

# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union Okanagan of UBC, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students  
Executive Committee Meeting, March 22 at 1:30 pm, 2024, UNC 133C

---

## Directors Present

President (chair)

Vice President Finance and Administration

Vice-President External

Vice-President Internal

Cade Desjarlais

Osho Gnanasivam

Lakshay Karnwal

Shreyansh Mehendiratta  
(Team)

## Directors Absent

Vice-President Campus Life

Uday Gill

## Staff Present

General Manager

Governance Coordinator

Jason Evans

Cecily Qiu

## Guests

Student

Student

Ideja Efendija

Fabiola Melchior

## **1. CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:36 P.M.**

### **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**

24/03/22.01

Gnanasivam/Karnwal

Be it resolved that the agenda be adopted.

Karnwal/Gnanasivam

Be it resolved that the agenda be amended by adding 6.4 Volunteer Shirts under Discussion.

Amendment carried.

Desjarlais/Karnwal

Be it resolved that the agenda be amended by adding 6.5 Discussion on Clubs under Discussion.

Amendment carried.

Desjarlais/Karnwal

Be it resolved that the agenda be amended by moving the following items to the in-camera session:

4.1 Smart Meals Agreement

6.1 Picnic

6.2 StudentCare

Desjarlais explained that those items were related to contracts.

Amendment carried.

Carried as amended.

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

24/03/22.02

Karnwal/Gnanasivam

Be it resolved that the minutes from the meeting held on March 8th, 2024 be adopted.

Karnwal stated that one sentence in the minutes was redundant. Under 4.1 Smart Meal MOU, it read: "Karnwal also confirmed that \$20,000 goes back to the Hub's budget line and \$45,000 each year would be from the SUO Student Service budget line." First, he thought it was confusing by saying that \$20,000 goes back to the Hub's budget line, and in the previous paragraph, the number of \$20,000 had been explained, which read: "It (the hub) would commit to an in-kind contribution of about \$20,000 in staff time." Secondly, Student Service budget line was mentioned but not confirmed at that meeting.

Karnwal/Gnanasivam

Be it resolved that the sentence, which read "Karnwal also confirmed that \$20,000 goes back to the Hub's budget line and \$45,000 each year would be from the SUO Student Service budget line", be struck from the meeting minutes.

Amendment carried.

Carried as amended.

#### 4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

##### 4.1 Smart Meals Agreement

Was moved to in-camera.

#### 5. NEW BUSINESS

##### 5.1 February Honoraria for Board of Directors

24/03/22.03

Gnanasivam/Karnwal

Be it resolved that the February Honoraria for Board of Directors be disbursed as follows:

Name	Title	Disbursement	Note
Alamchandani, Darsh	Director-at-Large	\$50	Late
Arora, Aryan	Director-at-Large	\$50	Late
Arora, Rajat	Faculty of Management Representative	100%	
Desai, Anjali	College of Graduate Studies Representative	100%	
Donaldson, Hanna	Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative	100%	

Grover, Sunish	Faculty of Science Representative	\$50	No Report
Halpin, Grace	Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative	100%	Late*
Hora, Twinkle	Director-at-Large	100%	
Madaan, Japnit	Director-at-Large	100%	Late*
Mayhew, Georgia	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Representative	100%	Late*
Pfaender, Rishan	Faculty of Applied Sciences Representative	\$50	Late

\*Board directors who notified the President of the late submission.

Desjarlais stated that he had communicated the policy on the monthly report many times. He added that Halpin, Mayhew and Madaan did notify him that they would submit the report late and they submitted the report within the grace period. Therefore, those three members would receive 100% of the honoraria. Evans stated that there was a flat fee of \$50 for board members to attend the board meeting.

Carried.

## 6. DISCUSSION

### 6.1 Picnic

Was moved in-camera.

### 6.2 StudentCare

Was moved in-camera.

### 6.3 Expo Sponsorship

Karnwal stated that sponsorship decisions from big companies were usually made early in the year and BMO had reached out showing their interest in sponsoring the Expo and Frosh. He asked about the process of signing a contract for the next year and how the contract package would look like. Desjarlais recommended Karnwal work together with Evans on a MOU. Karnwal also asked if BMO could open accounts for students at their space during the event. He wondered if there was any restriction on this kind of bank business due to their contract with RBC. Evans would check their contract with RBC. Desjarlais reminded that any

information of Expo sponsorship should be communicated to Rusch and the incoming VP External.

#### **6.4 Volunteer Shirt**

Karnwal stated that he would like to order some volunteer shirts for student ambassadors who helped promote Smart Meals. Gnanasivam stated that they budgeted a certain allocation for SUO swag under Service at the beginning of their term, but the money had been entirely spent. Karnwal would work on his advocacy budget line to cover the expense. He stated that the volunteer shirt was designed by B. Evans (Communications Manager), and it was for all SUO volunteers in the future including those Smart Meals ambassadors.

#### **6.5 Discussion on Clubs**

Students representing Lesbians for Livable Futures Club brought questions regarding the denial of their club ratification. They also expressed concerns on how the club ratification process worked, how transparent it was and what communication had been done for the club ratification. Melchior stated that the application was submitted in January. There were some back and forth around the application with multiple cancellations of meetings from VP Internal. When they asked for clarification in writing regarding the questions that Mehendiratta had, they received no response. Also, there was no response to their request for the reasons of the denial. She thought the whole process was incredibly long and inefficient, and the bureaucracy in the system made it very difficult for students to accomplish what they wanted to do. Efendija stated that they had been accommodating Mehendiratta and had tried three times to organize a meeting. They even came to his office hours, trying to meet him, but in vain. They met Gnanasivam by chance, who was willing to take their request. Efendija considered the whole experience disappointing, and she also stated that it was unprofessional to deny a club's application without giving any reasons. Mehendiratta apologized for the meeting cancellation as it was right before the reading break. He said the reason for the denial was that they had a Pride Resource Center. It was a decision from the board rather than a personal decision. Melchior stated that it would have been helpful for them to have a meeting beforehand to clarify the reasons why they thought more political space on campus for queer community was necessary, which could have been communicated to the board for decision. Efendija added that even though the Pride Resource Center existed on campus, it did not mean every queer student was included and represented.

Desjarlais agreed and stated that lack of process was not acceptable. He also stated that if executives could not come to their office hours, it needed to be clearly and explicitly communicated. There should be a process of rescheduling the meeting. Desjarlais would be happy to continue the discussion and follow up with them the next week so that they could be given a fair chance to explain their reasons. Although he could not force the board member to express the reasons why they vote for/against a club ratification, Desjarlais thought that the board members would be more inclined to share their views with the student representatives present at the meeting. Gnanasivam stated that for transparency, the Pride Resource Center was not mentioned at the board meeting as a reason for the denial of the ratification. There was no explanation at the meeting. Gnanasivam said that he was the only person voting in favor of the ratification, and Desjarlais, the chair, would have voted in favor if he could. For future practice, he would communicate their intent with Rusch (Membership Outreach Coordinator) and Mehendiratta.

Students suggested that SUO shall work on an efficient process for the club ratification; secondly, they suggested a policy change to provide reasons for any denial of the club ratification; thirdly, they suggested there should be a mechanism for students to bring concerns and complaints to the attention of the board and SUO. Evans stated that they recognized those issues and concerns, and at the last board meeting the board ratified a club oversight committee with the mandate to address concerns and provide oversight.

## **7. IN CAMERA**

24/03/22.04

Gnanasivam/Karnwal

Be it resolved that the meeting be moved in-camera. [2:16 p.m.]

Carried.

24/03/22.05

Karnwal/Gnanasivam

Be it resolved that the meeting be moved ex-camera. [3:45 p.m.]

Carried.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.