

Tuesday, April 11, 2017

AMURE Annual General Meeting 2017 Minutes

Chair: Josh Pavan

1. Call to Order
2. Adoption of agenda
3. Adoption of minutes from Special GA
4. Adoption of minutes from last AGM
5. Executive updates
6. Board representative updates
7. Budget presentations
 - a. 2016 report
 - b. 2017 budget
8. Motions from members
9. Motions from Board
10. Elections of Executive Roles
 - a. Grievance Coordinator
 - b. Steward Coordinator
 - c. Communications Officer
11. Election of New Board Members
12. Adjournment

1. BIRT Josh is nominated for Chair

Moved: Jill
Seconded: Sean
Passed

2. BIRT Agenda adopted

Moved: Sean
Seconded: Tim
Passed

3. BIRT Special AGM minutes adopted

Moved: Sean
Seconded: Didier
Passed

4. BIRT 2016 AGM minutes be adopted

Moved: Sean
Seconded: Tim
Passed

5. Executive updates

- a. President, Sean Cory
 - Bargaining
 - Pay equity

- 15 and Fair
 - Campaign to end casualization
 - 7 grievances
 - *post links to 15 and Fair efforts in Minutes
- b. Katie Saulnier, Communications Officer presented by Tyler Lawson
- Communications: 5 newsletters sent out providing updates, bilingual and published on website
 - Website updated
 - Listserv issues were somewhat resolved
 - Accessibility committee created some significant changes to improve accessibility of union
- c. Tyler Lawson, Research and Member education coordinator
- Focused on training, did monthly trainings
 - Wrote workshops specific to academic context at McGill to share with other unions
 - Worked on Health and Safety
 - Worked on Casual Commiseration
 - Planning board and executive training for May
 - Committees: Accessibility, IUC
 - Organizing Labour Library with AMUSE and MUNACA
 - 15 and Fair efforts were extensive
 - Participated extensively on Bargaining
 - Supported AMUSE on strike
 - General outreach, coffee events
 - Postering
 - Tyler attended Coalition of Graduate Employee unions conference in LA
- d. Jillian Vasko, mobilization
- Will fill in after meeting*
- e. Tim Nessim, Grievance Coordinator
- Meeting with people to file grievances
 - Only 2 or 3 filed
 - Pay Equity Grievance which was discussed in some detail last month
 - Bargaining has been a lot of the efforts
 - Resigning as Grievance Coordinator for two reasons:
 1. Won't be able to serve out term
 2. Very few people work as Execs and maintain research positions, should be led by the people doing the jobs as much as possible, so stepping down in hopes that someone who is currently a research employee will take on role
 3. Has made other recommendations to the Board; making greater use of liberations and possibly greater use of paid staff which could reduce the number of hours required for the executive positions
 4. Grievance position is fairly flexible; requires some knowledge of collective agreement but there are resources; most important skill is to be a sympathetic listener

- f. Didier, Steward Coordinator
 - Complimentary position with mobilization and research education
 - Accessibility committee worked extensively with the IUC to propose changes to the Sexual Assault Policy
 - Board meeting accessibility efforts; how to make them a safe space for everyone
 - New project: how to make buildings more accessible because some union members have different needs, reduced mobility and have had some injuries
 - Board has decided to work on a set of by-laws that will be internal to the union
 - Participated a lot in the Bargaining committee
 - Couldn't do much in the summer due to a law internship
 - Remuneration policy; and IUC
- g. Francois, Treasurer will present budget

BIRT: Executive reports are adopted

Moved: Sean
Seconded: Francois
Motion passes

6. Board of Representatives Update, presented by Matthew Malone

- a. Board is new instrument but is vital, supervises the work of the executive, designed to keep the executive responsible
- b. Proposing a couple motions but they are related to the Board

BIRT the board report is adopted

Moved: Matt
Seconded: Radia
Motion is passed

7. Budget Presentations, presented by Francois Charron

- a. 2016 budget presented
 - question: what was 15 and fair budget spent on?
 1. 15 articles commissioned; 4-5 short videos produced; work on sending people to solidarity efforts; website
 - question: was there a vote for this project?
 1. Person present that they wanted to do the project, the board vote to give a budget to it, we didn't realize how much it would cost, then voted to put a limit to it
 2. When we started the year we were including 15 and Fair under other line items, we thought to be more transparent we would pool all the costs that was devoted to 15 and Fair
 - Question: this happened before I was a board member, curious about how the decision to make videos were made?
 1. President oversaw the decision to make the videos, there was a committee

- That doesn't address the question: how was the decision made to make videos instead of traditional forms of communications we've used such as posters?
 1. President doesn't remember the exact conversation in which it was decided
 2. It was done on the fly
- Comment: How the decisions were made?
 1. AMURE member/ outreach worker speaks to this issue: it was made in participation with other unions such as AMUSE, MUNACA, AMURE
 2. All the unions chipped into 15 and Fair
 3. Posters were made in an collaborative capacity
- Question: do you think the 15 and fair project will cost as much this year?
 1. Definitely not, last month all we did was to keep the webpage hosted
 2. Don't expect to see more unless we decide to work a lot on it, next budget (2017) has accounted for 'new project' funds which could be used for 15 and Fair
- Board minutes indicate that the decisions to spend and make the video were probably done either individual or committee, then once it was apparent that it was costing as much as it was, in June's Board Meeting 15 and Fair brought it to the board, then among the board the decision was made to cap the spending
- Why keep the site up if we are not updating it? It needs new posts and updates to keep people coming back to it
 1. It could stay for 1 or 2 years, so in case someone hasn't seen it then they could review it
- Do you know how much the other unions have spent on 15 and Fair?
 - Exact figures are not available
 - It was small when it started but now it has become a priority amongst other groups who have kept it visible

BIRT the Budget Report 2016 is adopted

Moved: Francois
 Seconded: Benoit
 Passes

7b. 2017 Budget presented by Francois Charron

Q: Why is this year's Dues smaller than last year (168K vs 141K)?

A: It is a more conservative estimate on dues. Last year we overestimated. Plus, dues that are started to be collected from postdocs Jan 26th will not arrive until April.

Q: Where is the delayed money in which Budget?

A: If you start to pay dues right now, it takes 3 months to receive it

- It's a bureaucratic process via McGill, to PSAC, then PSAC
- So you said McGill still owes money from last year—based on money you're expecting, is it in expecting dues, or is it hanging in the balance last year?

- Start a completely new year, when receive cheque, will put in this budget, has a feeling we will receive it soon
- This budget reflects the expected return of revenue
- For the 75000 is the 30 000 included? It's higher than last year
 - It's because we added Post-docs 26 000, research associates and research assistants McGill contributes 49 000
- This is the liberation, this is to pay the Exec, for the liberation of the time, so you receive the money for McGill, who on the exec works for mcgill?
 - Francois, all the work was done after the hours because he could not be liberated as he was alone in the
 - It's not what's in the collective agreement- you have to submit the budget back to prove that there was this amount of hours spent?
 - No, they subtract whatever money we use to liberate people than they pay us the rest
 - Say we spend Francois to training, we tell McGill that he will be liberated two days, at the end of the year they amount the two day salary from the 49 000 then they give us the rest
 - We don't have to justify to McGill how we spend it
 - It's in the collective agreement? Yes, we get a certain amount outlined per job class, 23 000 and 26 000, for Research Assistants and Research Associates
 - But they don't limit the amount? It's in bargaining
 - McGill will pay this contribution if you do the job within your working hours or not?
 - McGill has an amount that they pay to people to interact with McGill, so because the union is an interactive with McGill, it's fairly typical in most collective agreements there is some way for the employer to compensate people for time spent on unions, either directly paying salary, or by pay through the union
 - It's a package, typically employers give office space
- Can you explain how it works?
 - McGill sends email: Can you please confirm liberations over the year
 - We send them a list of what was liberated, and they subtract this from \$49 000
- Is the money for this year or last year? Is it a pay-back? Most of the executive is not a McGill employee, that's why they're paid by our dues, if we could use more of the money from liberations to pay the exec
 - It's unlikely they will change this, the only thing we're talking about with McGill is should it go up?

- There is no restriction on how the money can be used we receive from McGill. The liberation process only applies to Employees, but that's not all we can use the money for
- That's different from MUNACA, they have to show how many hours, who spent what,
- MUNACA has two full time liberated and a half year's salary spread out, they do it the same way, they email McGill and ask to be liberated for these specific time, MUNACA tends to go over

Question: it's not a lot of room to move around, if things go wrong. Last year the money was taken from savings, and not going back to savings.

Answer: we know it is tight, but for expenses we never spend as much as we budget. You can see on our last budget, we rarely go over our projected expenses. We have tried to account for the overages from last budget in this budget.

We are already lower for spending from January, February, March.

Sometimes we pay more or less, some things remain constant. We have looked three years back to try and see what we spent in the past.

Q: Keep saying we have money in the bank- what is the amount in the bank?

A: Current in bank (Jan 17th, 2017): \$168 800. 83

Q: What would the amount be we have reserved to strike?

A: Strike funds comes from PSAC, it's about \$75 a day per person, from their funds. As part of our dues, we pay 1\$ per month to support the strike fund.

Q: whoever is on board, and executive committee, these people are paid for everything?

A: some people have volunteered to not be paid. The idea is that everyone should be paid
 - in the beginning everything was volunteer, during the first two years that's how it started but it was difficult to get things done

Q: This was implemented to get the work done?

A: Yes, that was the idea.

BIRT the Proposed Budget is adopted for 2017

Moved: Francois

Seconded: Radia

Enter debate about budget:

Proposition: If someone is paid \$20 to work for the union, we could reduce the wage to \$15 and contribute \$5 to 15 and Fair. Maybe this is a thing that could be worked on by a committee. Say we are investing in it with our money and our will. I would add something to the savings, even our savings are high, so that when we take some we put it back.

Question: I don't understand the proposition.

My proposition is still an idea, but maybe to increase our bargaining leverage, is to reduce expenses to \$15...

There is an item on the Agenda to limit the budget. Perhaps we could postpone this discussion until then.

Recommend the financial board or the people in charge of the finance to think about reasonable amounts to put in savings.

What is possible? Could propose not to pass the budget; could propose to send it to a committee for review and then bring it back to a special GA to vote on it.

Question: can we go back to 1.6 dues?
Yes.

Question: Is this the place to propose a motion to adjust the new project to pre-approve a budget for new projects before they spend money on it? To place restrictions on new projects so that they are pre-approved by the board?

Can you clarify your question?

Is it possible to a pass a motion that would make it necessary to have the board pre-approve the funds attributed to the new projects?

Yes, but not at this point in the meeting.

BIRT: To change McGill contribution liberations from \$75000 to \$49000
[McGill contribution to liberations reduced to \$49000]
[Savings increased to \$26000]

Moved: Matt

Seconded: Tim

Motion is intended to accurately reflect the anticipated revenue.

In favor: 13

Opposed: 5

Abstention: 3

Amendment passes

Q: Can we have the details for the executive and board salary?

A: \$80 000 is for employee; average of hours x 20 x government

I think it's time to motion on the budget

BIRT Cap to each individual expense line to so that they cannot be more than what is budgeted.

Moved: Benoit

Seconded: Nikola

Benoit speaks to motion: last year we had problems with items, we went over budget, and spent too much and didn't know how to improve the situation, so that we can prevent ourselves going into deficit.

Speaker: there are important items such as the Psychologue which are important enough to go over.

Benoit: we had a hard time to find money, it was heartbreaking. We were running into a big deficit. We need to be responsible and accountable.

Didier: raise a caution to raising a cap. Of course it's always a good idea to save money and spend within our means. At the same time we don't know what will come up, \$15 and Fair for instance unified the unions and there was overspending on that which was unanticipated and yet it served to unify the unions which could increase bargaining power and visibility. We do not know at this point what kind of demands the next year will bring, to bring a cap would restrict our *manoeuvres* or what we can do.

Macho: Speaking against the motion, even if we would have passed such a motion at the past AGM, we still would have had the same problem. I don't think this will necessarily solve the budgetary problems.

Tim: I see where the motion is coming from and I support the idea to make sure we really stick to this budget and there's pressure to stick to the budget; I'm wondering if I'm a little more what if an emergency comes up, what if something needs to be dealt with? There are occasionally emergencies that come up. I am wondering if Benoit would consider a friendly amendment that overages would need to be approved by 2/3 of the Board.

BIRT: Each individual line of the budget be capped so that funds cannot be attributed to it once the limit is reached, with the exception that the board can approve overages with a 2/3rd vote.

Q: would it be possible to have it so that overages would be sent to a Special General Assembly?

A: Yes this is possible.

Mostafa: sometimes you need to make money to spend money, there needs to be flexibility so that the board can act as necessary. For instance, if there was an overage on grievances, then there could be delays that would be disruptive and potentially harmful to our membership. There should be trust in the board to carry forward our voice to McGill.

Didier: Point of Information: I think it would be good to clarify how much of a financial situation is due to the union's spending and how much is due to the revenue that McGill was supposed to give, for instance with regards to Post-Docs and Pay Equity. The Pay Equity means that for 7 years there was meant to be a Pay Raise that McGill has yet to give them. How much is the situation due to McGill and how much is due to union spending? If there is a greater responsibility on behalf of McGill then why should the union board be held accountable.

Speaker: wanted to add that we have to trust Treasurer, I don't think it's important to cap it.

Speaker: I agree there will be times when this can go over and we should trust the board. But we heard that the 15 and fair project went ahead without approving anything and yet the money was spent from the dues. Not even the board knew that. I think that there needs to be some kind of way of controlling where the money is going. We need to make sure this situation does not occur again.

Radia: In support of the friendly amended motion, I wanted to speak to the idea that you need to spend money to make money. We need to be responsible to our members and unfortunately McGill has been unaccountable. We need to respectfully try to stick within budget and fulfill our responsibility to our members. The reason that financial cuts were made so that we can be accountable and to favor that our board does a lot of work, that the exec do work, and the members do a lot of work. These decisions aren't made lightly.

Tim: wanted to clarify 15 and fair comments. What happened was that 15 and Fair was taken on, the board endorsed it, but not all the individual expenditures were approved. This is normal for how committees work. I don't want my earlier comment to be unfair to the people who work on this project, not all the individual expenses were approved. I also want to respond to the idea you gotta spend money to get the job done comment, agree with this but think that the amendment suggested goes a long way to address that. This amendment was that spending above the lines could be authorized by 2/3rds vote of the board in emergency situations.

BIRT: Each individual line of the budget be capped so that funds cannot be attributed to it once the limit is reached, with the exception that the board can approve overages with a 2/3rd vote.

17 in favor
3 opposed
3 abstentions
Motion passes

BIRT The proposed budget, withstanding the former motions, be approved.

Moved by: Francois
Seconded: Sean

Favor: 13
Opposed: 7
Abstentions: 3

8. Proposed Motions from Members

BIRT: that section 35.2 length of term of an elected position be amended as follows:

The term for an elected executive position shall be twelve (12) months or in the event of a replacement by an election until the end of the initial mandate to the position concerned.

Moved: Matt
Seconded: Radia

Matt speaks in favor of the motion. It should be amended as the General Assemblies are annual.

Radia speaks in favor of the motion. The average length of a contract is 12 months at McGill, this is more in line with the working expectations of the contract. If an elected executive has a 12 month contract and 24 month executive role, they are stuck with an extra 12 months.

Didier speaks against. The 12 months is necessary to ensure stability.

Sean speaks against this. Grievances are multi-year projects. It's worked well in the past, other unions have officers that are in for 3 years, such as MUNACA and PSAC. We don't have a problem with people coming in that are new, there are three new executive positions open.

Tim: Agrees that stability is important, but there is always going to be hiccups in transition. The union needs to deal with this and create institutional memory. I think at the end of 12 month terms, they can run again under this motion. I think if the membership feels that they are representing them in a satisfactory way that doesn't end the possibility. I don't see the harm in putting it to membership to decide more often, it doesn't mean that members never work more than 12 months.

Radia speaks in favor. Even if some of the bargaining and the grievances are multiple month allows accountability and allows us to vote on executives. If we are unhappy with the executives we're not stuck with them for another year. If an executive does not live up to expectations then it is better to be able to replace them.

Macho speaks in favor of the motion. Some classifications such as casuals that are short term, then it would be possible to get them in more often. There's nothing to stop the executive running again.

Tyler having thought about this, and looked at this with other unions. The board is in place to assure accountability. I think it's nice to think you have continuity in the position and there is a learning curve within the job. Being able to formally count on continuity at your job will allow you to invest yourself in the projects your working on and you will be able to see these things through in a way that ultimately really benefits the long term goals of the union. It's important to get these mechanisms in place.

Didier: while it's true there is turnover with casuals at McGill, it's also true that to be a member of the union after your contract has expired you're still a member after 12 months. This means that people have lost their contract even after 2 months they can still have representation for 12 months, so the turnover is not as huge as you may not think. Someone spoke about grievances and how grievances are handled. It's important to be accountable to the board as it is to the members. With grievances what's important to members is to have continuity in who represents them in their grievances. For members to rely on perpetually renewed contracts, this forces members to re-explain the grievances to the members.

Tim: wants to respond directly to Didier. He is grievance officer and disagrees. Whoever takes over role will be certain to pass on files. Does not think it would at all be compromised by one year terms.

In favor: 11
Against: 11

Abstention: 3

Motion is defeated.

G.2. AMURE Remuneration Policy

**Moved by Matt Malone
Seconded:**

Be it resolved that AMURE adopts the AMURE remuneration policy under Chapter VII of the AMURE's bylaws

Chapter VIII- Amure Remuneration Policy

41. The purpose of the policy is:

- (a) to ensure that a living wage is paid in a timely way for all work done for AMURE, and to ensure that the wage takes into account the debt that our members tend to carry
- (b) to ensure responsible, transparent, and efficient spending of AMURE funds; and
- (c) to foster an atmosphere of mutual trust

42. Work done for AMURE by members or former members is remunerated at a rate of \$17 per hour, unless the work is remunerated by McGill liberations or directly by PSAC. No one, however, will be paid less than \$17 an hour.

43. Work done for AMURE is remunerated on a bi-weekly basis by direct deposit or e-transfer (whichever is most cost-effective for the union)

44. AMURE's payroll coordinator will be the AMURE president, or by any other person chosen to fulfill this role by the AMURE board.

45. The Payroll coordinator will ensure that every new AMURE executive, board member, steward, or other person who will foreseeably be remunerated is informed of this policy and set up to receive remuneration on a consistent basis within two weeks of taking on their role.

46. Hours worked are submitted to the Payroll Coordinator using a timesheet developed for this purpose on a bi-weekly basis by Monday of the pay week.

47. AMURE members fulfilling roles are expected to work the following minimum number of hours.

- (a) 10 hours every 2 week period, for executives (not including the president)
- (b) 1 hour every 2 week period, for board members
- (c) 0 hours every two week for stewards

48. At every AMURE board meeting, the payroll coordinator will report on the members whose work exceeds the number of hours in Section 7.

Propose friendly amendment to article 42 that the pay decrease take effect on August 1st 2017.

Chair suggests this be it a BIFRT.

BIRT these bylaw changes be effective on August 1st 2017.

Accepted as a friendly amendment

Speaker asks why reduce the wage? It is not very much. I agree \$20 is good. I don't agree \$17. I would agree with all the other propositions, but not the \$17.

Matt: I move this because the minimum for casuals is \$12.90. I observed that AMURE only asked for \$17 for casual research assistants and I took this personally that my union would only fight for casuals for \$17.

Sean Proposes Amendments:

42. Work done for AMURE by members or former members (excluding the President) is remunerated at a rate equal to a minimum of regular research assistants and associates unless the work is remunerated by McGill liberations or directly by PSAC.

48. It is the responsibility of the Payroll coordinator, President or treasurer to ensure that all remuneration is consistent with the budget and to report remuneration paid at every board meeting.

Votes in favor: 11

Opposed: 9

Abstentions: 4

Question: who decides how much the president gets paid? It is the salary that was paid at McGill. It could up or down. It's tied to the amount the president is liberated for. It's not set in stone that the president earn what they were earning before.

It's a huge portion of the budget. 20% overhead included in the \$80 000. This is more than half of the budget in one salary.

Didier in support of sean's motions for several reasons. One is that the salary of the executive would go down as a symbolic gesture. I don't think the positions are linked, I don't think the casual wage should impact the executive salary for two reasons. There are more reasons than the union that the casual research assistants are vulnerable. We know that when wages go up casual research assistants are laid off more often. Casuals are already extremely vulnerable in terms of being laid off, in terms of probation period, maybe the union was thinking we have to calculate our demands in terms of wages in terms of other items. Second of all, we have to respect the work of executive. It is a full time to be an executive, it's a full time job to be an exec, it's not as if you can combine both or do this easily. The last reason I want to support Sean's motion, instead of \$17, it's a formula which reconciles the members interests with that of the exec. The motion is to balance the interest of the casuals, its more presice and mathematical.

Ariel: \$17-\$20 how much difference will it make in the budget? Plus it was chosen for personal reasons. Third, it was not a mathematical approach what would be worth paying for the board members. I believe this brings to a question of credibility and undermining the members of the board. You need to believe that people are doing the job, but we should be discussing it as well in a way that we are very appreciative of people who have been doing job on the board. If you were to change this for anyone it would be fair to

have more research done, not take it personal, not base it on a minimum, take an average and see what a research assistants do, what research associates do, because I've seen people working as casuals working \$35 an hour. My opinion is that I don't know how much difference this would make, another thing is that if you are proposing something to save money how are you going to spend the money you are going to save. How are you going to make AMURE a better place than just cutting funds for the sake of personal reasons, which maybe undermine, not in a fair way, not respectful.

Speaker: so one thing which is very clear, you suggested the minimum of research assistants/ associates is \$27 and \$24. So you are not talking \$25, you're talking \$26 dollars. We are representing casuals and post-docs, where are these in the calculations? When the union started it was the idea that the executive will be McGill employees and that most of their hours would be liberated. They would be volunteers. At MUNACA they are not paid to be on the council. There are people who work for money and not because they want to contribute to the union. It's scary.

Point of Information: MUNACA has 2.5 fully liberated people, and 5 executives who have weekly meetings.

Tim: we have filed a grievance that the \$25 is the current rate for Research assistants. As far as the amendment itself, I agree with the idea that lots of work should be done on a voluntary basis. I can say a lot about remuneration but the matter on the table is whether we should we lower the pay or raise it to whatever the minimum is, I think it's fundamentally a problem if I'm going to McGill to give our casuals \$17 and I won't accept that for myself that's a problem. I do not support the motion.

Tyler: The request for \$17 is almost 50% raise. Current bargaining does not guarantee we won't get a good minimum. It's been said that it doesn't seem respectful for the current employees. I think the suggestion that this be indexed to minimums with a bit more substance.

Matt: I want to reiterate my goal in bringing forward the motion is to have oversight and to give the board power to have transparency. Flexible on issue of payment. We tried to pass this, and were blocked within our own ranks. This is my salary also. I am on the board and am also a casual, and if we wanted to ameliorate the situation of casuals then we would hire them on the board.

Didier: We have to be careful, there are two sides to bargaining. McGill offered a bad offer. We can't accuse the union of not representing the casuals for something for which McGill is partly responsible. Second, since we are talking about making it more concrete than abstract, let's talk about the advocacy of volunteer work for the union. Volunteerism is a concept that thrives in Law school. Pro bono is basically a way of compensating for a system that is unjust. We are talking of people who are economically vulnerable. Volunteerism as a union practice I cannot necessarily agree with, because it's for people who can afford it. It's also the situation where people have been in a position of economic vulnerability and are working on the executive. We can't fault the union for which the union is partly responsible. 2, volunteerism is problematic. 3, let's stop stigmatizing the exec.

Radia: there should be a minimum to say thank you, a wage of recognition, to encourage members to get involved. It shouldn't reflect what current research assistants and associates are making, those are based on education, etc. To be a board, to be an exec, if we wanted to we could hire someone at minimum wage or 15. This should be a thank you

for the work to put in to help move the union forward. It should not be based on the job class, it's more about thank you for what you're doing and recognition. As it is written here, \$17, 20, 21 is fine, but to give a pay scale or salary scale for exec work is going above.

Speaker: union helps get respect at work, I come here to help me feel respected at work. I don't know if we raise more than \$20, I think we need to talk about the raise of the salary, which is another debate, of course it does matter, but the philosophy is do we want a raise or not? What I wanted to say \$17 is unacceptable, I would stay with \$20, maybe when we elect another person we can talk about raising the salary, or we can talk about this every year, that we want to be raised.

Mostafa: I agree, I think also in terms of the spirit there should be averages per hour, per year, etc. There should be expectations, average number of hours needs to be based off.. to do that it's like a budget motion almost the entire budget. I think it needs to be studied further and then brought back to another General assembly. I'm for sticking of the same and then bringing back to a next General Assembly. The standard in union is you give people the top rate, you give the highest paid member rate to the average for the paid staff.

Speaker: I agree with the idea more to formalize something that is going on already. But coming back to the volunteering I just want to stress the fact that here today is 50 people not even, volunteering for union is very small. I think volunteering doesn't work much, I think paying people is much fairer.

Nikola: I understand that people want respect for the work. My question is why you want to enter and serve the union. Is it for the money? Or do you want to serve the union? You want to be paid for a job that you do not know how to do. You want to be paid for your experience in a certain domain, in a different domain. Then you know what is to be paid very less as the less as our union. Then we fight for that. I think whatever amount is respectful, we have to question ourselves to why we work for the union.

Amendment proposed: In addition to the minimums, there would be a 25 maximum hours every two weeks for executives, 5 board, 2 for stewards. Excluding the President.

Accepted as a friendly amendment

Tim: Move to split the motion and vote on 42 separate to split the motion Accepted as a Friendly amendment (matt)

Sean: Motion to Call the question
Motion passes

BE IT RESOLVED THAT AMURE adopts the AMURE Remuneration Policy under Chapter VIII of the AMURE's bylaws.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these bylaw changes come into effect on August 1st, 2017.

Chapter VIII- AMURE Remuneration Policy

41. The purpose of the policy is:

- (d) to ensure that a living wage is paid in a timely way for all work done for AMURE, and to ensure that the wage takes into account the debt that our members tend to carry*
- (e) to ensure responsible, transparent, and efficient spending of AMURE funds; and*
- (f) to foster an atmosphere of mutual trust*

43. Work done for AMURE is remunerated on a bi-weekly basis by direct deposit or e-transfer (whichever is most cost-effective for the union)

44. AMURE's payroll coordinator will be the AMURE president, or by any other person chosen to fulfill this role by the AMURE board.

45. The Payroll coordinator will ensure that every new AMURE executive, board member, steward, or other person who will foreseeably be remunerated is informed of this policy and set up to receive remuneration on a consistent basis within two weeks of taking on their role.

46. Hours worked are submitted to the Payroll Coordinator using a timesheet developed for this purpose on a bi-weekly basis by Monday of the pay week.

47. AMURE members fulfilling roles are expected to work the following minimum/maximum number of hours.

- (d) 10 / 25 hours every 2 week period, for executives (not including the president)*
- (e) 1 / 5 hour every 2 week period, for board members*
- (f) 0 / 2 hours every two week for stewards*

48. It is the responsibility of the Payroll coordinator, President or treasurer to ensure that all remuneration is consistent with the budget and to report remuneration paid at every board meeting.

**In favor: 16
Opposed: 2
4 abstentions**

Voting on

42. Work done for AMURE by members or former members (excluding the President) is remunerated at a rate equal to a minimum of regular research assistants and associates unless the work is remunerated by McGill liberations or directly by PSAC.

8 in favor
10 opposed
5 abstentions

**Motion to move to elections: Sean
Seconded: Jill**

Motion to adjourn: nikolai
Motion seconded

17 in favor
2 opposed
abstention

AGM Adjourned