AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 9th, 2013

Attendance

Kyle Warwick (VP External), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (councillor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Jennifer Law (councillor)

Also Present: Matt Parson (President), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council).

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:10 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Jennifer Law                 Secended: Kyle Warwick

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of November 29th Minutes

Moved: Kyle Warwick                 Secended: Jennifer Law

That the minutes of the November 29th meeting of LPC be approved as circulated.

Minutes amended to read that Sheldon was directed to draft code changes related to non-disclosure agreements, not that the changes were approved by LPC.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Bylaw Change Review

Reviewed Housekeeping changes and substantive changes (Bylaw Changes 2013)

- Housekeeping is largely bringing AMS bylaws into alignment with the BC Societies Act. (Compliance)
- Student Senate Caucus is largely removed from bylaws
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

AMS Student Society
6138 SUB Boulevard
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
www.ams.ubc.ca

- Honoraria section is revised
- Removal of posting of Minutes in physical form
- All suggested questions approved

Reviewed Quorum Change
- Quorum: from 2% to 1% 1000 members to 500. New rules: whichever is greater (1% or 500)
- Quorum change question approved as presented

Reviewed Substantive Changes
- New addition to section 2: addition of theological colleges. Giving Vancouver School of Theology, St. Marks, Regent College. This will make them voting members of council (all of them receive one representative)
- Discussion over the change of executive turnover: which term should be that changed (the longer, 14 month term), this upcoming year or the next year
  - Felt changing turnover for the next executive would be unfair as the change would be too close to the upcoming elections and it hasn’t been made public knowledge
  - Potential candidates need fair warning that their terms are potentially longer
- Bylaw 11: establishes endowment fund, never to be drawn down, only interest can be spent

Set names for the actual questions:
  - “Quorum Reduction for General Meetings.”
  - “Other Changes: Executive Turnover, Representation for Affiliated Institutions, and Entrenching the AMS Endowment Fund.”
  - “Housekeeping Changes: Changes Required by the Society Act and Reflecting Current Practices”
    - Society Act to be described in a summary or footnote.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Wednesday the 16th January at 3:00pm in SUB 224.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 3:59 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 16th, 2013

Attendance

Kyle Warwick (VP External), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Dan Olson (member-at-large), Hans Seidemann (councillor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor)

Also Present: Ian Campbell (EUS President), Tagg Jefferson (Engineering Student Centre Student Governance Committee Chair), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council).

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:18 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya Seconded: Kyle Warwick

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Kyle Warwick Seconded: Tristan Miller

That the minutes of the LPC meeting from January 9th be approved as circulated.

The motion carries unanimously.

Code Changes 2013: Conflict of Interest for Others

LPC had previously directed Sheldon to draft something in regards to non-disclosure agreement. In the new code:

- Non-Disclosure agreements are created for all officers of the society
- These officers must sign and oath of office
• All officers except those of subsidiary organizations (constituencies, clubs) and resource groups are included

Moved: Kyle Warwick              Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That LPC recommend the code changes contained in Code Changes 2013: Conflict of Interest for Others to council for approved as presented.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Internal Policy on Records Management

• Section D of this policy describes controls on access to contracts with outside organizations
• We might like to add another section: providing that an outside organization approves, council upon resolution may make public any contract requested by a subsidiary organization
• Concerns were raised about making contracts public, and there was a suggestion that there should perhaps be an exception
• Would also like to add a section to say that subsidiaries should be allowed to keep a copy of contracts signed by the AMS on their behalf, as this reflects current practice.
• Should also specify a difference between a draft or executed contract, to ensure that completed, but unsigned agreements are also controlled
• Should amend to allow anyone involved in the negotiations of the contract my view the final contract, but not to be circulated further
• Would also like to make it clear that people who are responsible for executing contracts should be able to see the contract after it is signed

Sheldon directed to incorporate these suggestions into a revision of the internal policy on records management, for approval by subsequent meeting of LPC.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Wednesday the 23rd of January at 3:00pm in SUB 224.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 3:59 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 23rd, 2013

Attendance

Kyle Warwick (VP External), John Chow (councillor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Jennifer Law (councillor)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council).

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:16 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Kyle Warwick Seconded: Jennifer Law

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Internal Policy on Records Management

- Policy Sheldon drafted as directed at the last meeting achieves the desired objective of balancing privacy while keeping those who were involved in the construction of the contracts reasonably informed to the final result

Moved: Jennifer Law Seconded: John Chow

That the Legislative Procedures Committee recommend Council pass the following changes to code of procedures as presented

Approved with unanimous consent.

Note: Passed without quorum present
Next Meeting

Next meeting – Wednesday the 30\textsuperscript{th} of January at 3:00pm in SUB 213.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 3:21 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of January 30th, 2013

Attendance

Kyle Warwick (VP External), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (councillor), Jennifer Law (councillor), Hans Seidemann (councillor), Dan Olson (member-at-large), Paolo Mercado (member-at-larger)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Tanner Bokor (VP External-Elect), Chris Panadero (Human Resources Associate)

Recording Secretary: Jennifer Law

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:19 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Kyle Warwick          Seconded: Dan Olson

Amended without dissent to include revision of position descriptions for Composting Coordinator, AVP External, & External Events Commissioner

That the amended agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of January 16th Minutes of LPC

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya          Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That the January 16th minutes of LPC be approved as circulated.

Approved with unanimous consent.
Approval of January 23rd Minutes of LPC

Moved: Kyle Warwick          Seconded: Dan Olson

That the January 23rd minutes of LPC be approved as circulated.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Handbook for Student Government Employees

Chris: There’s no current handbook for student employees on the student government side – this handbook focuses more on terms, process for discipline, how we recruit & hire, mention EZ Labour system. We want to have a resource for all employees, to address the health and safety component as well. This also includes discrimination and harassment policy.

Hans: Points out minor formatting issue. Also, Sheldon had some concerns on how it relates to code. Set up as handbook for part time employees, need to be approve by council. Suggestion: recommend to council on Wednesday to pass/approve the handbook, and then adjust/approve code to reference it afterwards.

Kyle: Hiring employees - include the fact that we need two people and hiring manager in the handbook. Makes sense to be explicit. (manager and hiring committee).

Ekat: We should leave it open ended and flexible.

Kyle: Manager +1 person is in code. Theoretically putting a check on someone from favouritism. Makes sense to at least mention it, and we don't need to be overly specific.

Hans: We could add another line - just a small mention - "hiring should be in accordance with guidelines outlined in code". This is the only manual it will impact since it's student government hires.

Ekat: When do you update it?

Chris: Every year.

Kyle: Should we put in the reference to EZ Labour? Customer relation type work or something, fail to show up for a shift what happens?

Ekat: How are we going to account for it? Say the case of theoretically missing a meeting,

Chris: Yes, everyone is going to switch to it. Salary employees - manager to manage their time, add hours next week.
Discussion:

- Timesheets or payroll difference?
  - Determined it only applies to hourly hires.
- Scheduling shift changes and attendance?
  - Taking away shift is very severe for punishment, should be gradual.
  - Making that part more general and broad, saying managers are responsible for employee's time/work
- Log in and log out easy payroll?
  - Still applicable for "all hourly employees".

Hans: is this intended to cover committee chairs?

Kyle: Student government side doesn't use EZ Labour.

Ekat: Committee chairs report to Kirin: should someone look into that?

Kyle: Good explanation for probationary period. Other things are standard.

Hans: Only shoes with closed heels and toes?

Chris: To make sure employees don’t run around with open toe shoes – we can change it to certain areas like the Pit where food prep is happening.

Ekat: Open toe shoes are professional too! What about heels with open toes?

Discussion: change to footwear that complies to health and safety standard

Ekat: Gifts and complementary items, the process seems strange.

Tanner, Chris: Usually distributed at the Christmas party.

Hans: As it stands it's the same as all the other employees. Government employees should be treated the same way.

Kyle: Problems: paying for dinner, not really a "gift." Trivial gifts like soap. Code states that execs must notify council if gifts have a value above a certain amount, and if not, then they should be run by the oversight committee. Handbook should reference that section in code. It's a blurry area. Also, it should be the Director of Student Services handling those questions instead of Director Operations when problems come up.
Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya  Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That the Handbook for Student Government Employees be approved in principle, subject to the recommended changes.

Approved with unanimous consent.

**Assistant Vice-President External Position Description Changes**

Tanner: There are two changes. With regards to timing, this position would start earlier than April 30th because otherwise I won’t have an AVP when I take office.

Kyle: Also amended duties because the AVP doesn't need to do so much research work.

Ekat: Did you add that they must be flexible to travel? Have a drivers licence?

Tanner: Only that they be flexible in time commitments.

Kyle: Sheldon says changing the length of the term isn’t important enough to send to LPC?

Hans: Will check on that for future.

Moved: Kyle Warwick  Seconded: Dan Olson

That the submitted changes to the AVP External Position Description be approved as circulated.

Approved with unanimous consent.

**External Event Commissioner Position Description Changes**

Tanner: Position was created in August. It used to be a 5 hour / week position. This change is for rehiring the position for a full term, and doubling the hours. Start date would be Feb 27, for a one year appointment.

Justin: Why is it only one year?

Kyle: Budget concerns.

Ekat: Wording in the position refers to BaFCom: should be changed to VP External.

Hans: Why is it increased to 10 hrs?
Tanner: Not enough time to do what is expected of them in 5 hours. Event planning needs more help, especially for next year with the upcoming provincial elections.

Hans: I have concerns doubling the weekly hour allotment at the same time as we make the position a full-year term.

Tanner: It’s unfortunate that Kyle’s leaving as I’m coming in. We just want to establishing the regular pattern of hiring for future commissioners.

Moved: Kyle Warwick Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That the submitted changes to the External Events Commissioner Position Description be approved as amended.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Composting Coordinator Position Description Changes

Hans: This is increasing the position hours from 4 to 5, and adding an additional compositing coordinator.

Justin: Dates change to 2013? Unclear when this is intended to begin / end.

Hans: Justin Ritchie isn’t here, so we should wait until they give input on what they want for this.

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Wednesday the 6th of February at 3:00pm in SUB 42V.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 4:21 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of February 6th, 2013

Attendance

Kyle Warwick (VP External), John Chow (councillor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Jennifer Law (councillor), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (Councillor), Gary Tse (member-at-large)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council).

Recording Secretary: Tristan Miller

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: John Chow  Seconded: Jennifer Law

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Jennifer Law  Seconded: John Chow

That the minutes of the January 23rd meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Discussion on Code Changes regarding Handbook for Student Government Employees

- Section 9, Paragraph C, Article 1 describes Personnel Procedures.
- Executive Committee shall establish provisions on the rights and duties of appointees to be contained in the Executive Procedures Manuel but there was the creation of a handbook for
student government appointees to comply with the Employment Standards Act and good HR practices.

- 2 handbooks already, doesn’t include student government employee handbook.
- Need to find a way to reference the new student government handbook
- Suggestion to make changes under article 2, mirror language from article one, and describe the handbook there.
- Make it the default source for employment related information, with additional information related to governance positions to be contained in the Executive Procedures Manual.
- Sheldon to draft code for next meeting.

Change of Position Description For Composting Coordinator

- This change would add an additional composting coordinator (from 1 to 2), and increase their hours from 4 to 5 hours per week.
- It’s felt that the workload merits this, and the proper process has been followed.

Moved: John Chow  
Seconded: Gary Tse

That the changes to the position description for the Composting Coordinator be approved as presented.

*Approved with unanimous consent.*

Next Meeting

Next meeting – Wednesday the 13th of February at 3:00pm in SUB 213.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 3:54 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of February 27th, 2013

Attendance

Kyle Warwick (VP External), John Chow (Councillor), Tristan Miller (VP Finance), Jennifer Law (Councillor), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (Councillor), Dan Olson (member-at-large), Anne Kessler (Councillor), Paolo Mercado (member-at-large)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Tanner B. (AVP External)

Recording Secretary: John Chow

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:30 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Tristan Miller          Seconded: Justin Fernandes

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Kyle Warwick          Seconded: Jennifer Law

That the minutes of the Feb 6 meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

Approved with majority consent.

Justin Fernandes Abstains

External Advocacy Commissions

- ADVOCOM is a new proposed Commission
- To create a new commission for VP-External
- Vice chair will be hired and appointed
Along with Associate VP-External
Aboriginal and other political clubs are interested in sitting in the committee
Tristan: There’s a rule about vice chairs and associate VP’s?
Sheldon: AVP can be vice chair
Tanner: I don’t want AVP to be vice chair
AVP and Councillors can attend but not be part of
Commissions are not the same as committees and consist of people outside of the AMS council
Article 3 is suspended until New Executives are turned over on Friday. (Should not be considered at the moment)
Kyle: If people are OK, the substance of it is ready to go and the value of it is acceptable.
Sheldon: In article 2, it is stated that the Vice-Chair-to-be needs to be hired but also that the Vice-Chair has to be an active member appointed by council.
  o Change text to: 6 Active members and 1 shall be Vice Chair
Ekateryna: Is the AVP an active member in this commission.
Hans: The AVP is an addition to the 6 appointed active members
To be determined later. Code to be edited outside of meeting.

VP Academic Proposed Position Descriptions

The Campus Development Project Assistant is a member of the AMS University Commission, which supports the work of the Vice-President Academic and University Affairs.
The Assistant will be responsible for aiding the VP Academic and Campus Development Commissioner in developing and implementing the Acadia Park Community Needs Assessment.

2 Month Position:
  o Engaging residence and assistance with quant/qual analysis.
  o Facilitate interviews/meetings with residences
Final Report will be completed my Kiran
Sheldon: Have to go to council
New positions should be recommended to council by LPC

Moved: Dan Olson                                      Seconded: John Chow

That LPC recommend to Council the creation of the Campus Development Project Assistant as described.

Passes without dissent

Anne Kessler Abstaining
Mental Health and Well Being Commissioner

- The Mental Health and Well-being Commissioner supports the lobbying work of the University Commission. The Commissioner is responsible for conducting research, writing report, policy briefs and recommendations on issues pertaining to student mental health and wellbeing at UBC. The Commissioner will play an integral role in carrying out the goals and strategies identified in the UBC Mental Health Network Strategic Plan and will work collaboratively with the AMS Vice-President Academic and University Affairs and Chair of the UBC Mental Health Network.
- Council has already passed the motion of hiring this commissioner. However, it is unsure if the job description for this position has been presented to Council.
- Approve now and come back to it later

Move: Kyle Warwick   Seconded: Ekateryna Baranovskaya

That LPC approve the job description for the Mental Health and Well Being Commissioner, as described.

*Passes without dissent*

Anne Kessler Abstaining

Changes to the Name of the Facilities Manager

- Facilities Retail Manager was changed to Sales Manager
- Position still held by Jeffery but the name of the position has been changed
- Changes for SAC code: The sales manager or their designate shall attend meetings of SAC

Moved: Anne Kessler   Seconded: Tristan Miller

That LPC recommend to council approval of the code changes described in “Code Changes 2013: Sales Manager”.

*Passes without dissent*

Ekateryna Baranovskaya Abstaining
Personnel Handbook Code Changes

- Changes: These are not the only personnel handbooks. There will be a third.
- Chris said it looked fine to him

Moved: Ekateryna Baranovskaya           Seconded: Kyle Warwick

That LPC recommend to council approval of the code changes described in “Code Changes 2013: Personnel Handbook”

*Approved with unanimous consent*

Council Taxi Reimbursements

Ekateryna: Edit the code on Taxi Reimbursements as it is a problem for councilors who depend on Transit to get home in areas that are far away from UBC.

*Discussion on budgetary restraints, timing of taxi eligibility, etc.*

Determined that budget Committee should look into this program, as there is no budget allocated for Taxi Reimbursements at the moment

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 3:59 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 6th, 2013

Attendance

Present: John Chow (Councillor), Jennifer Law (Councillor), Justin Fernandes (Councillor), Hans Seidemann (Chair), Anne Kessler (Councillor), Justin Chang (Councillor), Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance), Gary Tse (Member-at-large)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Tanner Bokor (VP External)

Regrets: Derek Moore (VP Administration)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:14 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: John Chow Seconded: Anne Kessler
That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: John Chow Seconded: Jennifer Law
That the minutes of the Feb 27 meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

Approved without dissent.

Justin Fernandes Abstains

ADVOCOM Code Changes

#
Hans: The code change was sent around already. Tanner and Sheldon have consulted on it, and ExecCom already passed it through already.

Tanner: There were a few changes from the last draft presented: grammatical changes, added AVP as a voting member, and added chair of UNECORN as an invited guest.

Anne points out that UNECORN was written wrong.

Justin: If a GSS member was appointed, will the GSS non-voting seat still be there?

Tanner: Yes. The changes also allow the AVP to be the vice chair if the commission agrees.

Hans: SUDS is removed?

Tanner: Yes

Anne: If the AVP is the vice chair, there’d be 5 active member. Was that intended?

Tanner: That was intended.

Hans: So at most there would be 8 voting members, 7 if AVP is the chair.

Moved: Joaquin Acevedo Seconded: Anne Kessler

LPC recommend Council adopt the ADVOCOM code changes.

*Approved with unanimous consent*

**Discussion on Timing of the Executive Reports**

Sheldon: Code requires 3 executive reports a year. Section 6 of the executive section states they should be submitted by the last meeting in May (for goal setting), 1st meeting in September (for progress), 1st meeting in January (for ending). January didn’t make sense as their terms are not done. Code was suspended for this reason. Historically it used to be later in February, but it was moved earlier as the final report tends to be forgotten.

Hans: These dates will be changed with the exec start/end dates.
Anne: September seems early.

Hans: October would’ve made sense timing-wise, but September is usually for what I did over the summer, even though it was only 3 months between the first one, with 6 months until the next one.

Joaquin: It makes sense to me that these reports take place at the beginning of May/end of April, late September, and maybe the end of January.

Hans: First meeting of May, last meeting of September, first meeting of February seems to make sense.

Discussion on Clarifying Oversight Rules

Sheldon: Timing for oversight is set in Section 5, article 14, paragraph 3 for the Ombudsperson (in July, October, February). In Section 6 article 1 paragraph 8 it states that oversight should meet in February within 2 weeks of elections.

Hans: PAR should be determined after everything (eg reports) are completed. Tying to the executive reports’ timing might work. Goals are meant to be submitted by middle of May; maybe it should be more specified. Maybe we could have all of oversight meet with all execs instead of the 2 people team.

Anne: Should one of the meetings be specific to their PAR (~January)?

Hans: When we did oversight this year, all meetings were related to PAR (What are your goals, how are they it going, etc). If we did meeting in May, October, and February, it would line up with reports. May to set goals, October to change if anything major occurs, and February to determine PAR.

Anne: Should we have it in code that it is the role of both Oversight and Executives to hold the meeting?

Hans: That’s a good idea. Setting a time in code might help, especially if chair changes within the year like this year. I like the team interview idea.

Justin: Should we tie it to the reports?
Hans: To have a report for May, Oversight would have to meet with the executives in April. Maybe we can suggest April, October, February as PAR goal meetings.

Anne: Should that be stated to be separate from the quarterly team meeting?

Hans: That is a separate meeting. Maybe we can specify it more.

Sheldon: What about 3b?

#
3:49pm Justin F left

Hans: Change b to say April, set goals, October, review progress and suggest changes when appropriate, February to evaluate progress against PAR goals and set PAR payment. Just so there’re less places for the chair to look for it.

Anne: Should we keep 3ai?

Hans: Most of 3a should be kept. We’ll add the changes to 3b. With regards to PAR goals in Oversight Committee, in section 6 article 1, paragraph 8 d, e, f) measurable goals section; execs and oversight have problem communicating with how these goals are evaluated. We tried to do that while approving the goals, and asked how these goals should be evaluated. (Eg Matt’s beer hall goal, it specified how many beer halls, and with how many attendees, etc). Some of these will be more qualitative than quantitative. With specific goals, success would be 100% of PAR, non-success could be judged by how much has been accomplished towards the goal. Should there be criteria on how the goals are evaluated.

Gary: Is there a format for the goals to be written?

Hans: No. Some executive teams coordinated, some don’t.

Gary: If there is a standard form that had the overarching goal, as well as parameters to achieving it, it would make it easier for executives and oversight to implement it.

Hans: If goals are not met, then it’s more subjective to “how much was done”. As a hypothetical example with Whistler Lodge, if everything was done to try to get it sold, but a referendum failed, it was not accomplishable, despite all efforts put in. A standardized goal form might be helpful, especially if there are measurement steps.

Action item: Have Oversight make a form/set up a framework for PAR evaluation.
Joaquin: I like the idea, although maybe it would be too free or too restricting depending on how the chair forms it.

Anne: We should just have it created once, instead of having it created every year in Oversight.

Hans: A lot of the time executives can’t/don’t fulfill the goal, but have done a lot of things relevant to the goals.

Joaquin: What if we list 5~8 steps to achieve the goal?

Hans: That’d be useful in the October meeting, so maybe a few of the steps could be changed.

Sheldon: Regards to code, did you want to make things more specific or more vague?

Hans: More specific.

Sheldon: section e) – add steps to be taken to achieve those goals to the goals/deliverable.

Hans: Yes, and mention and/or a measurable metrics for the goals, which could be used for evaluation. Maybe even adding it as a separate paragraph specifying this section. PAR payment dates in Feb should change.

# Joaquin left at 4:12pm

Anne: Are we going to talk about the employment of PAR just for the legal issues? Because it is a blurry line between payment versus bonus. This should probably be clarified.

Hans: Sounds good, we should invite people (Eg, Chris, Ross) next meeting.

Sheldon: Intended goals are not included in PAR goals due to it being harder to achieve, than easier goals that they will likely achieve.

Gary: Wasn’t the point of oversight to be a conversation? So that they can pick up on that?
Hans: There is a distinction between what had to be done, versus new achievable goals.

Anne: Should we have provision of the right type of goals?

Hans: The goals are meant to be related to the portfolio including but not limited to hiring, etc... Goals set in the past are usually good, and it’s been more of an evaluation issue. Goals are also harder to define because of the roles of the different executive.

Discussion on Referenda Code Changes

Sheldon: It might be more useful for me to go over it to then make suggestions next meeting.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.
Attendance

Present: Justin Fernandes (Councillor), Hans Seidemann (Chair), Anne Kessler (Councillor), Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance), John Chow (Councillor), Gary Tse (Member at Large), Justin Chang (Councillor).

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council)

Recording Secretary: Joaquin Acevedo

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:14 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Anne Kessler  Seconded: John Chow

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Code Changes for PAR

Hans: This package has changes for the timing in PAR.

Anne: I suggest that there be an additional meeting specified: one in April to work on PAR goals and a second in May to approve PAR goals.

Sheldon: PAR goals are due no later than middle of May.

Hans: We should add to Oversight Committee in Section 3, b would include a meeting in May to approve goals prior to going to Council.

Hans: We need feedback from Ross and Chris about PAR. There was an issue this past year determining how to evaluate progress to a goal that may not have been met
completely. Goals now include steps or deliverables to help do this. Metrics in goals must be included to be approved.

Anne: Section D should include language that specifies that PAR payment can be prorated based on steps and deliverables.

Justin: That is already included, what if Executives reach a goal without following steps?

Ross: I would use the steps only if the goal is not achieved. We shouldn’t get too specific in case their goal is no longer realistic.

Hans: It is now emphasized that Execs can modify their goals in October in case that needs to happen.

Anne: A criticism of PAR is that Executives make goals that are easier to reach and don’t take risks. We should make full PAR payment available at the discretion of Oversight if all steps are completed to encourage Execs to be innovative in their approach.

Justin: PAR can be obtained if the goal is achieved without following the steps but won’t be directly reflected in the language.

Hans: There is an issue with the name of restrictions of salary based on performance.

Anne: This is a bonus to the executive, perhaps the name needs to be changed to reflect this in order to avoid employment standards.

Ross: Executives are not necessarily employees, they are elected officials. The reason this was passed as a restriction was because Council wanted to influence behaviour.

Hans: (responding to a question from Justin Fernandes on when the amount of the restriction is set) The way it’s written in Code, it’s that they have a remuneration and PAR is a restriction of that. The recommendation from LPC does not need to be established every year.

Anne: Do we want it to be a restriction or a bonus?

Ross: It doesn’t matter what you call it because it is the same. In other organizations, the reason bonuses are put in place is to encourage executives to go above and beyond.
Hans: There was a perception that this money is guaranteed unless there is an extraordinary reason that it was not achieved. Perhaps, rename it as Performance Accountability Incentive.

Ross: Executives should be told that there is an earning potential including their performance during their term. Use it as positive incentive.

--- Gary Tse and Justin Chang enter the meeting --

Hans: There should be a different motion to do changes to delivery and structure from the name.

Hans: In Oversight section, add a meeting to approve and recommend Executive goals to Council. In Executive Section, add a clause that states that deliverables and steps can account for a portion of PAR and full PAR may be achieved if all steps are met and not necessarily the goal.

Anne: Add “and steps” to other sections.

Hans: We only need to reference in other sections.

Sheldon: Will send out a draft prior to next meeting.

Moved: Anne Kessler Seconded: John Chow

That LPC approve in principle, the Code changes entitled Code Changes 2013 – Oversight and PAR.

*Passes without dissent.*

*Joaquin Acevedo and Justin Chang abstain.*

**Discussion on PAR vs PAI**

Hans: We should change PAR to Performance Accountability Incentive (PAI) everywhere. Additionally, in Executive pay, change the language to reflect this to be as a bonus rather than a restriction. We can’t recall money that has already been disbursed. When creating these Code changes we need to clarify that the amount being remunerated is not changing the base salary.
Hans: May want to change Section J, to say that PAI may be reduced as opposed to withheld. Also note that 50% is of the overall PAI rather than what is achieved. I.E. an executive may reach 80% of their goals but not follow all the values leaving them with 30% of PAI.

Chris: Are Executive guaranteed then 50% of the overall PAI?

Hans: Clarification – this is not related to achievement of other goals. It is based on the whole potential PAI. They are additive not percentages.

Sheldon will work on the language based on the intentions of LPC.

Chris: There should be no issues with this. Asks about evaluations and would like to see how values are measured.

Anne: Does Oversight need to have minutes submitted to Council?

Sheldon: Yes, but there are some things that shouldn’t be included. There can be in Camera minutes to be kept in Archives but not circulated.

Hans: Need basic committee minutes, but in Camera minutes are in Archives.

Chris: HR is in charge of employment files. Thinks that Executive files should be kept in HR regardless of technical status of Executive.

Hans: Therefore, private minutes of Oversight should be kept by HR and add language in Code that would direct people to visit HR to see these.

Sheldon: It’s legal to publish pay of executives, but not specific to a position or individual.

Hans: Suggests that the paragraph be amended that a summary should include basic findings but exclude percentages or dollar values of remuneration. This is a good balance between transparency and privacy issues. These will have placeholder for Council but we’ll need to receive a copy of the discussed changes and vote on it next week.
Approval of Minutes

Moved: John Chow  Seconded: Gary Tse

That the minutes of the Mar. 6th meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

Approved, Opposed by Justin Chang.

Executive Code Changes – Executive Reports

Hans: Streamline the schedule with Oversight. Reflect our discussion last week.

Justin: What’s the role of VP Academic in keeping the reports?

Hans: Suggests a change that each Executive will be responsible to submitting their report to Council.

Gary: Notes that it’s already tied to PAR and could be struck unless you want to be specific.

Hans: We’ll strike paragraph 6 as it is already listed specifically in PAR.

Moved: Gary Tse  Seconded: Justin Chang

That the code changes entitled “Code Changes 2013: Executive Reports” be approved as amended.

Approved without dissent.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 20th, 2013

Attendance

Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance), Anne Kessler (Councillor), John Chow (Councillor), Jennifer Law (Councillor), Justin Fernandes (councillor), Hans Seidemann (Councillor), Gary Tse (member-at-large), Justin Chang (Councillor)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Tanner Bokor (VP External), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (AVP External)

Recording Secretary: Jennifer Law

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:07 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: John Chow Seconded: Anne Kessler

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Code Changes 2013: Oversight and PAR

Anne: I had a concern with section 3b) “....meeting in April, meeting in May” should be more explicit that the meetings are with the exec, and not simply meetings of the committee. Also have concerns with section 8k) “...partial payment in proportion to the extent the steps are completed”. The strict number of steps may not be a good indication of how much work is required to complete each one. The description should be more broad.

Ekaterina: You may also want to consider having disputes on PAR payments from the executive go to the Ombudsperson to work out the issue.

Hans: Ombudsperson shouldn’t really be getting involved with HR / payroll / employment concerns.

Ekat: Is the day of the payment still specified?
Sheldon: 8i) specifies that it’s made once a year, in the month of February. Not a specific date.

Moved: Anne Kessler Seconded: Jennifer Law

That LPC recommend that council consider and approve the code changes contained in “Code Changes 2013: Oversight and PAR”.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Joaquin Acevedo abstaining.

**ADVOCom Vice Chair Job Description Changes**

Tanner: The major changes to the position are that the ADVOCom Vice Chair now also takes on the duties of the old SUDS commissioner during the summer. To account for this, we’ve given the position an increased 5 hours a week over the course of the term (now 20 hours).

Hans: Do we need to send this to council for approval, or can we simply approve it ourselves?

Sheldon: Code states “When a new appointed position is created, the terms of employment, including but not limited to the job description and the number of hours for that position, shall be set by Council in the Code or by a Council Resolution, on the recommendation of the Legislative Procedures Committee.”

Hans: This would be a new position, since we struck down the old commission. We should take this to council, even though the position existed previously, since there is an increase in hours anyways.

Joaquin: The executive committee decided that the SUDS commissioner should not be paid at tier 2 since the job has no content creation, only coordination.

Tanner: We determined that the best thing to do was remove the SUDS commissioner, and allow ADVOCom Vice Chair to take on those duties instead, since they also have work to do over the summer, for instance, provincial election campaigns.

Sheldon: There has been a desire in the past to not have more hours for a single position. 20 hours might be a bit much?

Hans: The difference between 15 and 20 hours isn’t really all that significant though.

Sheldon: Code specifies there must be a minimum of 15, so 20 is likely fine.
Moved: Jennifer Law  Seconded: John Chow

That LPC recommend to Council the creation of the position of ADVOCom Vice Chair, as presented.

Passes without dissent.

Joaquin Acevedo and Justin Chang abstaining.

Code Changes 2013: Executive Performance Incentive

Hans: Section 8L isn’t worded as we had talked about at the last meeting. This reduces the amount of PAI available to be earned, instead of reducing their payment, calculated earlier, by a percentage of the total available PAI (up to 50%). We should consider changing the wording to something more like “reduce the incentive payment by up to 50% of the total incentive”.

Justin Chang: We may also want to add wording to ensure that it’s clear the payment can never be less than $0.

Ekateryna: That’s unnecessary. You can’t have a negative dollar amount bonus, or force them to pay the society. Also there are two broad sections of PAI: the goal setting section, and the values violation part. We need to arrange them so that it gives the executives incentives, and ensure that oversight is reasonable with their evaluation.

Gary: Should we define the PAI maximums and payments more clearly. Maybe through a definition in code?

Anne: It’s pretty clear for now, but it just doesn’t do what we want it to do.

Hans: We can look later into adding definitions in code to help clarify.

Sheldon: Section 8a specifies that "Council may create and set the maximum value of a Performance Accountability Incentive, payable to members of the Executive in addition to their regular remuneration".

Hans: we should refer to that section when talking about the 50% for values violations.

Anne: Maybe we should include an example for illustration purposes.

Gary: Examples are poor form, since they can never cover all possibilities. Better to be clear in the code.
Hans: Here’s my suggested wording for the section: “If a member of the Executive has, in the opinion of the Oversight Committee, violated the Society’s Values, the Oversight Committee may recommend to Council that the incentive payment, as determined in accordance with paragraph (j) above, be reduced by up to 50% of the maximum value of the incentive, as set by council subject to paragraph (a) above, such a reduction to take effect only if approved by a Two-thirds (2/3) Resolution of Council.”

Hans: Also, we should make sure that section 8J doesn’t refer to section 8L anymore, and take away that wording in the paragraph.

Sheldon: Why?

Justin Chang: Up to section L, the code refers to how the PAI payment should be determined based on the goals set. After calculating that, then if the society’s values are violated, then we’ll reduce the payment by up to 50% of the total available payment. If we have J refers to L, then it will become circular.

Sheldon: Should we put these changes off to another meeting?

Hans: As it’s my last council meeting tonight, and I expect these may be contentious, I want to be able to be present as Chair to speak to them.

Anne: Note that section 3B still refers to PAR.

John: Why is the potential value violation deduction up to 50% of the total PAI? Did council decide this?

Hans: The percentage was set by LPC back in the day so that Oversight couldn’t go overboard with the reduction. To go ahead with a reduction as well, Oversight has to recommend it to council, who votes on it.

Move: John Chow

Seconded: Anne Kessler

That LPC approve and recommend to council the code changes contained in “Code Changes 2013: Executive Performance Incentive”.

Passed without dissent

Joaquin Acevedo Abstaining
Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 4:04 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 27th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance), Justin Chang (Councillor), John Chow (Councillor), Justin Fernandes (Councillor), Anne Kessler (Councillor), Jennifer Law (Councillor), Derek Moore (VP Administration), Hans Seidemann (Chair).

Also Present: Ekateryna Baranovskaya (AVP External), Matthew Duguay (ECSS), Kiran Mahal (VP Academic and University Affairs).

Regrets: Gary Tse (Member-at-Large)

Recording Secretary: Justin Chang

Call to Order

The meeting is called to order at 3:26 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Anne Kessler Seconded: Joaquin Acevedo

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent, quorum was not met.

Change of Job Descriptions from the Services Coordinators

Matthew: Original contracts were for 52 weeks, but we want to switch that to 53 weeks, in order to have a one week overlap between the old and new coordinators. This realistically only extend their term from the Tuesday to the Friday. The existing coordinators would end on May 3rd, while the new coordinators will come in on April 29th.

Hans: Have all the people affected been notified?
Matthew: Yes.

Moved: Joaquin Acevedo          Seconded: Anne Kessler

BiRT LPC recommends that council approves the contract extensions for all 8 service coordinators.

*Approved with unanimous consent, quorum was not met.*

**ECSS Other coordinators**

Matthew: Some changes have been made to some coordinator roles:

Externship Coordinator: Added job description to say that they should coordinate with the alumni office.

Volunteer Coordinator: The hours will be lowered to 10 hours/week, as workload did not justify the hours.

Internship Coordinator: Job description changed to include active recruitment events, in addition to a reduction to 10 hours/week.

Minischool: Job description changed to include the submission of reports to ECSS, and they will no longer require Serving It Right, as it was not vital to their role.

Speakeasy: Job description changed to include that they work with peer counsellor.

*Regarding Volunteer and Externship coordinators’ hours being reduced from 20 hours to 10 hours a week.*

Hans: Have they all been informed?

Matthew: Yes.

Hans: Can these be documented into meeting minutes/a memo?

Joaquin: Are Externship, Internship and Volunteer related to Volunteer Connect?

Matthew: They used to be, but since the volunteer connect coordinator was removed, the three coordinators are equal.
John Chow and Justin Fernendes entered.

Moved: Justin Chang       Seconded: Joaquin Acevedo

BiRT LPC approves the changes to job description for the remainder of the coordinators.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Change in Job Description for the Services Review Associate

Kiran: We’re doing a services review, and this person will facilitate. This position will be Tier 1.

Hans: Do they need 20 hours a week?

Kiran: There will be a lot of data collection to do, and we want to do it while the coordinators are still around.

Anne: Why is it under your portfolio?

Kiran: It’s under the ECSS, but I have worked with the services for two years now.

Moved: Joaquin Acevedo       Seconded: Jennifer Law

BiRT LPC recommends that council approve the job description for the Services Review Associate.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Change in Job Descriptions under VPAdmin’s portfolio

Kiran: These are on behalf of Derek (VP Administration). All the positions here were bumped into tier 2, but it might not be appropriate for the actual work done.

Joaquin: These aren’t budgeted yet.

Derek entered at 3:50pm

Derek: I intended to increase the pay because I believed they work harder than usual employees, but was not aware of the tiered system.
Arts Gallery Commissioner - Changes in hours from 20 hours to 25 hours/week, and pay rate changed to $11.25.

Derek: After reviewing with the out-going commissioner, it seems that 20 hours was not enough, since the shows at the art gallery switch so often, and the commissioner would have to manage the transition. There is also a duty change to remove updating the website, as there is now someone who handles that.

Hans: Are there anyone who reports to the commissioner?

Derek: There are volunteers that are present at the gallery.

Joaquin: Will these changes start with the next person?

Derek: Yes.

Anne: It is stated that Tier 1 up to 15 hours/week and are entry-level, Tier 2 up to 20 hours/week for supervisory roles.

Hans: I think those are based on the existing positions. The Art Gallery Commissioner do supervise volunteers.

Justin: And what about the hour increase?

Hans: That was true to the positions when these were established. The tiers were designed for wages and not for hours.

Anne: The position is specified to be in Tier 1, but it does not seem to be an entry level jobs.

Moved: Derek Moore Seconded: Jennifer Law

BiRT LPC approves the changes to the job description of the Art Gallery Commissioner.

Approved without dissent, Justin Chang abstains.

SAC Club Administrator

Derek: We made the difference between the administrator and the vice chair more clear. Their duty sometimes overlap, so we clarified the description, so that it states it is
more administrative work as opposed to conflict resolution (which is under the job description of the vice chair).

Hans: Is that position in code?

Derek: I’m not sure; it is only 2 years old.

Hans: I don’t believe they are in code, so LPC can approve these changes.

Joaquin: Why does it merit Tier 2?

Derek: Works with the SAC vice chair, deals with administrative work. No supervisory work.

Hans: LPC doesn’t suggest changes, only approve and recommend to council where appropriate. Supervisors are the only one that should suggest.

Moved: Jennifer Law  Seconded: John Chow

BiRT LPC approves the changes to the job description of the SAC Clubs Administrator.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Assistant to the VP Administration

Derek: The job description has been increased from 15 hours to 20 hours/week. The current assistant has expressed the heavy workload.

Joaquin: Other assistants are 10 to 15 hours/week. The current assistants switched roles and also dealt with SUDS, which is why the positions merited more hours.

Anne: We can hire at 15 hours/week for the summer, then readjust if it is appropriate.

Discussion on PAI definitions in code

Discussion on Code changes related to referenda results

Hans: Both will be tabled until next meeting so that Sheldon can be present.
Approval of March 13th Minutes

Moved: Anne Kessler  Seconded: John Chow

These minutes are approved

Approved without dissent, Justin Fernendes and Justin Chang abstained.

Approval of March 20th Minutes

Moved: Anne Kessler  Seconded: Joaquin Acevedo

These minutes are approved

Approved without dissent, Justin Fernendes abstained.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of May 7th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Paul McDade (Councillor), Serena Ng (Councillor), Derek Moore (VP Admin), Anne Kessler (Chair), Hans Seidemann (Member-at-large), Phaidra Ruck (Councillor)

Guests: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk-of-Council), Caroline Wong (AMS President), Chris Panadero (HR), Tanner Bokor (VP External)

Regrets: Chris Roach (Councillor), Maria Mohan (Member-at-large), Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance)

Recording Secretary: Hans Seidemann

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:14 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Derek Moore Seconded: Serena Ng

That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

VP Academic Commissioner Contract Extensions

Anne: LPC Considers changes to contract terms for appointed AMS employees. There are two commissioners in the VP Academic portfolio who need extensions because they haven’t been able to hire replacements yet. They need extensions until May 17th for the Equity Commissioner and the Campus Development Commissioner.

Moved: Derek Moore Seconded: Paul McDade
That the contract extensions for the Equity Commissioner and Campus Development Commissioner be approved as presented.

_The motion carries unanimously._

**Code Changes Related to Bylaw Changes From Referenda**

Anne: We changed the bylaws through referendum back in January, principally to remove the student senate caucus, and to add affiliated institutions to AMS council. Those changes passed, but the code still reflects the old bylaws, and needed updating. Sheldon was previously directed to update code, and has provided the package before us, which corrects those two problems.

Hans: Are these all the bylaw-related changes?

Anne: It’s all I’ve received from Sheldon, we’d have to check with him. As far as I know though, this is it.

Phaidra: Did we confirm why we want to separate Senate Caucus instead of bringing it in to the AMS?

Anne: Yes. The Senate is a UBC body, we’ve just held their elections for them, but we’ve never had any real authority over their actions.

Phaidra: But do we want to affirm that separation? It looks like the original intention of the old bylaws was to try and exert some influence on that body. Do we want to abandon that?

Hans: We never really had any authority to influence them, so this maintains our connection, but doesn’t try to exert influence where we don’t have any.

Sheldon: Senate Caucus has existed as a completely separate body for years now. I could have looked into how it was intended to be managed back in the 70’s when it was drawn up, but didn’t.

Hans asked Sheldon whether these are all the bylaw-related changes to code, and Sheldon said yes, except for those which come into effect later (i.e. executive turnover

Moved: Phaidra Ruck  
Seconded: Paul McDade

That LPC recommend that council approve the code changes contained in CODE CHANGES 2013: SENATE CAUCUS and AFFILIATES.

_The motion carries unanimously._
Discussion on Wage Tiers

Anne: 2 years ago Council passed a motion creating 3 tiers of compensation for employees: one for regular employees, one for supervisory roles, and one for specialized skills. It was only ever passed in council, but never included in code, which makes it hard to reference and make good use of. We’d like to put this in code, but it sparks a larger discussion on who is covered by these tiers. Is it everyone who’s not permanent staff? Does it cover all the business employees? For instance, why are some positions appointed and not hired?

Chris: Sheldon might be better to explain that.

Sheldon: The larger issue is who does this cover? Who are considered student government employees?

Chris: The way I think of student government employees is that they encompass all student employees on the government side of the org chart. Also, with the businesses, they have their own tier system, for instance, employees at the Pit follow a different structure for those serving liquor.

Sheldon: The question as I see it is who is covered by this? Employees working for permanent staff? Safewalkers? Do these people need to come to LPC for contract changes?

Chris: If you want to change contract terms, and it’s significant, it should go through LPC.

Sheldon: Code talks about a hiring process for a number of appointed positions, including but not limited to student services coordinators, commissioners, AVPS, exec assistants, publication coordinators, etc.

Hans: That list is exactly what we considered when I was chair with regards to who we considered when deciding who to hear changes for at LPC.

Caroline: But then if we want to have some checks or balances in place for employees of permanent staff, what would be the structure for that?

Sheldon: I would think that this would be best for HR or for that permanent staff member’s boss to give the ok on.
Anne: It would be a good idea though if HR followed similar tier structures for employees of permanent staff as exist for the appointed employees. We wouldn’t want a postering person working for a permanent staff member to make more than an AVP working for an executive.

Phaidra: Do we want to write all those employees into code then?

Sheldon: Alongside the tiers though, do we want to have a line that describes who has to come to LPC?

Caroline: Yes, it seems like it would make sense to have LPC only cover employees who don’t report directly to permanent staff.

Sheldon: So should we remove the AMS Insider editor from the listing, so that it doesn’t get covered by LPC’s purview?

*General approval for the suggestion that the AMS Insider be not considered by LPC*

Anne: What about several levels down the org chart? So what happens if a tutoring coordinator wants to change the hours of a given tutor? How would that work?

Sheldon: But many of the students listed in the list I provided don’t get approved by council, so do we want them to be covered by LPC or not?

Chris: I would prefer that ECSS go through LPC instead of being exempt. Even though they report to the Director of Student Services, they hire their own staff, etc.

Sheldon: Well code says that the ECSS position reports to the President.

Caroline: That shouldn’t be. They report to the Executive Director. So we should change the code to reflect that.

Hans: If a permanent staff member changes the hours of one of their employees that are unbecoming, then there’s a mechanism to deal with that: you fire the permanent staff member. Because we don’t have that option with council or committees or executives, that’s why LPC has oversight over their desired contract changes. We should only be handling those.

Caroline: ECSS should be an employee of the executive director, who would have the authority to punish or fire them, which would remove LPC’s responsibility to manage their hires and changes to their contract terms. If ECSS wants to change hours or wages, they should do it through the Executive Director or HR.
Hans: So long as we have consistent wage tiers across the governmental organizational units, then that should be fine.

Sheldon: So I should draft code to account for this? There are also sections for determining how to appoint coordinators. Should we remove that as well?

*General agreement that the ECSS should not need LPC approval for changes in the terms of employment for their employees, and that the tiers and needing LPC approval should be for employees or appointees of council, committees of council and the executive.*

Someone asked whether the services would be covered under the tiers, and Sheldon clarified that the services already had their own tier system. It was asked whether student employees of permanent staff should be covered, and there was general agreement that they should have their own separate but similar wage tier system. Sheldon is going to draft some code to reflect these changes.

Anne: We should move on the tier system specifically. There are three tiers, at $10.50/hr for entry level, $11.25/hr for supervisory and $12.25/hr for specialized skills. *She brought up the presentation for the April 2011 meeting and showed them.* The reason for the change was that the minimum wage was increased and it was decided that we should standardize wages to be more equitable between positions and to have more clarity about appropriate wages.

Paul: The descriptions for the tiers are very vague.

Anne: Yes, the motion had very little description and only described which positions are which tier. We want to add more detail about the tiers to make it easier to decide which position is which tier.

Phaidra: Can you send the powerpoint to us?

Anne: Yes.

Sheldon is going to draft something for next meeting for us to review.

Caroline: Just to let the committee know, one item of business that will be upcoming during the summer is changes to committees.

**Adjourn**

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

Minutes of May 13th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Anne Kessler (Chair), Phaidra Ruck (Councilor), Maria Mohan (At-Large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist and Clerk of Council), Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance), Serena Ng (Councilor)

Guests: Tanner Bokor (VP External), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (AVP External)

Regrets: Chris Roach (Councilor), Hans Seidemann (At-Large), Paul McDade (Councilor), Derek Moore (VP Admin)

Recording Secretary: Phaidra Ruck

CALL TO ORDER 1:10pm

Approval of Agenda

Additions: Amendments to FINCOM vice chair hours and code change to remove First Week from the list of services

Moved: Phaidra Ruck Seconded: Joaquin Acevedo

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Phaidra Ruck Seconded: Serena NG

Abstention: Joaquin

That the minutes of May 7th, 2013 be approved.
The motion carries.

FINCOM Hours

Joaquin: The FINCOM vice chair currently works 15 hrs week, and the VP Finance office is normally supported by a couple other positions. The position has been working more than 15 hrs week, 1 person is taking on more work, rather than distribution among the smaller positions. It takes time to hire the team, so I am recommending we increase the hours to reflect the workload increase and hours to 20 hours.

Moved by: Joaquin Avecedo  
Seconded: Serena NG

BITR LPC recommend to council to increase hours of the FINCOM Vice-Chair position from 15 to 20 hours/week for the remainder of the term, until April 2014.

Note: The current occupant of the position has agreed to this change.

Motion carries.

PAY TIERS

ANNE: The tiers system was passed a couple years ago, and now we are trying to work out how we will work this into code.

EKAT: Codifying the difference between regular staff and appointed staff?

Sheldon: This refers to current code for appointees and employees.

Joaquin: What about the issue of BAGB? We don’t want them to fall under this.

Sheldon: We can exclude BAGB.

Sheldon: Here’s the list of who is included so far (2nd paragraph lists) ... commissioners, vice presidents, exec assistants, shinerama coordinator, etc.

What is left out is the service coordinators, because they are not appointed, they are regular employees.

Anne: The services already have their own tiers that were approved by council.
Joaquin: In terms of pay equity, we should try to bring that in.

Sheldon: This came up before.

Anne: I think that as long as the pay is similar, we don’t have a pay equity issue.

JOAQUIN EXITS FOR ANOTHER COMMITMENT

QUORUM IS LOST

Sheldon: This is the first stab at trying to bring order

TANNER EXITS

Anne: This is so employees can go through HR but Execs have to come to LPC for changes to the terms of employment for positions. Usually, it’s just minute position description changes, like Joaquin just did.

Ekat: This is one of the only mechanisms of council that interacts with the job descriptions of the services to keep in the loop. Sometimes it is important to have the oversight and control over the questions, such as why a job hours are cut.

Anne: But having them come to LPC takes time from other issues.

Serena: If it doesn’t come here, where does it go?

Anne: The executive director, which is currently unfilled so it would be the President.

Phaidra: Are services and appointees the same people?

Sheldon: We are looking at changing these positions to not be appointed.

Ekat: It depends on which position.

Phaidra: Maybe we can have a written record of the job changes.

TANNER RETURNS

Anne: So we can add a part any job description changes or changes in the terms of employment under the ECSS will require consultation with the Exec director, and a rationale (quick note) be available for the reason for the change. A well, we should exclude BAGB.

Serena: Where else are the tiers written?
Anne: No where, only the original motion.

Phaidra: Recommend to strike ‘professional’ from highest tier, change to specialized, to reflect wage is not the level usually regarded as that of a professional.

Anne: We should also add more of a description of a tier, maybe add which position is which tier into code?

Sheldon: This would be helpful as a point of reference.

Serena: Maybe we should postpone approving this?

Anne: Yes, Sheldon will edit the draft and we will look again next meeting.

**ECSS CHANGES**

Tanner: We should wait for Caroline

Anne: I would like to see them stay in council, but we will discuss this fully another time.

**FIRST WEEK**

Anne: Listed as a service, but it’s an event that’s run by the events office. The recommendation is to strike from a list of services.

Sheldon: Another question was whether SASC should be listed here since it is not run under the ECSS.

Anne: There is a services review right now, we should maybe wait until that’s done.

Tanner: We are just going through the process of hiring someone to manage this project right now, so we should wait.

Moved: Phaidra Ruck                Seconded: Serena Ng

BIRT remove First week from the list of services.

_Carries Unanimously_
Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of May 21, 2013

Attendance

Present: Phaidra Ruck (Councillor), Chris Roach (Councillor), Paul McDade (Councillor), Niloufar Keshmiri (Councillor), Cole Leonoff (Councillor), Hans Seidemann (Member-at-large), Anne Kessler (Chair)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Tanner Bokor (VP External) Matthew Duguay (ECSS), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (AVP External)

Regrets: Maria Mohan (Member-at-large)

Recording Secretary: Hans Seidemann

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 4:07 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Chris Roach    Seconded: Paul McDade

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Hans Seidemann    Seconded: Anne Kessler

That the minutes of the May 13 meeting of LPC be approved as presented.

Approved without dissent.
Tiers and Appointees in Code:

Anne: This was brought to LPC as a draft last meeting, but it was felt further revisions were needed.

Paul: Is there any reason we use the specific wages for each tier?

Anne: It’s really hard to find out what the pay rates are, this makes it readily findable / accessible.

Ekateryna: Short of having it in code, it’s really hard to find them.

Phaidra: Does this raise a problem by putting it in code that if a wage tier wants to be changed, it requires 2/3 instead of a simple majority vote of council?

Hans: Council already does 2/3 for setting procedures for employees, so the standards would be the same for wages.

Ekateryna: More oversight over wages is generally better anyways.

Sheldon: Why are we including appointees who report to committees? Other than Eric Gauf last year, when will this be used?

Anne: It’s easier for us to have the description exist, than have to add it in later if we ever create the position?

Sheldon: What about poll clerks? Should they be included as appointees? They report to the Elections administrator, which is appointed themselves.

Chris: How much time do Elections Administrators have to hire these poll clerks?

Tanner: They’ll likely get hired in July, and hire their poll clerks usually right before the election (in January).

Anne: So we’re agreed that the sections covering appointees would also cover poll clerks?

General assent
Sheldon: Is this really what we want? If a commission decides to hire posterers and things like that to do work for them, do we want them to be considered appointees?

Hans: There shouldn’t be a situation with a commission or committee hiring an employee, unless they’ve been set up as an executive project officer, since it’s the only structure that allows for an employee to report to those bodies. In those cases, they should be covered by the rules regarding appointees.

Sheldon: So do we want to add a line to include those who report to the elections committee?

Hans: Why don’t we just say that it includes anyone who reports to an appointee?

Paul: But there might be a lot of people who fall under that description?

Sheldon: We could add it in to the section that describes appointees?

General Assent

Anne: With regards to the pay rates, I didn’t think we were going to include the pay rates in the code in the same place as the description, because that may impact how easy it is to change.

Hans: If it’s in the code, it’ll require a 2/3 vote anyways. My only suggestion would be to include the name of the tier next to the pay rate, so that it’s clear which is which.

Phaidra: Are we going to run into problems with this definition conflicting with the pay rates of existing position?

Anne: No. They should agree with the existing positions. They were all brought in line with the tiers when they were introduced.

Anne: My other question was with AVP’s though: since they’re not technically supervisors, they wouldn’t be included in tier two, but they work independently, and aren’t entry levels.

Phaidra: Could we say that tier 2 also includes specialized skills, and tier 3 has “advanced” specialized skills?
Chris: It seems like you could make the argument that AVP’s have specialized skills, and could be considered tier 3.

Ekateryna: Could we leave the tier of a given AVP to their executive?

Chris: If council wants to put an employee at a given pay-scale, it doesn’t matter what the description is, right? If they wanted to pay a tier-1 employee at $12.25 per hour, they could just vote to change that.

Hans: The point of code though is to set guidelines. We should try and provide direction so that Council has something to consult down the road if they have questions.

Discussion on how the section should be worded. Eventually settled on describing tier 2 as “supervisory, or having increased responsibility”

**ECSS Discussion:**

Anne: It was discussed earlier at LPC about how ECSS should be handled. Currently, we don’t have an Executive Director, and the ECSS reports to Caroline. I like that ECSS is on council and Execom, since we created this position originally as being essentially an executive, without all the difficulties of bylaws changes and whatnot.

Matthew: I don’t have a voting seat on council. It was always conceived that the ED would be the services representative on council.

Sheldon: Caroline felt that the ECSS shouldn’t be a presidential officer, and shouldn’t report to her.

Chris: But until we have an executive director, then we should just leave things be.

Hans: Could we specify that the ED or their designate attend council?

Anne: But currently, the ED is Caroline essentially, and we don’t want her to be able to designate someone else to attend council to represent the services.

Hans: Could we set it up for Matthew to report to the GM in the interim between now and when we are in the budgetary position to hire an ED? That might work better than just having ECSS quasi-report to president for 2 years.
Anne: Caroline said she wanted to keep things as they were for now.

Chris: We should present any ideas for changes to the executive committee and let them consider it before we go ahead with anything.

**Appointment of Alternate Chair**

Sheldon reads the description of alternate chairs

Moved: Chris Roach  Seconded: Paul McDade

That Hans Seidemann be named the alternate chair of LPC.

*Approved with unanimous consent.*

**Bylaw Changes**

Anne: We’re talking about having a referendum or special general meeting in the fall. It would be good if we can take this opportunity to change bylaws where they cause problems. Sheldon and I are likely going to be drafting some suggested changes to bring to you down the road. I wanted to run them by you for feedback first.

*Reading of the list of bylaw change suggestions produced by LPC in 2012*

**Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of May 27, 2013

Attendance

Present: Anne Kessler (Councillor; Chair) Niloufar Keshmiri (member-at-large), Cole Leonoff (Councillor)

Also Present: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist, Clerk of Council), Tanner Bokor (Vice-President, External Affairs)

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 5:06 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Cole Leonoff  Seconded: Niloufar Keshmiri

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes of the May 21st meeting of the committee was postponed until the next meeting when quorum is present.

Tiers and Appointees in Code:

The most recent version of the Code changes pertaining to the tier pay-rates for appointees of Council was discussed.

Moved: Niloufar Keshmiri  Seconded: Cole Leonoff

That LPC recommend to Council to approve Code the changes titled “Appointees and Tiers.”
Approved with unanimous consent.

*Note that quorum was not present.

**Policy Guidelines**

Tanner: When Pierre first came in last year, one of the first projects that he was tasked with last year was a Policy Manual. There was a checklist used at the time that has since fallen out of use to some degree and so we felt that it should be placed in Code to help guide UNECORN and EDUCOM to ensure that the relevant steps are followed in this process unless there exists reasonable grounds on which to exempt the following of steps. Moreover, when policies expire there is nothing that happens – they simply remain in the Manual as expired policies, whereas the proposed Code changes require a notification to be delivered to Council and to the relevant committees to ensure that there is some attention given to this.

Niloufar asked whether this would amount to many notifications, with Tanner saying it would likely be once every two months or so. Sheldon asked whether Niloufar was worried that Council might become overwhelmed with this, with Niloufar confirming that concern as well as noting that it might be interpreted to diminish their importance if it seemed to be occurring so frequently. Tanner emphasized that this should not be a significant issue.

Sheldon asked about Section 2, Article 11, noting that it appeared as if two different sources could notify Council of an expiration of a policy, either the Executive Committee or relevant committee. Sheldon suggested and Tanner agreed with the notion that it should come from Executive Committee.

It was agreed that the notifications shall include the text of the policy and date it was passed.

Sheldon raised a concern with the reference to the Manual being maintained by the University and Government Relations Advisor stating that the position might not always exist or be filled; Tanner noted that given the importance of the position it is unlikely this would be an issue.
Tanner noted that changes to policies should be recommended jointly by both the University and Relations Committee and Education Committee as they are both affected.

**Elections Reserve Fund**

Anne requested that the committee debrief her on the mandate from Council for the Legislative Procedures Committee and University and External Relations Committee to meeting to discuss the Elections Reserve Fund. Anne asked for clarification on whether this would be a joint meeting or not and it was noted that from the wording of the relevant motion at Council that it would not be.

Each fund, municipal, provincial, and federal, was noted to be capped at $30,000 as a cumulative amount over the years collected from a contribution of $5,000 into each fund per year until such a cap is reached. The issue was raised that municipal spending limits for campaigns are $3,000 per organization and as such the $30,000 cap seemed unreasonable. The current balance in the accounts is $5,000 in each of the federal and municipal funds.

**Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:44 P.M.
Attendance

Present: Hans Seidemann (Member-at-large; acting Chair) Niloufar Keshmiri (member-at-large), Cole Leonoff (Councillor), Paul McDade (Councillor), Phaidra Alisha (Councillor), Derek Moore (Vice-President, Administration)

Recording Secretary: Niloufar Keshmiri

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 5:05 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Phaidra Alisha Seconded: Derek Moore

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes of the May 21st meeting.

Moved: Cole Leonoff Seconded: Paul McDade

That the circulated Minutes be approved.

Abstention: 1

Election Reserve Fund Code and Lobbying Fund:

The VP Finance requested at the previous council meeting to suspend the transfer of funding into the election reserve and lobbying fund, and the matter was tabled and sent for further review to LPC. This fund was set up just over a year ago to cover the three major areas of lobbying for the external portfolio, municipal, provincial and federal, and
it is set up on a schedule that allows for there to always be funding available for the given cycle.

There is currently $10,000 in the fund for municipal and federal elections.

The committee briefly discussed a possible transfer from the constituency aid fund, however it is defined in bylaws and therefore the current balance cannot be altered for any other purpose then as defined for the fund, prohibiting its use to fill the election reserve in case of a transfer suspension.

An alternative solution discussed by the committee was a suspension of code to allow for less to be transferred. Last year, part of the VP External budget was used to supplement spending for the election because there was only one year of transfers. However, it was the concluded by the committee that LPC would not make definitive recommendations on whether changes on a year-by-year basis depending on financial need might negatively affect future campaign efforts, that was though to be better handled by the University and External Relations Committee.

The discussion of the committee shifted to the structure and intentions of the fund. It was part of the initial intention of the fund for it to be used in order to get out the student vote and not necessarily fund an issues campaign. Part of the creation was also attributed to our departure from CASA, and the new need to conduct independent lobbying efforts. This year there were particular guidelines in place on how the AMS, and its clubs and constituencies, could act and the impact on the AMS’ spending capabilities. There is currently equal division for the three levels of government, but concerns were raised as to possible spending limits that might render the current caps ineffective.

The committee agreed unanimously that the structure of a bulk amount placed into a broad fund and then divided into separate funds is a good model, though there were still concerns about the usefulness of equal division.

Though it was consider that lobbying efforts could merely be perceived as something that a VPX could budget for in a given year, the trade-offs are negative and unnecessary for their office given the necessity of the effort.
The committee concluded that it is broadly in favour of having a fund that is also distinctly divided into three separate funds. The minimum may need to changed upon further inquiry into past spending and spending limits, but the structure of the fund as it stands is appropriate.

Those questions can be referred to UNECORN for further discussion.

Discussion is tabled.

**Constituency Aid Fund:**

The aid fund was initially interpreted to fulfil the purpose of covering any constituency shortfalls, though the outline seems to be much more broad.

The section of code allowing to furnishings replacement was interpreted by the committee to reflect emergency damages to said furnishings. The same was concluded of elections in case of emergencies. Special projects relating to academics seemed to not reflect the emergency nature of the aid fund. The only other case where this would make sense is if the constituency has a very small budgets and therefore small capabilities to do such. The committee proposed clarifying the furnishings section by prepending the code to add that the fund is designed for emergencies or where no other funding exists, independent of specifics.

Some of the limits as outlined in code seem to be irrelevant or out of date, and Hans suggested sending the limits for further review.

Phaidra asked whether there should be some oversight about the allocation of this fund, which the committed concluded falls under the jurisdiction of finance commission.

The committee concluded that should the fund not be used to cover budget shortfalls then it might be more appropriate to place a cap, given that the fund current has $75,000.

There also needs to be a look into whether constituencies experience budgets shortfalls and are incapable to withstanding any temporary shortfalls and whether the current code allowances for the funds usage are appropriate.

Point 4 of the code is also missing.
Elections Committee Bonuses:

Sheldon has drafted code that defines the pay given an off cycle election or referendum, $750 and $50 for every referendum question outside of the third.

A reference was added into the pay tier system code section with the original code appearing in Elections Bonuses.

BIRT Legislative Procedures Committee recommend that council adopt the code changes entitles Code Changes 2013: Election Bonuses.

Moved: Phaidra Alisha Seconded: Paul McDade

Approved with unanimous consent.

Policy Guidelines:

There are changes requiring notification of appropriate bodies when policies expire and a checklist of the steps taken when a policy is being formed.

The standing committee is going to be notified a month before it expires, should it expire without action, executive committee sends it back to council who could send it to exec committee.

The committee feels that the policy should be amended to include renewal in addition to the preparation of a new policy.

Hans finds the policy guidelines somewhat cumbersome and proposes the policy be sent to Anne and Sheldon for further clarification.

The committee recommends sending the guidelines to the relevant bodies and tables discussion.

Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 6:13 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of June 19, 2013

Attendance

Present: Derek Moore (VP Admin), Cole Leonoff (Councilor), Sheldon Goldfard (Archivist and Clerk of Council), Anne Kessler (Councilor and Chair), Phaidra Ruck (Councilor), Niloufar Keshmiri (Member-at-large), Chris Roach (Councilor)

Guests: Tanner Bokor (VP External)

Recording Secretary: Phaidra Ruck

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:10pm.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Cole  
Seconded: Derek

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Elections Bonuses

Sheldon: Code already passed elections bonuses in 2012. We paid the elections committee with a lump sum in the past, and when we migrated to the tier system, it paid hourly rates instead of lump sums. Then, we said, what happened to the bonuses? In January 2012, the bonuses were left out, so we passed a resolution in Council, but it didn’t go in Code. Then, our second amendment was to put the bonuses in Code. Due to the budget meeting prior to the motion, we were sensitive to people having bonuses in tough financial times. I checked with HR at it does not seem to be illegal to pay someone a bonus in general, but there is an issue if this make sense having migrated to a hourly pay system.
Anne: Some jobs on salary make up for the fact that there are irregular hours within a week (gives an example, of one job with low hours one week, and over 40 the second, paying the same rate in general)

Sheldon: We should probably amend code. Caroline emailed to follow up on the hiring of an elections administrator, which is apparently supposed to happen in April. In all the time I’ve been here, this hasn’t happened. Rather the hiring occurs closer to September and cycles through the election period.

Anne: I wonder if there is an issue of paying people more if we hire them earlier? What does the job description with the hours say?

Sheldon: I’m not sure, we can look into what happened last year as a guideline.

Anne: So, should we add in the hours, say, 60 a week to the job description?

Phaidra: This would be good for the sake of transparency.

Anne: There is an issue with paying overtime, as well...

Sheldon: One suggestion is opening up the dates, especially if it’s impossible to follow. Generally things that are impossible to follow shouldn’t be in code.

Anne: Well, things brings up the issue of how to pay overtime, and whether a bonus is the appropriate way to address the issue of referendum, or perhaps scale a bonus based on a referendum.

Niloufar: Question on hours

Sheldon: It is a general notion of ‘hours’ but it is basically salary based, according to HR.

ENTER Chris Roach

Niloufar: They work a lot of overtime in a short period of time.

Sheldon: we could rescind the bonuses and go to all hourly pay

Anne: It’s tough to support without a backup plan...

Phaidra: why don’t we just pay overtime?

Chris: We should know close to how many hours elections take.

Anne: So we need to look up the job description

Tanner: I have a meeting with the elections committee and can look into it, maybe talk to Jenny
Sheldon: well, HR knows, and the job posting should say how the hours are set.

Anne: Would you be in favour of saying something to say you will work 5 hours in October, and more in election time, etc

Chris: Maybe something less restrictive is better, so we don’t have this kind of issue coming back. Maybe it’s better to have a committee decide on needs basis, like if there is a referendum, then we think it will be X hours to the EA. I don’t think job description or terms should be in code, because it fluxates so much.

Sheldon: true, and it’s kind of inconvenient

General consensus for Anne and Sheldon to look into this more and bring it back.

Approval of the Minutes

Moved: Chris Seconded: Cole

That the minutes of June 3d, 2013 be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

SAC Skyping/phonning in

Anne: So Sac wants a mobile option for their meetings.

Sheldon: There was a question of proxies...(you can’t send a proxy to SAC)..so I drafted a mobile option after there was a demand from a SAC member.

Anne reads proposed amendment (based off of the code for committees):

**SECTION VIII A: COMMISSIONS**

**Article 1.** General

...

11. *Commissions may, at their discretion, allow members who cannot take part in a meeting in person to phone in or to connect to the meeting electronically, so long as a speaker phone or some other similar device is used to allow all members present in person or connecting from afar to hear each other and participate in debate.*
Cole: Should we clarify that they can vote? Because this just notes debate.

Phaidra: What about other electronic communications, like text or typing? How feasible is it to have hearing possible for mobile members?

Sheldon: Speakerphone is pretty good for this.

Anne: Text or typing doesn’t guarantee the member hears the whole discussion, or that the committee hears what the member thinks. Last year in LPC a member regularly phoned in successfully.

General agreement to make voting more explicitly allowed. Sheldon will draft for next meeting.

POLICY GUIDELINES

Tanner: So we discussed this at the last LPC meeting, but there were 2 people there, so here’s the second go around. Pierre has basically worked on creating a framework so policies can be effectively developed and implemented. These are checklists, and guidelines, and general information. This was approved by council last year, but it’s not really being followed. So, we came up with the idea that codifying the guidelines, with mechanism to operate under to get policies to council. I will go through the changes line by line.

Section 1, article 3.1

Sheldon: This is a technical change, since Pierre is really in touch with these documents the most, and can keep them up to date.

Section 2, Article 11.d c

General agreement around the table with changes

Section 2, Article 11.2 d

Phaidra: It would be great to have the context included with the text and the date.

Chris: I think council should be able to pass contexts, if we are doing this, because contexts can be misconstrued, and affect the interpretation of a policy.

Tanner: We can do that, going forward, to have a context statement included.

Sheldon: But- do you want Code to add text and context?
General agreement around the table with changes.

Section 2, Article 11.2 f

Sheldon: The part about amending is redundant for article 11.5.

Tanner: Can we add the second sentence to article 11.5?

General Agreement

No problems with Article 11.7 a to c

Section 2, Article 11.7 d

Anne: This seems awkward with section c above. Why not put in section c “... other person bringing it forward in consultation with the University and Government Relations Advisor”?

Tanner: That’s the intent.

General agreement on change.

Section 2, Article 11.7 e

Phaidra: the first part is redundant to 7.c.

Chris: Sometimes extra clarification is better to put things in practice.

Sheldon: We could put the end of 7.e on 7.c.

Tanner: The second part is really important

Section 2, Article 11.7 f

Chris: I’m a bit worried the way this is worded may have implications that these policies will only go to council on the approval of these 2 committees...therefore these two committees can supersede council.

Tanner: I can see that. We will can make that change.

Sheldon is going to draft these changes for next meeting for approval.

EXIT Tanner

BYLAW CHANGES
Anne: Bylaw 4.1.b: So there is a discussion to lower referendum question submissions by the membership from 1000 to match the AGM quorum at 500.

Chris: That sounds good to me. *General agreement*

Sheldon: 1% or 500, got it noted.

Anne: Bylaw 19.1.a, same thing, change to 500 or 1%?

*General agreement around the table.*

Anne: There is also a thing with having referendum Q signed by 2/3 of Constituency Presidents, bylaw 19.2.a.

Cole: Well, 2/3 constituency councils is more pragmatic, since Presidents are only one part.

Chris: Fantastic

*General agreement around the table.*

Bylaw 5 section 3.d.ii.5

Anne: VP Academic receives applications for employment. We were going to just delete this, it’s not done in practice, it’s a leftover part from when the VP Academic was the only VP. I don’t think it’s necessary to say who receives applications.

Bylaw 11

Anne: There’s talk of changing the chair of budget committee from the VP Academic (another leftover) to the President of the society, or someone else.

Cole: I think this is suppose to be a balance of power, so having the President chair budget committee kind of defeats the purpose.

Chris: I think it should be the same as for regular committees: appointed by Council.

Anne: Keep in mind that there are committee changes coming through, and we may be changing to a system of appointing within the committees.

Sheldon: Appointed by the committee? Budget committee is the only committee in the bylaws, so we need to change bylaws if we make changes.

Chris: It will never get past council anyway. It should stay in bylaws, and not make it a sub committee. But that’s not the point at hand. I think it should be a non-executive chair.

Derek: This is a vestige from when the role was different.
Anne: Partly this change is to relieve the vp academic of work overload.

Chris: Let’s streamline this to reflect the practices of other committees.

*General Agreement around the table*

EXIT Chris (quorum lost)

Bylaw 5 sec 4

Anne: There is a thing that says the first meeting of council should be 14 days after the AGM.

Nil: Is there an official council turnover meeting?

Sheldon: There used to be, put it wasn’t happening in practice so we took it out of code.

EXIT Derek.

Sheldon: This was part of a housekeeping amendment which passed, and this is an orphan from that other one passing...you could argue that this forces to call Council into session.

Sheldon: Sometimes there is a lag, this was violated I think on one occasion...

Anne: I think it’s a very odd situation, mostly we meet regularly.

Sheldon: with the new May turnover, it is possible it can lag on (eg. be several weeks before Council is called with the new exec).

Nil: It would be good to define when the term begins

Sheldon: That’s what we took out before, we used to have that.

Anne: So there is nothing which specifies when turnover is?

Sheldon: This is the thing.

Anne: Why did this go?

Sheldon: It said turnover was at the AGM, standardizing time, which no one followed in practice because their elections were later.

Anne: One advantage of not having one turnover time is to help transition of council, so there isn’t just old and new council.

Phaidra: I kind of like that idea, less culture shock.

Cole: It seems like setting a date is more trouble than it’s worth...
Nil: How would new people come into office, this might create difficult administration to have one turnover date.

Anne: Another change in the same section, mandating meetings during the summer.

Sheldon: In the school year, it says we meet twice a month, and we do not have to have meetings at all from April to August.

Anne: We thought saying once a month in April-Aug makes sense.

Sheldon: This will also go to referendum.

*General agreement around the table.*

Bylaw 5 Section 4.b.iii

Cole: I am wondering why we can’t have proxies for BoG or Senate.

Sheldon: I think the idea is for the constituencies to be represented. Senate is technically not a constituency.

Anne: Plus if the Senate is in session and they send a proxy Senator...they are missing that meeting...

Sheldon: Executives cannot send proxies either.

Cole: Ok, I was just curious why that was, thanks for the explanation.

Sheldon: This section deals with the fact that technically the affiliate colleges cannot send proxies, and we would like to change this.

*General Agreement*

Bylaw 9: Section 1.f – Revise due to Senate Caucus

Anne: We removed Senate Caucus from bylaw, but we missed this reference. We just want to remove all references to it.

Bylaw 15 1b – also refers to Senate Caucus

*General agreement to remove.*

Cole: We’ll be sure to cntl+F (ind) this time round...

Anne: One last question, on removing executives. It’s actually common that council can remove the executive.
Sheldon: We used to have that until last year. Maybe 2011. Our lawyers told us we couldn’t do that, because removing the executives would be like directors removing directors, which is not allowed.

Sheldon: there is a way to remove the executive by referendum

Anne: How about stripping the power from the executive, so they remain directors.

Sheldon: In 2010, legal consultation did affirm this would be ok. The next time this came up, we got an amendment going, and went for counsel. We had new lawyers that disagreed.

Anne: Well, how does a CEO get removed?

Nil: Well, they are usually an employee

Cole: Sometimes they are both.

Cole: So, maybe they would become non-executive members of the board after.

Sheldon: [Quotes code] “The board of directors should consist of the voting members of council.”

Cole: But then could we technically say that they are on Council but not on the board?

Sheldon: Yes, we could.

Cole: It can be a dangerous thing if there is liability for being a director, and executives are not directors.

Anne: But right now we can’t stop them from doing terrible things.

Sheldon: Council can reverse anything the executives do. Once council tried to remove the President.

[tells the story Tim Chu and Blake Frederick]

Cole: Council can call a referendum, including for recall?

Sheldon: Affirmative.

Nil: I would be cautious about completely removing executives from council.

Cole: Agreed, it’s not worth losing their votes, unless it would be possible to have a way for them to be on Council but not on the Board.

Discussion of constituencies, power, board of directors
Anne: At the moment, complaints haven’t resulted in legal action. But we should get some clarification on the laws.

Sheldon: Technically constituencies contravene the society act too.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is June 24th 2013.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 3, 2013

Attendance

Present: Niloufar Keshmiri (member-at-large), Cole Leonoff (Councillor), Phaidra Alisha (Councillor), Anne Kessler (Chair), Joaquin Acevedo (Vice-President, Finance)

Guests: Tanner Bokor (VP External), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist and Clerk of Council), Pierre Cenerelli (University and Government Relations Advisor)

Late: Derek Moore (Vice-President, Administration)

Recording Secretary: Niloufar Keshmiri

Call to Order

The meeting called to order at 3:04 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Cole  Seconded: Phaidra

That the circulated agenda be approved.

Approved with unanimous consent.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes of the May 27th meeting and of the June 19th meeting.

Moved: Cole  Seconded: Derek

That the circulated Minutes be approved.

Abstentions: Joaquin

Attending and Voting from afar
Currently commissions cannot vote from afar, though committees can, and there is no specificity about whether they can vote for afar. Changes have been made to include these to aspects.

BIRT Legislative Procedures Committee recommend that council adopt the code changes entitles Code Changes 2013: Attending and Voting from Afar.

Moved: Cole  Seconded: Phaidra

Approved with unanimous consent.

Policy Guidelines:

Question as to whether both committees, external and academic, have to set the guidelines. The reason is because both committees have to follow the guidelines, and therefore both would be required to provide input. The question is about whether there needs to be agreement between both committees for it to go to council. (7a, 7b) There should be an and or with regard to both of the committees, and council will be the judge of whether it should be accepted, rather then limit it to being considered by both committees. The language can be shifted to accommodate consultation rather than approval, specifically carried out by the chairs. For section a. of the code, there doesn’t need to be an establishment of new guidelines because they already exists, and section 8 of both approval is counter intuitive.

Even though it is after the fact of its creation, it would be useful to still have it in guidelines.

The code might read as though we are looking for new guidelines with every transition or currently. It could be changed to refer to one set of guidelines, which would then be maintained by the UGRA. We will not need to say that they need to be approved by both, merely state their existence, and then how they can be changes and adopted. The guidelines themselves do cover the consultation process by both committees.

It should also explicitly says that it needs to be approved by council, as well as the changes to reflect the more accurate or between the committees.

A discussion about the number of policies and whether a limit would be more effective begins. However, policies are often used to express an opinion, and whether a
distinction should be made between resolutions and policies. Such classifications might make more obvious between policies that have no advocacy behind a motion. For example, a support of a policy, but that would be the role of the guidelines themselves to limits that kind of debate. These resolutions would then be a belief statement. There is currently no distinction between these two different types of motions.

Policies would then inherently be more precise and include more details, rather than a general statement.

BIRT LPC refer to the UGRA the issue of policy distinctions.

Moved: Joaquin Second: Cole

Approved with unanimous consent.

The committee tables the issue until next meeting.

**Bylaw Changes:**

SAC is currently in bylaws, responsible for the building, clubs ect., the other commissions that have been created since were not included in bylaws due to the ease of creation, and therefore SAC is the only commission in bylaws. It also means that the compositions of the commission can't be altered, but it would add greater flexibility. Quorum is currently set at 5, which might be better to change.

The concern would be about how they are managed, and whether changes can be made by a single person or council. Committee reform would then not affect SAC. The code does currently says that the Vice-Chair is a signing officer, where you need 2 signing officer for a society document, but that they are under the vp admin is a conflict of interest where they qualify for both signatories. The question becomes, should the signing authority be granted to all the execs, and recommended that only 3 of the execs should be signing officers for the student side where there are currently 4, and that ever cheque needs to go through the vp finance, though some of this is pending digitalization of the online system.

The risk is perceived by the committee to be minimal, were it be transferred to code.
Bylaw 13 refers to all of the things that SAC manages, and if they are changing frequently. That power might be better delegated to something else in the bylaws, the stability of SAC. Bylaws can be changes to council shall designate these responsibilities to a body.

Striking all bylaw 7, vc as the signing authority, and the reference to the responsibilities of SAC.

Move to direct Sheldon to draft possible changes to bylaw and code to reflect possible changes.

Moved Joaquin        Second: Phaidra

*Approved with unanimous consent.*

**Constituencies Aid:**

The aid fund was initially interpreted to fulfil the purpose of covering any constituency shortfalls, though the outline seems to be much more broad.

Some of the limits as outlined in code seem to be irrelevant or out of date, and Hans suggested sending the limits for further review.

Phaidra asked whether there should be some oversight about the allocation of this fund, which the committed concluded falls under the jurisdiction of finance commission.

The committee concluded that should the fund not be used to cover budget shortfalls then it might be more appropriate to place a cap, given that the fund current has $75,000.

There also needs to be a look into whether constituencies experience budgets shortfalls and are incapable to withstanding any temporary shortfalls and whether the current code allowances for the funds usage are appropriate.

Remove the section of code requiring $3,000 be placed in the fund. If we don’t remove it from code, then we could broaden the scope for allowable usages.

The limits for expenditures should also be reevaluated.
Consultation with the constituencies would be helpful to determine possible uses.

BIRT LPC to refer this issue to Fincom.

Moved: Cole    Seconded: Nil

*Approved with unanimous consent.*

**Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:08 P.M.

Moved: Joaquin    Seconded: Derek
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
Minutes of July 8th 2013

Attendance

Present: Derek Moore (VP Admin), Cole Leonoff (Councilor), Anne Kessler (Councilor and Chair), Niloufar Keshmiri (Member-at-Large)

Guests: Tanner Bokor (VP External), Sheldon Goldfard (Archivist and Clerk of Council)

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

Note: The committee does not have quorum.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:07 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Cole               Seconded: Niloufar
That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Policy Guidelines
The committee agreed that after much previous discussion (see the minutes of May 27th, June 3rd, June 19th and July 3rd) the changes to Code regarding Policy Guidelines were ready for approval.

Moved: Niloufar  
Seconded: Derek

BIRT the committee recommend to Council the approval of the Policy Guidelines Code changes.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

### Constituency Aid Fund

The committee agreed that pursuant to its previous discussions the changes to Code regarding removing the automatic need to contribute funds to this account, which already constitutes a significant, untapped resource.

Moved: Niloufar  
Seconded: Derek

BITR the committee recommend to Council the approval of the Constituency Aid Fund Code changes.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

### Pay Tiers in Code

Sheldon: We added into Code all of the relevant positions for the different relevant tiers and found that the Clubs Administration position had never been properly approved by Council and thus properly confirmed within a tier.

Moreover, with regard to the Art Gallery Commissioner, the position has been classified in Code as Tier 1 but has historically been a Tier 2 position, as per a past LPC resolution that evidently was not properly confirmed by Council.

The VP Academic has also inquired as to whether positions within her portfolio were appropriate to be classified as Tier 1 given the number of other positions falling under Tier 2 for other portfolios, and so the Chair was directed to speak with the VP Academic on this topic. Sheldon suggested that the VP Academic would be best to attend an LPC meeting to provide further explanation.
Returning to the issue of Clubs Administrator, it was noted that a motion from Council would now be needed to officially approve the position and its remuneration at a Tier 2 level.

Contracts

Sheldon: The records of the Society are to be available to members as per the bylaws in all such cases as where do not infringe upon individuals’ private rights.

Our policy is to enable members to view these contracts but not to receive physical copies of them. This recently became an issue as an individual visited with the intent of copying the contract and there was uncertainty as to what sort of detailed note taking should be allowed in this area. This became an issue in terms of whether individuals can essentially copy contract details in notes. Therefore, the issue has been raised as to whether or not students should be allowed to take such notes on contracts.

Niloufar noted that the issue was one where either an individual may take full notes on a contract or no notes at all – that this is ultimately an all or nothing situation. Derek reiterated.

Anne expressed some skepticism regarding restricting individuals’ rights to access contracts in that sort of context. Cole noted that this was somewhat of an all or nothing matter once again – that he felt that whatever contracts could not be restricted reasonably based on confidentiality should thus not be an issue that would warrant such efforts to restrict them.

Cole inquired as to what might be the main concern regarding allowing these contracts to be public. Sheldon responded that this primarily concerned business contracts – for instance, with SUB tenants and their amounts paid for space/rent.

Anne proposed the idea of bringing this to Council with two alternatives as Code changes: something that states that some contracts may not be allowed to have notes taken on and that some contracts may be made fully available in terms of notes/copies. Sheldon suggested bringing these two options to the committee for the next meeting, rather than Council. After further discussion, the committee decided that the former option would be preferable to the latter and directed Sheldon to focus primarily on this (limiting the ability to take notes across the Board in Code).

Committee Reform
Anne presented her list of questions that she had drawn up to pass on to Council members, past and present, regarding committee effectiveness within the AMS. Anne mentioned that at Mona’s suggestion she intends to engage very specifically with other AMS committee chairs during this discussion. The committee discussed which questions it felt would be core to achieving the survey’s goals, i.e. those which would most comprehensively cover the relevant areas of concern.

The committee agreed upon the following set of questions:

- How many committees do you currently sit on?
- How long have you been on AMS Council or been a member at large of its committees? [Please be specific to which committees you are referring.]
- What works well in the committees you are on? Is time well spent?
- What does not work well? How could it be improved?
- Do you feel as if you have been able to contribute to the projects you would like to be involved with in the AMS? Did you have the opportunity to sit on the committees you wanted to?
- Did your committees work well with the Executive?
- What do you think the relationship between the Executive and Committees should be?
- Do you think Council time is well spent?
- Do you feel as a first-time member of a committee that there is sufficient orientation to enable you to be active member of that committee?
- Are there any areas that are not sufficiently addressed by the current committee structure (i.e. should we create new committees to address these)?

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is July 15th 2013 at 5:00 P.M.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 6:07 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 15\textsuperscript{th}, 2013

Attendance

Present: Anne Kessler (Chair), Phaidra Ruck (Councillor), Joaquin Acevedo (VP Finance), Tanner Bokor (VP External), Hans Seidemann (member-at-large), Niloufar Keshmiri (member-at-large), Cole Leonoff (Councillor), Mona Maleki (councillor)

Guests: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist and Clerk of Council)

Recording Secretary: Hans Seidemann (member-at-large)

Call to Order

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

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Phaidra Ruck Seconded: Hans Seidemann
That the agenda be adopted.

\textit{The motion carries unanimously.}

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Mona Maleki Seconded: Niloufar Keshmiri
That the minutes of July 3\textsuperscript{rd} and July 8\textsuperscript{th} be approved.

\textit{The motion carries.}

Notes on Contracts Code Changes

Anne: Last week someone asked to view a contract and asked to take notes. It raised the question of whether taking notes on contracts should be allowed.
Sheldon: A copy isn’t supposed to be given to the member according to current code, but the new code changes proposes prohibiting members from taking notes or photos of making their own copies.

Anne: If a member wanted a copy they could come to council right?

Sheldon: Council passed a motion allowing contracts to be made public provided the other party agreed in writing.

Moved: Phaidra Ruck Seconded: Cole Leonoff

BIRT LPC recommend to council to adopt the changes to the internal policy described in INTERNAL POLICY CHANGES 2013: TAKING NOTES ON CONTRACTS

The motion carries unanimously

Tier Changes

Anne: When Hans was chair, Derek brought forward a position change to the Art Gallery Commissioner. LPC determined that the role should be paid at Tier 2 instead of Tier 1, but it never went to council so it hasn’t been made official yet. So LPC needs to recommend that council approve that change. As well, LPC needs to recommend that council set Clubs Administrator position as Tier 2 as well, since it was never set by Council.

Joaquin: We may not want to enshrine this position in code, as we may want to change it down the road. There are issues with how this position is set which affects how other commissioners are paid. If we set it now, it could cause problems.

Sheldon: Didn’t LPC discuss these positions back in March?

Hans: We did, but I can’t recall the outcome. We could check the minutes.

Agreement to determine what happened in the March meeting and return to this issue.

SAC Changes

Anne: Caroline is looking at a referendum in the fall and one potential change is SAC and how it’s handled in bylaws. One of the changes is that a SAC member sits on the budget committee, but this doesn’t really accomplish anything in practice. Do we want to keep this or change it?

Sheldon: It might be worthwhile to ask SAC what they think about that.
Hans: I would recommend that the best solution would be to remove composition requirements from the bylaws entirely, and set them in code, which makes them more flexible.

Joaquin: If we remove the VP Academic from the committee, will we be adding a new councillor to make up the position?

Anne: That’s the question. Would we want to replace it or just get rid of them.

Tanner: Could we just have the bylaws reference the code for composition? That seems like that would work best.

Anne: What do most people think of this?

_Broadly approved to remove it from bylaws and set it in code instead_

**Committee Reform**

Anne: We haven’t received a lot of survey responses yet. We’ve received 7 or 8 so far. We’ll try to get more people to participate soon. Questions for this committee though: What do you think about the two tier system?

Hans: Really don’t like it. It seems like it adds unnecessary bureaucracy which would slow down their work and make it less fulfilling as a councillor to sit on them. If anything, I would keep the existing committees, but expand their duties so that they are all working on worthwhile efforts.

Anne: Another thing we’re looking at is taking responsibilities from FinCom and putting them into SAC.

Sheldon: FinCom administers a number of funds.

Joaquin: They also handle hardship questions and things like that.

Sheldon: How is FinCom functioning?

Joaquin: It hasn’t been filled out because of budget constraints, but it is working to approve fund applications and things like that.

_Discussion on commissions. Disagreement on their purpose and value._

Anne: Another suggestion was to merge Oversight and AgendaCom.

Hans: We split them because the President sits on Agenda, and it’s a conflict to have them in the room for Oversight meetings.
Tanner: It seems like you’re trying to force one committee to meet (Agenda Com) by merging it with one that actually does.

Phaidra: Do we really need the agenda committee to set the agenda? Couldn’t it just be set by the President and staff?

Anne: I think there’s value to having it reviewed by councilors prior to going to council.

Mona: It really makes a difference having councilors look at it ahead of time so that it doesn’t surprise council.

Tanner: Agenda Com also has other duties right? Like hiring the Speaker of council among other things.

Hans: It seems like overkill to try and alter the structure of the committee for a logistical problem. For instance, the Oversight committee could remind the President that their PAI is dependent on fulfilling their duties, and chairing this committee is one of the President’s duties.

Sheldon: Council can also refuse to accept an agenda if they don’t like it.

Mona: Most councilors are new and might not know that they have that option, or how to speak up if they’re not properly informed of the agenda ahead of time.

Anne: There’s also an issue with motions coming to council when they touch on areas that might better be covered by committees. For instance, there are some motions that would be better brought from a committee than the VP.

Hans: Often times, it’s not even that the motion has to come from the committee, but at least if the Chair is aware of it they can flag any issues.

Phaidra: Can we move that we agree not to merge these committees so we can avoid talking about this again? Also, it would be good if committees can be more project-based, so that we can better use our committee members.

Hans: Committee members can always pursue projects on their own, but you can’t really mandate that committee members do things because there’s always a wide range of time and commitment and skill. It’s better to leave it open for members to pursue things on their own when they want.

Tasks Assigned
Anne Kessler – Check meeting minutes from March for pay change recommendations for Clubs Administrator and Art Gallery Commissioner

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is July 22, 2013.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:07 pm.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of July 22nd 2013

Attendance

Present: Anne Kessler (Councilor and Chair), Cole Leonoff (Councilor), Niloufar Keshmiri (Member-at-Large), Mona Maleki (Councilor), Caroline Wong (President; non-voting), Derek (Vice-President, Administration)

Guests: Tanner Bokor (Vice-President, External Affairs), Sheldon Goldfard (Archivist and Clerk of Council), Ekateryna Baranovskaya (Associate Vice-President, External Affairs))

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Mona  
Seconded: Derek

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Vacancies

Both Chris and Paul have resigned their positions on the committee due to their time commitments. Mona also noted that she may need to resign due to her impending departure
from the committee. It was noted that even if these positions cannot be filled by Council, it will help the committee to achieve quorum if there are fewer committee members.

**Tiers**

Anne: We realized that the tiers document we had approved was missing several positions and that the Clubs Administrator’s past pay at Tier 2 was unclear in terms of rationale. We found the minutes (March 27th) for the relevant committee meeting, but it was unclear what changes were officially approved by the committee for consideration by Council. With regard to the Clubs Administrator, we cannot amend their contract for this year regardless, but we can resolve the issue for future years. Kiran (Vice-President, Academic and University Affairs) had noted concerns that her portfolio’s members were arguably fulfilling equally significant roles and that there could be an issue of pay equity.

Caroline and Derek both spoke in favour of the position being maintained as a Tier 2 position. Mona asked whether she could see the most recent job description to analyze whether it’s best set at Tier 1 or 2. Derek said that he would look into his records to find such information.

It was noted that this was not an urgent matter to send to Council for its Wednesday meeting and so it could be dealt with formally in time for the August 21st meeting.

Anne also noted that she will invite Kiran to the next committee meeting to allow her the opportunity to discuss with the committee her concerns regarding consistency in pay tiers.

**Constitution (or By-law) Amendment: Non-Partisanship**

Tanner expressed an interest in amending the Constitution (or By-laws) to state that the AMS is a non-partisan organization. Tanner suggested this might best belong in the “Purpose” section of the Constitution, either as a part of point C or D by adding “… in a non-partisan manner.”

Tanner noted that he was somewhat indifferent between including it in the Constitution or By-laws, and Sheldon noted that both are equally difficult to amend (unless an unalterable component of the Constitution). Tanner did note that as a matter of “principle” it might be best suited to the Constitution rather than By-laws. Ekateryna stated that it might fit under the By-laws sections pertaining to the President or Vice-President, External Affairs, though Tanner expressed concern in that he was of the idea that the Society as an entirety should be non-partisan. Some debate was held as to whether Council could be exempt from this but that the
Executives should not. There was a discussion of what constituted “partisanship” and whether a candidate individually could still be endorsed, perhaps if not running as a part of a party. Anne suggested simply putting this in Code, and Nil noted that might be appropriate given that Council’s ability to suspend would still allow individuals who are theoretically representatives of students and their beliefs to act in such order.

It was questioned whether this has ever been an issue before, and Sheldon provided a brief history of minor past incidents that several members of the committee felt were generally not of much substance. Derek expressed that it might in some situations be appropriate for the Society to take a partisan position on an issue, while Tanner noted that there is a difference between supporting a position, law, or perhaps even candidate and supporting an actual party in its entirety. Cole noted that if this were added into By-laws it would be necessary to include significant explanation and definition to ensure there is no ambiguity as to that previous issue of what constitutes partisanship.

**Election Bonuses**

Anne: It seems, after talking with our previous Elections Administrator Jenny Chen, that it may be necessary now to remove the bonuses section from code pertaining to their compensation, and that in the long term it might be best to look into changing the pay that the elections committee hours are set, for example paying them for different hours at different times of the year, rather than a flat 20 hrs/week.

Anne noted this issue may be of some urgency so it should likely be necessary to address it at the July 24th meeting; Caroline noted that the Administrator will not actually be hired until September and so any necessary Code changes can occur at the August 21st meeting.

Moved: Mona  
Seconded: Niloufar

Be it resolved that LPC recommend to Council that it rescind the Elections Bonuses Code changes made previously.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Committee Reform**

Returning to the issue of committee reform, Anne began with a question as to the future of the Extraordinary Hiring Committee as well as the Sustainability Committee. With regard to the
latter, it was suggested that the Committee could perhaps be transformed into a more “full” committee of Council that would extend beyond its current more limited mandate pertaining to specific projects rather than broader issues of sustainability.

On the topic of the possibility of an overall “Hiring Committee” rather than “Extraordinarily Hiring Committee” that is a standing committee that meetings more frequently. Such a Committee would then deal with many issues currently handled by LPC in terms of relevant Code changes and other various hiring matters (whereas the current committee structure is such that it is involved almost solely in the actual hiring process rather than tiers issues, job descriptions, etc.). In either case, transforming a committee into a full standing committee could increase its membership numbers.

Tanner suggested maintaining the Extraordinary Hiring Committee as an extraordinary committee as many issues it would address would continue to be ad-hoc in nature.

Anne emphasized that many hiring issues in terms of tiers and job descriptions currently bog down LPC and for that reason it would be more efficient to redistribute such responsibilities.

Cole noted that some confusion could result in matters still being sent to LPC if Extraordinary Hiring Committee were to have concerns on Code details or the appropriateness of the style of such Code changes.

Sheldon suggested that Caroline take this matter to Extraordinary Hiring Committee for feedback.

Niloufar suggested that a working group or sub-committee of LPC might be most appropriate for removing such inefficient discussions at the full committee level, with Sheldon noting that this had originally been the intent of the current committee structure and that such a working group may even have previously existed, but that the use of that type of structure had waned over the years.

Caroline did express some concern that as of right now the current Extraordinary Hiring Committee might not be too interested in taking on such responsibilities but that she would bring up the suggestion for discussion at its next meeting.

Cole noted that he could see a working group focused on this issue not meeting with particular frequency or ultimately not attracting enough interest from committee members.

The committee agreed to continue discussion on this at a later date.
Next Meeting
The next scheduled meeting is July 29th 2013 at 5:00 P.M.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of August 7\textsuperscript{th}, 2013

Attendance

Present: Anne Kessler (Chair), Cole Leonoff (Councilor), Niloufar Keshmiri (At-Large), Maria Mohan (At-Large), Phaidra Ruck (Councilor)

Guests: Tanner Bokor (VP External)

Regrets: Hans Seidemann (At-Large)

Recording Secretary: Niloufar Keshmiri

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:10pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Phaidra Seconded: Cole

That the agenda be adopted.

\textit{The motion carries unanimously.}

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Niloufar Seconded by: Cole

Tabled until next meeting as members had not looked over them.

Discussion about Aboriginal student representation

Phaidra brought this issue to LPC. There was discussion of options such as representation on Council, how many seats would be appropriate, whether this creates an equity issue of not representing other interest groups. Tanner brought up the idea of a Student Assembly where
many campus groups could be brought together for discussing issues of the AMS. Phaidra felt this did not give aboriginal students enough real power and was only token representation. Suggestion of aboriginal student’s commissioner (under VP Academic), like international student’s commissioner. General agreement on pursuing this issue more. Phaidra and Tanner will wait until fall when students are back, and consultation can occur to see what Aboriginal students want. In the fall the many aboriginal students’ groups may be merging as well, and this would significantly help with issues such as the problem of which group to elect aboriginal students from.

Tiers Issue
Tabled until time to look over Job Descriptions.

Survey Responses (Committee Reform)
Tabled to next meeting when there is more time, and fewer time sensitive matters on the agenda.

Referendum Coordinator Job Description (JD) Changes
Tanner explained that Execcom will soon be hiring a referendum coordinator for the referendum in the fall. It is time sensitive and they wish to be able to post it before the next Council meeting (August 21st). They would like LPC’s approval of the JD first, and, with LPC’s approval, will go retroactively to Council.

The changes to the JD are: - the position will report to Execcom instead of the President.
- Under “Duties and Responsibilities,” add “Other duties as assigned.”
- Under “Skills and Qualifications,” add “Experience leading a team is preferable.”

Caroline recommended, because of the short hiring period, to keep the position at tier 1. LPC discussed this and believed the position warranted tier 2 because it will be supervisory. Because it will be posted before Council approval, the position will be posted at tier 1, and upon Council approval, moved up to tier 2.

In the past there was a $275 bonus for successful referendum questions. It was decided the bonus didn’t make sense – should either be none, since passing the questions is part of their job, or should be more, to serve as an actual incentive.

BIRT LPC recommend to Council to approve the JD changes, tier level 2, and no bonus.

Moved: Phaidra        Seconded: Maria
Carries unanimously.

SUB Management and SUB Repairs and Replacement funds bylaw changes

The SUB repairs and replacement fund states that we need to have 25% of our assets in this fund – a residual from a time where we were self-insured. Keith suggested that we get rid of SUB management fund (and put it’s money into repairs and replacements) and lower the 25% to 10% to help with repairs and such. While we don’t need this money for insurance purposes, it will help with maintaining and replacing furniture and fixtures.

The biggest issue with the 25% with the new SUB is that we would never be able to meet the requirement, and in the end we don’t need this much money. This would be a bylaw amendment.

SUB Management fund has overlapping mandates around capital expenditures, and we don’t need three funds (Student Spaces being the third fund). We would also need to make sure that the mandates are also combined.

The committee directs Sheldon to draft up new languages around these bylaw changes.

We would also need to clarify what would happen to the extra above and beyond the 10%. It would be better to talk to Keith about how much there might be in excess of the cap.

Proxying

There are currently no restrictions on who can proxy, including that it has to be from your constituency or even a member of the society.

The idea of the bylaws is that the constituencies have to be represented.

Cole notes that the process is currently somewhat burdensome and therefore not fulfilling the current purpose. He recommends that we remove the second signature but only allowing it to be a member of the society.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is August 12th 2013.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6pm.
ATTENDANCE

Present: Joquín (Vice-President, Finance); Anne (Chair; Councillor); Cole (Councillor); Niloufar (Member-at-Large)

Late: Derek (Vice-President, Administration)

Guests: Ken (Human Resources Department)

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 P.M.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved: Cole Seconded: Niloufar

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

TIER SYSTEM

Anne: Returning to our discussion at the last Council meeting, it seems as if there was some confusion regarding the tiers system. I think it would be appropriate at this time for me to prepare a presentation to Council to explain the system, perhaps not for the next meeting but the following one.
Joaquin: Council can read the LPC minutes regarding the discussion we had on approving the tiers system a few months ago, correct?

Anne: Those minutes haven’t been submitted yet, but hopefully soon. I still feel a presentation might be helpful. In spite of Council approving the relevant set of Code changes to codify the tiers system, clearly there still exists some confusion and lack of understanding.

(4:17 P.M. - Derek arrived. Quorum was achieved.)

Elections Administrator Job Description

Anne: There are some minor changes but I am unsure as to whether this needs to go to Council or whether LPC can approve this itself. I believe LPC can approve this itself, as it is simply a one-line change to duties and responsibilities that is more about technical wording than actual substantive meaning. I believe we have the jurisdiction to pass this.

Moved: Niloufar  
Seconded: Joaquin

That the changes to the Elections Administrator job description be approved as presented.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Sustainability Outreach Coordinator and Sustainability Coordinator Job Descriptions

Joaquin: There has been a lot of overlap in these two job descriptions. I’ve taken out the administrative components from the Sustainability Coordinator job description to emphasize the focus on larger strategy matters. I also want to change the Sustainability Outreach Coordinator title to Sustainability Assistant Coordinator to more properly clarify the type of operational structure within the Sustainability Office. These changes reflect primarily what is already occurring and so we are just ensuring consistency here in that regard.

Anne suggested that the Sustainability Coordinator job description be updated to say “… engineering or other related field…” to reflect the fact that another subject field, for instance, environmental science, might be equally applicable. Ken and Joaquin emphasized that there are significantly technical components to the job and that as a result an engineering background would likely appropriately deserve some greater emphasis. Nonetheless, Joaquin stated that he would be comfortable with such a change, though emphasized that this is a preference and not
a requirement. Anne noted that the job description might imply that it is necessary to already have earned a Masters or PhD degree and so the job description should perhaps have this section clarified.

Moved: Joaquin
Seconded: Niloufar

That the changes to the Sustainability Outreach Coordinator and Sustainability Coordinator job descriptions be approved as presented The motion carries unanimously.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Minutes**

Moved: Niloufar
Seconded: Derek

That the minutes of the committee of July 15th 2013, July 22nd 2013, and August 7th be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**SAC Clubs Administrator**

Niloufar asked Derek to provide some greater degree of explanation of why he feels the position should be considered to be at a Tier 2 level.

Derek asked that the committee consider which other positions are currently paid at a Tier 2 level. Examples including the Elections Administrator, all AVPs, Art Gallery, Referenda Coordinator, all commission Vice-Chairs, and the Shinerama Coordinator.

It was noted that the Shinerama Coordinator was apparently mistakenly being paid at Tier 1 given that the position oversees a team and given that the position is in fact listed in Code as a Tier 2 position.

Derek argued that the SAC Vice-Chair and SAC Clubs Administrator positions are very similar in a lot of ways and that as a result it would be inappropriate to somehow value the Clubs Administrator’s work at a lower amount. Niloufar suggested that this perhaps then required greater action to differentiate the role.

Joaquin suggested that the committee should specifically consult with the Vice-Chair and Clubs Administrator to gain their perspectives on this.
Joaquin and Anne both suggested that the Clubs Administrator’s job description should then perhaps be updated to reflect the work they do given that Derek suggested that they work in a tag-team fashion with the Vice-Chair.

Derek suggested a wider analysis of the tiers positions in terms of the equity in pay between them. Joaquin reminded the Committee of Kiran’s concern that if the Clubs Administrator’s job were considered Tier 2 then there would be a serious issue of inequity in comparison to other portfolio’s positions that are similarly significant and difficult in nature of work.

Niloufar suggested that the Committee follow Council’s suggestion of holding a joint meeting between LPC and Executive Committee.

Anne once again raised the point of there being a clear issue with job descriptions not matching the work being carried out by different positions, and Joaquin suggested that Ken look through a greater set of records and review positions to ensure the accuracy of their respective job descriptions.

Cole reiterated a general suggestion by Ken that the criteria for the different Tiers positions should be further developed as they are rather vague and overly general at this point and may have created an issue in terms of accurately reflecting workload.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is TBA. It was noted that there would be no meeting this next week and that there would likely be one final meeting before committee turnover, likely on September 10th or 11th.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of September 27th 2013

Attendance

Present: Joaquin (Vice-President, Finance); Anne (Chair; Councillor); Cole (Councillor); Paul (Councillor); Niloufar (Member-at-Large)

Late: Phaidra (Councillor)

Guests: Ken (Human Resources Department); Tanner (Vice-President, External Affairs);

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 A.M.

Approval of Agenda

Anne noted that Mathew was sick and could not make this meeting so the Committee will be postponing the Services Review Code changes until its next meeting. The agenda was amended to reflect this fact.

Moved: Cole Seconded: Niloufar

That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Alternate Chair
Phaidra had nominated Cole for the position previous; Cole accepted the nomination.

Moved: Phaidra Seconded: Niloufar

That Cole be appointed Alternate Chair of the Committee.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Polling, Statistics & Engagement Commissioner**

Tanner: With Kiran having resigned her position as Vice-President, Academic and University Affairs, it was noted that there was an absence of individuals skilled with work in polling activities and that given the work done by the AMS this position will be a great asset to External and, potentially, Academic portfolios. A couple of projects within the External portfolio are being cut back on to re-allocate funds towards this position.

Sheldon asked whether this individual would sit on the Advocacy Commission, and Tanner responded that they would not; Sheldon and Anne noted that this might be confusing given that the job title was Commissioner, and so it was suggested that they be called a Coordinator.

Niloufar asked whether it might be realistic to expect a sufficient pool of applicants for this, and Tanner suggested that many Political Science students might be interested in this role.

Cole noted that the line “Able to research and write high quality policy papers and briefing documents” might be somewhat intimidating to students interested in the position, and Anne suggested removing “high quality” with a general agreement that this might overstate the type of work being conducted by the Commissioner in that it will likely be primarily briefing notes that the Commissioner will prepare.

Anne expressed a concern that the breadth of the job description might not reflect the fact that the individual will be primarily working on polling and surveying and thus perhaps should be limited somewhat from its current scope; Tanner noted that it was important that the individual have some flexibility in their ability to work with different areas of skill sets and so the broadness of the description was appropriate.

Joaquin did express some concern regarding the number of staff in some Executive portfolios relative to others, to which Tanner responded that these roles can be shared between portfolios in working for different projects. Joaquin emphasized that positions like this did not equally benefit all portfolios and were not particularly applicable to those such as Finance, with
Tanner noting that this was a partial reason for the broadness of the job description – the individual will be able to step into a wide array of situations and provide skills.

Ken emphasized that it would not be advisable to expect an ability to work for other Executive offices given the limited hours in the job description and the significant responsibilities already assigned to the Commissioner. Tanner noted that most crossover work would still be between the External and Academic portfolios.

Joaquin expressed a concern that the Committee was not being given sufficient justification for the position’s need, and Tanner emphasized that the this role was imminently needed to not cancel important projects.

Niloufar asked whether this position might oversaturate students’ interests in completing surveys; Tanner noted that the Commissioner would be careful to avoid being intrusive in that sense.

Anne acknowledged that there was a gap in the work of the External portfolio but expressed a concern that a large amount of the Commissioner’s work should be the responsibility of preexisting staff members within that portfolio. Tanner stated that there is currently no individual within his portfolio with polling, surveying, and consultation session responsibilities. Tanner noted that Pierre (University and Government Relations Advisor) had expressed a need for this position before.

Joaquin reiterated his concerns regarding this role, in particular the uneven number of staff members in Executive portfolios, as well as the financial situation of the AMS that did not justify creating this position even if it were done through re-arranging funds. Anne noted that this inequity of support staff within portfolios was primarily only the case with the President and Vice-President, Finance having only one individual working for each of them in that support capacity. In response to a question by Anne, Joaquin noted that he, like others, would appreciate more support staff, but that it would be inappropriate to add them at this time, in the same way that he felt this position was inappropriate at this time. Tanner further put emphasis on the need for this role and the importance of its activities.

The Committee overwhelming expressed an interest in seeing these concerns further addressed and Anne suggested that this job description be returned to the Committee in a week’s time, which would not unduly delay the position’s hiring, as it would need to go to Council first, which would occur after that meeting regardless. A general consensus was agreed to be that the job description was somewhat too all-encompassing and a slightly slimmed down set of responsibilities might be more appropriate and that “other duties” might better suit the nature of the role being one in which these additional responsibilities are relatively minor.
Executive Coordinator of Student Services (ECSS) Name Change

Ken: Mathew had expressed an interest in changing the name of the position from Executive Coordinator of Student Services to something more appropriate, especially given the new Executive Director (of Student Services) position. Student Services Manager had been felt to be the best description of the role. Sheldon asked whether there was any other change in the job description, hiring process, or position in general, to which Ken responded that this was solely an issue of the position title.

Unpaid Internships

Council has decided that a working group or sub-committee would be more appropriate than LPC as a whole in determining the stance on this issue that it was suggested the AMS should adopt (specifically, whether the AMS should or should not be providing students with unpaid internships). Cole asked whether a working group was truly necessary in this case as he felt the discussions might not be that extensive that a working group would be needed.

Phaidra expressed an interest in participating in this working group, and Anne noted that Mathew would also be an appropriate individual to have as a member of it. Niloufar suggested that LPC invite members from the University and External Relations Committee and Education Committee.

Anne agreed to contact the other University and External Relations Committee and Education Committee Chairs to address this. Due to the absence of quorum, it was agreed to postpone a formal motion – which Sheldon had noted to be necessary to establish a working group – until the next meeting.

PAI

Anne: There is nothing in Code to address the reality of a mid-year resignation by an Executive in terms of distributing PAI. The Oversight Committee had agreed that that PAI should be evaluated normally, scaled to the portion of an Executive’s term, but to a maximum of 75% of the total regardless to ensure that there is no incentive to resign right before the end of one’s
term when turnover work is essential. The Oversight Committee had agreed that the reason for one’s resignation should be considered.

Phaidra asked whether Executives would be required to disclose the reason for their resignation to Council, with Anne stating the idea was that it would be provided only to Oversight Committee. Ken raised concerns regarding issues of privacy with regard to, say, medical issues, and that in the case of such a situation a medical professional would be needed to assess an individual’s ability to continue their work.

Phaidra suggested the reason for one’s resignation might not be a relevant consideration, to which Niloufar, Cole, and Paul agreed.

Cole expressed a concern regarding the 75% cap as being an overly large penalty, especially in the case of someone who might resign very near to the end of their term due to a medical or other understandable reason. The Committee noted that Council could then suspend Code, though Cole noted this would defeat the point of any other attempts to protect that individual’s privacy as they would be forced to very publically justify and explain themselves.

Niloufar stated that she felt that a greater emphasis should be put on reaching one’s goals rather than simply time-based work.

Cole noted that in Code 70% of PAI was based off of goals and that this amount should not be scaled and that that only the remaining 30% should be scaled based off of the amount of time served in the role. Niloufar concurred. Paul disagreed, emphasizing that the scaling should be based off of time overall.

Ken suggested having a separate bonus for completing objectives and another for completing the individual’s term. Ken noted that in the business world, bonuses would not typically be awarded at all for the failure to complete one’s work.

Phaidra suggested that scaling the entire bonus to a cap based off of time would be a “punishment for being good” in the sense that individuals completing all of their goals would not be fairly rewarded for that, which Cole and Niloufar emphasized was their point.

Anne noted that this creates issues for the next individual to fill that Executive’s role, in terms of what sorts of goals they could reasonably set and fulfill, and whether this would only be the remaining, unclaimed portion of the previous Executive’s PAI, which could be unfair in the case of a previous Executive who completed 100% of their goals.
Ken noted that a better understanding of whether this was an incentive, retention, or performance bonus was needed going forward, to which Anne suggested that a complete overhaul of the current PAI system might be needed.

Niloufar suggested that this discussion required greater input from the Executives and their predecessors.

Paul and Phaidra suggested that there would be two bonuses, one that is not received at all for not having completed one’s term, and another for goals.

Ken offered to return to the Committee with greater information regarding external models and options.

Anne concluded that a broader discussion would likely be had on this in the coming weeks and months.

Phaidra noted that she felt that an individual elected in a by-election, in particular the upcoming Vice-President, Academic, by-election, should only be eligible to receive the residual of the unclaimed portion of the previous Executive’s PAI. Joaquin argued that this was an unfair process, with Phaidra suggesting it was the only appropriate option given limited funds. Joaquin emphasized that unless Council motions to limit such an entitlement for PAI, it cannot otherwise be limited.

Next Meeting

TBA.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:22 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
Minutes of October 3rd 2013

Attendance

Present: Joaquin Acevedo (Vice-President, Finance); Anne Kessler (Chair; Councillor); Cole (Councillor); Jeffrey Pea (Member-at-Large), Matthew Dugay (Councillor)

Late: Phaidra Ruck (Councillor)

Guests: Sheldon (Archivist and Clerk of Council); Tanner (Vice-President, External Affairs)

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 P.M.

*Note that quorum was not present.

Approval of Agenda

Joaquin requested to add the appointment of a sub-committee to address the issue of the AMS stance on internships.

Moved: Joaquin Seconded: Cole

That the agenda be adopted as presented.

The motion carries unanimously.

ESA Elections Issue
Anne: Phaidra is not here to discuss this with us, but the essence of the issue is that the Education Students Association has previously had its elections managed by the University on their behalf. There was a tie in the most recent election, and an administrator from the University was responsible for randomly determining the victor of the election. Phaidra has proposed that there be an amendment to Code to require that student elections be run by students.

Sheldon: The Code currently specifies that constituencies must appoint a chief elections official and elections committee to administer elections. Perhaps we could add additional clarification here, though the current wording here seems sufficient.

Anne: The election results here could be declared invalid and overturned?

Sheldon: This would be determined by the AMS Elections Committee.

Anne: I will speak to Phaidra separately about this to see how she might like to proceed.

**ECSS Name Change**

Matthew: After discussing the name of the ECSS position with Ken, we agreed that, especially with the creation of the new Executive Director role, the name of “ECSS” might not be an appropriate term to use here. After looking at a few possibilities for this, we agreed that Student Services Manager would be the most appropriate choice here.

Sheldon: The Code change component here would be relatively simple, as it would just result in every instance of Executive Coordinator of Student Services being used in Code being replaced with the new position name.

Joaquin: This makes as a change, though I do think we need to re-evaluate the duties and structure of the current ECSS role – for instance, to see if, with the addition of the Executive Director role, an amended set of responsibilities might be appropriate.

Matthew: I agree that with the completion of the Services Review and the possibility of the addition of new services, it might be particularly relevant to review the position more comprehensively.

(Tanner arrives – 1:16 P.M.)

Sheldon read a brief overview of what the details are surrounding the position in Code.

(Phaidra arrives – 1:17 P.M.; quorum was reached.)
Anne: My understanding of this role was that it was in many ways intended to be an additional Executive, but that it was created as a way of avoiding the hassles of going through a by-law amendment referendum.

Joaquin: Would it be appropriate to have the outgoing Executives hire for the ECSS before turnover?

Matthew: I might suggest hiring for the position mid-March, instead, because it is important to give the Executives some control over who they would be working with when it comes to this role. It might make sense to have the position hired by the Executive Director, but because the position is “student at its core” it might still be worth ensuring that the position continues to be hired by students.

Anne: I do feel that having the Executive Director hire the role would make sense.

Joaquin: I would be concerned that the activities of the student services branch of the AMS might then not be quite in line with what the Executives are working towards.

Anne: It would be difficult with timing for them to be hired by March if the elections are late February. I would be comfortable with the outgoing Executives still hiring for the position.

Matthew: I would be comfortable with that if the rest of the Committee is.

Anne: Is everyone comfortable with saying that the Executive Director, outgoing President and Vice-President, Academic, the outgoing ECSS, and two service coordinators selected by the outgoing President comprise the hiring committee for the position and hire by March 1st?

Joaquin: As we are changing the name of the position, it might be appropriate to also take this opportunity to review Code and other documents (i.e. various policies) to flag any potential misalignments of responsibilities.

Sheldon: I will circulate the relevant draft of Code changes for our next meeting.

**Services Review**

Matthew: We are not looking at an overwhelming number of changes here, but we need to remove Mini School from Code.

Sheldon: This was automatically removed when Council abolished it as a Service.
Matthew: We are looking at the possible addition of a number of new services for which feasibility studies are being conducted in time for January. The Committee will review these possible additions to Code if needed at that point in time.

Matthew: I think it should be codified that regular meetings between the Student Services Manager and all service coordinators be held in a committee form every two weeks, with the Student Services Manager acting as Chair of this committee. This is something that has not happened in a number of past years and is quite important as a vehicle for important discussions.

Joaquin: I think this might take us down the wrong road if we establish this as an actual committee rather than as a more informal group of individuals working together. The strategic type of work that the committee might be involved in is more the role of the Executive Director. I don’t want Council to attempt to send work to this “committee” that might bring these in the wrong direction.

Tanner: Perhaps then this should not be called a “committee.”

Sheldon: We should then just mandate the occurrence of these meetings and not refer to them as being the meetings of a Committee.

Matthew: Another recommendation is that the mandate of each student service be included in their Operations Manuals.

Sheldon: This is already in Code.

Matthew: This is more an issue though of putting the appropriate emphasis on actually ensuring this is done.

Matthew: The last item for discussion here regarding the Services Review is the recommendation that there be transitional honoraria for service coordinators. In short, there is no money for this at this time.

Sheldon: Was there not an additional item, a recommendation that an annual update be given from the AMS services department?

Joaquin: I interpret this to be more an issue of a presentation being given to Council, rather than a formal report.

Anne: I also interpret this as more of a summary-type presentation and not a formal report.

Matthew: That is much a more reasonable responsibility to carry out.
Matthew: This presentation might be best given in May, fulfilling an orientation-type purpose; it would be done several months into the new Student Services Manager’s term, and so would be reasonable. The alternative is that the outgoing person provide this presentation in February, but that would be mid-year for a lot of services and might not be the best time to give such an update.

Anne: Time is running out here, are should postpone the remaining part of the discussion till next week.

**Polling, Statistics, and Engagement Commissioner**

Tanner: The job description has been updated and was distributed to the Committee.

Joaquin: I still have significant reservations regarding this position, in terms of the equity between Executive offices, in terms of the role being bounced around between different Executives, etc.

Moved: Cole  
Seconded: Matthew

That LPC recommend to Council the Job Description, terms of employment and tier for the Polling, Statistics ad Engagement Commissioner.

*The motion carries.*

**Next Meeting**

Thursday, October 10\(^{th}\), 2013.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of October 10th 2013

Attendance

Present: Joaquin (Vice-President, Finance); Anne (Chair; Councillor); Cole (Councillor); Jeffrey (Member-at-Large); Niloufar (Member-at-Large); Mathew (Councillor)

Late: Derek (Vice-President, Administration)

Guests: Sheldon (Archivist and Clerk of council)

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Cole Seconded: Joaquin

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Referendum: Bylaw Changes for Various Funds

Joaquin: Right now we have several funds administered by the AMS that are redundant with each other, and so we are looking to collapse those that are unnecessary. We looked at the New SUB budget to determine what items would be maintained as furnishings in the new building, so that we would maintain the right amount of funds in our accounts to provide the necessary
reparis to the building and its furnishings and not hold an unreasonable excess of funds in those accounts. We are looking to strike the Student Union Building Management Fund from the bylaws and reduce the Student Union Building Repairs and Replacement Fund from 25% to 15% “of the replacement value of the Society's furnishings and equipment.” Based off of some work Keith has done looking into this, he believes 15% would be a more appropriate amount.

Anne: The Student Union Building Repairs and Replacement Fund is very similar to the Student Union Building Management Fund, but we are wondering whether the wording for the Repairs and Replacement Fund should be altered to expand the scope to perhaps include renovations. However, the Student Spaces Fund can be used for renovations and other matters and so if we are able to maintain and continue the existence of this fund then we might not need to alter the Repairs and Replacement Fund’s purpose in the bylaws.

Sheldon: It is strange that some of these funds are included in the bylaws while others are not; we might want to consider removing them from the bylaws, but I will look into the reason why they were entrenched in the bylaws in the first place.

Anne: That said, I don’t see much of a need to have more flexibility with these funds beyond the changes we are making now – the mandates for the funds are very long-lasting in nature.

Joaquin: I think there is more work to be done on this especially if we want to stand behind the mandate regarding keeping business and student government/services separate as large capital expenditures may be something we want to create a fund to support that is administered by the business side of the AMS itself. Also, regarding the 15% quota, we need to determine how we are defining “assets” as the wording here is rather vague; for instance, if the building itself were considered an asset in the sense that applies for the bylaws, then this fund would need to be maintained at an unreasonably high level well beyond our ability. Perhaps some of the relevant definitions should be established in Code.

Anne: This is the way it works for other funds; there is wording in the bylaws for those funds stating that there shall be such greater explanation laid out in Code.

Joaquin: Code is the more appropriate place to define these things rather than the bylaws.

Anne: We may want to define the 15% as referring to the Society’s non-business assets.

Niloufar: However, it might be dangerous to do this before a fund has been properly established and built up to support the businesses.

Joaquin: Right now, there’s $700,000 in the Repairs and Replacement Fund, and $120,000 in the Management Fund.
Anne: Perhaps referring to 15% of the “student government assets” would be more appropriate here as this way we can have more flexibility; we can define businesses as a part of student government, but we cannot define businesses under “non-business assets.”

Sheldon: Do we really need this 15% at all?

Joaquin: For some things, for instance, imagine a $150,000 set of industrial ovens – we couldn’t find the money easily under normal circumstances without such a fund.

Sheldon: We will certainly have to run this by our lawyers, if we are moving around money from these accounts even through a referendum – as the bylaws are stronger than a typical referendum, and so we might need to change the bylaws to even allow that change and a referendum may not in and of itself be enough to move those funds. We will flag this for specific review by our lawyers.

Anne: I’m relatively comfortable with sending this to the Referendum Committee with the addition of the “student government assets, as defined in Code” component for the calculations regarding a minimum and the spending process.

Joaquin: I’ll discuss this with Keith and bring forward some relevant wording.

(Derek arrives – 1:41 P.M.)

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Joaquin
Seconded: Derek

That the minutes of October 3rd, September 27th, August 28th be approved as presented.

The motion carries unanimously.

Executive Coordinator of Student Services Name Change

Anne: Sheldon sent out the relevant set of Code changes regarding the change of the name to Student Services Manager as well as the other relevant changes as discussed at our last meeting (for instance, holding a student services meeting and such).

Sheldon: I realized Code already said that the ECSS is required to meet with services coordinators and co-coordinators?
Mathew: This hasn’t always been interpreted to mean a group meeting, thus the need for the Code changes to be approved as presented.

Anne: Do we want to add a date regarding the report to Council on student services?

Mathew: This should probably be done after the fiscal year. Therefore it would likely be in May or June and be done by the new, incoming Student Services Manager. May is likely better given that there is usually stronger attendance by Council members at that time. We should add that clarification.

Anne: Are we ready to send this Council?

Mathew: I think we should see this once more next week before sending it off to Council.

Other Bylaw Changes for Referendum

Anne: I admittedly have not had time to go through the bylaws in enough detail to bring back a concrete set of revisions but will be doing so soon.

Cole: I do want to add that I think we should schedule a longer meeting to review these.

Unpaid Internships Working Group

Anne: There was some confusion as to what was wanted by this Committee in terms of the nature of this working group, but we have some time to figure this out.

Appointment to the Referendum Committee

Anne: We should wait another week to address this, when it is clear whether I will still be on the Committee and when we have more members present.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Thursday, October 17th 2013 at 1:00 P.M.
Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 P.M.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of October 17th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Paul (Chair; Councilor), Joaquin Acevedo (Vice-President, Finance); Cole (Councillor), Jeffrey (Member-at-Large), Matthew (ECSS), Niloufar (Member-at-Large), Derek (Vice-President, Admin)

Guests:

Regrets:

Recording Secretary: Matthew Dugay (ECSS)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:04pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Niloufar Seconded: Cole

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Matthew Seconded: Cole

That the minutes of October 10th, 2013 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

ECSS Name Change

Bringing Paul up to speed regarding code changes.
Debate regarding SSM start date of March 1st
Concern that the current way the code is written is that once the executive transition time is changed the ECSS would be hired too late to complete a presentation on the services in May.

Sheldon - Hold off on changing code until the executive transition time is actually changed

Discussion of who will be on SSM Hiring Committee this year if there is no code change to that section.

Paul – concerned that the incoming will be in before the new SSM is hired

Matthew – That won’t be an issue, the timeline works out

**Motion to approve sending to Council.**

Moved: Joaquin Seconded: Cole.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Fund Bylaw Changes**

- Discussion regarding code changes.
  - Joaquin - Businesses would no longer use student funds for capital purchases, businesses will contribute 15% to fund.

- Referendum question to move money from abolished fund to new one (fee question).
  - Would have to move a large amount of money.
  - Sheldon – bylaw changes would need to be run past lawyer(s).
  - Would need to go to Referendum Committee.
    - Referendum Committee would determine how money will be allocated.
  - Joaquin – we no longer require the two funds to exist.

- Paul – is there any disagreement to funds bylaw changes.
  - Joaquin – need to determine if renovations will be covered and how fund will be replenished if goes below 15%.

- Paul – should postpone one week to determine nature of Student Spaces Fund

**Referendum Committee Appointment**

Paul – Any volunteers for Referendum Committee?

Cole and Jeff volunteer, Jeff respectfully withdraws.

*BIRT that LPC appoint Cole to Referendum Committee*

Moved: Derek Seconded: Nil.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

**Budget Committee Bylaw Changes**

- Budget Changes – changes Budget Committee.
  - Striking the VP-AUA from the Committee.
- Changing the two active members of the Society.
- Four representatives from affiliate colleges.
- Joaquin – makes sense for VP-AUA to be removed from the Chair.
- Cole – division of power, remove VP-AUA from having too much authority.
- Paul – 5 voting members of Council seems like a lot.
  - 4 voting members of Council, 3 others.
- Paul – why is SAC being struck from Budget Committee?
  - Derek – unaware that SAC had an obligation to sit on Budget Committee.
  - Joaquin – SAC Vice-Chair has been attending some meetings, challenge in that SAC is being given privilege while other departments are not on Committee (i.e. Services).
  - Nil – why is SAC involved? Services are a larger component to the budget than clubs.
    - Joaquin – useful for other departments to be members but makes me question whether or not a staff member should be included. Should they be included?
    - Sheldon – don’t want partiality on Budget Committee. SAC is a major component of the Society.
    - Joaquin – directly reports directly to Budget Committee, VP-A could influence the Committee (conflict of interest).
    - Sheldon – VP-Finance used to sit on SAC rather than Council.
- Paul – 3 active members if SAC struck.
  - Cole – should be 5 members of Council all together, makes it a larger entity.
  - Paul – would it be useful?
  - Joaquin – difficult to reach quorum, would make easier to achieve with greater numbers. Do you need to be versed in Society operations to be a successful member of the Budget Committee?
  - Paul - SAC = Councilors, Commissioners, Members of Large
  - Derek – SAC is more operational, Council is political, Members at Large (MaL) represent students.
  - Nil – MaL provide an outside perspective. Don’t know how a member of SAC would be beneficial over anyone else.
    - Paul – postpone for one week so Joaquin can consult Budget Committee

Other Bylaw Changes

- Sheldon – changes to Bylaws for AGM quorum. AGM now requires 500 for quorum, but 1000 for changes to the bylaws.
- Sheldon - This is a housekeeping change
- Joaquin – what can be done at AGM’s?
Sheldon – cannot change fees; any other business can be done.

Paul – petitions and Bylaw 3, general meetings (response from Sheldon).
  Paul – should number of signatures be reduced?
  ▪ 1000 signatures difficult to achieve.
  ▪ Joaquin – 1000 members is a good idea, issues of importance.
  ▪ Nil – changes can be made through AGM process.
  o Paul – Bylaw 19 is a housekeeping change. Asks Sheldon to draft up revised Bylaw 19.

Tasks Assigned

Joaquin – Talk to Budget Committee about structure – Due Next Meeting

Next Meeting

  • Paul – next meeting will be sent out in Doodle Poll, to be sent out this evening. Doodle will be closed on Sunday. Try to finding a meeting time for next week.
    o Joaquin & Jeff – should be permanent meeting time.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59pm.
The meeting was called to order at 1:07 P.M.

The Chair noted that quorum was not present, given the presence of only five voting members (including the Chair).

Introductions

The Chair asked that a brief round of introductions take place for the benefit of guests and those who are new to the Committee.
Approval of Agenda

It was noted that the exact order of some of the discussion items might change depending on the time of arrival of certain Committee members and guests.

Moved: Paul McDade  Seconded: Derek Moore
That the agenda be adopted as presented.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

The approval of the October 17th meeting minutes was postponed given the absence of quorum.

Aboriginal and International Student Commissioner Job Descriptions

Anne provided a brief overview as to the justification for the existence of these two positions, in particular, that there was substantive work that could be carried out by each position separate from the other and that the Office of the Vice-President, Academic had not yet hired for other positions resulting in an availability of funds to cover the costs of the existence of two such positions. No concerns were raised regarding the content of the job descriptions.

The Committee agreed that “Aboriginal Student Commissioner” and “International Student Commissioner” were more appropriate titles for the positions than “Aboriginal Commissioner” and “International Commissioner.”

Cole noted that the positions had already been posted with a disclaimer that the job descriptions were subject to change by LPC and Council.

Moved: Paul McDade  Seconded: Jeffrey Pea
That LPC recommend to Council that it approve the Aboriginal Student Commissioner and International Student Commissioner job descriptions as presented, at tier 1 pay, and that Code be amended to reflect the names and tiers of these positions and to remove “Aboriginal and International Commissioner” from the list of positions.*
The motion carries unanimously.

*Note that quorum was not present for this motion.

Referendum Campaign Team Job Descriptions

Paul expressed a concern that the four different positions (Communications Team Leader, Logistics Team Leader, Marketing Team Leader, and Promotions Team Leader) that constitute the referendum campaign team – outside of the role of Referendum Coordinator – were insufficiently differentiated from each other to the extent that there could be significant role ambiguity in the responsibilities of the positions. Anne noted that, in the past, there had not been different types of roles for referendum campaign team members and that they had all shared general responsibilities for promotional activities; she noted that the idea at this point was

Cole noted that the positions had already been posted with a disclaimer that the job descriptions were subject to change by LPC and Council, and that Caroline had expressed to him that there was some urgency regarding hiring these positions, given the fast-approaching referendum.

The Committee discussed the issue of differentiation between the different positions’ responsibilities and agreed that no referendum campaign team members should be hired until LPC can next convene to discuss, with the Referendum Coordinator, the positions’ responsibilities and the justification for their being structured as-is.

Discrimination, Harassment, and Bullying Policy

Ken noted that new legislation from the Workers’ Compensation Board / WorkSafeBC requires that the AMS adopt a Discrimination, Harassment, and Bullying Policy and that the AMS had just recently heard back from its legal counsel regarding such a policy. The proposed policy was to be sent to the Chair for circulation to the other Committee members for their consideration, with an emphasis on the timeliness of approving such a policy; it was noted that the policy should be reviewed and approved at the next LPC meeting so that it may be forwarded to Council for approval at its November 20th meeting.
External Policy Review

Cole noted that while this has been circulated to the Committee for review and discussion at this meeting, there was insufficient time left to discuss it prior to the departure of the executives from the meeting. It was noted that the Committee would likely not be able to discuss this for several weeks now, as the review of proposed by-law changes for the upcoming referendum had become a priority for the Committee.

It was asked that the Chair provide such notice to Caroline to advise her that the Committee would be unable to take on this project for the immediately foreseeable future.

Proposed Bylaw Changes: Budget Committee Composition

Anne reported back on her consultation with Budget Committee regarding what its composition should be. It was agreed by Budget Committee that there was no clear rationale for having a SAC member be part of the Committee, but that there was some disagreement over who should act as Chair. Some members of Budget Committee has suggested that the Vice-President, Finance should act as a non-voting Chair; members of LPC expressed concerns regarding the resulting in a budgeting process overly dominated by a single individual who would have complete control over what material is brought to Budget Committee for consideration. Cole noted that as a previous member of Budget Committee, it had been his experience that the power of the Chair lied not in their influence over the actual proceedings at meetings and that removing the vote of the Chair – which is only used in the case of a tie – would potentially achieve little in ensuring a division of power continues, as most of the Chair’s power over the budgeting process pertains to what material is presented to the Budget Committee. Due to time constraints, the Committee was unable to discuss this further, though it was noted that the previously suggested idea of having a Councillor who is a member of Budget Committee be selected by Council to act as Chair may create issues in the absence of qualified Council members who are prepared to enter into the role of Chair so early in their term, especially given the nature of budgeting as occurring early in those members’ time in office. Some members of the Committee expressed an opinion that an Executive should thus be Chair of the Committee – though perhaps not the Vice-President, Academic, given their existing workload -- though it was noted that this does post a conflict for such an Executive who might be driven to pursue greater funding for their own portfolio’s initiatives.
Next Meeting

The Chair noted that several Committee members who had indicated they would be available for this meeting did not show up. He expressed concerns regarding that Committee’s ability to process new and existing business should quorum not be possible due to continuing attendance issues. He mentioned that he would be sending out a new Doodle for a regular meeting time – as the previous Doodle has been intended only for a specific week – and would be reminding Committee members to inform him of attendance issues. It was also noted that Committee meetings may be set for 90 minutes for the next while in order to help continue through the important and at times lengthy discussions pertaining to by-law changes.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:11 P.M.