Attendance
Present: Cole Evans (President), Eshana Bhangu (VP Academic & University Affairs, arrived 10:45), Mary Gan (VP Finance), Lauren Benson (VP Administration), Saad Shoaiib (VP External, left at 11), Lorris Leung (Senior Student Services Manager), Mitchell Prost (Student Services Manager), Keith Hester (Managing Director), Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist & Clerk of Council)

Guests: Aashna Josh (SASC), Nicolas Romualdi (Strategic Plan)

Recoding Secretary: Sheldon Goldfarb

Call to Order
• The meeting was called to order at 10:35 am on Zoom.

Agenda
• The agenda was adopted (Lauren, Mary).

Minutes
• The minutes of January 19 were approved (Saad, Mary).

Strategic Plan
• Nicolas:
  o Revising our Mission and Values statements.
  o Creating a Vision statement (didn’t have one before).
  o Have been consulting with lots of you.
  o Creating drafts and then will seek input from all students.
  o Before publishing even the drafts, want to get thumbs-up from the Executive because even these drafts reflect on the AMS.
  o I’m personally happy with the draft Mission and Vision.
  o The Values may need work.

• Saad:
  o Should we be referring to “all levels of government” in the Mission Statement instead of just saying “government”?

• Cole:
  o Just saying “government” is synonymous with that.
Nicolas:
  - Don’t want to name specifics because then might leave something out.
  - Quite happy overall with the new Mission Statement.
  - Shorter but more encompassing than the old one.

Saad:
  - I do like this.

Nicolas:
  - It’s not the last opportunity to modify it, but is this good enough to send out?
  - There was consensus that it was ready.

[Eshana arrives.]

Nicolas:
  - There was never actually a Vision statement, though Eric and Chris Hakim worked on one.

Saad:
  - There's nothing in it on sustainability.

Eshana:
  - We shouldn’t be adding for the sake of adding.

Cole:
  - No mention of equity either, but we’re providing resources to be sustainable and equitable.
  - It’s important to stay away from specifics.
  - If we were first and foremost a sustainability organization, that would be different.

Lauren:
  - The old drafts talked about engaging in the world.
  - We could add something like that and then address sustainability.

Nicolas:
  - Sustainability will be a value we embody, not the mission.
  - And for the vision we could talk of engagement with the global community.

Cole:
  - I like the word “flourish” that the Vision ends with.
  - Everyone can apply their own lens to it.
  - Better not to get into the nitty-gritty; keep to the high level so everyone can see their vision in the statement.
  - We can go more into detail in the Values.

Nicolas:
  - Here is the Values draft.

Cole:
  - I question the term “procedural fairness”: sounds too much like legalese.
- Can just say “fairness.”
- Eshana:
  - We’re losing something by removing it.
- Cole:
  - What are we trying to say?
  - That if a student has a complaint, we should treat it fairly.
  - Maybe cut the part about fairness and talk about being ethical.
  - We don’t have anything on advocacy.

[Saad leaves.]

- Nicolas:
  - I don’t think advocacy is needed in the Values. It’s in the Mission.
  - It’s an activity, not a value.
- Cole:
  - We should be advocating for what the members want, not just what those in power want.
- Eshana:
  - I don’t think “student-centric” in the current draft covers it.
  - Maybe that value can be more impassioned; say something like putting students first.
- Cole:
  - Fifty percent of our work is advocacy, so we need a value for it.
- Keith:
  - There’s nothing about accountability to our members.
- Nicolas:
  - Can consolidate that with the notion of consensus in Value 3.
- Cole:
  - We often use referendums; that’s decision by majority, not consensus.
- Nicolas:
  - Consensus is not the opposite of majority.
  - I don’t want to use the word democracy.
  - I like “consensus.”
- Cole:
  - Consensus is the goal.
  - All people may not agree on when and how to return to campus, but I’m sure people agree on prioritizing immuno-compromised people.
- Lauren:
  - We’re already carbon neutral.
  - If we say we’re trying to be carbon neutral ...
• Nicolas:
  o I’m reluctant to set another target: what would that be?
  o Can still keep carbon neutrality as our guide.
• Lauren:
  o Maybe say “beyond” carbon neutrality.
• Cole:
  o We’ve moved away from sustainability just being about the environment.
  o Talking of social and economic sustainability: how can we capture that?
• Nicolas:
  o If we take out “carbon neutrality,” it may get lost.
• Lauren:
  o Maybe say “beyond carbon neutrality” and add “a holistically sustainable mindset.”
• Cole:
  o I don’t know what “safe community” is trying to say.
  o It seems more Vision than Values.
  o And let’s remove “expert advice”: it seems very patronizing.
• Nicolas:
  o Do we still want a value referring to expertise?

SASC Fee
• Lorris:
  o SASC (the Sexual Assault Support Centre) would like to increase the fee from $9 to $18 to help with increased workload and provide more support.
  o Don’t know what you feel about the amount.
  o We feel $9 is a good amount to help us over the next five years.
  o If we only ask for $6, we might have to ask for more in three years.
• Aashna:
  o This will hold us for a few years.
• Cole:
  o I think everyone supports raising the fee.
  o Questions:
    ▪ What has the best likelihood of passing? People might say, Do I want to pay this much more?
    ▪ That’s a massive injection of money. Is there a plan to use it all in Year 1? Or perhaps it would be better to do a graduated increase? By means of a fee that ramps up.
• Aashna:
  o Realistically, we wouldn’t use it all in the first year.
  o We want to add more support workers to meet demand, but we won’t use all the money next year.
How would a fee ramp up?

- Cole:
  - We’ve done this with several fees, building fees.
  - The new Recreation Facility fee is starting at $5, then going up to $10, etc.
  - The Campus Culture fee too.
  - The SASC fee could go to $15, then $17, $19, $21: structured however you like to fit SASC’s operational needs.
  - It would also be a more efficient use of student money.

- Aashna:
  - For next year, $6 is the lowest we can do.
  - I’d advocate for $7, but $6 is doable.

- Cole:
  - SASC is growing exponentially, so it needs an exponential increase in funding.
  - A graduated increase allows the AMS to fund SASC while efficiently using student money.
  - It will likely be a popular referendum. You could even go straight to a $10 increase, but make sure you’re using it in Year One. We don’t want money sitting in funds.
  - Deadline: To Council for February 16.

- Mary:
  - Because of annual turnover, would a graduated increase cause problems?

- Cole:
  - It hasn’t been a problem in the past.
  - We have Keith to keep on top of things.

- Aashna:
  - Is February 16 the earliest?

- Cole:
  - Could do it at the February 2 Council meeting, but usually you want to focus closer to the referendum (March 7-11).

- Sheldon:
  - Can’t do February 2 anyway; it’s too early. The referendum has to take place within 30 days of being called by Council.
  - Could call it February 9 if there was a Council meeting then.

- Cole:
  - Currently there’s a deficit in SAIF (the Sexual Assault Initiatives Fund)?

- Keith:
  - Yes, over $130,000.

- Cole:
  - The increase could wipe that out: another reason to increase the fee.

- Aashna:
  - Is there anything people want me to present?
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- Cole:
  - Just be clear how the money will be spent.
  - To our students that’s a 100% increase: a lot of money.
  - Say we’re bringing on staff; it’s going to cost.
  - Also show usage rates, the increases since the last referendum.
- Eshana:
  - And point out that these increases are occurring despite the existence of UBC’s SVPRO.
- Aashna:
  - Our numbers have not gone down since SVPRO arrived.
- Cole:
  - We’ve hired three referendum coordinators who will work with you.

Other Referendum Questions

- Cole:
  - Talking about fees with Mary.
    - More about fee optimization.
  - Bylaws:
    - Need to go through them.
    - Probably Executive-led.
  - Brewery.
- Keith:
  - I’d leave the old brewery referendum as it stands.
  - The only issue is that it requires a financing agreement with the University.
- Cole:
  - Yes, that referendum doesn’t do anything unless we activate it.
  - Health and Dental changes:
    - Have to talk.
    - The Student Experience Survey results suggest there might be a good chance to raise the Health & Dental fee, especially if we make the increases opt-outable.
- Mary:
  - Not sure all the increases will be opt-outable.
- Keith:
  - I thought they were.
  - We have to clarify. That’s a big thing.
- Cole:
  - So the questions would be:
    - SASC.
    - Bylaws.
    - Fee Optimization.
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- Health & Dental.
  - Other ones:
    - Requiring all fees to have digital opt-outs.
    - May want to talk about how that would impact CiTR and the Ubyssey.
    - They’re separate societies.

Election Change Campaign

- Cole:
  - Introducing a new annual campaign for elections to encourage people to vote by donating money to a cause if you vote.
  - Similar to the Bell Let’s Talk Campaign.
  - Giving an added benefit if people take an action.
  - This year the idea is to procure vaccines for people around the world through COVAX.
  - Donate to UNICEF Canada for their vaccine fund.
  - For every vote we’d donate $2 to the fund.
  - Funded from the International Projects Fund.

- Eshana:
  - This is one of the best things Cole has ever done.

- Sheldon:
  - Donations are restricted by Code.
  - Would have to suspend that section.

MOVED ESHANA, SECONDED COLE:

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Executive Committee recommend to Council that up to $30,000 be allocated to the 2022 Elect Change Campaign from the International Projects Fund.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the relevant section of Code be suspended.”

... Carried

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12 noon.