

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)	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	Berat Celik
Director-at-Large	Aryam Dwivedi
Director-at-Large	Megan Johnston
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 Health & Social Development Representative	Grace Halpin
Faculty of Management Representative	Jes Mindi
Faculty of Science Representative	Maziar Matin Panah

Directors Absent

Board of Governors Representative (ex-officio)	Tashia Kootenayoo
Student Senate Caucus Representative (ex-officio)	Salman Hafeez (Saami)
Faculty of Applied Science Representative	Akshata Pathak
Faculty of Education Representative	Lindsay McGrail

Staff Present

General Manager	Jason Evans
Governance Coordinator	Bri Fedoruk
Well Manager	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