The **GRTF Presentation**

You've Been Waiting For
Before we talk about compensation, there are a number of areas we need to discuss.

Accountability mechanisms, hours worked, and total $$$ all change depending on Council structure.
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GRTF: Background

GRTF was created to explore ways to make student leadership more inclusive, democratic, and effective.

There were three goals:
1. Improve the Council experience for elected representatives.
2. Improve the functionality of Students’ Union governance.
3. Improve transparency towards the student body.
The final GRTF report found a number of interconnected challenges with our current system:

1. High barrier to entry for students to get involved with Council.
2. Lack of understanding around councillors’ responsibilities.
3. Students’ Council culture problems and EDI concerns.
4. Lack of recognition for councillors’ committed work.
5. Council committee overlap, fatigue, and inefficiency.
Issues: Council Efficiency and Workload

- Council’s workload is very unevenly distributed between Councillors
- Committees have dramatically different workloads and time commitments
- Significant amounts of time are spent on issues that are not “strategic” (could be done by staff)
- Large number of committee seats to staff (11 standing, many ad hoc). A typical board has 5-6
Potential Fixes: Committee Structure

- **Balancing the workloads of Councillors and Committees**
  - Reassess the mandates of committees. Some may be combined, divided, etc.

- **Committee expectations**
  - Setting a minimum and maximum number of committees for Councillors to sit on

- **Stronger accountability**
  - More tools for chairs and Speaker
Three issues affect this. Today we will focus on one:

- Culture of Council
- Procedures and processes
- Structure of Council
EDI and Council Experience: Structure

- Report in progress on alternative governance/meeting management systems
- Meeting changes require structure changes
- Council is too big to act as a deliberative body
WHICH SHOULD COUNCIL BE?

Parliament/Assembly
- Many people, more constituencies
- Determines balance of power
- Too large for real conversations

Board/Cabinet
- Fewer people
- Less performative role
- **Deliberative body**
EDI and Council Experience: Structure

Structure has two main issues:

- **Size of Council**: Bigger? Same? Smaller?
- **Electoral constituencies**: Faculty? At-large? Other?
EDI and Council Experience: Structure

- Issues with size:
  - Hard to form relationships
  - Hard to ensure everyone is heard
  - More difficult to build consensus
  - Hard to distribute work

Source: Council Structures across Canada report
Council: Current System (33 seats)
Council: Current System (23 seats, 1 per 2000)
College-based seats (21 seats)

- Natural and Applied Sciences: 13,063
- Social Sciences and Humanities: 10,791
- Health Sciences: 2,843

- Aug: 1632
- NS: 1541
- CSJ: 1241
- Open: 1004
- Exec: 190
- Exec: 806
- Exec: 1581
Potential Solutions

◉ Reduce the size of Council from 33 to ~23
◉ Reduce the number of committees
  ○ Amalgamation and elimination
◉ Minimum/maximum committee requirements
  ○ E.g. everyone gets 2 committees
◉ More powers/supports for Speaker and Chairs
  ○ Ensure Councillors are doing assigned work, support those who need help
◉ New, more inclusive standing orders
  ○ Not covered in this presentation, but very important
Question and Discussion