

Motion

Be it resolved that

Section 3.14(g) be changed to:

No person nominated to stand for election may be elected by acclamation. All candidates shall be included on the election ballot with a confidence/non confidence option. A Candidate will only be elected if they receive more votes of confidence than votes of non-confidence. Candidates who receive half or more votes of non-confidence of the voting membership of the Society in an election are ineligible to be declared elected to any position in that election or appointed to any position on the Boards of Directors of the Society or its subsidiaries, or employed in any position by the Society or its subsidiaries until they run in a subsequent election and receive more votes of confidence than non-confidence.

Sections 3.14(h), and 3.14(i) are to have the words "of confidence" inserted after the word "votes" in all places the word "votes" occurs in those sections.

If these changes affect any other part of the bylaws, the other sections are to be revised to be consistent with these changes to Section 3.14.

Reasons:

The use of acclamation makes it possible for a person to be elected or confirmed in a position of responsibility in an organization where the majority of members of the organization do not have confidence in that person's ability to represent them or to fulfill the responsibilities of the position. It also causes suspicions regarding the disqualification of potential opposing candidates.

I considered a confidence/non-confidence vote requirement for unopposed candidates only but realized that the geographic representation requirements of our bylaws would make this confusing and difficult to manage.

I thought it might be better to have all candidates run on their own record on a confidence/non-confidence vote rather than against other candidates. This would let members clearly indicate who they had confidence in and remove from consideration any they did not have confidence in. This would encourage candidates to display their talents rather than run down other candidates who they may eventually have to work with on the Board. Thus any person who members indicate confidence in could be considered elected to a position through the complexities of sections 3.14(h), 3.14(i) and 3.14(j).

Removing the possibility of acclamation by requiring a confidence vote would remove the suspicion that unwanted nominated candidates would be disqualified for reasons not specified in the Bylaws.

In reality I expect most candidates would receive more confidence votes than non-confidence votes so very few candidates would be ineligible to fill a position via election at that election, or appointment or employment after the election. Any candidate that the members did not express confidence in could

not be appointed to a Board position or employed by the Society or its subsidiaries in defiance of the voting member's lack of confidence in that person.

This motion would show the CSIC Values of Accountability and Integrity by showing consumers the fact that CSIC is a self-regulating organization that is run by people that its members have confidence in.

I urge all CSIC members to support this motion which requires the elected members of the Board be persons in whom we have explicitly expressed our confidence in, not just someone who ran for the position that no one else was deemed qualified to run for.