



Agenda of the AMS Governance Committee
(Agenda for August 11th, 2021 Meeting at 8pm | [Zoom](#))

Attendance

Present: Katherine Feng (Chair), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist and Clerk of Council), Romina Hajizadeh, Jason Liao, Saad Shoaib (VP External)

Regrets: Kamil Kanji (Vice Chair), Rebecca Liu

Guests: James Cabangon (AVP External), Dana Turdy (Policy and Governance Lead)

Recording Secretary: James Cabangon

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:00pm.

Territorial Acknowledgement

Approval of the Agenda

Moved: Saad Seconded: Katherine

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be adopted.”

Agenda Items

1. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve previous minutes passes

2. Advisory Board Code Amendments

- Related Code change (Students at Large)

Cole: Making sure that the advisory board is completing its functions when reporting to council. Duties outline what activities the advisory board does. President chairs the advisory board. Currently members are appointed by the HR committee and the president would bring recommendations to the AMS Council. Mechanism placed was Section 5 - . It's important to note that advisory board minutes are sent to council for approval as there is no need for the advisory board to vote. Executive committee is also responsible for members of the advisory board being removed. No voting occurs, intention is that it (advisory committee) is only there to advise not to make advice by resolution

Katherine: corrected typo. How did you come up with the \$1,500 figure?

Cole: Original intention was \$300 per meeting, the figure has always been there. Advisory board has been changed to 11, ninety minute meetings. We could include a calculation in the form of a compensation formula.

Saad: Why isn't there a specific provision within the mandate of the advisory board to find mentors who are specific in appointment to the VP's they are assigned to?

Cole: It is not "super necessary". At the end of the day it is up to the executive committee to make those appointments.

Katherine: How do the appointments currently work?

Cole: They are supposed to take place by an application process, more or less a job interview. However, this method has not yielded any interest or appointments. Now, the president and the VP finance will ask people that they know. Generally, it's not people the executives know. It is mostly people who were former VPs of the AMS or other

student unions. More so word of mouth. In the past we used to have professional members and student members, however, the students were no longer students.

Dana: Code change does not stop the executive committee from going forward with an application process.

Katherine: Is there a need for improvements to the way people are informed about advisory board positions?

Cole: We did applications in my first year and we got a bunch of people applying to the advisory board; however they were pretty random and were not connected to the university in any way. We now have people who are connected to the university on the advisory board and we believe it to be more effective.

Sheldon: The current draft says that the president shall be the chair.

Cole: [unintelligible]

Sheldon: We should remedy the contradiction by removing Issue of clarifying if they don't get their two thirds. Do you want that added to the code?

Katherine: Proposed changes need clarification. If they miss more than a third of meetings, the full honorarium is not paid. So how much is paid?

Cole: Could just pay \$100 for each meeting they attended.

Katherine: It says "no more than three consecutive terms". Can people serve more non-consecutive terms?

Cole: Leftover from last code. Language that said they could not serve three consecutive terms. We don't want the same person to sit on the advisory board for twenty years. Have new people cycling through that people can spend on the advisory board. In that scenario, council would just suspend that section of code and appoint a replacement. It is more of a guideline. If you want to keep someone on the board, we just suspend code.

Katherine: Does anyone have further comments or questions?

3. I-22 Policy on Committee Appointments

Dana: Policy on committee appointments. Cole and I did committee appointments for council and students at large. Essentially, a lot of code is not reasonable for the president's office to follow - specific timelines. Want to make it as non-prescriptive as possible. With certain due dates so committees can be appointed in time. Summer appointments - language was very specific. Digital call for nominations.

Cole: For some of these changes we tried to come up with a timeline of every step but it didn't make sense. Five days into May is really quick - we don't have a full complete council list by then. Opening nominations by the first council meeting was the best solution. This year, we found it's hard to get councilors to fill out the nomination form. Especially when we have to send out multiple reminder emails. Gives the President's office more leeway.

Katherine: Thanks Cole and Dana. Have a couple questions. Why was the verification [of results] through the Clerk of Council removed?

Cole: This came from Sheldon. Sheldon said it was unnecessary and complicated for him to verify. We said you don't really need to do that - it is important to have the results available to councilors.

Sheldon: Basically, when I was sent the results for verification, I'm looking at tables and numbers of names. I could not make any sense of them. I said what does it mean. Justin, the previous Policy Assistant, couldn't make any sense of it either. It's a long list. The real reason why that provision is there is to prevent Election fraud.

Katherine: We should also require that the application form for students at large include a deadline. When a number of students at large were looking to nominate themselves, they missed the deadline since it was not listed or were confused about it.

Cole: Usually keep students at large nominations open longer than council nominations. Gives us more flexibility to put it out in a newsletter.

Katherine: In support of keeping that window longer but it's important for students to know when to apply by.

Dana: Do you mean the length of time in between?

Katherine: Amount of time that student at large applications are open for. Kyle (student at large), any thoughts based on your experience?

Kyle: I don't remember having an issue with the due date but I did find that there was not a lot of information around what the positions entailed. There was a sentence at most. I would like to see a bit more description.

Dana: I had applicants email me asking about the deadline - we didn't have it in the initial broadcast or website. There is a point of contact for the inquiries - the Policy and Governance Associate.

Cole: We added more context this year, but we'll add more. Describing how often committees meet can be hard since it varies.

Dana: I agree, received emails how often the committees would meet. Cole and I found it hard to answer as committee times are [subject to the committee]. We should give an estimate of how much time there is to dedicate.

Katherine: I agree. Any other thoughts on the amendments to I-21?

No one had any other opinions.

Sheldon: we've been talking about changes - do you want amendments to these policies when things are advertised, they state the positions, etc?

Cole: not necessary, but we can.

[Yes - will vote on next week once more amendments are drafted]

4. Student at Large Definition in Code

Sheldon: I can explain. We allow people to serve on two committees. I-21 is connected to the Code definition which exempts the finance committee from that rule if that makes sense. Finance committee used to have a high quorum - five members was quorum. Wanted to make sure that someone could fill that seat on the finance committee. Quorum is no longer high. Need is gone.

[Agreement with change]

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Code relating to the Advisory Board is approved as presented and discussed.

Move: Katherine Second: Kyle

Vote: (5 yes / 0 no / 0 abstention)

Motion passes

I-22 will be voted on next week once revisions to the proposed amendments are drafted based on today's discussion.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Code change relating to Students at Large is approved as presented.

Move: Katherine Second: Kyle

Vote: (5 yes / 0 no / 0 abstention)

Motion passes

Katherine: That is all for today.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled to be on August 18th at 8pm.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03pm.