



THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

AMS Executive Performance and Accountability Committee  
Minutes of August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2023

### **Attendance**

Present: Max Holmes (Committee Chair – Speaker of Council), Karisma Jutla (Committee Vice-Chair - Chair Student Life Committee), Ayesha Irfan (Chair Governance Committee), Clayton Cullaton (Councillor)

Regrets: Koda Tootoosis (Councillor), Thomas Dunsmore (Councillor), Lawrence Liu (Chair HR Committee & Chair Finance Committee), Rowan Bapty (Councillor)

Invited Guests: Kamil Kanji [5:05-5:20], Ian Caguiat [5:20-5:35], Tina Tong [5:35-5:50], Abhi Mishra [5:50-6:05]

Recording Secretary: Max Holmes

### **Call to Order**

*The meeting was called to order at 5:05PM and it was noted that a quorum was not present for the meeting.*

### **Approval of the Agenda**

*The agenda was adopted with unanimous consent.*

### **Monthly Executive Performance and Accountability Sessions**

*The Committee entered incamera at 5:05PM and left incamera at 6:20PM*

### **Chair Update**

The chair informed committee members that the draft feedback forms are done and that we are ready for feedback on them. Additionally, apologized for the cancelled meetings and that rescheduling happened due to executive and committee member availability.

## **Executive Performance Review Surveys**

Chair – The forms are the same for every executive except for the last five questions are unique.

Ayesha – Before I go, I wanted to say that I thought it was very detailed and great. I would want more space for nuance and areas where people can add comments.

Karisma – I agree that we should be asking for more additional comments and I actually like the way you added to the end of every section, so don't think we need more frequency. However, I think that we can be clear with people that we expect and welcome comments that expand on the survey answers.

Chair – One thing I will do is to create this into a survey and not in word format. We can have a final page that very clearly encourages people to add more comments and feedback.

Karisma – Even using the language “please elaborate” would be helpful.

*Ayesha left at 6:30*

Chair – How do people feel about the rubric? Personally, I did a 1-5 with definitions for each so that we can clearly have some qualitative data here.

Karisma – Yeah, I'm on board with that idea. It's crucial to clarify that a score of five is rare, indicating exceptional performance. By doing so, we ensure that our average of a good executive leans towards a four, highlighting standout achievements without overinflating ratings.

Chair - Feedback isn't just for pointing out issues; it's also for acknowledging strengths. Our initial communications about this need to be clear to avoid misunderstandings. In terms of categorizing feedback, I retained the committee's emphasis on general performance, incorporating aspects like time management and communication. For alignment with the strategic plan, I've broken it down by our core values and strategic priorities, ensuring it covers all areas without my subjective input. Lastly, I've also focused on goals and unique executive responsibilities, aiming to highlight both progress and communication of successes. How does everyone feel about this structured approach, especially regarding the strategic plan?

Karisma - I believe the sectioned approach works well, especially if we're integrating the strategic plan which stands distinct from generic feedback and goal-oriented comments. This structure offers a broader perspective on societal impact. However, we might need to reconsider some terms, like 'above and beyond', for clarity in rating.

Karisma – I am wondering about the five-point system, especially when ranking attendance. Can you really rank attendance using this system? There are aspects where exceeding might not make sense.

Chair – I understand your point about the language we've borrowed from AMS. We can explore other formats like the "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" system seen in surveys. Some items might not fit the overperformance language. Maybe we should consider altering our language or even bring forth multiple options for the ranking system.

Karisma - While I appreciate the current system, there are elements that may not fit neatly within it. Perhaps we can have sections where sliding from "agrees" to "disagrees" might be more suitable, especially for areas where exceeding isn't feasible.

Chair – The staff form had a yes-or-no section which we could integrate. This could be a separate segment focusing on basic executive responsibilities.

Karisma - I value the nuances in the current system. However, I agree that there might be a few items that could be better addressed in a breakout section.

Clayton – We might benefit from adding a "not applicable" option, as not everyone will have the context for every item. There's also a need to emphasize listening in the general responsibilities. It's essential, given recent feedback. Perhaps there can be binary questions like "Do you feel listened to?" Lastly, it's vital not to deviate too much from the AMS format to maintain consistency, especially if HR gets involved.

Chair – I recall drafting an item focused on listening. We could emphasize this more in the document. For the next meeting, I'll try presenting this in an actual survey format for clarity. And I'll make sure to include a "not applicable" option.

*With no other business on the agenda, the meeting adjourned at 6:40PM.*