



REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE ON THE RESOLUTIONS PROCESS REVIEW

**INCLUDING EXTRAORDINARY UBCM
BYLAW AMENDMENTS**

AUGUST 2010

**PLEASE BRING THIS REPORT WITH
YOU TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION**

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE ON THE RESOLUTIONS PROCESS REVIEW AUGUST 2010

1. DECISION REQUEST

That the UBCM membership consider and approve 2 proposed changes to the resolutions process, in order for the changes to take effect at the 2010 Convention.

2. INTRODUCTION

The resolutions process review was initiated by resolution 2008-B137, which requested that each Area Association prioritize and submit their top 5 resolutions for debate at Convention; that the UBCM Executive bring forward a maximum of 25 member resolutions for debate at Convention; and that UBCM develop a tracking system for resolutions.

Since this resolution was received in 2008, UBCM has:

- Presented a policy paper to the UBCM membership at the 2009 Convention
- Conducted 16 interviews with Past Presidents, the current President, the former Executive Director, and the former and current Resolutions Committee members
- Reviewed delegate feedback from past Conventions (2003-2009)
- Reviewed the UBCM Bylaws, Conference Rules and Procedures, and Executive Policies
- Circulated a discussion paper with proposed changes to the resolutions process in March 2010
(ubcm.ca/EN/main/resolutions/policy-areas/governance/resolutions-process-review.html)
- Presented the discussion paper at the NCLGA, AVICC, SILGA and AKBLG conferences¹
- Conducted a survey on the proposed options in the discussion paper (survey results are presented in **Appendix C**)

Based on the extensive research and member consultation, UBCM has made 5 changes to the resolutions process for 2010, which are discussed in this paper. Members are asked to consider 2 more changes to the resolutions process, and endorse the related resolution, **Extraordinary Resolution ER1** (attached as **Appendix A** and also printed in the **Resolutions Book**) to approve and implement the changes for the 2010 Convention and future years.

¹ There was no presentation opportunity at the LMLGA conference. At the NCLGA, AVICC, SILGA and AKBLG conferences, delegates supported the review of the resolutions process and felt that the Resolutions Committee was thinking about the correct issues.

3. CHANGES TO THE RESOLUTIONS PROCESS

This section outlines 5 changes that have already been made to the resolutions process for the 2010 Convention, and the 2 changes that the membership must consider and approve if they wish them to take effect at the 2010 Convention.

A) Five (5) Changes to the Resolutions Process for 2010

i. Placement and Grouping of Resolutions in the Resolutions Book

In the past, many resolutions that have been submitted have not made it to the Convention floor for debate, though they were submitted on time and printed in the Resolutions Book. This has led members to question how resolutions are categorized in the book, as this affects whether or not their resolutions get debated.

Based on the feedback received from members about this option, UBCM has amended the placement and grouping of resolutions in the 2010 Resolutions Book. The new placement and grouping retains the A, B and C categories but groups resolutions that are recommended by the Resolutions Committee as ‘endorsed’ or ‘endorsed with proposed amendment’ into a B2-a or B3-a category.

UBCM has introduced the new placement and grouping of resolutions in the 2010 Resolutions Book, and is also recommending that the B2-a and B3-a resolutions be considered as a block rather than individually (this is currently how the B1 block is dealt with).

The membership will be asked to vote on whether or not resolutions placed in sections B2-a and B3-a should be considered as a block.

The new placement and grouping is detailed in the table below:

Current Placement and Grouping	New Placement and Grouping
1. Extraordinary and/or Special Resolutions (when required)	1. Extraordinary and/or Special Resolutions (when required)
2. A – resolutions that address priority issues	2. A – resolutions that address priority issues
3. B1 – resolutions that are supporting existing UBCM policy (considered as a block)	3. B1 – resolutions that are supporting existing UBCM policy (considered as a block)
4. B2 – resolutions that propose new policy within the jurisdiction of local government (sorted by subject)	4. B2 – resolutions that propose new policy within the jurisdiction of local government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Resolutions recommended to be endorsed or endorsed with proposed amendment (sorted by subject) <i>(Pending member endorsement at Convention, these resolutions would also be considered as a block.)</i> b. all other B2 resolutions (sorted by subject, considered individually)
5. B3 – resolutions that propose new policy,	5. B3 – resolutions that propose new policy,

<p>outside the jurisdiction of local government (sorted by subject)</p> <p>6. C – resolutions that have been consolidated, referred to policy papers for Convention, referred to special sessions at Convention, or referred to a Special Resolution.</p>	<p>outside the jurisdiction of local government</p> <p>a. Resolutions recommended to be endorsed or endorsed with proposed amendment (sorted by subject; <i>and pending member endorsement at Convention, these resolutions would also be considered as a block</i>)</p> <p>b. all other B3 resolutions (sorted by subject, considered individually)</p> <p>6. C – resolutions that have been consolidated, referred to policy papers for Convention, referred to special sessions at Convention, or referred to a Special Resolution.</p>
---	--

ii. No Resolutions with the Recommendation ‘Pending Clarification from Sponsor’

This option was proposed to encourage sponsors to present clear, understandable resolutions prior to Convention, so that sponsors would not require additional time during the resolutions session to clarify their resolution.

The option stated, that if clarification were required, UBCM would contact the sponsor, and the sponsor would be given 1 week to respond. If the sponsor did not provide a response within 1 week from the UBCM request for clarification, then the resolution would not be printed in the Resolutions Book and would not be considered at Convention.

Members supported this option at the Area Association presentations and in the member survey (86%). Therefore, for 2010, resolutions that were not clarified were not to be printed in the Resolutions Book and would not be considered at Convention. UBCM issued a member release about this change on June 22.

For 2010, all sponsors contacted by UBCM provided clarification on their resolutions, so no resolutions have been left out of the Resolutions Book.

iii. Additional Time for Resolutions Sessions

In order to get through more resolutions, additional time has been added to the resolutions sessions. UBCM has allocated 6.5 hours for resolutions at the 2010 Convention. Friday morning clinics have been removed from the 2010 Convention program to provide the additional time for consideration of resolutions.

iv. Dedicated Blocks of Time for Resolutions

Some members indicated that the resolutions sessions were interrupted too often with party leader speeches, elections, nominations, and breaks. In response to this feedback, UBCM has dedicated blocks of time for resolutions without breaks – with minimum 1-hour blocks of time.

The 2010 Convention Program offers 3 resolutions sessions between 1.5 and 2.25 hours in length.

v. Provincial Meetings & Resolutions Sessions

UBCM has advised the Province of the timing of the resolutions sessions in an effort to reduce the number of provincial meetings scheduled during the first policy session on Wednesday morning, when priority resolutions will be addressed.

UBCM has requested that provincial staff avoid scheduling meetings during the Wednesday morning resolutions session, if possible, since priority Section A, Special and Extraordinary resolutions are considered at that time. However, because many members have noted that the opportunity to meet with Cabinet Ministers during Convention is very important for them, UBCM has not requested any limiting of Cabinet Minister meetings.

B) Two (2) Changes that Require Member Action

Members are asked to review and consider the following 2 changes to the resolutions process. If members are in favour of introducing these changes, they should endorse **Extraordinary Resolution ER1** provided as **Appendix A** and also printed in the **Resolutions Book**.

i. Move B2-a and B3-a Grouped Resolutions as a Block

Moving resolutions as a block could allow more resolutions to be addressed at the resolutions session. This option would group B2-a and B3-a resolutions with the recommendation 'endorsed' or 'endorsed with a proposed amendment', and they would be considered as a block. Members could pull resolutions from the block only if they were in opposition to the resolution or were proposing an amendment. This is consistent with how the current B1 block is handled.

The survey respondents overwhelmingly supported this change (82%), with only 14% opposing the change.

UBCM staff conducted an analysis to determine how many resolutions could have been addressed if some resolutions were considered as a block. In 2009, the UBCM membership dealt with a total of **112/202 resolutions**, or **55%** of the resolutions. If the 2009 resolutions were grouped to make sections B2-a and B3-a, the membership would have been able to consider a total of **173/202 resolutions** or **86%** of the resolutions.

UBCM has introduced a new placement and grouping of resolutions in the Resolutions Book, which include B2-a and B3-a categories. These B2-a and B3-a resolutions could be considered individually or as a block.

The membership is asked to vote on whether or not the B2-a and B3-a resolutions should be considered as a block.

ii. If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question

Delegate feedback from 2009 clearly stated that too much time was spent on just a few issues and that too many of the same speakers were commenting on every resolution.

This option attempts to address this issue, and if endorsed, would minimize the time spent debating a resolution if no delegate wished to express opposition to the resolution or propose an amendment. With no opposition or proposed amendment to a resolution, then the question would be called.

The majority of survey respondents (81%) supported this option while 10% were opposed. With the guarantee that the sponsor would always have the opportunity to introduce each resolution, an even greater percentage of respondents supported this option.

Responding to this survey feedback, UBCM is proposing the following process, incorporating sponsor introduction of each resolution even if there is no opposing speaker:

1. Chair introduces a resolution by reading its number and title.
2. Resolutions Committee member reads the enactment clause(s) and Resolutions Committee recommendation.
3. Chair invites the sponsor to introduce the resolution.
4. Chair asks if anyone wishes to speak in opposition or propose an amendment.
5. If no opposing speakers or proposed amendments, then the Chair calls the question; however if a delegate wishes to speak in opposition or propose an amendment, then the Chair invites the delegate to speak for a maximum of 2 minutes.
6. Chair facilitates debate on the resolution and will make an effort to alternate debate between delegates wishing to speak in opposition and delegates wishing to speak in favour of the resolution. The Chair may use his or her discretion to minimize repetitive debate by calling the question if multiple delegates have presented similar arguments in favour of or against a resolution.

To assist the chair in determining whether delegates wish to speak in favour of or in opposition to a resolution, two microphones will be placed at each microphone station on the Convention floor. At each microphone station, one microphone will be for delegates speaking in favour of the resolution, and the other will be for those delegates wishing to speak in opposition.

4. NEXT STEPS

The membership is asked to consider the following two changes to the resolutions process, and endorse **Extraordinary Resolution ER1** (attached as **Appendix A** and also printed in the **Resolutions Book**) to amend the UBCM Bylaws to implement the changes at the 2010 Convention and for future years:

- Move B2-a and B3-a Grouped Resolutions as a Block
- If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question

Members will note that, in addition to the two changes described above, several ancillary amendments to the UBCM Bylaws are being proposed. These ancillary amendments are consequential to the main resolutions process changes described above.

After the 2010 Convention, UBCM will evaluate the impact of changes to the resolutions process to determine how to proceed for the 2011 Convention (more on this in **Appendix D**).

5. RECOMMENDATION

That the membership review and endorse **Extraordinary Resolution ER1**, which is attached as **Appendix A** and also printed in the **Resolutions Book**.

APPENDIX A

ER1 Extraordinary Resolution to Amend the Union's Bylaws respecting RULES OF PROCEDURE and the HANDLING OF RESOLUTIONS

WHEREAS resolution 2008-B137, which requested several changes to the UBCM resolutions process, was referred by the membership to the UBCM Executive for further consideration;

AND WHEREAS in response to resolution 2008-B137 the UBCM Executive through its Resolutions Committee conducted extensive research and member consultation, and as a result the Resolutions Committee has recommended certain improvements to the resolutions process that require amendments to the UBCM Bylaws:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Union's Bylaws be amended effective upon adoption of this Extraordinary Resolution as follows, with the full wording of the proposed amendments provided for reference as **Appendix B** of the **Report of the Resolutions Committee on the Resolutions Process Review**:

- Sections 23(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) on the HANDLING OF RESOLUTIONS be deleted and replaced with new sections (a), (c), (d) and (e) to make it possible to block vote on some or all of the grouped resolutions; and a new section (b) to implement the requirement to call the question on a resolution if there is no delegate wishing to speak in opposition or propose an amendment; and
- Sections 14(a), 15(c) and 22(c) be amended for clarity, consequential to the amendments to Section 23.

APPENDIX B**FULL WORDING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE UBCM BYLAWS**

S. 14(a) is amended by adding the following words in brackets (the “Annual Resolutions”) after the words, “Annual Convention” in the first line and before the words, “shall be forwarded to the Executive Director”.

S. 15(c) is deleted and the following substituted in place thereof:

“(c) The Resolutions Committee:

- shall examine all Annual Resolutions*
- shall recommend in favour of or against the Annual resolutions, respectively*
- may correlate the Annual Resolutions*
- may recommend amendments.*

Any Annual Resolutions may be referred by the Convention to the Resolutions Committee either alone or with other Annual Resolutions, or with new resolutions for study and report to the Convention.”

S. 22(c) is amended by adding the words, “other than to an Annual Resolution” in the first line after the words, “speak to a motion”, and before the words, “shall arise and address”.

S. 23 is deleted and the following substituted:

- (a) Unless the Convention has by ordinary resolution resolved to group the Annual Resolutions pursuant to a recommendation of the Executive and has concurrently resolved to block vote on some or all of the grouped Annual Resolutions in a process recommended by the Executive, the Chair shall cause each Annual Resolution as printed in the Resolutions Book to be separately read one at a time, and such Resolution as read will not require a mover or seconder and will, once read, be properly before the Convention,*
- (b) After the reading of each Annual Resolution and before the reading of the next Annual Resolution:*
- (i) a spokesperson for the Resolutions Committee will concisely give the recommendation of the Resolutions Committee;*
 - (ii) the Chair will then call for the sponsor of the Annual Resolution as read to speak, and if the sponsor does rise to speak, the sponsor may speak for three minutes;*
 - (iii) the Chair will then call for any person opposed to the adoption of the Annual Resolution as read to speak;*

- (iv) if no person opposed rises to speak, the Chair must call the question;*
- (v) if a delegate does rise to speak in opposition, such delegate may speak for two minutes, and thereafter the Chair shall recognize subsequent speakers until no further delegate rises to speak;*
- (vi) upon there being no further speakers to an Annual Resolution, the Chair must call the question;*
- (c) In the event of the Convention passing an ordinary resolution to group the Annual Resolutions as recommended by the Executive and to block vote as contemplated by S. 23(a), then the Chair need not cause such of the Annual Resolutions as are to be subject to block voting to be read one at a time, and S. 23(b) shall not apply. The Chair must introduce a motion to move each block of Annual Resolutions separately, and subject to S. 23(d), the Chair shall call for the question;*
- (d) Each time the Chair moves a motion to adopt a group of Annual Resolutions as a block, any delegate may forthwith move an amendment to have one or more of the Annual Resolutions in the group removed from the block vote and considered and debated separately. A delegate may only move such a motion if he or she wishes to speak in opposition or propose an amendment to an Annual Resolution. Such motion must be seconded and must receive a three-fifths majority vote to pass. If the motion passes the Annual Resolution or Resolutions subject of the motion, shall be considered immediately following a vote on the block as amended. Section 23(a) and (b), as they apply to the consideration of individual Annual Resolutions shall apply to such separately considered Annual Resolutions;*
- (e) Should debate continue on any Annual Resolution for an undue length of time, then in the absolute discretion of the Chair, the Resolution may be cleared from the floor by the Chair deciding to refer the Annual Resolution to the Resolutions Committee for further consideration and subsequent report. Any delegate may forthwith move without seconder a motion “shall the Chair’s decision be upheld?” which motion must be forthwith put to the vote without debate. If such motion is successful, debate on the Annual Resolution shall continue until the question on the Annual Resolution is called.*

[**Note:** Included in this policy book for reference is a copy of the Bylaw of the Union showing the proposed amendments from both Extraordinary Resolution ER1 and Extraordinary Resolution ER2 in bold and underlined, and the consequent deletions lined out.]

APPENDIX C**2010 SURVEY RESULTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO RESOLUTIONS PROCESS**

A discussion paper was circulated to the membership in March 2010 and presented at the Area Association conferences. Members were then asked to provide their feedback on the proposed options in a member survey.

A total of 69 surveys were received² from UBCM's 1450 members. AVICC delegates provided the bulk of responses (55%), followed by NCLGA (17%), SILGA (15%), AKBLG (9%) and LMLGA (5%).

Though there was a low response rate and the results are not statistically significant, the results do provide general feedback and reactions to the proposed options. The following table summarizes the proposed changes and the related survey results:

Proposed Changes for 2010	Supported Change	Did not Support Change	Other³
Placement & Grouping of Resolutions in Resolutions Book	56%	13%	31%
Move B2-a and B3-a Grouped Resolutions as a Block	82%	14%	4%
No Resolutions with the Recommendation 'Pending Clarification from Sponsor'	86%	11%	3%
Additional Time for Resolutions Sessions	74%	22%	4%
Dedicated Blocks of Time for Resolutions	87%	5%	8%
Provincial Meetings & Resolutions Session	81%	8%	11%
If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question - Pro/Con Microphones	81% 65%	10% 24%	9% 11%
Proposed Changes for 2011			
Resolutions Already Policy Not Debated at Convention	62%	11%	27%
Resolution Follow Up/Tracking - Satisfied with current follow up tracking?	33% (not satisfied)	36% (satisfied)	31%
Reducing and Prioritizing Resolutions - Support proposal in resolution 2008-B137	37%	35%	27%
Reduce Speaker Time	44%	56%	0%
Official Convention Moved to Earlier in the Week	31%	28%	41%
Official Convention Held for an Entire Week	35%	50%	15%
Specify Time at which Resolutions 'Off the Floor' May be Debated	73%	6%	21%
Increase Threshold Required for Majority Vote	25%	66%	8%

² This includes a letter received from the Regional District of Okanagan- Similkameen with comments on the options in the discussion paper.

³ This category denotes responses that did not support or oppose the proposed change. The response may have provided an alternative option; offered general comments that did not support or oppose the change; or a response that was unrelated to the proposed option.

1. MEMBER FEEDBACK ON PROPOSED CHANGES FOR 2010

A) Placement & Grouping of Resolutions in the Resolutions Book

Of the responses received, the majority (56%) supported the new placement and grouping of resolutions in the resolutions book.

A small percentage of respondents (13%) opposed the change, saying, “the whole explanation is confusing, and something this person finds inappropriate”, and “I like it as it is, and I think the changes proposed will solve nothing”. One respondent liked the option but did not support the change for 2010, “as members were not aware of this change and may not have submitted their resolutions to their local area associations”.

A significant percentage (31%) provided a response that has been categorized as ‘Other’. These responses did not support or oppose the proposed change but provided either an alternative suggestion such as “put executive resolutions at the end of the convention”, or “change b2 b&c to c&b”; general comments on the proposed change, such as “priority given to actual do-able propositions”; or comments that were not related to this option⁴.

Due the large percentage of responses in the “Other” category, and the confusion over this proposed option, UBCM is proposing a simplified Placement and Grouping of Resolutions in the Resolutions Book for 2010. Rather than prioritizing by both Area Association recommendation and Resolutions Committee recommendation, the new simplified Placement and Grouping prioritizes resolutions by recommendation of the Resolutions Committee only. The simplified version is presented in the table below:

Current Placement and Grouping	New Placement and Grouping
1. Extraordinary and/or Special Resolutions (when required)	1. Extraordinary and/or Special Resolutions (when required)
2. A – resolutions that address priority issues	2. A – resolutions that address priority issues
3. B1 – resolutions that are supporting existing UBCM policy (considered as a block)	3. B1 – resolutions that are supporting existing UBCM policy (considered as a block)
4. B2 – resolutions that propose new policy within the jurisdiction of local government (sorted by subject)	4. B2 – resolutions that propose new policy within the jurisdiction of local government
	a. Resolutions recommended to be endorsed or endorsed with proposed amendment (sorted by subject; <i>and pending member endorsement at Convention, these resolutions would also be considered as a block</i>) b. all other B2 resolutions (sorted by subject, considered individually)
5. B3 – resolutions that propose new policy,	5. B3 – resolutions that propose new policy,

⁴ For example:

- “what is the priority for my area may be of no consequence to others, so good luck!!!”
- “so much time is wasted in presenting and arguing about "process"”

<p>outside the jurisdiction of local government (sorted by subject)</p> <p>6. C – resolutions that have been consolidated, referred to policy papers for Convention, referred to special sessions at Convention, or referred to a Special Resolution.</p>	<p>outside the jurisdiction of local government</p> <p>a. Resolutions recommended to be endorsed or endorsed with proposed amendment (sorted by subject) <i>(Pending member endorsement at Convention, these resolutions would also be considered as a block.)</i></p> <p>b. all other B3 resolutions (sorted by subject, considered individually)</p> <p>6. C – resolutions that have been consolidated, referred to policy papers for Convention, referred to special sessions at Convention, or referred to a Special Resolution.</p>
---	--

B) Move B2-a & B3-a Grouped Resolutions as a Block

This proposed option noted that B2-a and B3-a resolutions, with the recommendation ‘endorsed’ or ‘endorsed with a proposed amendment’ would be considered as a block. Members could pull resolutions from the block only if they were in opposition to the resolution or were proposing an amendment. This is consistent with how the current B1 block is handled.

The overwhelming majority of respondents (82%) supported this change though some cautioned that a clear explanation is necessary, particularly for those members that are newly elected, as to what block voting is and how to remove a resolution from the block.

Of those that did not support the change (14%), many felt that too many resolutions would be removed from the block, and this would take even more time away from the resolutions sessions. Others felt that the membership should be allowed to consider each resolution one at a time “rather than be guided in block voting”, and that “block votes don't allow for discussion of issues that may need a higher public profile”.

Passing resolutions as a block would save a significant amount of time and allow delegates to consider more resolutions at Convention. In 2009, the UBCM membership was presented with 202 resolutions⁵. The B1 block had 59 resolutions of which 5 were pulled for individual consideration, therefore the membership ended up considering 54 resolutions as a block. The membership considered 58 resolutions individually (including the 5 that were pulled from the B1 block). This means that the membership dealt with a total of **112/202 resolutions** in 2009, or **55%** of the resolutions.

If the 2009 resolutions were grouped to make sections B2-a and B3-a, 115 resolutions could be considered as a block (assuming, like in 2009, that 5 resolutions are pulled from the block). If the membership considered the same number of individual resolutions (58) as in 2009, then the membership would be able to deal with a total of **173/202 resolutions** or **86%** of the resolutions.

⁵ This includes all part A and part B resolutions, 1 resolution pulled from part C for individual consideration, as well as 2 special resolutions and 9 late resolutions. This does not include the rest of the part C resolutions or the 11 late resolutions that were not admitted for debate.

UBCM is recommending that B2-a and B3-a resolutions be grouped and considered as a block. The membership will have to consider and endorse the related resolution to activate this change for the 2010 Convention.

C) No Resolutions with the Recommendation ‘Pending Clarification from Sponsor’

Every year, a handful of resolutions in the Resolutions Book appear with the Resolutions Committee recommendation of, “No Recommendation Pending Clarification from the Sponsor”. This change was proposed to encourage sponsors to present clear, understandable resolutions prior to Convention, so that sponsors would not require additional time during the resolutions session to clarify their resolutions.

The discussion paper proposed that if a clarification were required on a resolution, the sponsor would be given 1 week to respond. If there is no response from the sponsor after this time, the resolution would be given the recommendation “No recommendation pending clarification from sponsor” and would not be printed in the Resolutions Book and not considered at Convention.

The majority of respondents (86%) supported this change. Some of those respondents agreed that resolutions still requiring clarification at the print deadline should not be considered at Convention but suggested that the resolutions should be placed at the back of the Resolutions Book in order to acknowledge receipt.

Of the 11% that opposed this option, several said that UBCM should attempt to clarify the resolution through email or phone. One respondent said that they were opposed to this option and “just because the Resolutions Committee doesn't know what to do with a resolution doesn't mean the collective will of the Convention won't be able to figure something out”.

It is clear that several members are not aware that UBCM currently requests, and would continue to request, clarification from the sponsor on certain resolutions. The discussion paper noted that this proposed change is being put forward as it can be difficult to obtain a response and additional information from the sponsor, resulting in the recommendation “Pending Clarification from Sponsor”.

Based on the positive feedback received supporting this option at the Area Association presentations and in the member survey, UBCM is moving forward with this change for 2010 and in future years. Any resolution that still requires clarification by the print deadline will not be included in the Resolutions Book and will not be considered at Convention. These resolutions could be considered at the 2011 Convention, pending clarification.

D) Additional Time for Resolutions Sessions

Nearly three-quarters of respondents (74%) supported the option of adding 30 minutes or more to the resolutions sessions at Convention. This would represent a total of 6.5 hours or more for resolutions.

However, 22% of respondents did not support this option and preferred the resolutions sessions to be a total of 6 hours or less. A few respondents noted that given the other changes at Convention, extra time for resolutions might not be needed.

UBCM has allocated 6.5 hours for resolutions at the 2010 Convention. The Friday morning clinics have been removed from the Convention program to provide the additional resolutions time.

E) Dedicated Blocks of Time for Resolutions

This proposed change was supported by the majority of respondents (87%). For those who did not support this option (5%), some felt that the election nominations, speeches, etc. were a welcome break and were not considered an interruption.

UBCM is responding to this feedback by providing 3 resolutions sessions at the 2010 Convention, between 1.5 and 2.25 hours per session.

F) Provincial Meetings & Resolutions Sessions

The option to advise the Province of the timing of the resolutions sessions in an effort to reduce the number of provincial meetings scheduled during that time, was largely supported by the survey respondents (81%). Many felt that resolutions were “the work of Convention” and should be the priority.

Eight percent (8%) did not support this change, stating that it was very important for them to have this opportunity to meet with Ministers and other provincial staff.

Many members have noted that the opportunity to meet with Cabinet Ministers during Convention is very important for them. Therefore, UBCM has requested that provincial staff meetings (not Cabinet Minister meetings) not be scheduled during the Wednesday morning resolutions session, if possible, as priority A, Special and Extraordinary resolutions are considered at that time.

G) If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question

The majority of respondents (81%) supported this option saying, “there is no need to support a resolution if there is no opposition, particularly if the resolution has been endorsed by an Area Association and is recommended by the Resolutions Committee. Sometimes I get the feeling resolution proposers just want to hear themselves talk”, and “it is very time consuming when a council member continually gets up to speak in favour when no one is against. This is not the time to be politicking”.

Ten percent (10%) of respondents were opposed to this option. Comments included, “Not in favour. Opinions need to be shared on important issues that raise their profile”, and “even if all are in favour, important to give voice to”.

Another 11% provided a response that did not clearly support or reject the proposed option. Some of these respondents supported the proposed option but felt that the sponsor should be able to introduce the resolution, whether or not there was opposition

(the original option did not allow the sponsor to introduce their resolution unless there is first an opposing speaker).

Responding to the feedback that sponsors should be allowed to speak to their resolutions, even if there is no opposing speaker, the Committee is presenting the following process that would allow this to happen:

1. Chair introduces resolution by reading number and title
2. Resolutions Committee member reads the enactment clause(s) and Resolutions Committee recommendation
3. Chair invites the sponsor to introduce the resolution
4. Chair asks if anyone wishes to speak in opposition
5. If no opposing speakers, then Chair calls the question; however if a delegate wishes to speak in opposition, then the Chair invites the delegate speaking in opposition to speak for a maximum of 2 minutes, followed by a speaker in favour of the resolution (2 minutes)
6. Chair facilitates debate on the resolution and will make an effort to alternate debate between delegates wishing to speak in opposition and delegates wishing to speak in favour of the resolution. The Chair may use his or her discretion to minimize repetitive debate by calling the question if multiple delegates have presented similar arguments in favour of or against a resolution.

The membership will be asked if they are in support of this proposed option and process at the 2010 Convention. If they are, they will be required to endorse the related resolutions to introduce this change for the resolutions sessions at the 2010 Convention.

H) Pro/Con Microphones

This proposed change is linked to option **G) If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question** and would place separate microphones for those wishing to speak for or against a resolution. Pro/con microphones were suggested to assist the chair in determining if there is any opposition to a resolution, and if there is not, the question could be called immediately.

Though a majority of the survey respondents were in favour of introducing pro/con microphones (65%), there was not overwhelming support for this option, as was the case with several of the other proposed changes.

The 24% who did not like this option questioned whether pro/con microphones would save any time; whether it was necessary; and how this would affect mobility-challenged delegates.

To assist the chair in determining whether delegates wish to speak in favour of or in opposition to a resolution, two microphones will be placed at each microphone station on the Convention floor. At each microphone station, one microphone will be for delegates speaking in favour of the resolution, and the other will be for those delegates wishing to speak in opposition.

2. MEMBER FEEDBACK ON PROPOSED CHANGES FOR CONSIDERATION IN 2011

A) Resolutions Already Policy Not Debated at Convention

The majority of survey respondents (62%) felt that resolutions that were already policy (the current B1 resolutions) should not be debated at Convention and should not be included in the Resolutions Book. Eleven percent (11%) of respondents disagreed and wanted all resolutions, whether they were current policy or not, considered at Convention and printed in the Resolutions Book.

Another 27% provided a response that did not clearly support or reject the proposed option. Many of these respondents thought that resolutions should be printed in the Resolutions Book but not debated saying, “Leave them in the book, but with a clarification explaining why they will not be debated”. Some did not support this option unless “there is a document summarizing which resolutions will be added to current UBCM policy”.

The survey also asked: “If your resolution was determined to be existing UBCM policy, would you be satisfied with a letter from UBCM stating that your resolution was endorsed by the Executive, would be kept active for 3 years and that UBCM would continue working on this issue?”

To this question, 80% of respondents said they would be satisfied, 3% said they would not be satisfied.

There were many questions from the membership as to how UBCM would deal with resolutions that were determined to be current policy. Some of these questions were:

- What happens to those resolutions that are found to be existing policy? Will they be noted in the Resolutions Book as existing policy, or a document that summarizes the resolutions placed in this category?
- How will the membership know when the 3 years is up? Will there be a notification that this resolution can now be resubmitted?
- Define the meaning of “kept active”
- What is the process if the sponsor disagrees with the decision that their resolution is already existing policy?
- How will members receive updates on these resolutions, to ensure that UBCM is working on them and to view the progress on the resolution?

B) Resolution Follow Up / Tracking

The survey asked if members were satisfied with the current process for following up and tracking of resolutions, which is to post the provincial responses on the UBCM website and officially convey, by formal letter, to the local government sponsor the provincial and federal responses, as well as responses from other organizations. In addition, resolutions and responses as received are added to the searchable resolutions database available on the UBCM website. Further, a summary of successful legislative and regulatory changes brought about by resolutions is printed in UBCM’s Annual

Report. As well, members can contact UBCM's Information and Resolutions Coordinator to inquire about the status of responses.

Respondents were split in their answers. Thirty-six percent (36%) said they were satisfied, 33% said they were not, and another 31% provided another answer.

Many of those respondents who were unhappy with the current process felt that it was too slow, saying, "We just heard about our resolution from last year, September, and here we are in another year and have already had to submit our resolutions to our regional association"; or that they didn't know what the status of their resolution was, saying, "need more communication on where past resolutions are in the queue", and "tracking is ok but results of activity are not always well publicized".

Many suggestions were received on how to improve the resolutions follow up and tracking, including:

- Put the info and results on the website quickly
- Send email updates to sponsors on the progress of a resolution
- Let members know, in the newsletter, which resolutions have been considered by the Province and which ones have been rejected
- Have a status manual showing status of resolutions
- Release an annual or semi-annual report on the status of all resolutions
- Allow members to comment on the provincial response
- Staff should divide up resolutions by what ministry would be responsible [and assign] a block of resolutions to each [member] of the [UBCM] Executive, [who would be asked] to put some pressure on the Province to resolve

C) Reducing & Prioritizing Resolutions

Three questions were asked related to reducing and prioritizing resolutions.

The first was whether or not members were in support of the suggestion in resolution 2008-B137, which requested that each Area Association prioritize and submit their top 5 resolutions for debate at Convention; that the UBCM Executive be asked to bring forward a maximum of 25 member resolutions for debate at Convention; and that UBCM develop a tracking system for resolutions.

Responses from the survey were split on this idea. Thirty seven percent (37%) supported the request in resolution 2008- B137, while 35% were opposed. Another 27% provided another answer, and many of these questioned how Area Associations would prioritize their 5 resolutions, if there should be more than 5 resolutions, and if this was necessary with the other changes for Convention.

The second question in the survey asked if there was a need to reduce and prioritize resolutions above and beyond what was suggested for 2010. The majority of respondents (65%) said no, while 11% said yes. Several respondents noted that the resolutions process needs to be reviewed after 2010 to see if there is a need to further reduce and prioritize resolutions.

The third question asked how else members wanted to prioritize resolutions. Responses included:

- Decision by UBCM Executive as to those items with (1) greatest provincial impact, (2) greatest chance for implementation, (3) within UBCM control, and (4) burning issues for several regions of province and need UBCM assistance and political clout.
- Remove duplication first and then [prioritize resolutions in the] order they arrive.
- Ask those who sent them in where they think theirs should be.
- The UBCM membership should choose its top ten Resolutions for the year. All resolutions would be submitted but the top ten would be considered the priority ones. The voting on the top ten could be done at the same time that the UBCM Executive is voted for.
- The priority for considering resolutions should be: (1) those that are recommended by an Area Association and the Resolutions Committee, (2) those that are recommended by an Area Association, (3) those that are recommended by a Regional District, (4) those that are recommended by a single municipality, and (5) those that are not endorsed by the Resolutions Committee.

D) Reduce Speaker Time

This option was proposed to help move the resolutions process along at a faster pace. Members were asked if the time allocated for speakers should be reduced.

The majority of respondents (56%) were satisfied with the amount of time that is currently allocated for sponsors and subsequent speakers (3 minutes for the sponsor, and 2 minutes for other speakers).

Forty four percent (44%) wanted to reduce the speaker times. Of those wanting speaker time reduced, the majority (67%) would shorten the sponsor speaking time from 3 minutes to 2 minutes.

E) Official Convention Moved to Earlier in the Week or Full Week

The survey asked 2 questions for this proposed option.

The first question was: “Should the official Convention be moved to earlier in the week (Mon-Wed, or Tues-Thurs), in order to offer the resolutions sessions first, before delegates are fatigued from workshops and other sessions?”

To this question, 31% said yes, 28% said no, and 41% provided another answer. There was a lot of confusion regarding this first survey question. Many respondents provided an answer that indicated they believed this question had asked if the official Convention should be held the entire week. A number of respondents to this question suggested that Convention should be held on the weekend as many delegates have jobs that they need to attend to during the week.

The second question was: “Should the official Convention be held for the entire week?” Fifty percent (50%) of respondents said no, and 35% said yes. Some members were

opposed to holding Convention for the entire week, as it can be costly and unfeasible for small local governments and those delegates that hold full time jobs.

F) Specify Time at which Resolutions ‘Off the Floor’ May be Debated

This option would specify a time and date during Convention for debate of resolutions admitted ‘off the floor’. A sponsor could still introduce a resolution ‘off the floor’ at any time, and the membership would vote immediately on whether to admit the resolution for debate. If admitted for debate, however, the resolution would not be debated immediately, but would be tabled for consideration at a specific time later in the Convention (e.g. Friday morning). This would allow debate of resolutions printed in the Resolutions Book to continue in a more efficient manner, while ensuring that the resolution admitted ‘off the floor’ would be debated.

Most respondents were in support of this proposed option (73%), with only a small number opposed (6%). The remainder of the responses (21%) did not directly support or oppose the proposed option, and many of these respondents did not think that ‘off the floor’ resolutions should be allowed at all.

G) Increase Threshold Required for Majority Vote

This option would increase the majority threshold from 3/5 to 3/4, making it easier for the Chair and the scrutineers to determine, both visually and mathematically, a 3/4 majority rather than a 3/5 majority. If so, a resulting benefit would be shorter times required to determine whether or not the required majority had voted in favour of a motion.

Twenty five percent (25%) of respondents supported this option, and 66% were opposed. Of those that were opposed, some mentioned that technology should be used to figure out the majority.

Another question that was raised by some respondents was: “Why isn’t the threshold for majority at 51%?”

H) Other Improvements to Resolutions Process

Members were also asked to suggest other improvements to the resolutions process. Comments (which were not addressed in the discussion paper or this policy paper) included:

- Try and keep conversations at the back of the room to a minimum
- More comfortable chairs
- Offer door prizes
- There should never be any recognition of resolutions that receive Gold stars or blue ribbons
- Consider declining the speeches of provincial government leaders
- Room should be smaller, and delegates should be forced into the front of the room to create an intimate interactive experience
- Bring some theatre to the process. Hype up the contentious items and set times for these resolutions to be heard

APPENDIX D

AFTER THE 2010 CONVENTION

After the 2010 Convention, UBCM will evaluate the impact of changes to the resolutions sessions to determine how to proceed for the 2011 Convention.

Specifically, the following issues will be considered:

Issues and Proposed Options from 2010

- Quorum for resolutions sessions (suggested at Area Association consultations)
- Review Placement and Grouping of Resolutions
- Review If No Opposing Speaker, Call the Question
- Feedback from the members on the 2010 resolutions session changes

Proposed Options for the 2011 Convention

- Resolutions Already Policy Not Debated at Convention
- Resolution Follow Up/Tracking
- Reducing and Prioritizing Resolutions
- Reduce Speaker Time
- Official Convention Moved to Earlier in the Week or Full Week
- Specify Time at which Resolutions 'Off the Floor' May be Debated
- Increase Threshold Required for Majority Vote