

- a. Reconsider council of director, especially regarding members at large
 - i. Instead of getting rid of MAL, include LC in the process
 - 1. NOMCOM gives rec to LC and then BoD has final say
 - ii. Give LC creative freedom over solving democracy vs MAL problem → outline what the problem is and give LC creative control over solving it
 - iii. Let them know that they can include NOMCOM in determining a solution
- b. Note that The current recommendation of the amendment asks voters to consider both the responsibilities of a BoD director and a faculty leader (LC councilor for example) which have very different responsibilities.

(From Rep Chin):

- a. Assign Director Duncan + others to write the report to LC tomorrow by midnight to provide LC (this needs to be a motion)
 - i. Specify non-negotiables (if you have any) to LC
 - ii. What the BoD feels as a whole is its position vs contested positions in the group
- b. To consider achieving the same aspirations of adopting a more democratic process in selecting directors, but in a different way than how its written
 - i. Non-negotiable : being more clear about the transition process of the current recommendation
- c. Reservation with electing MAL: when we chose the current MAL there was an exclusion of candidates based on concerns with maintaining confidentiality
 - i. The Board positions becomes a political position and might make the Board more political than intended
 - ii. Keep meritocracy with applications and vetting candidates
 - 1. NOMCOM presents to LC and LC makes the decision?
- d. Options
 - i. Only 1 member nominated from each faculty
 - ii. For x MAL positions that are added are elected
 - iii. Any amount of nominations from each faculty only one accepted MAL from each faculty ?
- e. Faculties have expertise, not just bias, different faculties solve problems differently / knowledge base (add into the phrasing of the problem)

Problem:

The membership feels that the Board of Directors is selected undemocratically and does not represent the general members. As such, section 6.2 of the constitution was revised to state that MAL are selected (xyz process)

Reason:

The Board's reservation with the amendment to 6.2 of the Constitution is that: They do not achieve the goal of the promoting more transparent and more democratic processes for the selection of board membership, instead, note that the current recommendation of the amendment asks voters to consider both the responsibilities of a BoD director and a faculty leader (LC councillor for example) which have very different responsibilities.

The board recommends that the Legislative council reconsider the members at large in the appointment process and composition to better reflect the democratic process.

Recommendations

Some ideas floated at board include:

1)

Moving forward:

With that, the Board is prepared to honor the decision of the Legislative Council such that if you return to the Board the section 6.2 with no changes, they are prepared to ratify the document.

Notwithstanding the decision made about clause 6.2, the Board has further issues regarding the transition process and the lack of a review process for these changes. As such, our non-negotiables are that the Legislative Council further outline this process. The recommendation is as follows:

1. Flesh out how the transition between the old board and new board will happen.
Answering questions like:
 - a. (transitional year? When is the best time during the year to make the transition? When should student faculty associations be made aware of timelines?)
2. Allow for a year-1 review process run by a governance committee to see if additional changes are needed after the transition to the new board

This is not about overriding the powers of council but to emphasize and identify gaps in the amendments and to prioritize the wellbeing of the transition and the society.

