AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
Minutes of January 27th, 2014

Attendance

Present: Matthew (ECSS), Michael (Councillor), Joaquin (VPF), Lauren (Councillor), Cole (Chair), Sheldon (Archivist), Mason (Member at Large)

Recording Secretary: Lauren Telford (Councillor)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:06PM.

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Joaquin
Seconded: Mason
That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Council Absentee Notices

Cole: We aren’t going forward with the change to send letters to Council. Sheldon now sends out notice. A bit of a hassle, only in Code though so easy to change.

Recommend to Council for change.

Moved: Matthew
Seconded: Joaquin

*The motion passes unanimously.*

Fee Exceptions for Youth – wards of the province who age out of Government care

Cole – The discussion for this was mainly last week. No other comments.

Recommend Motion to Council

Moved: Joaquin
Seconded: Mason

*Motion Carries Unanimously*
Adjustments to PAI for Council Resignations

Cole – Oversight realized that they didn’t know what to do for Kiran. 10% based off of executive committee holding meetings with quorum, minutes, etc. 20% for filling of duties. 70% for achieving goals and deliverables. Half a term – half of 10%, half of 20%; the idea was to pro-rate. Harder part is their goals. 70% chunk? If goals are all done in 6 months, the goals possibly aren’t structured enough. Pro-rated portion to maximum of 75% of the 70%. Should there be a penalty for not being around during transition purposes? LPC in the fall thought that there shouldn’t be a penalty that affects goals, which is irrelevant for transition.

Joaquin – Wouldn’t it be easier to pro-rate everything? Still address it with those criteria.

Cole – LPC rejected that motion. We don’t want to encourage ‘quick’ achievement of goals.

Mason – How are the goals evaluated?

Cole – I don’t know a ton about this. Oversight committee sends members to sit with executives to determine goals. Metrics to evaluate.

Joaquin – Metrics and goals are submitted to council to be approved.

Sheldon – Not on how paid.

Cole – The real question is the 70%. Kiran and Derek will have to be evaluated up to the full 70% (can’t change for now).

Sheldon – Have you consulted with Ken?

Cole – He said we have to evaluate them as is.

Sheldon – People resigned in other organizations, so they must have their bonuses taken care of.

Cole – If executive were to complete all of their goals, should they be eligible to receive the full 70%. Argument that productivity should be rewarded.

Matthew – View it as incentive to complete one’s term. To qualify for full amount. Concerned that Kiran and Derek set a precedent.

Cole – Maybe there should be a separate portion for completing term.

Matthew – If we add it as a percentage, we’d only be losing this much.

Joaquin – I agree. Wouldn’t go back for Kiran and Derek, but forward-moving.

Cole – Anne, for example, could receive residual of old person’s.

Matthew – Should be pro-rated.
Mason – They are not motivated to make own goals.

Joaquin – Up to council to regulate.

Mason – Council could have overlooked if they came in so early.

Lauren – Didn’t complete if not there for follow through and no one has transitioned.

Cole – max to 75% as absolute cap. Very specifically trying to ensure no one quits right now.

Joaquin – Previously, LPC tried to decide if we wanted this to be punitive, if there are too many caps it gets to complicated.

Mason – Instead of bits and pieces.

Cole – A portion of it for transition. Which they wouldn’t get; punitive in its own way.


Joaquin – We’re only paying Kiran for transition once.

Cole- Who specifically are they transitioning? Consensus to prorate.

Joaquin - Pro-rating based on number of weeks.

Matthew – Yes, number of weeks in office.

Sheldon- Timeline for submission of goals for interim?

Cole – Goals should be set a certain amount of time after taking office. Say a month. We’ll look at transitional honorarium next time. We seem opposed to any sort of absolute cap.

End of agenda!

Cole – This is miraculous.

Cole- I’m resigning from this position before next council meeting.

One more thing! Services prohibited in campaigning in referendum or election

Matthew – Services as individuals or services as department.

Mason – I think just department.
Cole – I don’t think an individual should be restricted. Does anyone have thoughts on clarifying this in code? (Students that are members can’t campaign for elections.)

Sheldon – Safewalkers shouldn’t be wearing t-shirts for referendum, for example.

Cole- Free to campaign on personal time, not when time is affiliated in AMS.

Cole – I’ll look into how this can go into code.

**Tasks Assigned**

Cole and Sheldon – to write up something before next LPC meeting on PAI for executives who don’t complete their terms.

Cole – to look into how Services impartiality could go into Code.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:43pm
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Minutes of March 7, 2014

Attendance

Present: Graham Beales (Chair), Matthew Duguay, Mateusz Miadikowski, Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council)

Guests: Daniel Levangie (Executive Director), Ken Yih (Senior Manager, HR), Tanner Bokor (AMS President)

Regrets: Jeffrey Pea, Cole Leonoff, Lauren Telford

Recording Secretary: Matthew Duguay

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 14:09 without quorum.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

- Cannot approve motions without quorum

VP Finance Position Reviews

There was discussion surrounding concerns raised from the previous LPC meeting. The position for AVP Finance was edited to say it would review budgets of other groups, and this allayed the concern re: resource groups. Once the changes were understood changing Finance Commission Vice Chair to the AVP Finance and Funds and Grants Administrator, and the move of the Sustainability Projects Coordinator from the Administration portfolio to the Finance portfolio no further issues were raised. The AVP Position, the Funds and Grants Administrator, and the Sustainability Projects Coordinator will be sent to AMS Council for approval. The other position changes were negligible.

There were questions as to whether the names of positions, (Administrator, Coordinator, etc), were standardized. The answer was no, but it shall be looked into. It was decided that Ken and
the Student Services Manager of the time will draft a set of guidelines for position names for the next hiring season.

It was mentioned that keeping the name of every paid position in the executive portfolios in code required a lot of maintenance. A decision was made that code changes for this year will be held until hiring is complete, Sheldon will draft a change to code to remove said names, and the HR department will maintain a list of hiring positions.

**VP Administration Position Changes**

The only point of contention was the pay of the Clubs Administrator Position at Tier 2 rather than Tier 1. This was copied from last year, when there was a long discussion of the issue at Council. However, LPC agreed that the position did not fit the requirements for Tier 2, and therefore it was changed to Tier 1 and was forwarded to Council for March 12, 2014. The other VP Administration changes were nominal.

**Conflict of Interest in Policy**

Ken quickly outlined the background allowing students to hold a position on Council as an AMS employee. It was generally agreed that this was a conflict of interest and should be changed as most councilors can easily give up their seat if they need the money. The committee decided to wait to finalize the discussion once it has quorum.

**Tasks Assigned**

Sheldon – Draft Code to remove Tiered positions in Code

Ken & SSM—Draft guidelines for position names

Ken—Create system to document all hired positions within HR.

Graham—Send motions re: new code changes to council.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is March 11, 2014.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 14:51.
Agenda of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
June 5, 2014

Attendance

Present: Veronica, Janik, Paul, Jenna, Sheldon, Ava, Jeff

Invited:

Regrets: Graham, Mark Bancroft, Lauren Telford

Recording Secretary: Jenna

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:38 pm

Agenda Items

1. Welcome & Introductions – 3 min

2. Approval of Agenda & Remarks from the Chair – 2 min

   - Removing Vantage College
   - Approval of Agenda
     Moved: Ava, Second: Paul
     The motion passed unanimously
   - Remarks from the Chair
     Jenna: VSEUS Committee
     Sheldon: Code Change – Council can make the President a signing officer, this year Anne is gone for three weeks, code amendment to make President signing officer for the summer. This will be a temporary code amendment. It is in Bylaws now, not in Code.

3. Transitional Honoraria for Committee Chairs (as Circulated) – 5 min

   Sheldon: adding on committee chairs, nothing else is changing.
Move: Veronika, Second: Paul
The motion passed unanimously

4. Resource Group Code Changes (as Circulated) – 10 min

Ava: as long as the code changes are in the nature of what was discussed at meetings, the recommendations they chose, they stay. Significant changes would be problematic, so we should go through proposals.
Section XI, Article 2, Section 1:
-Ava: Add “as long as two weeks notice of the inspection is given,” so that they may be aware of this (ex: Women’s Centre)
Section XI, Article 3, Section 2
-Paul: to add “from that resource group”
Section XI, Article 3, Section 10
-Ava: should this be consultation or facilitated by FinCom? Consultation would be the VP Admin and the resource group hiring, with FinCom doing the paperwork. FinCom should be in the administration end of the hiring.
-Veronika: FinCom should not be facilitating the hiring, because then they would be in charge of the interview process. This is not what FinCom needs to be working on.
-Ava: interview and hiring process must go through Human Resources department so FinCom does not need to be included to deal with paperwork after the fact. Human Resources Manager would be able to ensure that proper paperwork is done.

Vote on these code changes
Move: Veronika, Second: Jeff
The motion passed unanimously

5. Council Agenda Code Changes (as Circulated, postponed from May 29th) – 20 min

-Sheldon: Tanner brought it up, wanted time at the beginning of the meeting for up to 3 minutes each for Members-at-Large (up to 5). To include an in-camera portion of meeting in the Council meeting, in the hope that in-camera matters would be postponed until the end.
-Paul: should not be an included section in the agenda, being that it is optional. We should not have to prompt it or encourage it.
-Sheldon: mentioned last meeting, should appointments been done early?
-Paul: presentations, statements and then appointments before motions.
Article 2, Section 14 (new)
- Paul: change to 3 members
- Veronika: should say statements from ‘members-at-large’, rather than ‘AMS members’, in order to stop Counsellors from using this time
- Paul: include “sign-up must occur before meeting” with the Administrative Assistant
- Jenna: “in-camera portion”
- Veronika: should be moved from order “in-camera (optional), but Section 21, (j) to be discussed
- Paul: Once ordering is fixed, “appointments” should be in section (f), rather than “appointments to committees and commissions”, so as not to limit it
- Sheldon: elaborates “students at large” not “members-at-large”

Vote
- Move: Ava, Second: Paul
The motion passed unanimously

6. **Conflict of Interest Discussion** – 15 min

   a. Suggestion: add code to conflict of interest rules to allow non-Councillors (e.g., AMS staff) to identify who might be in a conflict of interest

   Sheldon: Ken, HR Manager – has shown that non-directors probably know of conflicts of interest, so they should be the ones who should be able to raise conflict of interest problems. Invite Ken to the next meeting?

7. **Vantage College Discussion** – 30 min

   a. At what level of representation will Vantage College be recognized?

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 6:00pm Thursday, June 12th 2014 in TBD location

Adjourn

1. Moved Paul, Seconded Veronika

   There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:31 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
June 19, 2014

Attendance

Present: Graham, Paul, Jeff, Mark, Yannick, Paul, Sheldon, Mateuz, Veronica

Invited:

Regrets: Jenna Omassi

Recording Secretary: Veronica Knott

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 pm

Agenda Items

1. Welcome & Introductions

2. Approval of Agenda & Remarks from the Chair
   
   Moved: Paul
   
   Second: Mark
   
   Unanimous

3. Approval of June 5, 2014 Minutes
   
   Moved: Paul
   
   Second: Mark
   
   Unanimous

4. Conflict of Interest Discussion – 15 minutes
   
   a. Suggestion: add code to conflict of interest rules to allow non-Councilors (e.g., AMS staff) to identify who might be in a conflict of interest
b. Graham: Currently, only Directors can point out conflicts of interests. This mean that the Speaker, nor AMS Staff can point out a conflict of interest.

c. Sheldon: Many members who sit in Council cannot point out conflicts.

d. Graham: Currently, it doesn’t forbid people from pointing it out but it would be odd.

e. Sheldon: Anyone can speak in meeting technically, there is no restrictions.

f. Graham: We can ignore it, since there is nothing for forbidding them from speaking.

g. Sheldon: Did we speak to Ken about this.

h. Jeff: Is this going to happen often?

i. Paul: I could see it coming up and I could see it the most likely but I want to know why they want it distinctly in code.

j. Veronica: I thought last time we decided they could tell a director.

k. Graham: But what if the director did not agree with this conflict.

l. Sheldon: This is mostly because we didn’t go with the Conflict of Interest document. So then since the Clerk of Council won’t have a list.

m. Paul: In code, do directors have a duty?

n. Sheldon: “they shall”

o. Graham: Agreement is I should talk to Ken.

p. Paul: We don’t think it should be as bidding for AMS Staff. Let’s wait it out.

5. Code Review Re: Student Fee Referendum(to be circulated) – 30 minutes


b. Sheldon: First Question, making reference to the Endowment Fund to make a reference to something that isn’t currently there. When we passed the code in 2013, the motion stated the terms of reference should be in the code, which was never done.
c. Graham: How long have we had the fund?

d. Sheldon: It was in the by-laws in 2013.

e. Graham: Is there money in there?

f. Mateuz: Yes.

g. Graham: What is the purpose?

h. Mateuz: Surpluses go there and spent on the recommendation of budget committee.

i. Sheldon: Limit is open, principal cannot be spent, interest benefit for increasing amount, and advancing the mission of the society, including strategic planning, governance and other mission. If unforeseen surplus, in fund.

j. Graham: Do we have a proposal for the terms of reference for other allocations of society revenues? And terms of references for disbursement of the interest of the fund.

k. Paul: No point discusses it until we’ve looked into the numbers.

l. Graham: Would Mateuz like to look into that?

m. Mateuz: Yup, code and common amount to keep in endowment.

n. Sheldon: Second question, most recent referendum where we changed SUB repairs and replacement fund, for student government repairs and we need to create code for what student government furnishings.

o. Graham: Any knowledge of why?

p. Sheldon: Splitting of operations and student. We are only supposed to use it for the student side of the AMS. Didn’t want to define the AMS student in the bylaws.

q. Paul: I don’t think we’re qualified to define AMS student verses business.

r. Graham: We could define the specific furniture.

s. Paul: Don’t want to specify it too much.
t. Graham: How much?

u. Mateuz: Almost a million but unsure. Always keep 15% of evaluated.

v. Graham: What about student spaces?

w. Paul: I don’t think we can define this, do we want this to be more restricted or more open.

x. Mateuz: The fund is set, at 15% of student government furnishing.

y. Sheldon: Actually were deciding how much money is in this fund by defining the student government.

z. Paul: We can’t create a satisfactory answer.

aa. Mark: Out of curiosity, where does the money currently come from?

bb. Sheldon: All from this fund. Last year we abolished the SUB Management fund.

c. Graham: Mateuz to look into it.

dd. Paul: How do you even start it.

ee. Sheldon: I spoke to Keith, I’d have to look into it.

ff. Graham: There are other split societies, how do they manage it.

gg. Paul: I know we’ve been talking about un-doing the split. So not worth it, can we move on.

hh. Graham: Move on to election reserve fund. We have no more money going into it.

ii. Mateuz: The fund has no physical accounts.

jj. Paul: But it exists in code.

kk. Sheldon: Are you recommending we abolish it?

ll. Paul: Recommending we send it over to UNICORN for their opinion.
mm. Mateuz: Money from general fees don’t go to elections reserve, similar amounts will be budgeted in the VP External’s portfolio. Therefore it is more of their decision to spend. If it’s in the fund, Council will have to approve it.

nn. Paul: This should go to more people before it comes to us. This is more about if we need the fund, which is not in the realm of LPC.

oo. Sheldon: It was sent here from external three years ago.

pp. Paul: Send it to UNICORN.

qq. Graham: They have a meeting next week, see if we can get it on agenda.

rr. Sheldon: Question Four, took fees away from lobbying fund and student services fund. Do we want to remove from code for these funds and other sub management fund? However SUB management fund still has money in it.

ss. Graham: I had discussed with Matthew, but it’s on my laptop.

tt. Paul: My understanding was that we won’t keep them.

uu. Mateuz: But we’re keeping the External Portfolio, how are they different/

vv. Graham: Are student services funded out of general budget?

ww. Mateuz: Out of fund. But when we fund out of funds, it will be funded by general membership fee.

xx. Paul: I think it’s weird to not have a separate allocation for them. It feels sketchier to spend it out of general budget.

yy. Mateuz: Then you allocate money in the budget restricted to them. Before it would be a big pool then they spend how much out of it they need, based on approval from budget committee.

zz. Paul: Then if we keep the fund, we move it from general to services, and then move it to them.

aaa. Graham: It would be the same thing but extra transfer.

bbb. Mateuz: But if it was budget, it wasn’t in separate fund it was able to be responsibly used.
ccc. Graham: Once it hits zero, scrap the fund and budget it out of general budget.

ddd. Graham: How much do Student Services cost?

eee. Mateuz: If we run out of fees, then it can come out of general budget. Will be good for future planning.

fff. Graham: Sheldon come back the writing to remove it once it hits zero.

ggg. Paul: I don’t think we should do it till it’s gone.

hhh. Mateuz: We also have the Lobbying Fund which will hit zero next year.

iii. Paul: Don’t know what it’s used for.

jjj. Mateuz: It cannot be used for expenditures, only for lobbying. But was suspended last year.

kkk. Paul: Just silly since takes money away from offices.

lll. Graham: We should talk to both UNICORN and VP External. And maybe Budget Committee?

mmm. Paul: I think we should push everything back to Budget Committee.

nnn. Graham: Agree Services can be scrapped when at 0.

ooo. Sheldon: we can leave all three in place until hit 0.

ppp. Paul: As long as nothing about putting money into,

qqq. Sheldon: only lobbying to elections reserve.

rrr. Paul: But can do name changes.

sss. Sheldon: Additions and Improvement to the Software System.

ttt. Paul: Referendum right?

uuu. Sheldon: Just putting it into code. Added in “these were put through by referendum if relevant”. E.g. not the Old Barn Renovations since it was demolished. However, not Whistler Cabin since we still own it. That is the most substantial change we can make.
vvv. Paul: All code changes up to Point 6 Article 6.

www. Sheldon: Won’t touch funds until after. But make change to Capital Projects Fund. SUB Repair Replacement Fund changed to 15% but not finished sentence since we can’t define student government.

xxx. Graham: Question about Capital Projects Fund, discussion about Software that is not a capital project.

yyy. Paul: Leave it as general. Don’t want to add restrictions to council.

zzz. Sheldon: I’ll come back next week.

6. Discussion: Constituencies – 45 minutes

a. Definition of a Constituency & Which bodies should be recognized

i. Graham: Largely because of Vantage College, currently degree granting bodies which is all faculties or schools. But this will not include Vantage College, but they are AMS members.

ii. Paul: They should have some representation.

iii. Sheldon: Other issue is School of Economics. How do we decide who they represent?

iv. Graham: The university has strict guidelines about where you’re registered. For example a school majoring in Arts but taking Economics cannot be in VSEUS.

v. Mateuz: Music needs to change it’s constitution.

vi. Graham: Still consider students no longer taking courses.

vii. Sheldon: Enrollment services don’t collect those fees.

viii. Jenna: Who is the legitimate body to represent VSEUS?

ix. Graham: I would say, based on past practices, the school over the Faculty.

x. Jeff: Why does Kin not have someone?
xi. Veronica: Jason!

xii. Graham: UBC has definitions of what is in which school.

xiii. Sheldon: Should be the constituency your in by the registration in the school body.

xiv. Graham: Administrative body so Vantage is included.


xvi. Veronica:

xvii. Graham: Don’t start in first year for nursing and pharmacy.

xviii. Sheldon: Larger issue is we tied ourselves to UBC definitions.

xix. Paul: Problems with schools who don’t start in first year. But not about defining constituencies. More concerned about Senate definitions just being referred to. But I would prefer the guidelines are copied and added as changed.

xx. Sheldon: It would be good to see what the senate guidelines are.

xxi. Paul: That they are not a school or Faculty.

xxii. Veronica: How are they going to be elected?

xxiii. Graham: Education.

xxiv. Paul: Size, 1000 students.

xxv. Veronica: My issue is will they get proper representation.

xxvi. Paul: They need representation.

xxvii. Sheldon: Create a non-voting seat.

xxviii. Graham: They are being represented without a vote.

xxix. Sheldon: It’s like VST and Regent.
xxx. Paul: Their not one year programs. We’ve had great first year councilors, don’t have enough time to know what’s going on.

xxxi. Jeff: Going to be consistently first years that have trouble with English.

xxxii. Veronica: I prefer non-voting. Why are they AMS?

xxxiii. Sheldon: Their taking first year classes.

xxxiv. Graham: A new classification outside of UBC, with slightly different language requirements.

xxxv. Sheldon: Way to reach students who don’t go through IB.

xxxvi. Mateuz: Will be treated like a normal voting member.

xxxvii. Graham: Treated to like a Faculty.

xxxviii. Sheldon: Regent and VST are individual members but not their constituency.

xxxix. Paul: Are we considering a Vantage college constituency?

xl. Jeff: Current non-voting

xli. Sheldon: Not that represent students, but student services manager and ombuds.

xlII. Graham: Meeting with Vantage College, creating a constituency.

xlIII. Paul: I feel like we shouldn’t discuss this. Focus more on VSEUS and less on Vantage college.

xlIV. Graham: Would you like us to return for non-voting seat?

xlV. Paul: I feel like we should talk to Council without a set opinion before.

xlVI. Graham: Facilitators on AMS side to create a constituency. I would recommend SAC or VP Admin office.

xlVII. Paul: Wouldn’t be absurd to throw it on SAC.

xlVIII. Veronica: Difference between clubs and constituencies.
xl. Sheldon: There isn’t much about monitoring constituencies, including constitutions.

i. Sheldon: Question is next time UBC creates a new school, how does it work?

ii. Paul: Council was looking for a way to look for handle this.

iii. Sheldon: Procedures for forming a constituency.

liii. Graham: LPC can help with writing constituency.

liv. Sheldon: We can modify, but don’t need to originally see it.

lv. Veronica: Council wants an application system.

lvi. Paul: As well, as a timeline for creating a constituency.

lvii. Application:

1. Need to be an association of students at a School or Faculty recognized by UBC.

2. Constitution approved by LPC.

3. If within Faculty, within constituency, prove written communication with existing constituency that you are planning on leaving.

4.

5. Council constituency approves a constituency based on a referendum by it’s proposed members.

   a. “Once conditionally approved by council, then AMS will help you hold a referendum for the people you propose to be a constituency for. Then they have a 2/3 majority vote.”

      i. Then they can apply for the Emergency Fund.

      ii. Referendum will be authorized to be the constituency as well as fees. But has to be two separate clubs. Then conditional approval fails.
lviii. Graham: What about multiple applications?
lix. Paul: Get blocked by LPC and Council
lx. Sheldon: What about fees not approved?
lxi. Graham: You can be a constituency without fees.
lxii. Sheldon: What about “Council shall recognize of the degree granting faculties and schools“?
lxiii. Paul: But they have to be the a student society?
lxiv. Veronica: By by-laws are we mandate to accept them?
lxv. Paul: Can we chose not to recognize as a student society as those students? Since they did not go through our procedure.
lxvi. Graham: I would want majority students vote in favour.
lxvii. Veronica: UBCO has 60%.
lxviii. Paul: Thrilled for 20%.
lxix. Graham: But 80% not vote,
lxx. Paul: That’s apathy not vote. Set at fee referendum, 10%.
lxxi. Graham: Come back in 2 weeks.

b. AMS Facilitators of Constituency Creation
c. Over-arching timeline to create a Constituency

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 6:00pm Thursday, June 26th 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Paul, Seconded Mark
There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:31 pm
Agenda of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
June 26, 2014

Attendance

Present: Jenna, Mateusz, Paul, Jeff, Ava, Tanner, Sheldon, Graham, Janik

Invited:

Regrets: Mark, Veronica

Recording Secretary: Jenna Omassi

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:09 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Agenda – 2 min
   Moved: Mateusz, Seconded: Paul

2. Remarks from the Chair – 2 min
   N/A

3. Policy Review—Responsible use of Student Emails (To be circulated) – 20 min

   Graham: Cannot pass unless we pass policy on policies. There are some typos to be pointed out. The main thing to do is get comments. Difficulties are goals and definitions, but the policy itself can mostly be copied over. The first half of the “policies” is new, but is before the LIBR clauses, so they are not bindings. Typo in the first line, should not be 2(5 in the second clause.
   -Under definitions: “purposes of this policy” only
   Old Policy
   -Comment (1): expanding into other domains, but does this align with UBC policy?
   -Should tenants be included in the policy?
     -Paul: should they be allowed access?
     -Graham: Policy, 5. “in consultation with the marketing manager and operations,
with the President”
-Graham: people we have contracts with. They will be kept out.
-Graham: is once a month too restrictive?
- Ava: maybe at the discretion of the president?
- Tanner: university just does not want us to spam them. To define this restriction in the MOU.
- Sheldon: originally the university restricted to once a term, recently changed.
This policy is in a response to the university.
-Paul: Policy, 2. Send to SLCC, at their discretion instead of at the discretion of the President. Need to define “emergency”.
-UNECORN must pass their policy first, before we can vote and pass any policy.

*Action Item: definition of “emergency”*

**4. Constituency Discussion (Preliminary Code Circulated) – 40 min**

-Do we want an external group to be able to carry out their own referendum? Or should it be the AMS who is running the organization and creating this constituency on their behalf, this way there is no organization that starts it off.
-Paul: important to discuss VSEUS, because it is the reason we are discussing this.
-Ava: how should this have worked?
-Paul: more work for the AMS, but it is more legitimate. Is this sketchy?
-Jenna: if there is interest, then the AMS should facilitate.
-Paul: the problem with organizations already formed, is that there is a desire to be an executive of the constituency. Unless there is a way that we can ensure that nominations and elections are fair. There may be more trust in the AMS with them facilitating this.
-Tanner: hybrid model – society (ex: AMS) has a meeting of those students and there is a working group/committee, this committee works on a constitution, holds a referendum, constituency is created. Senate will give us a notification when a new school or faculty are created.
-Sheldon: what is the trigger for the creation of this constituency? We could either have a group approach the AMS OR the AMS can approach students.
-Paul: Having SAC approaching them, in that VP Administration works with that. The Clerk of Council will notify SAC when students are enrolled.
-Sheldon: Should it be our senators who do so? Since VP Academic is the liaison with Senate, should they be the ones to find out numbers and find out if students are enrolled in the school.
- Mateusz: VP Academic let the Executive committee know. The Executive Committee sends out a notice to the students in the school and calls the meeting. Committee to create constitution and Elections Administrator should hold those elections.
- Hold referendum, run by EA
  - Then hold executive elections and other referendums
- Jenna: What is a student society? It is a student’s association/undergraduate society that is recognized by the majority of students in a referendum, held by the AMS. This must be defined clearly.

5. **Capital Projects Fund Referendum Changes (Preliminary Code circulated)** – 20 min

  a. Define “Student Government Furnishings”
  → To be postponed

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is 6:00pm Thursday July 3rd, 2014 in SUB 266J

**Adjourn**

1. Moved Mateusz, Seconded Ava

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:33 pm
Attendance

Present: Jenna, Graham, Sheldon, Ava, Mark, Jeff, Tanner, Paul

Invited: Ken Yih (Director of Human Resources), Daniel Levangie Executive Director

Regrets: Janik, Lauren

Recording Secretary:

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:07 pm

Agenda Items

1. Adoption of the Agenda – 2 min
   Graham: might ask for discussions if there is time at the end.
   Move: Paul, Second: Mark
   Passed unanimously

2. Remarks from the Chair – 2 min

   Graham: UNECORN meeting tomorrow, policy on policies and other policies that might be rescinded (CASA). SLCC is on Monday and they will be approached with the policy on policy as well, and the responsible use of students’ emails. The communications policy has been commented on by the communications manager and Daniel.
   The Council meeting on August 13th will be pushed back to August 20th. If all goes well, that meeting can be pull of policy changes!

3. Adoption of June 19, 2014 Minutes – 2 min

   Move: Jenna, Second: Paul
   Passed unanimously
4. **New SUB Community Engagement Coordinator JD** – 5 min
   
a. Increase from 15 to 35 hours / week until the end of August.
   
   Ava: With the Opening Ceremonies, following the same model as first week. Like First Week there is one full time staff or two part-time coordinators, they see it as beneficial to increase the current Community Engagement Coordinators’ hours until August. At that time there will be an assistant hired. This is retroactive as the current coordinator has already been working 35 hours, since June 1st to August 31st. The job description when she was hired was for 15 hours and then to increase hours June 1st.
   
   Sheldon: Changes to the term in employment during the time, which means it should be going to Council.
   
   Graham: regardless of employment, their JD is changing and it has to go to Council.
   
   Jenna: is there a problem since it is retroactive?
   
   Graham: funding from New SUB
   
   Ava: her salary is coming out of the New SUB hiring, though some of her salary (her base pay) is coming out of Ava’s budget allocated by the budget committee
   
   Move: Mark, Second: Jeff
   
   Passed unanimously

5. **SAC Clubs Administrator JD Modification** – 5 min
   
a. Increase from 15 to 20 hours per week until the end of October
   
   Graham: this is the same as the last situation
   
   Ava: two sets of office allocations, helping Carol plan the SAC wine and cheese and the pizza night/open house in the fall. On top of her other tasks, she has been taking on more. Ideally the start date would be the beginning of July.
   
   Jenna: if we did the community engagement coordinator’s salary retroactive, then we should be doing the same for the SAC Club Administrator.
   
   Ava: The SAC Club Administrator knew.
   
   Mark: If she has been working these hours, then she should be paid.
   
   Graham: where is the money coming from?
   
   Ava: the SAC budget
   
   Voting on July 1st-October 31st
Move: Paul, Second: Mark
Passed unanimously

6. Nest Fest Assistant Coordinator (As Circulated) – 10 min

Graham: HR had a few questions about this. Currently this position reports to two people – events manager & New SUB community engagement coordinator.
Ava: The two work together as a team, which is why that the position is reporting to both.
Tanner: there are a few positions that report to a few people.
Graham: Ken said that it is not recommended, not that it is not permissible.
Tanner: I would probably say that they report to the community engagement coordinator. (Amendment made)
Graham: the other question was in regards for it being tier two pay rate. They are supervising, but does not mean that they are managing. Are they using events staff, or have their own staff?
Ava: There is a team that they would oversee. This would be a team to volunteer. The community engagement coordinator would not have the time to oversee them.
Tanner: Nest Fest is autonomous event, so there is quite a bit of responsibility towards this position.
Lauren comment: qualifications “knowledge of AMS and its affiliates”
Paul: why does this position need it?
Ava: if you can plan an event, that is sufficient for the planning of the Nest Fest.

Move: Jenna, Second: Ava
Passed unanimously

7. Committee Appointment Policy (As Circulated) – 30 min

Graham: LPC would like to take this and finish it, instead of sending this back to Exec Com.
Sheldon: The original idea is that we want to encourage more members-at-large to apply for committees. The core is on page three (“recruitment process”). A lot of other stuff is philosophy. We could just make a Code amendment and speak about what the President must do to recruit students.
Tanner: this is off a template. The original base point for this is a policy for recruitment. Most things have been modified.
Jeff: a few months ago we looked at something like this and sent it back to Exec Com. It is now being brought back.
Sheldon: another section that is interesting is the exemption section on page 5. This is all about executives on committees. Not sure there is much to do with recruiting students at large.
Jenna: It is hard to find the purpose. It is very long-winded and with the purpose stated should not have all of this written, and only the important parts should be brought out.
Graham: the purpose is outlined at the beginning. Either rewrite a policy that matches this purpose only (because there is a lot more) and put that into code. Or put both into code with separate sections.
Paul: why is it one-week and not two or other? Change the deadline to ten-business days (technically two weeks)
Sheldon: Paragraph 3 speak of 5 to 7 days, but this is because we don’t know this is coming. Resignations are a good example (and will not necessarily be known two weeks in advance)
Tanner: It would be great to have the forms that are used for nominations to come through LPC.
Sheldon: Should the consultation/information sessions?
Tanner: They used to have them.
Jenna: This would be problematic because no one would come. It is hard enough to get them to apply on the forms online.
Paul: It would have to not be every time there are open spots.
Ava: There should be an option to speak to chairs of council.
Graham: should this go into Code and not Policy? Decided that it would be going into Code. Vote on information sessions being a part of Code – 3 yes and 2 no in the unofficial vote. As long as it is twice a year, rather than every time there are open positions.
Sheldon: I will take the core pieces of this and put it into Code. What about emergencies? Instead of having the elaborate piecing on this, there should be a short version of what to do. Exemptions – pre-approved positions.
Tanner: VP Academic, VP Admin there need to be pre-approved positions, university committees that they have to have reserved seats there. The executives would get kicked off some committees that they are currently on if they had to wait for Council to wait for approval.
Graham: delegate authority to Exec Com to make these types of appointments and then would report to council (no motion) to let them know that certain executives are on
committees.
Paul: Council should just know and have the chance to weigh in. There should be a presentation or a motion to approve the list of committees that the executives sit on. The only problem is that the agenda committee has the list of pre-approved committees, but Council does not see it. That change needs to be made.
Tanner: This can be added to the process already in place to appoint executives to standing committees.
Paul: a motion with a list and then some to follow up when other committees come up
Tanner: Exec Com should recommend

8. Constituency Creation (As Circulated) – 20 min

Graham: have not heard back from the university about fee assessments – what students with dual degrees do.
Sheldon: Discuss new changes
Paul: When does the organizing committee dissolves?
Tanner: Agreed it was when the election was called
Paul: Then no conflict of interest
Graham: Will be changed to 14 days notice (from 7 days for referendum)
Sheldon: We need to decide how to choose the chair – should it be chosen at the original meeting or through the voting members of the committee?
Paul: should be fine choosing from the committee
Sheldon: When do they submit the constitution?
Paul: They have to have finished their constitution before the referendum.
Jenna: Their constitution should be looked at after the referendum. The referendum is based off of the AMS Elections Rules, not the constitution. So the referendum can happen. Then the constitution is changed be LPC after.
Paul: LPC should definitely look at it.
Jenna: But this should be after the referendum has happened.
Jenna: What is the point of the letter mentioned in 12? This should be after the step 1, to ensure that there is an acknowledgement of the affected constituency. The affected constituency would be let known of the fact that there is a new constituency coming and the ramifications.
Paul: If there is an affected constituency and if the constituency President wants to sit as a non-voting member on the committee as a non-voting member, they should be provided with that opportunity.
AMS Legislative Procedures Committee

Agenda of July 24, 2014 Meeting

9. **Policy Review Assignments (To be Circulated) – 15 min**

   Graham: Currently separating out policies with initial comments from Sheldon, with steps to update each and who to consult with (initial people). Some high priority:
   - Ethical purchasing
   - Surveillance
   - Travel
   - Bi-elections timing
   - Cold beverages
   Ava: they were all assigned, but never happened
   Graham: They are a few that I will be trying to rescind, others that will just go away
   Jenna: I’ll take AMS Travel Policy
   Tanner: I’ll take Ethical & Sustainable Purchasing

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is 6:00pm July 31st, 2014 in SUB 266J

**Adjourn**

1. Moved Jenna, Seconded Ava

   There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
August 7, 2014

Attendance

Present: Graham, Mark, Janik, Ava, Mateusz, Sheldon, Keith, Graeme, Ross, Ken, Jeff, Paul, Phillip

Invited: Ken Yih, (Director of Human Resources), Ross Horton (General Manager), Keith Hester (Director of Finance and Administration), the members of the Business and Administrative Governance Board

Regrets: Veronica, Lauren, Jenna

Recording Secretary: Mark Bancroft

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:17 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Agenda – 2 min
   Moved Aboriginal Students Commissioner to after BAGB
   Corrected date to August 7
   Moved by Janik, seconded by Mark

2. Updates & Remarks from the Chair – 2 min
   Graham: Status of Policy Reviews? Janik still needs his
   Ross: Jenna working on hers.
   Mark: Working on mine.

3. Approval of the July 31, 2014 Minutes (As Circulated) – 2 min
   Moved by Mateusz, seconded by Ava

4. Motion from Council re: BAGB & the GM Reporting Structure (As Circulated) – 60 min
a. The original motion presented to Council is attached.

Graham: Most discussion at the last Council meeting revolved around the wording of “report”. LPC was asked to look at the whole motion keeping in mind BAGB’s motivation behind the motion.

Sheldon: Council had stricken the line about the General Manager reporting to President. Speaker ruled that LPC can consult on the stricken line.

Graham: Not sure if LPC is the best group to come up with alternative wording, especially for report – It would be better to go to Legal or HR.

Sheldon: Before we worry about the wording we should understand the philosophy behind the motion.

Graeme: BAGB looks at the commercial operations of the AMS. The Motion comes as a result of concerns raised during BAGBs time. The wording of motion was mulled over quite thoroughly by BAGB. There is concern from BAGB about LPC changing the words of the motion. The spirit behind the motion is that there is an information gap between what executives feel they should know and what they do know, and this motion aims to narrow the gap.

Going through the motion point by point:

Point 1: BAGB interprets report as the sharing of information. The intention was not to set up a hierarchy.
Point 2: The Executive are the directors of the Society. There is concern they do not have the authority or information with regards to the businesses to act as directors.
Point 3: Advising is not the same as asking for permission. The purpose is just to inform. This is so the President is always in the loop and is not being blindsided. An example is if the media asks the President about something business related, the president is able to answer.
Point 4: Question is whether $20,000 is a valid threshold. Keith has recommended to BAGB that we reconsider the amount.
Point 5: Reaffirms that BAGB is a strategic board. As a strategic board BAGB has made really big impacts. It reaffirms the advisory nature of the Board. Because of the limited amount they meet, BAGB cannot be responsible for day-to-day operations of the businesses. That
responsibility should fall on the President.
Point 6: This is to act as a check and balance.

Through this motion BAGB is not trying to change the structure of the society.

LPCs term of references should be whether this motion complies with AMS bylaws and if not, why not? Is it breaking code, and if it is, in what capacity and what needs to be changed?

BAGB would like LPC to review if the motion breaks code and then report back to BAGB by our August 26th meeting. It will be an open meeting, where all stakeholders can attend. BAGB would like to work on the motion during that meeting to then present to council.

Phillip: In creating the motion BAGB was aware of Societies Act 24,25,26: Directors must supervise the management and affairs of the society. The motion was crafted with this in mind. It is important that directors are able to manage and supervise the affairs of the society.

Graeme: This is not currently how the AMS is operating. This motion is a temporary measure to holder over until the larger governance review of the society. It is a stopgap measure as we enter the new SUB and students have questions about what is going on with the businesses. Does not need to go into full force this year.

Graham: Lots of people don’t believe that there is an issue in reporting structure.

Ross: No one’s communicated that there are issues in the reporting structure to me.

Phillip: From the perspective of BAGB the motion deserves second look, especially with some of the contentious points. BAGB does not expect LPC to fix the wording in the meeting. BAGB would like to look at the motion again.

Sheldon: The issue whether reporting violates the bylaws – this is the only clear issue in the motion where there might be a conflict with bylaws.

Paul: Why aren’t we considering putting this in code?

Graeme: The answer to this question might be beyond my knowledge.
Phillip: Not well versed in the nature of the Society. When BAGB crafted this motion it was for quick implementation as a stopgap measure.

Ava: Can we put it in code as a temporary measure?

Paul: Motions are still binding but they are difficult to hunt down and are easy to forget.

Sheldon: This is slightly odd because if you want to change code you required a 2/3rd majority but a motion just needs a simple majority.

Graham: Did Ross see the motion before it went to Council?

Ross: To clarify my earlier point, no performance or accountability issues have been communicated to me. The Executive feel as though they’re not in the loop, and I echo this sentiment.

Phillip: Motion was shared with Ross before it went to Council. Ross was asked to prepare a memo for BAGB to review. Ross did this and BAGB considered the memo in a conference call before the motion went to Council. BAGB did not make any changes to the motion after receiving Ross' feedback. BAGB did not amend the motion partly because the conference call was one day before the AMS Council meeting and partly because BAGB members felt that amending the motion on the phone did not allow for full discussion and debate about the amendments.

Graeme: The next BAGB meeting is an open conversation. Not just voting members can attend. For the Governance Review, is there pressure from Council for changes or should BAGB help stoke the fire?

Ava: Tanner has a new hire to look after the Governance Review. Things are slowly being rolled out within the next two weeks.

Paul: Is there a timeline for the review?

Ross: Tanner expects the report to be done within his term.

Sheldon: Does BAGB want to create a time limit on this motion?

Graeme: BAGB would consider it.

Graham: Does LPC want to send it to BAGB and then send it back to LPC?
Paul: This should happen anyway for due process.

Graeme: We would like to invite someone from LPC to the next BAGB meeting to provide knowledge on code.

Graham: People who it effects would be best the best people to comment on it, not LPC.

*Motion to refer the Motion presented to BAGB:*
Moved by Paul, Seconded by Janik

Graeme: For Point 3 of the motion – Is advising a violation of liaising?

Sheldon: Don’t think it’s violating code or bylaws.

Ross: It’s the reporting section that will violate bylaws.

Graham: Might want to clarify Code with respect to the reporting.

Paul: It is sounding more and more like code needs to be changed. Changing code makes it more solid, lasts longer, and is easier to find as opposed to a Motion.

Ava: Looking at the Calendar, we would have two LPC meetings to talk about code changes before the first September Council meetings.

Sheldon: Does LPC want to see code changes? This is not in code currently. It is BAGB, not the Executive who do a lot of these things.

Graham: Recommend Sheldon draft code to fit with the motion.

Ava: It is not very likely that the entire executive can on a daily basis oversee the day-to-day operations of the businesses.

Paul: You are arguing that day-to-day oversight shouldn’t be in the motion. Not if the changes is presented in code or a motion.

Ava: There needs to be a clarified notion of what day-to-day constitutes.

Graham: Is it under anyone’s roll for the day-to-day operations?

Ross: Mine.
Graham: Got an email from Tanner about creating a more stringent process about the firing of senior staff and the General Manager with Council requiring a 2/3rd majority to approve.

Ross: That wasn’t on his mind. I would rather this preposition of Tanner be tackled separately. In my opinion only the GM should be able to fire senior staff..

Graeme: Reporting vs Liaison. Is anyone going to look into this further?

Graham: Best alternative is to ask legal?

Paul: How long is that going to take and how much is that going to cost?

Ross: It would cost between $500-$1000 dollars. Will not take a long time. Legal can have it done in 48 hours.

Ken: I would recommend finding out what you want to accomplish first and then finding the wording.

Paul: Didn’t people already know what they wanted to accomplish?

Graham: At the last council meeting it seemed like people thought they knew what they wanted to accomplish but then realized they didn’t.

Sheldon: Sounded like at Council BAGB did not want the strict sense of report, why not change the word to “liaise with.” It also sounded like BAGB did not want day-to-day operations in the traditional sense.

Mateusz: Could change it to overall operations.

Graeme: Would not feel comfortable changing wording now without the opinion of the other members of BAGB who feel strongly about the wording.

Phillip: Hypothetically how would you approach legal? It takes a lot of time for everyone to attend BAGB meetings and will it be better it we just approach legal?

Ross: You would go through myself or Tanner.

Ken: Have the discussion first and only use legal as a final stage.

Graeme: Is someone from LPC coming to BAGB meetings or will we have to refer back to LPC?
Paul: You will need to refer back to LPC anyways.

5. Job Description – Aboriginal Students Commissioner (As Circulated) – 5 min

Graham: Anne would agree with the removal of “an asset” from the knowledge of indigenous student interests.

-Wide agreement of this point

Jeff: It states “previous research experience is an asset, though not required”. The “though not required” is not consistent with the formatting of the other points where “is an asset” is found.

Ava: “Though not required” makes it more friendly and approachable to students who may not have that experience.

Paul: I recommend adding “though not required” to “is an asset”

Graham: Lauren would recommend adding a point about good communication skills to Qualifications and Experience

Ava: Could be: Professional conduct and communication skills

Mark: Formatting issues with “Might not hold any other position at the AMSInterest in student issues and advocacy”

Paul: Knowledge of indigenous student interests and perspectives should still be an asset. Under the job duties it seems like they would not require this knowledge initially.

Jeff: What about researching?

Paul: That’s the biggest one if, but once can pick up the knowledge as they’re researching it.

Motion: To add: “Is an asset” back on to the end of “knowledge of indigenous student interests and perspectives”
Motion passes by vote

JD moved by Ava, seconded by Paul

6. Constituency Creation (As Circulated) – as time permits

Sheldon: How do we define who is in a school?
Graham: Got an answer back – A single person can switch back from multiple faculties and schools, and can be in more than one. The simplest of answers is tied into the Degree-granting Faculty. There are more complicated pieces: When a student is pursuing courses for more than one degree, they pay fees into both faculties. The closest example is Kin, pay into Kin not Education. Economics currently pay into AUS.

Sheldon: Who’s getting their Degree from Vancouver School of Economics?

Graham: BIE, BA in Economics.

Sheldon: What about first year students planning to go into Economics?

Graham: They are still AUS.

Sheldon: You’re in the school if you’re pursuing a degree granted by the school and are taking courses in that sessions.

Graham: Do we want to have it defined by the university or AMS?

Paul: I am leaning towards letting the university define it. The university is in control of the fees and is ultimately in control. It is too much of a headache for the AMS?

Jeff: What in case the university changes something?

Sheldon: Do we want to say then defined by the University?

Ava: If the definition is not easily accessible we should specify it in Policy.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 6:00pm Thursday, August 14th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Ava, Seconded Paul

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:29 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
August 21, 2014

Attendance
Present: Jenna, Tanner, Mateusz, Sheldon, Ava, Jeff

Invited:

Regrets: Janik, Paul

Recording Secretary: Jenna Omassi

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order 6:19 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Agenda – 2 min

   N/A

2. Updates on the Policy Review – 5 min

   Jenna: updating Travel Policy, will be wrapped up after Orientations
   Jeff: updating Alcohol Reimbursement
   Tanner: When Anna returns, scheduled to speak about it
   Graham: Communications policy, feedback from Daniel, with all the procedures in it that
   have to be changed.
   Tanner: MOU signed with UBC will also alter it

3. Approval of August 7, 14, 2014 minutes – 2 min

   N/A

4. Code Changes re: Committee Appointment Policy (As Circulated) – 30 min
Graham: LPC thought that there was too much in the policy for recruiting students, and was not actually needed. It should rather be a code change
Sheldon: the amount of time to post for students at large has changed
Jeff: For the old code for students at large, could you only hold one spot on a committee? Should we be clarifying who a student-at-large is?
Sheldon: The basic rule is that only one can be on a committee. Under the rules, you can be on another committee if there is advertising and no one comes forward, to a maximum of two. Should I be adding a section about the definition of a student at large? For context we can include the definition.
Jenna: In 6D, what is happening with the information session? Is this feasible? Who is organizing and who is attending?
Tanner: It is feasible because it is twice a year and a bulk meeting. The president organizes the information session, the committee chairs will be there. It would be 5 business days/7 days before the Council meeting where appointments happen.
Sheldon: I will make those changes and clarify this.

5. **SAC Clubs Management Software Research Associate JD (As Circulated)** – 15 min

   Graham: the date and name have been changed
   Ava: The date is the day after the last council meeting in December, so that if they have to present at council, they can do so at that meeting.
   Graham: last week the committee did not think that the position needed to be going for more than two months
   Ava: the amount of things that council wants is extensive, and that is why it is worth it to do everything and have the position do an extensive job and cover all their bases. Especially since budget committee approved a timeline until February.
   Tanner: “email friendly” is strange, what about “experience with microsoft office is an asset”

6. **Policy on Policies (As Circulated)** – 30 min

   Questions/Comments from Sheldon
   1) Hard deadline or in a cycle
      -We agreed eventually that the review would be every two years
   2) “Clarify the position of AMS Council on matters of policy”
      -Tanner: is policy defined in code? (Yes)
      -Graham: a lot of external policies are just positions of AMS Council.
- Tanner: should we be using the word “policy” to define our stance/position, or only internal policies?
  - Graham: we can erase it or erase the sentence after “AMS Council”
  - Sheldon: It is not needed unless it can be justified? Erased

3) Should we require that these go to a committee first?
- Sheldon: Who can propose policies? For the last two groups, should their policies go to committees first? It would undermine the committee structure otherwise.
- Tanner: Clubs can’t put forward policy. That would be jumping through SAC straight to council.
- Graham: Staff were allowed until very recently to propose policy changes.
- Jenna: All of them should be going through committees, students, clubs, constituencies, all of them. It should discuss committees, with others allowed to go through there.
- Sheldon: to address this, we can speak about students at large, staff, clubs, constituencies and resource groups going through committees to propose policy changes, but only committees and commissions can actually propose policy changes to council.
- Sheldon: do we want to let commissions propose policy?
  - Graham: FinCom & SAC are examples of why they should be allowed.
  - Tanner: we need to make sure to also mention the membership, like a referendum.

4) Bold
- Graham: the list does not have to be in bold
- Sheldon: these are the section titles and they should always be in bold, so that is why they are in bold here
- Tanner: it can be put in the style guide. This will be a brand new guide to be presented to council by Abby.

5) What is the implementation date? Is this different from the effective date?
- Sheldon: should we just call it the effective date? Replace implementation with effective because they are synonymous.

6) Not needed (point 3)

7) Like done for external policies (point 4)

8) Is it LPC or the President?
- Sheldon: Changes have been made to put in LPC
- Graham: It should be the President, but it depends on who the president is.

Questions/Comments from Graham
A) Or all AMS Committees?
  - Sheldon: just cut out “of council”
-Ava: include commissions

B) Responsible Committee

-Graham: this is only here so that committees cannot bring up policies that other committees have not been consulted on. The committees bringing policy to council should be the ones that are going to be consulting it.

-Tanner: this does not go with the policy checklist that is already around. Could this be structured as a guideline rather than a policy? This cuts out concerns around operative clauses. I will bring the checklist and longer document for next time from External Policy to be referenced to decide if this is the step we want to be taking.

7. Consent Agendas (added by Tanner)

Tanner: Non-controversial motions so that there can be discussion, but omnibus them all. This works for the Board of Governors.

Graham: How is that different than lumping the motions together?

Jenna: For AMS Council this may not work, with our Council wanting to speak and us never knowing what could happen with proposed motions.

Ava: It would be important to change council culture of questioning and reading before changing this.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 6:00pm Thursday, August 28th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Jenna, Seconded Ava

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

AMS Student Society
6138 SUB Boulevard
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1
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Agenda of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
September 4, 2014

Attendance

Present: Tanner, Graham, Mark, Paul, Ava, Sheldon, Janik

Invited:

Regrets: Jenna

Recording Secretary:

Quorum not reached.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of the Agenda – 2 min

   Consensus to amend agenda: Discussion of Position Descriptions

   Approval of split-up of Administrator position into

   1. Research associate

   2. non-existent position

   Postponing of Starting date of RA from 10th to 11th

   Discussion of irrelevancy of line 5 in Software Administrator

   SAC Clubs Management Software Research Associate

   SAC Clubs Management Software Administrator

2. Updates on the Policy Review – 5 min

   N/A
3. Approval of August 7, 14, 21, 2014 minutes – 2 min

N/A

4. Code Changes re: Committee Appointment Policy (As Circulated) – 20 min

Sheldon: To be a Student at large you cannot be on two committees. Only after additional advertising you can be added to another committee but not on more than 2 committees at a time.

Graham: Uncomfortable with formulation in 6 “bulk of appointments”

Sheldon: 6. (c) & (d) instead of “bulk of appointments” refer to Article 2 that specifies the two meetings

Ava: We had problems with students getting involved were not sure what there were getting into. Would be beneficial to include in upcoming topics in the committees in the postings.

Sheldon: So an addition to section 6.

Ava: Yes, but optional, because not all committees know what they will be working on.

On Article 2, section 7.

discussion on whether or not to include “standing committee” instead of committee.

5. Policy on Policies (As Circulated) – 20 min

Graham: There has been a bunch of changes, there is a conflict.

Sheldon: The issues who polices the policies: Policy on policies changes says the body responsible seeks out discrepancies but in Internal Policies code we suggested that the president reports to the committee.

Graham: If committee finds a policy is not followed suggest to council.

Paul: We should include that in the policy, instead in code.

Sheldon: I have to revise both Policy on Policies and Code for Internal Policies anyway.
Sheldon: I made some suggestions with respect to the clerk of council...

Graham: Yes, there should be Pierre as well

Sheldon: So I am including those.

Graham: Any other issues?

Paul: What is the point h. i. Under definitions? It seems odd.

Graham: The point is not to use the same word for multiple meanings.

Sheldon: It is an encouragement to be consistent throughout the policy.

Graham: External policies will be switched to the same mechanism with expiry date.

Paul: What happens to Int. policy after the review date?

Graham: Problems arises for the case that the body responsible does not longer exists.

Paul: After disbanding of committees all the policies have to be assigned to LPC to distribute to new committee.

Sheldon: So, send it to LPC in case the relevant committee does not exist anymore. (in 3 (b))

Sheldon: Point 3 (b) Article 11. Policies should apply to external policies too. (Expiry date)

6. **Responsible Use of Students’ Emails (As Circulated)** – 20 min

Paul: Numbering issue. No issues contentwise, it is just drastically different from previous one.

Tanner: Information security policies should be looked into in that context. Amend record policy.
Unrelated:

**Tanner:** Nothing in code how to cancel a contract.

**Sheldon:** It says AMS terminates the contract.

**Tanner:** It does not specify who specifically has the authority to sign off a contract cancellation.

**Sheldon:** It would make sense if Council votes on canceling the contract that that would be legal.

**Paul:** We should still have code on that.

**Tanner:** Can we get rid of “yielding time” in favor of just recognizing the speaker form the floor?

**Various:** When appointing Students at large can they come from the floor and can we put that in code?

**Tanner:** Question brought up by Campus Security: What is the policy on removing individuals from council chambers?

**Sheldon:** Why was that brought up?

**Tanner:** Physical altercation, appeals to some changes.

**Sheldon:** What do you want me to write then?

**Tanner:** A possibility to eject individuals from council chambers.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is to be decided by the incoming committee.

**Adjourn**
1. Moved __________________, Seconded __________________

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7.30 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee  
September 23, 2014

Attendance

Present: Jenna, Mateusz, Jeff, Mark, Paul, Shabaan, Aaron, Lauren, Marjan, Janik, Ava

Invited: Jenna Omassi, Aaron Bailey, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Mohammed Shaaban, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets:

Recording Secretary: Ava Nasiri

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Appointment of Vice Chair

   • Shabaan Nominates Aaron
   • Aaron Bailey Appointed Vice Chair

3. Updates on Policy Review (15 min)

   • Some policies have been assigned
   • Lauren on Alcohol consumption, finding it difficult to receive feedback
   • Shabaan: How do policy reviews work?
   • Jenna: Sign up for policy, consult relevant bodies, bring feedback back to LPC. There is a checklist provided with the policy reviews.
• Mark: Working on responsible use of computers, consulted Keith and is shifting format to policy on policies.

• Jeff: Working on alcohol reimbursement policy

• Janik: Working on environmental

• Video Surveillance taken by Marjan

• Communications taken by Shabaan

• Executive Smartphones taken by Aaron

• Action Item: Jenna to send out checklist

4. Land Acknowledgment (10 min)

• Action Item: Sheldon to draft language to incorporate Land Acknowledgement in code for council agenda

5. Policy on Policies (15 min)

• Policy on policies lays out the format that all policies should follow in a uniform manner, outlining procedures, fonts, layout etc.. This policy also distributes review of policies to relevant committees in place of all policies going through LPC.

• Shabaan: Has this be re-revised?

• There was discussion at previous LPC meeting as to how if responsible committee recognized that a policy was not being complied with, they would bring this to the attention of the President and vice versa

• “If it is recognized that a policy is not being followed, it shall be brought to the relevant committee and the President”

• Sheldon: Where the archivist and clerk of council is mentioned in this document, the university and government relations advisor should also be mentioned as to capture external policies as well as internal policies.

• Action Item: Sheldon to revise wording and bring back to LPC
6. **Responsible Use of Student Emails (20 min)**

- Discussed at previous LPC: What responsible use of emails looks like.
- Paul: Change “the” to “and” under responsible use
- Aaron: Blank spot under Policy for number 3
- Campus wide email: Under C, states operations and lessees can be an exception
- Shabaan: Emergency defined as different than the possible third email in a month that can be approved by SLCC
- Tanner: possibly necessary to revise policy to incorporate possibility of sending same email to all segments of students/ targeted emails
- Not necessary to have a separate policy for segmented emails
- Paul: Revise section 2, 5, 6 to say “the AMS can send two **campus wide emails**”

**Action Item:** Tanner to send in wording for policy around segmented emails to incorporate as a segment of policy

7. **Committee Appointment’s Policy (20 min)**

- Not actually drafted
- Recruitment policy – “Recruiting Students at Large/Executives on Committees”, stating we have to advertise for students at large on AMS committees
- Sheldon: Maybe we should only allow people to apply for one committee
- Paul: Should still allow for someone to sit on two committees
- Discussion on pros and cons of allowing students to apply for one committee vs. applying for multiple committees
- Tanner: Might be a good idea to look at what other student societies do

**Action Item:** Tanner to send Jenna research on what other student societies do
8. Statements from Students at Large (10 min)

- Adding one paragraph to code about students at large being able to speak at council during the students at large segment, if there are spots available.

- This shall be first come first serve

- Students come in to speak to council for something specific.

- Lots of discussion on fairness and how to deal with more than 3 students who haven’t signed up wanting to speak.

- A sign shall be put up during the time before AMS council welcoming members at large and directing the to speak to the speaker of council if they would like to speak to council.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm September 30th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Shabaan______________, Seconded ______________ Marjan

   There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at __6:11__ pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
October 7, 2014

Attendance

Present: Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Marjan Hatai, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Ava Nasiri, Sheldon Goldfarb, Tanner Bokor,

Invited: Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets: Lauren Telford

Recording Secretary: Jenna Omassi

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:03 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda

   First: Paul, Second: Ava
   Unanimous Agreement

2. Approval of Minutes

   LPC Minutes 2014-06-19
   LPC Minutes 2014-07-24
   LPC Minutes 2014-08-07
   LPC Minutes 2014-08-21
   LPC Minutes 2014-09-23

   -Paul: 07/24 – unicorn, UNECORN
   -Paul: 06/19 – biting rather than binding
   Moved: Marjan, Second: Jeff
3. **Updates on Policy Review**

- Everyone knows what they are doing
- Ava: Beverage

4. **Land Acknowledgment (10 min)**

- Paul: minor, don’t put script in Code
- Mateusz: on the agenda
- Jenna: Bringing this up because Anne and the Aboriginal Student Commissioner have brought up that we should look at defining this acknowledgement
- Paul: what that consists of is up to the speaker, Code is a document for rules, do we want to have a policy for it?
- Marjan: What does the university do?
- Ava: I would be on board with keeping it open
  First: Ava, Second: Paul, All in favor

5. **Cheque Signing Policy (15 min)**

- Paul: Emailed the people listed in the policy in February and got their ideas, made a note from references from Keith. I want to make sure I am not doing definitions wrong, what goes where, effective date and approval date need to be changes.
- Jenna: could the policy be sent to FinCom?
- Sheldon: policy on policies says that responsible committees, every policy shall be the responsible committees or commissions. Maybe we want to change it to “responsible committees and commissions” or “responsible bodies”.
- Paul: If we do say the responsible committee is other than LPC, we need their approval in writing.
- Sheldon: that committee would have to make a resolution
- Mateusz: The right committee would be FinCom. Is there a possible conflict of interest though?
- Paul: The first note is from Keith
- Mateusz: Keith is referencing a bylaw
- Paul: So then we can keep it that there are no related policies. The second note is about an electronic transfer policy procedure.
- Jenna: in terms of other changes made, let’s go over those
- Paul: AMS signing officers noted in Bylaw 8. Some of the tenses had to be changed
because it was originally a motion. In general the spirit is the same.
-Sheldon: the thing is that the BoM was asked that we give them a motion, which was in
the policy.
-Paul: instead the bank will be provided this policy (under section 3)
-Sheldon: did you check with Keith whether that is enough?
-Paul: I did not specifically ask him about it. That would be a good idea in terms of
cheque signing.
-Tanner: as long as it is mentioned, it should be fine. The policy should be fine.
-Paul: other thing is the applicability section makes sense
-Jenna: It looks great.
-Action Item: Sheldon to edit the dates and and edit out notes and then
First: Ava, Second: Janik

6. Statements from Students at Large (10 min)

-For October 22\textsuperscript{nd}
Move: Marjan, Second: Ava

7. Recruiting Students At Large (20 min)

-Jenna: LPC must decide to either send the Recruiting students at large code with the
changes in regards to advertising now, and then deal with the nomination process, or
just deal with the nomination process now. We must also look at the possibility of a
Nominations Committee vs. In person statements or online applications.
-Ava: In terms of students applying and having massive spreadsheets, having students
coming to Council (or proxies) would be more effective. This would also be easier for
having a matrix of their desires. If they cannot show up then what is point?
-Mateusz: the other way around. It would be too difficult to have that many people.
-Tanner: we moved it online because there are many students who expressed interest
and could not attend. We do not have Code that allows for proxy to come.
-Sheldon: code is silent.
-Tanner: past speakers did not allow for proxy speakers.
-Paul: it is more or less the choice of the person whether they want to apply online or
come into Council
-Sheldon: the Code is silent on this. Maybe we need to create the code around that.
-Paul: I am still against a nominating committee because Council is not able to decide
who is sitting on committees is there is a NomCom. In practice Council does not care
that much, it is not taken very seriously. However, Council should have some idea of who they are electing.

-Marjan: what if the NomCom acted as a narrowing down?
-Paul: NomCom would get all the applications and choose which ones are narrowed down. Then Council would decide.
-Tanner: How can you retain Council choosing and have committee to bring students forward.
-Ava: we have a lot of committees, it would be difficult to make another. Online applications were made for accessibility. What if they made a video?
-Paul: if they come you only get students that are dedicated.
-Jeff: people more invested in joining a committee would come in person and going through that process. Individuals who cannot make it would find a way to get around it. This would allow for a proxy (submitting a statement).
-Tanner: vetting should happen.
-Jenna: (coming in rather than online)
-Marjan: What if we just kept it online and sent it to Councilors earlier?
-Mateusz: sent earlier. The biggest problem was how it was laid out.
-Marjan: it should be laid out by committee
-Ava: each person should be applying on one committee
-Sheldon: this is the main thing that was brought up initially. If this is the only change then we can put it on here and this can be sent to Council. This currently doesn’t speak about them coming in.
-Jeff: I think it is important to have one committee to sign up for, at the same time, students at large should not be stifled to sign up. It should be clear that they cannot sit on more than one committee.
-Tanner: form construction will be brought to LPC.
-Jenna: it is a problem (in person vs. online), we should include this application process in Code as well.
-Paul: if not applying in person at a council meeting, can only apply to one committee, required to submit an application. It should be mentioned that there are two ways to apply and that it would be preferable that they come to AMS Council to present.
-Sheldon: Code currently doesn’t speak about appointment process, but we are now including it?
-Jenna: let’s move on for now

8. Policy on Policies (15 min)
-Paul: with these changes, we need to include “Policy Type: Internal Policy” for the Cheque Signing Policy being sent to council
-Sheldon: and cheque signing should be I-2, not just #2
-Jenna: any other changes?
-Sheldon: we don’t discuss commissions in the “Responsible committees”
-Jenna: Will LPC still be reviewing policies? Will there be a problem with this in the maintenance?
-Paul: that is why the President is supposed to be making sure that policies are still in place. Now we just need someone to make sure it is actually coming to Council every 6 months.
-Sheldon: we could specify archivist and clerk of council for internal policies and Pierre for external policies. That could change.
-Jenna: we should be defining ‘Responsible Committee’ or changing it. It could be good to change the definition from ‘Responsible Committee’ to ‘Responsible Body’
-Sheldon: I can change the Policy on policies to change committees to bodies and change in the Cheque Signing Policy (under F)
-Paul: I would specify committees or commissions (to ensure not resource group or council), not any body
-Paul: ‘Review Date’ should be the same for both parts of the policy (to be changed on cheque signing policy)
-To be brought back to committee.

9. In-Camera Code (15 min)

-Jenna: This was sent from Council because of the inconsistency, being that we cannot vote once in camera, but must still determine who is allowed to stay in the room during in-camera sessions (ex: proxies, staff…)
-Sheldon: except in accordance with C and D
-Sheldon to send back to LPC

10. Recruiting Students At Large (cont.)

-Sheldon: I can draft language to include nominations

11. To Do

-Look at Code on when Executive Ternaries are due because turnover dates have changed
-Conflict of interest to speak beyond motions
-Speaker’s Powers
-Agenda reform
-Student Court
-BAGB: Tanner – there will be a motion coming back to LPC, probably request for change in structure of BAGB
-Sheldon: last year there are many things that are out of date
   -Jenna to find
-Vantage College
-Governance Review (membership bylaws)
-Drafting code moving responsibility for hiring away from LPC to EHC
-Musqueam contact (executive)

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm October 7th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Paul, Seconded Marjan

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:28 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
October 14, 2014

Attendance

Present: Tobias Friedel (UNECORN Chair), Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdaide, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Ava Nasiri, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Invited: Tobias Friedel (UNECORN Chair), Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdaide, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets:

Recording Secretary: Jenna Omassi

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:02 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda
   Move: Lauren, Second: Mark

2. Cheque Signing Policy (10 min)

   It looks swell. Good job Paul.
   Move: Paul, Second: Lauren

3. Recruiting Students At Large (15 min)

   Sheldon: goes beyond advertising to nomination process
   Jenna: mentions nomination process
   Sheldon: they can come in person or send an application beforehand
   Paul: a fan of 6F
   Sheldon: They no longer have a list of committees, only if they come it is problem
   Jenna: it is all encompassing
Sheldon: includes what is supposed to come to Council in March
Move: Janik, Second: Ava

4. Policy on Policies (20 min)

Jenna: Bodies vs. Body
Sheldon: Any external policy referring to many?
Tobias: Normally a hierarchy between the bodies
Ava: Easier to organize it if one is on top of the other
Jeff: There should be consultation between the bodies anyway
Sheldon: Throughout it is “responsible body” as a singular
Janik: Is it possible to transfer policies to other committees?
Jenna: in doing the policy reviews we are already delegating work an re-looking at who reviews policies. The policies can also be reviewed/amended.
Sheldon: What happens if a body no longer exists
Paul: It is the President who deals with it then, because it is the responsible body and the President.
Sheldon: I would think that if we are abolishing a committee, Council would look at all the policies and re-assign them.
Jenna:
Sheldon: Section 9Bii – our policies don’t expire anymore, there is only a review date
Paul: There is an expiry date under the review date
Janik: In practice that would be the same as a review date
Tobias: What is the reason behind them not expiring anymore?
Paul: they are systematically reviewed. It is essentially the same idea.
Sheldon: Internal policies have never expired, just not external policies. This code change will change this.
Paul: In practice it boils down to the same thing.
Tobias: If it does not expire, it is still on the books. There should be a difference between a position statement and an external policy. External policies should be long-lasting.
Sheldon: You would have to rescind it at that point. Pierre has been speaking about starting a new category called “position statements”, but currently they are all policies. The new policies will say that they don’t expire unless rescinded. However, according to what is written there can be an expiry date should Council want.
Jenna: Is it enough for it to be stating a “expiry date” in section 9Bii?
Sheldon: We could be putting it in the accompanying code change II,11,#6
Paul: it could be useful to mention that.
Sheldon: under review date in the policy 9E, maybe it should say “if a policy is set to expire...” Should I be making it explicit that policies can expire?
Paul: Yes, this should be mentioned.
Janik: What is the difference between expiry and past review date
Paul: Expiry means it is gone, and past review date it still exists. Rescinding is difficult.
Jenna: The only other portion is 9-Q-iv where “Archivist & Clerk of Council” has been removed.
Jenna: why is SLCC in the consultation section? I will check with Serena that it has been consulted.

5. In-Camera Code (15 min)

Jenna: (e) has been included
Tobias: procedural question – how are votes in camera kept?
Paul: documented in in-camera minutes
Tobias: this is problematic procedurally
Sheldon: this was conflicting
Ava: in-camera vote was done before I was a councilor, but I was not invited because I was not a councilor.
Tobias: the people in the room need to be responsible enough, but mandating something like that is problematic.
Sheldon: it is said in code
Paul: we already have something, you just have to have council to approve
Jenna: this has systematized it, and mitigated the problems we had with the code before
Move: Paul, Second: Angela

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm October 21st, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Mark, Seconded Paul

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:42 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
October 21, 2014

Attendance

Present: Jenna Omassi, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Invited: Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets: Lauren Telford

Recording Secretary: Jenna Omassi

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:08 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda
   Move: Paul, Second: Mark

2. Policy Review Update (5 min)
   Video surveillance – who is it?

3. Policy on Policies (15 min)
   -Jenna: UNECORN yesterday. They brought up a problem with procedures, in that there are problems with the responsible bodys... (cont.)
   -Tanner: unnecessary, we should get rid of Q
   -Jenna: when would you need a procedure?
   -Paul: I cannot think of one
   -Tanner: external policies that have procedures are more strategy, there should not be a dictation of how that needs to go.
   -Paul: amending procedures would be useless
   -Sheldon: problematic because the template is under ‘procedures’, but we can make it
the appendix. Then we can remove procedure altogether (a few mentions about procedure)

-Sheeldon: I left in that expiry happens in three years automatically, though that is no longer the case. Other than that everything is changed. It is up to council to set the expiry date. When a policy is amended can the expiry date change?
-Sheeldon: this says that you can have a policy that expires if you would like. (Expiry date if applicable). The policy on policies says that it is a maximum of three years, so I would be inclined to but this portion out (cont.)

To send back to committee – to Council November 5th

4. Performance Reports to Council (15 min)

-Jenna: turnover date has moved
-Sheeldon: moving everything over two months. July, November, April, moving everything two months. It might be easier for them to do a report for November than September.
Action Item: Sheldon to change, November 5th meeting
Move: Paul, Second: Angela

5. Conflict of Interest Beyond Motions (20 min)

-Tanner: should be go to legal beyond this. The definition of conflict of interest is different in this Code than in legal terms.
-Sheeldon: where does it exist in legal terms?
Action Item: invite Ross & Daniel
-Sheeldon: when there is no motion on the table, if there is a conflict of interest they can still speak. This would ensure that participation in a discussion is included in conflict.
-Paul: this was the intent in the first place
-Tanner: the challenge is there is a difference between conflict of interest and conflict of duty. Conflict of interest, financial interest, conflict of duty is if there is a perceived.
-Paul: we should be saying conflict of interest, conflict of duty
-Sheeldon: we extended the definition of conflict of interest
Action Item: Tanner to find section of Society Act that deal with this
-Sheldon: the other change is that for proxies for someone with a conflict, the proxy shall state the conflict, is it both? The suggestion in is that it should be both, with the amendment put in.
-Marjan: it is clear that both are included
-Tanner: Article 1, Section 3 – why an “apparent” conflict of interest
-Jeff: someone suggested that at the beginning of your term you should bring up all the potential conflicts
-Sheldon: #9 and #10 talk about what a conflict or apparent conflicts are
Action Item: hold for next meeting

6. Speaker’s Powers (15 min)

-Jenna: changes that speaker can eject someone
-Paul: should repeated disruptions of council be explained
-Marjan: repeated, deliberate disruptions
-Jenna: do you agree?
-Paul: it is not just disruptive, you cannot carry on the meeting without someone. This has never happened, this is just in case. There is something on the table that a student disagrees with and there is an ‘in council protest’
-Paul: should it be the “chair” or the “speaker”
-Tanner: it should be whoever is chairing the meeting who has this power
Action Item: find a more appropriate place for this
Action Item: look for an appropriate place to put a requirement that minutes put on the website.
-Sheldon: should we include “that stops Council from functioning” to clarify

7. Responsible Use of Students’ Emails (20 min)

-Sheldon: changed from segmented to targeted, because it reminds me of caterpillars
-Jenna: Added in for grad, VSEUS
-Janik: remove “procedures” because of changes to policy on policies
-Sheldon: #10 President AND Executive Director, should it be “or”?
-Tanner: in accordance to the agreement we have with UBC it should be both (AND)
-Paul: what about ‘Grad Class Council’, they are neither an AMS constituency or club
-Sheldon: we can include “or other body” to make sure they are counted
-Jenna: it should be the policy I-3
-Mark: Consultations all complete
Move: Angela, Second: Marjan

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm October 28th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Jeff, Seconded Janik

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 pm
Minutes of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
October 21, 2014

Attendance

Present: Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Invited: Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets: Paul McDade

Recording Secretary: Aaron Bailey

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda

   Moved: Angela, Second: Aaron

2. Policy on Policies

   Jenna: changes, cutting out all references to procedures
   Sheldon: cut out “amended every three years” in the Code section
   Move: Marjan, Second: Jeff
   Sheldon to send to Council

3. Conflict of Interest Beyond Motions

   Jenna: Ross & Daniel speaking about it
   Jenna: phrasing ‘not common to others’ from email
   Tanner: spirit of that code
Sheldon: took the phrasing from Robert’s Rules, otherwise no one on council would be allowed to vote
Marjan: it makes sense to an extent – I am unsure to what extent does that work?
Would being an RA not be a conflict?
Tanner: this comes down to definitions
Marjan: Should we be giving a definition?
Sheldon: maybe we should figure out what we wan to prevent? What is the conflict we do want to prevent?
Tanner: BoG & unions
Sheldon: Executives have often shown themselves in conflict, obviously PAI is a direct conflict. But based on that we can generalize. Personal benefit?
Jenna: Does it have to be personal?
Tanner: Personal or professional.
Ava: conflict of commitment
Sheldon: unless you were put on the Board by Council
Jenna: ultimately up to the chair, and then up to Council
Sheldon: Send updated version

4. Security of the Council Chambers

Jenna: this was changed from discussing just ‘Speaker’s Powers’ to the security of council chambers so that anyone acting as chair can eject someone from council chambers, in the case the speaker is not chairing.
Marjan: I like the use of ‘deliberate’
Move: Marjan, Second: Mark

5. Posting Minutes

Jenna: When we looked at the ‘Speaker’s Powers’ section in Code we realized that Code says that the Speaker should be posting minutes, this moves the task to the right person.
Sheldon: bringing It into 21st century
Ava: Do we approve Council minutes at council? (Yes) Why is there always such a large delay?
Sheldon: Prep time by myself, Joanne, getting all of the reported speech in. We are better now than we used to be.
Ava: Would it be possible to post unofficial council minutes after?
Sheldon: I circulate council notes
Ava: What about public access to Council notes/minutes? But I will bring this back to LPC
Move: Lauren, Second: Marjan

6. PAI Process Timing

Jenna: PAI timing is moving to match the new executive terms and the new oversight process (Code Section V, Article 15)
Sheldon: do we want to move these earlier?
Tanner: they should be later
Ava: It would have been helpful to have a group work on goals in the first month
Jenna: Exec Com & Veronica

7. Job Descriptions

Jenna: Tanner brought up that job description approval should be moving to the Extraordinary Hiring Committee so that hiring can fall under one committee (Code Section V, Article 7)
Ava: LPC meets on a regular basis, if a job description is time sensitive, as opposed to EHC. If it is under EHC normally, or with LPC if it is time sensitive.
Jenna: How often is it the case that there are time sensitive job descriptions?
Tanner: There are a few times
Sheldon: there were a lot of them in the past year
Tanner: Ken has data on what that cycle looks like
Jeff: Would EHC meet more often if this switched over? If that is a concern, then EHC could meet more often.
Lauren: we would have more frequent meeting times then, it is on a more need to have a meeting basis, when needed.
Jenna: positive externalities, in that job descriptions will be bundled together, planning around those groups.
Lauren: if we bundle these descriptions with other applications that EHC puts out
Ava: Before we make any changes, speak with Ken to ask what it would look like, to ensure that this is a practical process. I don’t like the idea of a shared responsibility, but LPC as fallback.
Jeff: are the people on that committee looking at descriptions as intensely as we would? Despite job descriptions we get, they don’t take that long.
Sheldon: two different issues: job descriptions and hiring. It only does the hiring for some specific hiring. So it is not the same. They don’t both have that much to do.

Tanner: it would make more sense to only have one hiring committee.

Sheldon: so that’s a much bigger change. Currently there is no committee that helps executives with hiring. The actual hiring is just done by the individual executive.

Tanner: there are a lot of problems in the process of HR, and in previous years there have been questions about certain hires, having a committee only on hiring.

Ava: this way you have council having a say on these interviews.

Lauren: then they would be relatively practiced at doing interviews.

Jenna: Ken & HR, EHC

8. Functioning of committee

Jennas: Does LPC like that I am bringing ideas and proposed changes to the committee first and then asking Sheldon to draft the Code for them after we have discussed? Or would you rather I come to the committee with Code changes already made?

Ava: I like ideas first, starting off from another base. It saves a lot of amendments to the Code changes you bring to the committee

(General Consensus)

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm November 4th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved Mark, Seconded Angela

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 pm
Agenda of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
November 11, 2014

Attendance

Present: Janik, Sheldon, Jenna, Tanner, Ava, Lauren, Mark, Aaron, Ron, Jeff, Angela (late)

Invited: Ron Gorodetsky (Student Services Manager), Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets:

Recording Secretary: Aaron Bailey

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda
   - Motion to amend to move Student Services Presentation up
     - Moved: Ava, Seconded: Mark
     - Friendly
   - Motion to approve Agenda
     - Moved: Lauren
     - Seconded: Mark
     - Unanimous approval

2. Approval of Minutes

   LPC Minutes 2014-09-04
LPC Minutes 2014-10-07  
LPC Minutes 2014-10-14  
LPC Minutes 2014-10-21  
LPC Minutes 2014-10-28  

- **Amended: Change in Ava’s attendance**  
  - Friendly  

- **Motion to approve**  
  - Moved: Ava  
  - Seconded: Janik  
  - Unanimous approval  

3. **Governance Review Update**  
   - Jenna: Nothing to report  

4. **Players Club Grant Contract**  
   - Ava: Theatre club; oldest AMS Club in existence? Hoping to apply for the Centennial Fund, but do not feel they have the skills to do so. Want to contract out a grant ghostwriter. Dance club also contracts out people to teach classes. Ken said that the contract doesn’t need to be formal due to it’s small scope and scale; could just use the Dance/Yoga instructor contract.  
   - Sheldon: LPC doesn’t need to deal with it; SAC has authority.  

**CONCLUSION:** Referred to SAC  

5. **Security of Council Chambers**  
   - Jenna: Number of Councilors were worried about the discretion of the Chair concerning threats and disruptions to Council. Wanted to see clear examples and measures of scale.  
   - Ava: What if a silent group of protestors wanted to be present, but were asked to leave?  
   - Tanner: We could lift British Parliament’s Standing Orders regarding expulsion
Aaron: Retroactive challenge of the chair for deliberate disruption

**CONCLUSION:** Tanner to circulate the Standing Orders to LPC

6. **PAI Process Timing**
   - Jenna: Only changes made are the timing – push everything back by two months; June, July, November/February, April is new timeline.
   - Lauren: Have exams been considered?
   - Jenna: March is still during their terms, May is after Oversight turnover.
   - **Motion to approve new timeline**
     - Moved: Lauren
     - Seconded: Angela
     - Unanimously approved

7. **Job Descriptions to Extraordinary Hiring Committee**
   - Jenna: Lauren has spoken to EhComm and they agree that job descriptions should move there and all hiring should be done by them moving forwards. They will just be ordinary at that point. Also looking to make changes to the committee as well: name change, what they fully encompass, if someone from HR should sit on the committee/be connected, involvement in other hiring processes
   - Sheldon: That was what BAFCOM was: it ended up being one person doing all the things.
   - Jenna: AVPs would be hired by Execs; Hiring Committee members would be present, but as a resource.
   - Ava: Wouldn’t make it mandatory to have a Hiring member sit in on all interviews for flexibility.
   - Tanner: Move BAGB hiring to the Committee as well.
   - Tanner: Consideration of Executive remuneration should move to Oversight Committee. SSM remuneration to ED Code section.
• Sheldon: Meetings and interviews need to be separated and defined.

• Jenna: HR Manager to attend meetings by invitation.

• Sheldon: Add Code for interview procedure.

• Lauren: HR Manager present at all quorate meetings.

8. Student Services Position

• Jenna: position is complicated, as per her diagram. SSM is under ED, but also sits on ExecComm and Manager’s meetings. Not necessarily codified properly at present – Presedential officer AND non-voting ExecComm member. A bit of a mess currently. She met with Dan and Ron to discuss the current structure and possible considerations for change.

• Ron: Doesn’t make sense for them to decide whether they do/do not want to sit on ExecComm/Council. Suggesting that the ED makes the decision based on the capabilities of the individual. Currently doesn’t attend Council unless absolutely necessary; gets most information from Daniel.

• Sheldon: Historically considered the sixth executive, but the role has changed over the years to a more services-focused perspective.

• Aaron: Is it relevant for them to attend so frequently if nothing is being discussed that relates to their position?

• Ron: Potentially add some Code that specifies that the SSM should attend in the absence of an Executive Director.

• Tanner: University Governance Relations Code has an attendance-by-invitation clause; could consider moving SSM into that group.

• Ron: Change reporting to provide a written or verbal report to ExecComm monthly.

• Tanner: Remove SSM as a Presidential Officer, should flesh out Code of the ED first to nest it there.

• Sheldon: Should consult ED first.

• Ron: In the absence of the ED, SSM should still report to the President.
• Jenna: SSM attends SLCC by invitation of the Chair – doesn’t make sense as the Assistant SSM covers the relevant duties of that position.

• Tanner: Must consult with Budget Committee about the future of that position.

9. University Commission

• Deferred to next meeting

10. Exchange Student Fees

• Jenna: Confusion over what fees are being paid by outgoing and incoming exchange students. Code says they only pay the UPass fee.

• Tanner: Incoming students must pay the base membership fee to access the UPass – it’s in the contract with Translink.

• Jenna: Students are paying fees that they aren’t supposed to be according to Code, but they need access to services.

• Sheldon: Right now it’s an all-or-nothing with services and the Health and Dental plan. Exchange Students are still members, but don’t pay fees to access the H&D plan/UPass.

• Tanner: Letter to the Board needs to be submitted for clarification.

• Ava: We need to provide clarity to Go Global and let them decide what students need.

• Jenna: Still needs to be codified.

• Tanner: Some students are still being mis-assessed. Enrollment Services may not have been paying us the fees that they should have been.

11. Travel Policy

• Deferred to next meeting

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm November 18th, 2014 in SUB 266J
Adjourn

1. Moved ___Angela____, Seconded ___Lauren____

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at ___6:30____ pm
Agenda of the AMS Legislative Procedures Committee
November 18, 2014

Attendance

Present: Sheldon, Mark, Aaron, Ava, Lauren, Jenna, Paul, Jeff

Invited: Anne Kessler (AMS VP Academic & University Affairs), Aaron Bailey, Jenna Omassi, Lauren Telford, Marjan Hatai, Angela Tien, Paul Mcdade, Janik Andreas, Jeff Pea, Mark Bancroft, Tanner Bokor, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Ava Nasiri, Daniel Levangie, Sheldon Goldfarb.

Regrets:

Recording Secretary: Aaron Bailey

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 pm

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Agenda
   
   • Motion to approve agenda
     
     o Moved: Ava
     
     o Seconder: Lauren
     
     o Friendly

2. Governance Review Update

   • Has yet to meet yet... DEFERRED TO NEXT MEETING

3. Student Services Manager Position

   • Sheldon has created necessary additions and changes
Changes may still be made to the ASSM and SSM positions from Budget Comm

- How is the SSM hired and remunerated, if they are not like Executives? Should they receive transitional honoraria?
- Tanner: ED would know what the SSM is doing, so it might be unnecessary
- Lauren: ED could be doing other things instead if we used the transitional honoraria system
- Tanner: Transition system is changing, so it’s a moot point. Remove it
- Tanner: Remove the SSM from code and just have the ED hire them
- Sheldon: We’ll be removing everything about the SSM being treated like an Executive and treating them like an employee. Do we still want them to be active members of the Society?
- Jenna: After the Governance Review that may change, so we’ll hold off.
- Sheldon: When would they be hired?
- Tanner: Let’s have a conversation with Daniel
- Jenna: Can we add there term to the definition? Is it necessary?
- Paul: Put it under the Student Services section? Does it need to be in Code?
- Sheldon: We should at least stipulate a one-year term under Student Services
- Tanner: Student Services budget still formed by SSM and approved by ED

CONCLUSION: Minor changes and updates

4. Security of Council Chambers

DEFERRED TO NEXT WEEK

5. Job Descriptions to Extraordinary Hiring Committee

Refer to Code changes

CONCLUSION: No changes necessary
6. University Commission

- Anne: Code section is redundant. We have staff meetings already and we cover almost everything listed here presently. We should move a couple of the points (B & C) to her job description to bolster it.

**CONCLUSION:** Cut the University Comm from Code

7. Travel Policy

- Paul: Reword applicability and exclusions
- Tanner: There is an ABCS AGM, but not annual conference
- Jenna: SSM and Directors will now be under applicability as well
- Ava: Add Shinerama conference
- Paul: Why is ExecComm approving overage charges?
- Tanner: BudgetComm should take care of that
- Ava: ExecComm meets more regularly. Would be better for timely opportunities.
- Jenna: Responsible body is under Executive Committee

**CONCLUSION:** Will make minor changes and update LPC

8. Musqueam Communication

- Anne: Some staff have been in touch with the Musqueam Nation without following proper protocol. Policy would just ensure that they are required to consult with University and Government relations and Exec Comm before making conversation.
- Tanner: Should be under Executive procedures
- Ava: What about First Nation Studies Student Association?
- Anne: How about groups with existing relationships are exempt?
- Tanner: Will discuss at ExecComm to further explore
9. Placeholder Items

- Tanner: Are placeholders philosophically good for Council?
- Jenna/Paul: Without them, it’s hard to know what is actually on the agenda or the length
- Tanner: Maybe the placeholders should actually have a bit of detail about what they will look like, in addition to when the full text will come through
- Tanner: Let’s discuss the idea with Council in discussion period

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is 5:00pm November 25th, 2014 in SUB 266J

Adjourn

1. Moved ______ Ava ________, Seconded ________ Aaron ________

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at ____6:30____ pm