SUO
Students' Union
UBC Okanagan

3272 University Way, UNC133
Kelowna, BC CANADA V1V 1V7
T: 250-807-8842
F: 250-491-1083
www.suo.ca

EMERGENCY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Students' Union UBC Okanagan, Local 12 British Columbia Federation of Students
Board of Directors Meeting, February 6th, 2026 at 3:30 pm, UNC105

Directors Present

President (meeting chair)	Peter Idoko
Vice President Finance and Administration	Rajat Arora
Vice-President External	Olivia Lai
Director-at-Large	Aaditya Golash
Director-at-Large	Naden Qually
Director-at-Large	Jessica Goel
Director-at-Large	Saadia Awais
Faculty of Management Representative	Tejas Bhatia
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Representative	Quinlin Osadczuk
Faculty of Health & Social Development Representative	Ali Wasti
Board of Governors Representative (ex-officio)	Noah Arney
Faculty of Education Representative	Vacant

Directors Absent

Vice-President Internal	Shreya Patnaik
Vice-President Campus Life	Ashley Kyei-Badu
Faculty of Creative & Critical Studies Representative	Kiki Akinlade
Faculty of Applied Science Representative	Donald Onyewuchi-Ohiri
Faculty of Science Representative	Yasmine Trabelsi
Student Senate Caucus Representative (ex-officio)	Saami Hafeez

Staff Present

General Manager	Jason Evans
Governance Coordinator	Lijie Qiu

1. **CALLED TO ORDER AT 3:47 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. **NEW BUSINESS _REVIEW OF SUO LETTER REGARDING UBCO CAREER DEVELOPMENT FEE**

Members reviewed the letter and shared their feedback. The letter was subsequently revised as follows:

Dear AVP Students Dale Mullings and Career Development team,
I am writing on behalf of the Students' Union of UBC (SUO_of_UBC) to provide our feedback on your proposal for the career development team.
We want to start by expressing our gratitude to Dale and Jana for presenting at our open session on Monday, February 2nd. Your presentation truly helped our Board and the students in attendance gain a better understanding of the situation at hand and the reasoning behind this proposal. Following our consultation and board meeting, these were the main points brought forward by both the students and our board:

1. ***Concern for Affordability***

As you are well aware, the SUO has long been advocating for student affordability. With tuition fees increasing yearly, it is difficult for us and our students to understand why students still need to pay for services that should be provided by the University. Likewise, previous tuition increases, such as with the faculty of management, have cited career development as justification for the increase or a beneficiary service paid through tuition. As such, what is the need and purpose of the added proposed $125 per semester and how is this number decided on. Students would want concrete justification for having to pay an increased fee when they already pay the university to offer core services. Additionally, implementing such fees may deter students from utilizing the co-op program where they are already paying fees for enrollment and possibly even unenrolling from courses due to financial burden. We ideally would not want students to pay this fee. However, if there were no other way, we would like to explore the possibility of reducing the fee to within the range of $75 - $100, a removal of the summer fee, a consideration of an opt out process for students in professional programs or in financial hardship, and a reconsideration of the fee for part-time students. Additionally, we are suggesting that the University explore external funding for this service as well.

2. ***Clear outcomes and documentation***

With regards to the implementation of the fee, the SUO is asking that the University honor its commitment to providing clear documentation containing clear outcomes and objectives of this initiative. Documentation must include, but is not limited to an MOU, a budget, and KPI's. These and

any other documentation that may be requested will ensure the SUO and student body are able to keep oversight over the use of the funds.

3. ***Definition of Advisory Committee***

The SUO is requesting the roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee to be clearly outlined. Understanding the importance of student input in important decisions such as these, we are requesting that the advisory committee not only include elected student leaders but also have accommodations for students in the larger student population to provide feedback and guidance. Finally, we are requesting that the Advisory committee serve as oversight for the use of the funds and serve as a key voice in the allocation of the funds and a guarantee of SUO involvement in the proposed Advisory committee.

4. ***Specialized Support***

The SUO is requesting that the University honor its commitment to providing tailored support to different student demographics through the implementation of these funds. It is no secret to students that certain faculties are more funded and have more financial support resulting in better access to services. As such, we are requesting that the funds be used to ensure that services are equitably distributed across our diverse student body and consideration be made for underserved departments and faculties such as CCS in the Arts or Physics in the Sciences.

5. ***Industry relations***

The SUO is requesting that the University explore corporate partnerships as opposed to implementing the fee. If fees are to be collected, we are requesting that the fees are used to increase industry relations. We are looking to see an increase in on-campus activity from the industry but also the facilitation of better off-campus collaborations such as the one between the SUO and Aesthetiks Lab which resulted in a 10% discount for students.

6. ***Implementation***

Finally, as expressed in the feedback session, there is concern with the sample size and the overall data collection and analysis in the process. Per student feedback raised to the SUO through the session, they felt the 548 students identified in the survey are not seen as being representative of our whole population of almost 12,000 students. Furthermore, the data on youth unemployment conflates joblessness with entrepreneurship/non-traditional income. As such, it is recommended that pilot industry-embedded programs in disciplines such as Biological Sciences and computer science be used as pilots for this initiative.

Thank you once again for involving us in the conversation about this fee and we look forward to hearing back from you on this matter.

26/02/06.01
Idoko/Qually
Be it resolved that the letter regarding the feedback on the UBCO Career Development Fee be approved and sent to UBC.
Carried.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.