Day 1 – CALS Board Meeting, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB

In attendance:

Regrets: Kyle, Audrey, Shin, and Christine (left early)

9 am start

1. Fenton welcome, pronouns, territorial acknowledgement, set intentions and breathing (hell ya)
2. Quorum: 12 voting members in attendance
3. Minutes from March meeting (simon, Dan) – approved
4. CALS Goals (for the following slides, grab notes/deck from Fenton) - Fenton
   1. See 3 actions on slides
   2. Conversations and decision making
      1. Increase membership fee/create annual fee (more discussion later connected to vision/mission)
5. Treasurer’s report/Finance Update – Dan (grab deck)
   1. We’re playing catch up, CCLR years change how budget appears and how we plan for the future/discuss membership fees
   2. Statement of financial position - report
      1. Cash on hand, increase about $4k
      2. Investments, increase approx. $3k
   3. Statement of operations – report
      1. From last year, a CCLR year
      2. This year, lots of movement
      3. Dan to Dawn – does T and F pay out every year. Dawn – every year
   4. Statement of expenses, this year – Dan
   5. Questions/Comments
      1. Dawn – 500$ for emerging scholar award, needs a line item (even though it flows right through annually)
   6. Membership Fee Structures
      1. Example, LSA fee structure and benefits (see slides)
         1. Membership followed by discount to conference, access to membership contacts
      2. Example ANZALS
         1. 1 to 2 year membership options
      3. MOU from previous years but would need to revisit, esp if changing to an annual format
   7. Current Operating Budget
      1. Board member travel? Congress? Accounting.
         1. Dawn – audit for accounting, CCLR year are approx. double expenses ($7500, for every third year).
      2. We’ll need to dip into balance to conver expenses, this and next year.
   8. Questions/comments?
      1. Dawn - We’ve increased our productivity and operating activities, running us into a deficit, fees have not been raised in the last 10 years.
   9. Annual fee proposal – Dan presents options
      1. Totals over three years, projected to cover new expenses
      2. Dan offers questions for reflection:
         1. Renew 3 year membership term or switch to an annual membership?
         2. When to start new fee structure?
            1. Dan suggests next CCLR year, 2026 to give us time to adjust.
   10. Motion: To Accept financial report May 2023 - April 2024 as presented by Treasurer Dan (Kim/Simon)
   11. Motion to accept Amendment: To accept T and F $500 for emerging scholar award (Fenton/Elisabeth)
   12. Vote to approve motions – unanim
       1. Dan will make amendments and present report at GMM
   13. Motion to accept the 2024-2025 budget as proposed (Fenton/Giana)
   14. Discussion?
       1. Rich website costs may be quite varied
       2. Colleen – no costs provided for travel for board meetings
          1. Dan – projection, unsure
          2. Dawn – costs need to be accounted for for the day of the meeting expenses
          3. Dan – for 2025-2026, is the fiscal year
       3. Rich – offering something to students, pre-conference (for example 2REAL)
          1. Dawn – comes from Legacy fund, first offering CALS connection grant
          2. Rich – Something to consider to integrate into operating budget
          3. Fenton – adding operating budget, preconference, commitment, part of our growth
          4. Simon – adding to annual operating budget? Or only CCLR years?
          5. Rich – separate initiatives like 2REAL from CCLR years, may help
       4. Motion: to accept amendments of the annual operating budget as presented by Dan treasurer (Simon, Colleen)
       5. Vote: Unanimous, motion passed
       6. \*\*\*Presentation of the operating budget prompted discussion around a change to annual budget to support special sessions/initiatives annually
6. Annual membership fee – Dan (when and how much)
   1. Simon – wait until 2026, fees already paid for this cycle
   2. Fenton – capture new graduate students at CCLR
   3. Rich – Move to new membership better before CCLR (opportunity to communicate changes and benefits earlier)
   4. Dawn – honour 3 year membership to those who already have the 3 year membership; still need to figure out if we’re joining congress; pro-rated/discounted rate and annual option? Discuss value and benefits of membership. -to discuss over the next day/further discussion
   5. Rebecca – option to collect membership fees in Regina?
   6. Rich – collecting fees: if annual, collect membership fees whether annual or triannual. Look at NAS model – benefits/offering, discounts (tiered model subsidizing)
   7. Dan – if change in implementing fees, as early as next year (2025-2026) cause we need to look into different models; could coincide with Congress
   8. Fenton – if implemented by 2026 there will be a board turnover (there will be challenges either or); CCLR is our biggest driver so might be worth communicating the change then. Pros and cons to be weighed. Discuss $$ of annual fee to Fall. Gives us time to discuss member benefits, create more value for members; advocating for implementation in 2026 even if theres a board turnover
   9. Elisabeth – if move to annual fee structure, there might be people who don’t pay the annual; only those who come to cclr might end up paying for that year; except if we go to congress; same benefits each year to drive membership
   10. Fenton – congress is an event we want to attend annually; didn’t go to congress this year cause we didn’t have a rep from McGill. 2026implementation, time to build, create knowledge and additional benefit and work through this. Now, there’s no perception of this existing;
   11. Rich – easier to do soft launch next year for an infrastructure that wont be tested necessarily at CCLR; offer student benefits outside of CCLR if annual membership is implemented. Lessen confusion? Move forward towards this once there is a proposal.
   12. Fenton – soft launch a great idea; practice for communicating benefits; advocate to members at institution close to a congress institution, to take on a role to support congress. Congress at George Brown next year – get buy in from members to host that + creation/labour of membership benefits
   13. Dawn – ANZALS only other association that does not meet every year (they meet biannually); what is our value in non-cclr years?
   14. Rich – weighing pros and cons; chicken or the egg situation; Elisabeth agrees
   15. Simon – supportive of soft launch leading to CCLR year, like option of giving people options of entering at different points
   16. Colleen – supportive of soft launch, option for 2 or 3 years provides incentive for CALS to consider how members benefit on an annual basis outside of cclr years, Rebecca agrees
   17. Dawn – is there enough leisure programs to sustain an increase in conference offerings, much more labour
   18. Rich – re: labour, investment in CALS tohire someone with a defined skillset, what are those benefits. Will create more opportunities for revenue for the future
   19. Fenton – soft launch before May 1 2025, and it’s our fiscal. We’ll hold voting on what the annual will be for now. Summer project for Dan to revisit options for fees.
   20. Motion: to approve a new membership fee structure starting in May 1, 2025 (Rich/Simon)
   21. Discussion:
       1. Rich - Target date for approval fee structure in the Fall
   22. Vote: unanimous, passed
7. Simon – Website (ask for slides) - <https://forms.office.com/?redirecturl=https%3a%2f%2fforms.office.com%2fPages%2fDesignPageV2.aspx%3fsubpage%3ddesign%26FormId%3dGjnGA9TyV0my54XNBi0O8Y1fOTK3DFVEqiUUIvYwYNhUQVVCWTJQTVVOQlFYQlFaS1NLSjlOVDdaVy4u%26Token%3d95706c47ef534860a8dd28919a472658>
   1. Not eliminating the listserv,
   2. Discussion?
      1. None
8. Rich – communications
   1. Listserv – can be added
9. What do member benefits currently get – Fenton
10. Importance of priorities
    1. Dawn - $30k 5-years ago, do we keep as much as we have around? Think about sustainability of funds.
    2. Rich – why should we keep this amount around? Should be allocating more funds to creating impact for students and ECR. Advance leisure scholarship rather than making profit. Annual membership fees may be increased soon, let’s think about how we keep ourselves stable
    3. Kim – creating guidelines to refer to if we’re in a financially safe position year after year. Focus on advancing leisure scholarship
    4. Dawn – meeting with the accountant again, let’s revisit financial structure ($200k before income tax, etc.)
    5. Kim – multiple objectives met through fewer initiatives
    6. Rich – how do we prioritize?
    7. Elisabeth – add to procedures, for permissions for video

Awards

* Record past award winners (6 months), forms built in through the website (website development)

Outreach and events and student advisory committee

* Recruit and circulate info on SAC
* Explore organizations and make connections (email from Shin, collab with Dr. Ancescue (sp?) WLO)

Anti-O

* Website – One way communication - Translation language (inclusive writing style), accessibility; Mentorship - EDI in pairing system (choice of mentor), EDI in labour of mentorship, the process of system; Website – Two way communication, Some rules of engagement, being political comes with labour, how to host a political leisure identity while respecting the organization
  + Rebecca - Should mentorship be put into its own subcommittee
  + Rich – whose job is membership? Building community.

Leisure/Loisir

* More info, abstracts and articles, archiving open access website, scope etc. supporting stydent awards, session sponsorship
* Mentorship – Rebecca available to mentor them (2026), visibility at CCLR. Highlighting the shared special issue

Communications

* Verification of emails, building out a project plan (implement for September),
* Recommendations to go out for people to discuss at it will affect operating budget
* Functionality foci – one way communication, Archival video, payment portal everything else comes after.
* Fenton – what hire do we need? Need to hire for skill set.
  + Rich – hire a wordpress developer, which payment portal do we want to use
  + Website insurance and board insurance
  + Create a proposal for the Fall for the board to vote on?
* Motion: to allocate up to $14k to hire a web developer with specialized skills to improve website functionality and communications (Richard/Elisabeth)
* Discussion: n/a
* Vote: unanimous, passed.

Subcommittee reports

Awards

* Annual connection grant event, could be connected to the discussion earlier on
* Emerging Leisure Scholar Award – need to refine, contributing to leisure vs. leisure scholar
* Motions: TO accept the award recipients as put forth by the awards committee (Giana/Fenton)
* Discussion? n/a
* Vote: Unanimous, passed

Motion to offer Richard a $500 honourarium (Simon/Colleen)

Unanimous, passed

Day 2

Regrets:

1. Review of Day 1
2. Territory, pronouns, Praises for Dan, breathing exercise
3. Motion to offer Richard a $500 honourarium (Simon/Giana)
   1. Discussion?
      1. Audrey – how do we recognize paid vs. unpaid labour, Audrey to note for P and P
         1. Fenton – precarity
         2. Simon – specialized skill set
         3. Audrey – how might it differ from graduate students/ost-docs
         4. Dawn – what about students and others, would not feel comfortable having a formal contract
         5. Kim – people could be securely employed and still precarious
         6. Colleen – when work is beyond board member expectations, the work is valued at significantly more than the honourarium
         7. Audrey – needs to discussed before work is done
         8. Dawn – this is the first instance
         9. Kim – maintain fulsome discussion in minutes
         10. Colleen – some were not aware of the extent of the work needed so could not anticipate need in advance
         11. Audrey – PnP when extraordinary amounts of work does not exceed certain amount and will be approved in advance of the work being done
   2. Vote – unanimous, passed
4. Rebecca – LL – see notes
   1. Anti-Racism special issue published
   2. Most cited issues: 6 of the 10 are from the Race special issue
   3. Social media – some have expressed discomfort with sharing work over Twitter, so returning to reporting releases
      1. Kim - How do we reference authors? Not tagged
      2. Rich – criteria for reporting, some connection to leisure/loisir, communications can support
      3. Colleen – LinkedIn?
         1. Rich – no presence, falls under communications, need a mechanism to populate in multiple areas
         2. Elisabeth – big responsibility, news feed and linked in together,
         3. Dawn – karen still manages twitter account
         4. Rich – contract should be focused on website, rather than social media, a social media management strategy will be needed to auto propogate to various social media venues
         5. Rebecca – work with Rich in the Fall
      4. Leisure Society Podcast
         1. Dan’s episode released on Leisure Society Podcast
      5. 50th volume in 2026
         1. Audrey – volume on the future of JSS, rather on the past or most read
         2. Dawn – Most impactful articles selected by editors that changed the direction of the fir
         3. Audrey – short papers that mention which papers shifted your perspective
         4. Simon – Agree, folks from range of career points
         5. Dawn – a short description of why they selected the papers they did
         6. Fenton – making a space for new directions, precarity of our field, what are unique challenges and opportunities
         7. Kim – multimedia?
         8. Dawn – permanent archive, Rebecca and issues 1 and 2
         9. Rebecca – sponsor special event at CCLR
         10. Giana – students would appreciate a social/reception
         11. Fenton – merch
         12. Dawn – may work in the evening because of our 50th, acknowledgement of Rebecca’s efforts
         13. Dan – need support for planning?
         14. Rebecca – will reach out to editors, and support from CALS would be appreciate, will come back in the fall to propose
         15. Kim – acknowledging retirements and retirees
         16. Dawn – commentaries from award winners? ANZALS commentary
         17. Audrey – Shorter <2000 words
      6. Leisure Scholar Award – Dawn
         1. Dr. Audrey Giles winner
         2. She’s touched and grateful <3 Shared kind words. Found her people
      7. Congress – George Brown College
         1. Dawn – indifferent, lots of labour
         2. Dan – We pay fees
         3. Kim – regarding kyles comments about having an outlet to present on off years, a variety of locations, accessibility of locations, access to other substantive areas
         4. Rebecca – congress has a template, biggest work is program
         5. Simon – logistical considerations, has congress done enough anti-racism wise,
         6. Dawn – advocacy group for federal government
         7. Kim – critical mass of scholars at George Brown, engages local leisure scholars
         8. Rich – may be missing opportunities to work with other organizations, if we’re moving to an annual fee structure, need to be all in or not every year
         9. Kim – in areas of higher concentration of leisure programs, no prob, in areas where this is less support can we create a policy to support smaller programs/insittuions where leisure programs are less visible
         10. Dawn – could an RA help?
         11. Fenton – should we go to congress for 2025?
         12. Rich – operational concerns, need to plan for years when hosting may not be easy
         13. Audrey – lots of labour for program
         14. Kim – can’t expect people to say yes, need support no matter where
         15. Dan – congress for mentorship and for student engagement
         16. Colleen – commitment to an annual meeting either virtyally or in person
         17. Elisabeth – what does joining entail? Do we really need someone on the ground?
         18. Dawn – what is the key role of the person on the ground?
         19. Rebecca – probably didn’t need to be therein person, but helpful for room issues, etc. IT support
         20. Fenton – running congress is not board members’ responsibility; it’s congress, but can approach some members in George brown, asking if they are willing to do that
         21. Richard – clarifying on the ground commitment; need to clarify logistics and responsibilities; we’re growing up as a board; specifying board labour increases/hires for additional things
         22. Fenton: far less labour to attend congress than cclr; chance to mingle with interdisciplinary scholars; more close-knit engagement; there has to be someone outside the boardto do that work
         23. Rich – congress in UBC
         24. Rebecca – gather interest to sell it that way
         25. Dan – are we committed to continue then? If so, we need to set up a process; call for volunteers to take up that labour even outside the institution/province; market congress as part of cals membership benefits
         26. Fenton – formal call in the CALS listserv; combo of board members (on our way out listserv, as Rich mentioned lol); kim can reach out to folx at George brown; again, this is not labour for the board ; motion abt board wants to support at hosting congress at2025 in George brown
         27. Dawn – board can meet in person; easily able to justify travels to meet in person – added value
         28. Audrey – but no expectation to go to congress to meet as a board; meeting will be hosted at the same time with congress; cost savings for board?
         29. Dawn – for those who want to travel, use travel fundsfrom board with consideration of virtual ways to participate, no expenses for board travel
         30. Audrey – board member meeting expenses at congress vs. CCLR for PnP
         31. Rich – will we have a conversation to discuss our involvement with congress broadly, core part of benefits for pricing structure
         32. Motion: move CALS support attendance at congress in non CCLR years (Dan/Audrey)
             1. Discussion

Kim – future discussion for support via an RA or otherwise

Simon – in support of follow up

Dawn – legacy funds and associated awards

* + - * 1. Unanimous, passed
    1. Kim to connect with Maggie, Mahsa, Maggie
    2. Fenton – mission and vision
    3. LUNCH
    4. Fenton – guiding values, aspirations, etc. review of collated paragraphs
    5. Motion to replace existing mission vision, and values with the current unfinished story (Richard/Dawn)

This is our fluid, emerging statement. It is an unfinished story:

The Canadian Association of Leisure Studies (CALS) is a community advancing and mobilizing leisure scholarship by engaging community members, scholars, activists, and other knowledge holders. CALS values diversity and is working to create more diverse representation across the organization through intentional, value-based collaboration and leadership. CALS works toward a culture of collegiality and support.

We envision that CALS will be a self-governing, sustainable, well-supported organization with cohesive, collective, and clear direction and strategic priorities. We are a growing, lively, and engaged community of scholars, practitioners, and knowledge holders that strives to meet a diverse range of needs in a variety of leisure contexts. The vibrancy of the CALS community is reflected in the association’s journal, *Leisure/Loisir*, the tri-annual Canadian Congress of Leisure Research (CCLR) conference, and other activities.

We aim to unite all parts of Canada/Turtle Island in conversations about leisure that are politically active, anti-oppressive, culturally responsive, and grounded by the practices of former mentors and archived knowledge. Collectively, we cooperate to approach challenges with humility and openness.

*CALS Board 2023-2026*

Online document for reference: https://umanitoba-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/g/personal/fenton\_litwiller\_umanitoba\_ca/EVkN\_-tI9\_FFpiaOxjMZMKcBv-mG0SqIRn8-Y14swDGIOw?e=THmB2i&wdLOR=c1B85E22D-785B-8A4D-AF03-881182E3DA50

* + - 1. Discussion n/a
      2. Vote: unanimous, passed
    1. Federation meeting – Fenton
       1. Ongoing support https://www.federationhss.ca/en/2024-edid-action-plan and encouragement for students to apply <https://www.federationhss.ca/en/2024-edid-action-plan>

1. Process related to Editorship
   1. Rebecca - Revise to October 1st of the additional two year term
   2. Rich – to the CALS membership
   3. Kyle – why is this 4 and 2 years and everything else is 3? 3 year follows BOD and CCLR, creates an offset so it is not an enertirely noard and editor
   4. Colleen – is it detailed somewhere on selection of editor (ad-hoc committee formed)
   5. Rebecca – required a letter of support from dean, acknowledging major service role, less pressure for internal service
   6. Audrey – folx may not have a workload reduction, but might not have to be a requirement
   7. Rich – this is a process for the board than it is for the CALS board, does it have to be a CALS member?
   8. Simon – Editor should be engaged in leisure scholarship or has a commitment to advancing leisure scholarship
   9. Elisabth – amentdment to sub-committee
   10. Colleen – vould hange over time
   11. Rich – set by ad-hoc committee
   12. Kim – what happens if no one applies – then we work
   13. Rich – remove examples
   14. Dawn – friendly edits
   15. Motion to approve procedure for editor of leisure/loisir (Audrey/Simon)
       1. Discussion? n/a
       2. Vote: unanimous pass
2. Letters of support
   1. Kyle – KM by SSHRC, it would be helpful if CALS had a comment that talked about valuing non-conventional knowledge mobilisation
   2. Kim/Fenton – c.f. or n.b. SSHRC definition
   3. Rebecca – revise to “funding or other types of applications”
   4. Colleen – evaluative component? Worth thinking through
   5. Dawn – tool for funding
   6. Kim – statement in place of letter of support
   7. Rich – uncomfortable, is this our responsibility
   8. Audrey - agree with rich
   9. Fenton – language makes the board responsible for tasks promised
   10. Colleen – community organizations yes
   11. Rolling discussion – expectation of support, CCLR
   12. Rich – discomfort with labor of letters of support
   13. Kim – gets too tricky with budget allotment, in-kind support for listserv, etc.
   14. Rich – other mechanisms, grants
   15. Audrey – is this work for the board or work for the president, it’s real impacful for the researcher
   16. Fenton – would feel comfortable about what the inkind support is and the types of tasks the board would engage
   17. Elisabet – how many letters of support do we get
   18. Rich – puts onus on president and it becomes a risk
   19. Dan – agree with Rich
   20. Dawn – different types of letter of support
   21. Rich/Kim – it’s too much labour to decide on an individual basis
   22. Fenton – as of this time, we will write letters of support for LL, - contributions to scholarly community, grants directly to support CCLR, recognition of service to Leisure/loisir. Table individual researcher
       1. Does not preclude
   23. Motion: to support letters of support for CALS conferences, LL editos, board member propmotion applications or external service award (colleen/Audrey)
       1. Discussion: in favour
       2. Passed unanimous
3. Email voting procedure
   1. Roberts riles require online or email voting to be rediscussed in person
   2. Audrey – does not say anywhere that we need to follow Roberts rules
      1. Can make an exception for email voting
      2. If someone doesn’t answer, it is an abstention
      3. Audrey – feels strange to need to rediscuss in person, 50% + 1
         1. Changing by-laws will need to go to membership, 50%+1, so 8 board members
         2. Fenton – agrees
         3. Dan – change rules
         4. Fenton/Dawn – difficult to have a robust discussion over email, move to adjust by-laws, save for emergences
         5. Audrey – remain nimble and do what needs to be done
         6. Elisabeth – votes that don’t need a lot of discussion, approve during meeting motion
         7. Fenton – emergency votes
         8. Rich – email vote is only used during emergencies
         9. Fenton – only use email voting in emergency, member to add to discussion point. A “special meeting” before next meeting. Tabled document.
         10. Dan & dawn -consideration of impossibility to be able to have quorum in a snap and therefore, a vote to move a motion even while meeting asynchronously
4. Electronic meetings
   1. Fenton – Roberts rules: second form of connections for meeting; each member responsible for internet connection/ability to connect (but equity considerations: not all board members have stable internet connection)
   2. Fenton – vote on and add to P&P manual?
   3. Simon – fairly indifferent, not sure if document aligns to the spirit of other documents we are reviewing and revising now
   4. Elisabeth – asking for informal permission to use wording in structuring hybrid structures for classes
   5. Fenton – stole it from the internet LOL; wont go to P&P but will help fENTON with meetings
   6. Break, then close.
   7. Discussion:
      1. Simon – usefulness
      2. Kim – what is the utility, feels like Qual 2.0, feels limiting, feels like an institutional need for advocacy, what is the utility of it? Why not use SSHRC, we support a range of epistemological postions
      3. Dawn – there are some groups that are not well-supported
      4. Audrey – some are still fighting needing the justification, need a subgroup to really hash it out
      5. Christine – from a student perspective, outputs matter
      6. Dan – is it a barrier to new members joining the association
      7. Rich – agree should post
      8. Kim – would it alternatively deter, need to reflect *all* forms of knowledge dissemination
      9. Dawn – inside and outside of the academy
      10. Fenton – table and return in Fall
      11. Colleen – reflect diversity in leisure.loisir
5. Review and Close meeting
6. AGM encourgage to attend
7. Las tmeeting of august to determine meeting for October, thank you for your engagement.