

BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Board of Directors Meeting, March 13th, 2023, UNC 106

Directors Present

President (meeting chair)	Jakson Pashelka
Vice-President External	Cade Desjarlais
Vice President Finance and Administration	Vrushank Kekre
Vice-President Internal	Dhruv Bihani
Vice-President Campus Life	Danial Asif
Director-at-Large	Berat Celik
Director-at-Large	Aryam Dwivedi
Director-at-Large	Megan Johnston
Director-at-Large	Spandan Ghevriya
Graduate Studies Representative	Kirthana Ganesh
Faculty of Applied Science Representative	Akshata Pathak
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Representative	Twinkle Hora
Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative	Hanna Donaldson
Faculty of Education Representative	Lindsay McGrail
Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative	Grace Halpin
Faculty of Management Representative	Jes Mindi
Faculty of Science Representative	Maziar Matin Panah
Board of Governors Representative (ex-officio)	Tashia Kootenayoo
Student Senate Caucus Representative (ex-officio)	Salman Hafeez (Saami)

Directors Absent

Staff Present

General Manager	Jason Evans
Governance Coordinator	Bri Fedoruk
Communications Manager	Becca Evans
Student Advocate	Rachel Fortin
Membership Outreach Coordinator	Izzy Rusch
Executive Coordinator	Sarah Speier
Well Manager	Michael Ouellet
Finance Manager	Leanne Smailes

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY

We would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, 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

23/03/13.01

/

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

3. REPORT ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

3.1 Senate

4. PRESENTATIONS

4.1 ASaferWalk

4.2 Marine Design

4.3 AquaTech

4.4 Okanagan Electric Motor Sport

4.5 Faculty of Education Presentation

4.6 Robert's Rules of Order

5. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/03/13.02

/

Be it resolved that the minutes of the Emergency meeting held February 13th, 2023 be adopted.

23/03/13.03

/

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held February 27th, 2023 be adopted.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

6.1 Executive Committee

23/03/13.04

/

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held March 3rd, 2023, be adopted.

23/03/13.05

/

Be it resolved that five thousand (5,000) dollars be put forth towards the Multi-Spiritual

space retrofitting for UBC Giving Day 2023.

6.2 Finance Committee

6.3 Policy Committee

6.4 Campus Life Committee

6.5 Campaigns Committee

23/03/13.07

/

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held February 28th, 2023, be adopted.

6.6 Graduate Student Committee

23/03/13.08

/

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held February 2nd, 2023, be adopted.

23/03/13.09

/

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held February 16th, 2023, be adopted.

23/03/13.10

/

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held March 2nd, 2023, be adopted.

6.7 Oversight Committee

23/03/13.11

/

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held February 10th, 2023, be adopted.

23/03/13.12

/

Be it resolved that the Executive Reports of January 2023 be adopted as attached.

7. REPORT ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

7.1 Board of Governors

7.2 Other University Committees

8. NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Club Ratifications

23/03/13.13

/

Be it resolved that the Marine Design Club be ratified.

23/03/13.14

/

Be it resolved that the AquaTech Club be ratified.

23/03/13.15

/

Be it resolved that Okanagan Electric Motorsport be ratified.

23/03/13.16

/

Be it resolved that the KDT (Kpop Dance Team) be ratified.

23/03/13.17

/

Be it resolved that the Book Club be ratified.

23/03/13.18

/

Be it resolved that the Film Club be ratified.

23/03/13.19

/

Be it resolved that the Southern Medical Club be ratified.

23/03/13.20

/

Be it resolved that the Street Art Association be ratified.

9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

9.1 Transition Documents

10. ADJOURNMENT

EMERGENCY BOARD MEETING AGENDA

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC , Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Emergency Board of Directors Meeting, February 13th, 2023, UNC 105

Called to Order at 18:07

Directors Present

President (meeting chair)

Vice-President External

Vice President Finance & Administration

Vice-President Internal

Vice-President Campus Life

Director-at-Large

Director-at-Large

Director-at-Large

Director-at-Large

Graduate Studies Representative

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Representative

Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative

Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative

Faculty of Management Representative

Faculty of Science Representative

Jakson Pashelka

Cade Desjarlais

Vrushank Kekre

Dhruv Bihani

Danial Asif

Berat Celik

Aryam Dwivedi

Megan Johnston

Spandan Ghevriya

Kirthana Ganesh

Twinkle Hora

Hanna Donaldson

Grace Halpin

Jes Mindi

Maziar Matin Panah

Directors Absent

Board of Governors Representative (ex-officio)

Student Senate Caucus Representative (ex-officio)

Faculty of Applied Science Representative

Faculty of Education Representative

Tashia Kootenayoo

Salman Hafeez (Saami)

Akshata Pathak

Lindsay McGrail

Staff Present

General Manager

Governance Coordinator

Well Manager

Jason Evans

Bri Fedoruk

Michael Ouellet

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY

We would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, 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

23/02/13.01

Desjarlais/Bihani

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

Carried

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.1 Student Association Funding Committee

23/02/13.02

Kekre/Bihani

Be it resolved that the Student Association Funding Committee approve a total of thirty one thousand four hundred (31,400) dollars for 2022/2023 Student Association term two (2) funding.

Discussion centered around the need for motions to be brought to the Board from the committees, regardless of what was in the portfolio of a Director, however, it was discussed that it would be necessary for the Board to hear verbal updates, as well as motivations, so that they could make informed votes, when they were being asked to.

Evans noted that the committee could approve each club, as it was within their purview, but the total amount needed to be seen and approved by the Board if it totaled more than twenty-thousand (20,000) dollars.

Carried

23/02/13.03

Kekre/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the Student Association Funding Committee recommends an amount of twenty-two hundred (2200) dollars to be granted to the Pakistani Student Association for the 2022/2023 Term Two (2) funding.

Kekre provided motivation.

Celik asked why adding five hundred dollars more would make such a difference for them?

Kekre replied that they had reached out stating that they were having difficulty raising funds to meet their commitment for this term.

Carried

3.2 Building Steering Committee

- **The Board Calls for an Update from all those Involved in Capital Project Work to Date**

Pashelka directed the Board to look at the Capital Building Project handout, and updated on the work to date of the committee. He addressed the funding promises from UBC, as well as the size decisions concerning the building to the Board. He noted that this model would be the most affordable for the students, and the differences between the Okanagan Campus and the Vancouver Campus in terms of asks and expectations.

23/02/13.04

Pashelka/Kekre

Be it resolved that the minutes, notes, and reports from the meetings:

- June 6th, 2022
- August 19th, 2022
- September 1st, 2022
- September 1st, 2022
- November 4th, 2022
- February 2nd, 2023

be adopted as attached.

Pashelka outlined the reason for the doubled minutes from the Building Steering Committee September 1st, explaining that the previous group was a 'Working Group,' so minutes were ambiguous. The Building Steering Committee was mandated prior to the Board. There was an edited version of the minutes and an unedited version, which were both sent to the Governance Coordinator. He admitted that this was partially his fault, as he was responsible for minutes as chair, and it was a mistake to adopt the other minutes. He noted that the first set of minutes that appeared in the agenda [with the time beginning at 10:11, rather than the meeting that was recorded at beginning at 10:06] were the correct minutes.

Desjarlais asked when the referendum 'Working Group' first met?

Pashelka replied that the first meeting would have been June 6th, 2022.

Desjarlais replied, asking, from June 6th until now, we had eight (8) rounds of minutes to approve at this moment?

Pashelka replied, yes.

Desjarlais continued, reiterating, that this Board would be making a multi-million dollar decision, based on these minutes provided, which we have just received? That was not completing one's fiduciary duty, and not doing your due diligence, as a Board, and as our General Manager. You have not completed what was mandated of you, and he could not in any good faith vote in favour of adopting these minutes. They [in reference to the minutes] were not even in proper formatting – let alone in Robert's Rules of Order. This committee answers to this Board, and to the students. Was he supposed to read through this in twenty (20) minutes, and think this was all okay? He continued stating that he respected everyone in this room, but he had to be honest in saying that if a student was here sitting in this meeting, they would not feel good about this decision. He again asked for those involved to provide further information, but without that, he would stand strongly opposed to any referendum on this building. He thought the Board needed to seriously reconsider where they were at, asking the amount that was proposed here to our students. He was opposed to the amount the SUO would be asking of the students compared to the amount that UBC was prepared to pledge. His final point on the topic was that the amount of minutes present and information provided was concerning to him to make any vote on.

Pashelka responded that this project, when it was first introduced to the Board of 2019/2020 by their president, had been planned to move forward much before this. Last year's Board and leadership did not feel they needed to move forward and make progress on this project during their time, despite the desire for more space on campus. He noted that the pandemic hindered this progress, as well as the campaigns that were run during that Board. He undertook this objective to bring this project back to life to deal with the issue that students were facing. He agreed that it would be a lot of money for students to be paying. He agreed that they were behind the growth of Vancouver. This ceded that this should have been in progress much sooner. He was hoping that this team could make this come to life. Communication was not the clearest, and the project fell flat. His objective was to hear the students concerns and bring to light what they wanted. He wanted to know what the Board felt about the building topic because this was a huge project.

Ganesh replied that it was executed poorly, and receiving minutes in this manner. She felt it was manipulative to be given this many documents on a topic this important to students, this late, this close to an election, to approve. She continued, agreeing with Desjarlais that they failed to be in the proper format. She mentioned that it would not have even come, however, if members of the Board had not pointed out that we needed updates and minutes, and she thought that this, also, was a poor ethical decision. She continued that even after having skimmed through the minutes to this point, there were still many questions. It was not until November that the Board had any idea of the proposed size of the building. The Board was still unaware if a size had been approved. The Board was

unaware at this moment how much financial oversight there was. Was there a financial body outside of this organization who looked over this plan? Do we have access to their reports? Is this a fiscally responsible decision? Or do we have just the word of others stating that 'they checked.' Is that enough? The Board, as far as she was aware, was still unsure as to where the building would be located. She did not think that the Board had even received the Proposal document that was being circulated until members got to the meeting, and there failed to be enough copies for each Director. She felt that the manner that this had been presented was forcing her to believe this was an urgent decision that necessitated being made today. She reminded everyone that the worst that could happen would be that this project passed to the next Board. She felt that there was a great amount of work to be passed along, but she did not think that it was enough at this moment, for anything. She, personally, would not approve these minutes. She felt it unfair to be asked in the manner presented, to do so justly.

Evans responded that he took Desjarlais point seriously. He was employed a year ago, a year and a few months, which means this project started before his time. Without institutional knowledge, he was not up to date with the project, and needed to catch himself up. He noted that the SUO was currently at Executive One (1) of the project, in terms of the process we were at, which meant that we were at the beginning phase in terms of what we needed to do as a committee. He mentioned that the previous President of the SUO, was integral to the communication phase of this project. When he began, he did not know where they were, what context to use, and he was heavily relying on the staff. The Board at that time created a referendum question to ask students if they were okay with the SUO looking into a possibility for a building coming this year. That question that was put forward at that time gave the Board the mandate to look into the possibility of a building. That was where he then came in, in terms of managerial oversight. When we understood that they were acting as a committee, or, rather, people of whom he had no knowledge of who they were, what he did in the interim was to strike an internal working group, to go to Vancouver and research. The real work started this year. Last year it was much talking and ideas. This year, the work that had been put in, was hard work. This was a legacy project. The question was vetted by external lawyers and treasurers. The original fee structure was much higher, and they had gotten the fee down to what was presented to the Board at this meeting. The minutes provided here, up until the Governance Coordinator highlighted to those working on the project that documents needed to be received by the Board, the people in the committee were people he had never met. That committee was adopted by a previous Board, but we did not know who those were. In the vision, we were working together with what we had, in our own 'working group,' so a lot of work went in. He did understand that the minutes were out of shape, but they were out of shape because they were a 'working group,' trying to bring it together, to light. We were at Executive One (1) which meant that we were

at the first stage of the real work. The real work was getting the referendum so that students could understand, passing the referendum question did not mean that it started there, it meant getting to Executive Stage Two (2). Then Executive Stage Three (3), before we could break ground, and have more concrete documentation to present to the Board. This was just to say, are we wasting out time. If we had to produce real work, we would cost the students thousands of dollars. We did a survey at Expo, and they mandated us in that survey to come up with a plan. Beyond his time, he had no control over that. He knew that he did the work he could to the best of his ability. What happened before was just conversations, the approved committee met at the beginning of the year in January. They spent quite a bit of money on legal fees and treasury fees to make sure the process was properly structured and in place. After this, if this referendum question would be passed today, they would be able to provide proper documentation moving forward.

Mindi replied that she wanted to acknowledge that the committee had put in a lot of work to this point, but she wondered why the committee had not produced minutes every two (2) weeks like they had stated in one of the minutes documents provided? And if they were not meeting that often, what happened to that?

Evans replied that that was a proposal started at the initial stages, they had not actually been meeting that often.

Pashelka added that they would meet, and then get to the point where they would have to ask UBC for input. After the first semester, they started to meet more outside of meetings with UBC.

Ouellet replied that he would speak to the minutes. He thought that perhaps there should be follow up questions later concerning how they got to the question, how they got to each stage. In terms of the minutes, in terms of institutional knowledge, a lot of the work happened pre-creation of the committee, and pre-pandemic. There was a plan in place to have a committee at some point, which we did last term. The last referendum was a plebiscite, and things did not move forward, which killed a lot of momentum. Only now had they started to take minutes properly. Last Board did not do any work on the Building. The Board of Governors had been happy with the steps the SUO had taken so far. There were no minutes from that time, and he did not know why because he had joined after that point. He tried to take the lead after he joined the committee, such as organizing trips. There really had not been work since Ali's term ended. There probably would have been more minutes if the last Board had done more work. He thought there should be questions later about how they got to certain numbers.

Fedoruk updated the Board on the minutes and why they were appearing all at once, stating that she had been searching for a while, after being asked by Members to be able to produce documents. She provided these minutes as part of her duty to produce documents as a part of the Societies Act, not only to the Board

members who ask, but to Members of the student body at large. She recently received these documents as submissions. She reminded the Board that all committees, standing and ad hoc, are mandated to produce minutes to the Board. She continued, stating that committees were not defined by their titles, but by the work that they did, and the powers and duties that they were given by the Board. She directed the Board's attention to the committee that was struck by the Board in 2021, which they had made some amendments to in a previous Board meeting, in Winter Term (1), 2022. She had recommended those changes because it seemed to her that the committee was having difficulty producing communication to the Board with the original membership outlined by a Board, without the direction of a Governance Coordinator, included external individuals to the SUO in the membership. This is not only an issue for confidentiality, but it also messed with quorum, and other Robert's Rules of Order issues, they had amended the membership of the committee by striking them in an effort to clean up the membership. She stated that when she asked if meetings were happening, she was being told that they were not being conducted at all. She did not receive any responses from any committee members with documents when she called for agenda items to be produced. When it came to her attention that meetings were being conducted, based off of business that was being conducted, she began attempting to track down minutes if they existed. She produced the documents in this manner because she felt that the Board needed them to make a more reasoned decision when they had to say yes or no to this referendum question. Had we been conducting work properly, this committee, under whatever name they wanted to work under – 'Referendum Working Group,' 'Building Steering Committee,' or any other name – should have been producing documents to this Board, while work was being conducted, no matter what they were doing. There should have been motions brought forward determining what size of the building they wanted, whether that be from the direction of the committee to the Board, or from the Board to the committee telling them what they would like best to choose. There should have been more communication. Up until this point, this was the 'Building Steering Committee,' based on the work that was conducted, and the work that was motioned to be allocated as a part of the powers and duties of the committee. She read the original "powers and duties" of the Building Steering Committee, they "have the power to make decisions related to the SUO capital building project," any decisions, was the work the committee was created to work on. She provided the minutes that she could in the format they were submitted in, she was not able to edit the documents she received, but she reiterated the importance of her duty to produce documents to the Board.

Ganesh replied that even if nothing had been happening in a committee, valid minutes would still include, "no progress made." Valid minutes do not always have to indicate progress, but could accurately reflect stagnation. She also noted the lack of attendance of the Executive Directors, Pashelka missing two (2) meetings,

Kekre missing three (3) meetings, and Bihani missing four (4) meetings. She noted that this meant that the only consistent voices in the room were staff at that point, so the student voice was not being heard in the room, and she thought this was a problem.

Desjarlais agreed.

Bihani apologized to the Board as a part of the committee for not producing the minutes to the Board. He wondered why the minutes were not being handed over to the Governance Coordinator, he asked the General Manager.

Evans replied that Speier was still learning that they had not needed to produce minutes because they were informal meetings, and they were not a formal committee. He quoted her as saying she had been told that the meetings were informal.

Bihani asked where she had been told that from?

Evans replied that he did not know.

Bihani remembered Fedoruk letting the Board know that even in an informal meeting, minutes or documents should be produced.

Fedoruk replied that last year, around the time that the first set of minutes were dated, she had received an email from Speier asking about meetings and the committee, and Fedoruk provided Speier templates for both the agendas and the minutes for the meetings to be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order. She let Speier know that the meetings would need to produce minutes if they were conducting any business concerning work on the Capital Project. She responded to me stating that they would be calling the committee a 'working group,' and that they were not going to be resubmitting minutes after I had sent her back an edited version – like she did for each of the other committees and minute takers who are not herself. After the June meeting, she did not receive any further documents, and members continued to tell her that meetings were not happening.

Vrushank also extended his apologies to the Board for making sure the minutes were passed along to the Board as they should have been. He noted that he would receive summary notes from Speier with action items, so updates were happening within the committee.

Pashelka apologized for the oversight to the Board as chair, he was more focused on the content of the meetings, rather than the internal workings of the process.

Johnston mentioned that what Kekre mentioned sounded much like an agenda.

Mindi responded that she was concerned that all of the members of the committee were not alarmed by the minutes being inconsistent, as a Director responsible for taking minutes for multiple other committees. She was surprised at the ability of the committee to conduct themselves without following the regular processes the SUO followed elsewhere.

Ghevriya wanted to know what the Board wanted to do about the meeting minutes. She did not think they were getting anywhere at this point.

Johnston moved to recess for ten (10) minutes to allow Board members to read the agenda package.

[Meeting recessed at 19:10]

[Meeting commenced at 19:22]

Desjarlais stated that approving the minutes as presented would be a disservice to the students if members vote in favour of the adoption. He did not think it was transparent, and considered it crooked.

Motion failed

23/02/13.05

Pashelka/Mindi

Pashelka moved to go in-camera

Carried by Special Resolution

- **Referendum Requirements One (1): Motion to campaign yes or no – must be made by resolution before the SUO may begin campaigning**

23/02/13.06

Bihani/Asif

It was resolved that the Yes Campaign would begin with the Expo event, Wednesday, September 14, 2022.

It was resolved that further tools in support of the Yes Campaign would be pop-up signs, a banner in the Commons foyer, Handbills and buttons to give out at Expo, and shirts for the staff and Directors to wear around campus.

Desjarlais provided a little context, this motion was provided in the unofficial minutes we previously failed to adopt, but using Robert's Rules of Order language, so it must be brought to the Board.

Fedoruk added that any Resolution from a committee must be brought to the Board. It was a misuse of verbiage from Robert's Rules of Order. It became clear to her that we had been campaigning for much longer than she was aware of, because of the specific use of 'resolved,' making it a Resolution. The previous agenda addressed some requirements we needed to have to be able to hold a referendum, but at that time she was under the impression that we had yet to strike a campaign in the positive or the negative.

Johnston did not know if she could confidently support the campaign at this moment, not being confident with the Board's decision on the referendum question moving forward.

Asif mentioned that it did not make sense to approve the motion if it had already happened.

Fedoruk agreed, it did not make sense with the timeline, this Resolution should have been produced closer to the time it was made, with the minutes submitted to the Board. This was part of the communication aspect that Robert's Rules of Order brought to the organization. She continued that she had to bring it to the Board because it was a motion in the minutes, and it was a motion because of the words that were used, for example, the words resolved make those two statements a Resolution, which is both mentioned in Robert's Rules, but also in our own policies. She told the Directors that they could strike it down or they could approve it, that was their decision as the Board, and they had that right with their vote.

Motion failed

23/02/13.07

Pashelka/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Yes Campaign for the Building Referendum Question begin today's date, and be continued until the end of the Campaigning Period.

23/02/13.08

Mindi/Johnston

Mindi moved to table the question until after the referendum question was considered.

Carried

3.3 Electoral Committee

- **Nomination Period: Official Opening and Closing**

23/02/13.09

Johnston/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the Students' Union Winter Term Two (2) Elections Nomination Period commence at 8:00am, February 6th, 2023, and run until 12:00pm February 17th, 2023.

Carried

- **Campaigning Period: Official Opening and Closing**

23/02/13.10

Desjarlais/Hora

Be it resolved that the Students' Union Winter Term Two (2) Elections Campaigning Period commence at 8:00am, Monday, February 27th, 2023, with a suspension period between 8:00pm, Friday, March 3rd, 2023, and 8:00am, Monday, March 6th, 2023, to be reinstated at 8:00am, Monday, March 6th to the close of polling.

Desjarlais wanted to know why there had been a suspension decided upon?

Evans replied to the Board that the CRO decided on this.

Desjarlais stated that our policies stated what the timeline was outlined as, according to the policies [Regulation]. He furthered that if there was valid reasoning, he would be open to considering it, but he was unsure if the reasoning

provided allowed for the desired context. He felt that the weekend before voting started was quite important, and it would add unnecessary CRO challenges during that time, based on the experiences last year.

Fedoruk added that she was unsure what to do if the Board were to strike down a motion from the CRO when the power to decide times was within her portfolio. This had been a problem with previous portfolios when brought to the Board.

Bihani replied, that from his perspective, the Board's decision overrules. She wondered if the General Manager knew what we were to do when portfolios of individuals intersect with Board decisions.

Evans replied that the Board was not supposed to touch anything to do with the election, and he pointed to the Regulations not allowing the Board to make decisions during election months. It could be seen as interfering with the Election.

Mindi wondered if the CRO was in charge of dates, why were those dates chosen to be off? She wanted to know why this was not taken into consideration. She felt like polling could have been pushed back in the week. She felt it would be unfair to suspend campaigning, and it could give an unfair advantage.

Ghevriya was unsure of the policies surrounding what the Board could do in regards to CRO decisions, but she felt that this would cause many more offenses to take place over that weekend, since she felt they would be campaigning anyways.

Desjarlais added that this felt like a change to Regulations, which we were not allowed to do during the month of February.

Bihani replied that according to our Regulations, the Campaigning Period was defined. If we approved the motion from the CRO we would be going against our Regulations.

23/02/13.11

Desjarlais/Bihani

Desjarlais moved to amend the motion by striking the suspension period from the motion, so that it reads:

Be it resolved that the Students' Union Winter Term Two (2) Elections Campaigning Period commence at 8:00am, Monday, February 27th, 2023, and continued until 11:59pm, Wednesday, March 8th.

Carried as amended

- **Polling Period: Official Opening and Closing**

23/02/13.12

Johnston/Hora

Be it resolved that the Students' Union Winter Term Two (2) Elections Polling Period commence at 8:00am, Monday, March 6th, 2023, and run until 11:59pm, Wednesday, March 8th, 2023.

Carried

- **All Candidates Meeting: Date and Time**

23/02/13.13

Desjarlais/Asif

Be it resolved that the Students' Union Winter Term Two (2) Elections All Candidates Meeting be held at 2:00pm, Friday, February 17th, 2023.

Carried

Bihani wanted to know if the All Candidates meeting would be recorded?

Evans replied that it had been, historically, he believed.

Fedoruk asked that questions concerning Elections details be brought to the CRO.

- **Referendum Requirements Two (2): Motion with the entire referendum question as it will be presented to the Student Body**

23/02/13.14

Mindi/Bihani

Be it resolved that the referendum question be adopted as follows:

Revision Date: February 13, 2023 (v.3)

Do you approve of the Student Union of UBC Okanagan ("SUO") establishing a new capital fee and a new operational fee for the purpose of paying for the construction and operation of a new SUO Student Building ("Building") plus the amount of financing those costs, plus administrative charges as outlined below?

1. Beginning in the 2023/24 academic year, active SUO of students and students eligible to be members of the SUO will pay \$75.00 for each of Terms 1 and 2 of the Winter Session, for a total of \$150.00 per academic year (the "Capital Fee"). The Capital Fee will be used to pay for the design, construction, and furnishing of the Building, as well as the repayment of any loans, including interest on such loans, made by UBC or other lenders to the SUO to finance the payment of the design, construction, and furnishing of the Building.
2. Beginning in the 2027/28 academic year, the Capital Fee will increase to \$100.00 for each of Terms 1 and 2 of the Winter Session, for a total of \$200.00 per academic year. The Capital Fee will continue being paid at this rate until all loans associated with the construction project, including all interest charges on such loans, have been repaid, at which point the Capital Fee will no longer be payable (anticipated 2052/2053).
3. Beginning when the building is open for occupancy (anticipated in Fall 2027), students will pay an additional fee of \$28.00 for each of Terms 1 and 2 of the Winter Session for the purpose of building operation and maintenance costs which may be paid to UBC if UBC maintains or operates the building (the "Operational Fee"). The Operational Fee will be indexed and

increase annually to the BC Consumer Price Index (CPI). The total combined Capital Fee and Operational Fee would be \$256.00 per academic year, subject to annual indexing increases, until the loan, including interest charges, is fully paid.

4. After the loan paid from the Capital Fee is fully paid, Students will continue to pay the \$28.00 Operational Fee for each of Terms 1 and 2 of the Winter Session for a total of \$56 per academic year, subject to annual indexing increases, while the Building remains open for use.
5. In the event the UBC Board of Governors determines the Building will not be built, the Capital Fee will cease to be collected, and the Operational Fee will not be collected. In such event, the Board of Directors of the SUO may allocate any collected Capital Fees not used to pay for the Building cost towards identifying students' informal-learning needs at UBC Okanagan and constructing spaces to meet those needs.
6. The SUO will pay from the Capital Fee and Operational Fee, such administrative charges assessed by UBC for managing the collection and remittance of the fees.

*Fees would not be collected during the Summer Sessions.

Yes___ No___

If approved:

- Informal learning, study and club spaces will be prominent features of the SUO Student Building.
- The fees collected prior to construction will be used to create an infrastructure reserve so that a smaller loan is required.
- The fees collected after the commencement of construction will be used to finance a loan from UBC or a third-party lender. These fees will continue to be levied until the SUO of UBC Okanagan has repaid the loan and the interest on the loan. The loan is anticipated to be paid by 2052/2053.
- It is anticipated that construction will commence in the summer of 2025, and the project is anticipated to be completed in 2027.
- The total construction cost, not including the cost of financing, is estimated to be \$50 million, with a UBC contribution of \$7 million.
- In the event the SUO Student Building project does not proceed for any reason as scheduled, any fees already collected will be held until such delay is reconciled.
- The SUO of UBC Okanagan Board of Directors will establish a process and criteria for active members demonstrating financial need to apply for a full or partial refund on the new student society fee.

Johnston was not comfortable with asking so much of the students. She thought there should be a cap on the fee, such as, 'up to twenty-five (25) years.'" She continued with wondering why we were asking UBC-O for such a small, one (1) time, contribution. The timeline of the building and the relationship of the SUO with the university was longer running than a one (1) time donation. The question itself, point number five (5), she disagreed with. She did not think that the fee should be collected before it was approved by the Board of Governors. She felt it was rushed to be pushed for this election, and that it had not been planned in an organized way. She would like to see this happen eventually, but there was not enough time for them to approve the question as it was presented here today, nor would she be doing her duty to the students if she answered yes to the question today.

Evans replied that point number five (5) was actually a positive for the students, it meant that if the building was not able to be completed for any reason, we would stop collecting fees from the students, and any fees that had been collected, it would be up to the Board at the time to decide how to increase study spaces.

Johnston replied that her issue was with the essence of that point, she felt it was too vague. If there was a proposal this large, there should be no what-ifs, the building should be happening.

Evans replied that this was a point of prudence, to have this clause included, of a just in case scenario.

Ganesh agreed, this was not good enough. She felt that the university should be committing more, perhaps not all at once, but over time. She felt this was a good starting point, but it was not ready to be voted on. She suggested that it would be valuable to keep this in the transition document for the next President, so they knew where we were at. She felt that the students did not have a true representation of the trajectory of progress. Without having a map of all the decisions that were made, she did not know how students would agree to an increased fee, especially on the heels of the tuition increase. She was not saying that due diligence was not done, but that the students do not know how the due diligence was done, and we had a responsibility to provide to them context.

Celik felt there were two (2) problems with the proposal, first the interest rate. The money we collect for the interest rate could be used to build an entirely new building. It did not make sense to him, we were contributing all of this work, and not receiving much in return, and UBC should be approached to contribute more. The second would be where are the external stakeholders? He felt there was still work to do on the project before they could vote yes on a question. This proposal he could not accept, but he felt that the amounts could be adjusted to make for a better project.

Desjarlais stated that since being involved in student governance, he strove to conduct himself in the best interest of students. He thought of those he went to class with, those who were struggling and using the student food bank. He thought about asking them for more money, when his commitment during his term had been to reduce costs. He did not think we were at a point where we needed a building – our organization was large, but it was not that large. Enrollment would not be increasing in the next five (5) years. In his view it had become a vanity project. He felt that those working on the project had been working in a bubble, away from student voices. He was concerned that the placement of the building would be in direct opposition to the parking issue he had been working to also solve for students during his term on the Board. He felt that the project had started with good intentions, but those had been lost. He would not be voting in favour of the referendum question at this time, not because he did not believe in the principal that it was serving the students, but because he believed that it was not at a place to move forward, and it was asking a lot while proving little information. While he could speak to Evans that this may be legally in-line, was this morally correct? He did not think so. He did not feel it was up to our standards, and if we were looking to build some type of a relationship with the students, then we did not need to rush this, or it would be better to not run the question at all.

Evans responded to questions posed, having worked with the Executive team. Because the building was not built, no financial agency would be giving the SUO that money. It would have to come from UBC first. What UBC was proposing after the building was built, we could refinance, with a third party, for a cheaper interest rate, that would reduce costs over a period of time, or reduce the amount of years. Or, the SUO could expand on the building if they wished, depending on the Board at that time. This was not new to UBC, with the AMS in Vancouver, but also with UofA, and other students' unions, where students actually build their own buildings – not saying that the university should not, but that what it has been throughout Canada. He had heard from students that space was an issue for students, especially clubs. This gesture from the SUO was to meet that pinpoint, to say to students that we had heard what they had been saying and a response to something they had told us they wanted. What he had been hearing, in terms of feedback, was that students were upbeat, happy for the building to move forward. With that said, the referendum question had been vetted, through a number of processes, we were currently in Executive Stage One (1) of the process, which means everything that comes after this would be, the design of the building, the proposed location was in Executive Two (2). But what they are saying was that we want to be sure, before investing students' money, going forward that students were agreeing that they were agreeing to want have the building done, more importantly than done, but would have been costly, we did not want to spend ahead and then not have the students' support. Then we would reach Executive Two, Three, and Four stage. If you do not do it now, to him, it was costly, in the

future as well. It would make it more expensive. He supported the question; a lot of work went into it. As much as it may not appear, we put a lot of work into this, making sure the question was appropriate. The CRO, legal, as well as treasury. This was the cheapest it could have gotten, he had seen scenario one, two, three, and four, the team had seen. At one point the cost was much higher, and the team worked the amount down to the amount he was presenting in this meeting. The team worked on thinking how they could make this affordable for students. If they were going to be doing a referendum that the last Board put forward, he felt that it was their duty that they should at least present it, to let the students voice be heard.

Pashelka replied that despite all the work that went into this, he thought that the students deserve something. Whether to present a referendum charging them fees, is the something we present, he acknowledged the mixed opinions and emotions in the room, which was fair, they were all elected to share their opinions. But, ultimately, students who had interest who had come up to himself as well as Evans, and others at the booth, deserved to vote. He believed that just as the Directors here had the right to vote, so did the students. He firmly believed as well, however, that the Directors in the room who felt fully opposed and did not want to vote had a right to express that today as well, as students speaking out against it. He ceded that the information had not been presented in the best way possible, however, he believed all the information was in place for the students to be able to decide by voting it yes or no. He mentioned, however, that those Directors who stood strongly opposed to the building, he respected, and if the question went through, they would not have to participate in the "Yes Campaign."

Kekre replied that Desjarlais was well spoken, it was difficult to put that charge on the students. However, it was a balance between fees taken and services provided. What he saw the building to be was a service. He reminded the Board of their experiences running last year during the Elections, about the same time last year, he felt that a lot of the platforms that the current Board had run on carried many of the same issue points – a lack of spaces: club spaces, study spaces, activity spaces, a lack of everything that rendered our student experience. His experience from his first year in 2019 to coming back in his third year and until now had degraded, and the very reason was that the student ratio had increased, space had remained the same, food options had reduced. Given that, he saw this building as an opportunity to cover all these gaps that they had been campaigning for, what their predecessors had campaigned for. There were not many platform changes last year, from what the last year's Board promised. He heard feedback from students that most nominees for director's were promising the same things, not much had been delivered. He saw this building as an opportunity to deliver on all these points. Yes it came at a cost, but they had tried their best to cut the costs to the students as much as possible. These were still conservative numbers, considering factors such as a lack of Membership increases, or donations, but he saw it as us

providing a balance between what we were asking students to pay, and what services we were providing. He stated that one might be able to say, "Well, these are UBC's problems to solve," and he noted that these issues have been brought to UBC's attention, and they had received the same answer, with perhaps a sweetly worded acknowledgment, but they brushed it aside with "there was not a problem;" "we do not have the money;" or "we hear you, but we do not know what to do." He recalled in the last Board meeting, when Desjarlais stated that students have a power that we underestimate, and he saw this moment as a source of power from the students, as defining a problem, and providing the solution ourselves.

Ouellet agreed with Kekre. He felt like this was the best deal the SUO would be able to get, and he wanted the Board to consider if they would be able to gather a better deal in the future. The location of the building...Why this needed to go ahead now – it did not need to, but the Board got to vote on this at that moment. The SUO had a plebiscite last year, a huge majority of those who voted in favour of that question wanted to see something brought forward to them. Do they get their opportunity or not? He was a little confused, if twenty (20) percent of the Executive Committee of this Board were saying that this was not the time to have a building, why was the project not stopped back in May?

Desjarlais responded because he had not been invited to the committee, and the Board had just received minutes at this meeting.

Ouellet continued, we always knew that there would be a cost associated with this project. Space has been a consistent problem here, this campus has never been large enough for its student body. The last contentious referendum was the U-Pass referendum – it passed with fifty-three (53) percent – only fifty-one (51) percent was necessary. What the Board needed to do was decide if there was a space problem on campus, and if the building once it was built, would be a service or a detriment. If you honestly feel that this building would be a detriment to the student body, then the Board should not pass the question, however, he felt like if the Board felt that students deserved more space on campus, the question should be approved. The AMS refinanced which helped them save millions of dollars over the course of their loan. We knew this would be a costly project. This was a problem, there still was not forward movement on this project. He felt the donation from UBC was a joke. We gave them the Commons, and their proposed donation was the best they could do?

Celik asked Ouellet and Evans if there was any way that we could work on this contribution in this month, before the process is complete?

Ouellet, asked, this month? One could always go and ask.

Celik stated that he would very much like to discuss further with UBC to reconsider their donation. As previously stated, the interest rate was a huge problem, and Evans had mentioned refinancing. He continued, also, the refinancing, if, for

example, today Evans was refinancing his own money in his bank, to make his own building, he would have a refinancing plan with him today to show the Board, which also led him to believe this was not well planned. There did not appear that there was a financial plan present for the Board to view, there was not one present in the proposal, so the Board could not know how the money would be refinanced. Evans responded that any building that we would be building, because we do not have the capital, it is the university's land, it was their policy that we took a loan from them to offset the costs. Their interest rate was standard, so we would have to take the loan from them first. However, what we have done, after speaking with lawyers, was to put a clause in the referendum question to take a third-party loan. Having a framework for that, this was something we could not know until it was something we were sure it was something we could move forward with. It would be a larger conversation that subsequent Boards would be privy to. In terms of getting a plan for those things, it would not be wise to have a plan for those things we did not know students were interested in yet, we would refinance a loan after the building was built. No third-party bank would lend us a loan without a structure in place first.

Ouellet replied that perhaps Mullings should be invited to the committee, as well as some of the heads of UBC. In the last meeting Mullings gave numbers, and he was not happy with that. The moment he explained the AMS percentage versus their student body, and he did not think it was reasonable. It was also a promise lower than what he had heard previously, and he wondered where that previous pledge had gone?

23/02/13.15

Pashelka/Johnston

Pashelka moved to extend the length of the meeting past three (3) hours to finish up the business of the agenda.

Carried

Bihani called back to Kekre's points, and agreed with much of what he had already said. He added that yes, he had heard a few people say they were not happy with paying so much, but the majority of the students he had spoken to were excited about a building. He wanted to let the Board know that many of the students he had spoken with were excited by the prospects of a building.

Ganesh did not trust that, based off of the explanations provided verbally or within the minutes, the other options were fleshed out appropriately prior to making their decisions. She did not know what plan A, B, or C, were, they could not determine for themselves which 'option' would have been better, and she did not want to take someone's word for it. In the absence of minutes and documents, she could not make a reasoned decision. She was not saying that discussions did not happen, but it was not here. There should have been more consistent updates than receiving all of the minutes all at once today. She could not vote in good faith based off of that,

since she was not privy to planning, procedure, or updates. She thanked Pashelka for his point about Directors not needing to participate in the "Yes Campaign" if the question were to go through, but any Directors as individuals, disagreed. She mentioned that of all the students on campus with a possibility to be here to experience the building after paying for it, graduate students were the biggest possibility – they were on campus for decades. Even knowing, that if a student who pays today they could potentially experience a building on campus six (6) years from now, she could not ask a student to pay this fee, in good conscience, and without knowing what was going on, or without being sure that there were not better options. She would have been sure if she had known what was going on. Without knowing what was going on, without the minutes and proposals and other documents, she felt manipulated and cornered into making a decision. It was not good enough for her to take people on their word that they tried their best.

Mindi understood that there were Directors who had put effort in what was presented today. She added, however, that as a student, if we ask this question, we would be giving them a question with half of the information, or we would be throwing them information that we were half sure about. She felt that she would still be confused with the minutes that we have had provided up until this moment. She did not feel she would be able to speak to the project to students. At this moment, the presentation was confusing, and not ready for the student body. Lastly, the last point of the question, she did not understand.

Pashelka replied that this was for students experiencing financial crisis, just like those students could apply for funding on the UBC website. It would be the due diligence of this Board or the next to provide this for the students.

Johnston replied that UBC had guidelines in place that outline what constitutes financial need in a student.

Mindi replied that it was the wording that she was confused by.

Johnston agreed with Mindi. She felt that what was presented was still misleading. She was at Expo where they first presented the 'Yes Campaign,' where the posters were all bright and shiny, and she was happy to say yes to promises such as climbing walls, but she was concerned that if the Board could not pass the minutes, how could the Board pass the question as it stood? She agreed with Kekre that part of the SUO was to find a balance between the fees and the services provided. But like Ganesh mentioned, how many students who paid would get to experience the building? She felt that to combat rising prices, we would need to provide a detailed financial plan to the students. An unambiguous one. She agreed with Ganesh about feeling a little cornered about deciding on this and presenting it to students. She agreed with Desjarlais about the issues that it could pose to parking. The students were not going to be at the table with us, we were their voices, and we speak for them. Many students have wanted a building, yes, but those same students, if we told them the information we had at this moment, she did not think

they would be okay with the fees we were asking with what she was being presented with in terms of information at this moment.

Desjarlais replied that it may have been naïve to think that pushback would not be here. He agreed with Johnston, if he had a flashy sign with a student need on it, of course students were going to agree, he would agree. He did not think this was a vote about whether space was a problem on campus. This vote was about whether this was the direction the union wanted to move in. He fully believed there was a space problem on campus. He believed that club spaces were short on campus. He believed there was an affordability problem on campus. He believed that students were struggling. Just because he did not vote for a building does not mean he thought that space on campus was not a problem. He felt that the plan presented tonight showed that the SUO did not think that these affordability issues were problems for students. He felt that creative solutions could be found to address this problem outside of a building. He felt like partnering with the city with spaces that could be utilized for club spaces would be a good direction, even if it was outside of his portfolio. We could create a subsidy program for clubs that would like to hold events in public spaces. It was more complex than deciding between addressing the issue of space or not.

Asif responded that he had been hearing all of the perspectives and had been seeing the work being completed since last year. He trusted the work that fellow Board members had put into this. He felt it should be put forward to the student. He felt it was our responsibility to put the question in front of the students.

Evans replied that some of the decisions were made because some of the options were out of budget. UBC would be giving money upfront to offset the costs of the initial expenses that we would be incurring.

Desjarlais asked where the minutes of these decisions were?

Evans stated that this was a legacy, something for the Board to leave behind as a footprint, and an investment for future students who would not be able to participate in the building.

Ganesh echoed Desjarlais that she wanted to know where the minutes of these meetings were? Of these decisions? She also agreed with Desjarlais that there was a false dichotomy being created. She reiterated that it felt manipulative for the choice to be phrased between whether we wanted more space for students or we did not, if we disagreed with the question. She stated that Evans saw this project as a legacy, she saw the project in this moment as straddling students with dept. If this had been brought to us back in July, we would have suggested offsetting costs, she knows she would have, and she was deprived on that opportunity. She felt like if this project went to shit, that was the legacy this Board would leave behind. For that reason, she would be voting no.

Pashelka asked the Board to think about the perspective of the beginning of campaigning to students, what you would feel and how you would speak with them.

Desjarlais moved to conduct the vote through rollcall, Johnston seconded.

The chair ruled in favour

President (meeting chair)	Jakson Pashelka	yes
Vice-President External	Cade Desjarlais	no
Vice President Finance & Administration	Vrushank Kekre	yes
Vice-President Internal	Dhruv Bihani	yes
Vice-President Campus Life	Danial Asif	yes
Director-at-Large	Berat Celik	no
Director-at-Large	Aryam Dwivedi	yes
Director-at-Large	Megan Johnston	no
Director-at-Large	Spandan Ghevriya	no
Graduate Studies Representative	Kirthana Ganesh	no
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Representative	Twinkle Hora	yes
Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative	Hanna Donaldson	no
Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative	Grace Halpin	no
Faculty of Management Representative	Jes Mindi	no
Faculty of Science Representative	Maziar Matin Panah	yes

For – seven (7)

Against – eight (8)

Motion failed

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Referendum Question – Student Recreation Facility Fee

Halpin updated the Board on the work that her and other students on another referendum question concerning a recreation building. Herself and a small number of students were able to gather ten (10) percent of the student population to show student support.

Whereas, The referendum question was submitted to the CRO, and it was recorded that the petition did prompt a referendum, however, she deemed the question to be in violation of policies concerning clarity, and has submitted the following motion:

23/02/13.16

Mindi/Bihani

Be it resolved that the referendum question as presented was deemed ambiguous by the CRO, and necessitates further revision.

Pashelka recognized the need from students, but the timing of receiving the petition was the issue at hand.

Desjarlais wanted to know what was too vague?

Evans replied that though it was vetted by UBC legal, it would go back to the CRO, as per our policies, it was within her purview to determine whether the question was ambiguous or not. The other drawback operationally, was that the ten (10) percent would trigger the SUO holding a referendum for this question. If the CRO did not approve the question, it would be breaking our Regulations to approve at the Board level.

Halpin wanted to know if there would be feedback from the CRO.

Fedoruk directed her to reach out to the CRO, and that she would be able to provide clarification on changes she would suggest to decrease the ambiguity. She continued that the CRO was not against the referendum, a referendum would be prompted by the policies concerning petitioning, since they had received the threshold of student signatures necessary. No, there would be no need to gather student support again, however, the referendum question would still need to follow the regular processes of referendum questions – it could be run at the next possible SUO Elections, such as the By-Elections, she was unsure of the process for which the students could demand we hold a referendum not-concurrent with the Elections or By-Elections.

Ganesh wondered if the Referendum Handout that the Governance Coordinator made could be added to the SUO website, so that administrative issues would not in the future hold up student voices and increase clarity to the students.

Carried

4.2 Club Ratifications

23/02/13.17

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Comedy Association be ratified.

Bihani provided motivation.

Carried

23/02/13.18

Bihani/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the It's Lit Club be ratified.

Bihani provided motivation.

Carried

23/02/13.19

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that Bolt be ratified.

Bihani provided motivation.

Carried

23/02/13.20

Bihani/Johnston

Be it resolved that the Pre-Optometry Club be ratified.

Carried

23/02/13.21

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Boxing Club be ratified.

Carried

23/02/13.22

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Malaysian Student Association be ratified.

Carried

5. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 21:33

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Board of Directors Meeting, February 27th, 2023, UNC 105

Called to Order at 18:04

Directors Present

President	Jakson Pashelka
Vice-President External (meeting chair)	Cade Desjarlais
Vice President Finance and Administration	Vrushank Kekre
Vice-President Internal	Dhruv Bihani
Vice-President Campus Life	Danial Asif
Director-at-Large	Spandan Ghevriya
Graduate Studies Representative	Kirthana Ganesh
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Representative	Twinkle Hora
Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative	Hanna Donaldson
Faculty of Education Representative	Lindsay McGrail
Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative	Grace Halpin
Faculty of Management Representative	Jes Mindi
Faculty of Science Representative	Maziar Matin Panah
Board of Governors Representative (<i>ex-officio</i>)	Tashia Kootenayoo

Directors Absent

Faculty of Applied Science Representative	Akshata Pathak
Director-at-Large	Berat Celik
Director-at-Large	Aryam Dwivedi
Director-at-Large	Megan Johnston
Student Senate Caucus Representative (<i>ex-officio</i>)	Salman Hafeez (Saami)

Staff Present

Governance Coordinator	Bri Fedoruk
Well Manager	Michael Ouellet
General Manager	Jason Evans

Guests

Students Against Violence Everywhere President	Joban Soh
United Youth for Human Rights Communications Executive	Nikki Rai
United Youth for Human Rights President and Founder	Frank Marchesan
Fempowered President	Sharfenaz Mahabub

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY

We would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, 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

23/02/27.01

Bihani/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

23/02/27.02

Bihani/Ghevriya

Bihani moved to amend the agenda by adding a club ratification under "New Business:

Be it resolved the Hinduism Club be ratified."

23/02/27.03

Kekre/Asif

Kekre moved to amend the agenda by adding an item under "Discussion Items" called "RFP Survey Results."

Carried as amended

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/02/27.04

Ghevriya/Mindi

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held January 30th, 2023 be adopted.

23/02/27.05

Ganesh/Bihani

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held January 30th, 2023, be amended by adding Elizabeth Houghton's honoraria to the motion on GSC Honoraria which was previously adopted.

Carried as amended

23/02/27.06

Mindi/Donaldson

Be it resolved that the minutes of the Emergency meeting held February 13th, 2023 be adopted.

Kootenayoo wanted to bring forward a concern of the minutes in their entirety. She was not present for this meeting, so she relied heavily on the minutes to know what happened. The way the minutes were recorded could be problematic. What was written in the minutes was a little harsh, and she while this may be verbatim what was said, she found this concerning that we were not creating a clear narrative of what was happening instead, she felt that certain things were not okay to be recorded. She asked for a revised copy resubmitted for the next Board package meeting. She did not feel that this was

professional in the current state for the Membership to be reading.

Desjarlais asked if she was seeking a motion.

Kootenayoo stated she could not seek a motion.

Fedoruk noted that she had sought a motion, which she can do and any student can do, but she would need a voting member to second for the motion to be considered.

Desjarlais stated that since Kootenayoo was an ex-officio member, was there anyone on the Board to second Kootenayoo's point?

McGrail raised her hand, and mentioned she also was not at the meeting. She understood that they were meant to be a transcription to show what happened, and she sought a motion to revise the minutes. She asked if it were possible for there to be internal SUO minutes and external minutes?

Desjarlais reminded both absent directors that the meeting that they had missed was almost four (4) hours long. He felt that considering the importance of the meeting, and the subject matter, the minutes would reflect that.

Fedoruk responded that she was asked to keep a close transcription of the minutes by multiple Directors, and reminded directors that she still needed to know what they would like amended, if they would like to seek amendments, as per Robert's Rules of Order.

Kootenayoo replied that she would still like a motion to change the previous minutes because there was in-camera discussion held.

23/02/27.07

McGrail/Mindi

Be it resolved that the minutes of the emergency meeting held February 13th, 2023, be revised to provide a summary for the members, and to maintain an internal copy for the SUO Board of Directors.

Desjarlais stated that it was within Robert's Rule of Order for the Board to decide what they would like to disclose to their Members. While he did recognize that there were elements of in-camera topics being discussed, it was meant to be transparent because they were discussing the Referendum question, and the process behind the Referendum question, which was clearly stated. It was not about legal ramifications, labour discussions, or discussion about land. It would be up to the Board to decide what we should share with the membership.

Pashelka agreed with a summarized version being drafted, not because the detail was not important, but because of the names that were mentioned. He felt that it would be a poor reflection of the organization with some of the language used.

Amendment carried

Original motion tabled

4. PRESENTATIONS

4.1 Presentation from the Faculty of Education Representative

23/02/27.08

McGrail/Kekre

McGrail moved to table the presentation

Carried

4.2 FemPowered

23/02/27.09

Bihani/Asif

Bihani moved to table the presentation.

Carried

4.3 SAVE (Students Against Violence Everywhere)

Sohd, the Students Against Violence Everywhere President, presented a Powerpoint to the Board.

Ganesh asked for some contact information for the club.

Sohd provided his email: joban25sohd@gmail.com

4.4 United Youth for Human Rights

Marchesan and Rai presented a Powerpoint to the Board on the differences between their organization and an already ratified club, Amnesty International.

[Sharfenaz and Matin Panah entered at 18:51]

Ganesh wanted to know if they anticipated sticking with Education or expanding their topics?

Marchesan replied that they would be mostly focused on Education, but if they planned to expand, it would be something different from what was already being offered.

McGrail thanked them for coming out, and appreciated them making the differences between their work and Amnesty International's known.

Kootenayoo thanked them for their presentation, and wondered if in the future they could root their purpose in a more localized place.

Matin Panah asked for more detail on the collaboration between Amnesty International currently.

23/02/27.10

Asif/Mindi

Asif moved to reconsider the motion previously tabled: A presentation from FemPowered

Carried

4.5 FemPowered

Sharfenaz presented about the club, FemPowered.

Kootenayoo thanked the Member for their presentation, and wanted for further clarification on 'broad' or 'further.' From the Sex Positivity Club and Advocacy Centre, as

well as the Women's Resource Centre, are also board initiatives. She wanted in her own words, clarification on this.

Sharfenaz replied that by broad, it would cover anyone who identifies as a woman, and it would differ from a resource centre providing resources, but holding events.

Kootenayoo replied that the Member sounded passionate, and urged them to reach out to the Womens Resource Centre coordinator.

Kekre asked for further detail on the survey, and wondered if those being asked knew about the Women's Resource Centre as well.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.1 Executive Committee

23/02/27.11

Bihani/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held February 10th, 2023, be adopted.

23/02/27.12

Ganesh/Asif

Ganesh moved to amend the minutes by adding "of the Fencing Club" next to the words "treasurer."

Carried as amended

5.2 Finance Committee

No updates at this time.

5.3 Policy Committee

No updates at this time.

5.4 Campus Life Committee

23/02/27.13

Asif/Mindi

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held December 1st, 2022, be adopted.

Carried

23/02/27.14

Asif/Bihani

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 27th, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

Asif provided an update on the events that had occurred:

- February 1st The Office Trivia in the Well
- February 3rd Pajama Party in the Well
- February 10th All Ages Beach Party in the Well
- February 14th Valentines Cookie Event in Picnic
- February 15th Star Wars Trivia in the Well
- February 17th LASO presented their Brazilian Carnivale theme night at the Well

He continued that coming up:

- March 1st BCCU Bingo Night
- March 3rd March Madness Theme Party at the Well
- March 4th Neon Holi Party at the Well hosted by the ISA
- March 8th Comedy Hypnotist in the Well
- March 9th the Sexiest Game Show at the Well hosted by the Sex Positivity Centre
- March 10th ASA is hosting an event at the Well
- March 11th an All-Ages Party at the Well

Bigger events still under planning:

- Recess
- Concert and Carnival
- SHAG was now being done through the Campaigns Committee

5.5 Campaigns Committee

23/02/27.15

Desjarlais/Hora

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 24th, 2023, be adopted.

Ganesh wondered about 4.1 Mental Health Passport, she wanted to add the walk-in clinic.

Desjarlais asked what the contact should be?

Ganesh replied that she would be, as well as the UBC InterProfessional Clinic, ASC 167.

Carried

Desjarlais updated on the Parking Petition, there was a meeting set up with the VP Finance of UBCO, AVP Students, the Students' Advocate, as well as other stakeholders, to show the level of community support they had received. He continued on Asif's point, that the Campaigns Committee had taken over the planning of SHAG.

5.6 Oversight Committee

23/02/27.16

Mindi/Matin Panah

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 24th, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

McGrail provided a verbal update on the Oversight Committee. She mentioned that for all of the Executives, meeting the requirements during exam periods was difficult, and they were looking for ways to support the Executives during these periods. They were thinking of having the finalized Trimester Reports for the next Board of Directors meeting.

23/02/27.17

McGrail/Bihani

Be it resolved that the Executive Reports of December, be adopted as attached.

Desjarlais reiterated that the end of December was a busy time, and office hours were not well attended at that time of the year.

Carried

5.7 Graduate Student Committee

23/02/27.18

Desjarlais/Ganesh

Be it resolved that the adoption of minutes from the meeting held February 2nd, 2023, be tabled.

Carried

Ganesh provided a verbal update on the Graduate Student Committee. They were back doing office hours once a week, in ASC 460, as well as on zoom virtually. The schedule would be up on Instagram soon. March 4th at 5:00pm in the Ballroom there would be an event for Graduate Student Cultural Night to showcase their cultures, and she invited Board Members to attend to meet with Graduate Students in their faculties. They were working with the GSS, the Graduate Student Experience Office, and other offices, and would probably be the largest event the GSC would be hosting. She asked for students to come dressed up and have some fun.

5.8 Student Association Funding Committee

23/02/27.19

Kekre/Matin Panah

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 26th, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

23/02/27.20

Kekre/Matin Panah

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held February 3rd, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

Kekre updated the Board on the business of the committee thus far.

6. REPORT ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

6.1 Board of Governors

Kootenayoo updated that there was a second call for the Board of Governors Representative, her position, as she would not be running again.

McGrail wanted to know if a student graduated in December, would a student be able to serve a full term?

Kootenayoo replied yes, that student would be fine.

Matin Panah reiterated Kootenayoo's point, both the Senate and the Board of Governors were looking for candidates, and for the Board to consider participating, or getting other students involved in participating.

6.2 Senate

6.3 Other University Committees: Presidential Search Committee

Pashelka was asked to provide an update on the Presidential Search Committee. He was bound by confidentiality to abstain from letting out any more information than he had already given out, but he had recently received an email from their office and asked directors to fill it out.

6.4 Other University Committees: Graduate Student Advisory Committee

Ganesh provided an update concerning another university committee, the Graduate Student Advisory Committee, currently tasked with providing input for the ICI Building. They were looking for expressions of interest from different Graduate student labs, and she would be sharing more information about the search with the Board.

[Kootenayoo left at 19:35]

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 Snow Policy SC5 Committee Nomination

Pashelka updated that the committee was looking for a student to sit on this committee.

Desjarlais called for nominations from the Board.

Halpin nominated herself for the position, she was interested in working with UBC Legal.

23/02/27.21

Desjarlais/Halpin

Be it resolved that Grace Halpin be selected for appointment to the Snow Policy SC5 Committee.

Carried

7.2 Club Ratifications

23/02/27.22

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Needy Feelers & Associates be ratified.

Desjarlais asked for clarification and a brief description.

Bihani replied that this club was to cultivate connections between people and to embody psychological safety.

Ganesh asked what their qualifications were to discuss things like psychological safety? It would be unethical to administer things like this without appropriate training. She felt that faculty support like a course union would be beneficial.

Bihani replied this was a fair question, and that he would follow up with the club.

Desjarlais felt that the name and mission statements were unclear, and slightly troublesome, and he wondered if the club should return to the drawing board. He welcomed them returning next year with a more fleshed-out idea.

Motion failed

23/02/27.23

Bihani/Pashelka

Be it resolved that the Space Exploration Student Association be ratified.

Carried

23/02/27.24

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Marine Biology Club be ratified.

Carried

23/02/27.25

Bihani/Asif

Be it resolved that the Marine Design Club be ratified.

Matin Panah wanted to know why this was being proposed as two (2) separate clubs?

Bihani replied that he mentioned this to the clubs, but they wanted to propose separate groups to let the Board decide.

Pashelka agreed, it seemed too similar, and the club description they provided seemed too vague to make a decision to ratify separately.

Ganesh asked for further clarification, such as technology, biology, conservation, indigenous studies, before the Board made a decision on funding,

Motion tabled

23/02/27.26

Bihani/Pashelka

Bihani moved to table the motion of the ratification of the Marine Design club to the next meeting.

Carried

23/02/27.27

Bihani/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the Student Association of the Right to a Third Skin be ratified.

The Board asked for further clarification on the name chosen for the club.

McGrail added that a Street Art Club should be made aware that they would not be given permission to tag on campus.

Bihani replied that they would need to ask for permission prior to holding their events, and he and the Membership Outreach Coordinator would determine if the event being held was appropriate.

Desjarlais was concerned about the club purchasing spray paint, and this being traced back to the SUO.

Motion tabled

23/02/27.28

Ganesh/Mindi

Ganesh moved to table the ratification of the Student Association of the Right to a Third Skin until they address concerns regarding their current name.

Carried

23/02/27.29

Bihani/Asif

Be it resolved that the FemPowered Club be ratified.

Kekre felt this club was too close to a Resource Centre mandate. He also felt that the survey they provided did not allow students to know about the Women's Resource Centre.

Mindi agreed and felt that if the student was still passionate, she could return next year.

Ganesh replied that she was on board ratifying them for a couple of reasons, as much as

their goals seemed similar to our current Women's Resource Centre, it was more aimed at community building and creating more feminist spaces, which would be helpful. She also felt that if this was a club that students felt they needed, then a feminism club should be something that the students are allowed to pursue.

Evans replied that the Women's Resource Centre had been inactive for the past two (2) years, and there was a recent resignation. It would not be unique to have a Women's Resource Centre, as well as a club which could feed off of each other. He felt it would be beneficial to make up for the gaps present.

Asif replied that after hearing Evans' point, the club should be ratified. The statistics shared were alarming.

Carried

23/02/27.30

Bihani/Pashelka

Be it resolved that SAVE (Students Against Violence Everywhere) be ratified.

Carried

23/02/27.31

Bihani/Pashelka

Be it resolved that the United Youth for Human Rights Club be ratified

Carried

23/02/27.32

Bihani/Pashelka

Be it resolved that the Hinduism Club be ratified.

Carried

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 ASaferWalk

Pashelka updated that before the Reading Break he had a meeting concerning the current SafeWalk program. He wanted to bring this forward because there was some interest in the boundaries, and being limited to campus. The aim of this program was specifically targeted at those who identified as women. He saw value in this and wanted to bring it to the attention of the Board.

Ganesh wanted to know what the service would be?

Pashelka replied that it was an app, and it would allow people to connect with one another. It was an alternative to SafeWalk. Those who identified as male were disallowed from using the service.

Ganesh would like to see a presentation from the organization.

8.2 Transition Documents from Directors Transitioning Out of the SUO

Fedoruk asked the Directors to begin thinking about their transition documents, as it was part of the peaceful transition of power within a democratic organization.

Ganesh updated that things like roles and expectations, a list of projects, and contact information, would be helpful.

8.3 RPF Survey Results

Kekre discussed the survey results.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 20:36

EXECUTIVE MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Executive Meeting, March 3rd, 2023, UNC 105

Called to Order at 11:05

Directors Present

President (meeting chair)

Vice-President External

Vice-President Internal

Vice-President Campus Life

Vice President Finance and Administration

Jakson Pashelka

Cade Desjarlais

Dhruv Bihani

Danial Asif

Vrushank Kekre

Directors Absent

Staff Present

General Manager

Governance Coordinator

Jason Evans

Bri Fedoruk

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY

We would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, 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

23/03/03.01

Asif/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

23/03/03.02

Pashelka/Bihani

Be it resolved the motion dates be amended to today's date.

23/03/03.03

Pashelka/Asif

Pashelka moved to amend the agenda by adding a second in-camera session.

Carried as amended

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/03/03.04

Desjarlais/Bihani

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held February 10th, 2023 be adopted.

Carried

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 UBC Giving Day

Pashelka updated on this item. Each year there is a Giving Day that UBC hosts, and the SUO usually contributes some amount of funds. Options of areas to choose from were to do with: student affordability, the Perseverance Scholarship for students with disabilities, Indigenous Students Bursary for indigenous students and youth, and the Multi-Faith Space fund, which would be used to retrofit a new space for spiritual and multi-faith use. He asked the group what they felt we should contribute.

Asif felt the multi-faith space would be a good place to contribute to, it was currently too small for the number of members liking to participate in prayer, but cannot fit so do not, and they skip their prayers altogether.

The committee discussed, to no avail, where they should gather the funds for the contribution from.

Pashelka remarked that it would be helpful to have Kekre in attendance.

[Kekre entered 11:15]

The committee cheered.

Pashelka asked Kekre about where funds could be collected for the contribution?

Kekre summarized the different streams where contributions were distributed last year, and where we currently stood.

Desjarlais stated that due to funding Picnic and other services to make up for places where services are lacking at the moment, we were lacking in available funds.

Kekre replied that the goal was to lower the deficit at the moment.

The committee discussed how much they could redistribute collectively.

Kekre suggested on focusing on the amount they were comfortable contributing, rather than where they could squeeze money out of, since that would be happening anyways.

Desjarlais suggested that we show restraint this year, given the state of the budget.

23/03/03.05

Pashelka/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that five thousand (5,000) dollars be put forth towards the Multi-Spiritual space retrofitting for UBC Giving Day 2023.

Kekre asked what would happen to remaining funds if they receive more than they need for construction?

Pashelka replied that from his understanding, it would be put towards similar space in the future.

Desjarlais also noted that this was for Giving Day, and ask that they update us.

Pashelka replied he could write something to ask them to do this.

Carried

4.2 Board Honoraria

23/03/03.06

Pashelka/Kekre

Pashelka moved to table the honoraria in the following motion until all director reports had been received.

Carried

23/03/03.07

/

Be it resolved that the February Board of Directors honoraria be dispersed as follows:

Name	Title	
Kirthana Ganesh	Graduate Studies	
Akshata Pathak	Faculty of Applied Science	
Twinkle Hora	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	
Hanna Donaldson	Faculty of Creative and Critical Studies	
Lindsay McGrail	Faculty of Education	
Grace Halpin	Faculty of Health and Social Development	
Jes Mindi	Faculty of Management	
Maziar Matin Panah	Faculty of Science	
Aryam Dwivedi	Director-at-Large	
Berat Celik	Director-at-Large	
Megan Johnston	Director-at-Large	
Spandan Ghevriya	Director-at-Large	

Motion tabled

5. IN-CAMERA

5.1 In Camera Session 1

23/03/03.04

Kekre/Asif

Be it resolved the meeting be moved in-camera.

Carried

5.2 In Camera Session 2

23/03/03.05

Asif/Kekre

Be it resolved the meeting be moved in-camera.

Carried

6. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 12:25

CAMPAIGNS COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Campaigns Committee Meeting, February 28th, 2022, UNC 133 & Zoom

Called to Order at 13:02

Directors Present

Vice-President External (meeting chair)
Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative
Faculty of Science Representative
Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences Representative
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large

Cade Desjarlais
Hanna Donaldson
Maziar Matin Panah
Twinkle Hora
Ash Marin
Georgia Mayhew
VACANT

Directors Absent

Director-at-Large

Megan Johnston

Staff Present

Governance Coordinator
Students' Advocate
Communications Manager

Bri Fedoruk
Rachel Fortin
Becca Evans

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY

We would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, 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

23/02/28.01

Hora/Mayhew

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

Carried

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/02/28.02

Donaldson/Matin Panah

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held December 20th, 2022 be adopted.

Carried

23/02/28.03

Donaldson/Hora

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held January 24th, 2023 be adopted.

Carried

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 BCFS

Desjarlais updated that he decided not to attend the upcoming executive meeting, scheduled for March 17th, 2023. Our report for adoption will still be submitted, but the business of the schedule for our organization at the moment would be limiting our attendance.

4.2 Parking Update

Desjarlais updated that the parking Survey had received close to nineteen hundred (1900) signatures. A presentation was being prepared, and Desjarlais invited Fortin to attend.

Fortin accepted.

Desjarlais would be sending along the presentation to the committee prior to the meeting.

B. Evans wanted to know if the posters should be removed now?

Desjarlais replied that they could be taken down, and asked the committee to remove posters they saw as well.

4.3 Bussing Update

Desjarlais updated that part of his portfolio had been focused on bussing, and increasing support, and finding solutions. There were discussions surrounding next September's schedules. They were looking to establish a bi-annual meeting between all four (4) stakeholders of the U-Pass. He asked for interested committee members to let him know if they would like to attend.

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 Motionball Sponsorship

Mayhew introduced the National non-for-profit the Special Olympics. There was fundraising with a community event, and she participated last September with the Kelowna community event, and was now involved with the event on UBCO.

Desjarlais replied that they had discussed the Student Activist Fund, to assist with events such as this.

Mayhew stated that the date was March 25th, 10:00am – 2:00pm.

Desjarlais asked B. Evans to connect with Mayhew to begin promotion of that event.

5.2 Career Fair March 2nd

Desjarlais updated that the Career Fair was set for Thursday, March 2nd, 11:00am – 2:00pm in the EME. The SUO would have a booth. Desjarlais called for volunteers from the committee.

B. Evans would coordinate the volunteer list.

Desjarlais asked how to draw students to the table? There were going to be prizes. He outlined that the Communications Manager would be there to provide headshots for students' LinkedIn Profiles.

5.3 Support for Turkish and Syrian Students

Desjarlais stated that he had made a commitment to donate to certain affected populations. The fundraisers were to support earthquake relief.

6. NEW BUSINESS

6.1 Event for Iran

Matin Panah updated the committee on his idea to have an educational meeting or event to speak about Iran, and the events happening currently. He had spoken with a new transfer professor, whose specialty was the middle east. They would like to talk about general information of Iran, including the pronunciation, the geography, the history related to current events, and other contexts. He had a team of people working on the event. They would be moving on to the reality of Islam, with the support of the Muslim Student Association, to speak to that. They would like to speak about the current sanctions of the country, the resulting diaspora, and why there are so many individuals leaving the country. They would have another student speaking on the recent protests, and another section on the symbolism. They would also speak to possible solutions, generally, and as the UBCO community. Their team met every Saturday to work on the slides, but his group was wondering when the presentation would be held.

Desjarlais wanted to know what type of venue Matin Panah was interested in booking?
Matin Panah replied that Com 201, the large lecture hall.

Desjarlais replied that the time would be dependent on classes and availability. He wondered if there was a backup room in mind?

B. Evans replied that the SUO theatre had a decent amount of seats.

Desjarlais asked if there was a date range they had in mind?

Matin Panah replied that they would be fine with March, and they were hoping for a Friday, but they were good with almost any day.

Desjarlais stated he would follow up with the Membership Outreach Coordinator. He wondered if the last two (2) weeks of March would work? He asked if they would like SUO swag included? We could also make a poster, and depending on time, there could be tabling happening. Would Matin Panah like food as well?

Matin Panah replied that perhaps some snacks and drinks, but not a full meal to keep it educational.

Desjarlais stated that they would narrow down the date, and then they could work on the logistics of food and beverage. Should they start with an Eventbright?

B. Evans directed Desjarlais to ask Rusch or Ouellet for an Eventbright post.

Matin Panah was thinking from 6:00pm – 8:00pm. He wondered if there should be a limit on photographs because of the repercussions for families or individuals back home.

6.2 SHAG

Desjarlais updated on the Sexual Health Awareness Gala, scheduled for March 23rd, 11:00am – 2:30pm.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 13:50

GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Graduate Student Committee Meeting, February 2nd, 2023, Zoom

Called to Order at 17:06

Directors Present

Graduate Studies Representative
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large
Student-at-Large

Kirthana Ganesh
Dina Alkharabsheh
Anne Claret
Emily Comeau
Elizabeth Houghton
Nibirh Jawad
Morgan King
Fátima Canales

Directors Absent

Vice-President Internal
Student-at-Large

Dhruv Bihani
Vikas Kumar

Staff/Guests Present

Governance Coordinator

Bri Fedoruk

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

23/02/02.01

Jawad/Comeau

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

23/02/02.02

King/Alkharabsheh

King moved to amend the agenda by adding an Information Item called "GSC Office Hours"

23/02/02.03

King/Jawad

King moved to amend the agenda by adding a New Business item called "Possible Rest Event"

23/02/02.04

Ganesh/King

Ganesh moved to amend the agenda by adding two New Business items called "Graduate Cultural Event" and "Election nominations."

Carried as amended

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/02/02.05

King/Jawad

Be it resolved that minutes of the meeting held January 19th, 2023 be adopted.

Carried

4. INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 GSC/GSS Meeting Updates

Comeau updated that they had met with GSS Executives on the past Monday. They had been planning an event for March 2nd, but Claret and herself were thinking that it may be better to postpone to decide on a shared goal. She wondered if we could schedule an event that they could attend, rather than making an event surrounding their attendance.

Ganesh wondered how the committee felt about postponing the initial advocacy event that had been planned.

The committee was all right with this.

She continued by asking if the committee would be all right with inviting them to a GSC focused event, rather than a shared event.

The committee agreed upon this as well.

Jawad replied it could be as simple as having some pizza to say hi. He wondered when the Cultural Event she had added to the agenda was planned for?

Ganesh replied, March, it would align nicely.

[Canales entered 17:19]

Jawad wondered what the food situation would be at the Cultural Event? If there was dinner, we could invite them to that.

Ganesh reiterated about the turnover after elections, and continuing communication between the GSS and GSC.

Claret replied that some of this would be up to them, they would have to leave their predecessors with a trail to pick up on with us. She continued that we would have to do the same.

Ganesh stated that she would leave a transition document for the next College of Graduate Studies position. She asked the committee for help with leads and information.

Graduate Committee Members expressed frustration that the GSS continues interactions with the SUOs Vice-President External without updating the GSC or the College of Graduate Studies Representative.

4.2 Parking Advocacy Campaign

Ganesh updated on the meeting she had with Desjarlais, the Vice-President External. He was running a Parking Petition Campaign, it got one thousand (1000) signatures within the first day. She urged the committee to write their concerns, as they were compiling it to share with campus Facilities.

Alkharabsheh replied that this was important for students. Fines were expensive, even for a small infraction.

Ganesh replied that they were looking at making the situation more equitable with a fee-sharing system or something of the like.

Alkharabsheh restated that perhaps it was not parking specific, but transportation in general required some advocacy.

4.3 Positive Space Committee Events

Ganesh gave a heads up that the Positive Space Committee had shared with her some events, like Drag shows in Penticton and Black History Month Events. She mentioned that if anyone was interested in being a part of the Positive Space Committee, they were welcome to join. They met once a month, with as much time commitment as one could or wanted to give. She could cc' anyone interested in their email list if they would like.

4.4 GSC Office Hours

Ganesh replied that she would be getting to this item this weekend.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Possible Rest Event

King updated that there was a Rest as Resistance Event at the library. It was based on a book she liked. With the idea that every single Graduate Student she had met was not rested at all, she thought we could rent the yoga room, and rest.

Alkharabsheh agreed that this would be a lovely idea.

Canales offered her services as a yoga instructor.

Ganesh agreed and added that this would be a good event to hold at this time of year.

King asked, February or March?

Ganesh replied that early March or late February would be best.

Alkharabsheh responded that a recurring event may be nice.

King replied that she would take the lead, and keep it simple.

Canales offered to assist.

5.2 Graduate Cultural Event

Ganesh updated that previous facilitators had run an event like this in the past. It was a social opportunity to share culture. There was a tentative booking for March 5th. The GSC was expected to support with funding, publicity, and managing the event the day of.

[Canales exited 17:56]

5.3 Election Nominations

Ganesh and Fedoruk updated the committee on getting the word out there for student nominees. Ganesh urged the committee to foster interest in the position. She asked if they did not know her, what would you like to know in order to better attend?

King replied, money, how much time, and the impact the student could make.

Comeau echoed time commitments being pretty important for Graduate Students.

Jawad replied that focusing on impact would be the best way to get nominees.

Ganesh wondered the best way to present these ideas?

Fedoruk let the committee know about the Information Session that the SUO would be having on February 9th for the elections.

Ganesh asked for support creating posts.

Alkharabsheh replied she could help tentatively. She could make the post and then give to King to post?

King agreed.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 18:27

GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Graduate Student Committee Meeting, February 16th, 2023, Zoom

Called to Order at 17:06

Directors Present

Graduate Studies Representative (*chair*)

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

President

Kirthana Ganesh

Anne Claret

Emily Comeau

Elizabeth Houghton

Nibirh Jawad

Morgan King

Vikas Kumar

Fátima Canales

Jakson Pashelka

Directors Absent

Student-at-Large

Vice-President Internal

Dina Alkharabsheh

Dhruv Bihani

Staff/Guests Present

Governance Coordinator

Bri Fedoruk

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TERRITORY

We would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded, 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

23/02/16.01

Kumar/Comeau

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

23/02/16.02

King/Ganesh

King moved to amend the agenda by adding an item called "Rest is Resistance Event" to the "Old Business" section of the agenda.

Carried as amended

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/02/16.03

Kumar/Houghton

Be it resolved that minutes of the meeting held February 2nd, 2023 be adopted.

Carried

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Office Hours

Ganesh asked the committee for support in adjusting the office hours schedule. She asked the committee where they would like to hold their office hours.

King replied that the Collegium was still good.

Ganesh replied that Alkharabsheh has said that some Graduate Students were having difficulty because of a lack of Salto access. It did, however, seem convenient.

King replied she did not know where else they would be able to meet.

Ganesh replied that it was getting sunnier, and it may be nice to continue to meet in the collegium. She thought they could do one (1) Instagram post for tomorrow. Those who did not have access could join remotely. She continued that there was some merch left, they did not need a lot because it would be virtual. She asked if they wanted to do a raffle? She asked if anyone opposed?

No one was opposed.

Ganesh continued that we should talk about the Election if anyone attended the office hours.

Comeau replied that we were trying to drum up engagement.

Ganesh was attempting to do the virtual equivalent of what they did during office hours.

King asked for suggestions for social media posts from the committee.

Ganesh wondered if Canales would be able to swap hours with Ganesh after she entered the meeting.

4.2 Graduate Cultural Event

Ganesh and Jawad had a meeting with Shabir, our coordinator. The plan was a little ambitious, but it was still fairly well preserved. At the moment, they have applied for the intercultural development fund. They have not heard back yet.

Jawad updated that the event would be in the ballroom. Last year there were performances by the students; there was also trivia. There were more requests as the event evolved. The more people that show up and get involved, the more successful it would be.

Ganesh replied that the layout would be similar, encouraging cultural outfits, in the spirit, for the event, the great equalizer, pizza. She continued, there was discussion about a costume for those attending the event to wear, some decorations.

Comeau asked, last meeting, we wanted to invite GSS, would we still like to for this? She confirmed 5:00pm, March 4th. They had spoken about doing something at lunch, but that might be late, so perhaps breakfast?

Ganesh wondered if we should invite them to the event, and have the networking thing the next day in the morning?

Claret stated that if they were planning on flying in the next day, it may be easier in the morning so we do not rush them on Tuesday.

Ganesh asked if anyone opposed to doing a brunch or something the next morning?

Jawad stated that because it had already been communicated, they could still be included, they should be allowed to come and leave when they would like to leave they could leave.

Ganesh said that she would invite the other Directors of the Board as well.

4.3 Election Update

Ganesh asked the students-at-large to share the election information on their own media in their own groups, she felt there was great momentum as graduate students, and it would be great to continue it next SUO Board term. She asked for the members to send along her email, her number, any of her contact information. She had started working on the transition document, and planning to work on it over reading break, and then sending along a draft to the committee.

4.4 Rest is Resistance Event

King updated that not much has happened other than that she had reached out to the Grad student in charge, but she had not heard back. She thought she would go ahead and reference them. She felt it would be good for the end of March.

Ganesh replied that the ending of the week but not the end of the week for the end of March.

King wondered whether it should be 4:00pm or 5:00pm?

Ganesh replied 4:00pm.

King asked about duration, and suggested one (1) hour?

Ganesh replied, experiential, perhaps ninety (90) minutes.

King replied she wanted to chat about the book, then chat with Canales about her yoga instruction, perhaps to walk us through a meditation.

Ganesh replied that they could keep a relatively short agenda for the GSC meeting. She asked if there was anything they needed such as equipment?

King replied she was hoping to use the yoga room in the Hangar.

Ganesh wondered about hot chocolate?

King replied that she was thinking of Tim Hortons.

Ganesh suggested hitting up UBC Yoga Club for yoga mats.

Claret suggested having a dairy-free option for hot chocolate.

Ganesh suggested asking Tim Hortons if they had a dairy-free option.

Comeau suggested tea.

Houghton thought that we could ask people to bring their own mugs.

King and Ganesh both had kettles in their offices they could bring.

King would get some tea bags.

Ganesh reminded her to keep receipts.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Building Referendum Update

Ganesh updated on the last SUO Board meeting. If the committee remembered, the last SUO referendum question. There was a massive yes. This then meant there would need to be a referendum question to raise fees. There were concerns about the lack of updates on the meetings. She, along with other Board members, voted against the question being asked in this election session. She added context for her opposition.

Pashelka provided some details on the Emergency Board meeting.

Ganesh wanted the committee to know she was thinking of what others thought when she cast her vote, including all of them.

5.2 Recreation Facility Referendum Update

Ganesh updated on the Faculty of Health and Social Development Representative presented a petitioned referendum. She asked for the creation of a Recreation Facility.

5.3 IGS Conference

King asked for anyone interested to put in a proposal on cross-curricular conversations. One could talk about their research using different disciplines, or one could speak on interdisciplinarity.

Ganesh asked if interdisciplinary sciences could join?

King replied that they could, yes.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 18:08

GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Graduate Student Committee Meeting, March 2nd, 2023, Zoom

Called to Order at 17:05

Directors Present

Graduate Studies Representative (*chair*)

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Student-at-Large

Kirthana Ganesh

Anne Claret

Emily Comeau

Elizabeth Houghton

Morgan King

Vikas Kumar

Dina Alkharabsheh

Nibirh Jawad

Fátima Canales

Directors Absent

President

Vice-President Internal

Jakson Pashelka

Dhruv Bihani

Staff Present

Governance Coordinator

Bri Fedoruk

Guests Present

Student Member

Anjali Desai

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

23/03/02.01

Vikas/Jawad

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

23/03/02.02

Houghton/King

Houghton moved to amend the agenda to add a "New Business" item called "Bob Ross Night."

23/03/02.03

Ganesh/King

Ganesh moved to amend the agenda to add an item called "Election Updates" under "Old Business."

Carried as amended

3. OLD BUSINESS

3.1 GSS Visit – Cultural Event and Brunch

Comeau updated that there were four (4) GSS Executives coming to the event. There were some children coming, it would be a family-friendly event. She wondered about brunch, and whether we wanted to make a reservation.

Claret wondered if the brunch portion would be a professional event with only shop talk, or if would it include families as well.

Comeau wanted to have a venue with multiple food options for flexibility.

King wondered what time?

[Canales entered at 17:17]

Comeau replied tentatively 11:00am for brunch?

King counted eleven (11) of the committee interested in attending so far. She thought it would be a good idea to get the Vancouver counterpart to confirm a ballpark number attending.

Comeau asked if people would be bringing cultural food to the event?

The committee replied yes, it was optional.

Ganesh updated that there were some grocery cards and swag to give away at the event.

Comeau asked for suggestions for events.

The committee gave suggestions:

- Mini golf
- Scandia
- Mission Creek walk
- Myra Canyon
- Snowshoeing at Telemark
- Rosevalley Canyon – has a beautiful frozen lake at the moment
- Skating downtown

Ganesh updated that registration had been maxed out. There would be non-vegetarian and vegetarian food. She invited the Board in the last Board meeting to come if they wanted to attend. We should expect to speak on the GSC a little. The GSC can fund the events they were planning to throw with the GSS. She asked members to attend. The event was planned for 5:00pm, but if anyone wanted to show up for 4:30pm for set up, that would be appreciated.

3.2 Rest is Resistance Event

King asked Jawad if he had heard back from a contact?

Jawad had not.

King was looking to hear from the Membership Outreach Coordinator. The event would be the last Thursday of the month, March 30th, 3:00pm-4:30pm, at the Hangar in studio one (1). She was in contact with a researcher who focuses on rest as resistance. Canales would lead a meditation. There would be some reflective questions with tea, and wrap up with asking what people could do to rest in the future. They just needed confirmation on the insurance. She asked the committee for thoughts.

Ganesh replied that they may already have some tea

3.3 Election

Ganesh asked the committee to encourage students to vote, but reminded students-at-large that they cannot campaign, or be perceived to campaign for any current candidates running.

[Desai entered at 17:41]

The committee made introduction rounds.

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Bob Ross Night

Houghton wanted to hold a painting evening, sometime in May or June.

Comeau replied that they had lots of art supplies at the moment.

Ganesh felt that would be a good idea.

Comeau replied that the BBQ which was in the summer went well.

Ganesh responded that depending on what Houghton would like to do, we could add to the ambiance with better supplies.

King asked if there could be funding allocated for a student-led conference?

Houghton continued that they were thinking to use the Collegium at the end of May.

4.2 Family-Friendly Event in May

Alkharabsheh wanted to know if May was an alright time to have a family-friendly event.

Ganesh felt it would be nice to space out the events through May, June, and July.

Alkharabsheh also updated that there would be a childcare meeting next week, and she could invite anyone interested in joining if they let her know their interest.

4.3 Student-at-Large Stepping Down

Fedoruk asked Kumar to submit a letter when he had decided on stepping down, and when he would like that to take effect. She also asked him to pass along any transition documents to her, so she may add them to the shared drive.

Ganesh invited Kumar to the meeting with University officials on Monday for transition logistics.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 18:20

OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Oversight Committee Meeting, February 10th, 2023 Teams

Called to Order at 18:01

Directors Present

Faculty of Education Representative (chair)
Director-at-Large
Student-at-Large

Lindsay McGrail
Spandan Ghevriya
Osho Gnanasivam

Directors Absent

Board of Governors Representative (ex-officio)

Tashia Kootenayoo

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

23/02/10.01

Gnanasivam/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

Carried

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/02/10.02

McGrail/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the minutes of the meeting held January 24th, 2023 be adopted.

Carried

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Updating the reporting process

No updates at this point.

4.2 Updates on ongoing investigation

The anonymous complaint was pulled on January 25th, 2023. The Oversight Committee has officially ceased investigation.

23/02/10.03

Gnanasivam/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the investigation be formally closed.

Carried

5. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

5.1 January reports

23/02/10.04

McGrail/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the January executive reports be adopted as attached.

Carried

It was noted that Danial's report was late, but was remained within the grace period. Two (2) executives, Pashelka and Kekre, reported more than their required hours. The Oversight Committee would like to remind the executives that they are only accountable for their defined hours. However, if this was a way of balancing the missed hours in December, then the committee recognizes your efforts and diligence.

5.2 Trimester report updates.

This was in progress. The committee was working on a format to make universal.

6. DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 Meeting request and next meeting date.

The committee would be meeting with the President. The chair would reach out once more to find a date and date.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 18:27

SUO Executive Monthly Summary

Name: Jakson Pashelka

Report Month: January 2023

Did you fulfil your hours requirement each week?

Yes, I exceeded my requirements by averaging around 30 hours per week

If no, which week did you not fulfil your hours requirement and why?

n/a

ACTIVITIES COMPLETED THIS PERIOD

- January Board meeting(s)
- Presidential Search Committee Meeting
- Executive Meeting
- CRO Hiring Committee Meetings x2
- SUO Building Fundraising Meeting
- Building Steering Committee Meetings x4
- AVPS Meetings (3) – Dale Mullings building discussions
- Student Affordability Task Force
- UBC Alumni – How can they support are future events?
- Trimester Review from OS Committee
- Indigenous Language Fluency St'at'imc Degree Meeting
- Safewalk Upgrade Opportunity Meeting

ACTIVITIES IN PROGRESS

- *Building Steering Committee – Finalizing details*
- *Collective Bargaining to begin in the next two weeks*

SUO Executive Monthly Summary

Name: Muhammad Danial Asif

Report Month: January 2023

Did you fulfil your hours requirement each week?

No

If no, which week did you not fulfil your hours requirement and why?

I was away on approved leave from the 9th till the 17th of January as I had gone to see my family back in my home country.

ACTIVITES COMPLETED THIS PERIOD

- Met with UBC to discuss recess
- Attended the executive committee meeting
- Met with Kelowna RCMP to discuss the policing for the recess concert
- Attended the board of directors meeting
- Met with career development team to discuss the career fair and its launch
- Chaired the campus life committee meeting
- Met with the booking company for potential acts for recess and speakers for the speaker series
- Office hours
- Implemented the office trivia at the well
- Met with Indian student association to discuss a collaboration for Bollywood night
- Office hours
- Implemented the harry potter trivia at the well
- Attended the academic integrity advisory group meeting

ACTIVITIES IN PROGRESS

- *Working with Michael Oulette to ensure that we are well planned for the events in the school year in terms of logistics.*
- *Working with the campus life committee and the cultural clubs for harmony*
- *Working with the booking company for potential speakers to bring to UBCO*

ISSUES FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

- *Start promotion of the silent disco party*

ACTIVITIES TO BE STARTED

- *Waiting on UBC's approval to start the promotion of the Recess concert*
- *Promotion of the career fair*

NOTES / OTHER

SUO Executive Monthly Summary

Name: Dhruv Bihani

Report Month: January 2023

Did you fulfil your hours requirement each week?

Yes I did full fill the requirement of each week.

If no, which week did you not fulfil your hours requirement and why?

ACTIVITES COMPLETED THIS PERIOD

- Attended Executive committee meeting
- Planning of career fair (to be held in March) – Decided about the giveaway swags. The place is also finalized and the companies coming will be finalized soon.
- Student association orientation- (Helped organize it. Also gave a presentation about elections and building referendum)
- Attended building committee meeting. Decided on 60000 sq feet building. The breakdown of the fees structure as well.
- Ratified a few clubs
- De-ratified badminton club. Met with Izzy and Vrushank to decide on how to approach the problem
- Helped Izzy conduct the expo.
- Attended my office hours. Met with a few students who had doubts regarding elections.
- Attended Student association funding committee. Decided on giving how much funding to the clubs
- Discussed a few policies for SA with Izzy. (Still need to implement though)

ACTIVITIES IN PROGRESS

- *Planning of career fair (career fair happening on the 3^d march, how the suo can help plan)*
- *Planning of the events for February and march (harmony, valentine cookie decoration,etc)*
- *Student association policy discussion*
- *Capital purchase policy discussion*
- *Badminton club issues for their membership fees*

ACTIVITIES IN PROGRESS

ISSUES FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

- *Badminton club issues since their members are complaining about refunding the membership fees*
- *Referendum question to be presented to the board*
- *SA policies as we have exceeded the number of SA*

ACTIVITIES TO BE STARTED NOTES / OTHER

- *Regulation on Media fund committee*
- *Review of a few club application to be ratified. Can only be done in the next board meeting*
- *Policy committee meeting. (SA policies and capital purchase)*

SUO Executive Monthly Report

Name: Cade Desjarlais

Report Month: January 2023

Outline the hours fulfilled for each week within the reporting month.

25 hours per week. Return to work January 9th, 2023

Provide an explanation for the particular week(s) in which you did not fulfill the required hours.

ACTIVITIES COMPLETED THIS PERIOD

- 4 weeks of office hours with students (Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays)
- Meeting with Mayor Dyas to discuss student transit and security concerns.
- Exec Review
- Mealshare and Picnic Meeting with Casey Hamilton to discuss the ins and outs of Mealshare
- Student Affordability Task Force Meeting
- Board Meeting
- Met with UBC Govt Relations to discuss the ongoing concerns surrounding the Right to Life Society
- BCFS AGM (Thursday – Sunday)...participated in meetings and seminars
- Campaigns Committee meeting
- Meeting with Governance Coordinator
- Picnic Grand Opening and writing of speech
- Picnic Cook off!
- Career Fair Planning Member
- Board of Directors Meeting
- Launched the Parking Services Petition and put up posters
- Interview with Capital News
- Published and wrote the Open Letter to the Board of Governors

ISSUES FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

- *February 6th BC Transit Meeting*

NOTES / OTHER

- *I feel like this was one of my most busy months of work and yet my report seems to be one of my shorter ones. The problem with this is that there is no way to properly communicate timelines.*

SUO Executive Monthly Summary

Name: Vrushank Kekre

Report Month: January 2023

Did you fulfil your hours requirement each week?

- More than 25 hours per week

If no, which week did you not fulfil your hours requirement and why?

n/a

ACTIVITIES COMPLETED THIS PERIOD

- Student Association regulations Discussion with Dhruv and Izzy
- Trimester Executive meeting with the oversight committee
- BOD meetings
- Finance Committee meeting
- Executive committee meetings
- Meetings with finance manager
- Building steering committee meetings
- Meetings with the UBC exec regarding the building
- Meeting with postsecondary coordinator from the students experience office
- SA Orientation
- Meeting about the UBCSUO business reviews with the general manager
- Meetings about planning for the green bean space
- Student Association Funding Committee meetings
- Meeting with Ballroom dance club in regard to their funding application
- Badminton club meeting regarding the breach of regulations
- Meeting interviews with the Proposed businesses for Green Bean Space.
- Meeting with IDS for their club funding application
- Meeting with tum est coordinator to explore SA funding options
- Meeting with motorsports club regarding the club funding application
- Meeting with Bhangra club regarding their club funding application
- Office Hours

ACTIVITIES IN PROGRESS

- looking at methods to increase SUO Revenue (In lines with food services)
- YTD Reviews with the executives, also preparing an expense tracker for the executives
- Looking into activating Legacy fund
- Reviewing contracts of the SUO run businesses.
- Selection of business for green bean space
- Building steering committee

ISSUES FOR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

-

ACTIVITIES TO BE STARTED

-

NOTES/OTHER

With the activities accomplished presented above, there were many meetings with the General Manager and the Finance Manager about the Finances and the Membership outreach coordinator in regard to club fundings and improvements in regulations. There were many instances when I was in office outside of my office hours.