



THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

AMS Executive Performance and Accountability Committee  
Minutes of June 12, 2023

### **Attendance**

Present: Max Holmes (Committee Chair – Speaker of Council), Koda Tootosis (Councillor), Clayton Cullaton (Councillor), Karisma Jutla (Chair Student Life Committee), Lawrence Liu (Chair HR Committee & Chair Finance Committee)

Regrets: Ayesha Irfan (Chair Governance Committee), Thomas Dunsmore (Councillor), Erin Co (Councillor)

Recording Secretary: Max Holmes

### **Call to Order**

The meeting is called to order at 5:00 PM

### **Approval of the Agenda**

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.

Moved: Clayton      Seconded: Koda

### **Update from Chair**

The Chair gave a brief update about scheduling and the future work of the committee.

### **Discussion of Terms of Reference**

Max: Opportunity for orientation and review the terms of reference and if there is anything we want to change. I noted one change necessary which was that we need to clarify who is the voting members. Currently, I am a voting member of the committee but as speaker I likely shouldn't be a voting member. Any other noted changes for membership?

None.

Max: Main duty of our committee is that we will be collecting feedback about the executives and reviewing their performance and report on our work to Council. We were created out of a committee that doesn't exist anymore (oversight) and the ethics and accountability committee. We have both proactive and reactive work as a committee. Our proactive work is collecting feedback and once a month reviewing the performance of the executives. Our reactive work is investigating any complaints about executives and members of council as directed.

Max: I will be trying to get us training on procedural fairness because we have legal obligations as a non-profit to review the performance of our paid executives. We have the ability to investigate, and we need to have training for that process. Likely, this training will be with the University Ombudsperson.

Max: We have very little that we do on our own as a committee, almost everything will be recommendations and reports that we make to Council. We will need to also create a process for the removal of Executives and we will spend time this summer working on that process.

Max: We need to start collecting in feedback in June, so that is most time-pressing. We may need to look at code suspension due to the timeline coming up soon on that. Is there anything people have questions on or concerns?

Karisma: Many people we have to get feedback from for the President, how will that process work and will they all come to the committee?

Max: Likely we will not have everyone come in person since people will not be comfortable and we wouldn't have enough time. Likely we will use a feedback form.

Clayton: How do we resolve conflicts of interest with the members of this committee?

Max: For conflict of interest, I as the chair would rule on your conflict of interest and if we are investigating members of the committee they will be excluded. Members of the committee can recommend work for the committee at Council that is not a conflict of interest.

Max: I will be sure to have non-voting be put next to my name for the committee's I serve on since as speaker I should never have a vote on standing committees.

## **Discussion of Regular Executive Performance Updates**

Max: Once a month we have regular performance updates at Council and the hope is that this committee can take some of those conversations to a committee. We will have the Executives come once a month to this committee and we will try to allocate one hour a month to these updates with the executives. We can use the executives' goals for these discussions and the progress they are making. The plan is we will start at our next meeting. Any questions?

None.

Max: Additionally, these discussions will be incamera since they are incamera at Council.

## **Discussion of Collecting Feedback about Executives**

Max: Code requires we collect feedback from specific people if we want to add others we will need to amend the code. This has never been done before so we will need to create the process. 12 staff and managers are included for president feedback and unclear if for presidents council we should be collecting individual or collective feedback. Little guidance from governance review so we will need to define these issues.

Karisma: Should we defer to presidents council to create the process that they want?

Max: We are collecting feedback on Executives which would be covered by employment obligations we have as a society. So, we might need to have a certain level of consistency and it could be difficult if we use a survey for President's Council to do that as a collective. Multiple options for them: have a separate process that isn't a feedback form for them as a collective way to give feedback, have individual presidents fill out the form, or have the group fill out the form. The last option doesn't seem very feasible though. What do people think about feedback from presidents council?

Clayton: If we allow the Council to decide we could run into issues of disagreement and a form that doesn't work for everyone.

Karisma: I think it would be a good idea to have the Council discuss the feedback they give on a regular basis.

Max: Important to remember that this feedback form is not the only way to submit feedback. People can reach out to our committee whenever they feel the need. The regular process is to make sure we have some regular information coming in to the committee.

Koda: How would we be collecting feedback?

Max: We would use some sort of survey or form like what we do for our permanent staff and managers. We can use a 1-5 scale and add comment boxes. The sections we could have for feedback are on executive goals, strategic plan alignment, and general performance.

Max: We have varying levels of collecting feedback for people. For the president we have all the managers, a few permanent staff for VP Finance and VP Administration, but no permanent staff for VP External and VP Academic. Also, VP External VP Academic have the least amount of student staff so we will collect the least feedback from them. Also, no peer feedback for some reason, only VPs give feedback to President.

Koda: How would we go about making changes?

Max: Likely we would need to do a Code Change, I think I can meet with the Executives along with the MD and HR Manager to discuss the feedback process and if changes need to be made. There is anxiety about permanent staff giving feedback to a committee and whether or not that information will be protected and that staff won't face retaliation. This is why I will meet with the MD and HR Manager to discuss what could be done to make people less hesitant to fill out the survey.

Lawrence: Can we really do it completely anonymous?

Max: So, we can ensure that peoples identities are not revealed directly but there is such a small number of people it could be very clear who is giving feedback. This is why I am meeting with management for more help on this issue.

Karisma: It will be important to get feedback divided into: student staff, permanent staff, and constituency presidents. It becomes very obvious quickly who the feedback can be from.

Max: This is why this will be so difficult because there is gonna be a lot of fear on the side of permanent staff to fill something out that it becomes quite clear the feedback is from them.

Clayton: This is why we will need to reassure people about what information is shared with whom and how we will use collective data for feedback.

Max: Agreed, we can be sure to make it clear what information is presented to Council and what info the Executives will get to see. For example, the comments will never be verbatim shared beyond the committee.

Karisma: Can we allow people to come and talk to the committee if they don't want to do written feedback?

Max: Yes we can do that.

Max: So three sections so far: executive goals, strategic plan, and general performance. Anything missing? Should we do a unique section for each executive?

Karisma: I like the idea of a fourth section unique to each executive. Also, have the information available, like executive goals, when people fill out the form.

Clayton: Also, for student staff we should ask about how supported they feel.

Max: Noted for the first draft. I will take this and talk to the HR Manager and Managing Director. Should we expand who the MD gives feedback on?

Lawrence: Somewhat split because not all execs work that much with the MD.

Max: I will take this to the MD and see what their thoughts are about it.

## **Discussion of Committee Scheduling**

Max: We will be meeting every two weeks on Mondays from 5-7 PM. At our next meeting, we will have the executives come. It seems this time works for most people. Do we want hybrid or remote?

Karisma: Would be nice to have a hybrid option.

Max: Sounds good, we can do hybrid starting in July and in-person/hybrid in September onward.

## **Discussion of Vice-Chairs**

Max: We will likely need the vice-chair to present our reports to Council because as the speaker I cannot participate in debate and the President can't chair during that section since it would be about them. So, the vice-chair will have a more active role which is why we may have two vice-chairs. Don't worry though I will deliver the feedback to Executives on behalf of our committee which is part of why I was made chair to have a buffer between councillors and the Executive when feedback is delivered. Do we want to delay electing a vice-chair since we are missing people today?

Committee agreed to delay the election.

### **Discussion of Committee Feedback for Executives**

The Committee moved incamera for two minutes.

### **Other Business**

There was no other business and the meeting was adjourned at 6:07 PM.



THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

AMS Executive Performance and Accountability Committee  
Minutes of July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023

**Attendance**

Present: Max Holmes (Committee Chair – Speaker of Council), Karisma Jutla (Committee Vice-Chair - Chair Student Life Committee), Koda Tootoosis (Councillor), Lawrence Liu (Chair HR Committee & Chair Finance Committee), Thomas Dunsmore (Councillor) [Left at 6:00PM]

Regrets: Ayesha Irfan (Chair Governance Committee), Erin Co (Councillor), Clayton Cullaton (Councillor)

Invited Guests: Esmé Decker [5:50-5:55PM], Eshana Bhangu [6:05-6:25PM]

Recording Secretary: Max Holmes

[Lost Quorum at 6:00PM]

**Call to Order**

The meeting is called to order at 5:06 PM

**Approval of the Agenda**

*Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.*

Moved: Thomas      Seconded: Lawrence

Approved unanimously.

**Email Vote Results: EPA Minutes June 12, 2023**

It was noted that the EPA June 12, 2023 Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously by the committee via email vote.

## **Email Vote Results: Code Suspensions**

It was noted that following EPA Code Suspension motion was unanimously approved by the committee via email vote:

“Be it resolved that the committee recommends to Council that Code of Procedures Section V, Article 15, Paragraph 3 be suspended until the end of July.”

## **Update from Chair**

Max: Had two meetings, a meeting with both HR Manager and Managing Director, and met with the Executive Committee for their feedback. Meetings were primarily to discuss the best way to collect feedback for executives and any thoughts they had on the EPA Committee as we start out. Also, a reminder that if there is feedback on the operations of the EPA committee councilors can email the speaker ([councilspeaker@ams.ubc.ca](mailto:councilspeaker@ams.ubc.ca)) to give feedback and schedule a meeting if they'd like.

## **Discussion about the Role of Chair and Vice-Chair(s)**

Max: We will discuss the role of Vice-Chair(s) and Chair since the Speaker chairs this committee and must remain impartial it will be important to discuss what responsibilities will rest with Vice-Chair(s) to help maintain the Speaker's impartiality. Additionally, we can have as many Vice-Chairs as we want.

Max: There are responsibilities specifically designated to the speaker either in their job description (JD) or in Code. Including: Relaying EPA Feedback to the Executives (it is important that people know this is the EPA's feedback and never the speaker's opinions), the collecting of feedback for the executives is handled by Speaker with assistance from HR, chairing the committee is the responsibility of the speaker too. We can of course discuss any of these though if the Committee wants changes, but it would require amending Code and the JD of the Speaker.

Max: Things that can likely easily remain my responsibility without affecting perceived impartiality include logistics of meetings including scheduling and minute taking for the committee. We can of course discuss these as a committee too.

Max: Things that the Vice-Chair(s) may want to set direction or take the lead could include: setting the agendas for the meetings, drafting committee reports to council, reporting to council and other committees about our work, consultation and execution of committee work. We can discuss these, and if there is anything additional, we want to add to this list, we can do that. The more direction from the Committee, the better since my role is entirely operational.

Thomas: More admin work could be given to the Vice-Chair. One added thing we could look at is the Vice-Chair of presidents council and who will work with them to get feedback. I agree that Chair should continue to relay feedback to Execs on behalf of the committee, but perhaps we could have the Vice-Chair in the room too.

Max: From an HR perspective, if the feedback is through a meeting, the best HR Practice would be to have a second person from EPA in the room. So, having a Vice-Chair in the room for feedback for Execs would make sense as the second person.

Karisma: I think that operational should stay with speaker, and the more council-facing aspects should be for the Vice-Chair, including reporting to Council. Collaboration on agenda setting would be good. Since Speaker Chair's Council, it makes sense that Vice-Chair would do all Council aspects. The speaker should stay impartial.

Max: I am paid to do logistical work, so I am happy to keep doing that. I don't want to have people take that on unless the Committee prefers that.

Max: I am happy to take directions from the Vice-Chair on work too. To help with logistics of their work with their and the committee's guidance while remaining impartial. So, is there any dissent on what has already been discussed for assigning duties?

No dissent voiced. The committee agreed responsibilities were as follows:

Speaker's (Chair) Responsibilities:

- Logistics of Meetings (scheduling, etc.)
- Gathering Feedback about the Executive and Presenting this to the Committee (HR Department will assist)
- Minute Taking
- Chairing EPA Meetings
- Relaying EPA Feedback to Executives (Vice-Chair will be in attendance)

Vice-Chair Responsibilities:

- Setting the Agendas for Meetings (collaborative with Chair)
- Consultation and Execution of EPA Work (ex. Revising the terms of reference for EPA)
- Drafting EPA Reports to Council
- Reporting to Council and other Committees about EPA Work
- Attend Executive Feedback Sessions with the Speaker

It was noted that there will need to be a line of communication between presidents council and the EPA Committee. The Committee agreed that they will wait to hear from the Presidents Council about this at a later point.

## **Vice-Chair Election**

Max: How many Vice-Chairs would the Committee want? This is more work than a Vice-Chair typically does, but that doesn't mean there needs to be more than one.

Lawrence: I wouldn't oppose having two to divvy up the workload more.

Karisma: It might simplify things if we have just one vice-chair.

Thomas: One to start, and then we can look at having another or having committee members assist the vice-chair.

Max: Okay, it looks like the majority prefers one to start. Additionally, the Vice-Chair (and the Committee) can always give me direction and assign work to me if they need assistance with anything that wouldn't cause me to be partial.

Nominations: Karisma

*Be it resolved that Karisma is appointed Vice-Chair of the EPA Committee.*

Moved: Thomas      Seconded: Koda

Approved Unanimously.

## **Discussion about Previous Oversight Committee**

Max: I requested info on the previous oversight committee since we have nothing to compare ourselves to as a committee. It included a previous investigation report that collected staff

feedback. There are clear and deliberate differences between our committee and oversight. Any questions about this?

Thomas: Should we be looking this at the things we should avoid doing since it was eliminated?

Max: It is up to the Committee; there are clear differences though, for a reason. Some lessons could be learned from the over 15 years of Oversight Committee existence. For example: The issue of what warrants an investigation plagued the Oversight Committee. It was unclear if every complaint, even if just performance related, should warrant an investigation or if only misconduct and more significant performance complaints should warrant investigation. Really this is for info for the committee.

Karisma: I agree the resources are good to have, but I agree this is probably about what we should not do as a committee. I know this was unanimously eliminated.

Max: Important differences between us: We don't do compensation and oversight did, oversight had a councilor as chair and this committee has the speaker, and more. One reason EPA was created though was the recognition that a committee could probably help with the "oversight" of the Executives since Council is a large body.

## **Feedback from Management and Executive**

Max: This feedback from management was already emailed, but a quick summary:

- Timing of feedback and that there are no goals in June, and there might be merit in collecting three times a year instead of four
- Unclear the purpose of feedback and so that will need to be clear to those involved in giving feedback, those evaluating the feedback, and those receiving the feedback what the purpose of this process is
- Unclear why there are large differences in how many people give feedback for certain executives, with some only having three student staff and then others having 10+ student staff and permanent staff
- Unclear if the Committee will receive complaints and feedback outside of the four times a year
- Who communicates expectations to the Executives is unclear, and perhaps this committee could have more of a role in that

Thomas: Should we include the Goals in the feedback process so that they know more about what to give feedback on and ask the same questions year to year?

Max: Streamlined feedback was highlighted, but that feedback should focus on what Council has approved, such as the goals of the exec. Also, the issue of how feedback is collected from different groups was highlighted (permanent staff, student staff, presidents council).

Max: It will need to be clear to permanent staff how this is being used and the level of privacy of the feedback given to ensure they are comfortable giving it. Now, we can talk about Executive feedback and invite Esmé to join our meeting.

[5:50PM Esmé joined the meeting]

Esmé: The Executives are happy to follow what is in code and to make any changes later in the year based on experience. The Exec was interested in how feedback will be collected: meetings, survey, or written. We are here to see how the Governance Review recommendations get implemented.

Max: Format has not been decided yet by the committee but likely survey or written and that meetings would be something that could be requested by EPA but would not be the default. I know frequency was raised at ExecCom too could you expand on that.

Esmé: We are happy to go to less frequency such as once a term (three times) but we are also happy with the current version of four times a year.

[5:55PM Esmé left the meeting]

## **Discussion about Collecting Feedback**

Max: So, the committee can decide how it wants to collect feedback, I know we previously discussed using a survey format. It sounds as if Goals will be important in feedback, so one area the committee will need to give guidance on is how will the June collecting of feedback differ if goals for execs haven't been approved yet.

Thomas: Perhaps June should be very different and we focus on the working practices of the Executives. Focusing on the Executives and not their staff too.

[6:00PM Thomas left the Meeting]

*The Chair noted that Quorum was no longer present for the Committee.*

Karisma: I think goals are great metrics to look at for the executives, but we could also look at the executive's duties too.

Max: If we collect in June, do we want it to be shorter and exclude questions about goals but then later in the year, ask the same questions and about goals to keep continuity of questions, or do we want an entirely different survey in June?

Koda: Continuity would be good, so same questions.

Lawrence: Agreed.

Max: Karisma and I will meet to start drafting a survey.

[6:05 PM Eshana arrived]

*The discussion was tabled due to the arrival of a guest.*

## **Discussion of Governance Review**

Max: Gave a summary of the Committee's current discussions to date. The committee would love to hear about the Governance Review and their intentions. Some issues we'd like to hear more about were:

- June is before goals are approved; what was envisioned for feedback then
- Importance of Permanent Staff feedback but two VPs (AUA and External) have no permanent staff giving feedback
- What format was envisioned for feedback from the Presidents Council was it meant to be separate mechanism, or they use the same mechanism and was it meant to be individual feedback or collective

Eshana: One distinction between oversight and this committee was to have more holistic feedback and not just look at Goals. The hope was that this committee could help with performance improvement and to have less of a blunt approach of random councillors raising issues with no notice. The EUS model of exec oversight influenced some of the ideas.

Eshana: Some VPs having no permanent staff giving feedback is the reality of the role and that they don't work closely with permanent staff in their roles. VP AUA works with University and VP External with Government.

Max: One issue the Committee highlighted was also that the sample size for those two VPs will be small since they also have smallest number of student staff too, could you talk about that more? Do VP AUA and VP External really not work with anyone in permanent staff on a regular basis?

Eshana: I don't think the two advocacy VPs regularly work with permanent staff in the same way as the VP Finance might with the finance permanent staff. Hopefully, Committee can address small sample size by keeping feedback delivered to Executives general and not in a way that would reveal the identities of staff who gave feedback. Adding any permanent staff would just be for the sake of adding them.

Eshana: For Presidents Council the idea was that the Vice-Chair of Presidents Council would deliver feedback on behalf of the entire council about the entirety of the Executive.

Max: Just double checking: The idea isn't that Presidents Council would be giving feedback through a survey or the same format as staff?

Eshana: Yes, Presidents Council would give general feedback through the vice-chair and not through the same survey format as staff. The idea was not to have each president give their own feedback like staff will but rather having presidents council give collective feedback.

Koda: With concerns about anonymity and purpose of feedback how can we motivate them to fill out the forms?

Eshana: Hopefully the staff will see that this feedback will help to improve the performance of Executives who are struggling and preventing things from getting too bad.

Max: I know there was also concerns about the relevance of the feedback and how it will be used but the committee is currently addressing those issues.

[6:25PM Eshana left the meeting]

## **Discussion about Collecting Feedback**

Max: Are we agreed with Eshana that Presidents Council will give their own feedback in their own form?

Koda: How can we make sure there is continuity?

Karisma: I think we can leave it to Presidents Council for the to determine since the structure of the Council is changing a lot. Also, I think I could just collect the feedback with Thomas since I serve on Presidents Council.

Max: Yeah, there should be no issues with who collects feedback from Presidents Council since all the feedback will come back to the Committee. For now, it says the Speaker collects all the feedback for the committee.

Max: I think we have enough to work on a draft survey unless there is anything further.

### **Discussion about Terms of Reference Changes**

Max: This is an opportunity to discuss any potential changes to the structure of our committee. One change I have noted to Governance Committee is that the Speaker is impartial and non-voting, so it should note that I am non-voting for the two committees I serve on (EPA, and Agenda).

Koda: Do you want to collect permanent staff feedback for the VPAUA and VP External?

The Committee was okay with not having permanent staff feedback for those VPs.

### **Discussion about Next Steps**

It was agreed that Max and Karisma would work together on a draft survey to collect feedback about the Executives, and the committee would discuss the survey at our next meeting. Additionally, the primary purpose of the next committee meeting will be to have our first feedback session with the Executives.

### **Other Business**

There was no other business, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:40PM



THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

AMS Executive Performance and Accountability Committee  
Minutes of July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023

### **Attendance**

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

Regrets: Koda Tootosis (Councillor), Thomas Dunsmore (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], Esmé Decker [6:05-6:20]

Recording Secretary: Max Holmes

### **Call to Order**

The meeting is called to order at 5:03 PM

### **Approval of the Agenda**

*Be it resolved that the agenda be approved as presented.*

Moved: Lawrence    Seconded: Clayton

Approved unanimously.

### **Approval of Minutes**

*Be it resolved that the minutes of the July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting are approved as presented.*

Moved: Lawrence    Seconded: Ayesha

Approved unanimously.

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

*Be it resolved the Committee goes incamera.*

Moved: Ayesha      Seconded: Clayton      Thirded: Lawrence

Approved unanimously.

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

### **Survey Questions**

Max: Beyond three themes for the survey: strategic plan, goals, and general performance is there anything else that we would want to ask about?

The committee agreed to focus on those three topics.

Max: What level of privacy would we want for the survey?

Ayesha: I'd be most comfortable with one person having access to the answers to the survey. Ideal this person would be impartial: speaker. And then this person can generalize the information for the committee to review.

Max: The committee can continue to request to follow-up with specific feedback while maintaining the person's privacy with the committee.

Clayton: Important for us not to take on the role of HR, so I hope we can refer to issues if needed and make that clear.

Max: Yes, our committee can't do everything. We will need to speak with HR about our role in complaints because ultimately HR issues with Executives and Councilors will come to our committee if they are disciplinary and/or serious.

Ayesha: I hope that we can highlight the importance of the survey to everyone and that this will be used for executive evaluation.

Max: We can make sure we communicate that too.

## **Discussion about Next Steps**

It was agreed the survey drafting would continue and be approved at a future meeting. Additionally, the role of our committee when it comes to adjudicating the result of investigations and disciplinary issues with councillors and executives would be discussed. The Committee also agreed feedback would be sent to the Executives by email.

## **Other Business**

There was no other business, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:40PM



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.*



THE ALMA MATER SOCIETY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA VANCOUVER

AMS Executive Performance and Accountability Committee  
Minutes of September 6<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) [Joined at 2:05 PM], Clayton Cullaton (Councillor), Rowan Bapty (Councillor), Thomas Dunsmore (Councillor) [Left at 3:10PM], Koda Tootoosis (Councillor) [Joined at 2:05 PM]

Regrets: Lawrence Liu (Chair HR Committee & Chair Finance Committee),

Invited Guests: Esmé Decker (3:15 to 3:30 PM)

Recording Secretary: Max Holmes

### **Call to Order**

*The meeting was called to order at 2PM.*

### **Approval of the Agenda**

*The amended agenda was adopted with unanimous consent.*

### **Chair Update**

There have been requests to talk to the Committee by members of the Executive. They were unable to attend today or retracted their requests. Any member of Council can request us to meet within a week and this includes members of the Executive. The hope is we will have the survey approved at our next meeting, but to have your endorsement would be helpful too.

*Koda joined the meeting.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

*The Committee unanimously approved the incamera minutes of July 17 and August 28.*

*The Committee unanimously approved the minutes of July 17 and August 28.*

## **Executive Performance Evaluation Surveys**

Chair – The complete Qualtrics survey has not yet been completed but I will show you the first part today. All of the written materials including the questions are completed. I will be checking with HR what we are able to say about confidentiality for the survey.

*The Chair guided Committee members through the draft Survey.*

*Ayesha joined the meeting.*

Clayton – Can we bold “why” and “any other relevant information” for the comment boxes to really emphasize the need for people to fill out the comment boxes?

Chair – Yes.

Clayton – Can we exclude “prefer not to answer” and only say “unable to answer” so we don’t have people use it as an out to not answer the questions.

Chair – Yes.

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.

Chair – Is there any feedback on the general performance and strategic plan sections of the survey? For strategic plan, this is taken straight from the plan so we cannot change the content too much.

*Committee members indicated they approved of the current version and didn’t have any more edits for these sections.*

Chair – Is there any feedback for the goals questions of the survey?

*Committee members indicated they approved of the current version and didn't have any more edits for this section.*

Chair – For the five unique questions for each executive, I took this mostly from what our bylaws and code say are their primary duties. Do let me know if there are any issues and we can go through each of these one by one.

Chair – For President the five unique questions are: Strategic coordination and leadership, effective spokesperson, stakeholder engagement and representation, strategic vision and leadership, and effective business management. How do people feel about these questions?

Clayton – Less about vision and more about the coordination of everything.

Karisma – If we could also talk about adaptability in the leadership question that would be great.

Chair – Seeing no other comments I have noted those suggestions and I will make those changes.

Chair – For VP Admin the five unique questions are: Effective Facility Management, Collaborative Campus Engagement, Sustainability and Climate Action, Effective Club Oversight, and Nurturing Nest Community. How do people feel about these questions?

Chair – Seeing no comments from members we will keep this section the same then.

Chair – For VP Finance the five unique questions are: Effective Financial Management, Financial Planning and Analysis, Clubs and Constituencies Financial Oversight, Timely Reimbursements, and Exemplary Fiscal Discipline. How do people feel about these questions?

Karisma – How much of the VP Finance time is spent on oversight of finances for clubs and constituencies?

Thomas – There can actually be a lot of support clubs and constituencies need specifically from the AMS Finance team. CUS we've needed this too. So, I actually like having this separate even if it doesn't happen for all groups.

Chair – There can also be situations where there is financial trouble with a club (or constituency) and the Finance team needs to create a plan to address the matter. That's why it was a separate question from reimbursements.

Clayton – The role seems to be providing some accounting support or is it actual oversight?

Chair – The VP finance is a signing officer and these are all AMS subsidiaries. So, AMS is the ultimate financial oversight for all clubs and constituencies. It isn't just accounting support. We can change financial planning and analysis is about advice to organizations too.

Karisma – The context from you and Thomas is helpful. If we can expand on the oversight and be clear about what that means.

Chair – Seeing no other comments I have noted those suggestions and I will make those changes.

Chair – For VP Academic the five unique questions are: Effective University Advocacy, Uniting Student Advocacy Efforts, Board of Governors and Senate Liaison, Supporting Constituency Advocacy, and Proven Advocacy Success. How do people feel about these questions?

Ayesha – The current VP Academic serves on the Senate and so I am curious if that creates a conflict of interest in advocating to the Senate and how that is addressed?

Chair – Not sure if this is directly relevant to the Survey, but Senate tends to be made up of people with overlapping roles. For example, deans and provost are on the Senate when technically the senate oversees all academic governance. There is no fiduciary duty and no code of conduct for senate. It is common for VP AUA to serve on Senate and has not historically been viewed as a conflict of interest. If there ever were more binding legal obligations for senators (like a code of conduct) it could create potential conflicts of interest, but that is the current situation.

Rowan – Mentions a lot speaking on behalf of students but doesn't really talk about hearing student interests.

Chair – We could get rid of Proven Advocacy Success since we already ask about goals and accomplishments there and replace it with something about listening and engaging with student stakeholders.

Karisma – I agree with that suggestion.

Chair – We can make this change for VP External too.

Chair – Seeing no other comments I have noted those suggestions and I will make those changes.

Chair – For VP External the five unique questions are: Effective Government Advocacy, Strategic External Representation, Effective Political Engagement, Well-Researched Advocacy, Proven Advocacy Success. Note: we will get rid of success like we talked about earlier. How do people feel about these questions?

Karisma – Nothing related to SUDS here, should we add it somewhere?

Chair – We can add it to Strategic External Representation, so people know that is tied to SUDS.

Chair – Seeing no other comments I have noted those suggestions and I will make those changes.

Chair – We will not be approving this today, but I will note for the new Committee members that we basically finished this work and you all were supportive.

*The Committee unanimously agreed to go incamera at 2:40PM.*

*The meeting adjourned at 3:40PM.*