Constitution and Policy Review Committee Meeting
June 14th 2016, 515 UC

Meeting called to order at 6:08pm

1. Announcements
2. Election of the Chair
   Ruth Lau McDonald nominates herself. Austin Pellizzer seconds.

Ruth: I am a student who has an interest in this, I want to make sure this is another avenue for engagement. I have been at Carleton for many years. I have experience chairing meetings in the past and this is something I am passionate about.

Lauren Konarowski: Will you be willing to work with the part time student that will be hired?

Ruth: Totally! Collaboration as a group will be great.

Julia Dalphy: Are you familiar with the past work and accomplishments of this committee or not?

Ruth: I mean not particularly because there has been a lack of publishing of minutes, this is something I want to change and increase accessibility for all.

Charissa Feres: How will you increase engagement?

Ruth: By doing different things, reaching out to students, usage of social media, but also classic things that are really effective such as town halls or postering.

Fahd: How will you set your opinion aside on certain things? Such as CUSA INC and nonprofit corporations?

Ruth: We need to seek a professional that will help us, someone outside this scope. No matter my opinion we need to lock things down and do what is right for students. Its about strengthening.

2. Election of the Secretary
   Charissa Feres nominates herself
   Julia Dalphy seconds

Charissa gives background
   I always have my notebook. I am always paying attention. I am detail oriented and can accurately write down everything that goes on.

Lauren: How will you develop a working relationship with the chair?
Charissa: Ruth and I have collaborated for council and communicated about things going on in CUSA. We share an interest in the governance of CUSA and with the committee we can get stuff done in a positive way.

Motion passed. Charissa is secretary.

3. Questions

4. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 6:28 pm
Constitution and Policy Review Committee
Meeting Minutes

Date: June 28 2016  Location: UC 513  Time: 6pm (meeting called to order at 6:18 pm)

Current Voting Members:
Ruth Lau Macdonald, Charissa Feres, Austin Pellizzer, Ashley Courchene, Lauren Konarowski, Fahd Alhattab, Sarah Garlough, Julia Dalphy

Attendees:
Voting Members: Ruth Lau Macdonald (Chair), Charissa Feres (Secretary), Lauren Konarowski, Sarah Garlough, Julia Dalphy
Non-Voting Members: Lily Akagbosu

QUORUM WAS MET

Review of Past Minutes:
- The Committee has decided not to be too formal with meetings, so there will be no official approval of past minutes, but there will be a brief review of them at the beginning of each meeting to keep attendees updated

Agenda Item 1:
Ground Rules & Expectations
- If a meeting does not have quorum (5 voting members present), the Committee will still hold a ‘working meeting’ where projects may be discussed, but no voting on any matters will take place
  - Communication and Timelines:
    o Meeting dates will now be communicated via Outlook calendar as well as through the Facebook group
    o The Chair will give a minimum 7 days’ notice for all meetings
    o If anything regarding the Committee needs to be posted on official CUSA social media platforms, contact Christine at creative@cusaonline.ca
    o The Committee will reach out to students and groups about meetings and projects via social media and email. This includes keeping a mailing list of councillors, service centres, academic associations, clubs and societies, students at large, etc. (See Action Item 1)
  - Conduct:
    o Meetings will be conducted with respect and professionalism
    o The Committee will not use Robert’s Rules of Order
    o Members may suggest other guidelines for conduct as they see fit

Agenda Item 2:
Brainstorm and Discussion around Committee Goals for 2016/2017
- Lauren would like the Committee to look at how Committees are structured, how they operate, and see if this should be updated (ex: is the current quorum for committee meetings realistic and appropriate?)
- Julia would like the Committee to look at the number of councillor positions in each faculty, explore how these numbers are determined, and create a procedure for regularly reviewing council structure and eligibility for faculties to have councillor positions (See Action Item 2)
- Julia would like the Committee to look into ways to increase Council outreach and engagement with students (ex: Council social media, blogs), while also ensuring that these platforms are kept up to date each year (See Action Item 3)
- Charissa and Lily would like the Committee to look at creating a Councillor terms of reference that would outline expectations, training, procedures for accountability, and mentorship, amongst other things. (See Action Item 4 and 5). There could also be an Ad-Hoc Committee or working group started
to look into Councillor engagement and how to address the one-year turnover rate as well (See Action Item 6)
- Ruth would like the Committee to review and tighten up CUSA’s processes (ex: reviewing the different types of voting majority for different matters, creating systems of accountability, reviewing and strengthening CUSA’s policies, etc.) This is something we can partner with the Legal Policy Analyst on. (See Action Item 7)
- Ruth would like the Committee to review the expectations around CUSA consulting students prior to making decisions that affect them
- Sarah has a list of things in the bylaws that seem unreasonable or that hinder efficiency that the Committee should address (See Action Item 8)

Agenda Item 3: Update on Legal Policy Analyst
- Lauren is currently in the process of interviewing candidates for the Legal Policy Analyst position at CUSA
- The student will begin their 8-week contract on July 4
- Their role will be to generally review CUSA’s governing documents to tighten them up, as well as do research into other students’ associations’ documents
- The Committee would like to work with the summer student (See Action Item 9)

Other Business:
- The CPRC Committee description on the CUSA website needs to be updated to better reflect its mandate (See Action Item 10)
- CUSA has been working with the Sarcony group consultants to improve their businesses and transitioning between executives. The Committee could potentially consult them on issues such as councillor transitions, mailing lists, etc. (See Action Item 11)
- Lauren has 5 sets of meeting minutes from last year’s Committee. (See Action Item 12)

Action Items:
1. Charissa will compile a list of people and groups the Committee should reach out to for meeting invites and general promotion of the Committee
2. Julia will write up a fact sheet with background info on council structure to serve as a starting point for the Committee (Ruth suggests contacting CIRP to get faculty enrollment numbers and other data)
3. Lauren will invite someone from the Communications Office to attend a future meeting in order to discuss possibilities for increasing Council’s digital outreach
4. Charissa will look into councillor terms of reference for other student associations and bring that info to the Committee as a starting point
5. Sarah and Lauren will look into councillor training material from last year and bring it to the next Committee meeting for comparison
6. Lauren will look into creating an Ad-Hoc Committee/working group for Councillor engagement
7. Ruth will review the terms of reference and bylaws around councillors, executives, and council employees
8. Sarah will send the list of bylaw inadequacies to Lauren to give to the summer student, as well as bring it to the next Committee meeting
9. Lauren will invite the Legal Policy Analyst to the next Committee meeting
10. Lauren will contact the Communications office to update the Committee description on the CUSA website
11. Lauren will contact the Sarcony group to find out how they can help the Committee with improving council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. <strong>Lauren</strong> will send out last year’s meeting minutes from this Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Meeting:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Committee will meet every 2 weeks throughout the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Next meeting will be on <strong>July 11 (5:30pm)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The meeting after that will be on <strong>July 25 (5:30pm)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lauren will take care of booking room locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting adjourned at 7:08pm
# Constitution and Policy Review Committee
## Meeting Minutes

**Date:** July 11 2016  
**Location:** UC 513  
**Time:** 5:30 pm (meeting called to order at 5:40 pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Voting Members:</th>
<th>Ruth Lau MacDonald, Charissa Feres, Austin Pellizzer, Ashley Courchene, Lauren Konarowski, Fahd Alhattab, Sarah Garlough, Julia Dalphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attendees:              | **Voting Members:** Ruth Lau Macdonald (Chair), Charissa Feres (Secretary), Lauren Konarowski, Sarah Garlough, Julia Dalphy  
                          | **Non-Voting Members:** Simon Hunt, Dina, Shawn Humphrey |

**Approval of Agenda:**  
- Taryn Ashdown’s motion was moved to the beginning of the agenda

**Agenda Item 1:**  
**Motion to Amend Clubs and Societies Bylaws**
- A handout with the full motion, along with annotations that indicate the changes to the Bylaws was distributed to the Committee. Taryn delivered a presentation on the motion.
- The Clubs & Societies (C&S) Office is creating a clubs guide that will include extracts of some C&S Bylaws, which is why they need the Bylaws changed in order to be accurate and clear in the guide.
- The main issue is that some of the C&S Bylaws lack detail, so they want to have clearer guidelines for accreditation and funding procedures, as well as to make things overall more transparent.
- Summary of key changes:
  - Clubs will now be mandated to submit a ledger in order to receive funding
  - Clubs only need to have a bank account if they are receiving funding
  - CUSA will not provide funding for club apparel or travel expenses
- These Bylaw changes will not be retroactive (they will only apply as of when they are approved)
- Q: Are ledgers only reviewed once a year? A: Ledgers are reviewed for the summer term and then once for the full fall/winter term. CUSA currently has a lack of resources to implement mid-year reviews, especially since there are around 300 clubs and 2 part-time C&S commissioners to help manage them.
- Q: Are there any long-term policy changes planned for C&S? A: There is currently a rubric used for assessing clubs for funding, which may be implemented permanently if it works well during the fall funding session.
- The Committee did not express any major concerns with the motion.

**Announcements:**
- Most Committee members didn’t submit their action items from last meeting. Why?
- Members were confused around whether they had to submit in advance or bring their updates to meetings.
- **For now on, any action items/updates must be submitted at least 48 hours before a meeting so that the Chair can attach any relevant documents/material to the agenda for review**
- Members also expressed a preference for google docs over dropbox, and that all material should be posted on Facebook in addition to being sent out by email (See action item 1)

**Agenda Item 2:**  
**Review of Action**
Charissa:
| Items from Last Meeting | - **Contact list**: includes all CUSA councillors/executives/staff, academic groups, etc. Intended to be used for student outreach for town halls and other initiatives  
- Terms of Reference for Council at other student associations: see [this document](#) for starting notes (See action item 2)  

**Julia:**  
- Julia has created the following documents: [CUSA Seat Breakdown Stats](#), [CUSA 2016-2017 Fees](#), and [CUSA Revenue](#)  
- Key points:  
  - There should be proportional representation on council for all faculties; however, there does need to be a cap on the number of councilors  
  - There are different types of council members (Ex: executives, faculty representatives, GSA, RRRA), and we should look at what issues/interests are being represented, which may in turn affect council structure. (Ex: what does being a special student mean? Are part-time students represented?) (See action item 3 and 4)  

**Lauren:**  
- There is no update regarding the Sarcony group because they focus on operations and organizational excellence, which doesn’t directly relate to the Committee.  
- The description for the CPRC on the CUSA website has been updated. The Communications team doesn’t think it’s a good idea to create a webpage just for the CPRC because it wouldn’t be very engaging. Ruth would like a platform where information about the CPRC, meeting minutes, etc. can be posted for students to access.  
- The CUSA Communications team has suggested creating a Facebook page for council updates. This would be curated by Communications staff, but all council members could submit posts (See action item 5)  
- Dina is the new legal policy analyst summer student for CUSA. Dina has done a first-read of the CUSA Constitution, Bylaws, and Policies for grammar inconsistencies and is researching other schools (mostly in Ontario) to compare documents. A report with Dina’s findings and recommendations will be presented to the executive first, then to council, and will be made available to students at large.  

**Sarah:**  
- Sarah has a list of Bylaw inconsistencies. (See action item 6)  

**Ruth:**  
- Ruth has been researching things such as the structure of the CUSA governing documents, how CUSA ratifies its Directors, AGMs, executive reporting (i.e. strategic planning), how partnerships can be formed between executives and councillors, financial restrictions and contracts, and the values of the Association as outlined in the CUSA Constitution  

**Agenda Item 3: New Areas of Interest**  
- The Committee has expressed interest in conducting a town hall for the upcoming school year. This can be in collaboration with other committees, and will allow students to come and express their concerns and suggestions regarding CUSA. There can be presentations/updates from each exec and/or guided discussion groups on various topics (See action item 7)
The Committee has agreed to create a working document that outlines our goals and projects for the summer/upcoming year. *(See action item 8)*

**Action Items:**

*Any action items/updates must be submitted to the Chair at least 48 hours before a meeting so that they can attach any relevant documents/material to the agenda for review*

1. **Ruth** will create a folder on google docs for all Committee documents
2. **Charissa** will continue research on Council terms of reference
3. **Julia** will reach out to OIRP for data on enrollment numbers in different faculties
4. **Lauren** will find out if CUSA has any data around numbers of students in each faculty (elections data?)
5. **Lauren** will continue discussions with the CUSA Communications team around a council Facebook page and other engagement platforms
6. **Sarah** will send the list of Bylaw inconsistencies to Ruth to add to the Committee google drive and send out with the next agenda
7. **All members** will send their ideas about the town hall to Ruth to compile into a document that we will ‘pitch’ to the executive
8. **Charissa** will create a document outlining the Committee’s goals/projects

**Next Meeting:**

- The July 25 meeting had to be re-scheduled due to the budget council meeting
- Please fill out this [doodle poll](#) with your availability for the next meeting

Meeting adjourned at 7:15pm
## Constitution and Policy Review Committee
### Meeting Minutes

**Date:** August 3 2016  
**Location:** UC 513  
**Time:** 6:00pm (meeting called to order at 6:13 pm)

### Current Voting Members:
- Ruth Lau MacDonald, Charissa Feres, Austin Pellizzer, Lauren Konarowski, Sarah Garlough, Julia Dalphy

### Attendees:
**Voting Members:** Ruth Lau Macdonald (Chair), Charissa Feres (Secretary), Lauren Konarowski, Julia Dalphy, Austin Pellizzer  
**Non-Voting Members:** Shawn Humphrey, Sophie Kourtsidis, Sabreen El Awad

### Approval of Agenda:
- Agenda was approved without amendment

### Announcements:
- Austin: Carleton Oxfam will be participating in Ottawa Pride (Aug 21). All students are welcome to join.

### Agenda Item 1: Review of Action Items from Last Meeting

- **Julia:**
  - No major updates on council structure *(See action item 1)*
  - Has informally spoken with students in architecture and info-tech to find out about their knowledge of CUSA councillor representation (they don’t know very much)

- **Lauren:**
  - Has a meeting with Tyler Hall from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) to talk about CUSA elections data and numbers *(See action item 2)*
  - The communications team has been very busy; however, it should be fine to have CPRC documents and a Committee contact list posted on the CUSA website *(See action item 3)*
  - A CUSA Council Facebook page is also in the works. *(See action item 4)*
  - The Committee expressed interest in setting up mailing lists/alias to make it easier to send out targeted emails to various groups of people on campus *(See action item 5)*

- **Ruth:**
  - Has created a google drive folder with all CPRC documents (see [here](#)) that should be accessible to all members

- **Charissa:**
  - No major updates on councillor terms of reference *(See action item 6)*
  - Has created a document outlining current CPRC projects and amendments to CUSA governing documents put forth by the CPRC (See [here](#))

- **Sarah:**
  - To the Committee’s knowledge, Sarah has not sent out the list of Bylaw inconsistencies *(See action item 7)*

- **CUSA Town Hall/Open House:**
  - No one has sent any ideas, but the Committee did some brainstorming during the meeting
o There can be booths set up based on faculties or themes, and students can walk around, ask questions, and give feedback on different aspects of CUSA
o Need to focus on mandate of the CPRC and structure the event in order to gather feedback that can inform policies, bylaws, etc.
  o The event can possibly be livestreamed, there can be question periods and presentations
  o October 12 is already going to be ‘CUSA Day’ so the event could potentially be scheduled that evening
  o (See action item 8)

**Agenda Item 2: Executive Compensation Committee Report**
- One of the recommendations from the recently approved Executive Compensation Committee (ECC) report (see here) is for the CPRC to assess the timeline for when the ECC is struck and must present its report
- The CPRC recommends the following:
  o (Concerning Bylaw IV, Section 3.0) The ECC shall be struck during the regular September council meeting and must present a report with its findings and recommendations at the regular November council meeting.
  o The report shall be distributed to council no later than 10 days prior to the November council meeting.
  o The ECC shall meet and present a report every year.
- Reasoning:
  o The ECC should be struck in September so that they are assessing and determining an executive compensation package for individuals who are not yet in office and whom are unknown (this decreases the politics behind executive compensation)
  o The ECC has, in the past, not been given sufficient time to thoroughly research and produce a report, which is why the CPRC recommends a deadline in November, which will give the ECC two months to complete their work, while also taking into account the timing of Fall break, midterms, and December exams
  o The CPRC felt the ECC should meet yearly, as opposed to every second year, in order to ensure more continuity and consistency in reporting. This would also ensure that the VP Finance has recent and relevant recommendations to follow when creating the annual CUSA Operating Budget
- (See action item 9)

**Agenda Item 3: CPRC August progress report**
- Ruth has written a summary report for the CPRC (see here) which will be presented during the August council meeting
- Due to issues with members being unable to access the report online, the Committee will review and approve the report at the next CPRC meeting (See action item 10)

**Action Items:**
Any action item updates must be submitted to the Chair at least 48 hours before a meeting so that they can attach any relevant documents/material to the agenda for review
1. Julia will continue research on council structure
2. Lauren will write a summary of the meeting with Tyler Hall, along with any data information gathered, and send it to Ruth to include in CPRC documents
3. **Lauren** will search for past CPRC meeting minutes to see what can be accessed
4. **Lauren** will continue speaking with the CUSA communications team, specifically around creating a council Facebook page and CPRC webpage
5. **Lauren** will talk to Rod Castro (CUSA GM) about creating mailing lists
6. **Charissa** will continue research on councillor terms of reference
7. **Julia** will follow-up with **Sarah** regarding the list of Bylaw inconsistencies in order to send it to **Ruth** to include in CPRC documents
8. **All members** will send their ideas for the CUSA Town Hall/Open House to **Ruth**
9. **Ruth** will draft a motion regarding the CPRC’s recommendations for the ECC and send it out to members to review and discuss at the next meeting
10. **All members** will read the CPRC August report before the next meeting

| Next Meeting:          | - August 17 (6pm) is the next CPRC meeting  
|                       | - August 30 is the next CUSA council meeting |

Meeting adjourned at 7:13pm
## Constitution and Policy Review Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date:** August 17 2016  **Location:** UC 513  **Time:** 6:00pm (meeting called to order at 6:07 pm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Voting Members:</th>
<th>Ruth Lau MacDonald, Charissa Feres, Austin Pellizzer, Lauren Konarowski, Sarah Garlough, Julia Dalphy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Attendees:**          | **Voting Members:** Ruth Lau Macdonald (Chair), Lauren Konarowski, Julia Dalphy, Austin Pellizzer, Sarah Garlough  
                          | **Non-Voting Members:** Shawn Humphrey, Jessica Beaudoin-Walker |
| Approval of Agenda:     | Agenda was approved without amendment |
| Announcements:         | Shawn is technically eligible for voting status on the CPRC; however, due to his position as CUSA council Chair, he will not be accepting it in order to remain neutral and impartial |

**Agenda Item 1:**  
Review of Action Items from Last Meeting

| Lauren: | - Attended meeting with Tyler Hall from OIRP (See data received regarding CUSA elections data [here](#))  
          | - The CUSA communications team feels that if we used mailing lists then students would receive too many emails and become disengaged. However, an email alias for each faculty would make it easier for students to email all their faculty reps at the same time (more accessible and efficient)  
          | - A Council Facebook page is in the works (See action item 2) Lauren would potentially be the moderator of this because the Communications office doesn’t want to get involved in the political affairs of CUSA  
          | - The Committee’s section on the website is being updated (See action item 3) |
| Julia:  | - See updated google doc ([CUSA Seat Breakdown Stats AUG](#)) with added information from Lauren’s meeting with Tyler  
          | - According to the CUSA Bylaws, in order to have its own seat, a degree/school must have at least 250 students  
          | - There are inconsistencies in the way seats are broken down (not all degree programs with more than 250 students have a seat and not all seats have at least 250 students represented)  
          | - There are currently 26 council representatives. If we added seats for every degree that meets the 250 cut-off, there would then be 32 councilors (remember this doesn’t include executives, RRRA, and GSA)  
          | - **Issues:**  
                        | o Currently, Council structure is based on current year enrollment and we don’t know what that is since enrollment isn’t finalized until well after May  
                        | o What is a ‘constituency’?  
                        | o Where are special students counted?  
          | - **Possible Options:**  
                        | o Break down seats so that Schools or Degrees that meet the 250 student cut off have a seat and those who don’t make the cut off only have an executive representative |
- Every degree program gets one seat with no minimum cut off (total of 25 degrees)
- Every degree program below 1000 students gets one seat, between 1000-2000 gets two seats, and 2000 + gets 3 seats
- Divide by faculty (5) and base the number of seats for each on the percentage of students in each faculty as counted in the previous year’s general election

- **Recommendations:**
  - Replace the word “constituency” with “faculty”
  - Council structure should be annually reviewed in April by the VP Internal and CEO, and then presented to Council
  - Utilize previous year’s CUSA election data to determine seat number
  - Every constituency (faculty) has a minimum of one seat
  - The maximum number of councillor seats is 25
  - Special students to have their own separate seat

- **See action item 4**
- **See action item 5**

**CUSA Town Hall/Open House:**
- Still brainstorming ideas (**See action item 6**)  

**Agenda Item 2:**
**Motion to Create BGInS Councillor (Jessica)**
- Jessica (PAPM Councilor) received a motion (see [here](#)) from a student in BGInS asking to add a seat in council for that degree
- The Bachelor of Global and International Studies degree is expected to have around 500 students this year (was just below 250 last year)
- They currently are represented by Public Affairs councilors
- If added, this would increase council from 34 to 35 members, and 26 to 27 councilors
- Jessica would recommend that a seat be added during the upcoming election
- Jessica will hold off on presenting this motion in order to wait and see how council structure changes

**Agenda Item 3:**
**Motion for Executive Compensation Amendments**
- See motion [here](#)
- Changed so that the Executive Compensation Committee report should be presented and voted on in November with the report submitted to Council two weeks prior
- Added that either the CUSA GM or financial officer sit on the Committee because they are staff members who are not part of the collective agreement
- Added VP Finance to the Committee
- Added that the Committee should consult the Financial Review Committee’s reports as well as past Executive Compensation Committee reports
- Added Executive Compensation Committee to the standing committee list
- **See action item 7**

**Agenda Item 4:**
**Update from Legal Policy Analyst**
- Next week is Dina’s last week of work so she won’t be employed during the August council meeting
- Next week, Lauren, Fahd, and Dina are meeting with the Ombudsman about the proposed changes (specifically electoral code changes)
- Dina will present her report to the CPRC next week Wednesday
- See Electoral Code Report [here](#) and its presentation [here](#)
- Dina’s recommendations will be presented by a lawyer to council
- **See action item 8**

**Agenda Item 5:**
- See report [here](#) (**See action item 9**)

---
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### Review of Committee Report for Council

**Action Items:**

*Any action item updates must be submitted to the Chair at least 48 hours before a meeting so that they can attach any relevant documents/material to the agenda for review*

1. **Lauren** will send Ruth notes from her meeting with Tyler
2. **Lauren** will send out a questionnaire to all of Council to get input on the Facebook page
3. **Lauren** will post all of this year’s CPRC minutes on the CUSA website and look into finding minutes from past years
4. **Julia** will create a presentation for council about the Committee’s work on council structure and possible options moving forward
5. **Julia and Sarah** will begin drafting changes to the Bylaws
6. **All members** will email Ruth with ideas about the Town Hall
7. **Ruth** will send the Executive Compensation motion to Lauren
8. **Lauren** will advise Council and post on the CUSA website the time and date of Dina’s presentation of her Electoral Code Report
9. **All members** will read the August Council Report

**Next Meeting:**

- Ruth will send a doodle poll on Sept. 12 to schedule the next meeting

---

Meeting adjourned at 7:58pm
COUNCIL REFORM REPORT

CONSTITUTIONAL & POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

PRESENTED BY: JULIA DALPHY
BACKGROUND & PROJECT INITIATION

• **CPRC Committee** has been meeting regularly this summer
  • (~2x a month); open meetings

• Most committee members have a **pet project / topic / policy** that they brought to the table to **lead review on**
  • *RECALL: It's this Committee's mandate to do this!*

• One of said topics is the **CUSA’s Council Structure**

• We’ve pursued looking into the current policy, how it is implemented, and considered various angles of it

• This presentation serves to update you on our progress and research so far.
RESEARCH METHOD & THOUGHT PROCESS

- Recall
- Define
- Ask
- Imagine
- Plan
- Create
- Improve
RESEARCH METHODS & THOUGHT PROCESS

Recall
• STEP 1: Found currently existing policy in CUSA By-Laws.

Define
• STEP 2: Evaluate how it’s currently implemented; find flaws; & define questions

Ask
• STEP 3: Research to get answers; collect relevant to-date data to fact-check those answers & answer those questions

Imagine
• STEP 4: Develop alternatives (a bunch of solutions)

Plan
• STEP 5: Evaluate alternatives to choose most suitable

Create
• STEP 6: Update the policy & put it into action

Improve
• STEP 7: Allow for / encourage future reflection & improvement opportunities
1 - RECALL: SO, WHAT’S THERE RIGHT NOW?

• CUSA BYLAW I – COUNCIL Subpoint 1.1.i., states that:

  “… Council shall consist of thirty-four (34) seats filled by:

  ...

  and

  (i) Twenty-six (26) Constituency Representatives elected by and from their constituencies. ”
1 - RECALL: SO, WHAT’S THERE RIGHT NOW?

• CUSA BYLAW I – COUNCIL Subpoint 1.2.a-j, states that:

“There shall be the following ten (10) constituencies from which Representatives shall be elected to Council:

a) The members registered of the School of Journalism
b) The members registered in the Eric Sprott School of Business
c) The members registered in the Arthur Kroeger College of Public Affairs and Policy Management
d) The remainder of the members registered in the Faculties of Public Affairs
e) The members of the School of Humanities
f) The members registered in the Faculties of Arts and Social Science
g) The members registered in the Faculty of Engineering and Design
h) The members registered in the School of Computer Science
i) The remainder of the Members registered in the Faculty of Science
j) Those members registered as Special Students”
1 - RECALL: SO, WHAT’S THERE RIGHT NOW?

• CUSA BYLAW I – COUNCIL Subpoint 1.3.a-c, states that:

“1.3 Constituency seats shall be distributed to each constituency in as close a proportion as possible to the contribution of membership fees by members of each constituency during the current term of office of Council subject to the following provisions:

a) No constituency has less than one constituency seat
b) No constituency has more than forty-nine (49%) percent of the constituency seats
c) A constituency can only be formed if a School or Faculty is comprised of more than 250 members of the Association. ”
# 2 - DEFINE: NOW, WHAT’S REALLY GOING ON?

- Break down into key information: CONSISTENT, UNSURE, INCONSISTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALM</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Councillors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25 + 1 (but ran election so OK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Constituencies</td>
<td>10 named in ByLaw: 5 Faculties &amp; 4 Schools &amp; Special Students</td>
<td>FASS, FPA, FED, Sprott, Science; PAPM, Journ, Humani, CompSci Special Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding Constituencies</td>
<td>“A constituency can only be formed if a School or Faculty is comprised of more than 250 members of the Association.”</td>
<td>Via motion brought to Council to add as a Constituency is 250+ members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>“no constituency has &lt; 1 seat”</td>
<td>Ran election to fill, so OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>“no constituency has &gt; 49% of seats”</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2 - **DEFINE:** NOW, WHAT’S REALLY GOING ON?

- Break down into key information: **CONSISTENT, UNSURE, INCONSISTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALM</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Criteria (# Seats)</td>
<td>No numbers stated, just: % Membership Fees. “shall be distributed ... in as close a proportion as possible to the contribution of membership fees by members of each ... ”</td>
<td>FASS: x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FPA: x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FED: x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science: x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sprott: x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPM: x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism: x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities: x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science: x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Students: x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>2016/17 year “during the current term of office of Council”</td>
<td>???</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 - DEFINE: NOW, WHAT’S REALLY GOING ON?

- **Big Picture Questions:**
  - When is the last time the proportion of seats assigned to each constituency was re-evaluated?
  - Do all students pay the same fees? Part-time VS. full-time? Diff. Faculties?
  - How is “contribution of membership fees” calculated? When? By who?
  - Have the proportions changed over the years? Enough to affect the seats?
  - How are numbers used for the “current term” before the year even ends?
  - Why / how are Special Students considered in Section 1.2 over Section 1.1?
  - What is actually the definition of a “constituency”? Why is it diff for diff Faculties?
  - Is there any overlap, or double representation?
  - Is there any lacking, or missing representation?
  - Who’s in FPA, and who’s in FASS [double majors]?
3 - **ASK:** CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

- Tried to collect info to address question by question:

  - **When is the last time the proportion of seats assigned to each constituency was re-evaluated?**
    - *Inconclusive*— ie. *no idea*
    - Couldn’t get a date of the last time *Faculty (all 5) seats* were re-evaluated
    - *School seats* have been added over the years as they realize / hit the “minimum 250 constituents” rule.
      - But not *ALL* eligible constituencies, only some… (hold this thought.)
3 - ASK: CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

Do all students pay the same fees? Part-time VS. full-time? Diff. Faculties?

- All full time students pay the same flat fee to CUSA, regardless of your program
- Part time students pay fees on a per-credit basis
- Special students are either full or part-time, but are already counted... [hold that thought.]

How is “contribution of membership fees” calculated?

- Full-time: if fee is flat, then fees contributed is directly proportional to enrollment.
- EX: If 100 engineers pay $1000 [$10 each] to CUSA and 300 Arts students pay $3000 [still $10 each] to CUSA, then:
  - FED should have 1/3 as many seats as FASS, regardless of if you calculate it from %fees or directly from enrolment.
- This argument goes out the window for part-time students
- For them, inconclusive how this work on a varying per-credit basis & comparison
3 - **ASK: CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?**

**Who calculates “contribution of membership fees”? When?**

- CUSA only knows how much they receive in total on their cheques, over usually multiple payments issues to them – NOT the metrics of it

  - So, **currently CUSA has no way to calculate this.**

  - Additionally, CUSA doesn’t even have an “active” list of all current members and their metrics on hand (though, could maybe request one from school)

    - Therefore: there’s no way CUSA is following our own policy as currently written.

- **However, enrolment numbers are available.**

  - OPIRG had enrolment numbers for 2015-16 posted in May (else earlier)
    - Undergrads sorted by: Full/Part-Time; By Term; and/or by Degree Program (NOT Faculty)

- Also, different note: **CUSA election ballot invitee numbers are available**

  - These are issued on a binary basis (1 or 0) for all students eligible to vote in the election (ie. all members of CUSA)

  - Every member gets a vote, so this give us our numbers, by constituency, for the past year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Degree Program</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3 - **ASK:** CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

Have the proportions really changed? Enough to make a difference?

- Undergrad enrolment number from 2012 -2017 [by Const. ]
- General Trends:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCY</th>
<th>GROWING</th>
<th>STEADY</th>
<th>SHRINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>Social Work,</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>Global,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED</td>
<td>Engineering, BIT</td>
<td>ID, Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Cog. Sci., Health Sciences</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprott</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPM</td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Students</td>
<td>INSUFF</td>
<td>INSUFF</td>
<td>INSUFF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 - Ask: Can we get as much info as possible?

Have the proportions really changed? Enough to make a difference?

Actual CUSA 16-17 Ballots: Current CUSA Seat Mix [consti.]:

- FASS: 7
- FPA: 6
- FED: 4
- Science: 3
- Sprott: 2
- PAPM: 1
- Journalism: 1
- Computer & SS: 2
- Humanities: 1
- Computer Science: 1
- Humanities & SS: 2
3 - ASK: CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

Have the proportions really changed? Enough to make a difference?

Yes. If we went by any of the above charts [based on CUSA election ballots], the seat numbers would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT CONSTITUENCIES:</th>
<th>CURRENTLY:</th>
<th>FACULTY-ONLY:</th>
<th>KEEPED CONSTITUENTS</th>
<th>FACULTY; USING ENROLLMENT FROM FALL 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprott</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 --&gt; “Minimum 1”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 --&gt; 1 “Minimum 1”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 --&gt; “Minimum 1”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 - ASK: CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

How are numbers used for the “current term” before it even ends?

- The way it’s currently written says:
  - EX: The 2016-17 Council breakdown should be based on numbers from the current term of office of Council. Our term of office is 2016/17.
    - **But, we ran the election in January 2016.** Waaaay before we would any sort of clue what the number for 2016/17 would be (high schoolers will still have no idea where they’re even going still ATP)
  - Recall: CUSA doesn’t even know how much membership fee contribution we get until we get paid for it later in the 2016-17 year [late Fall into Winter terms] – up to a year after we are done our elections. And even, then, we don’t know the breakdown of it considering all variables.

- Seat numbers must be determined for the new year before elections, so the current policy is just not possible

- However, it would be easy for us to **represent the previous year’s numbers** as other similar
  - By 2016 Elections, we would have know the 2015/16 numbers.
3 - **ASK:** CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

Why are Special Students in Section 1.2 instead of Section 1.1?

- **RECALL:**
  - Section 1.1 lists overall breakdown, and lists each each Exec, RRRA, GSA, and anyone representative essentially guaranteed one seat on behalf of a certain portfolio or organization.
  - Section 1.2 lists constituencies that make up the “other 26 seats”
    - This includes one for Special Students
    - This infers their seat would fluctuate with “%fees contribution”
    - Again, the issue of part time and full time status plays in.
    - Again, the issue of having no idea of %fees contributions of SSs
    - New issue of whether or not SSs are already represented by programs
  - Perhaps everyone would agree that Special Students should be distinctly represented to Council.

- Then, perhaps it would be valuable to just allow SSs one permanent seat, and be listed under Section 1.1 directly
Define “constituency”.

- Current there’s no definition in the By-Law beyond the allusion that programs with seats on Council represent a “constituency”

- Probably used to mean “Faculty” before format was broadened to include some of the Schools

- There’s also no binary clause of said definition.

  - Meaning: It’s not a consistent, all-or-nothing definition for everyone

    - **Consistent**: “Faculties serve as constituencies.”
      - EX: FPA & FED & Science

    - **Consistent**: “Every degree program with over 250 members is considered a constituency.”
      - EX: FPA + PAPM + Jour. & FED + BIT + Arch. + ID & Science + Cog. Sci + CompSci

    - **Inconsistent** [current]: “A constituency can only be formed if a School or Faculty is comprised of more than 250 members”
      - EX: FPA + PAPM + Journalism & FED & Science + Computer Science
3 - **ASK:** CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

Is anyone being over-represented? Is anyone underrepresented?

- **OVER** [election data]: x3
  - Every “school” currently, besides CompSci.
    - Based on “26”, approx. 3.84% represents one seat.
      - Comp Sci: 5.21%
      - Journalism: 1.84%
      - PAPM: 1.49%
      - Humanities: 0.77%

Special Students, IFF they’re considered being represented by program reps

- **UNDER** [enrolment data, over 172 people]: x8
  - FED: BIT, ID, Architecture
  - FASS: Social Work
  - SCENCE: Cognitive Science, Math
  - FPA: Global Issues
  - SPROTT: International Business
3 - **ASK:** CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

Visually, by degree programs:

Schools with separate seats in green; schools lacking separate seats in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTITUENCY</th>
<th>OVER 1000 STUDENTS</th>
<th>OVER 173 STUDENTS</th>
<th>LESS THAN 173 STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FASS</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>ID, BIT, Arch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Cog Sci, Math</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprott</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>BIB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPM</td>
<td></td>
<td>PAPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comp. Sci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 - **ASK:** CAN WE GET AS MUCH INFO AS POSSIBLE?

- **B.Arts -- Who’s in FPA and Who’s is FASS?!**
  - For **double majors**, or those who switched between, it can be hard to know
  - We determined that it’d likely based on your entrance program, unless you’ve manually switched it
  - Still, double majors have attested to receiving different ballots different years
  - What seat can they run for?!
  - However, CUSA’s election ballots only deliver one of the two ballots—so we can tell which program they vote for, via those metrics
    - In cases of confusion, the computer uses a special formula

If it’s good enough for elections, could it be good enough for us?
### The basics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALM</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
<th>POTENTIAL REVISED PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Councillors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25? 26? 30? [Pick a number]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Constituencies</td>
<td>10 named in ByLaw: 5 Faculties &amp; 4 Schools &amp; Special Students</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding Constituencies</td>
<td>“A constituency can only be formed if a School or Faculty is comprised of more than 250 members of the Association.”</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>“no constituency has &lt; 1 seat”</td>
<td>“no constituency has &lt; 1 seat” OK; define ‘constituency’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>“no constituency has &gt; 49% of seats”</td>
<td>“no constituency has &gt; 49% of seats” OK; define ‘constituency’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 - IMAGINE: IDEAS TO FIX IT? GOOD, BAD, MANY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALM</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Criteria (# Seats)</td>
<td>No numbers stated, just: % Membership Fees. “shall be distributed … in as close a proportion as possible to the contribution of membership fees by members of each … ”</td>
<td>“shall be distributed … in as close a proportion as possible to the membership mix of CUSA, as defined by lastest General Elections invitee statistics. contribution of membership fees by members of each … ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>2016/17 year “during the current term of office of Council”</td>
<td>“during the current from the previous year’s General Elections term of office of Council”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>“as presented as an Item of Information to Council from the VP? and to define available seats in the upcoming Writ of Elections”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE #</td>
<td>BIG IDEA</td>
<td>PREMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Just the Faculties</td>
<td>- Absorb School seats back into their Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The “constituencies” will just become “faculties”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Just the Degrees – ALL + SOME</td>
<td>- All degrees have min. 1 seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For each additional XX ppl, add a seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Just the Degrees – MINUMUM</td>
<td>- All degrees over YY have min 1 seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- For each additional XX ppl, add a seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Degrees lower that YY vote Exec-Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Just the Degrees – SINGULAR</td>
<td>- Every degree program gets ONE seat only, always.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Like many national boards do]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tweak What We’ve Got</td>
<td>- Keep Faculty seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Permit School seats by automatically making YY+ programs a constituency (no approval process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Subtract schools from the Faculty totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5 - PLAN: NARROW THAT LIST DOWN TO “GOOD”

- The next steps in the process are to narrow down the alternatives that we thought of
- **Pick the “best” one** for the greater good of students and sense of CUSA and CUSA’s purpose
- Looking for feedback from all Councillors on the direction they wish to see this policy revision go
- If you’d like to **productively help** with this process, we encourage you to attend our CPRC meeting— you’ll be given notice as always
6 - CREATE: HOW CAN WE PUT THIS IN ACTION?

- Hoping to revise the Policy that is already there based on feedback & participation, and
- Then the CPRC will formally propose a motion to Council

Then: we will put it into action for the upcoming 2017 General Elections and 2017/18 Council year to have fair representation.
7 - IMPROVE: HOW CAN WE ITERATE IN FUTURE?

- Key policies in an organization should be reviewed regularly.
- This doesn’t mean to change it every year, but it means to follow-up on how we implement (or don’t) the By-Law and check ourselves.
- Adding timelines and mandatory motions/reporting to the policy can ensure that annual renewals / updates actually get done.
  - EX: approving the seat distribution numbers before the next election; including it in the CEO’s report, or it being provided as an Item of Information (to eliminate debate)
- Avoids this entire kerfuffel, and in future if this system ends up being terrible, this review process should be revisited.
PREDICTED FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS:

Q: “I’m pretty sure that X, Y, or Z that you said is wrong”
A: Yeah, it’s possible- sorry! I talked to a lot of people, and the Committee did out best to get info as accurate as we could. I am no CUSA wizard! Please come to our meeting and share your wisdom.

Q: “Moving to Faculty seats undermines democracy because of our voting system for Councillors”
A: If we wanted to modify the voting system for Councillors, we could. The “secret ballot” ranked ballot voting system CUSA uses to fill Committees is set up to address this issue. It’s not flawless, though. Also: the schools lacking their own seat can use the flip of this exact argument: every Faculty not broken up currently feels the woes of plurality voting. Of course, we can develop an alternative that still allows Degree program seats.
PREDICTED FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS:

Q: “Why are we doing this? We’ve been fine all these years. Don’t fix what ain’t broken.”
A: It’s definitely broken as it stands– over half the Faculties have been undercut seats for ??? years. It’s important that everyone is properly represented, as we all pay our dues. Ignorance isn’t bliss in this case (it’s kind of embarrassing, too)!

Q: “CUSA can’t take away our School seats bc if we remove them, our students are being silenced. They’re the most active / best voter turnout / engaged / etc.”
A: The suggestion is not to take away anyone in particular’s seats. It’s about redistributing them as we are supposed to be, to not break our By-Law. It’s great your group in engaged, but maybe others aren’t because they don’t even have a seat and thus have no reason to care. They probably don’t even know they could have one. For example, PAPM & Journalism have ~400 people. Architecture & BIT have ~400 people. Two have seats, and two don’t. They all pay the same fees to CUSA. What if you were on the no-seat side of that equation? It’s hard to compare voter turnout to schools who don’t have a single-seat vote. BIT or Arch could 100% voter turnout– but we have no idea. Also: the schools lacking their own seat can use the flip of this exact argument. Of course, we can develop an alternative that still allows Degree program seats.
PREDICTED FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS:

Q: “If we give all Degree Programs seats, then there’s too many people on Council. And scaling up bigger programs also adds even more seats”
A: It’s a consideration we’ve thought of. It comes down to what the proper balance of size of Council and depth of representation of programs is.

Q: “If we cap Degree Programs seats, then cut-off programs will have zero Council representation and only an Exec vote…”
A: It’s a consideration we’ve thought of, too. But it doesn’t make sense to have our “half-Faculty, half-a-few-select-schools” system either.

Q: “Moving to Faculty seats will allow bigger programs to overpower smaller schools”
A: Potentially, but that’s what every other school deals with right now. At what cutt-off should a School be not represented and thus absorbed into the larger Faculty and thus programs? Is it fair that a ~400 PAPM and ~170 person Humanities program be represented with their own seats, while a ~400 Architecture, ~200 ID, and ~100 person music program be “absorbed” into their bigger Faculty(ies)? It just makes sense for there to be consistency. If the best people for the role run for it, and their supporters are plenty across the Faculty and want them to be elected, they will win.