Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Carter Maclean, Georgia Yee, Nicola Vanderveer, Ryan Wong, Sheldon Goldfarb

Guests: Cole Evans

Regrets: Christopher Hakim, Danny Liu

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:08 pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Sebastian    Seconded: Ryan

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes (Postponed until next meeting)

Moved: [name]    Seconded: [name]

That the minutes of May 26, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

Constituency Membership (Discussion)

Ryan to lead; please refer to:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/17PA6p_iM6a0i6APxCxJQwF9n5kJq7keOzycRSB39Y/edit?usp=sharing

- Ryan: Outlined the document. Is it mandated that every student be represented in a constituency?
- Sheldon: The by-laws are not explicit in this. By-law 5 lists constituencies and says they are entitled to send members. By-law 13 gives power to Council to assign students to
constituencies. Council has power to recognize a constituent. Each faculty and school are entitled to be constituents. We were at the mercy of the university who would decide when new schools were created. If new schools are created, if the new school is less than 1%, then they are not entitled to a constituency. Some people just aren’t in constituencies, unclassified students.

- Ryan: Want to rectify how students are represented in constituencies. Bachelor of midwifery falls under the faculty of medicine, but the faculty of medicine does not represent them. Would then be our job of Gov Comm to recommend which constituency the Bachelor of Midwifery should belong to. This could be my personal opinion.

- Ryan: How do we consult with students about this? A lot of students are unaware of this problem. Doesn’t want to say we should side step student opinion, but these cases will be on a case by case basis. Not sure if we can get permission to reach out to students and send them a google form asking if they are a part of a certain constituency or not. This would be very complicated. If we go through all this effort, students may want to be a part of a random constituency, so is it worth it?

- Ryan: How do we sort this out with students who belong to two different constituencies. For VSUS and AUS, students became members of both constituencies through an MOU. Would an MOU be the best way to go about this for each individual constituency? I believe yes because this is the precedent. May need to reach out to UBC Enrollment Services to see which constituency gets the money.

- Ryan outlined Option 1 and 2 on the document.

- Ryan: recommends not option 2, because it could create tensions and it is very complicated.

- Ryan: Short version of MOU: students in dual programs in Arts and VSUS, are members of both constituencies and pay directly to VSUS and VSUS then transfers money to AUS. Transfer hasn’t happened yet, supposed to be more discussion. might be around 50% transfer. Affected about 100 students.

- Sebastian: how much work goes into this? Is the yearly process worth all the work?

- Ryan: MOU was rushed because VSUS past president just wanted to get it done. In a revised MOU, the MOU could be smoothed out. Student body affected is a large portion of VSUS, but a smaller portion of AUS.

- Sebastian: Focus should be to tackle people in no constituency. For consultation maybe send a link to Enrollment Services

- Sheldon: When VSUS was created, in code section 2 article 16, a meeting was called for interested members of VSUS to consult. Obvious constituency for diploma students to merge with is the Commerce Faculty, but Commerce requires a large yearly fee ($800). Perhaps they could create their own constituency, but they haven’t come to AMS to ask for that.

- Ryan: Personal view: There is already a constituency they “should” belong to. They are not a school or faculty, so it wouldn’t make sense to make them a constituency. They are a part of the Faculty of Commerce. They should already be represented, but they are not.

- Ryan: student consultation being difficult.
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- Sheldon: By-law 2 defines members of the AMS. Have to be in a degree or diploma or taking credit course. If you are in a credit course, you are a member of the AMS. If you take continuing education courses exclusively, you could get a certificate. These students are not part of the AMS.
- Ryan: Can we talk to someone to see if these people do pay AMS fees?
- Sheldon: Enrollment Services. There was a discussion to see if they are in the right place. Gov Comm last year was looking at a list of which constituents students should be.
- Sebastian: Maybe we should get Katherine
- Nicola: Would be good to get clarification on the history of this issue.
- Ryan: There’s a lot of work to be done. Still don’t know exactly which direction we should go in. Students who don’t fall under a constituency is easier to resolve. Doing outreach to enrollment services. Will come back to see where we can outreach to.
- Sebastian: Dual memberships might be easier. We might just need to alert people to the issue of VSUS and let them see what might work.
- Ryan: Tried to resolve the Science issue. We need to come up with more guidance as a body as to what to do in the dual issue.
- Sheldon: We should decide how important this is to solve. No one is really demanding or up in arms about being represented on the AMS.
- Georgia: Good thing to look into if there are qualifying criteria for scholarships and such. If people are eligible for these things. See if anyone brought this up as a concern?
- Ryan: All programs that we are dealing with should already be members of the AMS and should already be eligible for these programs.
- Sheldon: Don’t have to be in a constituency to be in the AMS.

Chairs of Finance and Operations Committees (Discussion)

Cole Evans has been invited to share his thoughts at 4:15pm.

- Sebastian: We have spoken with the current chairs of these committees. Hoping to get Cole’s perspective on this issue.
- Cole: Two reasons why we should look at how to reduce the responsibility of executives to chair committees.
  1. The labour of being a chair. It is a lot more work to be a chair as well as an executive. Run into issues where chair reports are thin.
  2. Governance perspective: Board should be more involved in the leadership of committees. Seems as though the Executives are doing all the work and Council is just an approval stamp. Having more council leadership, make for more balance to Council
- Drawbacks:
  - not many councilors are well versed in the knowledge to chair committees. must create more rigorous orientation if councilors are chairs. Having executives to sit on the committee is good to help chairs
As Operations chair, Cole felt his role was just to bring stuff to committee for approval and not so much discussion.

Governance committee does a good job at making councilors more involved. As a result, the chair gets more airtime and more prominent in the council.

Sebastian: Chair of committee doesn’t have a lot of experience, what do you think of incorporating training of chairs?

Cole: Have half-assed committee training in the past. If councilors are chairs, they should have more close working relationships with executives that go beyond orientations. Maybe involve councilors sooner in executive transition. We are notoriously bad at committee chair transitions from year to year.

Sebastian: Should there be more detailed committee transition

Sheldon: used to have elaborate transition proposals, but now there is only a line that says predecessors must transition them. We could bring back the part about detailed transitions.

Sebastian: How do we make sure that good transitions happen.

Cole: It’s possible for no one to know what is going on when they come in. Gov Comm should work on solutions to get councilors more involved. If chairs are properly trained, they could be more involved in their role.

Georgia: For advocacy committee, VP, AUA, chat with the chair to create the agenda together. Vice chair could be compensated similarly to a chair so that there is a mutual relationship between the execs and the chair.

Sebastian: Great to hear Cole’s position. Nice to have chairs that have great knowledge, but it’s very possible that that just doesn’t happen. Could become a cycle where committee chairs don’t have good experience and transition poorly.

Georgia: Advocacy committee model is new with Execs talking with councilor chair. Rather than the exec driving the conversation, it helps to have a councilor chair. They are able to support each other’s work and it works well. If execs are chairs, having vice chairs who are compensated could work.

Sebastian: Does the agenda ever just get sent to the chair?

Georgia: Councilor chair creates the agenda and then discusses with Execs in Advocacy committee to see what their priorities are. It works if it’s collaborative. Model of Advocacy committee works well. It’s a big change from last year, where the execs were just talking at councilors. This year it works because all the councilors are involved.

Sebastian: What is the co-chair idea?

Georgia: If execs continue to be chair of the committee, then the vice chair could be councilor and could put together the agenda. Vice chair could be compensated for their work as well. This idea is working well.

Sheldon: There is nothing in code that required the vice chair to do these things.

Georgia: If execs are still chairs, in the case of finance if the chair needs background knowledge, then the vice chair could take on the labour of writing the reports and making the agenda.

Sebastian: Anything to add from Advocacy committee?

Georgia: Co chair relationship is necessary if execs need to help steer conversation
Sebastian: Next steps? We have a good base from hearing from exec chairs. Code changes requiring transition steps, better training, commitment from the President to do better training.

Sheldon: Where are we going with this?

Sebastian: I want to draft something to consider. Not formal, just a discussion of the elements. Use that as a basis to discuss.

Sheldon: I drafted a code change to make chairs non-executives.

Sebastian: Don’t want to have a document that is too detailed.

Sheldon: There was an idea that the steering committee was going to draft something last year.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is June 23, 2020 (tentatively).

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20.