AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 5, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Elin Tayyar (VP Finance), Jeremy McElroy (AMS President), Conny Lin (GSS), Bahador Moosavi (GSS), Hans Seidemann (Engineering), Mirko Carich (At-Large). Eric Gauf (Law), Stewart McGillivray (Arts), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

*The agenda was adopted by consenus.*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Jeremy McElroy                      Seconded: Eric Gauf

That the minutes of December 14, 2011 be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Referendum Question Updates

Elin and Jeremy: Presentation of updated referendum questions.

Consensus: The proposed questions satisfy code requirements.

Business Governance Review
Elin: The AMS needs to review how its businesses are governed in order to maximize efficiency and avoid political interference. This needs further study. I would appreciate a motion being made to encourage further study of this topic.

Moved: Eric Gauf  Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

BIRT LPC recommend that council direct the executive committee to study options for reforming business governance.

*The motion carries without dissent.*

**Compensation Review**

Kyle: Code currently states that LPC must produce a report of all compensation levels among student staff in the organization. This dates back from before the tier system was introduced. I feel it is now redundant. I would encourage us to recommend striking it from code.

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Elin Tayyar

BIRT LPC recommend council remove the code sections directing LPC to produce an annual AMS compensation report.

*The motion carries without dissent.*

**Fee Indexing**

Elin: We need to specify which months the CPI level for AMS fees is calculated based upon. Otherwise, future councils could keep choosing different months in order to always raise fees by the maximum possible amount. Going from September to September is convenient from a housekeeping perspective, but the key thing is that one way or another, a consistent time period needs to be chosen.

Moved: Elin Tayyar  Seconded: Jeremy McElroy

BIRT LPC recommend code changes establishing September as the basis point for CPI calculations affecting AMS students fees

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Fee Waiver for UBC-O**
Jeremy: I have managed to work out a repricocity agreement with UBC-O regarding UPASSS. As a result, UBC-O students studying at UBC-Vancouver will be eligible for UPASSS. They will be required to pay the AMS general membership fee of $21 and the UPASS fee, but no other AMS fees (since they are still paying UBC-SUO fees). UBC-Vancouver students will receive similar treatment when studying at UBC-O. Further details are available upon request.

Moved: Jeremy McElroy  
Seconded: Elin Tayyar

BIRT LPC recommend a code change to facilitate the passage of the UBC-O UPASS repricocity agreement.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Note: Quorum was lost after the passage of the UBC-O UPASS agreement.

**Bonuses for Elections Committee**

Kyle: Before the tier structure was brought in, most of the Elections Committee were eligible for bonuses. It is ambiguous whether or not this is still the case, since they were neither explicitly removed nor retained. We may want to consider passing a clarifying motion. Also, the Votermia Coordinator was not eligible for a bonus under the old system, but their job has been expanded for this year.

Hans: Your initial background information is fine, but anyone considering a candidacy in the upcoming election should likely withhold comment on this issue.

Consensus: Agreed. We want to ensure no possible conflict of interest.

Consensus: Previous bonus structure should be maintained. This is unfortunate for the Votermia Coordinator, but they were not promised a bonus in the first place, so we are not violating any contract. The Votermia Coordinator might be doing extra duties as a one time exception, so it doesn’t make sense to embed these bonuses for future years.

Moved: Hans Seidemann  
Seconded: Eric Gauf

BIRT LPC recommend council continue the existing bonus structure for the AMS Elections Committee members.

*The motion carries.*

Note: Quorum was not present for this vote.
Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will be determined once class schedules have been finalized.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 19, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Elin Tayyar (VP Finance), David Liu (At-Large), Isabel Montoya (At-Large), Bahador Moosavi (GSS), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:38 pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was adopted by consensus.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Elin Tayyar  Seconded: David Liu

That the minutes of January 5, 2012 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Administration of Sexual Assault Support Services Fund

Elin: Concerns have been raised that there have been administrative problems and delays with the Sexual Assault Support Services Fund. It would be worthwhile to explore transferring responsibility for this fund to the Finance Commission, since they already have experience in administering several other funds.

Kyle: Fincom would not have sexual assault expertise.
Elin: Could be solved by having SASC act in advisory capacity as is currently done.

Consensus: Student and Life and Communications committee should retain final decision making power. It may be worth exploring bringing in Fincom in an administrative support role. Kyle should liaise with both Tristan and Jarrett before any decisions are made on this matter.

**Composting Coordinator Job Description**

Consensus: This appears very worthwhile.

Moved: David Liu
Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

BIRT LPC recommend that council approve the Composting Coordinator job description as presented.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Making Tiers and Appendix to Code**

Sheldon: The process for approving the Composting Coordinator Job Description and the recent confusion around Elections Committee bonuses both make it clear that we need to specify certain details about the Tier system. This would be effectively be accomplished by designating Tiers as an appendix to code.

Consensus: Agreed. Sheldon is directed to draft language that would make Tiers an appendix to code.

**Rules for Electronic Meetings**

Sheldon: It turns out that the most up to date version of Robert's Rules has considerably more detail about electronic meetings, such as meetings where members are present by phone or Skype. If aural communication is possible, Robert's Rules permits us to have electronic meetings, but says we must specify many of the details ourselves.

Kyle: In practice, we already allow people to phone in for committee meetings. I would be skeptical of allowing it for council itself. It would present several exceptionally difficult logistical
problems, and the majority of councillors can already send proxies to council, and in addition, council is almost always scheduled at a consistent time.

Consensus: Allowing electronic meetings for committees is likely ok, allowing them for council is inadvisable. Sheldon is directed to attempt to draft code to this effect.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is January 26, 2012

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 26, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Jeremy McElroy (AMS President), Stewart McGillivray (Arts), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Note: Quorum was not met.

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:40 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was adopted by consensus.

Elections Campaign

Jeremy: We currently do not budget properly for elections awareness/advocacy campaigns. Elections happen on a semi-regular basis. Some years have multiple elections, while others have no elections. This creates budget inequities, as some years face a disproportionate drain on the University and External Lobbying Fund. If we set aside $7000 per year for each of a municipal, provincial, and federal election advocacy campaign, we will have $21,000 for each municipal campaign and $28,000 for each federal and provincial campaign. This would put us relatively in line with previous historical campaign expenditures.

Jeremy: Once the costs of the University and Government Relations Advisor’s office are subtracted, the AMS realistically about $90,000 for advocacy per year. With $21,000 going to these election reserve funds, this would still leave approximately $70,000 for advocacy each year, which should be sufficient.
Jeremy: We already take a similar approach to this on various other AMS funds created through code.

Sheldon: Who will administer this fund?

Kyle: This fund, and the overall University and External Lobbying Fund should probably both be administered by council on the recommendation of either Un-e-corn or the Executive Committee. Current code referring to funds being administered by the External and University Commissions seems out of date, since those bodies are generally no longer active in a deliberative role.

Consensus: Sheldon will draft language around these proposals, and will bring drafts back to the committee for further scrutiny.

**Updating Job Description for Executive Coordinator of Student Services**

Jeremy: The current job description for the Executive Coordinator of Student Services makes it an incredibly unappealing position for qualified applicants. Asking for a 40 hour/week commitment at approximately $25,000 per year is inequitable compared to executive salaries, and it makes the position unattractive, as it suggests that candidates will have to drop almost all of their courses. Based on discussions with the current and previous ECSS, and based on the increased support for the position from the Director of Services that the AMS will be hiring soon, we should consider reducing the hours to 30 per week, and increasing the hourly rate to the executive level. This would result in an extremely slight drop in overall compensation, but it would make the position far more desirable to applicants.

Jeremy: Alternatively, we could raise the hourly rate, and keep the hours the same. The current and previous ECSS have stated that either option is reasonable. I support the first option (reduce hours to 30/week and raise the hourly rates).

Mirko: What does the ECSS do?

Jeremy: Supervise the service coordinators. In the future they may also take a larger role in increasing the public visibility of our services.

Consensus: Sheldon to draft language changing the ECSS hours to 30/week and increasing their salary to the level of an executive receiving full PAR.

**Next Meeting**

Kyle: It appears this meeting time is not ideal. I will likely be setting a different time in future.
Adjourn

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Mirko Carich

BIRT the meeting be adjourned

*The motion carries.*

The meeting was adjourned at 1:17 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 31, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Bahador Moosavi (GSS), Eric Gauf (Law), Isabel Montoya (At-Large), Hans Seidemann (Engineering), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Jeremy McElroy (AMS President), Stewart McGillivray (Arts), Elin Tayyar (VP Finance), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was adopted by consensus.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Bahador Moosavi  Seconded: Isabel Montoya

BIRT the minutes of January 19, 2012 and January 26, 2012 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Updating ECSS Job Description

Kyle: Sheldon has drafted amendments based on the discussion we had last time. Does anyone have any comments?

Bahador: Should the ECSS have a PAR?

Jeremy: Less necessary for ECSS than for executives, since the ECSS can be fired if performing badly, but executives effectively can’t be fired.
Sheldon: Being able to be fired doesn’t necessarily mean there shouldn’t be performance based pay. Glenn Wong is recommending performance based pay for managers and they can definitely be fired.

Bahador: We don’t need to create PAR for the ECSS right now, but we should possibly keep it in mind for the future.

Jeremy: These proposed changes will make the position far more attractive to possible applicants. This is crucial, as we have great difficulty finding qualified applicants for this position.

Moved: Bahador Moosavi Seconded: Hans Seidemann

BIRT LPC recommend the proposed changes to the ECSS position description, as circulated, to council.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Election Reserve Fund**

Kyle: Last week Jeremy presented about the idea of putting away $7000 for each of the federal, provincial, and municipal elections each year.

Jeremy: Election timing is relatively predictable. Our budgeting should reflect this. If this proposal is adopted, scrutiny will still be applied in future, on each of the specific expenses that occur under this proposed fund.

Elin: This should be looked at by Budget Committee.

Elin: It might be better to specify having 3 sub-funds, each dedicated to one level of election campaigns, rather than creating one overall fund.

Kyle: We should specify that this proposed fund would be drawn from the University and External Relations Fund.

Kyle: I will consult un-e-corn tomorrow on this. They may have some relevant thoughts, since this would affect their future prerogatives.

Consensus: Sheldon to draft further revisions, incorporating procedures for detailing with money that remains after an election campaign, specifying that there will be 3 sub-funds, and specifying that these new sub funds will come out of the University and External Lobbying Fund. Kyle will then circulate these revised drafts to Budget Committee and un-e-corn.
Consensus: Jeremy’s idea of creating predictability in budgeting is worthwhile, but a number of details still need to be determined.

Society Act Review

Eric: The AMS is governed by the Society Act. The province has been reviewing this legislation for a long period of time. We previously submitted recommendations for how this legislation could be improved. The province has now produced a document noting all the previous recommendations, and is now asking for further recommendations.

Kyle: It appears they basically ignored our last set of recommendations.

Eric: Yes, although they did at least acknowledge that they received them.

Kyle: I will include Pierre, the new University and Government Relations advisor, as well as une-corn in this conversation, in order to determine the best next steps.

Eric: We probably don’t want to submit exactly the same suggestions as last time, but this should be an easier process for the AMS to go through than it was the first time we submitted recommendations.

Rules for Electronic Meetings

Kyle: This was discussed at the previous meeting. Sheldon drafted up some language. It basically maintains and clarifies the status quo. It says that people are not allowed to phone into council meetings, but that committees can allow people to phone in.

Bahador: Not entirely comfortable with saying that people phoning into council meetings can’t debate, but on the whole, this is reasonable.

Moved: Eric Gauf  Seconded: Elin Tayyar

BIRT LPC recommend the circulated code change regarding rules for electronic meetings.

The motion carries.

Expulsion from the SUB Policy

Sheldon: I circulated this to Kyle. Basically it incorporates changes suggested by the lawyers into the internal policy. Some of the proposed changes should actually be made to the SAC policy handbook, so those portions of the lawyer’s recommendations should go to SAC.
Kyle: I will circulate the sections of this proposed revisal to SAC and LPC, dependent on which sections are relevant to each body.

**Two-Thirds Votes**

Kyle: This issue has come to a head, due to ambiguities regarding whether or not an ordinary majority is sufficient to increase or decrease our connection to CASA. It was possible to end up in scenarios where council may have been paralyzed, as all possible actions would have required 2/3rds support, which may have been impossible to achieve.

Hans: We should require 2/3rds support to increase our expenditure on an external organization, and require a simple majority to reduce our expenditure.

Consensus: This seems reasonable. Sheldon should draft an internal policy to this effect. If our membership status stays the same, but fees increase incrementally, a 2/3rds vote should not be required.

**Responsibility for Elections When No Elections Committee**

Sheldon: Since there is no elections committee for much of the year, we run into problems, such as not purchasing Simply Voting and having to resort to an inconvenient username/password system as a result. There are a number of changes that should be looked at, but not having some body have a caretaker role for elections during times without an elections committee means that these responsibilities, such as liaising with full time staff, can go unfulfilled.

Kyle: This responsibility could reasonably be given to either the VP Academic or to LPC. I will consult with the EA to get her thoughts on this.

Consensus: This makes sense. Also, we should ensure that we purchasing Simply Voting, so that cwl can be integrated.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting will be an emergency meeting at 12 noon on Friday, February 3 to discuss business governance.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of February 3, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Eric Gauf (Law), Katherine Tyson (VP External), Hans Seidemann (Engineering), Elin Tayyar (VP Finance), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Bahador Moosavi (GSS), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Guests: Caroline Wong (Arts)

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:05 pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

*The agenda was adopted by consensus.*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Hans Seidemann Seconded: Eric Gauf

That the minutes of January 31, 2012 be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Business Governance Restructuring

Elin: The plan is to create separate student board of directors to be responsible for AMS businesses. I have circulated a document with some more details. I am asking for approval in principle for this to go forward. Some details still need to be worked out, so I am also asking for you to create an extraordinary committee to finalize these details.
Elin: Some of the key points for this are that we would be creating a 12 member student board of directors, with 5 alumni, 2 executives, 3 non-executive councilors, and 4 students at large. This would be a legally separate board. It would donate its profits to the AMS Foundation, which has the power to issue tax receipts. Most positions on this new board would be multiple year appointments, with appointments expiring on a staggered basis, so that there is always continuity. The positions would be hired through a rigorous process, rather than the 30 second speeches that are currently used during council appointments.

Elin: This proposal is beneficial from a tax perspective. More importantly, it will allow greater business accountability, and it will allow AMS council to focus its energy on where its strengths are. The alumni would not make up a majority of the board. Their role would be to provide mentorship, not to take control. This model is partly based on the University of Helsinki student union, which is one of the most successful in the world. This will help reduce our reliability on highly unstable revenues from businesses, and allow for longer term financial planning.

Free Form Discussion: Numerous questions were asked about details of this plan. Elin answered several questions, and stated that other questions would be referred to the Extraordinary Restructuring Committee, if it is created.

Kyle: I need specifics on the form of this Extraordinary Restructuring Committee, in order to be able to create a motion for it.

Consensus: It should be composed of 5 non-executive councilors. It will work closely with the Executive Committee, in particular the VP Admin and VP Finance, but the executives will not have voting positions on this extraordinary committee.

Moved: Elin Tayyar Seconded: Hans Seidemann

BIRT LPC support, in principle, the AMS restructuring plan as presented
BIFRT LPC recommend that council create an Extraordinary Restructuring Committee composed of 5 non-executive councilors
BIFRT the Extraordinary Restructuring Committee shall liaise closely with the Executive Committee
BIFRT the Extraordinary Restructuring Committee shall automatically dissolve once council has made a decision regarding the current restructuring proposal

*The motion carries without dissent.*
Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is February 7, 2012

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:59 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of February 7, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Bahador Moosavi (for second half of meeting), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Eric Gauf (Law) (for first half of meeting), Conny Lin (GSS), Stewart McGillivray (Arts), Katherine Tyson (VP External), Emily Jarrett (Proxy for Bahador Moosavi for first half of meeting, Proxy for Eric Gauf for second half of meeting)

Guests: Carolee Changfoot (Elections Administrator), Thomas Brennan (Chief Returning Officer)

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:16 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was adopted by consensus.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Stewart McGillivray Seconded: Mirko Carich

That the minutes of February 2, 2012 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Removing Requirement for Contracts to go to SAC

Kyle: The current requirement serves no purpose and SAC never reads these contracts. They are fine with us removing this requirement.

Moved: Eric Gauf Seconded: Stewart McGillivray
BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt code changes removing the requirement for Contracts to be sent to SAC for information purposes.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Internal Policy on Joining External Organizations**

Kyle: We have already agreed to this in principle. This is to send the finalized wording to council.

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  
Seconded: Eric Gauf

BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt its proposal to require 2/3rds votes to increase membership status in external organizations and simple majority votes to decrease membership in such organizations.

*The motion carries without dissent.*

**Representation for DAP (Diploma in Accounting Program) and Affiliated Colleges**

Kyle: The fact that these groups do not have voting constituency representatives on AMS council is clearly unfair. It isn’t clear how to solve this, given various procedural complaints, but we need to give it our best effort.

Emily: This under representation is more urgent than you might realize. VST students were not able to participate in recent AMS elections. A complaint has been filed. At this point, it isn’t clear whether Regent or St. Mark’s students were also affected.

Kyle: Ideally the principle should be that if you pay full AMS fees, you get a full AMS voice. DAP is an especially difficult case to solve, as they do not have a constituency, and the CUS does not want them to join.

Conny: We should be careful to avoid creating a giant council. This is a problem that has plagued the GSS until recently.

Eric: Some other groups such as the Diploma in Urban Land Economics may also be in a similar position as the DAP students.

Conny: The Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies is currently represented through the GSS. In the future, it will have undergraduate members. At that point, these people may also need a constituency.
Consensus: If DAP constitutes itself as a constituency we will give it a non-voting seat. We should also aim to amend bylaw seats to give voting seats to these groups at the next referendum, likely to occur in October.

Allowing All Active Members on Extraordinary Restructuring Committee

Kyle: After further discussions with executives I have decided that it would be beneficial to allow all active members of the Society to serve on the Extraordinary Restructuring Committee. There are a large number of people who do not sit on council who could bring valuable perspectives. If we choose to allow non-councillors, we should delay the appointments for this committee, so that we can publicize it properly.

Moved: Conny Lin  
Seconded: Mirko Carich

BIRT LPC recommend that council allow all active AMS members to serve on the Extraordinary Restructuring Committee.

BIFRT LPC recommend that appointments to fill this committee be delayed until the February 15 council meeting.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Elections Review

Thomas: Rules regarding third party endorsements and candidate endorsements are unclear. It could be argued that any form of public endorsement is slate like. The exact mechanisms for mutual endorsements need to be looked at. People should probably not be allowed to endorse other candidates within their own race, but this may not make sense for BoG and Senate elections.

Carolee: We have had two meetings with people, such as Jeremy, Sheldon, Anna, and Demitri for a SWOT analysis of the election.

Katherine: Was hiring a contractor to run the elections discussed?

Carolee: It was not discussed in detail.

Thomas: Hiring a contractor would not cause greater objectivity. The only benefit it might have is increasing the perception of objectivity.
Katherine: Having a third party contractor would also avoid late hiring, but Jeremy disapproves of it, as he feels it is our mission to provide student jobs and learning opportunities.

Consensus: In future years the EA must be hired earlier. Also, Simply Voting should be purchased, so that the CWL can be integrated with it.

Kyle: Do you have any other recommendations for possible code changes?

Carolee: Possible recommendations include closing nominations after the first 4 school days in January, regardless of whether those 4 days occur in one week. Also, it may be worth explicitly tying candidate reimbursements to their participation in AMS elections events. It would also not be a bad idea to explicitly codify the reimbursement and spending limits, rather than leaving those limits to the discretion of the elections committee.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is February 14, 2012

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:51 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of February 21, 2012

Attendance

Present: Kyle Warwick (Chair), Isabel Montoya (At-Large), Hans Seidemann (Engineering), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Eric Gauf (Law), Tristan Miller (Proxy for Stewart McGillivray), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Guests: Deniz Calisal (Student)

Recording Secretary: Kyle Warwick (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was adopted by consensus.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Eric Gauf
Seconded: Mirko Carich

That the minutes of February 7, 2012 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Expulsion from the SUB Policy Revision

Kyle: Lawyers have made recommendations on improving this policy. Some of these recommendations should go to SAC, but some of them can be dealt with here. These recommendations have been circulated and everyone should have had the chance to read over them.
BIRT LPC recommend that council modify the Internal Policy on Expulsion from the SUB, in order to follow the legal recommendations from Davis LLP.

*The motion carries without dissent.*

**Permanent Staff Attending Elections Committee Meetings**

Kyle: From the discussions between Carolee, Jeremy, and others, a recommendation has emerged to have the Events Manager, Archivist-Researcher, and Communications Manager all sit on the Elections Committee, to provide consistent staff advice. Decision making power would remain entirely with the students on the Elections Committee.

Moved: Isabel Montoya  
Seconded: Tristan Miller

BIRT LPC recommend council adopt a code change causing the Events Manager, Archivist-Researcher, and Communications Manager to sit on the Elections Committee in a non-voting capacity.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Referendum Modifications to Fees Code Change**

Kyle: The most recent referendum made two minor changes to AMS fees, by lowering the Student Spaces fee and creating a new AMS ombuds fee. These will both require minor changes in code to implement.

Moved: Hans Seidemann  
Seconded: Mikro Carich

BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt code changes in order to make code reflect the 2012 fee referendum.

*The motion carries without dissent.*

**Ethical Purchasing and Sustainability Internal Policy**

Kyle: I failed to circulate the proposed changes from Uli Laue, the Director of Operations. I will circulate these proposals this week, and we can review them next week.
Elections Reserve Fund

Kyle: Concerns have been raised that the amounts proposed by both this committee and Budget Committee were relatively arbitrary. Katherine has said that she will find information on the historical levels of AMS election campaign spending, so that we have a more empirical basis to guide the creation of this fund. I will follow up with her on this.

Sexual Assault Initiatives Fund Administration

Kyle: We previously discussed transferring the responsibility for administering SAIF from the Student Life and Communications Committee to the Finance Commission. At the time I was told that SLC+C was opposed to the change. I have since heard from Jeremy that this is not the case. He strongly recommends making this transfer of responsibility. Having given some thought to the role of standing committees, I agree that their job should not be to make execution type decisions, such as this. It also appears that the amount of time that SLC+C must spend on this takes away from their ability to work on other aspects of their mandate.

Kyle: A question for Tristan. In your view, would this create a difficult amount of work for Fincom to handle.

Tristan: Yes. Fincom does have some expertise in handling funding allocations, but we would likely need a new commissioner, or a repurposing of existing staff in order to meet the new demand that this will cause. I will look into various possibilities in this regard.

Hans: As a member of SLC+C, I agree that having to spend much of the meeting on SAIF applications is not ideal. With that said, we can manage relatively well until Fincom is able to accommodate this increase in work load.

Moved: Hans Seidemann Seconded: Eric Gauf

BIRT LPC direct Sheldon to draft code language reassigning the responsibility for allocating SAIF from the Student Life and Communications Committee to the Finance Commission.

BIFRT LPC recommend such changes not be put into effect until the Finance Commission has had the ability to adapt its structure to accommodate an increased workload.

*The motion carries without dissent.*
Executive and ECSS Compensation Changes as Budget Amendments

Kyle: The confusion around the ECSS compensation changes reveals a possible code issue. Changes to compensation for the executives and ECSS now require a recommendation from both Budget Committee and LPC. It appears to be unclear what happens if the two committees disagree. This situation came close to occurring with the recent ECSS salary change, but it was averted when Budget ultimately did not object to the LPC recommendation. I’m not sure if this needs a change, but it could lead to ambiguities in the future and might be something to look at.

PAR Clarification

Sheldon: Oversight Committee asked me if the 50% that can be subtracted for violating HEART is a 50% subtraction from the total $5000 or from the amount that would have otherwise been assigned. For instance if an exec was going to get 50% of PAR and the were going to lose the full amount of HEART, would they then receive 25% of PAR or 0% of it.

Kyle: This is definitely an ambiguity. We don't need to solve it right now, but we should consider looking at this at some point.

AMS Harassment Policy

Kyle: We have received preliminary legal advice suggesting a number of problems with the current AMS Harassment Policy. The general suggestion is that we should split our harassment policy in two. Currently discrimination based on prohibited grounds (i.e. race, sex, etc), and otherwise unfair (but not human rights protected) behaviour (i.e. a manager bullying an employee on the basis of not liking an employee's favourite pop music) are both put into one policy. Our legal advice suggests splitting these two kinds of harassment into two different policies. They also suggest giving SAC the power to kick people out of student clubs if they are committing harassment.

Tristan: My reading is that SAC already has the power to kick people out of student clubs, if they are found to be harassing other club members.

Kyle: The lawyer felt it was important that harassment claims are generally not allowed to be made anonymously.
Deniz: It seems like these points of legal advice are likely quite reasonable. I have some additional concerns with the current policy.

Deniz: It is problematic that someone can file a harassment complaint based solely on the fact that they felt offended by something I said, regardless of the intent with which I said it. UBC has a Respectful Workplace Policy that strikes a good balance between ensuring the rights of the accused and the accuser. We should probably copy certain parts of this policy.

Deniz: The current wording of this policy leaves open the possibility that a club or other AMS subsidiary could believe something to be a human rights code violation without clear evidence, due to problematic vagueness.

Deniz: Cites specific sections of the current policy that are potentially problematic.

Eric: The current policy shifts very quickly and confusingly between very specific human rights grounds, and very broadly enumerated definitions of harassment. The UBC Respectful Workplace model seems reasonable, given that they have much higher exposure to possible human rights issues, and are therefore have a clear incentive to achieve an appropriate balance on this.

Sheldon: Some quick background: there used to be 3 harassment policies. There was one for employees. Another was then made for clubs, and finally a third was made for constituencies. Then it was decided that combining all three would be more streamlined.

Kyle: I will circulate UBC's Respectful Environment Policy to the committee, to use a reference point.

Deniz: The current policy is too long and convoluted. It would benefit from more clear and brief definitions.

Deniz: We should consider how these proposed changes would affect resource groups.

Tristan: Resource Groups should be covered. Based on a preliminary reading, they may not be covered under the current policy.

Kyle: I will have the legal opinion for you to see next week. It is in camera, and I will check whether or not Deniz is allowed to see it, perhaps depending on if he signs a liability waiver form.
Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is February 28, 2012

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:19 pm
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of February 28, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Acting Chair), Kyle Warwick (Chair), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Eric Gauf (Law), Stewart McGillivray (Arts), Ignacio Rodriguez (Science), Bahador Moosavi (GSS) Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher)

Recording Secretary: Hans Seidemann (Acting Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 pm.

Approval of Acting Chair

Moved: Eric Gauf Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

That Hans Seidemann be appointed acting chair for the current meeting.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Mirko Carich Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Mirko Carich Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

That the minutes of February 21, 2012 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.
Free Revisions Related to the Ombuds Fee

Sheldon: When a new fee for a specific purpose is created through referendum, a fund is usually created to hold those fees. A determination needs to be made as to who manages this fund, as it wasn’t specified in the referendum. On speaking with Kyle and Elin, it was determined that the best oversight would be to have the fund administered by council, on the recommendation of the Executive Committee. The fee is used to provide ombuds services to UBC Vancouver, but does not apply to Regent College and other non-UBC schools who have membership in the AMS. A fee exception has been created for those schools to exempt them from the Ombuds fee. Additionally there was some confusion over how fee indexing to CPI should take place, and in speaking with Elin, it was decided to use the data for September of one year to index for the following year.

Bahador: Are we actually allowed to exempt this fee?

Sheldon: In bylaws, it gives us that ability.

Hans: And the exemptions for Regent and other schools for the Ombuds fee are included in the language?

Sheldon: Yes

Moved: Eric Gauf Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt a code change to create the Ombuds fund to hold the new Ombuds fee, and to exempt non-UBC schools from this fee.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Responsibility for the Sexual Assault Initiatives Fund (SAIF) and Sexual Assault Support Services Fund (SASSF)

Sheldon: In examining how SAIF was handled I discovered that SASSF is currently handled by the Student Life and Communications Committee (SLCC) as well. This doesn’t make a lot of sense, since the allotment of SASSF is defined by the budget committee, so SLCC doesn’t have much control over this anyway.
Bahador: Didn’t we already deal with this a month ago? There were concerns about whether the budget committee would understand this well enough to administer the fund.

Eric: Do we want both funds to be administered through the Finance Commission? If they’re going to be handling SAIF it would make sense.

Sheldon: SAIF is taken from SASSF, so the two are different in implementation.

Kyle: SASSF can be thought of as fitting into the “safety” umbrella, so it kind of makes sense that it would reside with SLCC. That may be why it’s currently there.

Sheldon: It seems as if the budget committee makes most of the decisions anyway, so we might as well put SASSF in their portfolio.

Hans: Can we pass just the SAIF changes, but not SASSF?

Kyle: Why don’t we pass both, and if there are problems with SASSF then we can retract the motions prior to bringing them to council.

Moved: Kyle Warwick Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt a code change to remove administration of the Sexual Assault Initiatives Fund from the Student Life and Communications Committee, and instead have the fund administered by the Finance Commission.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Moved: Kyle Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt a code change to remove administration of the Sexual Assault Support Services Fund from the Student Life and Communications Committee, and instead have the fund administered by the Budget Committee.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Revisions to the AMS Ethical and Sustainable Purchasing Policy**

Hans: We haven’t received an edited version of the policy, only suggestions on possible changes.
Kyle: Uli Laue has made suggestions, but he didn’t want to make specific language. We can’t really pass this in its current form.

Sheldon: There were concerns from some that this policy was stringent, and could now be getting even more stringent. Is this currently enforced?

Eric: Uli seems willing to enforce this.

Ignacio: We might be in violation of our own policy already. We need to make sure we don’t get ourselves into trouble by making this even more stringent. I’d like to see it scrapped, as it’s impossible to verify that we’re complying with a number of the requirements.

Kyle: We should ask Nancy if this policy is ever used when making purchases.

Sheldon: We should also find out if it gets in the way of making purchases or causes other issues.

Kyle: I’ve heard that it may already be causing problems.

Ignacio: From what I can see, there are issues with this policy regarding overtime of employees, unionization rules, ages of employees, etc. For instance, most software is produced with a great deal of unpaid overtime. Given that’s the case, how do we ever purchase any piece of software in agreement with this policy?

Hans: We need to figure out how this is currently administered and / or applied before we review any potential changes.

Moved: Bahador Moosavi         Seconded: Mirko Carich

BIRT LPC direct Hans speak with Uli Laue about how the sustainable purchasing policy is administered and report back findings to LPC.

The motion carries unanimously.

Changes to the Oversight Committee Structure

Bahador: I’d like to talk about the Oversight Committee. Currently, standing committee chairs aren’t briefed about their responsibilities, which can create issues with attendance. I’d also like
to see some year-long appointments to the committee to serve on the committee during the entire term of the executive.

Hans: As LPC Chair, I’m now on Oversight Committee?

Sheldon: Yes. Currently, the Oversight and Agenda Committees are run in parallel. The Agenda Committee consists of the standing committee chairs and the President, whereas the Oversight Committee is the same as the Agenda Committee, without the President.

Kyle: Oversight does handle some issues other than executive oversight, such as ombudsperson oversight.

Hans: So Bahador, what you’re saying is that you’d like to appoint councilors to the Oversight Committee to full year terms?

Bahador: Yes.

Hans: So would you like to move that Sheldon draft code for this?

Moved: Bahador Moosavi Seconded: Ignacio Rodriguez

BIRT LPC direct Sheldon to draft code which would create the following committee composition for the Oversight Committee:

3 Agenda Committee Members, chosen by the Agenda Committee

2 non-executive AMS Councilors, appointed by council to full-year terms

Chair of the committee to be appointed by council

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is March 6, 2012

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm
 AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 13, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Tristan Miller (Executive), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Isabel Montoya (At-Large), Jay Shah (AMS Ombudsperson)

Recording Secretary: Hans Seidemann (Chair)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:21 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Isabel Montoya  Seconded: Mirko Carich
That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Tristan Miller  Seconded: Mirko Carich
That the minutes of February 28, 2012 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Revision of Position Descriptions for Services Coordinators

Hans: Everyone should have a copy of the revised position descriptions. These are revisions to the AMS Connect, MiniSchool, Safewalk, and Speakeasy Coordinators. Out of all these position descriptions, the most significant changes are to the Speakeasy position. They expanded their duties somewhat in this past year, and so in posting the job this year, they want to make sure that those expanded duties continue to be carried out.

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Mirko Carich
BIRT LPC approve the changes in the coordinator position descriptions as presented.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**ROBOCom Restructuring Coordinator Position Extension**

Hans: The Restructuring Coordinator position is on contract until the end of April. Sean and the rest of ROBOCom think that the position is going to need to continue past the end of April, potentially until the end of May or beyond, and they weren’t sure how we would go about extending that contract, or rehiring for the position.

Tristan: Is this employee a “coordinator”?

Kyle: I think he’s technically an Executive Project Officer. We could potentially extend his contract through the executive procedures manual. Though I wish Sheldon were here, since he’d be more familiar with this.

Hans: When I put this on the agenda, I was under the impression that it needed to get deal with today, but it seems like as long as this employee is allowed to continue past April, then we have until then to deal with that.

Tristan: The easiest thing might be to just create another short term contract, from an administrative standpoint.

Hans: So we’ll check with Sheldon about the language of the motion that we passed at council to see if council needs to approve these changes. I’ll also talk with David and Tristan to figure out the best way to get this contract extended or renewed, and we’ll try to have an idea of what the best method will be sometime shortly after our committee appointments are completed.

Tristan: Another good person to talk to would be Pretasha. I would start with her.

**Oversight Committee Code Changes**

Hans: We directed Sheldon to create some code changes related to the Oversight Committee.

Kyle: Tristan and I are declaring a conflict of interest.
Hans: Sheldon circulated his proposed changes to the committee structure. They include everything we requested. The only thing I note is that it doesn’t specifically mention that Oversight Committee handles PAR. In the motion that created PAR, it mentions that it is administered by the Oversight Committee, but it doesn’t mention par in the new committee description. This is because he copied it from the original description, but only changed the committee makeup as we had instructed. The only suggestion I have is that we have Sheldon add a line that indicates their PAR-related duties for goal-setting and monitoring with the executive.

Isabel: Yeah, that should be included in this committee description as well.

Hans: The only issue is that I hoped this could go to council next meeting before we fill committee appointments. I was thinking that we could agree that we approve this code change, assuming the inclusion of PAR duties, and have Sheldon circulate for approval before we send it to council.

Moved: Isabel Montoya  Seconded: Mirko Carich

BIRT LPC Approve the code changes outlined in Code Changes 2012: Oversight Committee as presented, assuming the future inclusion of PAR oversight to the committee’s stated duties.

*The motion carries unanimously. Kyle Warwick and Tristan Miller Abstain*

**Councilor Committee Appointment Requirements**

Hans: We had previously discussed changing the requirements for councilor committee appointments. I had thought that we had decided on this. Didn’t we have Sheldon draft a motion requiring councilors to only stand for a position, instead of requiring them to sit on a committee?

Kyle: I think there were some objections after the fact that kept us from bringing it to council.

Hans: The only problem I have with it is that summer appointments are coming up, and many people won’t be in town to attend meetings. Though we’ve now changed the rules to allow for electronic participation, so that may no longer be a concern.

Isabel: According to what I understand, you can serve on either the summer or the fall to fulfill your requirement, isn’t that true?
Hans: Interesting. It could be understood as needing to sit on a committee at some stage, without specifying the length of time. I think in the short term, it would be good to have a requirement to stand for committees at this upcoming meeting, and we can then review it again later.

Kyle: It does create a strange situation where people may stand for a position just to follow the rules, but don’t actually want to be on the committee. That being said, there aren’t any great alternatives, like adding more committee seats.

Tristan: You could also just count ad-hoc committees for the requirement as well.

Kyle: Yeah, but the ad-hoc committees don’t have the same level of involvement as the standing committees.

Mirko: What are we actually trying to accomplish here? Do we want everyone to be on a committee? I think most councilors are willing to get involved if they’ve gotten that far, and that they will stand if given the opportunity, but if they don’t want to, why should we force them to care, if we have people that are motivated to take on multiple committee seats?

Hans: I think a longer term solution to this is to deal with councilors that are uninvolved and not participating. I don’t think you enforce it by having rules saying “you must do this” but rather by having rules saying that councilors can be removed for neglecting their responsibilities.

Kyle: There are problems with that. If they miss a certain number of council meetings they can be removed, but those requirements are in bylaws. As an exec, it’s something we’re trying to figure out. It may not be a legislative solution.

Hans: I think that if we pass a motion requiring everyone to stand for a committee at the next meeting, right before the committee appointments, it will at least make people think about what committees they’d be willing to serve on, and hopefully increase participation at that meeting. After we’ve done the summer appointments, we can review this more comprehensively and find a better solution.

Moved: Mirko Carich  Seconded: Tristan Miller

BIRT LPC direct Sheldon to draft code changes requiring all councilors to stand for committee appointments, circulate those changes, and forward to council.
The motion carries unanimously.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is March 20, 2012

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:42 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 20, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Mirko Carich (At-Large), Conny Lin (Councilor), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist)

Also Present: Sean Cregten, Kiran Mahal

Recording Secretary: Stewart McGillivray

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Mirko Carich                     Seconded: Kyle Warwick

That the circulated agenda be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

SAIF and SASSFU Update

Hans: Spoke with Jarrett and he seemed on board with the idea of removing SAIF and SASSF administration from the duties of the Student Life and Communications Committee. It seems as if there was a miscommunication initially when the idea was presented to him and he was concerned that they funds would not be administered well if they were moved. He also proposed that someone with expertise be a member of the finance commission should we decide to move SAIF and SASSF administration to the commission. He suggested that ideally, the manager of SASC could fulfill that role, but was concerned about a possible conflict of interest.
Sheldon: The problem of the conflict of interest for the SASC manager was resolved under Kyle’s tenure as LPC chair. We simply required that the SASC manager abstain from any SAIF requests related to SASC activities.

Hans: Ideally, SASC should simply have the budget to handle their activities and shouldn’t have to make requests to SAIF. I don’t see a problem with them having a budget surplus at the end of the year if they don’t use all the funds available to them, and this would then remove any potential conflict of interest in having the SASC manager present on all SAIF applications. I’ll speak with Tristan and the outgoing SASC manager to see what suggestions they have, and report back to LPC.

Communications Code Amendment

Hans: The current Code seems pretty clear in the section related to the Executive Committee which allows all of the executives to speak on behalf of the Society.

Sheldon: Basically, all of the discussion related to communications is reactive to problems that occurred between Bijan and his fellow executives.

Hans: The proposed code change seems to also give cover to committee chairs to speak on behalf of the society, which I’m not sure we would want to do. I still don’t see why the section of code doesn’t provide executives with the ability to speak on behalf of the society.

Sheldon: Bijan pointed out that there was a section in bylaws that designates the President as the “spokesperson” for the society, and bylaws trumps Code. This code change would seek to clarify the bylaws in code to interpret them in such a way so as to give executives that ability as well.

Some discussion. Consensus reached that the issue is less pertinent under the current President and executive, and the issue is best set aside.

Sheldon: There is also a “Communications Protocol” that hasn’t been passed by council, which instructs Dimitri, and might be worth revisiting. In general communications policy is a mess, and deserves some attention.

Hans: Can you circulate all relevant communications policies / code sections for the committee to look at?
University Commission Code Amendment

Hans: Kiran wants to hire some new Commissioners, and this would necessitate an amendment to Code, which currently stipulates that there be only 4 members of the University Commission, one of whom must be the International Students Commissioner, and one of whom shall be the vice-chair (AVP Academic).

*N.B. Committee will study in depth further, the odd existence of the Commissions in Code. It was suggested that an amendment be prepared to resolve the current issue of commission membership.*

Kyle: This is a pretty simple motion, so we could probably send it to tomorrow’s [March 21st] AMS Council.

Moved: Kyle Warwick Seconded: Mirko Carich

BIRT a motion be sent to the next AMS Council, to the effect that Code Section VIII, D, Article 1 1(a) be amended by replacing the words “four (4) Active Members” with “up to seven (7) Active Members.”

Hans: Does this constitute a budget amendment?

Sean: This wouldn’t take funds from the current budget, as it’s for positions that will hired May 1st, and will be paid out of next year’s budget.

- Questions arose as to the jurisdiction of LPC over this issue; possibly, due to the fact that the positions in question are “appointed” by the VP Academic and University Affair.
- It was decided that LPC was meant to review it, but Code did not necessarily indicate it had to go to Council
- The possible vagueness of the previously-used language for Tiers specified each Commissioner, but was not necessarily all-encompassing
- When asked whether or not the VP Academic Office could wait until April 5th to post, Sean suggested it would not be optimal
- Stewart wondered whether or not the above motion could include a reference to the tier/hours/salary of the new Commissioners created
- New positions are: Academic Affairs, Campus Development, Mental Health and Wellness, and Equity

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  
Seconded: Kyle Warwick

BIRT the above motion be amended to also outline that the hours for Academic Affairs Commissioner, Campus Development Commissioner, and Equity Commissioner be specified as 10 hours per week, and that the Mental Health and Wellness Commissioner be specified as 15 hours per week, and that all of them be at Tier 1 pay level of $10.50 per hour.

*The amendment passes unanimously.*

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**University Commission Code Amendment**

Hans: This was an issue that Sheldon made me aware of. Perhaps he can clarify.

Sheldon: Currently, an amendment to the agenda counts abstentions as “No’s” which created a problem with the agenda item, “Report from the Elections Officer” a couple of council meetings ago. When the executive abstained due to conflict of interest, it made it difficult to amend the agenda, as their abstentions counted against the motion. I have a proposed code change that would not count an abstention as a “No” if the abstention is due to a potential conflict of interest.

*Discussion ensued as to the possible meaning of including proxies in the wording, and whether or not a proxy must abstain if the person on whose behalf they were proxying might be in a conflict*

Sheldon: I’ll refine the language to clear up any possible ambiguities prior to the next LPC meeting.
Committee Chair Appointment Discussion

Hans: I was informed that Matt Parson thought that we should delay the appointment of Committee Chairs until mid-April, and so thought we could discuss the merits of this.

Sheldon: This wasn’t intended to apply to the current committee chair appointments. It’s related to payroll issues and possible confusion as to how those are applied. Also, some of the undergraduate societies haven’t concluded their elections when these appointments are made, so it might be better to hold them at a later date.

Hans: It doesn’t look like this is a pressing issue, so I suggest we table the discussion for now and revisit it later.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is March 27, 2012

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 27, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive, phoned in), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Isabel Montoya (At-Large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist), Tristan Miller (Executive), Harsev Oshan (Councilor), Justin Chang (Councilor)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:09 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Harsev Oshan  Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from March 13th be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Tristan Miller

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from March 20th be approved.

Hans: I miss-spelled Conny’s name in the minutes. Will need to change “Conny Lai” to “Conny Lin”

Moved: Justin Chang  Seconded: Isabel Montoya
That the minutes be amended to correct the spelling of “Conny Lai” to “Conny Lin” in the LPC meeting minutes of March 20th.

*The amendment passes without dissent.*

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Agenda Amendment Code Change**

Hans: This code change fixes a situation where abstentions are counted as “no” votes in cases of amending the agenda. Conflict of interests might lead to failing of amendments to the agenda which would otherwise pass because those involved must abstain from the vote.

Sheldon: The code regarding abstentions for agenda amendments existed to get more voters turn out, so low turn-out votes don’t pass. Conflict of interest policy however goes against this.

Justin: What are the feasibilities of programming into the iClicker program?

Sheldon: This does not come up often, so programming the iClickers would be unnecessary.

Moved: Isabel Montoya  
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

BIRT LPC recommends that council adopt the code changes presented regarding abstentions to agenda amendments in cases of conflict of interest.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Creation of Harassment of Policy Working Group**

Hans: We were approached by a student regarding harassment policies. This student felt that the current policies were either too vague or too specific, depending on the situation, and that they were not an effective tool for dealing with harassment complaints. In response, we are creating a working group in order to fix these policies, and determine how they would tie in with resource groups.

Tristan: Technically it does applies to resource groups

Hans: It isn’t a good mechanism for dealing with it for the resource groups. Working group to be worked on for the next month or so.
Kyle: Caroline and Kiran would be good people to consult. Kiran is hiring an equity coordinator. Caroline is looking at equity policies, so it makes sense for them to be involved.

Hans: Working group within LPC, but definitely consult Caroline + Kiran

Sheldon: HR / David Hannigan would be a good person to consult as well.

Hans: 4 members sounds like a good number for a working group

Kyle: Never used working groups too much. But 4 is in the right range

Hans: Do we have any volunteers?

*Harsev Oshan, Isabel Montoya, Hans Seidemann and Kyle Warwick volunteer.*

Harsev: Is it necessary to have an exec?

Hans: No, but it is a good idea.

Moved: Justin Chang Seconded: Clarke McCorkell


BIFRT relevant staffs and other stakeholders are consulted upon when needed.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Sheldon: How would the chair of the group be established?

Hans: I would volunteer based on already being the chair of LPC, but would welcome someone else chairing this.

Isabel: I will do it.

*Isabel is appointed as chair with no dissent.*
Oversight Committee code amendment

Kyle: I needs to do other work and as an exec will be abstaining on everything with regards to this issue.

Justin Yang (via Tristan): All chairs need to be on the oversight committee or there will be inequity.

Hans: Justin was concerned that Chairs’ pay is partly dependent on sitting on the oversight committee. With current code changes, only a few chairs will sit on the oversight committee, but all Chairs get paid the same. But most chairs are over-worked anyways, so not that relevant.

Oversight takes care of execs and ombuds. Current oversight is all committee chairs minus president. Basically agenda committee minus president, and call meetings when necessary. Bahador suggested that since PAR exists, which requires goals be made with the Oversight Committee, and will need to meet twice during their term to evaluate progress, it would be good to have councilors (2) to serve the full term, as chairs might change, especially during the summer vs. fall term. At the time, we thought we should keep the same size, so only 3 chairs instead of all the chairs (self-selected) sit with the 2 appointed councilors.

When we initially presented this to council, the motion did not require the year long term, so we referred back to committee.

Isabel: Normal standing committees are around 11 members in theory, oversight would be smaller. So why is the size of committee questioned?

Hans: Don’t know why we were so concerned.

Isabel: I see it as a value for all chairs to sit in, and unless there’s a concern, I think it is good.

Stewart: Could the 2 non-appointed chairs run as a councilor?

Sheldon: Non-appointed chairs are not expressively disallowed from running as councilor.

Hans: On an aside, how would the chair of this committee be decided?

Stewart: What if one of the year-long councilors runs for chair?
Hans: As long as at least 2 people are within the full year, it should meet the purpose

Isabel: That should be able to stand for most cases.

Stewart: If we have self-select, isn’t it easier?

Hans: Wouldn’t it be easiest to just have council appoint the chair? Do we want to mention that if the two councilors are no longer councilors, they are still on the committee?

Sheldon: Refers to the New SUB committee.

Stewart: What about Arts? Do the September appointments affect this?

Hans: No. Once you are appointed to the committee, you serve your term regardless of your status as a councilor.

Moved: Isabel Montoya                  Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

BIRT that council adopt code changes so that the chairs of the standing committees (for the duration of the chairship) plus two non-executive appointed (by council) councilors (term is full year, despite the status of their councillorship) make up the Oversight Committee.

*The motion carries unanimously. Tristan Miller and Kyle Warwick are noted abstentions.*

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, April 3rd, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:54 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of April 10, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Isabel Montoya (At-Large), Tristan Miller (Executive), Justin Chang (Councilor), Conny Lin (Councilor)

Also in Attendance: Caroline Wong (AMS VP Admin)

Recording Secretary: Hans Seidemann

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Isabel Montoya

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Justin Chang  Seconded: Conny Lin

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from March 27th be approved.

Hans: Clarke McCorkell’s name is misspelled. I will fix this before submitting to council.

The motion carries unanimously.

SAIF and SASSF Restructuring

Hans: I circulated the proposed code changes that Sheldon had drafted previously. Essentially, SAIF applications would be handled by the Finance Commission, and SASSF would be handled
by the Budget Committee. Additionally, we’d like to add a commissioner to the Finance Commission, to organize and administer SAIF and other fund applications that go through the commission.

Tristan: The Fund Administrator can also do administrative tasks, and a separate committee could maybe evaluate SAIF applications if need be.

Hans: Regardless of what happens with SAIF, it sounds as if the Fund Commissioner would be of use.

Tristan: I have all the information on what the funds and grants commissioner would be doing. We went from 7 commissioners in the Finance Commission down to 3 several years ago. We’ve had too much work to do, so hiring this commissioner alleviates that. It would be at 5 hours per week, and they could take on other administrative tasks over the summer. They can also be assigned other tasks “from time to time” from the Finance Commission Vice Chair. It’s a multi-purpose role.

Isabel: Is this to fix what we discussed before where there were only 3 positions in the Finance Commission, but in practice, only you and Elin did the work?

Tristan: This would be adding one additional position. We looked at a couple of different ways to do this. Even if we removed the existing position, we’d still have to pay the employee, so we figured adding this new position would be simpler.

Justin: Why did Tom Dvorak eliminate the positions?

Tristan: Tom believed strongly in volunteerism, and felt that we’d get a lot of people to volunteer. That doesn’t happen though. He also felt that some positions weren’t necessary. One of the potential drawbacks that he had in his proposal to council was a potential overflow of admin work, and in fact, that’s what happened. We’ve added new funds since he’s been gone, and now the admin work is such that we need an extra body to deal with it.

Moved: Isabel Montoya       Seconded: Tristan Miller

BIRT LPC direct Sheldon to draft a code change adding an additional commissioner to the finance committee.

*The motion carries unanimously.*
Moved: Tristan Miller                Seconded: Isabel Montoya

BIRT LPC recommend that council adopt the circulated code changes regarding administration of SAIF and SASSF.

_The motion carries unanimously._

**VP Administration Commission Positions**

Caroline: Mike Silley last year split the New SUB Coordinator into the New SUB Engagement and New SUB Sustainability Coordinators. Now that we need to increase the hours of the New SUB Sustainability Coordinator, we realize that these positions were never properly created in code or approved by council, so we need to fix the back-door creation of the positions. I’d like to keep them as two separate positions. I would also like them put into code as a paid staff position, and I’d like the New SUB Sustainability Coordinator to have increased hours over the summer. Because of the workload, a lot of the SEEDS programs have been dropped because of some problems last year, so we need this increase in hours to allow them to get caught up.

Conny: So these increased summer hours would end in August?

Caroline: Hours would reduce to 15 for the New SUB Sustainability Coordinator.

Isabel: You’re extending the hours for the person who’s doing the job currently?

Caroline: He’s doing two positions now, but he’ll be shifting to work only on the sustainability position shortly.

Isabel: Don’t we have to re-hire if we’re changing the job description?

Caroline: They’ve already been hired, and it’s been set up poorly in the past. I want to get them properly set up in code now, so we can deal with them properly going forward.

Tristan: Do we have money in the sustainability fund to cover this?

Caroline. It’s paid out of the New SUB Fund, since it’s specific to the new SUB.

Hans: You only want this hourly increase to be in effect for this upcoming summer, not for future summers, to deal with this temporary workload, yes?
Caroline: Yes.

Hans: We’ll need to pass a motion to have Sheldon draft code within the parameters that we specify. Also, what are these positions? Commissioners?

Caroline. They’re coordinators I think?

Kyle: They may be executive project officers.

Caroline: I really don’t know then, since they’re not established in any formal way.

Hans: Before we refer this to Sheldon, we should try to figure out what these positions should be, and how they should be established in code before we direct Sheldon to draft his code.

Kyle: I think these are Executive Project Officer. It’s similar to what we have for Eric Gauf as the Restructuring Coordinator with ROBOCom, but he’s technically an executive project officer.

Hans: I’m not sure we want to set them up this way, if they’re more permanent staff. There should be code to deal with how we hire these kinds of positions, and we should try to follow it as best as possible.

*LPC consults code to look at Executive Project Officer and Coordinator descriptions in code.*

Hans: Reading the code regarding those positions seems to indicate that Executive Project Officers would be more applicable, as the New SUB Committee is an ad-hoc committee.

Moved: Justin Chang  Seconded: Conny Lin

BIRT Direct Sheldon to draft a motion to council creating the New SUB Engagement Coordinator and New SUB Sustainability Coordinator; those positions to be paid at the tier and hours at which they are currently paid.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

BIRT LPC recommend to council a temporary increase in the hours of the New SUB Sustainability Coordinator from 15 to 25 hours for the period ending August 31st 2012.

*The motion carries unanimously.*
Shinerama Coordinator

Caroline: Also, the Shinerama Coordinator doesn't exist anywhere in code. I would like to fix this as well.

Hans: Maybe it was set up as a motion of council already?

Caroline: Sheldon says it isn’t. Also, we should assign it to the VP Admin portfolio, since Admin has been dealing with it up to this point.

Hans: Isn't it dealt with through SAC?

Caroline: No.

Hans: Also, shouldn’t it perhaps be dealt with by the VP External?

Kyle: It deals principally with internal organizations, so Admin would make more sense.

Hans: So when we create this motion to council, we will specify who they report to. Should they report to a committee or directly to VP Admin?

Kyle: It makes more sense for it to go directly to Admin.

Caroline: They have their own committee that they chair, so it doesn't make sense for them to report there.

Moved: Tristan Miller Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

BIRT LPC direct Sheldon to draft a motion of council creating the position of Shinerama coordinator, to be compensated at the hours and tier at which it is currently paid, reporting directly to the VP Admin.

The motion carries unanimously.

Next Meeting
The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, April 17th, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:08 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of April 17th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Tristan Miller (Executive), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Justin Chang (Councilor), Harsev Oshan (Councilor)

Also in Attendance: Caroline Wong (Executive)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:13 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Harsev Oshan
Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the circulated agenda be approved.

April 3rd minutes was switched to April 10th minutes.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Tristan Miller
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from April 10th be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

LPC Jurisdiction on Compensation Changes

Hans: Typically when these requests come into LPC, LPC generally gets asked whether or not LPC should be dealing with it. It would be nice to clearly define what we need to deal with.
LPC consults Code Section V Article 7 3 (i)

The Legislative Procedures Committee shall: make recommendations to Council concerning financial compensation and review all terms of employment for persons holding appointed positions in the Society, including Committee Chairs and Executive Project Officers, but not including the Society’s hired employees other than the Executive Coordinator of Student Services;

Hans: The line is blurry between appointed and hired. It also doesn’t mention commissioners.

Kyle: Commissioners are not Executive Project officers.

Hans: But they are hired.

Kyle: Yes. Basically these codes were designed to give LPC a lot of power, whether or not it is necessary.

LPC consults Code Section V Article 7 3 (j)

The Legislative Procedures Committee shall: review, recommend changes to, and utilize a system of rubrics or rankings, to be approved by Council, to assess the appropriate level of financial compensation for each position;

Hans: This is basically dealt with by the tiered system. Do we want control of pay per hour, or number of hours as well?

Kyle: Hours should be included, as paying someone for one hour at $10/hour is different from 10 hours a week at $10/hr.

Tristan: There should definitely be a minimum hours worked.

Hans: I read it as more of a wage consideration, and not an hour consideration.

Tristan: Vice chairs are supervisors of commissioners, but if they work fewer hours than commissioners, then they would be paid less than who they are supervising.

Hans: So should LPC be looking into hours worked too?

Tristan: Not necessarily; hours and wage should just be considered separately.
Kyle: But for something like ECSS, where the hours were definitely taken into account with respect to their compensations. Sometimes hours are flexible.

Hans: If hours are flexible, then that’s even more reason for us to not cap hours. It might be better to leave it to the people that these positions report to.

Kyle: Check with HR, as compensation might be meant differently.

Hans: It specifies financial compensation. It makes sense for us to not be directly involved in mandating hours. Also we need to be able to have oversight over balance. If we don’t, we might run into cases where supervisors would increase hours when they need more, but not decrease hours when they no longer needed as much. Increases in hours might also occur for specific reasons, however sometimes those reasons are lost in transitions, and the hours were just taken as a given.

Tristan: Could we revert all wages and hours to default every time the position switches over?

Caroline: That would be too complicated; we would be doing HR-like work.

Hans: We could try to look into getting the supervisors/VPs to review the hours of their reports before hiring of new coordinators

Kyle: Might be a good idea to do these before job postings are posted.

Caroline: Might have to ask David Hannigan for HR related things, as well as create a policy for hiring for future VPs to use.

*LPC consults Code Section VI Article 3. 7 (d)*

*(d) On the recommendation of the Legislative Procedures Committee, Council shall set the remuneration for each Executive Project Officer.*

Hans: Remuneration sounds stricter as opposed to financial compensation, so it seems like we judge hours too?

Justin: Sounds like just payment.

Hans: I see remuneration has elements of hours to it.
LPC consults Section VI, Article 4. 3 (j)

On the recommendation of the Legislative Procedures Committee, Council shall, by Resolution, set the remuneration of the President’s Executive Assistant. Any change in the remuneration of the Assistant shall take effect at the time when a newly appointed Assistant assumes office.

Hans: Is this for all assistants?

Tristan: Most assistants of VPs fall under this. The title also needs to be fixed.

Kyle: Names were likely changed when Bijan wanted the positions to sound better. Matt seems to have just called it the President’s Assistants.

Hans: We should flag this passage to update it so it applies to all the VPs, and specify that LPC is to only deal with wages, not hours.

LPC consults Section XII, Article 1. 2

On the recommendation of the Legislative Procedures Committee, Council may grant remuneration or honoraria to Active Members who have been appointed to positions in the Society.

Hans: This seems to be obsolete. Maybe we could define remunerations as wages for hours worked; we would need to make sure this is consistent with all other mentions in code.

Moved: Tristan Miller  
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

BIRT LPC directs Sheldon to examine code regarding LPC’s duties with regards to remuneration, and draft code to clarify LPC’s duties as dealing with wages and salaries only.

BIFRT LPC directs Sheldon to draft up sections in codes that lets supervisors have power to change hours worked, and that these changes only start in a new term of employment.

Discussion:

Kyle: What about positions without a direct supervisor, for example elections committees.

Hans: Then it should be directed to whoever they report to.

Kyle: They don’t have anyone to report, except for maybe council.

Justin: Extraordinary Hiring?
Kyle: They are only hiring these positions, these positions don’t report to them.

Hans: Maybe the body that they report to will deal with it. In the case that someone reports to council, then council would deal with hours then.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Assistant to the VP Admin Changes**

Hans: We are no longer dealing with hour issues any more, given previous motion.

Caroline: What happen to the two sustainability positions?

Hans: These are new positions, so they need to go through council, but existing ones like AVP admin should be fine.

**Shinerama Coordinator Salary Increase**

Caroline: I want the Shinerama coordinator’s salary to increase from $3000 to $5000. Chris Roach (the national rep for Shinerama) came back saying that $3000 is not a good enough of a draw for the amount of work that is involved. For most Eastern universities, $5000 is the minimum. Also, I don’t think their salary should come from the funds raised.

Hans: How many years has it been under this coordinator?

Caroline: Don’t know. Shinerama coordinator has been pushed around; it was under the President’s portfolio and services. It is currently under services.

Hans: We should probably codify this position since it’s basically permanent. With the tiered system this $3k to $5k salary change is weird, although it’s technically going from $0 to $5k.

Tristan: We can hire them as independent contractors.

Hans: Shouldn’t try to backdoor something that is permanent. What are the hours?

Caroline: 20 hours per week for the summer.

Kyle: We can go backwards from $5k to see which tier they are based on cost.
Hans: Assuming 16 weeks in the summer, it would end up as $15.60, which is higher than our tier wages. Using the $3k, then they are $9’ish, which is lower than any tiers.

Caroline: They supervise the committee members.

Kyle: Do they have “special skills?”

Caroline: Kind of.

Hans: Tier 2 sounds appropriate.

Caroline: How are sustainability coordinators paid?

Tristan: Depends on who is the sustainability coordinator. Eg. Justin Richie will always be tier 2, because you cannot reduce the pay of someone doing the same job.

Hans: We can also extend their term or hours. I’d say we do tier 2 then play around so they get a higher wage.

Caroline: is that to $4k or $5k?

Hans: Well, we probably want to set them as tier 2 then see how much they work. We should also establish them in code, then we can amend code if we need to.

Kyle: Isn’t this against what we wanted in the first motion?

Hans: If we don’t mention hours while creating the positions, council might get worried. Is 20 hours a week what they were allotted previously?

Caroline: Was never measured; it was usually just a flat salary of $3k, which is too low. What if we do 25 hours? For 17 weeks to include September?

Moved: Kyle Warwick
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

BIRT LPC directs Sheldon to create the Shinerama coordinator position at Tier 2, with 20 hours a week, not to exceed $5k over a given year, and that they report to the VP Admin

*The motion carries unanimously.*
Academic Commissioner Hour Changes

Hans: We’ll let Kiran know that she can go ahead with that.

Election Fund.

Kyle: AMS spends money for municipal, provincial & federal awareness (non-partisan). We work with groups like Elections Canada, Elections BC, etc. Some years will end up with a lot of elections and in some years there are none. It’s not fair from a budgeting perspective for different years’ VP externals. Municipal and in most cases provincial elections are set for every 3 and 4 years respectively. For federal, elections might be called earlier than 4 years. We should set money aside each year for these 3 campaigns, so on years that we have an election, the VP Externals aren’t penalized for it.

We tried to bring this up before, and while the Budget Committee was wary about the numbers, they thought the principle was sound. I wanted to ask Katherine about the basis of the numbers, but she did not get back to me. I came to the conclusion that it’s not an exact science, but $5k each year per election would mean $15k for municipal elections and $20k for provincial and federal elections, plus or minus a bit in the cases where an election is called at an unusual time.

These amounts might seem a little high, but I feel lowering it might deter from their flexibilities. There are effective ways to spend the money, such as ads on the articulated B-Lines. There are also stupid things like the wrap covers around the 24Hours costing $4k, which is what Tim Chu did in 2009. Tim Chu spent $39k that year, under the line item blocky party signage.

Hans: The gist of it is that there would 3 separate funds, originally planned at $7k but now $5k for each fund each year. When an election is called, money will be pulled from those funds. What happens to money in that fund after the election cycle? We’ve previously discussed it and the two most popular solutions were to transfer remainders to the Endowment Fund, or to transfer to the other elections funds at the discretion of the VP external.

Tristan: I have two concerns. With the way funds are set up, money in those funds can only be withdrawn for the purposes stated, unless the funds are explicitly set up otherwise. The other thing is that fixed election dates are just window dressing. We still work on a parliamentary
system. We never know when an election will be called, so we should stockpile leftovers just in case.

Hans: if we do that, we will need to cap it after x amount, so that the funds don’t balloon beyond a practical size. Would $30k be an appropriate figure?

Justin: Wouldn’t $15 and $20k respectively make more sense?

Hans: I can envision a scenario where we have $20k in account and an election is called, and we spend $12k, leaving $8k left over. In those cases they’ll hit the limit before the cycle is complete.

Kyle: It is also more flexible this way.

Moved: Kyle Warwick  
Seconded: Justin Chang  

BIRT LPC direct Sheldon to draft up the 3 elections funds, for municipal, provincial and federal, with a deposit of $5k per year per fund, with a maximum cap of $30k per fund.

_The motion carries unanimously._

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, April 24th, 2012, at 5pm

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of April 24th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Tristan Miller (Executive), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Justin Chang (Councilor), Harsev Oshan (Councilor), Conny Lin (Councilor), Bahador Moosavi (Member at large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:09 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Harsev Oshan
Seconded: Tristan Miller

That the circulated agenda be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Bahador Moosavi
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from April 17th be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Code Change: Adding a Finance Commissioner

Hans: The commissioner will mostly be working to organize and administer SAIF and other fund applications that goes through the Finance Commission, as well as other duties from time to time as needed. Sheldon drafted the code change (see attached), which basically increases the number of commissioners from two to three.
Moved: Tristan Miller  Seconded: Harsev Oshan

BiRT LPC approves the code changes as written.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Approval of Code Changes Creating New SUB Engagement and Sustainability Coordinators**

Hans: The positions were proposed two meetings ago by Caroline. Mike Silley made the positions during his term, but never went through the formal structure.

Sheldon: This should not be our job. We should refer this to the executive committee. This also isn’t necessarily a code change, but rather, can be created through a motion of Council.

Hans: Do we not create these? Didn’t we create ROBOcom?

Kyle: ROBOcom was created in budget committee and executive committee somewhat, which de facto creates it.

Sheldon: Code says LPC should set remuneration, but not to create it.

Hans: We can ask Caroline to bring up to the executive committee. We can establish/confirm the hourly wage though. Were they at Tier 2?

Tristan: They are both coordinators, so they should be paid at Tier 2.

Hans: Provided she doesn’t change the current remuneration, do we need to be involved?

Sheldon: New SUB committee split the position into two, without informing council. When they were trying to alter the hours a little, they realize the positions only exist in the committee level.

*Discussion tabled until the tier can be determined.*

**Approval of Code Changes Regarding Shinerama Coordinator**

Hans: This was also brought up by Caroline two weeks ago. The position has been long-standing and should be formally established. It would also be of value to add in that the position would
report to the VP Administration. In the last meeting we went over hours and remuneration; currently they have $5k budgeted from Shinerama and VP Administration’s budget. We’d settled on Tier 2, with an annual cap of $5k.

Sheldon: We codified no less than 20 hours/week, paid at Tier 2. Code usually doesn’t talk about remuneration, at least not when it comes to the salary cap. LPC should be looking into pay and not hours.

Hans: It is a code change, so we should look into it too.

Sheldon: We’ll need a separate motion to set the position for Tier 2, so we can put the salary cap in that motion.

Tristan: We don’t have the tier system in code, but we could and retroactively put everyone under it.

Kyle: The tier system is de facto in code, because there are guidelines for the 3 different tiers

Hans: Can we approve the code as it stands now, then direct Sheldon to draft up the second part?

Bahador: I thought we used to not care about the salary because we used funds raised to cover it.

Hans: With this change they will no longer be using the funds raised.

Sheldon: I’ve worded the code pretty much according to the job description, apart from the part talking about AMS connect, since in consulting with Caroline that seems to not be the case.

Harsev: Is it 20 hours/week or 25?

Sheldon: 20

Moved: Harsev Oshan
Seconded: Tristan Miller

BiRT that LPC approves the code changes as presented.

_The motion carries unanimously._

_Back to sustainability:_
Hans: So the previous correspondence said that “hours and compensation as they were paid” for the 2 sustainability positions. But I believe they were in Tier 2.

**Approval of Code Changes Setting Shinerama Coordinator at Tier 2**

Moved: Justin Chang  
Seconded: Bahador Moosavi

BiRT LPC recommend that council set the Shinerama coordinator position at Tier 2 wage, with a $5k annual cap, with the final wording to be circulated electronically.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Approval of Election Fund Code Changes**

Hans: We talked about this last meeting. The code basically sets up 1 major election reserve fund, which are then split into three sub-funds, one of each level of government. Each year $5k for each sub-fund, totaling $15k, will be taken from the University and External Lobbying Fund. Any fund excess in the fund after an election will remain in the fund to serve the same purpose later on.

Sheldon: We also changed the body of dealing with the fund from the external commission to UNECORN.

Conny: So the funds are spent on the three elections, but for what exactly?

Hans: To drive attention, bring up important issues to students such as transit.

Conny: What if people want to be partisan?

Kyle: There is nothing that specifically states that AMS cannot be partisan.

Conny: We should add a clause stating what it can be used as, or at least, examples of what it can be used for.

Bahador: We can be put that in the Executive Procedures Manual, as opposed to code.

Kyle: The Executive Procedures Manual is pretty outdated, I’ll be fixing it, might as well put this in.
Sheldon: So we won’t put this in code?

Hans: We might include the part that excludes partisan-like procedures. I feel that if the AMS later decides it wants to be partisan, then it should require a code suspension.

Kyle: I agree, especially since it should be a big decision to decide to support someone, a code suspension would be warranted.

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Conny Lin

BiRT that the proposed code changes include a clause stating that such funds not to be spent in support of a particular candidate or party

Discussion:

Stewart: Would it limit the AMS’s ability to say, spend money to poll everyone, then pick a candidate to promote?

Justin: But the fund itself would not be used to support a particular person, as there would be equal spending on all the candidates.

Kyle: Tim Chu did such a thing. It seems fine.

*The motion carries without dissent.*

*Returning to the main motion:*

Stewart: The other two elections will not be soon, but because the provincial election is next year, could it potentially mean fewer funds available for this election period?

Kyle: Potentially.

Hans: Don’t you have 2 line items in the current budget for provincial activities?

Kyle: Those are for lobbying in general, not elections.

Hans: So we will have at least $5k, and then we might have to allot more for this year.

Kyle: It’s easier to just standardly do it, especially since it’ll only affect this one instance.

Sheldon: It is council and UNECORN’s decision anyways.
Bahador: Can you explain the process of the fund transfer?

Tristan: The budget committee proposes the budget, which is typically the minimum required for each fund, and then transfer the money in the University and External Lobbying Fund to the specific election funds. They then leave the rest in the University and External Lobbying Fund for other uses. Budget would decide how much to put in over the minimum if we put more than $15k in.

Sheldon: UNECORN would only control the usage of fund.

Moved: Kyle Warwick  
Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

BiRT LPC approves the code changes (as amended previously)

Discussion:

Sheldon: Would we need to see the amendment?

Hans: The amendment is pretty standard and friendly.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

*Back to the two sustainability coordinators*

**Approval of New SUB Coordinators Remuneration**

Moved: Harsev Oshan  
Seconded: Tristan Miller

BiRT LPC recommend to council that the two New SUB Coordinator positions be set at Tier 2, the wording of which would be circulated electronically at a later time.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Approval of LPC Remuneration Oversight Code Changes**

Hans: At the last meeting we went through positions where the hours would be ambiguous as to whether LPC should be dealing with it. It doesn’t seem to make sense as we likely don’t have more knowledge than council would. We directed Sheldon to make it so that the supervising individual or body to which the position would report deal with changes in hours assigned.
Sheldon: The code mentions that LPC would deal financial compensation and all terms of the employment, and the code change would remove the part about all terms of employment.

Hans: What about benefits?

Tristan: Students don’t get benefits, as they don’t work full time.

Hans: ECSS does though.

Justin: Not any more.

Tristan: Regardless of whether it’s considered financial compensation or remuneration, benefits would fall under that from a budgetary point of view.

Sheldon: We can add “and benefits” to the code change for it to make more sense.

Bahador: Benefits should be included as part of financial compensation, as opposed to being a separate thing. We should phrase it as financial compensation, such as benefits.

Hans: I’m confused about the distinction.

Bahadre: For instance, the wellness package is not part of financial compensation, which led to previous confusion with the ECSS’s position.

Hans: For those employees whose hours are set by council, we might have it so LPC deals with oversight of hours for those positions (such as Ombudsperson, election committee, student court, ECSS). So we can deal with it better than council can.

Sheldon: So LPC should review hours in some cases but not all?

Bahador: LPC should take care of oversight of positions where council is the supervising body.

Hans: We should add a section 4c where in cases where an appointee reports to council, review of hours will be dealt with by LPC and approved by council.

Sheldon: Did we want these code changes done for this council meeting?

Hans: Ideally, for Kiran and Caroline.

Sheldon: I’ll have to come up with the language for LPC’s section of code as well.
Hans: I’d like to approve the motion in principle and approve wording over emails.

Sheldon: There are some other issues. Council has passed motions in previous years stating hours for some positions. Sometimes it’s for that year only, but not necessarily always.

Hans: Any position established by council but not in code, where their hours are set by council, can’t be changed that way. A solution is we make it so that council releases control over those hours, unless the hours are codified. We can deal with that later on.

Sheldon: Another issue: If a VP decides their AVP need a different hours; AVP’s hours are in code. If VPs need to change AVPs hour, how would they do it? Would they approach LPC?

Hans: It’d make more sense that the VP would bring it up at council for themselves.

Bahador: But to get on the agenda, it usually needs a committee or two councilors

Hans: We should just redirect them to the executive committee.

Bahador: Or the President, because they can also put things on the agenda.

Kyle: Sounds like there is already a process for it. I would naturally just go on to the president or the executive committee in those cases.

Bahador: I feel if we give VPs the power to change hours, if they need to change hours, they would naturally go through the executive committee.

Hans: We can put it in the Executive Procedures Manual. Changes we need to make are: 1- adding LPC deal with hours of appointments of council, 2- benefits. Another is to have council divest power over the hours originally created through motions that are not code established in code.

Moved: Bahador Moosavi  
Seconded: Stewart McGilliray

BiRT LPC approves the principle of these changes, and Sheldon will circulate the wording electronically at a later time.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Approval of Employee Hours Oversight Code Changes**
Sheldon: I don’t know if we want the code, as every time council creates a position, it will be tied to council. The code we provisionally approved would mean council still decides. I was thinking in the future we should just not create hours.

Hans: I like the hours to be originally set by resolution of council, since councilors would be suspicious of creating positions without hours. I would change the one line saying we only need to bring hours to council if they’re established by council. If hours are set in code, then council should deal with them, if not, then the supervisor should. Things in code should have some form of permanency.

Sheldon: Section 4a. is still saying it can still be done by council resolution.

Hans: I think it’s a good thing.

Sheldon: And the part about the Executive Procedures Manual? Should we strike that?

Hans: Strike that

Sheldon: And the body/supervisor?

Hans: That can be set.

Sheldon: To be clear, it should be “set originally” by council. How do you envisage hours being set?

Hans: Hours should not be changed except at the intervals where people are being hired.

Kyle: My thought is that if position needs a change in hours, then it shouldn’t be done without due process either.

Bahador: What if we keep it, then have a resolution saying everything council has done with hours is suspended for a bit, have supervisors set hours for everyone, report back to council, then approve those afterwards, so we start fresh?

Hans: But down the road, we still have the problem of approving hours during creation of the hours.

Sheldon: How would you want hours to be set for new positions?
Hans: By whoever’s creating those positions.

Sheldon: So supervisors propose the hours to council, but afterwards hours are set by supervisors?

Kyle: it’s weird to change without council approval. But I guess with the turnover provision it’s fine.

Bahador: Well if you’re on top of your budget, it should be fine dealing with it.

Sheldon: So the hours could be changed right away after council approval?

Hans: The idea of this is that hours are only changed after year-end reviews, so if they want to change hours, then it can be changed without going through us.

Sheldon: So if you want to change in the middle of a term, then you would have to go through council.

Hans: Review and oversight is what we wanted to do this for. The process of changing hours is for review, and so for a new position since there is no review, the position can’t be changed.

Sheldon: I can draft it for tomorrow, then hammer out details for next meeting.

Kyle: We can just have a placeholder motion for the agenda, so this can still get onto next meeting

Moved: Harsev Oshan  Seconded: Kyle Warwick

Reconsider the previous motion.

The motion carries unanimously.

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Tristan Miller

Postpone the decision until the next meeting.

The motion carries unanimously.

Next Meeting
The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, May 1st, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:24 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of May 1st, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Justin Chang (Councilor), Harsev Oshan (Councilor), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council) Carven Li (Member-at-large, phoned in)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart McGillivray Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries without dissent.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Stewart McGillivray Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from April 24th be approved.

The motion carries without dissent. Justin Chang abstained.

Approval of Code Changes for Oversight of Appointee Hours

Hans: Sheldon drafted this after the meeting last week. In short it removes the responsibilities from LPC to review all the terms of appointments, and only deal with the financial compensation and benefits. It also adds in that LPC will deal with hours if the appointing body is council. When a new position is created by council, the terms will be set for the first term of the employment, unless council specifically changes it.
Carven Li disconnected, and quorum was lost.

Hans: After that term, the hours can be changed by the supervising body, provided they have conducted a review of the position and its hours in conjunction with the current position holder. If the appointment is by code, a code amendment will need to be used. Changes in hours during the term would require council to approve the change.

Stewart: Would there be some disparity with some job’s hour change be a simple majority and others would be 2/3rds?

Hans: Yes, depending on how/where the appointment is made. But it makes sense as the codified positions should be more stringent with changes.

Sheldon: But this does mean we no longer have power of terms of appointment such as duties and name.

Hans: I think we should draft an amendment later on in order to include the other aspects that were included in the term of employment, as the original intent was to remove the hours aspect of it.

Moved: Harsev Oshan  
Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

BiRT LPC approves the code changes as written.

The motion carries unanimously, but without quorum.

Update on Ethical and Sustainable Purchasing Policy

Hans: Had a conversation with the director of operations, who wanted to change the ethical and sustainable purchasing policy. Ignacio pointed out issues in the policy as it stands. The scope was unclear, the implementation was unclear, it cannot be applied to software, and other practical issues. Uli suggested that we:

a) develop a scope (limit to food and service, and office supplies, with an eye of applying this to businesses such as the Outpost),
b) determine internally what we want to see as a policy (draft up what the policy should be like, then audit each department against the new policy, to see if it is possible to achieve the policies in the different departments).

If it works, then we should do yearly reviews and have external audits every few years. It seems that the head of each of the units such as Nancy for Foods and Services, and Jeffery or Keith of the others, should conduct the audits, and have the sustainability coordinator to be in charge, and also add it into the coordinator’s duties.

Sheldon: What’s the first step if we start on this?

Hans: Uli has sent his comments on the policies, so we can spilt into meeting-sized chunks and do it in committee.

Sheldon: Should we do it as committee work or working group work?

Hans: Seems that our workload is light enough to handle doing committee work for working on this for at least the next month.

Sheldon: Does Uli have an idea on whether this is doable? Have we done the audit before?

Hans: Although it’s a policy, but it seems that the businesses are just using it as a guideline. Because it’s never been discussed how it was applied, that’s how the businesses are applying it. The language in the policy as it stands seems very absolute. Making it less stringent gives tangible ways to move towards the final goals.

*Friendly amendment to the agenda to add the reviewing terms of employment*

**Reviewing terms of employment**

Hans: So currently all the changes are done internally in HR, but we should codify power over appointments.

Sheldon: Do the two sustainability positions have terms of employment in the agenda?

Hans: Not really, just the creation of the position. Usually HR deals with the exact terms internally. With the removal of the terms of employment line in code, we should figure out
exactly how terms of employment should be done. I like the idea of doing the same process as hours.

Sheldon: With the current positions, we are currently not putting up the terms of employment, which probably is not great.

Hans: We should have the terms of employment before getting through council. HR would probably prefer it that way, instead of the other way around, which is how we are currently doing it.

Sheldon: We should talk to David Hannigan to discuss this, since we do have 3 weeks before next council meeting.

Hans: Should we amend the current amendment to add the term of employment, so that they are also dealt with the same way as hours?

Sheldon: Seems just sticking the phrase in would achieve everything we want, but we should still consult with HR before.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, May 8th, 2012, at 5pm

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of May 8th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Justin Chang (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Harsev Oshan (Councilor), Conny Lin (Councilor), Bahador Moosavi (Member-at-large), Isabel Montoya (Member-at-large), Carven Li (Member-at-large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of council)

Also present: Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart McGillivray Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That the circulated agenda be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously*

Appointment Hours and Work Term Code Review / Changes

Hans: I sat down with David from HR, and he brought up a few issues. To start, he had an issue with having students potentially working more than 20 hours a week, which is against AMS’s stance on mental health; he would rather we hire more students for less hours. David has some concerns with how reviews would take place and who would have oversight. David doesn’t want the review to be directed to him however he will have the HR associate Chris draft up a position review/creation form to use for new positions or to change an existing one. He envisions that the completed checklist will then come to LPC for review, before approving, or for positions that are codified, before forwarding to council.
Sheldon: He didn’t even like council changing hours during a work term.

Hans: He said he mostly had problems with decreasing hours during a work term.

Kyle: I’m not for one way or the other, as long as the executives have power to change the hours afterwards. For executives to be able to know how many hours will be needed when they are fresh on the job is quite difficult, as these positions’ role is changed constantly between terms.

Bahador: Council should be responsible enough to ask if the person getting extra hours is happy with that, as far as labour issues go.

Isabel: How would it affect the student? Say a student is hired to do 15 hours per week. If it turns out they need to do more, say 20 hours, what would happen if the student cannot do it?

Hans: That’s when we have to worry about; it could be considered constructive dismissal.

Isabel: What if the opposite situation occurs?

Bahador: They would not be able to decrease hours.

Hans: We might put in that no positions can be over 20 hours.

Sheldon: Actually David doesn’t want for positions to go over 15 hours.

Kyle: All the AVPs would be affected then.

Sheldon: There is also the issue Jamie brought up at the last council meeting, where graduate students on fellowships cannot work for more than 13 hours a week.

Bahador: They are looking into year-round hours, so that they can work the equivalent of 12 hours per week for 52 weeks a year.

Hans: We should also look up who’s over the limit to see who will be affected. What’s our thought about the review of hours, based on what we have and David’s discussion? For mid-term changes, we’ll need to discuss, but it looks like we won’t allow for a decrease in hours.

Sheldon: I can see the decrease being warranted if a student cannot work the added hours, and would like the hours to be lowered.
Hans: With the discussions, it looks like the employee will need to be consulted ahead of time.

Conny: Code could refer to the employer standards act.

Hans: Double coding to external documents could result in problems if the act changes.

Tracey: I wonder if it’ll limit the term of work. With the elections committee, there are times where they will work 40 hours for a while before going back to 10 hours or less.

Kyle: That’s typical for elections; they work much less than 20 hours most of the year, but for election period, they work close to 40 hours. I don’t want to make operational decisions, but AVPs usually need 20 hours, and sustainability sometimes goes up to 30 hours.

Tracey: I believe a coordinator was working 25 hours, and their supervising VP was aware, and they wanted to make the salary reflect the hours worked, but there was no documentation.

Hans: That’s why we want to do this, so we can create the formal process.

Isabel: What if we do shorter term hirings, where we’ll reconsider the hours for the second term?

Conny: For GSS, we are doing 3 months terms, and the goal is not to hire other people, but to allow hour changes to happen.

Bahador: That’s for remuneration though, not wages. People have 3 months of probation; maybe we can use that.

Isabel: But probations are usually to see if the employee’s right for the job, not if the job’s right for the employee. And for AVP, every year the jobs are changed based on the VP. With 3-month terms, if needed, the changes can be done.

Kyle: That seems hard to do, since hiring that often would be a waste of time, for training, interviewing, and so forth

Sheldon: With David, if you rehire every 3 months, he will want the job to be reposted.

Hans: With David’s view, we’ll probably not be allowed to just rehire the same person.

Sheldon: We might have to have David for this meeting.
Tracey: Is there a way to hire with a cap, so the contract adding a clause to the effect of, this job might need increases for up to 5 additional hours during busy times?

Kyle: That might solve the problem for small alterations, but for cases where the original hours were completely inappropriate, that would not be the best solution.

Hans: Lets deal with this piece by piece. Separate from caps on hours, and terms, how do we feel about the process of conducting the review? Are we comfortable with the process?

No dissent

Hans: Can we draft this up? This will be for hours and job description changes at the end of appointment.

Sheldon: Do you want to mention the checklist in the form?

Hans: Yes, although we don’t have a name yet.

Sheldon: Should it refer to HR?

Hans: David doesn’t want that. Approval will go through LPC, and mention formal review process. Also, this would be nice to be in Executive Procedures Manual.

Sheldon: That’s in code, tied in with transition reports. The review could be done within. Will the review be done with both set of executives?

Hans: Review should be done during transitions. People should have all been working long enough for the review to be done.

Sheldon: We could add to the transition honorarium.

Kyle: The transition report is a big chunk of it, so it could be fine just being in that.

Sheldon: As stands, the transition report is worth 1/3rd, in person training for the incoming is worth 1/5th, being around for consultation 1 month after transition is worth 1/3rd, and organizing office and files is worth 2/15th.

Hans: Do people want to have it as part of the report, or as a separate item?

Stewart: It would bring more attention to it if it was a separate item.
Hans: Maybe we should set the numbers for next week’s meeting. Now for changing hours for a position during the term: do we want to address it or leave it unaddressed?

Tracey: From a budgetary perspective, anything that changes more than 20% will have to be reviewed by the higher ups.

Bahador: Usual changes will easily be over 20%.

Isabel: If council wants to change hours, they will do it; they will suspend all code as needed.

Bahador: We shouldn’t encourage people to suspend code. At least make it a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> resolution. This will make it seem more important. 2/3<sup>rd</sup> resolution will incur more questions, as well as have the same impact as suspending code.

Hans: So should we say that the hours cannot be changed mid-term unless by a 2/3<sup>rd</sup> resolution and leave it at that?

Kyle: The 2/3<sup>rd</sup> should only be for increases only.

Bahador: Can we refer to the employer standards act? Say if the employee agrees because they’re having too many hours for their jobs.

Stewart: With 2/3<sup>rd</sup>, it might not necessarily tell more people to discuss it; it would be good to provide more details than less.

Sheldon: For AVP it says on average 20 hours; maybe that could be made standard.

Harsev: What if we leave it open? Or if the employee wants to go under?

Tracey: That’s what the up to part usually deals with.

Conny: Can we postpone this for later?

Hans: Well we want to have some things that we like to have code say, before consulting with David. It seems we like the ability for increase of hours by 2/3<sup>rd</sup> resolution. Do we want to have it open for both ways, or only specify increases only?

Bahador: Can we add something like, provided the HR professional is consulted.

Hans: But that’s what David does not want. Maybe we should keep it as by 2/3rds.
Kyle: Should we add in a part mentioning conforming to legal practices?

Sheldon: We’ll run it by David.

Hans: We could have it only take effect in the start of a term, unless by 2/3rds council resolution with prior written approval/consent of employee in question.

Justin: Will it be possible to just create an addition position for the additional hours if the employee cannot handle it?

Hans: Maybe with that, 2/3rd required for changing terms is harder than the majority required to create a new job.

*Conny, Bahador and Carven left at 6:01pm*

Hans: Do we want to put a cap on hours?

Sheldon: With summer positions, David’s more comfortable, but with fall terms he wants 15 hours.

Harsev: What if we put in a courses to max hours allowed to work ratio?

Isabel: It limits the amount of people that can apply. It also is patronizing.

Kyle: It also puts in restrictions for the high-performing students who can do it.

Sheldon: Work studies put a limit of 10 hours.

Isabel: That’s fine for jobs to be set for x hours a week, but not for a person can work for x hours a week if they only have y courses or less.

Stewart: I’m inclined to agree with Isabel. With the 5 executives, we expect them to only take so few courses.

Kyle: I don’t like limiting for certain cases, but I don’t want to discuss this until we have the managers of people that are over 20 hours are consulted with.

Hans: Maybe we should table until next week so we can look at the people who will be above the cut. As a more broad question, can we set it at the current maximum, then lower from there?
Isabel: Maybe it’ll be better with numbers

**Elections Committee Code Adjustment**

Sheldon: Currently the only staff in code to attend is me, in the committee section of code and not elections, which is where they usually read. It’s been brought up that the events and communications managers should come, or maybe the director of services. We wrote the code to say they can attend by invitation of the chair.

Tracey: If I were there, maybe they wouldn’t need to go.

Harsev: Carolee was communicating with Demitri and Anna directly, before going back to committee.

Hans: It’s for people who aren’t as prepared as Carolee, so that the right people won’t be neglected. My thinking is that the role of communications and events manager will be for helpful advice, which would be easier to give if they’re there directly.

Isabel: Why can’t we just have all three listed?

Hans: We can have the archivist there, and the director of services or their designate.

Harsev: I was hired because I was already competent for the role. I don’t know if it’d be necessary for someone from the AMS to join in as well.

Sheldon: It’d be easier with the events manager here, but it would be nice to have the automatic connection between AMS events and the election events.

Isabel: I thought it’s for a reminder that there are these resources that the EA is allowed to invite for help.

Hans: Do we like “at invitation of the chair, director of services or their designate, and clerk of council”?

Kyle: It seems nice. This was brought up at last LPC, and it’s worth passing.

Hans: We’ll have the changes drafted.
Elections appeal

Sheldon: The code says if there is an appeal, it goes to the chief justice of student court, and in case there isn’t one, then the speaker of student council, then deputy speaker. We haven’t had a chief justice for a while, and we haven’t hired a deputy speaker for a while either.

Hans: Are there any other fallbacks, if we continue not to have a deputy speaker?

Kyle: I could only think of the Ombuds.

Sheldon: That’s happened in other places in the past, but in general it usually turns out poorly.

Hans: Can we have Sheldon draft the removal?

General consent

Tracey: Does the deputy speaker have to be a student?

Sheldon: Not that I’m aware of.

Stewart: This is for anticipated vacancies, if the speaker gives notice? I’ve only seen it once where the speaker’s neutrality questioned in the debate.

Sheldon: It’s a non-voting seat, formed by 2/3rd resolution, and doesn’t hold any elected or appointed positions. It’ll carry the duties of speaker, if the speaker is not there or otherwise compromised

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, May 15th, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of May 22nd, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Tristan Miller (Executive), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Justin Chang (Councilor), Harsev Oshan (Councilor), Bahador Moosavi (Member-at-large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of council)

Also present: Jay Shah (ECSS)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:41 pm

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Tristan Miller Seconded: Harsev Oshan

Hans: I have not had a chance to circulate the minutes from last week.

Moved: Justin Chang Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

BiRT the agenda be amended to remove the approval of the minutes from May 15th.

Friendly amendment.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Externship Coordinator Position Creation

Hans: The position is presented on the same level as a services coordinator in the Volunteer Connect office, at the same level as internship coordinator.

Kyle: Do these report to the Connect Coordinator?

Jay: They do not, they report to ECSS.
Hans: Do you feel this has/will have as big of a role as the Internship Coordinator?

Jay: Yes. The position was started under the Internship Coordinator last year; Kiran saw a void in the program that could be filled with an externship program. By working with Darran Fernandez from Alumni Affairs, she steered a pilot program. It is recommended that Externship continue based on the interest generated from the pilot project. As it stands, the Internship Coordinator and the Volunteer Connect Coordinator work 20 hours/week. Ultimately it was envisioned that in a few years, the overall Volunteer Connect office would total to 45 hours, with an equal 15 hours split between all three. In the initial trials, I think having the additional 5 hours would prove to be useful while the Externship Coordinator start to figure out the role.

Hans: Would it be a good idea for the Externship Coordinator to initially report to the Internship Coordinator, before changing to co-coordinators with the three coordinators of the Connect Office?

Jay: It was discussed between me, Kiran and the outgoing Volunteer Connect Coordinator Tina. The feeling was that the individual can take on the perspective year by themselves. From a budgetary perspective it is also beneficial to not have them report internally, as the budget would be clearly divided.

Sheldon: How does this fit in with the new procedure?

Hans: They’ve yet to be approved. We could get it approved before the new procedure is put in place.

Kyle: Timing-wise it is actually established before either of the changes, it should be brought in beforehand.

Justin: How many students are served by internship currently?

Jay: Depends year-to-year, right now we have 20 students for this summer term.

Stewart: Is there a timeline for the final transition to the 15 hours/coordinate/week?

Jay: Depends on how this year goes, and what the demand is. Right now it’s looking like a 3 year timeline.

Moved: Bahador Moosavi
Seconded: Stewart McGillivray
The motion carries without dissent. Justin Chang abstained.

Review of Job Description Checklist

Hans: We approved the structure of wage and employment review. Chris Panadero from HR has put together a draft checklist that was circulated.

Sheldon: The checklist starts with “Is this a new position?” I don’t know how that fits in with the codes we made.

Tristan: Can we look into a different mechanism for rehiring the same person? I signed a new contract thinking that’s the correct way to do it.

Justin: Aren’t HR really against rehiring without opening it up to all other students?

Tristan: Yes. But as a VP who would have final say over some of the positions, it seems disingenuous, and even a waste of time, to go through the hiring process and interview students when the VPs have every intent to rehire the current position holders.

Bahador: How would you know if the current employee would be the best person?

Tristan: You don’t. The nature of usual contracts is that these positions are filled for longer terms than the 1 year that AMS has, which give allows the employee to learn and grow. Perhaps if there was a review process it could be justified for it.

Bahador: Is our objective the best candidate or efficiency?

Sheldon: Right now, when a new position is created, the terms of employment shall be set by resolution of council. There is no mention of how the positions are created.

Hans: Does LPC’s duties include the creation of jobs?

Sheldon: No. In general LPC doesn’t create.

Hans: Do we as LPC want to review the creation of positions?

Sheldon: What are the hirings we’re looking at?
Hans: More one-off positions, similar to executive project officers, such as sustainability and ROBOCom. Having it going through LPC does help because of our involvement with tiered system and terms. When approaching council, we can review it, and the creator would move it.

Tristan: It seems nice to do it together, because LPC will have to set terms and hours as well anyways.

Hans: It is vague how these are created, someone, as long as they can get on the agenda, then they could theoretically create it. Services are different. We should look at code to see if we would like to see creation of jobs go through LPC?

Justin Chang and Bahador Moosavi left at 6:13pm, dissolving quorum.

Having lost the recording secretary, an audio recording of the proceedings was taken. Unfortunately, due to a technical problem of some sort, that recording was either lost, or never recorded. A discussion of changes to the form supplied by HR took place. The list of proposed changes included:

- Removing item 1, and creating two separate forms, one for job creation, one for revisions
- Leaving in the section from item 1 asking about existence in code
- Removing the section from item 1 asking about existence in bylaws
- Adding the position of the requester at the top of the form
- Removing item 4, “Position Requirements”
- Removing item 5, “Purpose”
- Add a section for input from current employee for the review form
- Eliminate all approvals below “Committee” from item 8
- Add “Current Employee” to item 8 for the review form
- Removing item 5, “Purpose”

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, May 29th, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of June 19th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Dan Olson (member-at-large), Harsev Oshan (councillor) Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Kyle Warwick (VP External), Clarke McCorkell (councillor), Hans Seidemann (chair) Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council)

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:15pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Harsev Oshan  Seconded: Dan Olson

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That the minutes of the June 12th meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

The motion carries unanimously.
Commission Minutes Code Changes

Hans: SAC must forward their minutes to council because of the bylaws. In code though, we say that no resolution of a commission takes effect until council approves their minutes. In practice, commissions make decisions and execute on them all the time, and in fact we want this. We had Sheldon draft a set of code changes previously which remove this requirement, but reinforce that council can override actions of commissions that are submitted to us in minutes.

Moved: Clarke McCorkell Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That LPC recommend that Council adopt the code changes titled CODE CHANGES 2012: COMMISSION MINUTES.

The motion carries unanimously..

Review of External Communications Coordinator Position

LPC reviewed the position, but determined that it wasn’t within their jurisdiction to review positions within the communications department.

Discussion on Oversight Review of Ombudsperson Dates and Timing

Discussion took place on the Oversight Committee’s role in reviewing the Ombudsperson. They have an obligation to perform this function, but the timing of the regular reviews didn’t make sense considering the dates that the Ombudsperson is hired. After some discussion, it was agreed that it made sense to have reviews take place in July, October, and February.

Moved: Kyle Warwick Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That LPC direct Sheldon to draft code changing the dates of the Ombudsperson review to July, October and February.

The motion carries unanimously. Harsev and Hans abstaining.
Discussion on Committee Appointment Dates

The appointment dates for committees were discussed. Currently, the date is set at April 1st, but this causes problems with constituencies whose elections haven’t been completed. After discussing options, it was proposed that Agenda Committee select a meeting in April to set appointments, which is most convenient to Council and constituencies.

Moved: Kyle Warwick
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

That LPC direct Sheldon to draft code allowing Agenda Committee to set the date for committee appointments, at a meeting in April.

The motion carries unanimously.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Tuesday the 26th of June at 5PM

Adjourn

Adjournment at 5:05 PM.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 3rd, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Dan Olson (Member-at-large), Emily Jarrett (Councillor), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher), Noah Stewart (Councillor)

Also present: Ross Horton (General Manager), Tracey Axelsson (Director, Services), Eric Gauf (RoBOCom Coordinator)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:21 pm.

Discussion of ROBOCom Proposal

Eric Gauf presented his draft proposal to the committee for their feedback and suggestions. The committee and others present were walked through the proposal and discussed its relative merits, and how it should be presented to LPC in future when it is ready for presentation to council. No substantive decisions were arrived at, but Eric took detailed notes, which he will consider as he prepares his next draft of the proposal.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, July 10th, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of October 4th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Dan Olson (member-at-large), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor) Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Kyle Warwick (VP External), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (chair) Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Maria Cirstea (councillor), Tracey Axelsson (Director, Student Services)

Also Present: Caroline Wong (VP Admin)

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:42pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Dan Olson Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Voter Media Coordinator Code Changes

The Elections committee has some positions outlined in code, including the VoterMedia Coordinator. This description is very narrow, and restricts them to only working on VoterMedia, which limits the utility of the position.

Jenny, the Elections Administrator, would like to amend the description to allow this role to make it a more comprehensive online media coordinator. They are also wanting to change the hours from 5 a week to 10 a week to reflect this expanded role.
Moved: Dan Olson
Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That LPC recommend that Council adopt the code changes titled CODE CHANGES 2012: VOTERMEDIA ADMINISTRATOR.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya
Seconded: Gary Tse

That LPC approve the request for the change in hours for the VoterMedia Coordinator from 5 per week to 10 per week.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Nomination of Alternate Chair**

*Nominations were taken for the position for Alternate Chair. Only Maria Cirstea accepted the nomination.*

Moved: Dan Olson
Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That Maria Cirstea be appointed Alternate Chair of LPC.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Lighter Footprint Audit Strategy**

*Discussion took place on the Lighter Footprint Audit, and how best to conduct it. It was suggested that in future, it would be best to conduct this audit by hiring an external firm, as they would be able to look more objectively on our activities. In the meantime though, it was felt that a committee would be too cumbersome to be of assistance to the Sustainability Coordinator. For the current audit, it was proposed that the audit be carried out by the office of the Sustainability Coordinator, using volunteer support, and with guidance and support from the standing committees of council on an as-needed basis.*
Moved: Kyle Warwick  
Seconded: Dan Olson

That LPC recommend that the current Lighter Footprint Audit be carried out by the Sustainability Coordinator, with assistance from their office, and a volunteer team of their creation.

BIFRT LPC recommend that council direct the VP Finance to investigate the cost of performing external audits in the future.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Discrimination and Harassment Policy**

The revised policy was discussed. At one point, it referred to another policy, which was not a policy of the AMS, and the line was removed. It was also corrected to substitute referral to UBC’s supplementary discipline procedures instead of initiating expulsion proceedings, which the AMS can’t do. Also fixed grammatical errors.

Moved: Gary Tse  
Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That LPC recommend council approve the new Harassment and Discrimination Policy, as amended.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Sustainability and Outreach Coordinator**

This new position would work 15 hours per week at Tier 1, to take up some of the hours being reduced by the Sustainability Coordinator. After some discussion, some small changes were made to the position description, removing committee responsibilities and some small housekeeping changes.
Moved: Dan Olson  
Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That LPC recommend that Council approve the terms of employment for the position of Sustainability Outreach Coordinator, as amended.

The motion carries unanimously.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Thursday the 11th of October at 4:30PM

Adjourn

Adjourned at 5:50 PM.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of October 11\textsuperscript{th}, 2012

Attendance

Present: Dan Olson (member-at-large), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor) Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (chair), Paolo Mercado (member-at-large), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Emily Jarrett (councillor), Maria Cirstea (councillor), Tracey Axelsson (Director, Student Services), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council)

Also Present: Caroline Wong (VP Admin)

Recording Secretary: Maria Cirstea

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:39pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Emily Jarrett \hspace{1cm} Seconded: Tristan Miller

That the circulated agenda be approved.

\textit{The motion carries unanimously.}

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Emily Jarrett \hspace{1cm} Seconded: Tristan Miller

That the minutes of the June 19\textsuperscript{th} meeting of LPC be approved.

\textit{The motion carries unanimously.}
Moved: Dan Olson  Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That the minutes of the October 4th meeting of LPC be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Bylaw Review**

The committee reviewed the bylaws, beginning with Bylaw 6, and flagged the following sections for further review, either by LPC or the new Ad-Hoc Referendum Committee:

1. Most of bylaw 6 flagged because AMS doesn’t have power over senators. Consider only keeping section 5 related to Senators sitting on AMS Council, though section 5.b is in violation of the University Act.
2. 7.1.a flagged as being impractical and out of date to print and post minutes
3. 8.1 flagged: why does SAC Vice-Chair have signing authority, but not VP External?
4. 8.3 flagged: only allows council to name president a signing officer through a code amendment, which is strange and impractical.
5. 8.2 flagged: may want staff not directly underneath the GM to have signing authority over their units. Need to look at expenditures of business vs. services.
6. 8.4 flagged: need to check with Keith. Do signing officers need to be bonded, or simply bondable?
7. 7.2.a flagged: may want VP Finance or their designate (typically finance vice chair) to have a voting seat instead of non-voting position granted in 7.2.b.iii
8. 7.2.a.ii flagged: why are councillors allowed on this commission when they’re not allowed on others?
9. 7.5.d flagged: quorum should be a percentage, not a fixed number.
10. 7.3.a flagged: in practice, SAC vice chair is hired in advance of being appointed by SAC.
11. 7.3.b.ii flagged: SAC has no committees.
12. 7.4.a flagged: have members missing meetings become eligible for removal by SAC vice chair, not automatically.
13. 7.5.c flagged: voting by proxy not allowed at SAC?
AMS Student Society
6138 SUB Boulevard
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
www.ams.ubc.ca

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Thursday the 18th of October at 4:30PM

Adjourn

Adjournment at 5:38 PM.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of June 5th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Dan Olson (Member-at-large), Tristan Miller (Executive), Stewart Mc Gillivray (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor) Kyle Warwick (Executive), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council)

Also present: Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services), Mike Silley (UBC Board of Governors)

Recording Secretary: Stewart Mc Gillivray

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:16 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Tristan Miller Seconded: Stewart Mc Gillivray

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Sheldon: Have we clarified yet which committees Tracey, Uli, etc should be attending?

Hans: Currently it’s by invitation, we’ll look at that later.

The motion carries unanimously

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Stewart Mc Gillivray Seconded: Tristan Miller

That the minutes of the LPC meetings from May 15th be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.
Moved: Stewart M\textsuperscript{c}Gillivray  
Seconded: Dan Olson

That the minutes of the LPC meetings from May 22\textsuperscript{nd} be approved.

Amended 3\textsuperscript{rd} page -> Vote result previously said “Motion carries without consent”

*Friendly amendment*

*The motion carries unanimously*

**Dissolution of the Harassment Policy Working Group**

Hans: The Working Group has not yet met. Earlier today, its Chair, Committee Member Isabel Montoya, resigned from the Committee. Furthermore, Caroline Wong, AMS VP Admin, is quite enthusiastic about having her office pursue this issue further. Someone from her/Kiran’s office, Brett the Equity Commissioner, will be responsible for this file.

Sheldon: Is there a timeline for this process?

Hans: Not yet, but it will hopefully only take a couple of months.

Sheldon: And the other AMS policies we were to study? What of them?

Hans: We may keep the Ethical Purchasing Policy for LPC’s review.

Tracey: A general review is in fact taking place, to ensure that all contracts will be ready in time for the New SUB.

Hans: Excellent, LPC can audit/ review the results then.

Moved: Dan Olson  
Seconded: Stewart M\textsuperscript{c}Gillivray

That LPC’s Harassment Policy Working Group be dissolved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*
Approval of Code Change to Include the Hiring of New Positions in LPC Oversight Process

Hans: We had been given the form from Chris in HR, and changes have been proposed for Code.

Sheldon: The changes amount to LPC making recommendations for HR, before they ever come to Council.

Kyle: So hypothetically, to whom do I take the issue if I want to change the hours of my current Commissioner?

Hans: One way or another, it must come to LPC.

Sheldon: This includes written evidence of the employee’s consent, then it goes to Council after us.

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Dan Olson

BIRT LPC approves the code changes as presented.

The motion carries unanimously.

Discussion: SAIF and SASC

Hans: Code currently says that 2/3 of SASSF goes to SASC, the other 1/3 + unspent moneys go to SAIF. We’re hoping to move SAIF to FinCom. SASC has presented their Budget to the AMS Budget Committee, and included the previously discussed line item for new initiatives. The new Budget also takes the vast majority of the SASSF, which is needed for Staff.

Sheldon: Actually, we won’t need to suspend Code for their Budget, because Code says “a minimum of 2/3” goes to SASC, rather than “exactly 2/3.”

Hans: Nonetheless, do we want to remove the clause on ratios altogether?

Sheldon: It’s been many different numbers in the past, although the current 2/3 is a lower minimum than usual.
Hans: So right now Code says “at least 2/3, but more from Council on the recommendation of Budget Committee.”?

Tracey: Is there a process for them (SASC) to collect donations from other sources too?

Sheldon: Yes, donations made to SASC or SAIF can be made and then accumulated.

Hans: Perhaps I misunderstood the nature/existence of this problem then.

Sheldon: Not necessarily, we could decide that we want the minimum increased.

Hans: Not yet; SAIF, though currently under-utilized, could be overdrawn at some point, or we might want to apportion the money differently in the future.

Sheldon: Elin has emphasized that the SASF is now 1) higher, 2) indexed, and 3) cannot be opted-out of. Also, Student Life and Communications Committee needs to be taken out of the entire process, as previously discussed.

Hans: Yes, that’s still happening.

**Discussion: Councilors Holding Multiple Chairships**

Hans: Do we want to create a restriction? This could help us avoid future problems, weirdness, or a repeat of the Committee Appointments for the Summer Committee Terms?

General Discussion (Minutes do not contain everything said for this section...). NB: Hans declared a potential conflict of interest, as a current committee Chair.

- Would there then be multiple votes per person on Agenda/Oversight Committees if this happened?
- Could be bad to limit, we need natural leaders to head our committees, it’s not the same rationale for limiting the membership of Members-at-Large
- Perhaps in the future, if this became a problem, the membership of Oversight could be adjusted so that the number of votes didn’t change?
  - Reply: That could get wonky/problematic.
- If we don’t want to prohibit two Chairships, should we at least impose a ceiling of three??
• Consensus: we probably don’t need a rule.

Dan Olson had to leave, and Quorum was lost.

Number of Votes on Oversight and Agenda Committee

Kyle: Robert’s Rules generally prohibits members of a committee/council from exercising multiple votes due to multiple positions held.

Hans: But it could theoretically happen if someone held two or more Committee Chairships.

Tristan: You always want an odd number of votes (including the tie-breaking presiding officer), so taking one of the votes cast out of play might alter that balance.

Hans: So maybe this is not in fact a problem? Is there any other circumstance, apart from the two committees mentioned, where this could be relevant?

Moved: Stewart McGillivray Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That Sheldon draft language which would ensure no person may exercise more than one vote on Agenda Committee or Oversight Committee.

The motion carries unanimously.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, June 12th, 2012, at 5pm.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:06 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of June 12th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Stewart M'Cillivray (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor)

Guests: Caroline Wong (AMS VP Admin), Collyn Chan (AMS Assistant to the VP Admin)

Recording Secretary: Stewart M'Cillivray

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:21 pm.

Note: the meeting was not quorate, and did not become so at any time.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart M'Cillivray  Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Stewart M'Cillivray  Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the minutes of the LPC meetings from June 5th be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Amending Code to Restrict Multiple Votes on Oversight/Agenda Committees

Moved: Stewart M'Cillivray  Seconded: Clarke McCorkell
That the Code be amended as presented.

_The motion carries unanimously_

**Minutes of Commissions**

Hans: Currently Bylaws say that SAC must “submit” minutes to Council. Code also states that all Commissions must have their minutes approved by Council in order to go into effect. Clearly this is an onerous burden on the operation of the Commissions, especially in cases where they might be dealing with contracts and financial decisions between AMS Council meetings.

N.B. Some discussion ensued on the autonomy of the Commissions, the validity of the current sections of Code, alternatives, etc... Due to the sparse number of members present, the Recording Secretary also participated in this conversation and was not able to also take full minutes of it.

Hans: As such, I would propose that Code be changed by deleting the sections which state that a Commission’s actions do not have any force or effect until they have been approved by Council. Additionally, to preserve the current balance, a section should be added which only allows Council to overrule/amend/rescind the decision of a Commission if Council supports this course of action by 2/3.

Stewart: I agree.

Clarke: I too agree.

Caroline: Looks good.

Moved: Stewart Mc Gillivray          Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That Sheldon investigate such changes to Code as would satisfy the provisions agreed upon in the discussion.

_The motion carries unanimously._

**Remaining Motions**
Hans: Due to the scarcity of members, we should probably table everything until next meeting.

Moved: Stewart M'Gillivray  
Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the remaining business be tabled.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, June 19th, 2012, at 5pm.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:43 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 3rd, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Dan Olson (Member-at-large), Emily Jarrett (Councillor), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist-Researcher), Noah Stewart (Councillor)

Also present: Ross Horton (General Manager), Tracey Axelsson (Director, Services), Eric Gauf (RoBOCom Coordinator)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:21 pm.

Discussion of ROBOCom Proposal

Eric Gauf presented his draft proposal to the committee for their feedback and suggestions. The committee and others present were walked through the proposal and discussed its relative merits, and how it should be presented to LPC in future when it is ready for presentation to council. No substantive decisions were arrived at, but Eric took detailed notes, which he will consider as he prepares his next draft of the proposal.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, July 10th, 2012, at 5pm

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 10th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Harsev Oshan (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Dan Olson (Member-at-large), Emily Jarrett (Councillor), Kyle Warwick (VP External),

Guests: Tracy Axelsson (Director of Student Services), Brett Sinclair (Equity Commissioner), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist)

Recording Secretary: Emily Jarrett (Councillor)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Dan Olson                Seconded: Harsev Oshan
That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Harsev Oshan                Seconded: Dan Olson
That the minutes of the LPC meetings from July 3rd be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Change in Hours of the Transit and U-Pass Commissioner

Discussion: In requesting this increase, and in the absence of a set procedure for increases, the duties specified under code were fulfilled by Kyle to ensure compliance before increasing the hours. This occurred in the form of an oral report to LPC on the necessity of the change, and a
signed written document from the employee in question agreeing to an increase in their hours during their current term. This change is due in part to the transit campaign mandated by Council, and largely due to the need for coalition building in order to meet this. The change is also necessary because of a request from Campus and Community Planning that the AMS increase the research scope to include faculty and staff, in addition to students. As such, due to the increase in time required to meet these obligations, Kyle has recommended that the position be temporarily increased from 10 hours per week to 20 hours per week until October 19, 2012, and then continue at 15 hours per week. C&CP has not offered any specific financial compensation for the increase in research; however, Mr. Warwick has stated that other in-kind compensation is being contributed. A discussion ensued regarding how the last AMS transit campaign affected relations between the AMS and UBC, and how this request will affect the current campaign. It was agreed that the increase to 15 hours per week would be limited to the term of the current commissioner, to be reconsidered before the next term begins. Kyle will also prepare a copy of the current draft form for hour increases to present to Council

Moved: Kyle Warwick
Seconded: Emily Jarrett

That a motion be sent to council recommending an increase in the hours of the Transit and U-Pass Commissioner to 20 hours per week, effective immediately, until October 19th, 2012, to then continue at 15 hours per week until April 30, 2012.

The motion carries unanimously

Discrimination and Harassment Policy

Brett Sinclair, Equity Commissioner, presented on the current draft of the Discrimination and Harrassment policy. In preparing the current draft, he consulted with many students and organizations to discover their issues with the former policy, and identified the following concerns:

- Does not address Resource Groups and Constituency Clubs
- Issues with some rules being too strict, and other so lax that they are rendered unenforceable.
• Issues about the balance between discrimination and harassment, and freedom of expression and belief. (Only addressed the former, not the latter.)
• Academic Freedom is currently defined as being “defined in the UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan calendars.” The possibility was raised of writing a separate definition, possibly the same, and including it under definitions instead of as a reference, as currently, if UBC changes their policy, then automatically applies to the AMS. This would ensure that the ability to change the definition remains in the hands of the AMS with respect to this document.

A discussion ensued regarding the makeup of the Complaint Managing Board. Some linguistic changes were recommended for clarity in order to make it more in line with language used elsewhere in code, and more specific where vague. It was noted that the current policy has not been able to be used in the past three years as all complaints have remained informal. It was recommended that the Ombudsperson be consulted on the role of their suggested role in this body, and whether it is appropriate for a person in an ombuds position to participate in a decision making body. The question of where HR should be integrated into this process was also raised.

At this point it was agreed that all members would continue to review and submit written feedback to be consolidated and presented at the next meeting.

**Motion to Adjourn**

Moved: Kyle Warwick  
Seconded: Harsev Oshan

*The motion carries unanimously*

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04 pm.
Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, July 17th, 2012, at 5pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 17\textsuperscript{th}, 2012

 Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Stewart Mc\textsuperscript{c} Gillivray (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor)
David Pasca (Student at Large), Noah Stewart (Councilor), Harsev Oshan (Councilor)

Also present: Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services)

Recording Secretary: Stewart Mc\textsuperscript{c} Gillivray

 Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 5:15pm.

 Approval of Agenda

Moved: Harsev Oshan  Seconded: Clarke McCorkell

That the circulated agenda be approved.

\textit{The motion carries unanimously}

 Approval of Minutes

Moved: Harsev Oshan  Seconded: David Pasca

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from July 10\textsuperscript{th} be approved.

Hans: Emily noted by email that Sheldon’s attendance had been omitted, which was corrected.

\textit{The motion carries unanimously}
Bylaws and Referenda

Hans: we’ll review the Bylaws now, flagging specific areas we might wish to send to referendum, without specifically identifying the questions to be asked, language used, etc... Did anyone spot anything specific in the bylaws that we should look at?

Stewart: do we still want to look at reducing the quorum for an AMS AGM?

Hans: probably. it occurs to me that we should review previous suggestions as well. For example, we have questions surrounding Executive turnover, and quorum, and voting rights for Regent/VST/DAP.

Stewart: perhaps that could be a theme for an omnibus question, ie making Bylaws abide by the Societies Act?

Hans: yeah, that would be good, plus housekeeping changes, and separating any substantive ones. Further, we need to look at the section regarding honoraria for Execs (dates from the ‘40s or something), clarification of “public relations,” adding responsibilities for VP Academic.

Hans: do we still want to look at lowering quorum for AGMs?

Noah: it could bog down the passage of other amendments, best leave it alone

Hans: certain things can only be done by AGM, rather than referenda, and so we might still want to look at it. perhaps, as Noah suggested, we could create different classes of General Meeting, so that some smaller things can be done with significantly reduced quorums?

Hans: we should proceed with voting for Regent/VST, clearing up the honoraria, etc..

Hans: regarding the President as the spokesperson/responsible for public relations, perhaps we could add language which restricts him/her to representing only the will of Council?
Harsev: how would we determine what constituted the “will of Council?” would it be simple majority, 2/3, etc?

Hans: good question. also, would the President still be able to take positions Council had not already approved?

Stewart: perhaps we could have language which explicitly states the President cannot take public positions contrary to Council’s wishes?

Hans: maybe it’s not an issue at all and we should just leave it? Noah, anything else that should be flagged?

Noah: the item prohibiting Council from delegating any of its major powers to another body seems redundant.

Hans: yeah, we can look at it. also, Student Court doesn’t do anything and is never appointed, so we should look at elimination.

Hans: going through the bylaws, most Definitions seem fine, although perhaps a re-examination of the definition of “constituencies” could help with the Regent stuff. Also, does the Ubyssey need to be in the Bylaws at all? Should “UBC” be redefined as UBC-Vancouver? Would it change anything?

Hans: Terms of membership is defined in the bylaws. What happens if you don’t pay your fees?

Hans: there’s text here which says we refund part of your fees if you’re expelled part way through the year? Hans: flag Bylaw 2(2)(b) which refers to Student Court, and 2(2)(c) which talks about Council expelling members?
Hans: flag Bylaw 3(1)(a)(i) which says that AGMs are in February. If we change Exec turnover, this will make no sense, so we should add clarifying language attaching it to the last month of an Executives’ term in office? Also, Bylaw 3(1)(a)(ii) on the Auditors and the reports might need further examination. Finally, Bylaw 3(2)(a)(ii) on publication in the “Ubyssey or other campus publications” should be updated to always include the Ubyssey, rather than the optional “or.” Quorum should be flagged too.

Hans: Bylaw 4 on referendum might need rejigging, especially 4(4)(b).

Harsev and Noah and Clarke had to go, quorum lost. Committee continued to review the Bylaws, but will revisit any forthcoming sections when the Committee next meets.

Bylaw 5(1)(c) might need re-examination, as it doesn’t seem to allow Council to remove from office employees other than those listed in that section.
Bylaw 5(2) could be co-amended with the previous definition of “constituency” and so include such things as VST, Regent, DAP, etc..
The section on how many AMS reps each Constituency is entitled to might need re-examination.
Bylaw 5(2)(h) definitely not in accordance with society act, and we don’t follow it anyways, relates to missing 5 meetings and losing your seat.
Perhaps we should re-examine each of 5(2)(h) and (j) and (i), concerning missing Council, being/not-being BOG Rep on Council, and Senate Reps on Council.

Adjourn

Adjournment at 6:41PM

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Tuesday the 24th of July at 5PM
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 24th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Stewart McGillivray (councillor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Kyle Warwick (VP External), Emily Jarrett (councillor), Matt Parson (AMS President)

Also present: Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services), Brett Sinclair (Equity Commissioner), Kiran Mahal (VP Academic), Caroline Wong (VP Admin)

Recording Secretary: Stewart McGillivray

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 5:14pm, quorum was not present.

Acting Chair

Moved: Tristan Miller Seconded: Emily Jarrett

That Tristan be named the acting chair for this meeting.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart McGillivray Seconded: Emily Jarrett

That the circulated agenda be approved.

An addition to the agenda to set a wage for the Executive Projects position was suggested by Matt, and approved without dissent.

The motion carries unanimously.
Approval of Minutes

Deferred due to lack of quorum.

Executive Projects Position

Matt: Given that the role is roughly equivalent to an AVP, we’re recommending that it be re-classified as a Tier-2 position. It’s not an entry level position, the work done is quite important to the society.

Moved: Kyle Warwick           Seconded: Emily Jarrett

That the Executive Projects position be reclassified as a Tier-2 position.

The motion carries unanimously. Quorum was not present.

Discussion of change in hours for AVP Admin

Caroline: My assistant Collyn is currently working more than her allotted hours, working hard in my absence, assisting all execs with graphics and SUDS; being such a valuable asset, her time is quite divided. All the Execs agree it’s appropriate that her hours be changed from 15 to 20 hours.

Emily: would it make more sense to acknowledge that she’s doing a lot of work now, and have things frontloaded?

Matt: Generally I would agree, but administratively it’s easier this way.

Kyle: It seems that this might not be suitable for every year, we should have this only apply to the current year.
Moved: Stewart McGillivray  
Seconded: Kyle Warwick

That the hours of the AVP Admin be increased from 15 to 20 hours until the completion of her term.

*The motion carries unanimously. Quorum was not present.*

NB – to be re-affirmed at next quorate Committee meeting.

**Harassment Policy draft**

Brett: Haven’t received any emails with suggestions, so presumably this Committee doesn’t have any major changes to propose? I’ll quickly refresh everyone on its contents

Brett: we want Club disagreements to be better settled based on general human rights codes, as well as regulating individual complaints; academic freedom and freedom of expression are upheld, up to an infringement on someone else’s rights. This policy is essentially based off the BC Human Rights Code.

Brett: Every AMS member is able to claim their rights under this policy, and guests are encouraged to respect it too. This policy doesn’t preclude challenges through other avenues such as the University or the BC Human Rights Tribunal. AMS respects the right of an individual to pursue such challenges, but may suspend its own investigations until such other processes are completed.

Brett: One suggestion was that there should be a better definition of Resource Groups. Also, looking at the structure of the regulatory body by splitting it into a Complaint Resolution Body and Equity Mediation Body.

Brett: The definition of “personal discrimination” refers to any kind of discrimination against an individual, in line with either the prohibited grounds of the BC Human Rights Code or of the previously mentioned sections.

Brett: Also working on fine-tuning a definition of systemic discrimination.
Some discussion ensued on the balance between systemic discrimination, the commissioner's officer, Council, and this Committee.

Brett: “Sexual harassment” clarified as one’s right to not be sexually solicited by someone in a position of power relative to them, in the AMS.

Kiran: Does this definition include ones identified by SASC?

Brett: Relies generally upon the BC Human Rights Code.

Brett: Traditional AMS Equity policies have been quite long and comprehensive, outlining definitions, regulations, procedures, etc... Currently, however, it’s becoming more common to have a comprehensive body of policy, which keeps procedures as an appendix. I’m proposing that we make it so that the President is able to amend the procedures, subject to their not contravening the policy/code/bylaws.

Kyle: This would have to be pretty transparent so the President can’t mess around.

Brett: Yes, of course. The President is the best-placed person to oversee this policy, and must report any such changes to Council as soon as feasibly possible.

Kyle: We should check with David about this policy too.

Kiran: It should also be run by UBC’s Equity Office for some input.

Moved: Emily Jarrett            Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

That LPC approve the new Harassment Policy.

The motion carries unanimously. Quorum was not present.
NB – to be re-affirmed at next quorate Committee meeting. Also, to be re-circulated prior to next Committee meeting, and added to the Agenda for the August 1st Council Meeting.

Further Business

Tracey requested that David’s document for part-time employees be reviewed by this Committee.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Tuesday the 31st of July at 5PM

Adjourn

Adjournment at 6:12 PM.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 31st, 2012

Attendance

Present: Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Kyle Warwick (VP External), Emily Jarrett (Councilor)

Also present: Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services), Brett Sinclair (Equity Commissioner), Kiran Mahal (VP Academic), Caroline Wong (VP Admin), Matt Parson (AMS President)

Recording Secretary: Stewart McGillivray

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 5:14pm, quorum was not present.

Acting Chair

Moved: Stewart McGillivray
Seconded: Emily Jarrett

That Tristan Miller be appointed acting chair for this meeting.

The motion carries unanimously

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart McGillivray
Seconded: Emily Jarrett

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Amended by Matt Parson to add a motion to set the wage for the Executive Projects Position. Amendment accepted without dissent.

The motion carries unanimously

Approval of Minutes

Deferred due to lack of quorum
Executive Projects Position

Matt: Given that the role is roughly equivalent to an AVP, we’re recommending that it be re-classified as a Tier-2 position. It’s not an entry level position, the work done is quite important to the society

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Emily Jarrett

BiRT LPC recommends that council the Executive Projects position be reclassified as a Tier 2 position, with commensurate wage changes

The motion carries unanimously (quorum not present)

Discussion of change in hours for AVP Admin

Caroline: My assistant Collyn is currently working more than her allotted hours, working hard in my absence, assisting all execs with graphics and SUDS; being such a valuable asset, her time is quite divided. All the Execs agree it’s appropriate that her hours be changed from 15 to 20 hours.

Emily: would it make more sense to acknowledge that she’s doing a lot of work now, and have things frontloaded?

Matt: Generally I would agree, but administratively it’s easier this way.

Kyle: It seems that this might not be suitable for every year, we should have this only apply to the current year.

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Kyle Warwick

BiRT LPC recommend to council that the hours of the AVP Admin be increased from 15 to 20 hours until the completion of the current term or employment.

The motion carries unanimously (quorum not present)

NB – to be re-affirmed at next quorate Committee meeting.
Harassment Policy draft

Brett: Haven’t received any emails with suggestions, so presumably this Committee doesn’t have any major changes to propose? I’ll quickly refresh everyone on its contents

Brett: we want Club disagreements to be better settled based on general human rights codes, as well as regulating individual complaints; academic freedom and freedom of expression are upheld, up to an infringement on someone else’s rights. This policy is essentially based off the BC Human Rights Code.

Brett: every AMS member is able to claim their rights under this policy, and guests are encouraged to respect it too. This policy doesn’t preclude challenges through other avenues such as the University or the BC Human Rights Tribunal. AMS respects the right of an individual to pursue such challenges, but may suspend its own investigations until such other processes are completed.

Brett: One suggestion was that there should be a better definition of Resource Groups. Also, looking at the structure of the regulatory body by splitting it into a Complaint Resolution Body and Equity Mediation Body.

Brett: the definition of “personal discrimination” refers to any kind of discrimination against an individual, in line with either the prohibited grounds of the BC Human Rights Code or of the previously mentioned sections. Also working on fine-tuning a definition of systemic discrimination.

Some discussion ensued on the balance between systemic discrimination, the commissioner’s officer, Council, and this Committee.

Brett: “sexual harassment” clarified as one’s right to not be sexually solicited by someone in a position of power relative to them, in the AMS.

Kiran: does this definition include ones identified by SASC?

Brett: relies generally upon the BC Human Rights Code.
Brett: traditional AMS Equity policies have been quite long and comprehensive, outlining definitions, regulations, procedures, etc... Currently, however, it’s becoming more common to have a comprehensive body of policy, which keeps procedures as an appendix. I’m proposing that we make it so that the President is able to amend the procedures, subject to their not contravening the policy/code/bylaws.

Kyle: this would have to be pretty transparent so the President can’t mess around.

Brett: yes, of course. The President is the best-placed person to oversee this policy, and must report any such changes to Council as soon as feasibly possible.

Kyle: we should check with David about this policy too.

Kiran: it should also be run by UBC’s Equity Office for some input.

Moved: Emily Jarrett Seconded: Stewart McGillivray

BiRT LPC recommend that Council approve the newly updated Harassment Policy.

*The motion carries unanimously (quorum not present)*

*NB – to be re-affirmed at next quorate Committee meeting. Also, to be re-circulated prior to next Committee meeting, and added to the Agenda for the August 1st Council Meeting.*

**Further Business**

Tracey requested that David’s document for part-time employees be reviewed by this Committee.

**Next Meeting**

Next meeting – Tuesday the 8<sup>th</sup> of August at 5PM

**Adjourn**

Adjournment at 6:12 PM.
Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Chair), Tristan Miller (Executive), Kyle Warwick (Executive), Stewart McGillivray (Councilor), Clarke McCorkell (Councilor), Emily Jarrett (Councilor), Dan Olson (Student at Large), David Pasca (Student at Large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council)

Also present: Eric Gauf (RoBOCom), Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services)

Recording Secretary: Stewart McGillivray

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:10 pm. Quorum was had!

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stewart McGillivray                           Seconded: Emily Jarrett
That the circulated agenda be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Stewart McGillivray                           Seconded: Clarke McCorkell
That the minutes of the LPC meetings from July 17th, July 24th, and July 31st be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*
Re-Affirmation of the Executive Project Assistant being set at Tier 2 Wage Level

Moved: Stewart McGillivray  Seconded: Kyle Warwick

That the previous decision be upheld.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

RoBOCom Presentation by Eric Gauf

*Tracey left the room.*

Eric: RoBOCom recently compiled everything and made a presentation to Council last Wednesday. Among other things, the dissolution of BaFCom was recommended and so has been brought to this Committee. Going forward, we’ll be working with Sheldon to refine our proposals into proper Code, and then bring such Code proposals back to LPC.

Eric: First things first, does LPC agree with getting rid of BaFCom? Should it be entirely broken up and its duties distributed (as RoBOCom recommends), or should the shell-of-its-former-self continue to exist? Remaining powers would include some oversight of certain grants, appointments to commissions, working with FinCom, sustainability, etc… If BaFCom was to continue to exist, it would have powers over certain hiring and certain grants.

Eric: In the past, it seems most hiring has been done by a committee, but that the work usually comes down to one or two people doing most of the work before making the decision. The current hiring process is becoming somewhat problematic, with at least part of the process coinciding with exams, among other problems posed. Questions remain as to whether an internal policy for hiring should be adopted, or whether it would be best to include changes in the RoBOCom proposal. Separately, funding applications for student spaces could easily be shuffled over to SLCC. There are some concerns that Budget Committee should be inserted back into some of these processes as well.

Tristan: for some of these issues, it might work to send things to FinCom, given that it’s more appropriate to have funds administered by them, rather than the Budget Committee, which crafts the budget rather than administering funds.
Eric: the previous language is somewhat unclear on appointments to commissions, currently done through BaFCom (according to Code).

*Discussion ensued, concluding that SAC can recommend its appointments and have them approved by Council, while others wouldn’t be.*

Eric: Oddly, BaFCom has the role of recommending appropriate actions in the event of a deficit; while it might have previously made sense to do this for the businesses, a post-BGB AMS would no longer need this provision for the Student Government Budget.

*Straw poll revealed that all members agreed BaFCom could be eliminated.*

Eric: Also, it would make more sense to remove the non-student positions from the mandate of the Extraordinary Hiring Committee.

Eric: BaFCom’s oversight over most funds could be shuffled over – student spaces over to SLCC, some others over to FinCom. For the time being, we can all agree on the SLCC portion, but perhaps the rest of the funds can be left to a later date.

Hans: so would we want to specify how/which funds have to go to Council for approval?

Emily: perhaps there could be a dollar threshold for which applications go to Council?

Tristan: that’s an option, although any number is inherently arbitrary.

Eric: For hiring then, we all agree that there would be two people, one being the individual to whom the position reports and the other being an arbitrary second individual.

Eric: Several changes of significance were made regarding the Director of Student Services. Council/this Committee may wish to take some of these into account. For example, hiring cannot be something which is taken lightly, and there must be a clear process, without being overly prescriptive. Council’s process for Director of Services ought to mimic that which the BGB uses for the General Manager.

Hans: for removal of Director of Services, we should tread carefully due to the sensitive nature of the issue.
Tristan and Emily pointed out that privacy laws are clear that even the discussion of the matter by Council must not include any reference to the position/individual and can only legally be considered by Council, as the legal Board of Directors of the Society.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, August 14th, 2012, at 5pm.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of August 14, 2012

Attendance

Present: Dan Olson (member-at-large), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Kyle Warwick (VP External), Clarke McCorkell (councillor), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council)

Also present: Tracey Axelsson (Director of Services)

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 5:17pm, quorum was not present.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Kyle Warwick                      Seconded: Dan Olson
That the circulated agenda be approved.

_The motion carries unanimously._

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Dan Olson                         Seconded: Clarke McCorkell
That the minutes of the August 7th meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

_The motion carries unanimously. Quorum was not present._
Code Change related to Fee Changes

Sheldon: updates fee sections, updates by CPI, clarifies the health and dental fee as it is linked to the health portion of the BCCPI. Removes references to procedures that no longer exist like the services fee being opt-outable. Generally, it’s housekeeping of fees.

Moved: Dan Olson  Seconded: Kyle Warwick

That the circulated agenda be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously. Quorum was not present.*

RoBOCom Findings Regarding Honoraria

Eric: Does this section need cleaning up? We may want to include the addition of honoraria of ROBOCOM Members (for the BGB)

*After discussion, it was determined that honoraria for the BGB should be in BGB section*

Hans: Rules governing how much can be granted in honoraria apply, so we need to change this section to allow board BGB members a larger honorarium.

*After further discussion, it was determined that much of the honoraria clauses should be adjusted, and a specific reference added to the BGB section for their honoraria.*

RoBOCom Discussion: General Manager and Director of Student Services

A great deal of discussion took place regarding the effects of the proposed RoBOCom restructuring plan on the General Manager and the Director of Student Services. The following is a list of the recommendations of LPC to RoBOCom for inclusion in their final proposal:

- The Chair of the BGB and Director of Student Services shall be allowed to remain at in-camera sessions unless otherwise directed to by council.
- The GM currently attends Executive Committee and after ROBOCOM should not. General Manager should be replaced by Director of Student Services on Exec Comm.
• Remove the GM role from committees and council except for council by invitation.
• The GM and the Chair of the BGB shall attend council as requested/needed
• Director of Services should attend EduCom, LPC and SLCC, by invitation.
• Remove director of operations from Exec Comm.
• The Chair of BGB will not sit on Exec Comm because the VP Finance and President sit on BGB and can liaise.

Exec Comm:

• Remove: GM, Director of Operations, Policy Advisor
• Add: Clerk of council, Director of Services,
• By invitation: Policy Advisor, and GM

SLC:

• Mandatory attendance: Events and Comm Manager,
• By invitation: Director of Services, Facilities, and Designer

LPC:

• Mandatory: Clerk of Council
• By Invitation: Director of Services

Other Items:

• General housekeeping on committee attendance and structure to ensure the correct titles are being referred to and positions that no longer exist are removed and new positions added where appropriate.
• The honoraria section needs to be looked at again. Remuneration is more appropriate.
• Employees and council shall receive remuneration not honoraria
• Outstanding service to the society section (honoraria section) needs to be cleaned up.
• Sheldon to draft the appropriate changes.
Bylaw Review

Tabled until next meeting.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Tuesday the 21st of August at 5PM

Adjourn

Adjournment at 6:01 PM.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of October 25th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor), Dan Olson (member-at-large), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (chair), Paolo Mercado (member-at-large), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Tracey Axelsson (Director, Student Services)

Also Present: Satoshi Iura (Ombudsperson), Tanner Bokor (Associate VP External)

Recording Secretary: Paolo Mercado

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:59pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Dan Olson Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Paolo Mercado Seconded: Dan Olson

That the minutes of the October 11th meeting of LPC be approved.

The motion carries. All in favor, with Ekateryna against.
Discussion of UBC-O U-Pass Eligibility Code Changes

Tanner presented to LPC about negotiations with UBC-O’s student union regarding fee exemption. It has now been arranged to exempt UBC-O students from the AMS membership fee, and vice-versa, when taking semester’s at the other school. This requires a change to the code for fee exemptions, which had been circulated.

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskyka  
Seconded: Dan Olson

That LPC recommend council adopt the code changes outlined in CODE CHANGES 2012: FEE WAIVER FOR UBCO: 2nd change

Passed with no dissent.

Bylaw Review

The committee started by revisiting Section 8 Bylaw 1:

- Flagged: Adding language restricting executives from being the signing officer when requesting purchases
- Flagged: Want to consider keeping SAC Chair as signing officer

The committee then moved by reviewing Bylaw 9 and flagging:

- Flagged: Section 1a,b,g, stricken due to repetition in code
- Flagged: Section 1c – strike (strong maybe)
- Flagged: Section 1d – More for duties of AMS advocacy office
- Flagged: Check for code relating to Advocacy for students (See - Code Article 10 Section 10)
- Flagged: Section 1e – Change due to unclear definitions of Archivist
- Flagged: Section 1f – Revise due to Senate Caucus and include other commissions, adopt to future revisions of code

The committee finished by reviewing Bylaw 10 and flagging:
Next Meeting

Next meeting – Thursday the 25th of October at 4:30PM in SUB 266J.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 5:32 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Agenda of October 18th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Dan Olson, Ekateryna Baranovskaya, Justin Fernandez, Hans Seidemann, Gary Tse, Tracey Axelsson

Also Present: Ross Horton, Satoshi Iura, Tanner

Regrets:

Recording Secretary: Paolo Mercado

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:59 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Dan Olson Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovsyka

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Paolo Mercado Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovsyka

That the minutes of the October 11th meeting of LPC be approved.

Ekateryna voted on the negative.

Discussion of UBC-O U-Pass Eligibility Code Changes

Code changes to be presented by the VP External’s office for approval by LPC.

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovsyka Seconded: Dan Olson

That the code be changed.

Passed with no dissent.
Bylaw Review

The committee started by revisiting Section 8 Bylaw 1:

- Flagged: Adding language restricting executives from being the signing officer when requesting purchases
- Flagged: Want to consider keeping SAC Chair as signing officer

The committee then moved by reviewing Bylaw 9 and flagging:

- Flagged: Section 1a,b,g, stricken due to repetition in code
- Flagged: Section 1c – strike (strong maybe)
- Flagged: Section 1d – More for duties of AMS advocacy office
- Flagged: Check for code relating to Advocacy for students (See - Code Article 10 Section 10)
- Flagged: Section 1e – Change due to unclear definitions of Archivist
- Flagged: Section 1f – Revise due to Senate Caucus and include other commissions, adopt to future revisions of code

The committee finished by reviewing Bylaw 10 and flagging:

- Flagged: No section 1aii, 2 sections 1a iii = typo
- Flagged: Section 1aiii (Second) = strike or reword to fit with conduct in code – consult new Robocom changes
- Flagged: Section 1aiiv = adding information technology
- Flagged Section 1av = Unclear on who General Manager reports to – adding reporting relationships

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Thursday the 25th of October at 4:30PM in SUB 266J.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 5:32 pm.
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AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
Minutes of October 25th, 2012

Attendance

Present: Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor) Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (chair), Paolo Mercado (member-at-large), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Maria Cirstea (councillor), Tracey Axelsson (Director, Student Services), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council)

Also Present: Keith Hester (Director of Finance and Administration), Ross Horton (General Manager)

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:40pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That the circulated agenda be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Bylaw Review

The committee reviewed the bylaws relating to finances (sections 11, 12, 14, 16, & 20), with input from Keith and Ross, and flagged the following sections for further review:

- 11.1.a: What is the definition of the Budget? Preliminary or Final? Do significant changes make a difference? Expenditures from funds and subsidiaries cause problems. Do we need to change the dates or requirements? Look at the timing of budgets.
• 11.1 items B, C, and G, all flagged
• 11.2 to be reviewed comprehensively by Tristan and Keith, with results brought back to LPC
• Bylaw 12 needs a complete overhaul. Likely only want to keep section 4 and scrap the rest. May also want to include honoraria (more likely rename to “remuneration”) for non members as well if we keep section 4.
• 14.2: should amend the item to remove reference to spring or summer fees, as there is only one yearly membership fee.
• 16.1: Who should approve of the chartered accountants? It’s strange the way it’s done now.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Thursday the 1st of November at 4:30PM

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 5:24 PM.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of November 1st, 2012

Attendance

Maria Cirstea (councillor), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor), Paolo Mercado (member-at-large), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (councillor).

Also Present: Barnabas Caro (councillor), David Hannigan (Director of HR), Jenny Chen (AMS Elections Administrator), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council).

Recording Secretary: Maria Cirstea

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:38 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Maria Cirstea  Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Hours Change for Online Communications Officer

Jenny: Would like to increase the hours of the new online communications officer:

--changed position from voter media to online communication

--combined job with advertising/marketing

--needs more hours to maintain new things in portfolio

--stress on EA and CRO; this person will help with the stress and help with online presence

Hans: Didn’t we move it from 5 to 10 when we created this position?

Jenny: We want them to be on same level as the CRO because event and logistics is at 10 so want online communications is taken care of; also hiring one less person; not hiring the marketing person, who was 10 hours
Hans: So we’re going to make one position at 15 hours instead of 2 at 10?

Jenny: No, one used to be 5 and one used to be 10 so now at 15 it is all the same

Hans: David thinks we should hire more people; why would you rather have it one position at 15 instead of 2 at 10?

Jenny: With online communications you want one central person taking care of it all since you want one consistent look

Maria: Why not a team of two?

Jenny: Having 2 people doing communications leads to a lot of overlap and hard to separate roles; also thinking we could start off with 10 and if they start to feel overloaded they can increase to 15? Want the online communication person to be constantly updating and on top of all media

Sheldon: Code says there are the EA, CRO, online communications officer, and 3 others

Jenny: Going to be hiring all 3 others and just general advertising etc. going to draw upon AMS team to work on elections.

Hans: In terms of actual elections committee it is supposed to have 6 members, is there going to be just 3 general on the team? How many people are you intending to hire?

Jenny: Hiring 3 right now: one general and then CRO and online communications, then another one later for advertising.

Hans: Might make more sense to not increase hours but to just hire someone else if they need more help; add another person instead of adding hours, but try the 10 hour thing first; this also fits better with code

Ekat: Inclined to go with Jenny on this because it is her job

Paulo: Sometimes it is better to have one person following a unified vision

Ekat: Might be better for Jenny to have one time person
Hans: It’s easy to increase hours but hard to decrease them, so we could increase for a small period of time, like for this period, and then re-evaluate again next year; approve increase up until end of term

Jenny: Thinking just January increase hours to 15 when the bulk of their work will be here

Hans: they get paid for their work not tracking hours so some weeks they work more and some weeks they work less so it balances; how about we increase for this year and see how it goes for next year; put a clause in there that will make it be re-evaluated

Moved Ekateryna Baranovskaya Seconded Paolo Mercado

BIRT the position of Online Communications Officer have their hours increased from 10 to 15 from the period starting Nov 1, 2012 and ending April 30, 2012

*Passes unanimously, but without quorum. To be affirmed at the next quorate LPC meeting.*

**Approval of Minutes**

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That the minutes of the October 18th meeting of LPC be approved.

*Passes unanimously, without quorum*

**Approval of Minutes**

Moved: Justin Fernandes Seconded: Paolo Mercado

That the minutes of the October 25th meeting of LPC be approved.

*Passes unanimously, without quorum*

**Discrimination and Harassment Policy Review**

Review of concerns raised on the new internal policy.

David: Would like to see more HR, less GM involved; new Bill 14 by worksafe BC – this bill is a mental disability clause so that if something traumatic happens in the workplace they can claim it; has just passed workplace BC but nobody has made a claim about it yet; nobody really knows what a “traumatic event” means; recommendation is that with anyone with this type of policy
has it connected to health and safety officer because it might be a health and safety that the workplace is free from stressors; also may relate to bullying and harassment;

Hans: So we need to add an inclusion to both the document and to the duties of the health and safety officer?

David: Send it back to the lawyers and have them rework the changes

Hans: Let’s wait on sending it back until we talk to Caroline.

David: Did you know transgender have no rights in BC? Look in to that as well. Including transgender in the policy; gendered language

Sheldon: The line that says it does not apply to general workplace harassment; shouldn’t we look into it?

Hans: We should have a general harassment policy but this one is supposed to be a discrimination-based one. Moving forward, bring it up when we next have quorum and when we have Caroline; wait on that instead of putting anything to a vote.

Bylaw Review

Flagging items for further review, beginning at section 13.

Bylaw 13:

- Question: cannot use name of university and society 13.2.b.i.
- 3.c is the same thing except SAC doing that
- Sheldon: Students that don’t belong to constituencies? Not a faculty or school; part of Sauder
- flag section 2a
- flag section 9

Bylaw 15

- 1.b senate caucus?

Bylaw 18

- Section 2 should not cover confidential business strategies and things like that
Next Meeting

Next meeting – Thursday the 8th of November at 4:30PM in SUB 266J.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.