously.
2. ND: Intention to present what associate membership involves now, and consider the implications of associate membership. (slides presented)

1. Purpose of Associate membership: phasing-in or phasing-out between full membership and non-membership. Max 2 years at associate membership level. Right to participate but not vote.
3. **Secretary:** Goal here is to get feedback before the bylaw committee drafts changes to this policy, not to rewrite the policy as is. What's Working
4. **UBCGSS:** Why is associate membership used as a phasing-out mechanism? Is there budget abuse of the two-year period?
A: (Amanda) – Ensures long-term viability, and allows us to pay bills.
5. **WLUSU:** As an associate member, the membership level is valuable for financial responsibilities, and forces associations to evaluate their status. Tying membership status to fees: clarify membership status, keeping the same status as long as the same fees are being paid? Also, keeping associate membership status consistent, associate members can sit on board, but cannot sit on committees, which does not currently make sense. By giving full members more rights, associates are incentivized to become full members
6. **UW-FEDS** – Rather than having associate membership as a prerequisite, would an observer status be permissible? A: Full membership can be adopted immediately.
7. **Dir. At Large** – There is value in participation in the organization through associate membership. Committees do ask associate membership to do work, just not vote.
8. **MSU** – Have we philosophically defined what associate membership is, as a group? Would not be in favor of completely removing associate membership, which would be a barrier to MSU's participation.
9. **UCSU** – You can go to observer to full member right away, which is positive. Once you are a member, having two levels of status doesn't make sense, allows some groups to take advantage of reduced fees. Having transition in or out, but membership should mean paying full fees.
10. **ULSU:** Something committee will discuss is whether associate members should be allowed to sit on the board. Do people think they should? (straw poll shows support associate

members not being on the board)

11. **ASU** – We do not view associate membership as a punitive measure, we want to see a full participation from schools.
12. **UBCGSS** – Sees associate membership as a trial period and safeguard to schools leaving overly rapidly.
13. **Waterloo FEDS** – Concern about associate members paying the same fees as full members. Non-members also benefit, but do not pay at all.
14. **DSU** – People mention abuse of the system, is that the case?
15. **Director-at-Large** – Membership depends on the rights, full rights should mean full fees, and reduced rights equal reduced fees.
16. **ND**: Schools have said they will leave organization over particular policy disagreements. Historically, some schools have gone back and forth from full to associate membership. Our membership changes often.
17. **Secretary** – Looked at different organizations for how they handle this process. Many have similar associate memberships with reduced rights. Should associate membership come with different rights?
18. **UBCGSS** – Many VPs of finance are likely
19. **AUGSS** – Could schools sign onto multi-year funding cycles?
20. **ND** – Multi-year funding creates a problem of larger financial commitments to member schools. We're at a point of stable finances and ability to do more work. More members may mean less fees as schools spread costs more widely.
21. **UASU**– two reasons for associate membership, incoming and outgoing. Perhaps incoming should result in half fees, outgoing should have full fees but full rights.
22. **Dir. At Large** – Agreement with the previous statement.
23. **MSU** – Good idea, but because of student government turnover, means that membership is new to every incoming student administration.

24. **FEECUM** – Offer lots to new members in the organization, have a good foundation for recruitment. Would dividing associate membership be positive?
25. **Chair**: Encourage ideas being sent to the bylaw committee and home office.
26. **ND**: If there is more flushing out to be had, would there be options for extending discussion later on.

Move to leave committee of the whole, carried unanimously.

b. Ad-hoc Committee to Review Policy F05

Whereas the F05 review committee met six times between July and November 2012. Research did show that low income students were not accessing tax credits because of either the lack of income to claim a rebate or unawareness of the program. However, research could not determine where the students fall within these two categories. Furthermore, over half the total tax credit claims (54.1%) are between the age group of 20-29 years old.

BIRT the F05 committee has completed its mandate.

BIFRT The membership task the policy committee in developing policy intervention related to tax credits.

- *Recommendations:*
 - Committee has completed mandate, Repeal F05, separation of tax credits and grant policy, policy committee should be tasked with drafting developing a policy intervention on effectiveness of tax credits.
 - Debate:
 1. **UPEISU**: Many schools support grants as policy, tax credits benefit many students especially mature, professional and graduate students. Encourage voting on this policy.
 2. **MSU**: Where does this policy go, where does the research go, what happens? After sitting on the committee the issue has proven divisive. When talking about tax credits many in-school students are helped, those considering attendance should be considered as well. Accessibility needs to be dealt with through grants.

3. **Dir. At Large:** Is there room for more students at universities? And should we be transferring money from one group of students to another?
4. **ND:** Policy research will be retained and documents will be kept. The policy will be kept with a note from being struck.
5. **FEECUM:** As a member of the original policy committee, speaking in favour of the policy resolution from the committee. Asking to cut tax credits to fund grants would be more work for the policy committee
6. **MSU:** Returning to topic, we are not discussing the transfer of money, but we need to keep an eye on the effects of grants to bring students in.
7. **UCSU:** F05 has completed its mandate, why would we repeal the policy until we have a policy to replace the current policy?
8. **UASU:** Policy to strike tax credits over grants is recognized, but what research shows the effectiveness of tax credits?
9. **UCSU:** In discussions with an MP, asked about upfront grants instead of tax credits, was not able to give a clear answer on what the CASA position was.
10. **UPEISU:** Just generally, there have been two levels of the committee, we'd like to move forward positively. As an organization, it wouldn't be responsible to keep a divisive policy on the books. Tax credits have different students who benefit than grants. As a committee there are too many options for policies to move forward on,
11. **Dir. At Large:** As the policy is written, it moves funds from one place to another. There is no research that supports transferring from A to B, but low income earners aren't benefitting from tax credits. For rebates, the government does give some, the low income earners need the most help. Need policy that works for students
12. **Secretary:** As a committee member, tax credits were being discussed 3 years ago. Question for chair – more than 50% voted to remove policy F05, but required supermajority (65% over) to repeal policy.
13. **Chair** – motion requires **65%** of support to pass.
14. **WLSU** – Is the intent to separate grants and tax credits, and have policies on both?
15. **USCUW** – To clarify, we have lobbied on both grants and tax credits?

16. **Chair** – The original policy would be gone, the committee would be dissolved, and the policy committee would be tasked with looking at tax credits.
17. **UCSU** – Two comments, when we talk about responsibility we need to make decisions based on research. Need to find avenues to improve the system. When we talk about making tax credits effective, research concluded that (from ANSA, OUSA, CAWS), maybe changing towards universal grants, rather than scrapping policy altogether.
18. **Nat'l Director:** We're not sure yet what leverages could be used to enhance tax credit policy, the committee would have to be researching and drafting the new policy.
19. **MSU:** Agree with Calgary, but this is another time that has been studied. No research has been done specifically on taking tax credits to transfer them to grants, however. Movement towards tasking the policy committee to look into where money is coming from for grants. (seconded by WL, then BUSU)
 - **DSU:** Are we dealing with the initial amendment?
 - **UASU:** What research was shown about why tax credits are better?
 - **Call the question: Motion carried (amendment to amendment) DSU opposed**
 - **MSU:** We need innovative ideas to fund grants: we can't simply exclude tax credits, but other funding sources need to be examined.
 - **Secretary:** on the amendment, CASA has a number of asks relating to money, broadly we look at efficiencies in the system, but we can have a broader discussion on spending and more effective funding.
 - **Dir At Large:** Bigger point, as written the current policy states that we're moving A to B.
 - **UCSU:** Speaking in favour and calling the question, waiting until the last speaker
 - **MSU:** Have broad conversations, but task committees on specific recommendations.

- **USCUW:** Question of whether we want a time constraint on this motion?
 - Call the question on the amendment, adding “increase funding for grants within the PSE funding envelope”: Motion carried with **AUGSA voting against.**
20. **UCSU:** Motion to amend the original motion, by striking “policy F05 be repealed, and” from the text.
- **FEECUM:** Would this repeal contradict the activity of the committee?
 - **UW-FEDS:** Do we have other policies on tax credits?
 - **Research:** We have F05, and other reiterations of that policy
 - **UCSU:** Why strike a policy before a replacement is on the books? We need to wait until the policy committee comes up with a replacement.

(RECESS FOR LUNCH – 30 minutes)

21. (Continued) Chair: Motion to table? (declined)
- **Chair of Board:** Encouraging people to vote against this amendment. Grants have been proven to increase access, whereas tax credits have been proven to reduce debt after graduation. This would effectively put CASA in the position of being opposed to tax credits. It would be better to have no policy on tax credits than to oppose them. As a liaison between members and staff, and other organizations, that responsibility precludes simply supporting tax credits or grants alone.
 - **UPEISU:** Agreement with the previous speaker. Supporting the desire to act as an alliance for all students.
 - **UCSU:** I would like to avoid a debate on tax credits vs grants, most of the major lobbying is done, lets see what comes up for AGM, and weigh the recommendations against F05.
 - **WLSU:** In no way do I feel this debate is dividing the organization. There is significant research on the effectiveness of grants and tax credits. If we rely on passion, it may skew the issue. We have to come back to the research and make an evidence-based decision, what does the research indicate with respect to tax credits vs upfront grants?
 - **UW FEDS –** Speaking against this amendment, based on policies. We have several policies on grants already. Expanding Canada study grants, etc... are important and supported by policy

resolutions. What research does not support is trading tax credits for grants improves accessibility. Strong opposition to this amendment.

- **SAMRU** – haven't seen the research, however, voted for members to go to research the topic and make a decision. Speaking to provincial groups with parallel resolutions, they may not represent polytechnics or grad students.
- **Director-at-Large** – This is one of the few issues that we as an alliance debate on. A few points need to be clarified – much research has shown tax credits are inefficient as a means of improving access and affordability. Also, on divisiveness, it is wrong to pit levels against each other (polytechnics, undergrads, grads). Several student alliances have spoken out against tax credits, including college students alliance, CFS, and others that represent all levels of PSE.
- **DSU** (sponsoring) – Every policy makes a value judgement. As a professional organization, issues vary from group to group. It is important to make a decision because of the varied makeup, and consider the benefit to society. While I've never been 100% happy with the asks, but overall support the policies.
- **AUGSA** – Encouraging all members to vote against the policy, its been a contentious issue, we haven't acknowledged what the committee has done. The policy criticizes tax credits.
- **UASU** – The chair brings a point, do we want tax credits eliminated. OECD advocated increasing grants in exchange for lower tax credits. Ontario Min of Fin, Millenium Scholarship, and CASA research supports that motion. Encourage the focus being on improving tax credits.
- **SAITSA** – Suggest voting against the policy, grants do not benefit everyone, this would not help students at all. Many are in trades and mature students who would benefit from tax credits.
- **FEECUM** – voting for this motion would counteract the committee's mandate.
- **SMUSA**: Call the question on the amendment – Ending debate and voting.

Motion Passes, 1 opposed. Voting on the amendment, to remove the language to refer to “repealing F05” in the motion.

Motion fails. 8 in favour, 12 opposed.

22. **Back to main motion: USCWU** – Proposing amendment, “That the research of the policy committee be presented at AGM 2013”, in order to give the project a timeline. Respecting the tasks already in front of the policy committee.

- **DSU** – It’s important to have these debates, support the motion.
- **UWFEDS** – The committee has a number of projects in front of it, and may not have the time to present a thoughtful recommendation by AGM 2013, and may delay other projects
- **STFX** – Would the resources be available to invest more time into this topic?
- **Nat’l Director** – Would like to avoid delving into the policy side, but much research has already been invested, so we encourage everyone to read the material that has already been made available. Home office needs direction from the board on this issue. We don’t want to repeat work.
- **UPEISU** – Having recently put time into this issue, very proud of what the committee is presenting here, taking into consideration the limited resources, I would be willing to work on presenting the research for AGM regarding tax credits and grants.
- **WUSC** – In addition to ND statements, as a member I haven’t received that research. That would be helpful prior to AGM.
- **UNB Fredericton** – Start by thanking the F05 cmte, the report given wasn’t very substantial or reflective of the work that has gone on. A paragraph doesn’t do the work justice.
- **National Director** – We can take the research that has been done, make it more complete and share that with the membership if that is what is desired. That could be prepared in a few weeks, if needed.
- **DSU** – Suggest that we can make a decision on the AGM, the research has been done, may be circulated.
- **MSU** – Some people are unaware of the research, we need to be clear on what the research says before we make a decision. We

can set a timeline for deciding.

- **WLSU** - I would be very supportive of a motion to that effect, to share the research. Shudder at the idea of tabling this issue. But there may be no harm in tabling the issue, we're not advocating on the policy. Would a motion to postpone until the AGM be in order, giving the membership time to examine a summary of research? (seconded by MSU)
- **Motion to postpone until 2013 AGM:**
 - **UPEISU** – Warning everyone that there is about a full courseload worth of reading involved on this policy. Postponing would be pushing back a decision, and the committee has already reviewed it. Opposed to postponing.
 - **BUSU** – We do have the right research, it was reviewed by the committee, second time a committee has made the same recommendation to scrap the policy. This was discussed at last AGM. This further review will be a waste of time.
 - **MSU** – We've entrusted F05 to make a decision, but the committee has not done its job of informing members of what the research says. I would like to conduct a straw poll of opinions on whether you have made up your mind (hands raised)
 - **UNBSU(FR)** – Committees need to present evidence that their decision is the best one, a paragraph is not enough for that decision. Until research is presented, I cannot accept what the committee brings.
 - **Secretary** – On debate to postpone, more research is not going to change anyone's mind. I suggest we make a decision.
 - **AUGSA** – Could we put a time limit on this debate? (No opposition)
 - **USCWU** – Amendment is to present at 2013 AGM, on the policy committee considerations regarding what policy on tax credits would be productive and to explore opportunities for increasing grant funding.

- **UBCGSS** – Calling the question on postponement and circulation of a brief from home office. Carried Unanimously.
- Motion to postpone until AGM 2013: **Motion fails**
- **Return to motion** – research of the policy CMTE on effectiveness of tax credits and opportunities for funding for grants under the PSE envelope.
- **UASU** – noting that research has been posted to CASA website.
- **UCSU**: Calling the question on the motion to amend.
The motion passes.
- On the motion to present at the 2013 AGM:
Motion is carried, **motion passes.**

23. Returning to the main motion:

24. **UCSU**: Calling the question, seconded by Brock (**Motion fails**)

25. **UPEISU** – We had a comment made about everyone bringing forward issues that may or may not help all students, but on contentious issues like this one are distinct. As an alliance, we need to present policies that we all acknowledge are valid. Encourage respect for the committees work. I will present research at AGM if needed.

26. **Chair of the Board** – I urge everyone to support the work of the F05 committee, there is no new information that would be available to the members, it has been seen by the committee already. There is a difference between keeping F05 on the books, versus having no policy, since keeping F05 means keeping a policy that we know helps students. There is a difference between not lobbying something and being for or against something. I urge members to support this resolution

27. **UASU** – I would like to split the motion. Removing the second Be It Resolved, dealing with repealing F05 from the remainder of the motion.

- **UBCGSS** – by dividing those, we are moving F05 back into another committee.
- **UASA** – I believe these motions are mutually exclusive

- **UPEISU** – Would removal of the F05 section mean that the F05 committee has completed its mandate?
- **Chair** – I believe that this ruling would still satisfy the mandate of the F05 committee
- **WLSU** – Supporting, it would alleviate the concerns from the member from Calgary.
- **ULSU** (sponsor **UCSU**) – We should split these, the contentious section is repealing the policy, which increases the threshold to 2/3, and this allows the rest to be voted on with a 50% threshold. We can still achieve some outcomes that everyone agrees on.
- **UCSU** – Is this different from the motion to amend from earlier? (Speaker: Yes)
- **FEECUM**: Call the question to divide the motion. **Motion passes**, **UBCGSS** and **WFEDS** opposed, **AUGSA** abstains.
- Voting on Splitting the motion, dealing first with BIRT clauses 1, 3, and 4, followed by BIRT clause 2. **Motion Fails**.

28. Returning to main motion.

29. Calling the question on the main motion – that F05 has completed its mandate, that F05 be repealed and the issue of grants and tax credits be advocated on separately, etc. The motion passes.

- Noting the work of the F05 committee and all their time.
- Noting that in the future, committee decisions give a summary of evidence when they present their decisions.
- Noting that reports be given a full consideration of the decision making process.
- **ND**: Reports belong to the committee and the membership, and are the products of members, and should use common sense in their writing.

Further Information:

c. Policy Committee

- i. i) BIRT the Policy Statement “Encouraging the availability of advance polling on post-secondary institution campuses” be adopted.

Supporting Documentation: [“Encouraging the availability of advance polling on post-secondary institutions campuses”](#)

1. Motion on Advance Polling on campuses – Moved by **DSU**, seconded by **UWFEDS**
 - a. Motion by **DSU**, seconded by **UCSU**, to add amendments: condensing the “BIRT”, moving from 5 to 2 BIRT statements.
 - b. Seeing no debate – all in favour of the amendments as presented – motion is **carried unanimously**.
2. Any debate on the motion as presented.
3. **Nat’l Director**: Asking for a summary.
4. **DSU**: Motion asks to clarify the responsibilities of Elections Canada, pushing for more specified responsibilities with regards to contacting student organizations and setting up advance polls.
5. **UNB – Fredrickson** – This is a good movement, touching on issues that do directly affect students. Supporting the motion.
6. Calling the question on adopting the policy on Advance Polling: Speaker calls for a motion of unanimous consent on this issue – **adopted unanimously**.

1. Motions Rising from the Membership

- a. **Nat’l Director**: Two members have indicated that they would like to raise issues.
 - i. Motion to task the Board of Directors to review a variety of group decision models for the consideration of policy asks. Be it further resolved that the board report back for AGM 2013.
Moved by **MSU**, seconded by **DSU**.
 - ii. **MSU** – Raising the issue to consider options and gather feedback from members on methods of making decisions on priority-setting at policy and strategy. As a delegate, there was not a lot of information presented by the board. Options include methods such as online documents, mass phoning, and other means of providing feedback.
 - iii. **BUSU** – was there a particular issue arising from the policy diamond formation process before?
 - iv. **MSU** – We don’t always know how successful our asks are going to be, and modifications could be implemented on the diamond from

items that may arise from changing political environments. Policy committee could work with home

- v. **WFEDS** – Is this an amendment to the policy process?
 - vi. **ASU** – In my report on the national advocacy team, we look at the intersection between group decision making, issues, and political opportunities
 - vii. **Nat’l Director:** This is happening already, but not in a formalized way as of yet. We are reviewing the process of decision models. Home office will be assessing the options.
 - viii. **DSU** – I was planning on delivering a similar motion due to the experience at policy and strategy. There are many reasons why this would be difficult because of not a lot of prior experience. I would suggest the policy diamond be considered more loosely, and less restrictively.
 - ix. **MSU** – I agree with having a discussion, but this is not the time for that discussion, that should be held at AGM as a breakout session.
 - x. **Secretary** – This relates closely to the governance of CASA, I would like to look at different models, to get input from everyone. I am good with the motion, if there are specific models please contact the board with what you would like to see.
 - xi. **MSU** – What this motion is getting at is not policy and strat, but the specific asks that come forward.
 - xii. **MSU** – the priorities are optional to me, and a good discussion to have more than once, but the asks are the more relevant area to discuss.
 - xiii. **Nat’l Director:** Developing the asks is an ongoing process, and we need to be sure everyone knows what that process is. Everyone can continue to contribute outside of policy and strat.
 - xiv. Calling the question on this motion: **The motion is carried.**
- b. **Motion:** CASA lobby Health Canada on the issue of blood donations from men who have sexual relations with men.
- i. **DSU** – There was a blood drive on Dal campus, students raised the issue on campus, asked to bring the motion to CASA. Was not sure

about how strict the PSE-focus mandate is within CASA.

- ii. **UPEISU** – Is it our place to lobby Health Canada?
- iii. **Nat'I Director**: Our vision is to focus specifically on PSE issues, on Affordability, Accessibility, Quality and Innovation. Single issue groups tend to be more effective. However, this is a chance to network and discuss issues on campuses. This may be an issue of interest to members present.
- iv. **UPEISU** – if we want to have this discussion, would it be better to have it in a more general policy sense.
- v. **Speaker** – unless someone raises the issue of the motion being out of order, I will not be ruling on its admissibility.
- vi. **DSU (cont'd)** – The DSU supports the motion to lobby Health Canada on the issue of blood donor eligibility. Asking that Health Canada use the same criteria for other groups that have other higher-risk behaviours.
- vii. **Nat'I Director** – I would prefer we don't vote this down, we don't want to outwardly oppose this motion on any level although it falls outside of CASA's charter responsibility
- viii. **UWFEDS** – I would want to speak on this, being directly affected, and would support the discussion of this issue within members, but would move to postpone indefinitely.
- ix. **SAMRU** – we have already set the precedent of stepping outside purely PSE issues, with the policy on advanced polling on campuses.
- x. **BUSU** – I believe that the polling issue does fall within the CASA mandate in terms of our existence as a political organization
- xi. **UASU** – I really respect that this motion is being brought forward. I am in favour of tabling this indefinitely, we only received this at the last minute and haven't had much chance to discuss this issue. Outside of CASA would be a good place to coordinate and support issues like this.
- xii. **Chair of Board** – I fully agree with the spirit of this motion, and recommend postponing this indefinitely. There is a difference between the polling policy, due to the specific political goals of the polling issue related to CASA's goals. Students wear a number of different hats, here we are representing them as students, rather

than as social activists, regardless of how positive their goals may be.

- xiii. **Nat'l Director:** In terms of procedure, support the motion of tabling indefinitely. For the different hats students wear, and this may be a conversation this body isn't designed to handle, but if schools are interested in participating in this please communicate with Aaron, and this is an important issue and we can help support members on their efforts lobbying for this, but not under the CASA banner.
- xiv. **ULSU** – By postponing this indefinitely, this has no bearing on CASA's support for LGBT rights.
- xv. **UPEI** – Forward this issue through the newsletter, there is a lot of interest in councils
- xvi. **UNB(FR)** – Are these types of issues something CASA can advocate on? We need to be sure there is no double standard on what issues we are willing to support. Need to be clear that it is outside our mandate or not, and that other motions adhere to CASA priorities. Rather than postponing indefinitely, postpone until AGM so members can speak to their constituents.
 - 1. **UBCGSS** - Calling the question - Regarding the motion to postpone until AGM – motion passes.
 - 2. On the motion to postpone until AGM – **the motion fails.**
- xvii. Returning to the motion to postpone indefinitely
- xviii. **UBCGSS** – Calling the question on the motion to postpone indefinitely and overrule subsequent speakers – **the motion Carries.**
- xix. Voting on the motion to postpone indefinitely – **The motion Carries. UNB-Fredericton and DSU.**

c. **ASU** – Support the principle of examining the boundaries of CASA at AGM in terms of what issues are under the area of interest to this organization. Calling politicians onto campuses to host discussions can be productive on a range of issues.

d. Other motions rising from the membership – none put forward

4. Other Business

c. **Nat'l Director** – Thank you to everyone for your patience and energy, please continue to support your peers, and put in the work and time. Sometimes these meetings do go 9-5, and thanks for putting in a full workday around these important issues. It is now 3:13, the F05 process has come to a

resolution and that represents some productive work, less substantive debates have gone on longer. And thirdly, thanks to everyone for participating, please talk to each other about the issues you are interested in and work on those together. On policy committee and those issues, don't let your interests only exist around this table, we'll be working on the tasks we have been given in terms of research. The FCM had their advocacy week this week as well – they met with 116 people, we met with over 130. Walk away with the knowledge that the issues you're bringing forward are important and being heard at the federal level.

- d. **Speaker** –
- e. **UPEISU** – On behalf of delegates and members, thanks to everyone who put time into making this week a success, and a round of applause for everyone.
- f. **MSU** – On the note of thanks, thanks to the speaker and chair of the meeting.
- g. **Speaker** – Thanks for inviting me and thanks for the mug. This has been a good change of pace.
- h. **UPEISU** – Motion to Adjourn. Seconded by STSU, adopted unanimously.

Adjournment