

ETFO – TORONTO OCCASIONAL TEACHERS LOCAL
EXECUTIVE MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES
Wednesday, May 10, 2023
9:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Present: Sharon Brown, Gail James, Laura Barrett, Christina Meynell, Renée Massop, Jeishan Rajakulasingam, Sophie Kroesen, Marisa Gallippi, Fletcher Jerome

Regrets: Rinat Evron, Gabrielle Blais-Jones

Parliamentarian: Ruth Ann Morley

- 1) Welcome – Ruth Ann Morley, Parliamentarian

Upcoming dates corrected:

May 11 – Deadline for website posting and constant contact of AM information (**Annual Meeting Workbook, Proposed Budget, Current Financials, Annual Report**)

May 25 – Annual Meeting – Session 1 (Holiday Inn downtown)

May 31 – Annual Meeting – Session 2 (Holiday Inn downtown)

June 3 – Enough is Enough Rally and March to Queen’s Park

June 5 - Constitution Committee full day session for updating Reference Book

June 7 - Executive Meeting

June 8 - All-Member meeting to ratify Preliminary Submission

June 15 – All financial reimbursement forms due – final due date

June **20** - Local AM delegates Meeting at Fairmeadow 5:00 - 8:00 p.m.

- 2) Reading of the Land Acknowledgement Statement - read by Sharon Brown
- 3) Reading of the ETFO Human Rights Statement - read by Gail James
- 4) Human Rights Officer - Ruth Ann Morley
- 5) Approval of the April 19 Minutes

Motion 22/23 - 110

Moved by Renée Massop Seconded by Gail James

Move that the April 19 Executive Meeting Minutes be approved.

CARRIED with amendments

- 6) Approval of the May 10, 2023 Agenda

Motion 22/23 - 111

Moved by Christina Meynell Seconded by Sharon Brown
Move that the May 10 Executive Meeting Agenda be approved.

CARRIED

7) **9:15am Timed Item:**

Derek Hulse, ETFO Staff Officer for Collective Bargaining

– policy grievance process

Provide context: walk through collective agreement entitlements when it comes to grievances, and how grievances are dealt with. Also, different roles of different people and organizations.

In the collective agreement under the local clauses, 9.0 in our CA is the grievance arbitration procedure. Three different and separate types of grievances, two of them grouped together.

- 1) Individual grievance: an individual member's rights under the CA have been violated - that individual would file an individual grievance (e.g. discipline without just cause)
- 2) Group grievance: a group of teachers are affected the same way (e.g. all 3 LTOs at a given school missed their prep time in a particular week and that prep time wasn't paid back)
 - Same violation 3 times, you could file it as 3 individual grievances or you could file it as a group grievance
- 3) Policy grievance: the Board makes a decision that affects or could affect every member in a bargaining unit across the system. In this case, the policy grievance was around hiring.

In this case, the policy grievance is the route we go to enforce the terms of the Education Act, and the CA. All CAs are between Boards and the ETFO Provincial office. The bargaining rights are held by ETFO and under statute ETFO Provincial has the authority and the obligation to ensure that the CA is followed and adhered to in all cases.

When there is a dispute as to whether parts of the CA are being followed, the process in locals is that a local rep generally will bring the issue to the ETFO CB Staff Officer assigned to the local.

We have a discussion - background, what's happening. Do we need to get a survey going, or do we have enough info to file a grievance? Any grievance filed is

approved by the provincial office through the CB staff officer before it gets filed. The CB staff officer / Derek is either in contact with individual members for individual grievances, or the local president for policy grievances.

Very few grievances are resolved in the early stages of the grievance process.

Q: What was the first step in this grievance?

A: There were corresponding grievances filed in both the OT local and the teacher local – the teacher local was short members as a result of failing to hire contract teachers and put in LTOs, so that reduced their entitlement to contract teachers by 250. So there were two grievances on the exact same issue in each of the locals in the TDSB.

Q: Were they resolved together?

A: Yes.

This specific grievance:

Derek learned of it through ETT because it arose during reorg. There are specific criteria when a Board can hire a contract or occasional teacher.

An OT can be put in place for a teacher who's absent for a period of up to a year for things like a leave, or anything else that causes a teacher to be absent.

The Board was understaffed in September. The Board added positions as LTOs, but these employees were not replacing anybody. Jobs were being classified as LTOs that should've been contract positions.

ETT was concerned, and then the OT local was concerned. Jobs were being created and classified as LTOs that should have been permanent contact positions. In Derek's very early discussion with the Board, the Board was doing it to (in their words) "avoid redundancy". They didn't want to give out a bunch of contracts and then declare a bunch of people redundant when they had underestimated the enrollment for this year.

CB Staff Officer's position is that it's better to hire someone as permanent contract teacher and declare them redundant than to give them an LTO for a year, and the reason is that the ETT collective agreement has *recall rights* - once you're hired and if you're declared redundant, the Board has to recall you to a permanent position before they can hire someone else. That's a concrete benefit of hiring people as contact teachers to start. The Board disagreed. They didn't do anything with those positions, which led to filing grievances in both the OT local and ETT.

When there are two grievances on the same issue, you can combine or merge them, so they're heard by the same arbitrator at the same time. It adds an extra Step of the grievance being denied for both OT local and ETT - then we refer both grievances to arbitration. Howard Goldblatt was assigned lead counsel for ETFO, Board assigned

their legal counsel, and then legal counsel has discussions around arbitrator and timeline.

The Board reached out to Derek to discuss a possible settlement.

An arbitrator's jurisdiction is limited to "turning back the clock" and correcting the error: putting things as if they had not occurred. Arbitrators do not have the power to usurp management rights given to school boards.

Components of the settlement: between ETT, the OTs, ETFO, and the Board. When we look at the number of positions that were "hired inappropriately" as LTOs based on a survey. Came to 227 or 228 - surveys don't capture everyone, so we took the position that 235 jobs that were hired inappropriately. 235 jobs that should have been contract jobs in the system that were not made as contract jobs.

First component of establishing the parameters. Discussion next: how would these jobs be filled, and when?

The arbitrator can't wind the clock back to September - can't reverse time.

In Derek's experience, arbitrators are loath to upend classrooms. End of April, not just the 235 classrooms, plus all those teachers coming from elsewhere into those classrooms.

Next: how to fill those positions.

Initial thought: just convert the 235 people who are in LTOs to contract positions. Another thought was the hiring process where you post the jobs and you hire.

Here's the consideration: the way in which your board staffs - there are known LTOs that are filled, for example by the end of August. So, people who have submitted a full year parental leave, for example. There were hundreds of those positions that had already been filled prior to reorganization.

So you had, say, 700 members in those jobs prior to reorganization. If these 235 positions had been posted appropriately in the fall as contract positions, those 700 people, any of those who wanted a perm contract position, would've been eligible to apply for them under the terms of the CA and may have been successful because they were posted inappropriately as LTO positions. Your Board doesn't allow, unless there are specific circumstances, somebody to move from 1 LTO to another, and very few teachers would move from one 1.0 LTO to another 1.0 LTO.

So all of those people hired artificially and the way in which it worked out, were not given the opportunity to apply for those jobs

So the 700 group would have been disadvantaged by just converting the 235 positions, because they had been hired previously to the 235 who received their LTOs during reorg.

So we had to look at a window in which to make sure that those people who were affected by all of this had the opportunity to apply and were guaranteed an interview.

What we wanted to do as ETFO and Christina was adamant about this as well, was to make sure that anyone who should've been eligible to apply for those jobs and would have been given an interview, or has been somehow disaffected by the process so the 700 that didn't have an opportunity to apply, and the 235 who did end up in those jobs were guaranteed interviews.

Backdated seniority: when you get hired into a bargaining unit you get a seniority number (higher protects you from being declared redundant)

Also, because this pulled 235 people out of your bargaining unit, we allowed the Board to add 235 OTs, knowing that those numbers would balance out and arguably that's what would have happened anyway (also in an attempt to address the significant number of unfilled, which the OT leadership team has been discussing since early Oct).

Q: How in the settlement can we go back in time to ensure that the ppl who could or should have had the opportunity to apply for positions?

A: Jurisdictionally, that's what they would - they'd try and bring it back. Have the 235 jobs posted, have all of the ppl who were eligible to apply - the board would run their hiring process and make those people contracts. The one thing that Christina lobbied is that their seniority backdated to when it would have been had the Board hired correctly.

Q: What about unfair hiring? Concerns of ageism, certain groups being excluded.

A: Discriminatory hiring practices would be something ETFO could challenge if we had proof. What would happen in terms of a grievance on that fact, is that if we believe there's sufficient evidence to bring a grievance forward, we would make that claim and file a grievance. When you get to the arbitration, the Board would produce scoring sheets from the interviews. Case-by-case basis, heavily reliant on the concrete evidence we are able to provide. You have to be able to show patterns. Onus of proof rests with the federation.

Q: A lot of our members feel this was an unjust way to hire. Example of the Catholic Board turning LTOs directly into permanent jobs. Was that ever a discussion, to hire directly to permanent?

A: That was a discussion, but it would've negatively impacted any of your members who were in an LTO prior to reorg, because they would've been disqualified for applying to LTOs that were a result of reorg (because they were already in an LTO).

Global statement - anytime there's a hiring process where you interview 5 people, 4 people are going to be upset at the outcome. Being upset at an outcome doesn't necessarily mean the process wasn't fair.

Q: As a local, what are we getting back? What is the benefit for us?

A: "Us" is Toronto OTs, and the role of the local is to ensure that the rights and privileges negotiated under the CA are given to all your members. So what the local won through this was ensuring that the Board hire properly, and that 235 of your members were given perm contracts, which they otherwise would not have received had ETFO provincial and local not took this case on bc if we hadn't taken this case on, 235 of your members' LTOs would've ended at the end of this year. Then they would have had to apply for LTOs next year, now 235 ppl going forward have contract positions which, when you look at hiring - I've been doing this for 27 years. So 27 years, every OT local president I've ever talked to wants all contract positions to come from the OT bargaining unit. We've won 235 jobs. 95% of the grievances, anytime we file a grievance for discipline without just cause, there's nothing in it for the local.

Q: Was there any discussion of how the Board would go through the hiring process? Ensuring equity in hiring? Supplemental: Any discussion of providing us with a list of successful candidates?

A: First question: our position is that the process needs to take place relatively quickly because the 235 people hired need to be placed in accordance with the ETT staffing process. You don't want the 235 people to be identified in August because then the job assignments available at that point tend to be the less desirable ones. You want those 235 included along with the rest of the surplus staff.

Re: hiring process - under the terms of the CA and with the repeal of Reg 274, ETFO isn't in a position to negotiate that. The Board (under mgmt rights) has to run the hiring process to meet those issues. A previous Q about equity - if we have proof that the Board has given direction to hire in a discriminatory way, based on a protected ground, that's something we'd pursue. But again, if you interview five people, four people are going to be upset about the outcome.

Successful candidates - we already get a list, under our CA.

Q: Possibility of requesting a specific list of successful candidates in this position?

A: Not part of the violation - isn't a part of the remedy in this case.

What we were trying to do was to correct the violation of the CA and make sure that the process happened as it should have happened in September during reorg, had the jobs been posted correctly, and that's what this settlement does.

Q: If the Board wasn't in a strong position, why not ask for "a pony" (as previously mentioned)? Aren't the surplus positions the "leftover bits"?

A: They're along with all the other surplus staff, instead of being done later (where the ETT members would take all of the jobs first) – now they'll all be dealt with at the same time.

Q (supplemental): But if we were going back in time, and the Board were making up for that, our members would be ETT members, not necessarily in surplus positions. This pools all of them together into surplus staff when some of them might not be surplus because of seniority.

A: The 235 who are successful, theoretically they could get all the jobs, but it's not the 235 that are in the job. You could have someone working in Scarborough get placed in Etobicoke because of how they line up the positions - no respect to where they end up getting placed. Some of them might be in the school in which they were placed, a good majority of them would not have been, so no preference as to where they work. One of ETT's main bargaining goals every year is to give their members more of a voice in which area of the board they teach. Had we wound the clock back, none of them would necessarily have any voice in where they were placed.

Q: Doesn't ETT work on seniority as well?

A: Yes.

Q: So if we went back in time and the Board did what they had to do and actually put these positions out to hire contract, some people would be in positions they applied for because of years of LTO teaching.

A: That part is not accurate – seniority resets the same minute you become an ETT member - seniority is by the bargaining unit, not by employer.

Point of clarification: The seniority that's being awarded to these newly inducted ETT teachers is that they get their 2022-2023 year baked in? Correct.

Q: Inconsistencies in the interview process? Some people were allowed to have their notes available - some were not. Some were allowed to write down the questions, some

were not. We have evidence of people repeatedly saying there were all kinds of inconsistencies in the interview process. Is there anything that can be done about that?

A: Nothing in the CA that would govern that. I don't know what parameters were given to the interview teams by the board. There will be individual differences - doesn't constitute an unfair hiring practice.

Q: Members saying, "the implications and impact of this hiring process will be far-reaching", claiming some educators were privy to the questions ahead of time, and some people were allowed to take the questions with them.

Concerns about Executive input into the settlement process, and impact on our members (causing disengagement).

A: In at least some of those cases, I suspect that people were given those Qs by other OTs. If you have proof that a principal gave someone the questions ahead of time, I'm okay with dealing with that. When you're running 1200 interviews, over multiple days, using the same Qs, chances are somebody's going to tell you what the questions are. Making claims that this was an unfair hiring practice when we don't necessarily know – right now that is speculation.

Q: Privacy of those hired?

A: In the case of these 235 successful people, the group that probably has the right to know who they are is ETT, because they are now ETT members.

Motion 22/23 - 112

Moved by Marisa Gallippi Seconded by Sophie Kroesen

BIRT the Q&A with Derek Hulse be extended by 15 minutes.

CARRIED

Q: When the draft settlement was sent to our local, it was said that it was confidential. When the president asked if the Executive should be consulted, Derek said no, it was confidential. Was the correct process followed?

A: I have no knowledge as to what the ETT president did - can't comment. In terms of the process, ETFO owns the grievances, ETFO makes the final decisions based on legal advice, as to the parameters of a settlement. Details are confidential until such time as they are released publicly, because if things get out in the middle of settlement discussions it can completely derail the settlement. Same parameters we operate under

collective bargaining. We don't release CB information in the middle of the round. We release it once we have a tentative agreement. I don't believe the president has done anything incorrect or untoward in this process.

Q: Now the Board can hire 235 more OTs with the settlement.

A: Correct.

Q: Is it correct? For just until June?

A: They would come on the list, knowing that their 235 are coming off the list. That wouldn't have you go over the cap going into the next year.

Q: It goes over the cap this year, correct?

A: For a month and a half, yes.

Q: Why would that be something that we would agree to if we were already in talks? What was the rationale that we would agree to our cap being breached this year, if these members are being hired for Sept?

A: Because the unfilled rate at this point in time is approaching on any given day, about 20%, and the 235 is not going to negatively impact the amount of available work for members, so on the day that we negotiated this settlement there were over 700 unfilled jobs.

So the 235 are not going to affect the available amount of work. The other piece of info I understand is there are upwards of 600 people on your roster who haven't worked a day this year.

Q: Now that we've given them the 235, it's breached the CA this year. Where does that leave us in regards to further negotiations? In regards to all the asks we have for breaching the CA for their ask, where does that leave us now?

A: They've expressed no interest in changing the benefits waiting period, and OPSBA has taken the position that it's a matter for central negotiations and not local. They've also taken the position that the TDSB was in violation of the CA when they did it for the 2 times during the pandemic that they shouldn't have done.

Q: If they already had a weak case, why are we now giving them 235 positions to breach our CA?

A: Broader policy statement - ETFO's position has always been that every single teacher absence should be filled by a qualified certified OT. When we're getting 700 absences and 600 of your members aren't working at all in a year, your members are creating a difficult problem to deal with. The bargaining team is going to be faced with the Board coming to increase the cap dramatically, because the cap is not working and based on what is happening this year, and the makeup of the people on the cap, and how much those people are working, the Board is actually correct.

So in trying to ameliorate some of those problems, the Board temporarily goes above the cap by 235 people for 7 weeks, maybe not even that long because of the time it takes to hire.

Q: All-members meeting to discuss the hiring practices - would you still consider it out of order?

A: Discussing the policy grievance and settlement at an all-member meeting, I still maintain that would be out of order. Ongoing, meaningful communication with the members is always helpful. I think right now the issue is going to be the timing and proximity of the two. That's a local political decision, and it's not for me to make your local political decisions. I would just consider the timing of when you're going to have that meeting.

8) **Annual Meeting Organizing Updates**

a. Registration

Google Form goes out tomorrow. Financial information provided two weeks in advance, annual report two weeks in advance, it goes out to everyone regardless of registration status.

Timing of sending out the Annual Meeting Workbook: The Local is required to provide notice of motion, and that has to be in advance of the meeting.

b. Annual Report - reports from 2022-2023 Committee Chairs

- Please check draft report that was emailed to the Executive so it can go out to the members by THURSDAY

c. Annual Meeting Workbook

- Posted on Website by May 11 to meet terms of the Constitution
- As this book is 41 pages long, will print 1 per table and have some extra copies on the side.

Workbook includes:

- Agenda
- General information
- The Constitution requirements
- Robert's Rules of Order tips
- List of candidates
- Financial motions

- Proposed amendments to the cost and bylaws
- Winter General Meeting minutes and attendance

Financial Documents to be sent out from Gail as Treasurer include: proposed budget, current financial reports (balance sheet, actuals vs budget), and the Treasurer's Report.

9) **President's Report – Christina Meynell**

- a. Additional information re: 2023-24 proposed budget (passed by Exec. April 19th, 2023)

At the end of the 2021-2022 school year we had over \$800,000 remaining in our reserves. By the end of this year we'll be down almost \$400,000.

Motion 22/23 - 113

Gail James challenged the Chair

Chair's rationale: Presentation is appropriate as Net Income was not listed in the proposed budget at the April 19 meeting - president doing her fiduciary duty to the Executive.

CHAIR WAS UPHELD

Next year income for 2023-2024: \$767,867 (only \$12,000 per annum in local levy)

With the proposed budget, all of the reserves will be gone by the end of the 2023-2024 year, and we'll be in the hole by \$141,000.

May 8: Christina, Gail, and Laura met to go over the proposed budget

May 9: Christina, Gail, Laura, and Patrick Hop Hing (interim ETFO CFO) went over the budget again

The proposed budget that the Executive passed on April 19 did not display the annual net operating income or track the impact on the reserves. A spreadsheet with all the information was reviewed. It indicated suggestions for cutting the proposed budget to prevent all the reserves from being used. Christina proposed that the Executive needed to adjust the proposed budget now with consideration of this new information and should review line by line where cuts could be made.

Proposed Budget

Motion 22/23 - 114

Moved by Sophie Kroesen Seconded by Laura Barrett
BIRT the proposed 2023-2024 budget be reconsidered.

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 115

Moved by Sophie Kroesen Seconded by Christina Meynell
BIRT Total Expenses, Total Income, Net Operating Income be added to the proposed 2023-2024 budget.

CARRIED

Proposed Budget

Motion 22/23 - 116

Moved by Christina Meynell Seconded by Sharon Brown
BIRT the retained Earnings coming into 2022-2023, net reserve as a result of income at the end of 2022-2023 and the amount remaining in the reserve at the end of 2023-2024 be added to the draft proposed budget.

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 117

Moved by Christina Meynell Seconded by Sharon Brown
Amendment

BIRT the proposed budget be amended with the May 9 changes in green.

LOST

Motion 22/23 - 118

Moved by Marisa Gallippi Seconded by Sophie Kroesen
BIRT the meeting be extended to 4:30pm.

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 119

Moved by Christina Meynell Seconded by Sharon Brown
BIRT Budget Line 603 - Charitable Donations be amended to \$10,000

Motion 22/23 - 119A

Moved by Jeishan Rajakulasingam Seconded by Sharon Brown
Amend Line 603 to \$0

CARRIED AS AMENDED

Motion 22/23 - 120

Moved by Christina Meynell Seconded by Laura Barrett
BIRT Budget line 604 - Committees be amended to \$5,000

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 121

Moved by Marisa Gallippi Seconded by Sharon Brown
BIRT Budget line 605 - Communication be amended to \$60,000

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 122

Moved by Christina Meynell Seconded by Gail James
BIRT Budget Line 607 - Dependent Care be amended to \$6,000

LOST

Motion 22/23 - 122A

Moved by Marisa Gallippi Seconded by Renée Massop
Amend Budget Line 607 - Dependent Care be amended to \$8,000

LOST

Motion 22/23 - 122

Moved by Marisa Gallippi Seconded by Sharon Brown
Amend Budget Line 608 - Elections to \$30,000

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 123

Moved by Laura Barrett Seconded by Sharon Brown
Amend Budget Line 610 - Executive Expenses to \$1,500

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 124

Moved by Sharon Brown Seconded by Laura Barrett
Amend Budget Line 611 - Executive Honouraria to \$9,000

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 125

Moved by Sharon Brown Seconded by Marisa Gallippi
En Bloc Amendments to the Proposed Budget by Consensus
Amend Budget Line 612 - Fellowship to \$800
Amend Budget Line 613 - Furniture to \$3000
Amend Budget Line 615 - Insurance to \$5,000
Amend Budget Line 616 - IT Support to \$4,000
Amend Budget Line 620 - Meetings - ETFO AM to \$15,000
Amend Budget Line 621 - Meetings - Local AM to \$20,000
Amend Budget Line 623 - Meetings Fall / Winter General to \$30,000
Amend Budget Line 626 - Meetings - other to \$40,000
Amend Budget Line 627 - Meetings - OFL / CLC - to \$10,000
Amend Budget Line 630 - Negotiations / Grievance to \$80,000
Amend Budget Line 631 - Computer Equipment to \$6,000
Amend Budget Line 632 - Office Occupancy to \$25,000
Amend Budget Line 633 - Office Supplies to \$5,000
Amend Budget Line 634 - Political Action to \$5,000
Amend Budget Line 637 - Professional Learning Rebate to \$50,000
Amend Budget Line 639 - Public Relations to \$3,000
Amend Budget Line 640 - Release Time (daily) to \$5,000
Amend Budget Line 641 - Released Officers to \$550,000
Amend Budget Line 644 - Social to \$10,000

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 126

Moved by Gail James Seconded by Sophie Kroesen

BIRT this proposed budget be presented to the Annual Meeting for approval.

CARRIED

10. **Treasurer's Report - Gail James**

Motion 22/23 - 127

Moved by Gail James Seconded by Laura Barrett

BIRT an unbudgeted over expenditure of \$800 be approved for 2022-2023 Budget

Line 615 - Insurance

CARRIED

Motion 22/23 - 128

Moved by Gail James Seconded by Sharon Brown

BIRT an unbudgeted over expenditure of \$3,000 approved for 2022-2023 Budget Line

626 - Meetings Other

CARRIED without objection

11) **Executive Committee Updates**

- a. **Safe Space** - moved to next Executive Meeting

Brave Space Agreements

1. Speak from your own experience
2. Work to recognize your privileges
3. Step back and take time to reflect
4. Listen actively and wholeheartedly
5. Confidentiality
6. Own your intentions and impacts
7. Takes risks; lean into discomfort
8. Notice and name group dynamics in the moment
9. Challenge with care and compassion
10. Leave with an intention to act upon the learning

Source: Pillar Non-Profit

b. Info on Local poster for schools - moved to next meeting

c. Local Land Acknowledgement meeting with elder

Shared via email to the Executive:

Contact was made with Robert Durocher, the centrally-assigned VP on TDSB's Indigenous Education team, asking him if he could connect us with Indigenous knowledge keepers in our quest to create a land acknowledgement that is suitable for our local.

He shared a document that was emailed out to the Executive. This was a 24-page document called "Going Beyond A Land Acknowledgement" and is full of wonderful explorations of our individual and collective relationships with (and responsibilities to) the land, the history of treaties, activities to do with our students, and more.

We need to more specifically determine at our next meeting the budget, date/time, specific focus before being connected to someone we could pay for a consultation/talk.

12) Committee Liaison Reports

- a. Email updates of committee events

Elections Committee

The Elections Committee held the second session All Candidates' Night on Wednesday, April 26, 2023. We had 185 members register to attend and 132 attended. The second session was to feature the First Vice President candidates and candidates for Executive Member (Open) and

(Women Only), with a short revisit of the Vice President candidates (Open) and (Woman Only). The straw votes at the meeting indicates that the members preferred having two short sessions run via zoom rather than one long one. A great majority responded they found the sessions helpful in determining who to vote for. The vote was fairly evenly divided when asked if they would still attend if the dinner reimbursement was \$25 instead of \$50. The Committee conducted these straw votes to help with planning by the next year's Committee.

The Committee's next major job is finalizing all the planning for poll clerks, ballots and procedures for the candidate speeches and voting at the two Annual Meeting sessions. Two amendments to the Constitution have been submitted to the Annual Meeting to change voting for the 2024-2024 Executive to an all member vote, rather than in person voting by the Annual Meeting attendees. Depending on how these motions are disposed of at the Annual Meeting would require review and planning by next year's committee.

Constitution Committee

The Constitution Committee met on Friday, April 18 to review the 11 amendments received from members. The Committee made suggestions to ensure the stem of the motions were correctly referencing the existing articles / sections of the Constitution to be changed. The members who submitted the amendments were then contacted and asked to agree to the rewording.

The Committee divided up the Annual Meeting Workbook to proofread the amendments to ensure accuracy. This book has been sent to be posted on the Local website and will be sent out by Constant Contact no later than May 11 to comply with the Constitution. The Committee will next meet for a full day June 5, 2023 to update the entire Reference Book based on what amendments were passed at the Annual Meeting and make recommendations back to the Executive on what procedures need deleting or updated based on the revised Constitution.

13) Adjournment 4:53 p.m.