



**EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES  
MEETING #2017/18-Special 1  
DATE: 2018-08-29**

**Present - Voting members:**

Kattackal, L.– by phone / Costa, R. / Dworsky, B. / Ferguson, M. / Martineau, A./  
Maurizio, C. / Renaud, C / Zuikas, T. / Wentink, J.

**Regrets:**

**Present - Non-Voting members:**

Artuso, Lisa / Lord, F. /LeCault,

Secretary: LeCault, A.

Meeting called to order at 19:40 by T.Zuikas, seconded by C. Maurizio

**1. Adoption of August 29 2018 agenda:**

- T. Zuikas welcomes everyone and expresses that this special meeting was called so as to allow the Executive to answer a request for changes to be made to the PCASA Constitution.

**2. Request for changes to the PCASA Constitution**

- A written request, signed by 15 registered members of the PCASA, for changes to be made to the constitution of the PCASA was received on August 16 2018, and communicated to the Executive.
- Copies of the draft constitution document produced by the group of 15 members were also sent to all Executive members in preparation for this meeting.
- T.Zuikas invites J. Wentink (who is part of the 15 member group) to give the Executive some background information as to why this request is being made. T. Zuikas questions J. Wentink as to why he is the only member of the Executive to have been involved in this draft. No other member of the Executive committee than yourself? We had no idea of who was involved in this task force until this letter was received.
- J. Wentink briefly explains that the 15 members who believe the changes are necessary met on a few occasions during the last months. Emails were emails sent out but the intent was not to have a group of 40+ members; a smaller circle and then get feedback from a larger circle - we are open to suggestions, feedback, anyone can provide their feedback.
- The group has drafted a constitution, which is an entirely newly composed document, and which could not be read, side by side, with the current constitution, so as to facilitate the identification of the requested changes. Several exchanges with members of the PCASA who supplied feedback allowed the group to revise the proposed constitution prior to producing the document supplied this evening. The group acknowledges that the draft may still need to be reviewed and improved; that disagreements may remain, but they are confident that it currently meets the needs of the 15 members who collaborated and members who supplied feedback.



**EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES  
MEETING #2017/18-Special 1  
DATE: 2018-08-29**

**3. Discussion on reply by the Executive Committee to the request for changes to the Constitution**

- T.Zuikas questions the nature of the request - if we understood it correctly, the 15 members of the group request the Executive Committee sign-off on the draft? We cannot vote on a document that seems to remain a work in progress.
- J. Wentink suggests that all members can receive a copy of the working document and if they want to vote then they go to a meeting where the vote will be held.
- T.Zuikas clarifies that the request does not currently state that the Executive is welcomed to join the consultation - it was interpreted we were asked to simply proceed with a vote. If the executive had had the draft earlier, we could have scheduled a vote. At the moment, the calendar is set for several activities; the Youth Tournament and hosting Regionals; we do not foresee enough time to review the draft and schedule a vote. Was the object of the request (letter) to ask the Executive to vote on this document today? The executive has a specific window that gives a chance to answer the request, review and then get a date for a vote.
- C. Maurizio indicates that when the Executive is asked to hold a special meeting; it is given 30 days to answer the request and set a date.
- J. Wentink suggests the Executive propose a timeline; get back to the signatory of the request; get feedback from the executive and then set a date to vote.
- T.Zuikas mentions the Annual General Meeting is scheduled for October. He does not believe there is enough time to put the constitution in place and then have the AGM. Such a proposal could be defeated, at that point, our constitution obliges us to have the AGM by the 3rd week of Oct - concludes that we should go with the constitution as is, to not compromise the AGM, because there is not enough time. Since we need a good constitution, could Tony talk to Stephan, get it out to members and supply feedback, and then set a date. Although the feedback has already begun, it needs to go out to all. The draft has not gone through to a broader membership yet - has not gone out to ALL and it has to.
- T.Zuikas suggests forming a review committee to answer the request; 5 positions on the Executive committee are up for reelection. When did this group of 15 members begin meeting and discussing their issues with the current constitution?
- J.Wentink suggests the group of 15 is not seeking for another committee to be created for this purpose – questions who would be part of this committee. He indicates the group does not mean to press the Executive but that this review and vote should happen before the AGM in October.
- T. Zuikas mentions the group of 15 should not make assumptions in this matter. This Executive committee wishes to answer the request of the group appropriately. T.Zuikas opens the discussion with the Executive members present so as to clarify their needs in this regard.
- T.Zuikas comments that the draft is a good piece of work; it is not misguided and creates transparency for the club; it gives the review board more power than the executive board.



**EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES  
MEETING #2017/18-Special 1  
DATE: 2018-08-29**

- A.Martineau questions the operating rules - We should do the operating rules (review them) move some suggestions from this draft constitution into the operating rules document?
- J. Wentink comments there is a fine line between governing board rules and rules of operation. The group has given this a lot of thought and they would like issues such as discipline to be included in the rules of operation.
- C.Maurizio - our constitution says we have to abide by the operating rules? It's on our web site.
- R.Costa - what is the possibility? What I'd like to see and sign off on - could we take 3 folks from the committee and 3 from the Exec to sit together and discuss this?
- J. Wentink – the group agrees to discuss the proposal but not to have another committee formed to address the constitution. He does not believe the members of the committee would agree. You know where the operational friction sits in the club and thus, this group is open to feedback but not to creating a new committee. Keep it simple, anyone in that group will be open to listen, make notes and consider feedback.
- L.Artuso: if the meeting happens and 99% of the content is agreed to, but 1% is disagreed on, then it's a no go? Correct.
- C.Maurizio: we should be careful to avoid the whole document be thrown out. Reviewing a constitution used to be done with the old and the revised copies, one on one, side by side, so it's easy to identify where the changes appear. L.Artuso compares this to what is done at Ringuette.
- J.Wentink - we tried that and that does not work / we suggest one document, consensus or not, there will never be entire consensus. Think of this as you being a member of the PCASA, it's a living document. Executive members cannot claim they were not made aware of the group's work since the proposal was communicated to the Executive Committee.
- C.Renaud - why is it specific to Inter City / no Micro etc.?
- J.Wentink says those divisions were reached out to; even if they may not have been included or an integral part of the group. There has been a paradigm shift in the way we think about House League - as far as the approach of how you make teams etc. - they should not be treated differently / should be a good discussion to have.
- J.Wentink: says those in the group who were spoken to represent all the divisions.
- T.Zuikas opens the floor to any further comments?
- M.Ferguson - Rodney and Steph but no Champagne?
- T.Zuikas asks if there is a consensus; There will not be any transition time to address this draft because the AGM is scheduled for the 18th of October 2018.
- J.Wentink: start the process, talk to Steph / they want change, not for change's sake, but they want it done right.



**EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES  
MEETING #2017/18-Special 1  
DATE: 2018-08-29**

- T.Zuikas: If we adopt the new constitution at a time when we have 4 board positions available, next year, depending on the consensus, it can go to 7 or 9 - I don't believe it can be done right before the AGM.
- F. Lord: asks that the current constitution be reviewed by all Executive members so as to become more familiar with it, let them review the draft proposal from the group, and compare the two documents.
- J.Wentink: we rewrote it so they cannot place the 2 documents side by side but what the group can do is reference the changes in the proposed constitution and locate what it refers to in the old document (highlight changes in yellow) to facilitate comparison and review.
- F.Lord: if the objective is to have the review completed on time for the AGM then there should be a proposal included to the AGM agenda so the vote can happen at the AGM.
- T.Zuikas: you can't do that without the actual adoption of the new constitution / the operating rules is the document that can be modified immediately, not the constitution.
- C.Maurizio: suggests anyone can request changes to the operating rules and we would not need, and cannot have, right now a transition committee (no time) but for 2019 we could make it happen.
- F.Lord: This group's proposal is positive because of the level of interest in the PCASA it raises / we would not have to beg folks to join the PCASA.
- T.Zuikas: What if we plan to reply to the group's draft by the November meeting?
- J.Wentink: the Executive should expect a lot of pushback - according to them it should not take that much time - it could be quick. If it does not feel right, the group will push back - Steph was thinking September 2018.
- T.Zuikas: We are only obliged to set a date or deadline once we have an actual final proposal - eg. 30 days from when you give us the draft we set a date for a meeting.
- T.Zuikas: says he could meet with Steph and organize a small group of interested members.
- F.Lord: if the objective is to have the best possible document, it should not matter that we set a deadline for Sept or Oct. / it's already been 11 days since we received the document.
- J.Wentink: is convinced it should not take that long.
- T.Zuikas: Agreed - we want a date and it has to be after the AGM. If we set a date - then the second date will be depending on us receiving the final draft (two weeks to review).



**EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES  
MEETING #2017/18-Special 1  
DATE: 2018-08-29**

- L.Artuso: suggests
    - 2 weeks for all members to review the current proposal (inform the membership this version is not approved by the Executive - it has been produced by the group)
    - 1 week for the document to be updated from feedback received
    - 2 weeks for all members to review updated version and then voted on
  
  - J.Wentink suggests:
    - 2 weeks for all members to review the current proposal (draft 1)
    - 1 week for the document to be updated from feedback received
    - 2 weeks for all members to review updated version (draft 2)
    - 1 week for the document to be updated from feedback received
    - 2 weeks for all members to review updated version and then voted on
    - Total 8 weeks = end of October
  
  - C.Maurizio: what are the rules about this? Are we setting ourselves up for something we should not be doing / what if we, the executives, don't agree with the document? We'll have to send it out but it will not be supported by the Executive
  
  - T.Zuikas: I will call Stephan tomorrow night
  
  - J.Wentink: says it's a good idea to ask a couple of folks from the task force to sit with folks from the Executive to review it.
- 4. Resolutions to be issued:**
- T.Zuikas will advise Lisa when it's time to send out the first email.
- 5. Motion to Adjourn**
- T.Zuikas / seconded by C. Maurizio
  - Meeting ends at 21:30