

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC

Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students

Board of Directors Meeting, January 30th, 2023, UNC 105

Called to Order at 18:12

Directors Present

Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative (chair)	Grace Halpin
President	Jakson Pashelka
Vice-President External	Cade Desjarlais
Vice President Finance & Administration	Vrushank Kekre
Vice-President Internal	Dhruv Bihani
Vice-President Campus Life	Danial Asif
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 & Social Sciences Representative	Twinkle Hora
Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative	Hanna Donaldson
Faculty of Education Representative	Lindsay McGrail
Faculty of Management Representative	Jes Mindi
Faculty of Science Representative	Maziar Matin Panah
Student Senate Caucus Representative (ex-officio)	Salman Hafeez (Saami)

Directors Absent

Board of Governors Representative (ex-officio)	Tashia Kootenayoo
Director-at-Large	Berat Celik

Staff Present

General Manager	Jason Evans
Governance Coordinator	Bri Fedoruk
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.

Donaldson gave a different acknowledgement than usually made at Board of Director's meetings. She acknowledged that this meeting was taking place on unceded, and ancestral territory of the Syilx-Okanagan people. She, personally, had been reflecting on what it meant to be an uninvited guest to learn here, and noted what a privilege it was to learn about the people who still reside here today. She invited the Board to think about their positionality, and called for the Board to make changes in the way that land acknowledgments are made during meetings. She suggested that we take turns as a Board to make these acknowledgments.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEMBERSHIP

23/01/30.01

Ganesh/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

23/01/30.02

Pashelka/Asif

Pashelka moved to amend the agenda by adding the words "President's Advisory Committee Nominations and Appointment" after "5.3 Other University Committees."

Carried

23/01/30.03

Fedoruk/Desjarlais

Fedoruk moved to amend the agenda by adding another Discussion Item called "7.3 Candidates Information Session: Week of Feb. 6th – 10th."

Carried

23/01/30.04

Kekre/Matin Panah

Kekre moved to amend the agenda by adding a Presentation item called "December Quarterly Investment Report."

Carried

23/01/30.05

Bihani/Mindi

Bihani moved to add a point under "New Business" called "Club Ratification."

Carried as amended

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

23/01/30.06

Donaldson/Bihani

Be it resolved that minutes of the meeting held January 16th, 2023 be adopted.

Carried

4. PRESENTATIONS

4.1 December Quarterly Investment Report

Kekre streamed the December Quarterly Investment Report to the Board and provided an update. He reflected on many of the results being a reflection of the economic situation of the world at the moment.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.1 Executive Committee

23/01/30.07

Mindi/Matin Panah

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 20th, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

23/01/20.08

Mindi/Donaldson

Be it resolved that the Executives' budget for campus relations be increased from six hundred (600) to one thousand (1000) dollars per executive term.

Desjarlais wanted to know why this needed Board approval, since it was within the Executive Committee portfolio to make decisions such as these.

Fedoruk outlined that any motion made by committees needed to be brought to the Board.

Evans replied that it was not budgeted for, so the Board would need to give approval for the unbudgeted amount.

Kekre noted that the amount was technically already budgeted, but it was being centralized. This would be a better way of representing it, it was from the already existing lines of Campus Life, Club Development, External Advocacy, and this would be more of a structure for next year's Board.

Ganesh thought that unless it was a violation of policy, it would be better to pass

this through the Board because it would be odd for Executives to pass things like this to do with the budget on their own. It felt more ethical this way.

Desjarlais responded that the only issue was that if the motion failed, it would hold no water.

Fedoruk asked why it would hold no water?

Desjarlais replied that because the Executive Committee held the power to make those decisions.

Fedoruk again answered that the Board had the power to overturn any decision made by any committee, including those made by the Executive Committee.

Desjarlais insisted that a policy would need to be in place to make a motion to change.

Fedoruk responded that she needed to write down the motions that were made in meetings, and this motion was made, unprompted, in a meeting that Desjarlais did not attend, so she was bringing the motion to the Board, as she does for each of the other committees.

Smailes stated that even if there was no policy requiring Board approval, she appreciated the transparency the Executives were showing by bringing this to the Board. Reallocations less than ten (10) percent do not need Board approval.

Pashelka mentioned that approving the motion would increase transparency and provide better insight for future executives and Boards.

Kekre and Johnston agreed with Desjarlais that they should move to table the discussion until the next meeting.

Pashelka called the question on the previously pending motion.

Carried

Ganesh asked for an incorporation of the context to be taken of the discussion that transpired from the audio recording for future students on the Board.

5.2 Finance Committee

23/01/30.09

Mindi/Asif

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 18th, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

5.3 Policy Committee

No updates to report at the moment.

5.4 Campus Life Committee

Asif updated the Board on the events that have occurred during the last two (2) weeks, as well as the projected events for the upcoming two (2) weeks:

- Cookies & Consent Jan. 20th + 27th
- All Ages Party Jan. 14th
- Harry Potter Trivia Jan. 18th
- 19+ Festival Dance Party Jan. 27th
- Bollywood Night Jan. 28th
- The Office Trivia Feb. 1st
- Pajama Party Feb. 3rd
- Queer Night Trivia Feb. 9th
- All Ages Valentine's Day Theme Feb. 10th
- Super Bowl Feb. 12th
- Valentines Cookie Event Feb. 14th

Ouellet called for some volunteers from the board, and to let himself or Asif know if they could be available.

5.5 Campaigns Committee

Desjarlais updated on the Parking Petition: What the Park that the Campaigns Committee started. The point behind this was to reduce parking fees, reduce parking tickets, and increase the U-Pass subsidy to help offset the costs. He called for signatures. The response of the Board of Governors from our open letter, we were still waiting for. He continued on an update on Harmandeep Kaur's memorial, which was coming to fruition.

Ganesh asked if students who had input about parking should still be sent along to the VP External's email?

Desjarlais asked for comments to be made on the petition, it would help there a lot more.

Ganesh asked for a description of Picnic.

Desjarlais stated that Picnic was a space attempting to tackle food insecurity in a comprehensive and holistic way. It focused on mental health, events that would broaden their network, and a focus on healthy eating. It was a place to go to get resources. He directed further questions to the Food Security and Nutrition Manager. He would also be sending an information card to the whole Board.

5.6 Oversight Committee

McGrail updated the Board on the Trimester Review meetings. They were working on refining the reporting process. She asked the directors to please continue to add comments for them to look into. They would be submitting three (3) sets of minutes to the next Board meeting. Office hours had been received and posted.

5.7 Graduate Student Committee

23/01/30.10

Donaldson/Bihani

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

Carried

Ganesh updated on the past meeting. Graduate students, especially international students, were looking for some resources to assist with taxes. The GSC was creating a list with free resources for students. She updated the GSC that elections were coming up and urged them to apply for her position.

Ouellet wanted to know if Ganesh was aware of the UBCO SUO tax clinic. It had been gone for a while because of the pandemic. He asked her to touch base with the Project Manager. The Board room usually becomes a tax clinic in February and March. The international students were the largest group who utilize the clinic.

Evans echoed what Ouellet stated, and added that a call for a professional had been made and posted. There would be a tax clinic this year.

Ghevriya replied that she thought this would be a great idea, since she knew many students who needed help.

23/01/30.11

Bihani/Ghevriya

Be it resolved that graduate student honoraria be disbursed as follows:

Nibirh Jawad	\$100
Anne Claret	\$100
Vikas Kumar	\$100
Dina Khrabsheh	\$100
Morgan King	\$50
Emily Comeau	\$100
Fatima Canales	\$50
Elizabeth Houghton	\$100

McGrail wondered if the money came from the Graduate Student budget?

Ganesh replied, yes, they budget for two (2) meetings a month, per term.

Carried

5.8 CRO Hiring Committee

23/01/30.12

Bihani/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held January 17th, 2023, be adopted.

Carried

5.9 Building Steering Committee

23/01/30.13

Bihani/Akshata

Be it resolved that the report from the meeting held January 20th, 2023, be adopted.

Desjarlais replied that judging from the minutes, it looked like this was not on schedule, and it looks like there had been some gaps. He was unsure where, but the committee itself appears to be behind what the Board had mandated them to do, and he was disappointed. He was still unsure if we were on track for a referendum question for this next cycle. He urged the committee to share if this was the case now, rather than later.

McGrail asked if we knew how much UBC was giving. She was having a hard time advocating to anyone in her faculty without knowing what UBC was contributing.

Carried

Pashelka provided an update on the Building Steering Committee progress to date. Prior to the break, they were a working group rather than a formal committee. For a while they were waiting on UBC Facilities to get back to us. We were wondering about what the space would look like, how much space they were willing to give us. They had met fairly briefly, they met with Walliser to get some renderings done. They were spending some money on getting renderings done to present to the students. They were a little behind, it was true. Those from UBC provided their reasoning for not being able to contribute the twenty-five (25) percent that we had originally requested, based off of what was provided to the AMS. UBC currently did not have the capital to provide what we were asking for with the beginning of construction of the two other buildings on campus. There would be another meeting on Wednesday to confirm what their contribution would be. They had just had a meeting previous to this Board meeting. He outlined what students could expect per semester, and then what they could expect as an increase. After that, they would be sending the referendum question to the lawyer. He was also hesitant to hold a referendum while not knowing what the specifics of the contribution from UBC would be. With the appointment of our CRO, we would be able to work on this further.

McGrail asked if the referendum question gets put through, and it gets answered no, it would be no, correct?

Pashelka replied yes, we would be able to hold one the following year.

Fedoruk replied that while this was the case, holding consecutive referenda could confuse the student body, and reduce the campaigning power. All of the documents and rational we could provide regarding the building was part of the motivation towards the building. This was part of the style that Board members could put into their political terms.

McGrail asked then, could they hold off on asking the question until they felt more ready to present to the student body?

Fedoruk replied that the Board could hold a referendum whenever the Board felt ready to pose a question to the student body.

Pashelka replied that UBC did not provide with us a contribution up to our standard. We would be completing Phase Three (3) of the process by the end of the term this semester. At that point we could remove some of the weight from student fees.

6. REPORT ON UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

6.1 Board of Governors

6.2 Senate

Hafeez updating on the first meeting of the Senate, January 26th. February would be Black History month. There would be more announcement updates from the provost and the DVC office. He had updates regarding several indigenous related programs, approved and forwarded to the Board for approval, a part of UBC's Strategic Indigenous Plan. There was a Syilx Okanagan Leadership award, for students interested in pursuing indigenous language courses on our campus. They approved the dates of the next year for 2023/2024.

6.3 Other University Committees: President's Advisory Committee Nominations and Appointment

23/01/30.14

Mindi/Asif

Be it resolved that Desjarlais be appointed to sit on the President's Advisory Committee.

Pashelka told the Board that there was a new policy for the Provost, which governs the way that appointments are done for the membership of the committee. He was approach by the Executive Assistant of the Provost to appoint a student to sit on this committee. The duration would be for the rest of the school year, and it would consist of reviewing resumes and applicants.

Desjarlais asked for clarification? Was it for hiring?

Pashelka replied it was for the appointing and hiring process of the Vice-Provost.

Halpin called for nominations.

Desjarlais nominated himself to sit on the committee, he believed it was for the VP

Students', currently Dr. Ainsley Carey. He had much experience meeting with the AVP Students', and felt he would be an attribute for the committee.

Carried

6.4 Positive Space Committee

Ganesh updated on the Positive Space Committee and the upcoming events:

- Two Spirit Tease [in Penticton] Feb. 3rd and 4th
- Cabaret Feb. 9th
- Black History Pride Event Feb. 15th

She would share all of these events in an email to the Board.

7. NEW BUSINESS

7.1 Appoint the CRO

23/01/30.15

Lindsay/Donaldson

Be it resolved that Dana Penney be appointed as the Chief Returning Officer for the Students' Union.

Penney introduced herself to the Board.

Carried

23/01/30.16

Mindi/Kekre

Be it resolved that the ad hoc Electoral Committee be struck for the Winter Term Two (2) session.

Carried

7.2 Ratifications

23/01/30.17

Bihani/Desjarlais

Be it resolved that the Master's of Fine Arts Student Association be ratified.

McGrail asked if there was already a course union for Visual Fine Arts? Visual Arts Course Union? She wondered if it was normal to do the graduate student and undergraduate student course unions separately.

Ouellet agreed with McGrail, that it was illogical to separate these course unions. We were currently dealing with an issue of having too many Student Associations at the moment.

Ganesh replied that in Psychology, having the split made sense. A lot of their event planning was how to get into Graduate School, and other things that graduate students are looking for. The undergraduates were more focused on internal things like tutoring. She could only speak to Psychology.

Halpin replied that with her experience, she found it difficult to connect with

Graduate students herself. She saw value in making separate groups.

Mindi replied that if we started splitting these groups, what happened to the funding? If each faculty had two course unions, where would we cap this.

Desjarlais replied it did not matter, given the amount of money we give out each year. It was our job and responsibility to fund events we cannot do ourselves.

Carried

23/01/30.18

Bihani/Mindi

Be it resolved that the Badminton Club be deratified.

Bihani motivated. According to Regulation 12 under Student Associations, they were in violation.

Kekre added that they knew, as they showed up at the Orientation last semester, where these Regulations were discussed. Their reasoning was that SUO reimbursements took too much time for their cash flow.

Halpin asked if because that group was a bit of a larger group, what would happen to the money now? Would it go back into the Student Association budget?

Kekre replied that it would be absorbed into the general funds.

Halpin wanted to know if there were any other repercussions?

Bihani replied that they were going to look for members who were not currently executives to begin a new club so that they were following our Regulations properly.

Carried

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Referendum requirements: Motion to campaign yes or no

Pashelka replied that as it currently stands, we had a draft for a question, but it had not been sent through any lawyers yet. Speier and Evans had been gathering information from Capilano who had recently had a successful referendum. There would be another Board meeting on February 6th to pass a Referendum question if the Building Steering Committee and the Board deemed it appropriate.

8.2 Referendum requirements: Motion with entire referendum question as it will be presented to the Board

Discussion centered around the contributions through UBC and donations offsetting the costs of fees for students.

McGrail wanted to know if they would be able to provide feedback to the question.

Fedoruk replied that the question should be vetted by the CRO as well as the Electoral Committee, and within the portfolio of the CRO was the ability to request the question be rewritten for clarity and ambiguity, as well as the ability to request that legal be consulted before they accept the question as appropriate to pose to the student body.

Halpin replied that there would be multiple levels of cross checks prior to approval of a question.

8.3 Candidates Information Session: Week of Feb. 6th – 10th

- Choose a time
- Looking for participation from:
 - o the executives
 - o at least one (1) Director-at-Large
 - o at least one (1) Faculty Representative – perhaps the Graduate Student Representative and an undergraduate representative

The Information Session would be: Thursday, February 9th, 3:00pm.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 20:06