AMS Governance Committee

Agenda of January 16th, 2020

Attendance

Present: Katherine Westerlund (Chair), Jeanie Malone (Councillor), Dante Agosti-Moro (Councillor), Max Holmes (Councillor), Alex Gonzalez (Councillor), Sahar Dua (Student at Large), Cole Evans (VP Administration), Sheldon Goldfarb (AMS archivist - non-voting)

Guests: Dylan Braam

Regrets:

Recording Secretary:

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:07 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

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

Sheldon’s amendment passes.

_The motion carries unanimously._

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Cole Seconded: Katherine
That the minutes of November 18th, 2019 be approved.

_The motion carries unanimously._

Code Changes - 10 mins

3 changes, linked in the drive!
Managing director’s signing authority

[Cole]: bit of a strange one, we talked about this at exec comm. Most of the discussions were around the need to sign cheques if people are absent (including services). I know there is lots of discussion around this about who should and shouldn’t be signing things. This allows for Kieth to cover things if there is a backlog or anything. Nobody at exec comm felt strongly either way about this (Kieth liked it) but general sentiment is it’s net-positive.

[Sheldon]: second part also allows for Kieth to see all cheques (even ones he doesn’t sign). He’s in charge of the Society’s Finances.

[Danie]: Seems net-good.

[Cole]: the only time I could think of it being bad would be if there were a legal issue concerning the managing director.

[Katherine]: Couldn’t you just not tell them about the specifics of any meeting?

President’s Council

[Katherine]: Meeting frequency change from once per month to once per term.

General consensus: seems good

VP Admin Code change

[Cole]: wrote this a while back, there are just a couple lingering things in my job description. I don’t run the aquatic centre. Added in some things about the Arts facilities (like HATCH, Norm etc.).

[Dylan]: What about the paint club

Cole: they are also a club so still my job.

Moved by: Cole Seconded by: Dante

“BIRT The Governance Committee recommend these three code changes to Council for approval.”

Approved unanimously.

[Cole]: flames are up 1-0

**Bylaw changes - 20 mins**

What do we want to change, what’s our strategy? See the drive for last years bylaw amendment (with additional changes to the AGM requirements to be in line with the Society’s Act).

[Katherine]: Dylan would you like to talk about these?
[Dylan]: good news also we could just get the civil resolution tribunal to resolve that, just gotta run something badly and then get sued.

[Dylan]: for context: majority of these things are just cleanup.

Bylaw 1: deletes things because we don’t have voting senators anymore and don’t want the court.

Bylaw 2: membership changes to November to clarify situations about who is a member and who can vote, because it’s hard to stop people from voting and because our fees are annual. Clarifies things around health + dental plan. Expulsion: correction of typo (failing). Deleted court too.

Bylaw 4: rewrote 2, it’s more contentious. Previously these just needed to be answered yes or no, referred to student court. we are deleting student court so we were touching this anyways. Now it needs the negative response to correspond to the status quo (yes changes things, no is status quo), this comes from the Government of Canada. no material untruths allowed in the preamble. The last amendment is a personal project, means we can remember things we have done in the past.

[Dante]: What about amendments to the bylaws themselves?

[Dylan]: good catch, would add an exclusion “other than those which exclusively serve to amend the bylaws”

[Dylan]: bylaw 5: we say when the membership impeaches you, you can’t run in the election for that position. During vacancies, council can appoint anybody (not just a councillor) to replace people.

Bylaw 9: deleted this as cleanup because we now have the advocacy office.

Bylaw 13: all subsidiaries shall submit their annual report 7 days before June 30th. The issue was the “on or before”, because you could just submit it any time BEFORE that.

[Cole]: don’t know if that’s operationally the best way to do that. Maybe we could put this in code instead since it’s probably more malleable. “once per year” is a good phrase.

[Dylan]: I see your point.

[Katherine]: I think we should talk about this more.

[Dylan]: at a minimum this should make coherent sense.

[Dylan]: Skipping 18

Bylaw 21: student court. Hasn’t sat since ~2010. Council repeatedly rejected it’s actions. Issues: Council can overrule this body, council wouldn’t fill the positions and then would fill when an issue would come up, there is no way to make a claim (no clerk of student court). This all exists, and it’s just liability for us. If people disagree with us: they can sue us. The nice thing about this, now that the society’s act has been amended we can go to the civil resolution tribunal (no lawyers, all online, very simple and convenient).
[Dylan]: if you don’t delete this I will make myself chief justice and you will all live in my reign of terror.

[Dylan]: Let’s talk 18 now..

[Cole]: Arguably Bylaws failed due to lack of interest.

[Dylan]: people has issues with records and asked me why this wasn’t separate, they asked me why we didn’t separate it out.

anyways, 18: there are many problems with making every record public. The patch is council may establish a policy to keep certain records secret. The purpose for protecting 3rd parties is because some people give us good deals. Would propose cutting this because of contentions.

[Dylan]: I’m not giving legal advice.

[Dylan]: That’s it though, this is yours now. as they say, Tuum est.

**Elections Appeals committee** - 30 mins

Would it function as intended in its current state?

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is in two weeks.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 pm.
AMS Governance Committee

Agenda of January 30th, 2020 | In the AMS open offices

Attendance

Present: Katherine Westerlund (Chair), Jeanie Malone (Councillor), Dante Agosti-Moro (Councillor), Max Holmes (Councillor), Alex Gonzales (Councillor), Sahar Dua (Student at Large), Cole Evans (VP Administration), Sheldon Goldfarb (AMS archivist - non-voting)

Guests:

Regrets: Dante, Sahar, Cole

Recording Secretary:

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:14 pm.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Jeanie Seconded (reluctantly): Max

That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Seconded:

That the minutes of January 16th, 2020 be approved.

ALEX: amendment, I was not there please note me as not there.

* [The motion carries. The motion carries unanimously. The motion fails. The motion fails unanimously.]
AMS Governance Committee

Bylaw Amendments - 45 mins

Do we want to keep all these changes? Do we want to add more? See minutes from last meeting for recommendations from Dylan.

Alex: 3 points that mention sections that don’t exist. in bylaw 5, 2h and 2i mention sections which don’t exist.

  Sheldon: should be 5 2 a iii and 5 2 a ii

5 4 b ii also has this problem

Max: question around the referenda thing. Seems like we are adding a lot of requirements, has finance committee ever considered adding a budget for a proposed fee? Several referenda I can think of that seem like they are just abstract ideas instead of well thought out plans.

  Alex: would increase the barrier to entry.

  Max: Maybe we should increase the number of signatures? 2000?

  Alex: maybe it should be a percentage?

Katherine: Is this actually a worthwhile amendment?

  Jeanie: why don’t we ask council?

Max: how many questions are we going to have?

  Jeanie: student court maybe on its own?

  Max: I say put all bylaw changes together, except for ones that are important (eg. indigenous seat).

  Jeanie: we also need to like really bump it at council, councillors should be on board.

Max: I don’t think we have done a good job running our YES campaigns. Comms, exec, everybody needs to come together.

  Jeanie: constituencies have networks as well.

**chris and cole arrive**

Chris: I’m sending out the indigenous seat on council changes.
Max: to be democratic we should change AGM quorum to 8%.

Katherine: no

Max: I’m fine with these changes as is, one thing about the referendum percentage is maybe we should make it in line with quorum?

Jeanie: that’s a lot

Max: to be clear: take out the 1000 and just leave it at 5%.

Katherine: let’s look at the indigenous seat

Chris: this is what was recommended by them, one seat. They have been considering the code behind it as well.

Max: I support this being its own separate referendum

Max: my proposal is very good I abstain. We need to make one change. To walk through the code, this explicitly states that senators/board members. goes through conflict of interest rules. Change: currently under conflict of interest section, executives who are senators would be conflicted out of those discussions. We can change this to remove senators, as they don’t have these fiduciary duties to the ubc.

Cole: this sounds great.

Moved by: Katherine Seconded: Cole

BIRT we refer this code change to council for approval!

Results: Approved, Max, Chris, Alex, and Jeanie abstain.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is Feb 6th, 2020.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at [Time].
AMS Governance Committee

Agenda of February 6, 2020 | NEST 3511 | 5 - 6 pm

Attendance

Present: Katherine Westerlund (Chair), Jeanie Malone (Councillor), Dante (Councillor), Max Holmes (Councillor), Alex Gonzalez (Councillor), Sahar Dua (Student at Large), Cole Evans (VP Administration), Sheldon Goldfarb (AMS archivist - non-voting)

Guests:

Regrets:

Recording Secretary:

Call to Order

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

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Cole
Seconded: Dante

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Cole *very strained*
Seconded: Sahar

That the minutes of January 30th, 2020 be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Bylaw amendments - 50 mins

Doc is not available until after Council unfortunately. This may be a long discussion or short, based on what happens at council.
Katherine: people had no thoughts on 1 or 2, people liked the referenda things. People had many
People generally in favour of scrapping #4.
7) exec vacancies. Generally in favour, but max holmes didn’t like it that exec removed by AGM couldn’t rerun due to small numbers of people for quorum at agms.
People generally ok with everything else
Records:
[Cole]: have we considered putting “harmful to students/members”, we are trying to protect the organization and the students of course.
[Dante]: many things are harmful..
[Cole]: I’m fine with current wording, just thinking about selling it to the electorate.
[Cole]: think the phrase “designate as confidential” is a good phrase
[Sheldon]: my concern, is designate strong enough?
General sentiment: yes
General agreement, two referenda
1. Housekeeping bylaw changes
2. Indigenous seat
Katherine: I hate bylaws.

Next Meeting
The next scheduled meeting is [Month] [Date], [Year].

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 5:56 pm.
AMS Governance Committee Meeting - May 26, 2020
Meeting Minutes

Opening:
Land Acknowledgement - Sebastian Cooper
Approving Agenda: Georgia moved, Chris Seconded
Sebastian Cooper representative of Peter Allard Law School - Meeting Chair
Minute Taker: Shivani Mehta

Present; Sebastian Cooper, Nicola Vanderveer, Danny Liu, Carter MacLean, Ryan Wong, Georgia Yee, Chris Hakim, Sheldon Cooper, Shivani Mehta

- Introductions
- Overview of Governance Committee support
  - Sheldon Goldfarb
- Code Section XIII, Article 3: exemption from fees
  - Sebastian Cooper
- Ad Hoc Governance Committee review
  - Christopher Hakim
- Summer work plan
  - Sebastian Cooper
  - Exemption from fees / distance education; Chairs of the Operations and Finance Committee; guidelines and procedures for Council disciplinary action (based on the ad hoc governance committee's work); Reviewing procedure for committee appointments; Constituency Membership Definition project;

I. Overview of Governance Committee Support: Sheldon Goldfarb
i. Responsible for drafting of code - is it discussed in the committee and then edited. Provides code regulations and AMS history to have more depth when developing policy.

II. Code Section XIII, Article 3: exemption from fees: Sebastian Cooper
i. Students who study online during a regular school year are exempt from paying fees → the issue is that somebody could misinterpret that any student doing online courses will be exempt from paying AMS fees. This is a large amount of how AMS is funded.

ii. Propose that we create a code definition “what is meant by distance education” CTLT designed for courses to be taken online not courses that are being online as a result of COVID

Additional Comments
G.Y. - AMS services will not be suspended
R. W. - is a better to add a definition than to remove/suspend this from the code
  - Math and econ courses are also being redesigned to be online currently, if any student is taking these courses distance education instead of lecture/seminar
S.C. - just because something is online doesn’t mean that it is distance education
G.Y. - in conversation with VP Students, Ainsley Carry → despite courses being taken for the online atmosphere we are still charging same tuition per credit, but they are still looking to reduce fees for services that students will not be able to access
S.G. - the code says that the exemption only applies if ALL of your courses are distance
education
S.C. - whatever cultural shift that the AMS council will need to address in the future with online courses, at the moment we need a running definition of online learning
C.H. - something that we need to work with sheldon in order to create these definitions

ACTION ITEM
S.G. and S.C. will create a definition and bring this to council next meeting

III. Ad Hoc Governance Committee Review - Chris Hakim

i. Council Government Report - Chris was the most recent council chair. There was a presentation that came from the President’s office that identified the main issues with AMS governance and where we can address the turnover.

ii. The recommendations are scarce because there is mostly referral work and strong orientation work. Identified issue with council and governance → working over the summer to divide up the work and timelines ie. issue one and research from other boards, what can be transferred to improve this committee.

iii. The board self-assessment survey was collected to give insight into the council and its role. Helping to understand via data what council members were thinking of before and how we can move forward.

ACTION ITEM
S.C. - Ad Hoc Committee via email → next committees goals that need to be reported to executive council set at the beginning of the year

IV. Summer Work Plan - Sebastian Cooper
i. Chairs of the Operations and Finance Committee

ACTION ITEM
S.C. will invite the executives VP Finance and Admin to the next meeting in order clarify this before moving forward

Additional Comments
R.W. - where did the rationale come from?
S.C. - it was executive council that developed this idea and sent it to the committee
S.G. - Get more councillors involved in chairing this committee instead of burdening with VP Finance and VP Admin from the AMS
G.Y. - The proposed model will be like the Advocacy Committee → this will allow the execute member to support the Chair who will be the one to be developing the meeting agenda and keeping a clear line of communication with the various portfolios
V. Appointing Members at Large - Danny Liu

i. How are we going to make these meetings more equitable and accessible for people to apply

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

C.H. - an attempt to vote for these positions online seeing as we have a 10 grand software
People can read the blurbs and vote

S.G. - In the end people wanted to hear what the applicants have to say

R.W. - The rationale behind the sheet encompassing all of the names of the applicants - time to
vote for members at large it would come down to if you spoke, then you would get voted

G.Y. - the election system for the candidates and their blurb for whichever position they are
hoping like previous years using the online voting system. What is their preference for
the committee to make sure that each.

C.H. - people who have accessibility issues they were not able to make the in person meeting
before would not be appointed as members of the committees or members at large.
Having something written in front of people will be more ideal.

R.W. - It does make sense to have that pre-populated sheet to have more strict questions -
making the campaign pitches more concise and straightforward to determine the best
candidates

N.V. - the people that speaks first are at a disadvantage compared to the those who speak later

S.C. - you had to refresh your page and try to remember which courses are linked to which
person → it might be better have a prompt and have students respond to these without
restricting people.

S.G. - the run-off election was not in code and how to address this issue

S.C. - Do we want everything to be written in code or are we bringing ideas to council

C.H. - It will help us to better assess individuals' experiences, skills.. 38% of people who agreed
there was sufficient breadth in skills and experience to the committee

ACTION ITEMS

D.L. will be putting together a document about this appointment process and connecting
with the AMS President on this

VI. Adding this to the long-term goals - Sebastian Cooper

i. For students who are paying SUS fees how double majors are paying their society
fees or if they are - D.L.

ii. This is a project that was worked on by Ryan Wong in collaboration with Julia Chai
and determining the overlapping student fees, if students are being represented by the
correct society. Kat (the outgoing chair) was concerned with students who are not being
represented at all - R.W.

iii. All students officially pay a third party and therefore they were able to run in both
student government elections - how can we do this moving forward

Agenda for next time - Vice-Chair Appointment, recurring once a week 4PM Tuesdays
Additional Comments
C.H. - Recommendations taken by the AMS it serves as a great foundation, it is proprietary information that is secure but the governance committee may not be privy to that information
S.G. - the recommendations are public, but then the documents were sent to council and now the report is only for certain purposes therefore would not be email due to confidentiality

Meeting Adjourned at: 5:34 pm
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee, June 1, 2020

Attendance

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

Guests: Sylvester Mensah, VP Administration (regrets)

Regrets: Chris Hakim

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Sebastian  Seconded: Ryan

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries unanimously.] 

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Sebastian  Seconded: Ryan

That the minutes of May 26, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries unanimously.] 

Election of Vice Chair

- Nicola: “elected” with no opposition

Chairs of Finance and Operations Committees (Discussion)

Sylvester Mensah, VP Administration has been invited to share his thoughts at 4:20pm. Sebastian spoke with Lucia Lang, VP Finance, this week, and will provide her input to the Committee.

- Waited until 4:20 to discuss
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

- Sebastian: Lucia is in favour of these changes. She is concerned that the executive chairs the committee and views that the work to chair is a lot for the executives. For example, Finance has three subcommittees. She believes it takes too much away from her role as VP Finance. Executives do not get compensation from the extra work they do from chairing. It takes away from counsellors’ involvement if exec chairs. Would also give two qualified voices for council to question. Main issue she raised is accountability. As chair you can set goals, etc. Chair should be someone who is not the VP for checks and balances purposes. VP should still sit on the committee. Chair could be hostile to the goals of the VP, but Lucia does not believe this would be an issue. Lucia believes this change should happen soon, but not now. Perhaps post-budget. She suggested we bring in other voices such as Cole to discuss. As well as Cristina and Julia.

- Sebastian: It would be good to bring in other voices.

- Ryan: What are the differences in responsibility between the VP Finance and the Finance committee.

- Sheldon: Section 5 of the code and Section 6 refer to this. The VP Finance gets the budget together and brings it to the finance committee to approve. There is a history of discussion about this. Argument for executives chairing is that they are more knowledgeable. Some still chair committees, but it depends.

- **Action:** Sebastian: Will send out invites to the people Lucia suggested as well as Sylvester.

- Sebastian: Lucia also asked if VPs can assign work to committee members.

- Sheldon: There is no power to do that in the code right now, but it might destroy the oversight of the committee.

- Sebastian: Not sure the exact relationship between committee members and the VP assigning work to them. Maybe need to research that.

**Code Changes Regarding Defining “Distance Learning” (Discussion)**

Discussion of the first draft that Sheldon has provided.

- Sheldon: Old code said distance education. UBC defines it as distance learning rather than distance education. Students just taking distance education as designated by the university

- Sebastian: We want to be clear what we are referring to. We need to use the term distance learning to make it a lot clearer.

- Ryan: Article 3 Number 1. Why are medical students exempted from paying AMS fees

- Sheldon: Referendum in 1956. Medical students spend a lot of their time away from campus. If they’re so far away they can’t take the benefits of the program, so they were exempted.

- Ryan: In the spirit of that, shouldn’t the students who are not on campus, not pay that?

- Sheldon: You still get some resources even if you aren’t on campus. It’s a bigger philosophical discussion. In 1956, there were no services to access off campus, so the amendment passed because they were away all the time. To reverse that, you would need another referendum.

- Sheldon: What if the University designates all the courses as distance learning? Cole said it shouldn’t be an issue, so we shouldn’t have to worry about that.
- Sebastian: From Ainsley: “Only courses listed as “distance education courses” will not be charged fees. Courses that are temporarily delivered online are not “distance education courses.” This topic is going to the BoG for their approval of this clarification in the UBC Calendar.

Motion to vote to approve the recommended code change: Moved by Sebastian. Seconded by Nicola. Everyone nods and gives thumbs up. This motion passes.

2020/2021 Govcomm Goals (Discussion)

Discussion of the Committee’s short-term, long-term, and strategic goals, based on the draft document shared this week.

- Constituency Compositions
  - Google Spreadsheet and Docs in the AMS Governance Committee 2019-2020 Folder.
  - Danny: Might end up with awkward issues if there’s only one person in a constituency
  - Sebastian: Maybe someone take the lead on this. Breakdown the goals so that one person takes responsibility for one project.

- Sebastian: Asked Lucia about Finance Committee. Suggested we do a broader look at how we divy up the work between committees and VPs. Can incorporate this in the Goals and how we approach the chairmanships of operations and finance.

- Action: Moved that we send this document in as our agreed short term and long term goals to Steering Committee for the governance committee. Sebastian: Moved. Ryan: Seconded.

Committee Appointment Process (Discussion)

Continuation of the discussion regarding ensuring equity and efficiency in the committee appointments process, based on the document drafted by Danny Lui.

- Sebastian: Cole and Justin are drafting something on this. We could either draft something ourselves and send it to them or keep it and use it as our reference to the draft Cole and Justin provide.

- Danny: When Justin and Cole draft the appointment method, be mindful what each appointment method selects for. Do we value accessibility, democracy, etc. Be mindful of the biases.

- Sebastian: Should also pay attention to how we get people involved in the appointment method.

  Action: We should send them this document and then also keep it as a reference for when we see Cole and Justin’s document.

Next Meeting
The next scheduled meeting is June 9, 2020.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53pm.
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee, June 9, 2020

**Attendance**

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

Guests: Cristina Ilnitchi

Regrets:

**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**

Moved: Sebastian  
Seconded: Ryan

That the minutes of May 26, 2020 be approved

*[The motion carries]*

**Chairs of Finance and Operations Committees (Discussion)**

Review of input form Sylvester Mensah, VP Administration.

- **Sebastian** alluded to the danger (possibly for the finance committee) in bringing people or councillors into Committees who don’t necessarily have the best experience or resources to really excel in the oversight function. VP Finance is in a better position by having external staff in order to help. Sebastian discussed Sheldon’s research and was surprised at how recently it was made a requirement for VPs to chair the committees.
Carter had an inquiry about the finance committee: Would it be possible to make it so that there is a provision to require the chair to have previous experience on committee? Sheldon raised the conundrum of no-one appointed to the committee having previous experience.

Cristina Ilnitchi has been invited to share her thoughts at 4:15pm.

- Christina: Hasn’t been in respective VP roles but will contribute her personal experience, explaining how some committees where the people with the most knowledge will attain roles such as the chair or VP in order to bring discussions about what they truly want to see in this meetings
- Especially for finance meetings, she emphasised that the person that is most closely involved can be the VP finance, it would be very difficult in order to get the information necessary for council without the VP finance present
- Operations and finance should be open to having the VP as chairs, for the sake of transparency of the committee it could be beneficial
- She suggested that we must pay more attention to the role of councillors on the committees, and how the VP can do a better job at collaborating with the committee members
- When Christina was VP external, and a member of the advocacy committee, it wasn’t required to have the VP as chair but often she was
- Was there a difference? or shift? What she speaks from is her knowledge of advocacy, what happens in between the two weeks when they meet, when the VP was chair then we could have more updates / resources or material. When the chair was a councillor on the other hand it required a lot of coordination in order to get the information, and this didn’t often happen in the most organized or prepared way
- Not to say that councillors don’t do a good job, if you have someone dedicated; you must need to empower them in this role
- VP workload: one criticism that comes up often is if VPs are chairs they might not be as engaged in committee work; all about allocation of resources and if the VP is taking that on then they understand the responsibilities of said committee. Maybe we can improve on accountability and more deadlines, or addressing lack of consequences from executives might allow for more responsibility
- Empowering council members: Understanding the responsibility of the role, because you are committing yourself to more hours, more responsibility, taking on a more leadership role then the onus is on the person that does take on the responsibility
- We have seen a lot of councillors who excelled in this role, understand the job description; a lot of the difficulties arise from lack of hand off protocols, could be resolved from more orientations and better training
- Oversight/ accountability: The people who are overseeing are sometimes the people who are chairing the committees. If a VP finance is the chair then the committee could be lacking information and this could cause issues in checks and balances; doesn’t know any chair that has actively denied an agenda required, the respective VP would add it onto the next agenda, no more oversight than if you were the chair of the committee
How do we provide the skills for counsellors in training to provide them the skills to do the oversight needed? Is there room for more collaboration of having conversations that define more clearly the role and therefore the responsibilities? More so about strengthening the knowledge of VP and Chairs in order to work more collaboratively.

- **Chris Hakim**: The one thing about committee chairs is the level of involvement that a chair can provide, in his experience his chairs are more involved in executive work. It is hard to pick out of the group of committee meetings, talking to someone in the committee that has been appointed as a chair. We might lose this relationship benefit when a VP is the chair.

- **Christina**: In terms of what Chris said, it’s only a value to Council if the VPs are very involved in committees; she participated in the transition of the advocacy chair and how this benefited the committee as a whole of passing off information between participates during this transition. To the detriment of the council if they don’t have good transitions between chairs, and how we need a process more similar to the VP transition process.

- **Georgia**: We should have a more defined process for chairs? A written document? What is currently in the code requiring transition? Making sure it’s a written record in order to keep all parties accountable? Keep in mind that we could have a structure that the VP and Chairs don’t have to be either due to there can be a more fluid way of the structure and roles could be a beneficial to the committee as attributing to more emphasis on the responsibilities of chairs.

- **Chris Hakim**: Good transitions are great, the one thing is that transitions only set you up to be a good advisor, they attempt to catch you up to speed but they don’t make you that advisor or it doesn’t make you a great advisor, it possibly makes you a greater council member; Co chairs are not beneficial, the role of the committees aren’t just for an operational function, if it was to make sure that work gets done but the AMS is more beneficial to a singular chair and they are managing work and you are providing an accountability piece. When there is a co chair there is a conflict where you are both trying to manage a committee.

- **Sebastian**: We could make a requirement that the VP must be a member of the committee, not necessarily the chair.

- **Christina**: They must be a part of the committee as it might not be beneficial for the chair of VP to be not additionally a member of the committee.

- **Sebastian**: Discussed the accountability to continue the projects and works of the previous committees agenda, we can discuss further.

- **Sheldon**: Used to pay them a transitional honorarium, and how their used to be a more transition process, if we want to bring this back in order to create more emphasis.

- **Georgia**: Believes this previous policy would bring more incentive in order to make a transition report more seamless and make Chair’s accountable.

- **Ryan**: Agrees that it would be a great idea to bring back the incentive, and how this would allow the previous chair to continue to aid in the transition, asked if they remain the chair until they are replaced.

- **Sheldon**: Yes, he believes that the old policy was an incentive for even previous chair members to continue to transition.
- Sebastian: Would be keen to implement the policy or more so a requirement to a council have access to the transition

Constituency Membership (Discussion)

- Sebastian: suggested that one member of the committee take over a coordinating role as it might be one of those projects where everyone working on it might contribute to lack of progress
- Ryan: is now appointed as a coordinator lead for one of these projects, in order to facilitate outreach
- Ryan: Possibly send out an email or document or come to the next meeting in order to spell out exactly how this role will function

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is [June] [16th], [2020].

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at [4:47]
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Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee, June 16, 2020

**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_iM6a0i6APxCxJQwF9n5kJq7keOzycRSHhB39Y/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
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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.
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.
Attendance

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

Guests: Katherine Westerlund

Regrets: Carter Maclean

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Sebastian  Seconded: Chris
That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Sebastian  Seconded: Ryan
That the minutes of June 9 and June 16, 2020 be approved

The motion carries unanimously.

Chairs of Finance and Operations Committees (Discussion)

Discussion document drafted by the Chair.

- Sheldon gave brief history of the finance and budget committee and how the new finance committee and the old budget committee carry out different roles
- Discussed how these differences possibly allude to a reason as to why the finance committee chair might be VP finance
- Ryan led a discussion on various conflicts that arise when executives are in charge of the Finance committee, Chris suggested a counter for this conflicts this with the example of
Advocacy committee allowing executives as not voting members to serve on the finance committee and how this would allow for more knowledge bring brought into the meetings
- Sheldon brought up the code
- Georgia suggested taking inspiration and guidance from advocacy committee for Operations committee and how this can affect finance committee for executives becoming voting members and the conflict behind it
- Sebastian raised the question of if a chair that is not executive with past experience, are they able to perform as well as someone that has had a position of VP finance before?
- Chris commented on how it’s unlikely to have a “bad” chair, it would mainly be an issue of productivity or punctuality of documents for the rest of the committee.
- Georgia mentioned how we since we already have the budget created, we can definitely move forward with both finance and operations committee with executive support
- Sheldon discussed how the previous edits of the code has made it that VP finance must be on finance committee,
- Georgia has suggested that the VP finance to be able to elect themselves as chair on the finance committee, but not necessarily a rule, as well as allowing committee members to self elect that it must be as well as there is the option of not changing code.
- Georgia also reminded the amount of workload that the VP finance faces and how it might be best to not chair and have additional workload as having to run the meetings and that relieves that pressure
- Sebastian discussed the timeline of how this decision should be made:
- Georgia discussed how it would be beneficial to spearhead in order to make it so it’s clear by the time of the committee appointments
- Sebastian suggested seeking out to reaching out to people who were involved in the finance committee as the VP finance or as a committee member or both to gain further insight into how this decision can be made

At 5:30 the Governance Committee voted to move forward with Code changes, allowing both executives and non-executives to chair, with the changes coming into effect by September.

Constituency Membership (Discussion)

Previous Govcomm Chair Katherine Westerlund has been invited to share her thoughts and experiences with Constituency Membership at 4:30pm.

- Kathrine discussed how last year the ad hoc agreement between VSEUS and AUS, discussing how various students in their constituencies were not represented or doubly represented
- The ways in which we decide who is in our constituencies is not necessarily very defined and helpful. These barriers to constituencies allow conflicts arise such as 1) physical representation on our board at AMS and how some are actually lacking any at all 2) students in the same situation end up paying different student fees, at the discretion of UBC (Example engineering
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

constituency is fairly straightforward); there are cases such as being a dual major in Sciences and Arts where student fees can get quite complicated

- Discrepancies between how some students can be in the same situation and yet paying different student fees and how this becomes problematic when it becomes a pattern
- Discussed how her and Stephanie last year had began to work on a document of the list of degrees and constituencies and how that way once UBC has access to it would be able to see exactly who is charged what fee, which elections they should be voting in, what constituency they are in

- Sebastian: How many students do you think this issue affects?
- Kathrine brings up the example of AUS election error which resulted in a minimum of 8000 approx students being misrepresented
- Major groups that should be discussed would be the AUS, VSE and GSS, in addition to drafting a document of dual degree fees so that we have a straightforward distribution of fees and defining constituency
- Ryan brought up the CUS and the representation of their fees due to being in two different constituencies technically due to affordability
- Kathrine discusses various possibilities, one being cheap or zero cost student fees if students in CUS are unable or unwilling to pay the dual degree fees

- Ryan: Are any current certificate or diploma program represented by the AMS?
- Kathrine discussed how she believes that it was that diploma programs are more considered then the students in the certificate program
- Ryan: Has it ever happened where a student didn’t have a constituency and when we matched them with a constituency, they were not wanted?
- Kathrine, it hasn’t happened yet but in the example of bringing students into the CUS there will be issues that arise from the fact that the CUS wants exclusively bcomm student as well as that they pay increased fees to be a member of the CUS
- Ryan discussed how he believes there should be further research into a miscellaneous constituency and how this might benefit the issue of representation

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is July 7, 2020.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:36pm
Attendance

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

Guests: Justin Zheng, Associate, Policy and Governance; Cole Evans, AMS President

Regrets: Christopher Hakim

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Ryan Wong  Seconded: Carter Maclean

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries.

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Ryan  Seconded: Georgia

That the minutes of July 7, 2020 be approved

The motion carries.

Recommendations to Governance Committee & Policy I-21 Review (Discussion)

Justin Zheng will present on the AMS President’s office’s recommendations to the Governance Committee, and on the draft Policy I-21 (Policy on Committee Appointments).

- Cole has begun with the Policy i- 21, we took a lot of the recommendations from Governance and council and created a pretty good plan on how to handle committee appointments
- In the policy there is a system for a timeline of nominations to open for student at large, the precedens office to be approved once again,
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- we would open it for both student at large and council and electronically distributed as well the council would be able to vote for 48 hours for the nominations
- the successful nominations would be included on the next committee appointment agenda, the weird examples of when there are the 4 or more appointments being accepted, so that they can drop out of the committees if he needed

Question period was opened at 4:12

- **Sebastian**: Explore what the benefit is of the difference of having this as a policy instead of a code? Doesn’t reduce the number of material that people have to reference, they just have it separate now because now you have to look at both
- **Response Cole**: have a limited amount of procedural code and more so policy can advocate for accessibility, and where the policy is separated by numbers for the university so it’s easily accessible/ organized
- **Response Justin**: Westerns USC their code document has all of their policies in one document that’s 400 pages long and they have procedural advice and how this is quite difficult to even look through the table of contents, the benefit to having internal policies is that it’s easily accessible.
- **Re: Sebastian**: Student at large are unsure possibly still of why they have to go to multiple source son the website
- **Sebastian**: Ranked ballot system, and how it says the person has the highest vote on average (usually if you get over 50% you will get it nominated) but here we are saying “on average” that people are put on committees. If it is supposed to be
- **Response: Cole**: we didn’t specify the system, it’s sort of dependent for the person that is in charge, we are not attached to the method of selection that is being used and it’s nothing that they are too worried about. We could take out the average and that way whatever person is in charge that year is able to select a way that works best.
- **Re Sebastian**: The candidate, when selected it switches back to first past the post
- **Re Cole**: hard to do a rank system in a live meeting, this first past the post system was introduced as a way to continue ease throughout the changing times of whether it’s in person/ virtual. Tried to strike a balance between fairness and the simpleness of it.
- **Ryan**: I would personally be in favour of a system that is more consistent year to year versus the president being able to switch the system every year that they are nominated. Would there be a way to be more consistent? As well as if there is a way to make the systems more coherent, and then implement a system of tie breakers?
- **Re Justin**: Would that then be a criteria as in if it’s a certain situation then we go to the set way of breaking that tie breaker?
- **Re Ryan**: Yes, I’m not sure what that exactly looks like but it would be nice to have a more coherent way of documenting this
- **Sebastian**: Have you looked into a virtual system of voting?
- **Re Cole**: During the time of the voting system, we have explored other virtual systems of voting (Ex you X system when _____ happens)
- **Justin**: It would likely be better to decide which system works better for us, like software first versus what works best for us.

- **Sheldon**: If the aim is to reduce the amount of governance material that committees need to sift through, that perhaps we could do without. The definitions of the voting systems are just repeating what’s in code in addition to run off elections. As it is now there is a lot of redundancy.

- **Re Cole**: We could remove some things from Code, yet there would be.

- **Re Justin**: As of right now there is nothing set in code on how exactly, system wise, to go about nominancies.

- **Sebastian**: One thing we want to emphasis is that the main point should be accessibility.

**Recommendations (4:29pm)**

- Identified that there is a weird type of plan called framework policies (such as AMS sustainable action plan, where we are expecting them to be binding and yet they don’t align with our current plan)

- Code nor I-1 gives any validity to framework policies, Justin has created a structure of how these new policies are supplemented throughout policy documents.

- Vote tallies on recommendations, We thought it might be valuable for this committee to figure out a plan for analyzing the amount of votes/ percentages.

- Committee reporting, and how recently it has been announced that every committee submitted a monthly report to council so what were recommending is a better system on a meeting basis and instead of a monthly committee reports, and instead we could do in the council meeting that could be half a page in order to stay in communication in council, as well as the quarterly AMS report.

- Senators and Board of Governance are not voting committee members, since they don’t have judiciary duty to the society they only have judiciary duty to the University which is a separate, they are no longer eligible to seek committee of committee members and instead they can seek appointment as a student at large.

- Policy on transitions, a lot of chat on various committees about making a more robust transition outline, a more streamline process to make it more consistent year after year which would make it more involved in this committee, the president’s office, council and HR committee.

**Question period opened 4:38pm**

- **Ryan**: if the problem is that they don’t have a judiciary duty to the society and that the committee should be doing what’s best for the society, why do we allow student at larges at all.

- **Re Cole**: How can we guarantee that student at large are acting at the best interest in the society, we have considered in the past to remove them completely or allow them to sign something.

- **Sebastian**: We could not make them voting members, but allow them to sit on the committees.

- **Re cole**: They do take up a voting seat, it might overcomplicate things since student at larges.
Sebastian: First interaction with AMS could bring a great amount of diversity of views to AMS, as well as denying them members could deny a more broad sense of views/ backgrounds. Many senators and BOG reps have an institutional background which allows the risk that only one point of view is being represented.

Re Cole: That burden falls more on the individual council instead of society as a whole. From a governance perspective it would make sense to remove them completely, but of course then we lose that perspective.

Sebastian: Policy and transitions, the first policy on policies, who comes out with these framework type policies? Where is it originated from? Committees or executives?

Re Cole: Student driven by sustainability policy but it could not fit in. Possibly Sebastian would know more

Cole: Usually these come from committees

Ryan: Policy on policies, my concern is that internal policies are very black and white and a lot of the overarching themes are overarching goals or futures goals. Wondering in terms of an accountability type of situation,

Re Cole: I understand, the AMS used to have a structure where we would say we have more accountability and we would follow up etc.

Ryan: For your equity plan, is it planning to follow a similar plan for ASAP

Re Cole: It might be similar to ASAP as it might be more strategic/ holistic document versus a policy

Sebastian: Committee reporting, I like the idea of more accountability/ knowledge about communicating with students. The drawback is that if the issue is too much burden on council chairs, why

Re Cole: Move monthly reports to become quarterly reports, and written update to council instead of spoken updates

Re Sebastian: This doesn’t reduce the burden on as chair’s are getting paid 3 hours/ week and this would obviously exceed this limit

Re Cole: maybe we provide a template for committee chair’s so that it doesn’t take more than 20-30 minutes to do their every meeting updates

Ryan: when you advertise for student at large, then all the committee member appointments at large

Broader Recommendations Discussion:

Sebastian: The issue of many council members being unable to view the AMS emails, a suggestion could be someone has a gmail please check your spam, A disclaimer that *most AMS emails go to spam*

Justin: If someone was not appointed councillor then they would be automatically off the meeting, of said meeting as they would need another appointment
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- Sebastian: Put in a procedure to be able to remove their name from the running if they are appointed to more than one committee. There needs to be a system where the president can email everyone saying you are on ____ committee.

- Justin: Say the president sends that out on Friday and the council member would have until Sunday to let them know then if someone else was waiting for an appointment.

- Sebastian: Prior to september/ appointment where there is a rule where student at large cannot be on more than one committee and therefor

- Justin: I will recommend figuring out a more clear system a preference system and max number of committees you want to be on in nomination procedures

- Sebastian: In this document it alludes to chair appointment, we recommend that we strike with statements

- Ryan: Or add chair statements?

- Sebastian: I believe it would be better with candidates with statements being stricken.

- Justin: What are we adding exactly?

- Sebastian: A line clarifying that someone appointed to a committee remains on the committee until their replacement as well as taking out the “notwithstanding” in one of the paragraphs due to it making it redundant

AMS Discipline (Discussion)

Discussion of the report on censure history & on the review of Policy I-9.

- Interesting as it gives examples of what AMS voted not worthy of voting no
- Sebastian, of what passing censure was firing the director behind the director or going against united nations
- How
- Policy i-9 or KPI’s, sheldon has pointed out that we have been mandated, we will have to review i-9 anyways and we won’t necessarily have to focus on this right now
- Maybe it’s something we can wait until November (when executive has to report)

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is July 27, 2020.

Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at **5:56 pm.**
Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee, August 4, 2020

Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Carter Maclean (left at 4:52), Christopher Hakim, Danny Liu, Georgia Yee, Nicola Vanderveer, Ryan Wong, Sheldon Goldfarb

Guests: Justin Zheng, Associate, Policy and Governance; Cole Evans, AMS President

Regrets:

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:05pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Sebastian; Seconded: Nicola

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Sebastian; Seconded: Carter

That the minutes of July 21, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

Policy I-21 Review (Discussion)

Following discussions at the July 20 Govcomm meeting, Justin Zheng and Cole Evans will present on a revised draft Policy I-21 (Policy on Committee Appointments).

Prez: goal is to make Council more efficient, and take appointments completely out of Council

Justin: found a software that can conduct ranked ballots! Called: Election Buddy. Used before. Aim is to get this passed through Committee to be on the docket for August 26th meeting

Chair: what happens if a member drops? Worried about a scenario of people putting themselves forward for many committees but only wanting one. New draft doesn’t have provisions for that.
Justin: basically once people are notified of their appointments, and they decide to drop, they can notify the President, who will then just go down the list.

Chair: need a mechanism in the policy that allows people to withdraw. Also, since that scenario happened a lot in May, president should include in your transition report of how the votes occur in terms of the smaller details like dates of when the email is sent out.

Prez: if the committee isn’t confident enough on the policy alone, then we should make it as clear as possible in the policy.

Chair: then maybe we should add a paragraph allowing candidates to withdraw their candidacies prior to the Council meeting.

Chair: is the goal to get it approved at this Committee meeting or next one?

Prez: Probably not this one.

Chair/Georgia: The language of number 14 (dealing with a tie break) needs improvement.

Prez: ties could be unlikely; we should play around with the election software first maybe.

Chair: not comfortable with the current language; it switches back and forth between first past the post and preferential ballot.

Justin: could change the language to mean that the number of candidates that tie will have a second vote just involving them.

Chair: Let’s make it a revote.

Chair: What’s the plan with the duplication of parts of Code here?

Prez: plan is to remove any overlapping things from Code and have the policy be the important document.

Chair: Can you bring the committee your proposals for what language needs to be removed from Code.

Ryan: is there going to be an official vote in Council on the committee memberships?

Prez: the idea is not to have one because Council just voted in the ranked ballot. Council would just be notified.

Chair: We should have a Council vote. Important that Council expresses confidence in the finalized committee membership.

Prez: the timeline for this policy would be such that it runs out of alignment with the Council meeting schedule. We want to bring it completely out of in person Council.
Ryan: I would be uncomfortable not having a Council confirmation vote. I would be comfortable with an email vote.

Chair: does Code allow for email votes in non-pandemic times

Prez: not really, but we could make it such that it will allow that. I will work with Sheldon to amend the Policy such that there will be a Council confirmation vote.

Chair: expressed concerns of transparency about the vote: Council is supposed to oversee executive but a member of the executive is overseeing Council committee appointments.

Prez: Clerk of Council will verify the results. There is also wording that allows for Councillors to access the detailed results of the vote.

Chair: Clerk should report to Council confirmation verification of the results. There isn’t currently wording that allows Councillors to access the vote results - we should add this.

Georgia: Want to raise Sheldon’s comment on the draft: number 17 about who appoints the Chair of Committee if no one puts their name forward.

Sheldon: currently all of Council votes to approve the Chair. This would mean only the Committee approves the Chair.

Prez: we would be delegating that power to Committee, as we would need to get rid of that part of Code.

Chair: you can add once the Committee has been selected they can report back to Council.

Justin: we think it should just be an FYI to Council that the Committee has elected a person

Ryan: what if we make the language such that “at the first Committee meeting, the Committee moves to appoint an interim Committee Chair and further move to recommend their full approval at the next Council meeting.”

Justin/Prez: yes can do that.

Ryan: what happens if a person gets elected Chair, but not to Committee, is it necessary to include language about that?

Sebastian: to add to that, if someone gets a bunch of votes for Chair but not Committee, then it’s almost like a wasted vote.

Justin: don’t think language to address the first issue is necessary; unlikely to happen.

Sebastian: I don’t think the wasted vote would be too big of a deal. Let’s evaluate the results after the September run.
Sheldon: Do we want to suspend Code that says one Standing Committee so they can apply to just be on sub-committee/adhoc

Justin: Yes

Sheldon: asked about finance committee exception for student at large

Sebastian/Ryan: we’re fine with leaving it for now.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is August 18, 2020.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.
August 18, 2020 - Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee

Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Carter Maclean, Georgia Yee, Nicola Vanderveer, Ryan Wong (left at 4:45), Sheldon Goldfarb

Guests: Justin Zheng, Associate, Policy and Governance; Cole Evans, AMS President

Regrets: Danny Liu, Christopher Hakim

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Sebastian  Seconded: Nicola

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Sebastian  Seconded: Ryan

That the minutes of August 4, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

Policy I-21 Review (Discussion & Vote)

Following discussions at the July 20 and August 4 Govcomm meetings, Justin Zheng and Cole Evans will present on a revised draft Policy I-21 (Policy on Committee Appointments).

- Justin: The most discussed change to policy I-21 was the inclusion of a vote to approve committee appointments - that has now been included.
- Sebastian: Need to discuss the issue Sheldon raised about Paragraph 13 of the policy, that the AMS Code does not allow for general email votes, only in extraordinary circumstances.
- Justin: Don’t necessarily agree that Council must approve committee appointments, but this is the most efficient way to do it.
Sebastian: If we allow for email votes, we should not decide that right now, as it is a larger discussion. However, understand the importance of an exception for this.

Justin: Having email votes helps with expediency.

Ryan: Can we just amend the email restrictions in code to include an exception for committee appointments.

Sebastian: Any objections to the ⅓ objection requirement to bring appointments to an in-council vote?

Ryan: What exactly does rejection look like?

J: The language in the policy is loose. ‘In objection’ includes just voting no.

Sebastian: In the policy, it is a requirement that this vote is in email format. Could we change it to say that the policy could be email. Including, but not exclusively an email vote.

Sheldon: Could just say in email or in person. Can look through code to see if the code can be changed to say email votes are only held in extraordinary circumstances, and for committee appointments and draft a change.

Sebastian: Paragraph 15, why is the “if requested” needed?

Justin: Rationale is that if the councillor requests, but we could just have it mandatory in council

Sebastian: I would prefer that it is mandatory to present the results.

Sebastian: Can we approve I-21 now and do an email vote to approve the other code changes just discussed?

Sheldon: Yes

Sebastian: Move to approve policy I-21 and recommend it to council.

○ The motion passes unanimously.

Sebastian: will send code changes tomorrow.

Council Discipline (Discussion)

Discussion on the issue of Council discipline, based on the research compiled by Justin Zheng.

Sheldon: The other schools have mechanisms like committees for discipline. That is sometime the governance committee might want to think about.

Ryan: I agree with Sheldon on this. Western’s system seems to work. Disagrees with some of their specific things. Overall makes sense and we should consider expanding them into AMS

Sheldon: Interesting that these other schools are bicameral. Oversight committee could be something similar to discipline committee, but it was loathed.

Sebastian: Why was it loathed? Are we at risk of duplicating that.

Sheldon: Money/bonuses for executives was tied to work of the committee, and there were bad feelings. Might not have done too much discipline though. Should this be an ad hoc disciplinary committee or a standing committee?

Carter: Could have a standing committee where we have a disciplinary committee that always exists, but only called upon when needed.

Georgia: This would be better, since an ad hoc committee could run into issues. For example, councillors would need fairness training.
Sheldon: Should the Ombusperson be involved?
Ryan: I agree. Who hires and appoints the Ombudsperson?
Sheldon: Council appoints on the recommendation of HR Committee.
Sebastian: Should make clear that if there is an investigation, the investigation doesn’t necessarily mean anyone has done anything bad. What form should this take? Code change, policy, guidelines?
Ryan: Should have Justin or someone put together a policy similar to Western’s. Direct someone to go this and then get into the more nitty gritty debate. We see the value of establishing the process.
Sheldon: Could be in code as an extraordinary committee? Mainly, we would want a mechanism.
Sebastian: If you are willing to put a draft together that would be great.
Sheldon: I will do that
Sebastian: What are extraordinary committees?
Sheldon: Well the committee should be permanent in some way. Extraordinary committees are hired more so than appointed. Each one is different. Should it be like that or a regular standing committee?
Sebastian: Should be more of an extraordinary committee.

Recommendations to Governance Committee (Discussion)

Discussion of recommendations of the AMS President’s office.

Sebastian: Policy I-1 seems like it is something that should be pursued.
Sheldon: The code is put higher than internal policies. Policies are considered an extension of code.
Sebastian: Vote tallies. Do we want to include names of people voting against or for something in committees? Seems like a reasonable idea. Would this be in code as well?
Sheldon: Can draft something in code under the committee section to include this.
Sebastian: Could just put this in the rationale form from committees.
Sheldon: Rationale documents aren’t even in code.
Sebastian: Could include in chair transitions.
Ryan: Agree with most of the next recommendations. Need to investigate more the committee appointments of Senate and BoG policy.
Sebastian: Yes, we should invite more people to discuss this.
Sebastian: We left committee reporting with Cole and Justin - they’re drafting examples of what they want.
Georgia: Policy I-1, there is room to fit in the external policy manual, but this manual has not been updated for a while which could be a problem. We should fit this into the policy on policies.
Sheldon: I believe the policy on policies already includes this.
Georgia: Would this be in framework policies?
Sheldon: Would fit into the same box as internal. They have to follow the same format and procedures. This may also require a code amendment. Could look into this.

Georgia: The external policy manual is a bit of a mess and our stances have changed. Would it be necessary to separate it out of external and internal policies.

Sebastian: This issue may not be for the discussion of the policy, but for the advocacy committee.

Sebastian: Committee appointments of BoG and Senators. We should look at this over the next few weeks and invite people to committee to discuss (Chris Hakim, Alex Gonzales, Max Holmes, Jeanie)

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is August 25, 2020.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

September 1, 2020 Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee / Zoom link:
https://zoom.us/j/91681615917

Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Danny Liu, Ryan Wong, Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk)

Guests: Jeanie Malone, UBC Board of Governors

Regrets: Carter Maclean, Nicola Vanderveer, Georgia Yee

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 pm

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

That the agenda be adopted.

Moved: Seb; Seconded: Ryan

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

That the minutes of August 18, 2020 be approved

Postponed to next meeting due to lack of quorum

BoG/Senators appointments to AMS committees

Sebastian

- Committee has seen the written submissions from Alex Gonzalez and Max Holmes
- Cole Evans reached out to share concerns about some interpretations of the proposal

Jeanie Malone, UBC BoG rep attends

Jeanie, UBC BoG rep:

- Provided an introduction: former EUS president and current BoG; has served on AMS Committees
A similar discussion occurred under GORICIM when reps’ vote on Council was first removed.

- GSS is a similar body, they allow reps to be on Committee
- There are other ways to manage Conflict of interest issues: e.g. there are concerns with being on Advocacy, Finance Committee
- Removing reps should be part of a larger decision about non-voting Council members: if they cannot be on committees, what’s the benefit of having them on Council

Sebastian

- Asked about ways of currently managing conflicts of interest

Jeanie

- Note that Senators and BoG reps have different backgrounds and therefore conflict of interest would arise differently
- Ability to sit on Committees is a reason why senators might want to sit on Council
- Can be tricky: for example, as bother an elected Governor who is supposed to advocate for students but also would be personally affected by them: usually will speak to the issue but recuse self from voting
- As a BoG rep on AMS, stays arms length from issues to do with the businesses (e.g. since UBC food services compete), would also step away planning components
- Approach at BoG: governors disclose all interests at the beginning and then manage it on a day-to-day basis
- There’s a benefit to allowing reps to be on committees: BoG, Senate reps in the past have previously held an AMS/leadership position and brought that experience to committee work
- Note that Senate and BoG is difference: Senators have a less clear fiduciary duty than do BoGs because they don’t go through the same process, don’t have the same property/financial obligations
  - BoG deals with financial, HR, property issues; Senate with academic concerns of council
  - https://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/00_96468_01
- A new standard would have to be applied to all student senators - even those who also hold other positions (such as the current AMS president)
- Suggests reaching out to student senate caucus

Jeanie Malone leaves

Sheldon:

- Conflict of Interest is dealt with in Code: for example, where there are in camera discussions, Councillors have been asked to leave where the matters being discussed effects matters dealt with by other boards they're on
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

- This includes both committee and council
- Code also has provisions regarding non-voting members are not directors
- Sheldon to look share relevant Code provisions

Ryan

- At last orientation, we received information on what BoG/Senate does and on conflict of interest but not on BoG/Senate reps’ conflicts of interest

Sebastian

- Has this been an issue before?

Sheldon:

- There have been fears about this in the past but no examples

Sebastian:

- Maybe we can move this forward by ensuring everyone is aware of when these reps should recuse themselves from certain conversations. This could be part of our study into transitions.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is September 8, 2020.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.
Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Carter MacLean (AUS), Kamil Kanji (student-at-large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council), Danny Liu (SUS)

Guests: Isabelle Ava-Pointon, AMS Chief Electoral Officer

Regrets: Ryan Wong

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 pm.

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Carter        Seconded: Kamil

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Kamil        Seconded: Carter

That the minutes of October 2, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

AMS Election Plans

Presentation by Isabelle Ava-Pointon, AMS Chief Electoral Officer on proposals regarding a COVID-19-safe AMS election.

- Some requirements in Code that put some people at risk:
  - Four sections that require in-person aspects of the voting procedure.
  - Nomination forms: physical forms are currently required to be picked up and signed by 50 people. Move this to digital signatures.
● Sebastian: Should some of these just be made permanent changes? For example, removing the in person submission.
● Sheldon: In-person is used because one year a nomination form was presented that included a person who was not even a student - so the in person was included to ensure they are a student
● Isabelle: Now we have ways to check this. Agree that we could just make this permanent
● Danny: Nomination forms can also just be made available online.
● Isabelle: Why does it have to go through the administrative assistant?
● Sheldon: This is because the administrative assistant is always there and a permanent position
● Isabelle: Since it is online, might as well just send it directly to me
● Sebastian: Might be worthwhile to keep this rule in place
● Sheldon: check with Joanne to see
● Isabelle: There are still in-person polling stations around campus, but these are never really used, so for this election it is best just to suspend this for health reasons. (5.1, 5.2 and 5.5)
● Sebastian: If the main role of the booth is to advertise, will need to find another way to do the same advertising.
● Sebastian: Decision to hire poll clerks seems mandatory as well, might as well for clarity suspend that as well.
● Isabelle: Would poll clerks be deemed necessary?
● Sheldon: Might as well just suspend the section of poll clerks to ensure you have the authority.
● Isabelle: In-person campaigning could either be entirely suspended or encourage more online engagement
● Kamil: more precautions to put in place the better
● Sebastian: we shouldn’t suspend in person campaigning, because it seems a bit of an overreach. If people can do it safely they should do it.
● Isabelle: Enforcement of the rules would be hard.
● Kamil: Potential for risk is still high.
● Sebastian: There is a provincial election doing on and there is no huge discussion about halting in-person campaigning
● Sheldon: Might get more complaints about in person campaigning.
● Sebastian: Maybe put out some guidelines explaining how to campaign safely during COVID
● Isabelle: In code, there are rules, the election committee also comes up with their own rule book and punishments for that and can limit what is allowed that is an addition to the code. Might be a better tool than suspending code and can be more accurate.
● Sebastian: Suggest these things to council that will be in the handbook. Things can also change in the coming months.
● Isabelle: Will take these changes to Council at the first meeting in November.

Vice Chair

Election of the Governance Committee’s vice chair

● Kamil - congrats!
Policy I-1 and Strategic Plans

Consideration of proposed Code amendments to include reference to Strategic Plans.

- Rewording for Strategic Plans and other amendments
- Sheldon: External policy guidelines are not really used
- Sebastian: Not including the external policy guidelines (Section II Article II: 8 and 9) from the proposed changes so that we can consult with advocacy. Will reach out for Advocacy Chairs input
- Sebastian: What should be our review of Policy I-1
- Sheldon: Maybe do consultations; the committee would just open it up \and take a look at it and make recommendations to Council on what to do.
- Sebastian: Took a look already and nothing jumped out about the policy. Will email chairs of the committees and Execs and ask them if they have any issues.
- Sheldon: Include a separate proposal for strategic plans, not in the policy on policies. Amend policy I-1 to include an exclusion of strategic plans.

Committee Chairs

Consideration of a proposal from Lucia Lang, VP Finance:

- Create or revise the current contract to reference job responsibilities.
- Setting up a form for students to fill out regarding why they should be into these positions (more specifically the form should outline specific questions on the committee they are running to be a Chair of; i.e. a set of mini job interview questions that would demonstrate if the candidate is qualified and understands the committee).

- Concern with Finance committee, since you need experience to do well in the role
- Sebastian: Is it governance committee's role to write employment contracts?
- Sheldon: Not our responsibility, HR’s responsibility. Perhaps reflect code to say what should be in contracts.
- Sebastian: Will reach out to HR committee to see what they think about the first issue raised
- Sebastian: Could add new language to I-21 regarding Lucia’s second proposal
- Kamil: This should be in the code
- Sebastian: Do we want to specify what people need to answer in written statements?
- Kamil: This is important for running and managing the committee
- Sebastian: Could be concerns about equity; are we limiting some people from running?
- Kamil: It’s like a job, where you need to be qualified for the role
- Carter: Just make it qualifications for all committees, not one by one for each committee
- Sebastian: Will look at including something in I-21 to require candidates to provide a written statement detailing their qualifications.
Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting is October 26, 2020.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 pm.
November 2, 2020 Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee; 4pm

Zoom link: https://zoom.us/j/91681615917

Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Danny Liu (SUS), Carter MacLean (AUS), Kalith Nanayakkara (AMS VP Extern Affairs), Kamil Kanji (student-at-large), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council)

Guests:

Regrets: Ryan Wong, Katherine Feng

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 pm.

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Carter Seconded: Kalith

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Carter Seconded: Kalith

That the minutes of October 19, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

“Discipline” Committee

Addressing issues raised during Council consultation: chair, name, ad hoc mechanism, extraordinary vs standing.

For reference re/ a potential ad hoc mechanism:

“4. An Election Appeals Committee shall consist of:

(a) the Speaker of Council, who shall be Chair;
(b) one (1) representative of the person appealing the ruling, interpretation, or decision referred to in paragraph 4 above; and

(c) one (1) representative of the Elections Committee.”

Sebastian: Extraordinary vs standing?

Carter: What is the difference?

Sheldon: Not a lot of difference; currently have three Extraordinary Committees (Elections, Indigenous, Advisory).

Sebastian: They all have different mechanisms for appointing their members than the Standing Committees, which use I-21. We’re proposing a unique membership of this Committee so maybe it makes sense for it to be Extraordinary.

Sheldon: Will redraft.

Sebastian: Got feedback that “Discipline Committee” would be an inappropriate name considering the history of colonialism, and looking from an EDI lens. The other options that were brought up were “Ethics” and “Accountability.”

Kalith: At first Discipline Committee seemed like a fitting name, however after much consideration other options might work better.

Sebastian: We could merge “Accountability” and “Ethics”

Sheldon: The word “discipline” is mentioned multiple times in the proposed code changes. We could potentially leave it there and just rename the committee.

Sebastian: Maybe Sheldon we could see what names other schools/student unions have for similar committees?

Sebastian: We could remove the word “discipline” from the introduction and text, since it’s a problematic term. We can name this committee “Ethics and Accountability Committee.”

Committee agrees. Sheldon to redraft.

Sebastian: Cole mentioned that it would be problematic to not have representation from the side at issue in the allegation present at the meetings. Cole suggested that we could do it similar to the way the Elections Appeals Committee, which involves one representative from the matter in proceedings. If we were to pursue this route, every other member would be decided prior similar to other committees, but on an ad hoc basis, representatives from the respective issue would join the committee when it considered an issue.

Carter: Having people attend that are biased could be unnecessary. These individuals will still have their voices heard as both sides need to be considered anyway.
Sebastian: That is true.

Sheldon: Some history on the Elections Appeal Committee. Created about 20 years ago on an arbitration model - with the vision of having one person from both sides. However the reality is that the vote split leads to one person - the chair - breaking the tie.

Kalith: We could have them as non-voting members?

Carter: The danger of having involved people constantly there is that it could deter people from speaking freely.

Sebastian: I will reach out to Cole and see if he has more thoughts on the matter, since he brought this to our attention. What I’m getting from this conversation is that we should not change the make up of the Committee, but could amend the language to more explicitly state that the Committee must hear from the party whose conduct is at issue.

**Committee Chairs Memos**

Consideration of proposed policy language: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-bdXfEKbHmGgzya5s6xIVTbJ-MoT5O60WkWcTptyQ_M/edit?ts=5f9a8d46

Sebastian: This is kind of fun, but I guess that’s what being GovComm chair has done to me - finding this fun. This something we have been discussing since the summer. I shared this with outgoing chairs at the end of summer and again with incoming Chairs. I have heard back from three Chairs (Matthew, Lucia and Charissa). I also think there’s an advantage in doing this because it also provides a strong historical record. Any thoughts?

Sheldon: Seems to be based on the old code.

Sebastian: Yes, I made some amendments but for the most part it is based on the old code. This will be a lot of work for Chairs at first, however over time it should be easier as a result of continuity and consistency.

Kalith: Transition reports will be very helpful and serve really well. Chairs would take their role more seriously and continuity between Chairs will help for more efficient transitions.

Sebastian: I will look to make sure this includes transitions between all terms, including summer.

Sheldon: In the old transition stuff, payment and honorariums were included. Have we considered this?

Sebastian: This is something that is expected from the role, this initiative from us formalizes this, and I don’t think an honorarium is necessary. However, I can put it in my transition report that the next Govcomm should review the issue and quality of transition reports to decide whether an incentive is necessary.

Sebastian: Danny mentioned holding back pay until these reports are completed.
Sheldon: No, we can’t do that due to employment standards.

Sebastian: I will bring this to our next Council meeting and consult on it.

**Policy I-1 and Strategic Plans**

Consideration of proposed Code and Policy amendments to include reference to Strategic Plans.

Update from the Chair.

Sebastian: We have an ongoing responsibility to review Policy I-1. I reached out to the Executives to get feedback on whether they thought anything should be amended. Sylvester responded saying there was nothing that needs to be changed from his perspective. Kalith, are there any additional changes you think should be made?

Kalith: No.

Sebastian: We have 2 proposed changes that we can bring to the next Council meeting.

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is November 9, 2020.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 pm.
November 16, 2020 Agenda Minutes of the AMS Governance Committee; 4pm

Zoom link: https://zoom.us/j/91681615917

Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Ryan Wong (VSEUS), Kalith Nanayakkara (AMS VP External Affairs), Kamil Kanji (student-at-large), Katherine Feng (SUS), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council)

Guests:

Regrets: Danny Liu (SUS), Carter MacLean (AUS)

Call to Order

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

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Kalith Seconded: Katherine

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Kamil Seconded: Kalith

That the minutes of November 2, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

Code Changes: Ethics and Accountability Committee

Consideration of amended Code language to create an Ethics and Accountability Extraordinary Committee.

Seb: I don’t think we need to introduce the ad hoc element previously discussed. It turns it into an arbitration panel and would change the dynamic of the Committee.

***Carried with Unanimous Consent***
Seb: Next step is to bring this to Council.

***Carried with Unanimous Consent***

I-22: Committee Chairs Memos

Further consideration of proposed policy language: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-bdXfEKbHmgzya5$s6xIVTbJ-MoT5O60WkWcTptyQ_M/edit

Seb: we had a resounding silence in Council, so generally no one should have difficulty with this. We want to consider honoraria now. Is it financially responsible in general? Is it the right time to add a cost, given the impact of COVID-19 on AMS finances? Is it the right thing to do, given that it’s already a part of chairs’ job description?

Kalith: not able to comment on the financial aspect, think this is a bigger discussion. When former VP Ex transitioned me, she got an honoraria. Curious to hear from Sebastian’s perspective if outgoing chairs should receive an honoraria.

Seb: I don’t need an honoraria but after speaking with Cole it seems to be a large issue where information is not carried forward from year to year. Just asking Chairs to do transitions hasn’t fixed the issue.

Kalith: Who would decide if the outgoing Chair gets the honoraria?

Seb: Article 7 in the policy, says the Clerk would determine if it is done properly for a full honoraria.

Sheldon: I don’t think it should be the Clerk, I think it would be the incoming Chair, and if there is a conflict that it would be appealed to someone like the Ombuds.

Kalith: I get that honoraria is incentive to get Chairs to do transitions, however I think there should be a verification to make sure the transition is done correctly, so that the outgoing Chair is not doing it only for the honoraria

Kamil: I agree with Kalith, I’m in favour of honoraria. Who determines the amount?

Seb: Included in the Article 7 of the policy.

Katherine: In the case like Ops Comm, if the Chair is a Councillor, and the incoming is Executive, does the Councillor still have to do it?

Seb: Yes.

Sheldon: we don’t pay Execs for Committee Chairs, but we do pay honoraria for transition.
Seb: A somewhat tricky situation: Execs don’t get paid for chairing committees but under I-22 they would get honoraria.

Kalith: I’d be curious to see what Council thinks. If I was Chairing Advocacy Comm, I wouldn’t expect an honoraria, as it would be beneficial to the work that I do anyways. I personally think Execs shouldn’t get honoraria on top of the honoraria they get for transitioning Exec.

Seb: But the incoming chair might be a councillor, not an exec. The outgoing chair would need to transition both. They might need extra incentive for transitioning the committee chair?

Kalith: I think we should bring this to Council, interested to hear what Council thinks, as well as Execs with Committee Chairing experience.

Seb: New topic - Cole thinks the reporting Committee should be HR. What do you guys think?

Ryan: I think it should be HR because pay is under their purview as well.

Kalith: I agree

Katherine: I agree

Kamil: I agree

Sheldon: We need to check with the HR Committee. If one Committee comes to Council and says another Committee should do it, we need their approval.

Seb: I will reach out to Chair and also reach out to Cole/Lucia to ask about budget/finances per the first item.

Sheldon: It may be a conflict of interest about payment that Seb will get paid.

Seb: I will refuse my transition honoraria, I’ve also declared my conflict to Council.

Ryan: is President automatically chair of exec?

Sheldon: Only committees outlined in Code are included in I-22, and I don’t think Exec Committee is included.

Seb: Interesting point about ad-hoc Committees. Executives being the chair of a bunch of ad-hoc committees, and then getting paid for doing all the transitions - a concern.
Sheldon: I haven’t found that to be the case where the President chairs multiple committees.

Kalith: Again, I don’t think Executives should get paid for transitions. But if we don’t pay ad-hoc committees, then I’m worried about potential commitment issues to committees.

Ryan: I don’t think execs should get paid for committees that they are chairing automatically, but if they run competitively for one, they should get paid to transition that.

Kalith: Fair point, let’s hear from Councillors and Execs on this.

**Code Changes: Updates resulting from Bylaw amendments**

Consideration of proposed Code amendments required to bring Code into line with the amended Bylaws.

Sheldon: *explained changes*

Seb: Any questions for Sheldon?

Seb: Unanimous consent to present this to Council? *** Received***

**Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting is November 23, 2020.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.
THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

November 30, 2020 Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee; 4pm
Zoom link: https://zoom.us/j/91681615917

Attendance

Present: Sebastian Cooper (Chair), Danny Liu (SUS), Ryan Wong (VSEUS), Carter MacLean (AUS), Katherine Feng (SUS), Sheldon Goldfarb (Clerk of Council)

Guests:

Regrets: Kalith Nanayakkara (AMS VP External Affairs), Kamil Kanji (student-at-large)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 pm.

Agenda Items

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Carter    Seconded: Katherine

That the agenda be adopted.

[The motion carries.]

Approval of Past Minutes

Moved: Danny    Seconded: Carter

That the minutes of November 25, 2020 be approved

[The motion carries.]

I-22: Committee Chairs Transition Reports

Items:

- Update from Lucia
- Further consideration of proposed policy language: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-bdXfEKbHmGgzya5s6xIVTbJ-MoT5O60WkWcTptyQ_M/edit

This portion of the meeting was chaired by Carter.
Sebastian: Lucia didn’t seem to think there was a financial issue with the cost of compensating chairs for providing transitional reports (max would be around $2000).

Katherine: Have we figured out what happens with execs versus councillors yet?

Sebastian: We’re still discussing what to do; it seemed like there was agreement last time that if an exec is chair because they’re exec, they shouldn’t get compensated, since transitioning the chair will be encompassed by transitioning the new exec.

Katherine: How about the situation where an exec is transitioning a councillor so it’s no longer a part of the exec transition?

Sebastian: I think execs should be remunerated for transitioning a councillor chair since they’ll have been chair by choice.

Carter: I agree with that.

Danny: I agree.

Sebastian: Sheldon and I can work on adding something in the policy.

Sheldon: But then they won’t get paid for chairing but they would for the transition.

Sebastian: Maybe we could refer that to the HR Committee then since they deal with pay issues.

Carter: Yes.

Sebastian: Also want to point out that the Policy now has language to clarify the rules around conflict of interest for BoG or Senate reps on committee. Hopefully this will allow chairs to encourage BoG/Senate committee members to recuse themselves when they have potential conflicts due to their other roles. Also, section 7 clarifies the process: the incoming chair will tell the HR Committee whether the outgoing Chair completed the requirements under the Policy. The outgoing chair can appeal to HR (or to Governance in the case of HR).

Carter: Now we send this to HR then Council.

Sheldon: We don’t want this to apply to extraordinary committees but we do want to include ad-hoc committees. That would match Code.

Sebastian: Right. I’m also not sure if we should be directing the Indigenous Committee on how to do their transitions.

Katherine: I think we should email the Indigenous Committee for consultation on whether or not they would like to be included in this. It’s important for them to have a transition but how they do it is up to them.
I-21: Committee Chair Appointment – brief statement amendment

Consideration of proposed amendments to I-21 which would provide clarity to information that a candidate for committee chair should provide Council:

- “6. Councillors seeking appointment to a Committee may concurrently seek appointment to be the Chair of that Committee.
  a. Councillors seeking appointment to be Chair of a Committee must submit a brief statement to accompany their candidacy, outlining relevant experience and qualifications.”

Sebastian: explained above changes. If everyone is agreement with this we can bring it to Council

*Unanimous agreement*

I-10: Petition Privacy Policy


Sheldon Goldfarb will provide background / overview.

Sheldon: We’ve had this policy for three years as a way of dealing with a situation that arose from referenda campaigns. In 2016 the people organizing a referendum circulated a hard copy of the petition and someone took a photo of one of the pages with nine names and student numbers. I notified the nine students about this and asked for the advice of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of BC and they recommended we make a policy. The policy covers electronic petitions too.

Sebastian: Should we ask the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of BC whether they have any changes to make, particularly for electronic petitions?

Sheldon: Yes, I can do that.

Sebastian: I can also reach out to the same exec positions who were consulted last time.

Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting will likely be in January, 2021 due to the upcoming exam season.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.