

Our 6 motions vs. the Board's 5 "alternatives"

CFPC Annual Meeting of Members, Oct. 28, 2026. Page numbers are from the meeting package the College sent members on Oct. 7.

The pattern: the Board says it agrees with many of our goals (p.18). But in every one of its alternatives, the Board keeps the final say: who can run for President, what members get to see, which questions get an advance vote, whether an adopted motion gets acted on, and what gets disclosed. The result is no minutes, no sponsor names and no published vote counts. Ours put those decisions in the by-law, where only members can change them.

The key rule (p.19): "If both a member proposal and its corresponding alternative are approved, the alternative motion will supersede and replace the member proposal." So if you vote yes to both, you get the Board's version. The Board says vote no on all six of ours and yes on all five of theirs. (The package doesn't say what order the votes will be in.)

	What we asked for	What the Board offers instead	The catch: who keeps control?	Their version vs. today
Elections Motion 1, p.20; alt. pp.22-23	Members elect the President and all Directors. Any eligible member can run. An independent administrator counts the votes and publishes every candidate's total within 7 days.	Directors: the Board's picks run as "Board-recommended." Anyone else eligible can run too, and can't be screened out on merit. President and other officers: Board-nominated only (p.23). An independent provider counts the votes and reports "to the Chair and any appointed scrutineers"; members then ratify.	Board still picks who can run for President. (This year, one nominee for each officer job.) No published vote counts.	A bit better (Director seats only)
Board minutes Motion 2, p.24; alt. p.26	Board and committee minutes posted for members within 30 days. Limited redactions, and each one logged.	No by-law, just a Board-approved policy. Members get summaries of "material Board decisions and their rationale" when lawful and "in the best interests of the Corporation." The Board can keep "strategic deliberations and any other information" confidential if it decides, in good faith, to.	Board decides what members see. No minutes. The College says it "already publishes quarterly Board meeting summaries" (p.26)... so what changes? In 2023, 94.78% voted for member access to minutes.	Same as today
Advance voting Motion 3, p.27; alt. p.29. Both need 2/3.	Online advance voting on every member proposal, for at least 14 days. Proxies stay.	Advance ballots only where advance voting "is made available." And no more proxies: it "would replace the existing proxy framework."	Board decides which questions get an advance vote. And if you can't attend, no one can vote for you on surprise procedural votes at the meeting.	Mixed bag (you lose proxies)
Year-round proposals Motion 4, p.30	The College accepts proposals any time of year, holds them till the next statutory window, confirms receipt in writing within 10 business days, and keeps a register.	No alternative motion. Just an informal "administrative process for year-round dialogue" (p.31). The Board says "a by-law cannot alter statutory deadlines or remove the CFPC's legal grounds for declining a proposal" (p.32).	College sets the rules. Nothing binding. Our motion doesn't change the deadlines; it just holds proposals till the next window opens. No alternative, so a yes here stands on its own	Same as today (plus a chat)

	What we asked for	What the Board offers instead	The catch: who keeps control?	Their version vs. today
Response to adopted motions Motion 5, p.33; alt. p.35. Only at 2/3 support.	Within 90 days the Board posts a plan, or signed reasons for saying no. Members vote on the reasons. If they reject them, the motion comes back every year.	Same 90 days. But the Board can say no for many reasons, including “other corporate priorities.” Then the motion comes back once, with a non-binding vote, and only “if the Board determines it appropriate.”	Board decides whether to act, and whether you even get a vote. Members never get a binding say.	Better, but no teeth
Financial disclosure Motion 6, p.36; alt. pp.38-39	Five numbers a year: travel & hospitality (Board, officers, top 10 earners); sponsorship revenue, naming every sponsor over \$10,000; spending on the College’s own CPD products; consultants; and legal fees separately.	A few totals in the audited statements, starting about a year later. Legal fees lumped in with consultants. “The report shall not identify individual ... sponsors.” The Board can “aggregate, defer or omit” information, but only as much as needed to protect privacy, privilege, contracts and so on.	Board sets the definitions, and can hold some back. No sponsor names, even though the College’s own Board-approved 2013 industry recommendations say “Sponsorship terms must be publicly declared.” No separate legal-fee number.	A bit better
Who can change it later	Only members.	The minutes policy is the Board’s own. The Board could amend Alternatives 1, 5 and 6 between meetings (subject to member confirmation). Alternative 3 needs members.	Board can change most of it later. Ours stay put until members say otherwise.	Same as today

Their legal warning. The package says (p.19) that, on legal advice, “certain provisions in each proposal appear to be invalid or unenforceable, conflict with the Board’s statutory duties, omit necessary conforming amendments, or be inconsistent with the Act, the Articles, or By-law No. 1,” and might need “court direction.” (It also says it would make “best efforts” to implement the lawful parts.) It doesn’t say which ones.

On August 5 I asked, for each motion: which clause, and which section of the Act? On August 12 they said the College “does not propose to set out its legal analysis in correspondence.” The meeting package still doesn’t tie a single clause to any section of the Act.

Every one of our motions starts “subject to the Act and the Articles,” and says that if any part is held invalid, the rest still stands. And in the same package, the Board says it has just amended the College’s own by-law “to correct all known non-compliances with the CNCA” (p.40).

Credit where due: the Board’s separate by-law cleanup (item 12.1) has some real improvements, like dropping the Chair’s tie-breaking vote.

Greg Dubord, Oct. 9