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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UBC Land Use Plan governs the zoning of both institutional and non-institutional development on the UBC Vancouver campus, as well as providing building regulations, especially for non-institutional development. As such, it is a document that affects a diverse range of stakeholder groups, including faculty, staff, members of the campus residential community, and students. This report from the Alma Mater Society, an organisation tasked with representing the interests of students at UBC Vancouver, aims to analyse the consultation process that was utilised for amendments to this document. This report addresses some of the challenges raised by the consultation process and hopes to offer potential solutions to some of those challenges. The primary sections of the report are as follows:

2: OUTLINE OF THE CONSULTATION PROCESS
This section offers an overview of the consultation process, and is designed to inform the reader about the specifics of the process used.

3: ISSUE: CONSULTATION DEPTH
This section addresses some of the challenges encountered in the structure of the consultation, the quality of the survey questions, and the ability of stakeholders to provide input.

4: ISSUE: CIRCULAR FEEDBACK LOOP
This section addresses concerns with the design of the process in terms of conflicting advocacy interests, the ability of stakeholders to influence the decision making process, and the democratic accountability of the process and decision makers to the stakeholders.

5: ISSUE: ALMA MATER SOCIETY INTERACTION
This section addresses the role and experience of the AMS in the public consultation process, and the AMS’ private reception.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
Potential solutions to the issues raised are proposed at the end of each section. These potential solutions are by no means exhaustive, and are intended to provide a starting point to consider addressing the identified challenges, rather than as comprehensive solutions in their own right.

These potential solutions are developed in greater detail throughout this report, in the relevant sections. The headings for each of these potential solutions are provided below:

1. Match the Consultation Process to Community Engagement Values
2. Select an Independent Body to Oversee the Consultation Process
3. Consider a Third Party Audit of the Consultation Process
4. Increase Local Democratic Accountability
5. Actively Consider the AMS and Students as Key Stakeholders

PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT
This report was prepared by:
AMS Vice President Academic and University Affairs, Ben Cappellacci
AMS Associate Vice President Academic and University Affairs, Sean Cregten

Contact:
P: 604 822 3092
E: vpacademic@ams.ubc.ca
2 OUTLINE OF THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

2.1 PHASE I CONSULTATION

“UBC began its series of public consultation events for the Land Use Plan amendments process with two public open houses and workshops on July 15, 2010 and a subsequent e-consultation process online from July 19th to 30th.”

2.1.1 PHASE I STATED PURPOSE

“The purpose of the events was to inform the UBC community and other interested stakeholders about the Land Use Plan, its role in UBC campus planning, the need to make specific amendments to the plan and the public consultation process being undertaken as part of the amendment process.”

2.1.2 OPEN HOUSE, JULY 15 2010

The event began with presentations by Dr. Nancy Knight, Associate Vice-President of Campus and Community Planning, and by Dr. Andrew Riseman, Associate Professor in the Faculty of Land and Food Systems. These presentations lasted approximately half an hour and covered the pre-identified issues and the consultation process, and the Cultivating Place plan for the UBC Farm.

The remainder of the event was arranged around four table discussions, chosen and administered by Campus and Community Planning, and were posed as follows:

“Table/Issue discussion: How could UBC create affordable housing and a more complete sustainable community?

Table/Issue discussion: What are the most important aspects of a “Green Academic” land use category definition? [Words given as examples: green space, sustainability, academic excellence, teaching/learning, research, innovation, agriculture/horticulture, integration, living laboratory, non-building intensive, community engagement, ecology, ecosystem, stewardship, social sustainability, knowledge dissemination]

Table/Issue discussion: How would you regularize the academic land use designations to better support the integration of teaching, learning and research?

Table/Issue discussion: What are your thoughts on how Cultivating Place is proposing to use the UBC Farm Lands?”

The Open House was conducted twice, from 4:00pm – 6:00pm and from 6:00pm to 8:00pm. The sequential table discussion format discouraged attendance for less than the allocated two hours. Total attendance was 161, with 51 submitted responses. Discussion was limited to the pre-identified issues, and the format of the consultation was not amenable to raising other relevant Land Use Plan issues of stakeholder concern.
2.1.3 **E-CONSULTATION, JULY 15-30 2010**

The materials from the Open House were made available on the Campus and Community Planning website. E-mail responses to these materials were invited between July 15 – July 30 2010. The webpages containing the materials received a total of 111 unique views over the period, and a total of 19 email responses were received.⁵

2.2 **PHASE II CONSULTATION**

“UBC's second phase of public consultation included an e-consultation process online from September 27th to October 15th as well as a series of public consultation events comprised of one public house on October 7th and three workshops on October 13th and 14th, 2010.”⁶

2.2.1 **PHASE II STATED PURPOSE**

“The purpose of the second series of events was to inform the UBC community and other interested stakeholders about the proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan and to gain feedback.”⁷

2.2.2 **OPEN HOUSE, OCTOBER 7 2010**

This event was held in Acadia Park, and focussed on the impacts of proposed amendments to this area. A total of 17 people attended this open house, and information was disseminated. No survey booklets were received.⁸

2.2.3 **WORKSHOPS, OCTOBER 13-14 2010**

Three identical workshops were held, with participants requested to attend only one event. Each workshop lasted for three hours and followed a set structure arranged around a response booklet. Attendees were organised into discussion tables of approximately 12 people.

Before each table discussion, a promotional video was shown on each identified topic (Housing and Affordability, UBC Farm, Transferring Housing Density, and Regularising Academic Land Use).⁹ Campus and Community Planning staff then led table discussions on these topics, proceeding question by question through the response booklet. Discussion was focussed on the booklet questions and attempts to raise issues outside the response booklet were strongly discouraged.

Workshop details:
- Workshop 1: Oct. 14, SUB Ballroom, 11:00am – 2:00pm
- Workshop 2: Oct. 14, Tapestry (Wesbrook Place), 6:00pm – 9:00pm
- Workshop 3: Oct. 15, West Point Grey United Church, 6:00pm – 9:00pm

Total attendance was 80, with 52 submitted responses.¹⁰

2.2.4 **E-CONSULTATION, SEPTEMBER 27 – OCTOBER 15 2010**

A survey questionnaire and the majority of informational materials from the workshops and October open house were made available online from September 27 – October 15 2010. The survey questionnaire was identical to the response booklet in the workshops. There were approximately 800 unique page views, and 236 responses to the online survey.¹¹
2.3 **PUBLIC HEARING**

The next phase of public consultation will be the Public Hearing on November 30, 2010. This will be the final phase of consultation on the Land Use Plan amendments and is not included in this report.

2.4 **CONSULTATION PARTICIPATION SUMMARY**

2.4.1 **NOTIFICATION AND OUTREACH**

In an update to the UBC Board of Governors, Campus and Community Planning lists an approximate outreach and notification total for the Land Use Plan amendments process of 200,000 contacts. Contact were made primarily through advertisement in newspapers and email notifications, and included information on public consultation events and the details necessary to attend.

The following table shows the response percentage in terms of physical attendance at consultation events and written input received by Campus and Community Planning, against contact numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Contacts Made</th>
<th>Total Engagement</th>
<th>Engagement Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>0.559%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.129%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0.179%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The engagement percentages shown above demonstrate a very low level of response to the contacts made by Campus and Community Planning. While the contact number of 200,000 does not account for multiple contacts made to the same person, it still represents a significant effort at outreach. It is therefore surprising that the engagement totals were so low, especially in the ‘Total Input Received’ section. That such a relatively small number of people were willing to submit formal responses, especially when compared to the number of contacts made, raises questions about the avenues of response available to stakeholders, the quality of the outreach made, and the perceptions people held of the value of participating in this consultation process.

2.4.2 **EVENT AND E-CONSULTATION ATTENDANCE AND RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE I</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Submitted Responses</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15 Open House</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Consultation</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Subtotal:</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE II</th>
<th>Total Attendance</th>
<th>Submitted Responses</th>
<th>Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 7 Open House</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October Workshops</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Consultation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Subtotal*:</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 This contact number is the number of times contact was made, not the total number of recipients contacted.

2 Total Engagement is the sum of all attendance at consultation events and page views of the website over the e-consultation periods, regardless of whether input was submitted. As with the Total Contacts figure, this does not account for multiple views or attendance by the same person, and is thus an engagement maximum.

3 Phase I and II subtotals cannot be summed to give an overall participation total, due to participant overlap.
## 2.4.3 Quality of Attendance and Responses

Attendance at physical events (Open Houses and Workshops) represents a different calibre of involvement with the amendments process, and generally requires a longer time commitment than online participation. The first Open House and the October workshops required a time commitment of two and three hours, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Participation</th>
<th>Total Attendance:</th>
<th>Submitted Responses:</th>
<th>Response Percentage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15 Open House</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7 Open House</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October Workshops</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even with the significant time investment required at the Open Houses and Workshops, there were a relatively high number of responses that were not submitted. This raises the question of why a large percentage of respondents, despite demonstrating a high time investment, failed to submit written input, particularly since the workshops were oriented around a booklet response. The October 7th Open House is an exception to this booklet based format, as it was not oriented towards eliciting written responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online Participation</th>
<th>Total Attendance:</th>
<th>Submitted Responses:</th>
<th>Response Percentage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Consultation</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Consultation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td><strong>236</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online participation also demonstrates a reluctance to submit responses on the part of a large number of participants. This may in part be attributed to the design of the survey, which is addressed in Section 3 of this report.
3 ISSUE: CONSULTATION DEPTH

3.1 PARTICIPANT INPUT

In its ongoing mission to solicit feedback from key stakeholders Campus and Community Planning has developed many specialized tools by which it chooses to engage the campus community. These tools have manifested themselves in different ways depending on the perceived need for certain depths of consultation, which is largely a function of efficiency, time and need of information. Recent public consultations by Campus and Community Planning, including those for the Vancouver Campus Plan and the Campus Transit and Cycling Plan, have sought a considerable level of public feedback from campus stakeholders and have utilised techniques similar to the “Collaborate” and “Involve” public participation processes of the International Association of Public Participation’s Spectrum of Public Participation. Given the techniques, language and timing of the Land Use Plan consultation it would appear that a “Consult” public participation process was chosen to generate public feedback on the Land Use Plan.

While it is important to recognize that each project that needs consultation requires a unique mix of techniques and depth, the importance of the Land Use Plan was not matched with the appropriate tools to ensure that throughout the process stakeholders had an opportunity to communicate their ideas. Reviewing the engagement process for the Land Use Plan amendments reveals that while the four areas of proposed amendments were largely generated as by-products of consultation from the Vancouver Campus Plan, there was no explicit opportunity for the public to engage in further discussion on any other areas of the plan outside the university’s proposed amendments. As the consultation process largely focused on generating affirmation for the proposed amendments, the lack of opportunity to introduce community articulated issues highlights the limitations of the “Consult” framework. These challenges suggest that a more through process such as “Involve” would have better addressed community concerns.

Given the scope of the Land Use Plan, and its significant potential impacts for campus development and for stakeholders, a more responsive consultation mechanism with specific opportunities for stakeholders and the community to provide initial input would have been more appropriate.

3.1.1 SURVEY QUESTIONS

The key instrument for public feedback on the Land Use Plan amendments process was a standardized question booklet and accompanying online survey. The questions were divided into four sections, each addressing a core area of the proposed amendments. While the questions covered the changes proposed in a high level of detail, several flaws within the structure of the questions limited the accuracy and transparency of the question booklet as a feedback tool.

3.1.2 LEADING QUESTIONS

Within the question booklet there was information that was unnecessary to answer certain questions and which could be seen as leading the respondent to choose an answer favourable to the proposed amendments. Examples of this technique can be seen in Question 1 of Housing Density Transfer where the inclusion of “to support UBC’s sustainability, academic, community development and endowment goals” provides question framing that is not immediately relevant to the decision at hand. In addition, Regularizing Academic Land Use Designations Question 1 includes the line “to better support the academic mission of UBC,” which leads the respondent to provide input based on this interpretation of the amendment, rather than on the proposed amendments own merit.

3.1.3 DOUBLE-BARRELLED QUESTIONS

In question 1 of the UBC Farm questions there is an apparent paired nature of the questions purpose. The question does not allow for the possibility of the change of land use designation
without the transfer of land density. The question asks the respondent whether they support “redesignating the farm and transferring density,” a double-barrelled question on an issue of historical contention. The respondent is precluded from expressing their opinion accurately, unless they support or disagree with both issues equally. This can create a sample bias, particularly if one of the two parts of the question is of much greater value to the respondent. This limits the depth and accuracy of the consultation.

In addition it would appear that a question with a similar purpose is repeated in question 1 of Housing Density Transfer, where respondents are asked if they support a density transfer without mention of the designation of the farm, creating a redundancy within the questioning and further highlighting the double-barrelled nature of UBC Farm question 1.

3.1.4 Framed Questions
Several questions were designed to elicit a specific response given their wording and messaging. In the case of Regularizing Academic Land Use Designations, question 1 is framed as a question on supporting Academic land use regularization in general. However, it implicitly assumes that by supporting regularization as a concept the respondent is also supporting the specific zoning of campus areas as per the zoning map. There is no opportunity for input on which areas are zoned what, other than those identified for density transfer within question 2 of Housing Density Transfer.

3.1.5 Limited Opportunity for Additional Input
There was limited opportunity for general input on the plan or proposals within the question booklet. The question booklet was ended with a general question “what other ideas or issues would you like to mention which would be addressed in other plans or initiatives?” which precluded the possibility of any other discussion about issues that could be dealt with within the Land Use Plan. It is important to note that within the tabulated results of the feedback, 22% of student respondents made reference to the area known as Gage South without solicitation or any specific request for feedback on the area, and in spite of the fact that there was no section of the question booklet explicitly asking for additional input on non-identified land use issues.

3.2 Open House and Workshop Environment
The Open House and workshop environments featured a diverse range of community stakeholders and interested parties. While the normal channels of communication were used to advertise the Land Use Plan the numbers of participants was not entirely representative of the ratios of community stakeholders. Within the open houses there was a heavy emphasis on communicating the changes of the plan while public feedback was guided by the question booklet. There was heavy emphasis on the questions, and any deviation from the provided content was strongly discouraged. While this prescribed formula allowed for the collection of specific information on the Land Use Plan amendments it did not address the apparent need for further discussion on issues as raised by participants in the workshops.

3.3 Potential Solutions

3.3.1 Match the Consultation Process to Community Engagement Values
Consultations should utilise appropriate consultation mechanisms, which are responsive to the needs of stakeholder groups and contains specific opportunities for stakeholders to provide initial input. An inclusive and good faith consultation process with stakeholder groups supports the community engagement values outlined in Place and Promise: The UBC Plan. While we recognise the importance of having access to a variety of consultation tools, issues such as the Land Use Plan amendments have a significant impact on the UBC community and would be best served by a significantly more inclusive and open consultation process than the one used.
4 ISSUE: CIRCULAR FEEDBACK LOOP

4.1 PROCESS OVERVIEW

A chronological overview of the process and the primary stages and actors follows.

Shorthand key:
- Board: UBC Board of Governors.
- CCP: Campus and Community Planning.

The Board of Governors instructs Campus and Community Planning to identify the planning issues and the solutions, based on goals set in the Vancouver Campus Plan. Campus and Community Planning are also responsible for designing and conducting public feedback on these.

Campus and Community Planning conduct the consultations on their own proposals, using a series of affirmation type consultation tools, rather than input seeking consultation tools. Campus and Community Planning, a department of UBC, are therefore responsible for:
- Identifying the issues;
- Developing the amendments;
- Developing the consultation process;
- Implementing the consultation process;
- Reporting on the consultation process to the decision makers.

Campus and Community Planning staff are therefore being paid to both make the amendments and run the consultations, and are the sole information input to the Board of Governors on both the amendments and the consultations. There is no external audit of the information or process.

---

[IV From the IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation, the objective is to “obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions.” This is in place of seeking public identification of issues to be addressed.]
4.2 PROBLEMS WITH THE PROCESS

4.2.1 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Campus and Community Planning are tasked by the Board of Governors to identify the issues to be resolved, create solutions to resolve those issues, and design and conduct consultation on the issues and solutions they have identified. Campus and Community Planning are also the sole source of information for the decision makers, the Board of Governors. Additionally, “the management, administration, and control of the property, revenue, business and affairs of the University are vested in the Board,” and Campus and Community Planning are a financially dependent department of UBC. This is a circular process with a significant potential for conflicts of interest.

Section 8 of The International Association of Public Participation’s Code of Ethics for Public Participation Practitioners provides an ethical framework for conducting any public participation process:

“ADVOCACY. We will advocate for the public participation process and will not advocate for interest, party, or project outcome.”

This circular arrangement, wherein Campus and Community Planning is engaged in all aspects of the process, fails to functionally separate advocacy for the public participation process from advocacy for the proposed amendments and the identified issues. This is a conflict of advocacy interests.

There is a reflection of this dual role in the public materials advertising the consultation events, as well as in the events themselves as described in Section 2: Outline of the Consultation Process. The language used to describe the Public Hearing provides one of many examples of this: the proposed amendments include “increasing housing choice and affordability” and “regularising land uses to better align with the university’s academic mission and vision.” The advertisement of the Public Hearing is not simply an advertisement of an opportunity to participate in the consultation process, but also an advertisement for the proposed solution. This is not in line with the guidelines provided by the International Association of Public Participation.

4.2.2 NO PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE DECISION MAKING BODY
The positioning of Campus and Community Planning as both the creator of the amendments and the sole conduit for feedback on those amendments to the Board of Governors presents a challenge in terms of public access to the decision making body. Members of the public are not usually invited to speak at meetings of the Board of Governors, and therefore for public input to reach the decision makers it must go through the consultation process run by Campus and Community Planning. As a conflict of interest has been identified with the dual role of Campus and Community Planning as responsible for promoting both the amendments and the public participation process, this is a significant concern. This combination of factors has the potential to compromise the integrity of the consultation process as a mechanism for reflecting public opinion to the decision makers.

4.2.3 DEMOCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY
The core decision making body in this process is the Board of Governors. The Board is responsible for setting the priorities for physical planning at UBC, instructing Campus and Community Planning to identify the particular issues and solutions for these priorities, and for approving these solutions to be sent to a Public Hearing. The last step in this process requires the Provincial Government, acting through the Ministry of Community and Rural Development, to approve the final result.
Of the two main actors in this process, neither Campus and Community Planning staff nor the UBC Board of Governors are local elected representatives. While eight of the twenty one members of the Board of Governors are subject to election from either a student, faculty, or staff group, the Code of Conduct for Members of the Board of Governors states that:

“A Governor elected or appointed due to position or familiarity with related or stakeholder interests and concerns is not a delegate or democratic representative of any interest or group.”

Because the decision making body is largely unelected, it is not able to be held democratically accountable to the users and residents of the campus, who are the prime stakeholders in this process. These users and residents include 46,000 students (8,500 of whom are also campus residents), 16,000 staff and 8,000 other residents. These sizeable stakeholder groups are not able to exercise democratic accountability over the decision making process until the last step of the process, when it reaches the Provincial Government. However, as the Provincial Government is not elected locally, there are few avenues for local democratic responsiveness on UBC land use issues.

This lack of local democratic accountability to stakeholders is unusual in British Columbia and Canada, where municipalities or regional governments are generally responsible for local land use regulations. Both of these types of bodies are subject to election by the residents that are affected by the land use regulations, and the core stakeholders are thus able to exercise a much greater level of democratic control over land use. This local democratic accountability on land use issues is pertinent because UBC is unique in terms of Canadian universities. This is due to its physical size, its considerable student and neighbourhood residential population, and the fact that it has a significant and explicitly non-academic land use footprint. Furthermore, unlike inner-city Canadian universities, UBC is not situated within a larger democratic governance context such as a municipal government.

4.3 POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Three problems have been identified: conflict of interests between advocacy for the process and advocacy for the outcome, a lack of adequate direct public input to the decision making body, and limited democratic accountability to stakeholders. Potential solutions to these problems follow.

4.3.1 SELECT AN INDEPENDENT BODY TO OVERSEE THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

The consultation process and the gathering of stakeholder opinion on any major project should be outsourced to a professional, independent body that has no interest in the outcome of the project. This would be consistent with the International Association of Public Participation’s Code of Ethics for Public Participation Practitioners and would remove the conflict of interest that currently exists when the proponents of a project and a particular solution are also responsible for collecting public feedback on the same project and solution.

4.3.2 CONSIDER A THIRD PARTY AUDIT OF THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

The consultation process should be subject to an independent, third-party audit, to ensure that: the consultation process is fair to participants; the consultation process is adequately advertised; the consultation is designed to elicit meaningful feedback; and that the summary of consultation delivered to the decision makers is a full, fair and accurate reflection of the opinions expressed.
4.3.3 INCREASE LOCAL DEMOCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY

Non-academic issues affecting users and residents should be subject to some form of local stakeholder control, optimally through democratic responsiveness by the decision making body. A short-term measure to increase this would be to create an elected intermediary body that is broadly representative of stakeholder groups in between Campus and Community Planning and the Board of Governors, to break the circular feedback loop. The ongoing transit advisory working group, composed of multiple stakeholders, may provide one model for this.

In the longer-term, it may be valuable to consider a comprehensive review by a professional, independent third-party to address governance challenges due to the unique context of UBC and the desire for democratic responsiveness by campus stakeholders.
5  ISSUE: ALMA MATER SOCIETY INTERACTION

5.1  THE ROLE OF THE AMS AS STUDENT ADVOCATES
The AMS represents over 46,000 students at UBC-Vancouver. It has a long history of engagement with and advocacy for the student interest in physical planning processes on the UBC campus. In doing so, it recognises that the students of today are the alumni, staff, and faculty of tomorrow.

5.1.1 EXCERPT FROM THE MISSION STATEMENT OF THE AMS

“To improve the quality of the educational, social, and personal lives of the students of the students of UBC.

The Alma Mater Society of UBC Vancouver will promote high-quality student learning. It will advocate students’ interests, as well as those of the University of British Columbia and post-secondary education as a whole. ... It will solve problems constructively.”

5.2  AMS INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

5.2.1 RECEPTION IN THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS
The AMS has been an active participant in all aspects of the Land Use Plan public consultation process, including attendance at every series of consultation events. The AMS was initially informed that its opportunity for input would be primarily through the public consultation process, and proceeded in good faith on that basis. However, it quickly became evident that the format of the public consultation process was not adequate to address the concerns raised by the AMS. The directed and limited nature of the Land Use Plan consultation open house, workshops, and surveys resulted in a repeatedly poor reception of AMS Land Use concerns. Workshop facilitators consistently directed discussion away from AMS concerns and towards one of the four pre-identified issues and their solutions.

Recognising the limitations of the public consultation process in terms of providing input and raising concerns outside of the four identified issues and their solutions, the AMS (through the AMS executives and the AMS University and External Relations Committee) sought private discussions with Campus and Community Planning.

5.2.2 PRIVATE RECEPTION
The AMS approached Campus and Community Planning with a formal submission and for private discussions around areas of concern as identified in the AMS Land Use Plan Policy. These areas of concern included Gage South, University Boulevard, the UBC Farm, and housing affordability.

Private discussions with Campus and Community Planning were productive in communicating the concerns of the AMS and action was taken to constructively and collaboratively address the concerns raised. This interaction was extended and included a series of meetings between the University and the AMS University and External Relations Committee, as well as with members of the AMS executive. The incorporation of AMS concerns in this manner represents successful consultation with a stakeholder group. However, it is unfortunate that this interaction was ad-hoc rather than a formal part of the consultation process from the outset, and that the public consultation process was not designed to accommodate the raising of stakeholder-identified issues.
5.3 POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

5.3.1 ACTIVELY CONSIDER THE AMS AND STUDENTS AS KEY STAKEHOLDERS

As tuition paying members of the university community, students should always be considered key stakeholders in university issues. This is consistent with Place and Promise: The UBC Plan, and contributes to creating a campus culture of involvement. It is also important to recognize that the students of today are the alumni, staff, and faculty of tomorrow. They have personal interests in the strength of UBC, and their experiences at UBC will shape how they view the University as alumni. Cultivating an atmosphere of mutual respect and constructive engagement through inclusive consultation processes provides value to both the university and students, and enriches the experiences of both.

As the elected representatives of 46,000 students, the AMS should also be considered a key stakeholder, acting on behalf of a significant campus group. In considering students and the AMS as key stakeholders in the University, both students and the AMS should be an integral part of any consultation process.
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