

# EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students  
Executive Committee Meeting, October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2022, UNC 133C

---

Called to Order at 11:11

## Directors Present

President (meeting chair)

Jakson Pashelka

Vice-President External

Cade Desjarlais

Vice President Finance and Administration

Vrushank Kekre

Vice-President Campus Life

Danial Asif

## Directors Absent

Vice-President Internal

Dhruv Bihani

## Staff Present

Governance Coordinator

Bri Fedoruk

## Staff Absent

General Manager

Jason Evans

## **1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY**

*We would like to acknowledge that we are on the traditional, ancestral territory of the Okanagan Nation. We would like to recognize that learning happened in this place long before this institution was established. It is important to understand the privilege we hold to be living, working, and learning on Syilx territory.*

## **2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEMBERSHIP**

22/10/18.01

Asif/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

22/10/18.02

Desjarlais/Asif

Be it resolved the agenda be amended by adding an item called "Budget Recommendations to UBC Letter" under "Information Items" and moved to the beginning of the agenda.

Carried as amended

## **3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

22/10/18.03

Desjarlais/Asif

Be it resolved that minutes of the meeting held September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022 be adopted.

Carried

22/10/18.04

Asif/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that minutes of the emergency meeting held October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022 be adopted.

Pashelka introduced that he would like to see there being reserves for future emergencies.

Desjarlais suggested that there should be some awareness passed along to following Boards of the bargaining years. The contract for the transit workers had been up for the past few months, so had we taken more preliminary action, we could have been more prepared.

[Kekre entered at 11:15]

Pashelka agreed that an internal note could be helpful.

Desjarlais suggested a Bylaw or other policy they could add to the AGM Bylaw changes.

Carried

## **4. INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **4.1 Budget Recommendations to UBC Letter**

Desjarlais brought up the letter that was mentioned in yesterday's meeting. He wanted to gather more information from the committee. He was hoping Pashelka had more

information on this, or that he could look into this further.

Pashelka updated that the letter mentioned "tuition guidance," and that they would like "suggestions in writing." Mullings let him know that this meeting was to share what they had learned from the initial budget consultation, sharing what priorities would be. He tried getting further clarity from Mullings, but had not heard back as of yet.

Asif wondered what the priorities should be.

Desjarlais wanted to know if an item for this meeting should be that each of them should draft a list of priorities to submit to Pashelka, and he can then submit this to UBC.

Pashelka asked the executives to ask for the highest form of their imagined ideas. He wanted the executives to gather input from their respective committees.

#### **4.2 Use of the SUO Credit Card**

Kekre updated on the email Smailes sent out, along with the fillable form that was included.

Pashelka wanted to know if there were rewards?

Kekre replied that there are some for flying, but he would get back to them on this.

Desjarlais seconded wanting to know the rewards that would be included in this card.

### **5. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **5.1 AGM Addition from the SUOGSC**

Ganesh introduced her possible agenda item related to the GSC. She added that, as the executives are aware, the GSC became a standing committee last year. She outlined the necessity of adding her position to get graduate students to know that the SUO is representing them as students, rather than just the undergraduates. Since they have been added as a standing committee, they have grown a lot, it increased their budget, helped with advocacy, and helped with expanding their relationship with other parts of campus, like COGS. Ultimately, the goal was to have a separate Graduate Students' Union. Most universities of our size do have separate students' unions for their grad students. We know this is not possible for the near future, but she hoped to make small steps towards this eventuality. She wanted to talk to the executives about the Grad Rep role. Graduate students are not interested in this role, at twenty (20) hours a week, and she thinks this is because it is inaccessible for people in these stages of their lives. This limits the amount of people who are interested or able to apply for this role. They have also been attempting to increase awareness of the SUO to get the word out there more. She boiled this down to the Graduate Representative position necessitating more work than regular Board members, but less than what is mandated for the Executives. There are holes in the communication that are not allowing Graduate specific information to get to her, such as graduate student events, or other offices attempting to gather data about graduate students from other Board members or departments on campus. Her idea then, was to change the Graduate Representative role into an Executive position, as suggested by the previous Governance and Advocacy Coordinator, Sarah.

Pashelka replied that he did not know about the eventuality of the Graduate

Committee becoming its own union, however, he did see the benefit of changing the position to increase the communication, and limit the issues with communication.

Kekre replied that he had two possible solutions in his mind, one (1), the GSC could have their own website, linked to the SUO; and two (2), possibly increase the pay, to get the graduate students more interested.

Desjarlais replied that he did not think that the route of making the Grad Rep an executive role would not work in the current layout, he also does not feel like there would be enough interest in a position that required twenty (20) hours of work a week, when there is already an issue finding candidates for eight (8) hours a week.

Ganesh replied that there was currently a committee representative of Graduate students – the Graduate Student Committee – who was pushing her to come to this meeting today.

Desjarlais replied that he needed to see more support directly from graduate students. He needed more than the anecdotal data.

Ganesh wanted to know if there was any data coming from the alternate perspective? That graduate students are being serviced like the undergraduates? Financially, there are one thousand graduate students contributing, do we have information towards these things? She did not feel as if the executives break down their portfolios in a way that accommodates graduate student needs.

Asif asked about the schedules of graduate students and the time commitment, and whether they would apply at twenty (20) hours.

Ganesh replied that if the pay was increased, they would not take a TAship.

Kekre replied that there could be members of the GSC who attend the other committees which provide services, to have a voice, to put ideas forward, and they could be paid at a higher rate than the other Board members.

Ganesh replied that there could be a student-at-large position dedicated to graduate students.

Desjarlais disagreed that the Graduate Student Representative did more work than any other Board members. The hours they put in is not reflected in the requirements for the role. It would not be fair to increase the pay for these positions above the others.

Desjarlais added that there was no doubt that she was doing more than some Board members, but perhaps not all.

Ganesh replied that perhaps opening up the positions more explicitly could be beneficial for the graduate representation.

Desjarlais replied that engagement was a common problem overall here.

Ganesh replied that she understood this, but it felt as though this response falls flat. Most graduate student information that comes to the Board comes from Ganesh. She would not want someone else to have to do this position the way that she has been doing it, she wanted it to be something that someone could be comfortable with walking in to.

Pashelka replied that the Graduate perspective sees the SUO cater away from the graduate students. He wanted to know what separated an undergraduate from a graduate service.

Ganesh replied: age, family orientation (being child friendly), advocacy and outreach – there is general information, but not graduate student focused. The health plan covers both undergraduates and graduate students. Outreach times are not always conducive for graduate students. The scheduling of large events, usually right after exams, was great for undergraduate students, but terrible for graduate students because they are marking. She has found that early mornings, late evenings work for scheduling graduate events. They are students, but the student population considers them to be employees, and the employer populations considers these people to be students. They are left on a raft in the middle.

Kekre asked what Ganesh's possible solution and recommendation would be.

Ganesh replied that increasing graduate students across committees would be great, she agreed with Desjarlais' point about adding the Graduate Representative position to the executive committee. She does feel as though the general feeling of the campus against welcoming graduate students is reflected in the way that the SUO has been running.

Kekre replied that looking at it from a budgeting lens, the GSC was allocated a certain budget line, which would kind of be like a separate society, but he understands that this was not exactly the case. Perhaps there should be a reflective event that would come out of the budget line of the events, but add a graduate specific event at the same time as an alternative.

Ganesh replied that the budget that had been allocated to the GSC had been invaluable since its addition. What if, however, there was one student-at-large position allocated specifically to graduate students.

Pashelka added that perhaps this position could be a graduate student student-at-large position, but also, perhaps a specific focus while there are elections on graduate students.

Ganesh added that there could be more feedback soon because there are office hours that will be posted soon.

Pashelka wondered if there were policies that could be changed so that there would be tabling for graduate students during election periods mandated. He was also future-thinking about giving the GSC their own space in the new building.

Kekre wondered how the Vancouver campus' graduate student union worked so differently?

Ganesh replied that they had been established since 1945, and they have their own budget and staff. In terms of the elections, for example, during election period, do the representatives from the faculties involve their own graduate students, and direct them to vote for a graduate representative position.

Pashelka thought that a possible AGM change could be to mandate the VP Internal to attend the Graduate Student Committee meetings. Or to mandate attendance and a line of communication or update.

Ganesh replied that the face-to-face with student-at-large graduate students would help with hearing the concerns of the graduate student committee.

Pashelka returned to Ganesh's point about the lost communication.

Ganesh replied that she could not expect that every email that was meant for her to get to the right place, but that it needed to be known.

Pashelka wondered if Ganesh would like to attend the next few executive committee meeting.

## **6. IN CAMERA**

22/10/18.05

Kekre/Desjarlais

Kekre moved to amend the agenda by adding an in-camera session, and further resolved that the meeting be moved in-camera.

Carried

Kekre updated on Membership Outreach business to do with Course Unions.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 12:51