



**THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER**

**AMS Ad-Hoc Governance Review Committee**

Minutes of July 28, 2022

AMS Nest Room 3529

**Membership**

Voting Members: Max Holmes (Chair – AMS Councillor), Eshana Bhangu (Vice-Chair – AMS President), Audrey Chow (AMS Councillor), Cynara Onyemordi (AMS Councillor), Mathew Ho (AMS Councillor), Christian Kyle (AMS Councillor), Rachel Kim (AMS Councillor)

Regularly Invited Guests: Sheldon Goldfarb (Archivist & Clerk of Council), Kamil Kanji (Strategy and Governance Lead)

Recording Secretary: Kamil Kanji (Strategy and Governance Lead)

**Call to Order**

The Meeting is called to order at 6:05 PM.

**Approval of the Agenda**

Motion: Eshana Bhangu      Second: C.K

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

**Approval of the Minutes**

Motion: C.K      Second: Rachel Kim

Be it resolved that the minutes of the July 21<sup>st</sup> meeting be approved as presented.

**Scope Discussion (60 Minutes)**

Max: I hope everybody had a chance to at least glance over the document, today's discussion is just for us to discuss what we want to be looking at in the review and what we don't, the MNP document will be helpful in that regard and in seeing what has been done in the past, if the discussion is longer so be it, we can shorten the other items, at the last meeting mostly everyone agreed that we want to look at Council as we did in the last governance review, we want to look at council's relationship to everything so that means we will look at its relationship with the advisory board, we can look at advisory board serving its function of giving advice to

the Society that is valuable because we do compensate them, other things within the scope discussion we said last time was that we don't want to really go deep into the constituencies but obviously Council has a relationship with the subsidiaries, specifically the constituencies which we have a much closer relationship to than the clubs and so perhaps looking at what that relationship looks like, also is President's Council functioning in the way that we want it, I believe those were the pieces of focus on the Council bit, there was an expression at least from the President that we don't want to be looking into management structure so staffing structure of the organization, however Council does have a relationship with the managing director so we can discuss how much we want to include that within the review, there was mention last time of the student staffing structure and whether or not we want to be looking at the executives and the support they have, I noticed in the last governance review that wasn't really touched on very much despite the fact that it had a lot of feedback from student staff, and so really we need to determine how much we want to be looking at the executives, do we just want to be looking at the 5 executives or the support each of them has through their teams, then the last thing we didn't really discuss at all is that there are a lot of departments that don't fall under the businesses and are related to students like AMS Events, Student Services, Communications and Archives, I think that is the high level of what we can discuss today, what we want to look into, is there anything we want to start off with? Maybe we can start with what we want to be looking at with Council, and we can talk a little bit about the governance review document

C.K: I guess just going off the report they talk about how they look at the size, structure and representation of Council, I think for us it would be worth looking at the effectiveness of Council, I think strictly looking at what is the representation of Council and how is that affected is a different discussion than what isn't effective about Council because I think breaking it down into those categories as the report does makes it harder to identify issues, I think Council could be as bad as it is now with a different structure or with different committees but if we address issues of efficacy then we can limit the poor running of Council, I think we should also look at Committees, I talked to many people who have been involved in the AMS in the past that I know and every person was shocked that Student Life Committee still exists, whether we should remove it is a different discussion but I think we should come to some kind of conclusion, it seems like people come to conclusions every year and then the year ends and the new group does nothing with those conclusions

Max: I think when we discuss Council in the scope, it is truly everything so I agree we need to limit what we are looking at to certain degree, when we start to look at solutions we should look at the things we tried and what effect have they actually had, like reducing Council, how much of an effect that did that really have, maybe it has improved and maybe it hasn't, some things we could look at were some things not really discussed in the last review, I was looking at some SFU stuff and one of the things I didn't realize is that they pay their councillors 20 hours a month stipend, we need to look at how much engagement we are requiring of people nowadays when there really isn't compensation and so many other opportunities to engage that do pay, so I am hearing we want to look at Committees and their functioning, with Council we need to 100% look at Committees, specifically individual councillor resources and support,

when we look at the past few years there still is lots of turnover even though we tried to change the turnover date to May 1, there are people who leave mid way through the year, and it is hard to get engagement through Committees, also it is odd that there are less Committee positions than there are councillors, most boards would have members serving on 2-3 committees not some councillors that are serving on Committees and some not serving on any at all, any other comments on specifically looking at the Council scope?

C.K: The data they had from councillors were from the survey which is different than one on one discussions, one thing we could do fairly easily is have short 10-minute one-one human to human feedback with those who don't want to fill out the survey, we should try to look at ways to tailor the scope to councillors who are involved the least because it is for them that Council is not working for

Max: I think that will be the consultation item we have later in the agenda, I think one of the things discussed earlier today when I met with Eshana and Kamil is that we want to come to Council on August 17 with not just the scope and timeline for approval but also discussing what the internal consultation will look like, and getting feedback from Councillors on who we should be consulting and how they want to be consulted as one of the main groups, so coming back to scope, I did like how MNP broke out the issues and looked at things like compliance, oversight, the principles they had and the functions of Council, I think that is something that would help us once the consultation is done is to find some way to break that out and help identify what the issues are, any other comments for Council related to Scope? Specifically on Council, and we will get to the other part of the scope later

C.K: My understanding reading this is that it talks about instituting KPIs, are the executive goal presentations we get, out of this?

Sheldon: The policy on executive goals comes out of that

Max: We got rid of KPIs in that policy a year or two ago, we changed it to action items, the executive goals in my opinion are pretty useless when it comes to tracking the progress of the Society, when it comes to oversight I think if you look at the system we used to have and the system we have now Council does a horrible job, there really isn't much oversight, we added those in camera conversations recently but beyond that unless the item comes to Council there isn't much regular oversight of the executives and I would note that for everything whether it be services, the Managing Director, or the businesses, there really aren't any built-in oversight mechanisms for Council or if there are they aren't utilized by Council effectively. Council doesn't do a good job at Oversight at all.

C.K: I was going to ask if that falls under executive discussion, what are the other parts of the scope we want to touch on?

Max: When we get to the executive conversation I would say that is about their portfolios and their relationship to the MD and not their relationship to Council, when we talk about Council we are talking about all the presentations that come to Council, all the Committees, the staff that support Council, anything that is at Council or a Committee of Council that is what we are discussing when we are discussing scope right now

Matthew: So more like the effectiveness of Council?

Max: Yes, but more what we want within the scope of that conversation specifically, mostly what I am hearing is that we want to look at close to everything when it comes to Council but also is there anything we don't want to look at?

CK: Do we think the goals system is a way to keep them accountable, are we doing that and in what ways are we doing that, I guess for me, I don't feel like it does.

Max: I agree, everyone's updates are what they make of it, it is not required to talk about goals in the update which I see as a problem, I think accountability and oversight will be a theme of what are the issues in Council, is there anything else people want to add?

Eshana: Expand more on what you mean by the Managing Director and their relationship with Council?

Max: MD is a non-voting member of Council, they are supposed to have performance goals but that isn't really something that Council sees at all, Council gets one presentation on the audit which is basically just the written audit before it goes to the AGM, many boards specifically have an audit committee to look at risks and audit, so I think that is one of the things, to what extent does Council want to make sure it is doing that oversight responsibility and future planning, I think there is a high-level responsibility of Council to be looking at the businesses and this goes to all departments, the MD is one way of doing this because the MD is head of the permanent staff side of the organization so that means events and services as well not just businesses and all these parts have some sort of relationship to Council but ultimately they do all report in through the Managing Director, in the Bylaws the President is the liaison to the MD which means they should be getting feedback from the Executive and Council, Council is the highest representation of the Society and so it should be providing some sort of feedback to the executive on that management role.

Eshana: Well, it is on behalf of the Executive Committee that the President is the liaison to the MD.

Max: That is not how it is written in the Bylaws.

Eshana: Well we have different interpretations of the Bylaws then because I have read that part, I want to ensure we are staying away from getting too much into the management side of

things, the MD reports in to the executive and I would just say that we should stay focused on things like making Council as effective as possible and accountability measures most importantly for executives with the timeline we have because if we go down that hole of the MD relationship to Council beyond anything apart from a high level I think we can go down a slippery slope of focusing on things that don't impact students as much.

CK: We want to make Council more effective, and so it begs the question of what is it more effective at, is it more effective at overseeing people except for the person who runs all of our businesses, I get that the President represents the concerns of Council but to my understanding, there is no pipeline or easy route for an average Councillor to express if they have a concern with something about the MDs work, there is no pipeline besides asking questions at Council which is not really oversight because you aren't engaged in the process you're just asking a question which is then replied too, we should not say that we won't look at the MD relationship with Council, if we spend 3 meetings back to back talking about that then we will notice, I think it is in our scope and I don't think we should limit our scope out of that relationship with the MD.

Matthew: In sort of an ideal role as a Councillor would Council take a more proactive role in providing oversight of things done by the MD but based on the situation it really is what it says of the President if we are looking at effectiveness as a whole a more relevant scope would be between the President and MD?

Rachel: I think hearing both sides of CK and Eshana, I fall more with Eshana, there is only so much where we can impact how the MD manages the businesses, we have to focus on our relationship with the MD, we can improve our oversight mechanisms over the MD but we can't really impact on how the MD is doing their job because that can lead us down a slippery slope, I think we need to focus on the Council relationship with the MD.

Max: I think overall, one of the things is this is just the conversation on scope, I think we are getting into are there issues and will we address these things with solutions, I think it will be difficult if we say there are some things we would like to exclude from the scope of looking at Council, we can say generally that we will look at Council's relationships with the other parts of the organization, there are a lot of relationships with Council, I agree though that I don't think we will have much of an effect on businesses but there is a lot more that reports to the MD like Services, SASC and Events, these are all things that have Committees working on this, so is the relationship supposed to be these Committees working with AMS departments or is it supposed to be feedback to the MD and down to their reports or what, the scope should be what is the feedback line from Council to the MD to the departments who report to the MD, how are we supposed to be doing that, I don't hear from anyone that we want to look at anything outside these relationships with Council, is there anything we want to exclude from looking at Council, I am hearing we want to look at these things but it does mean we are NOT going to be looking at the HR reporting structure underneath the MD.

Matthew: So far, to clarify the scope is the relationship between Council and other parts of the organization but no exceptions to that?

Max: I am not hearing any exceptions on the relationships we will evaluate, once we get to solutions people will bring up issues then we can look at things that do not need to be addressed, so we could get to the looking at Councils relationship with the businesses and decide that there is nothing to be done, I am hearing we want to look at everything about Council, so Committees, the support resources Council has, training and orientation, and its general functioning.

Matthew: So, membership-at-large as well?

Max: Yes, so is the representation of Council what we would like it to look like, I think we follow the model of most Student Unions which is that they somewhat copy what their Senates do by using a faculty representation model. And we can look at how well that works for us.

Eshana: I thought we were talking about sticking to Council and not looking at management and departments, but are we looking at it just in a different way by calling it relationships?

Max: Management structures would be the reporting structure of staff into management, so specifically if you look at the last review, they looked at Executive Director, Senior SSM, etc, I think I've heard from the President and the majority of the committee that we don't want to look at the staff structure at all, what I am hearing is that want to look at Council's relationship with people who come and report to Council, like the MD and staff that go to committee meetings or Council.

Eshana: When you say staff structure should be excluded, then anything under the MD and how that reports into the MD I want excluded because I think it is a waste of time.

Max: That is something the Committee can talk about it, but from what I've heard we aren't looking at staff reporting structure underneath the MD. No Org Chart changes underneath the MD from this review basically.

CK: The relationship with Council is not the body itself, I think we are saying that we will not look specifically at the niche role of the MD and how the MD runs the businesses but rather our relationship with him.

Eshana: When it comes to exclusions I would like to be clear with what our areas of expertise are, I also ran on this and understand what will benefit students most directly, I will be very specific in what I want excluded, very specifically, the MD's staff reporting structure, how services interacts with Council we have mediocre ways which could be improved, but I would like staff and reporting structure below the MD excluded.

Max: Yeah, I generally think we have agreement on excluding any changes to org chart underneath the MD and the reporting structure of the departments they oversee.

Matthew: Sometimes in certain Committees there are some staff that are involved that report to the MD.

Max: For example, with the Student Life Committee: AMS events comes there but they report to MD, so we are looking at that specifically with those pre-existing relationships with people who report to the MD and do they function well, so if feedback is given at student life to events does that feedback really need to be followed when technically they report into the MD.

Eshana: Okay.

Max: What do we want with the scope of executives, I think we should not look at adding executives, we should look at our current executives, does it function well, are there overlaps, is it well understood what they do, and is it well understood who has what responsibilities, we should also look at their relationship with Council and oversight and accountability related to them, we added more with the Presidents management responsibilities but that is still beholden to Council, then the real question is do we want to look at their staff, do we want to look at the structure of the executive departments themselves, how deep do we want to go into the executives, do we just want to look at their roles or also their staff and departments

CK: My feeling is it's hard to limit this scope because if we are looking at the roles of executives and their portfolios then we are inherently looking at the staff within those portfolios, if we are looking at the portfolio of equity for example then we cannot do that without talking about the leads, it would be an incomplete discussion if we just shuffled responsibilities but didn't look at a breakdown of roles and responsibilities including the staffing of portfolios.

Max: One thing we discussed at the last meeting was referring issues, we might put something in the scope but get so much feedback on it and then are like let's send this to the HR Committee to discuss the deeper structures of it, we might see something is too much for us to take on and would refer it.

Matthew: I think it is also sometimes difficult to review portfolio staff because what's listed on paper might not be what is reflected in reality, like the current VP Finance staff, you might have staff who are going to be working more than what is on paper.

Max: The point is well taken, we will have to discuss in feedback with internal stakeholders, if we got feedback just from this year's staff, it might be difficult for them to give us feedback because they are operating under different circumstances than they normally do, and we will get into this later but that begs the question of how much feedback do we want and how far back do we want to go, do we want feedback from former staff or something else?

Matthew: Sometimes its performance of certain portfolios it's not just staff.

Rachel: First of all to reply to Matthew, we should not limit our scope in terms of excluding staff just because of the particular person, this review should not be focused on who we have for staff for this year but rather have a broader approach, we should not exclude some people just because of this year, but because staff is operational we should include them, VP is more management level, but the people doing the operation and nitty gritty work they will have more insight on the operational side and it is valuable to listen to their views.

Eshana: I agree, we should be keeping student staff in scope, it is not that they are doing most of the work, often times the perception is different than reality and it becomes based on who is in the role, that is tough to change but we want accountability for executives so if you have a poorly performing executive there are ways to hold them accountable regardless and so, in the same way, there should be a lens at looking at executive staff so that no matter who is in the role that there are ways to mitigate concerns different than the person assuming the role, also considering we have sustainability and equity under certain executive portfolios which are the entirety of those pieces in the organization, and so it is critical to include student staff in that regard.

Max: One thing we can look at with executives too is how well they are prepared to take on those different responsibilities, on a personal note I got very little training on how to manage staff, and so that is another thing, how well resourced are executives when it comes to management knowledge, executives have in the past struggled to manage staff and so how do we resource executives in that way and provide that support and feedback, staff are often on Committees so that relationship is important as well.

CK: We can put things in scope that we delegate but we can't delegate things that are not in scope, we should take on more in the scope because we can delegate and prioritize, I know I had to go through lots of people management and staff management and looking at the training executives receive is an important thing, my understanding is that it is easier to be an executive if you were an AVP but it should be easier to know how to manage things even if you were not an AVP, there should be more than transition reports, people are not being managed, disciplined or rewarded properly.

Max: I really like that point of how accessible are executive positions to anyone running not just those who have already worked for the society. Every Executive should be set up for success no matter their background. We must respect students' choice in elections and set everyone up for success.

Audrey: I agree we can delegate work, but I am wary of biting off more than we can chew, I worry about us not being realistic without a clear focus.



Max: Is there something now you have in specific that we are including that you feel like we should exclude?

Audrey: I think It is more we should keep in mind not making our scope too large.

Max: I think what will be helpful is that Kamil will write a first draft based on what was heard today, generally it should be inclusive and then we limit it down, we start with a bigger picture and then we can narrow down, it'll be helpful to see a first draft and then for us to limit where necessary.

Matthew: Parts of it might be referred to Committees?

Max: What could happen is that we will essentially do a survey for feedback, we might get feedback not related to our scope, we should not just sit on that or park it, if we get a ton of feedback on something not in our scope then we can maybe refer that to a Committee if it makes sense, if we hear issues we have a responsibility to ensure someone acts on it, I am hearing agreement, we are looking at Council and the executives, so constituencies do we mostly want to take the approach of it as a relationship of Council and the executive or is there something specific we want there?

CK: So I guess Council, executive and other, we would have to ask constituencies about what they would like in regard to their relationship with the AMS and we should look at the constituency review that was done a couple of years ago and see if those recommendations were properly addressed.

Max: I think it's looking at the executive relationship with constituencies and Council relationship, we will get into do constituencies communicate their issues well with Council and likely not their specific operations.

Matthew: What about affiliates?

Max: Are affiliates constituencies Sheldon?

Sheldon: The things we do for constituencies we do not do for affiliates, so they are not constituencies.

Max: The relationship of Council with affiliate institutions, and in that case, it is important to separate them out, we are looking at Councils relationship with everything which would include their relationship with affiliates.

Max: So I am not hearing we need to separate out constituencies as their own thing but rather look at their relationships, our scope looks like executive and Council, I would highlight the most important relationship is both those groups relationships with the membership, we will

get feedback on that through consultation, constituency relationship with Council has lots, Council is a high-level relationship with constituencies though, one of the things though is the executives do a lot and Council is not that well informed on what executives do, so with the executives we will need to be focused in on what relationships we are looking at there and how high level we are staying, anything we feel like we are excluding because execs and council is pretty massive scope?

Sheldon: If the aim of this committee is to improve and fix things then we might ask what needs to be improved and fixed?

Max: Yep, that's an open question, do people feel there is more we need to look at, I heard earlier that people are interested in relationships with communication with membership, the internal stakeholder consultation will help us identify issues specific to address, we will have to look at solutions before that just to do some research, any issues we feel like we would not be able to address just by looking at Council and executives?

CK: I don't think this falls under the scope of Council or execs but rather the general relationship of the AMS with the average student, I think that is what we are doing inherently and does not need to be in scope but making sure the changes don't just benefit the institution but benefit students broadly, making sure our changes are not just insular.

Max: I think you really get to the core of what is the purpose of the review, what are the benefits we are hoping for, one of the things is that we are not doing well with is being a results driven Society, we do not do a good job of tracking success, we do surveys and things but how much do we look at our impact on the average student and how that improves or doesn't every year, the first thing when looking at the scope is that this will positively impact all students and how do we make sure that is the role of improving oversight and accountability?

Eshana: Even though it feels insular, the point is that there is nothing in the AMS holding the people in it accountable for the things they have promised to the student body to the extent that they should be held accountable, even if it is affecting just the people in the AMS then the more accountable we make this organization the more it will benefit the students, and then the onus does not fall on the students to look out for flaws in the organization, every student should have the ability to hold the executives accountable but it should not be on them, the organization should be doing that and should have mechanisms in place for that.

Max: Fixing our accountability mechanisms is a pretty good summary of what is being discussed here so that the average student doesn't have to spend a bunch of time trying to fix the AMS, but we have to communicate that well, if we don't connect it back to students then it will be hard to get their feedback and engagement in the open consultation.

Matthew: Communication is a huge thing and there is a feeling of a divide between what goes in the AMS and what students feel like the AMS does.

Max: That is a good conversation for when we get into talking about solutions, let's get back to the scope.

CK: I think in our scope we should look at the ways we collect feedback briefly like the AES, SES and other surveys, looking at what is the purpose of those surveys and do they fulfill those purposes, they do answer questions about the AMS but those would be good materials to go into discussion and do we think we act on that feedback, and so I think we should look at the way we gather feedback.

Max: I think how well informed we are is the theme there, does it make sense that it is mostly the executives looking at those surveys, should Council do more there is definitely in the scope.

CK: Also, a follow-up to that is looking at are surveys enough.

Max: A-lot falls under relationships, is there anything outside Council and executives that need to be in scope?

No hands raised.

Max: Great discussion, more than enough here for a first draft, we will spend the next meeting going through the draft scope document.

### **Timeline Discussion (30 Minutes)**

Max: Is there anything we want to address or change the timeline, internal consultation will start the second when the scope and timeline are approved so that would be Council, executives, etc, September is proposing solutions and getting feedback from Council on those, we will also do research during the consultation in August, October will have membership consultation, that will be the time we do deeper internal engagement, we might, for example, hold a joint meeting with the executive or have a 30-minute discussion item at Council, October will really be a time for deep internal and external consultation, November will be getting and then acting on that feedback, figuring out what needs to change, then January we come with finalised Bylaw changes and any other changes, we will also make sure referendum coordinators are hired by the start of January, anything about timeline people think should change?

CK: I think defining internal stakeholders in our scope or timeline will be important, defining in our documents is important.

Rachel: What will the consultation look like? If it's just inviting stakeholders in then we will not meet the timeline.

Max: Let's save that for the next item.

CK: When do we expect meeting frequency to be higher or lower?

Max: I would prefer to meet weekly for two hours for August, maybe in late August we can change to an hour, during the school year we can look at changing it to an hour, right now our conversations are long but once we have clear work then they will shorten and there will be more Council conversations where lots of discussions will happen.

## **Internal Stakeholders and Consultation with them (20 Minutes)**

Max: We can make this an entire consultation discussion but let's start with the internal stakeholders, I can throw out some ideas, internal stakeholders will be Councillors, executive, executive staff, and Presidents Council, one thing we need to discuss is are we doing just current internal stakeholders or past stakeholders like past execs and Councillors, the list becomes big if you add past Councillors and staff, additionally the MD would be an internal stakeholder and then staff that have a relationship with Council like Sheldon and Joanne, do we want feedback from those staff that have a relationship with Council or Council committees so Events Manager, Communications Manager, SSM, Senior Manager of Student Services, Policy Advisor, so those who directly support Council and committees?

CK: I know what we do with the EUS is just email past people and get their feedback that way, so we could do it that way, one email for execs and one for specific staff, the past people are probably burned in some way versus those who stuck around.

Eshana: We should also prioritize internal stakeholders, it is very important to have past executives, but more specifically past Presidents come back and speak to the Committee, Kamil and I will likely meet with past stakeholders and bring feedback back but we should try to meet with past Presidents or executives as a Committee, we should not be going into Councillors, for staff it would be a good idea to get mass feedback via email.

Max: There are other methods possible, surveys are helpful for lots of people, we can also limit how far back we go in our consultation with former executives and staff as we can just look at last year or the year before, we can also send representatives from the committee to meet with groups and come back with feedback, that's what I see as one thing that could happen, if there are some stakeholders we want specialized feedback from then we can send some group of us to meet with them and come back to the Committee, we can prioritize past Presidents and with past execs it can be like a phone call or something.

Audrey: We should include past execs, and any staff with relationships to Council, if we are splitting up to do consultations then we should have a standardized set of questions.

Max: Yes 100%, what I have seen in the past is that we have a standard list of questions then a section for follow-ups that would be written out in the feedback that would go to Committee.

Rachel: I agree with these points but how far are we backtracking, like the last 5 years or what?

Eshana: We could do the last 3-5 years of Presidents, and then the last couple of years for executives, we don't have to make it super prescriptive.

Max: Yes and I would say we are not going further back than the last governance review, so not going further back than 2017-18 Exec.

CK: Yep I was going to say we should start with the last governance review forward, we could also use the other caucuses like VP Academic Caucus, VP Finance Caucus, and VP Student Life Caucus for consultation.

Rachel: If constituency reps on Council are bringing their opinion are they allowed to bring their constituency opinions?

Max: I think we can give some work for Councillors to go back to the constituency and report back, but I think that would be better suited for Presidents rather than Councillors.

Audrey: I agree, we should go through the Presidents.

Max: We will try with the Presidents to get some feedback, I think it can be discussed with Presidents Council and Council, we will bring the list back to Council and how we will do the feedback and they can express if they are okay with it or if they really want to bring the reports back themselves.

Max: I like consulting last year's Council maybe and select Committee Chairs or all Committee Chairs from the past five years.

CK: I think if Committees are in our scope then it means we should consult last year's Council and past Committee Chairs, there are currently Committees that are broken and so we should focus on consulting the former Chairs from those committees.

Max: There is lots of overlap between those we will consult with as many Committees were chaired by executives, but I think that is okay.

CK: The number of past committee chairs that were not execs is not that many people and we are not adding that many people if we do that, we are not in the new normal yet and so I am hesitant to say we have adopted better practices when they are being tested this year.

Eshana: It is different now and so we should draw comparisons to the pre-pandemic and pandemic years.

Rachel: We all know why certain things didn't work out and so will certain answers be available just based on common understandings about the AMS.

CK: I don't think the problem is a lack of student engagement in the AMS, I think people know about the AMS.

Max: Back to our focus, the rest of the comments must be relevant to internal stakeholders.

Eshana: Firstly, what CK is suggesting is student engagement, most students don't know about the AMS based on data.

Matthew: Do internal stakeholders also include the Speaker of Council?

Max: Yes, and Ombudsperson and Elections Administrator, I think we are done with internal stakeholders, we are doing internal consultation twice, first to identify issues and then the second time to get their feedback on solutions.

CK: If we are worrying about the volume of stakeholders then I think it is important to consult past people when identifying issues not so much on solutions.

Max: We are going to talk quickly about open consultation with the membership, I think for that a survey will be done, that is just a no brainer, we can talk a little bit about what other methods of consultation we want, I want to make sure we are consulting specific student groups too so sending things out in the club's newsletter, to all the people that work in constituencies, not just broad blasts to the whole student population but using different channels available to us, happy to see what else we want to see from membership consultation.

Audrey: When we do surveys will we have incentives for the survey?

Max: I might discuss a little bit about the budget at a future meeting, we can discuss how much money the Society wants to put into the consultation.

Audrey: Are we going to try and do an in-person consultation?

Max: Do people want to do some type of in-person consultation?

CK; I don't think we should rule it out, is this engagement on the problem identifying or solutions, are we getting feedback on problems or solutions, those are different things, if we are doing Bylaw changes it might not be a bad idea to present those solutions at a townhall or the AGM.

Max: The AGM will be in October so we can do some consultation then.

Eshana: I don't want to rule it out either, but in-person, consultations do get a much lower turnout, it is great when we want to hear qualitative accounts on issues but just know that we will not get a great turnout but we can booth and we can do it at clubs days where we might get some good feedback.

Max: The one comment I would add is that 9 times out of 10 if you are going to show up in person you will fill out the survey too.

Audrey: Are we going to do posters, lawn signs, or something?

Max: Last governance review was very successful in getting the Bylaws passed, they did not do engagement prior for solutions because they said it will come up at the referendum and get feedback that way, at a certain point our resources are much better spent on the referendum itself, it is a lot to engage people early on and then re-engage later, the AGM is the bare minimum of what we should do in person.

CK: What are the major barriers to getting Bylaws passed? Is it going to be a quorum thing, too many no votes, or something else?, do we need to look at certain stakeholders to try and prevent a protracted no vote campaign, Identifying why Bylaws failed might be a good idea?

Max: One package is normally how it's done, it simplifies it, makes it easier, we say these are the changes, we consulted you on them, vote yes or no, if you split them up then you might get the weird system where half pass and half fail, at that point, you have a very weird system where nothing is working.

Eshana: In terms of Bylaw changes I don't think students have engaged deeply enough to have a no campaign, but I think the main issues will be engagement and getting enough votes.

Max: There have been some no campaigns, they haven't been successful in getting a majority no but sometimes they hurt the ability to get quorum, there have been certain changes that there has been opposition too.

Sheldon: Yes, Eshana is right, the biggest issue will likely be quorum.

No more comments

### **Next Steps and Other Business (10 Minutes)**

Max: Internal stakeholder list, scope and timeline will be ready for the next meeting, I would like feedback though before we go to Council from some stakeholders like executives and

Governance Committee, Kamil will prepare the draft scope, the scope and timeline needs to be done for Tuesday and then Eshana can bring it to the executive committee and say that the committee has not seen it yet with the understanding that it will be limited down, Keith can give feedback on the 8<sup>th</sup> when he gets back from vacation, the final draft will be done by August 9<sup>th</sup> and then we need to approve it at our August 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting is adjourned at 7:58 PM.