

Only changes made that have not been brought to and approved by Council and the broader membership are listed here. Others that have been approved in previous Council and General Meetings, e.g. the use of gender-neutral language throughout the document, are not included in this document.

Major changes:

1. Removal of the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) position.
 - a. What? We are arguing that the CRO position be removed, and for their roles and responsibilities be taken on by the Deputy Speaker.
 - b. Why?
 - i. A CRO is only employed for a short period of time (October/November to April the following year). We have found that, by election time, they seldom have had enough time to transition into and “get into grips” of the role and organization. By the time they do, however, the election time is over, and their contract has ended
 - ii. This is not an ideal circumstance for both the Officer and the rest of the Elections team. For the CRO, there is a high level of expectation and, often, stress and pressure from the organization, candidates, SGPS membership, etc. In other words, they are expected to “hit the ground running” but this is not possible, because their contracts are so short. Moreover, in the event that a CRO is struggling to transition into the role, added responsibilities and duties would then undoubtedly fall onto the rest of the Elections team, i.e. the Speaker, Deputy Speaker, and Executive Director.
 - c. These responsibilities will be passed on to the Deputy Speaker, as their workload is lighter than that of a Speaker, thus making it more possible for the position to take on these added duties. Moreover, the Deputy Speaker in this position would be much more familiar with the organizational structure and duties of the SGPS Council to be more effective in the role.
2. Updating the roles and responsibilities of Council Representatives
 - a. What? In our mission to make SGPS Council an inclusive, welcoming, and accessible environment, we are updating the roles and responsibilities of Council Representatives. Doing this also prevents breach of Bylaw provisions. Below are some of the proposed changes:
 - i. Attendance requirement:
 1. Current: Council Reps must not miss 3 Council Meetings in one academic year. This, however, has not been strictly enforced in previous academic years, as Officers of the Council have limited capacity and time.
 2. Proposed: Council Reps must not miss 2 Council Meetings. Attendance will be taken by the Deputy Speaker, and we have added a requirement to ensure that Council Reps are identifiable during online meetings, so proper attendance could be taken.
 - ii. Departmental reports:
 1. Current: all Council Reps must provide a departmental report each term. This has not been adhered to and, in our view, often unnecessary and puts additional burden to our Council Representatives.

2. Proposed: Officers of the Council have a duty to ensure that Council Reps feel sufficiently able and welcome to bring issues to the table. Although this will not be documented in Policy, this could include “best practices” such as sending a call for items to all Council Reps.
 - iii. Council appointments:
 1. Current: Officers of the Council must ensure that a Council Representative for each department is elected by November of each academic year. However, this is often not possible and does not sufficiently take into account each department’s timelines.
 2. Proposed: Officers must take initiative and follow up with departmental assistants, to make sure that each department is represented at Council. However, they do not have the power to ensure that this deadline is adhered to.
3. Consolidating the provisions on Student Senate Caucus and Rector Elections, to refer to the AMS Policy Documents.
 - a. What? SSC and RE provisions in the BP document had to be changed and continually updated to make sure that it aligns with the document available on AMS Governance Policy website. Due to this, there may be periods of inconsistency between the two documents.
 - b. Why? To ensure that both organizations only need to maintain and update one document. Any changes and updates to these policy provisions need to first be approved by both AMS Assembly and the SGPS Council, but having one document just makes the logistics easier.
4. Human Resources (HR) change that allows transient employees to be re-hired after a performance review:
 - a. What? Currently, transient employees (non-elected staff who are SGPS members and have a term contract with the SGPS, e.g., Commissioners, SGPS student advisors) would have to re-apply and re-interview for their jobs annually.
 - b. Why? To encourage retention of fully trained staff, we have changed the requirement so that current employees can be re-hired after a performance review. Not only does this encourage retention, but it also honors the work that individuals have done for us and allows us to acknowledge and reward that work through a thorough performance review process.
5. Reducing the number of signatures required for an individual to run for elected positions
 - a. What? The current requirement is to have individuals collect the names, student numbers, and signatures of not less than 25 ordinary members of the SGPS, who support their nomination. The proposed change would lower this number to 10 ordinary members
 - b. Why? This change is done to make running for executive and other positions more accessible to people from smaller programs and to reduce any barriers in running for election. The requirement of signatures is still kept ensuring that people are committed to the election and have engaged with at least some members about their platform before running (VPC, on behalf of SGPS Exec).
6. Honoraria of \$200 is provided to SGPS committee volunteers

- a. What? The current framework does not have any formal recognition that SGPS ordinary members who have volunteered to serve on committees, such as the SGPS Awards Committee.
- b. Why? Formalizing the payment is done in order to encourage member participation, but also to recognize and honor the incredibly important work that our members do on our committees.

Minor changes:

1. Ensured consistency throughout document: In the past, Bylaw and Policy provisions were drafted and constructed by a specific committee but was not thoroughly reviewed in its entirety to ensure accuracy and consistency throughout. Thus, we wanted to correct this and make sure that the language used throughout remain the same.
2. Fixed (some of the) numbering system: Previously, there were several duplicate numbers. We are aware that cross-referencing and numbering need to be further edited, upon approval from Council and the broader organization.
3. Updated cross-referencing between provisions (related to the numbering system above).
4. Fixed typos, spelling, and grammatical errors.
5. Ensured definitions were clearly, accurately, and effectively defined: For instance, the document's previous definition of "2/3 Majority Vote" contradicted how it was defined in Robert's Rules of Order. This, and similar inconsistencies, were fixed throughout the document.

Next steps:

1. Questions, concerns, or comments about the major and minor changes proposed above.
2. Should we continue to format our Bylaw and Policy Provisions like this, or should we adopt the AMS format of separating them into specific topics? Some samples of AMS Policy documents can be found here:
<https://myams.sharepoint.com/policiesandprocedures/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=%2Fpoliciesandprocedures%2FShared%20Documents%2FGovernment%20Policies&p=true&ga=1> or, for a more general overview on AMS Governance Policy, see:
<https://www.myams.org/about/governance/policy/>.