

LSS Executive Meeting

October 4, 2012

In attendance:

President – Roni Jones

Vice President Academic – Erin Kizell

Vice President Student Affairs – Claire Haaf

Executive Director of Indigenous Perspectives and Student Development – Grant Sikkes

Executive Director of Communications – Paul Kressock

Executive Director of Sports, Clubs and Development – JoAnne Barnum

LSS Ombudsperson (ex officio) – Martina Zanetti

Executive Director of AMS Relations – Noah Stewart

Senator – Brendan Craig

Director of LSS Services (ex officio) – Michael Davis

Executive Director of Finance – Stuart Darrach-Cottick

Quorum met (6 voting members)

Conduct of students

- Three issues:
 - o Conduct of students at the AGM
 - o Conduct of students on Facebook
 - o Conduct of members of the Illegal Beavers Rugby Club
- Roni has met with UBC Equity among others and is planning to have a letter go out to students discussing the policies about non-academic misconduct
 - o Items posted on FB are punishable anywhere from warnings to expulsion if they demean other students
 - o Students need to be made aware of the expectation
- Faculty/UBC do not need a complaint to pursue this and once they become aware of issues, they have a duty to act
 - o Students need to be made aware of the potential sanctions out there
 - o Faculty did in fact become involved as a result of complaints and the Equity Office necessarily became involved
 - o Brendan: All that is required in that there be some nexus with the University
- Erin: The Faculty was aware of the issues before they even happened; they knew things were going to go down at the meeting
 - o Roni: Faculty has been good with respecting our governance in the past
- Jo: What is our position in respect of responding to FB posts?
 - o Roni: We are in a position to step in politely to remind people of what they are doing, e.g. a link to our Statement of Values; we are not obliged to do anything
- Erin: It is extremely appropriate for LSS officers to guide the discussion constructively

Budget procedure

- Generally speaking, there is a significant lack of information and although we are all volunteers, we do have a lot of shortcomings
 - o Historically, there had been no procedures in place with few formal requests for funds; there have been problems even getting people to the meetings
 - o Last year, there was a working group on budget procedures; they changed the make-up of the Finance Committee and budget forms were standardized and required a good deal of itemization
- This year, we fell short in a few respects; these were highlighted with meetings with, inter alia, Darlene Johnson and Pam Cyr:

- There was some notice of the meeting, but little notice of the relevant information; there was simply a bare-bones budget put out 48 hours in advance
- This year, the AGM was October 2, which is two weeks later than usual/desirable; we need to balance transparency with having the meeting as near as possible to the start of the year
- With the Equity Office: Does the LSS have an obligation to create an “equitable” budget that is reflective of the needs and composition of the student body?
 - Noah: Can the University dictate policy and procedure requirements?
 - Are the budget proposal policies equitable? For example, did ILSA deserve more money? Did we have a positive duty to make things fair if there is a risk of things being unfair?
 - Terry Kennedy did have a number of complementary things to say about the process itself
- We are in a good position to make necessary changes in the future, e.g. having a treasurer orientation, having plenty of notice, posting reasons, creating obligations on clubs for ongoing reporting on the receipt of funding not included in their budget proposals, but...
- What can we do about what happened this year?
 - Two options: redoing the whole budget, or not redoing it
 - There are important timing issues; we would need to have a vote from the students on redoing the budget, a new budget would need to be drafted based on new budget proposals, and with more notice, we would not be able to have another budget until mid-November if we do it properly
 - There may not end up being a substantial difference unless the proposals change significantly
 - We need to make this conversation open, admit the shortcoming, and discuss why it may not be feasible to do the process over again
 - Options: We could have letters, a town hall, a drop-in in the LSS office
 - There will always be dissent with the content, but dealing with the process is important
 - It is important to understand that clubs do not get funding at the expense of others, e.g. reducing rugby funding would not be redistributed
 - Content of a letter:
 - Our values
 - Consequences for misfeasance
 - About the budget situation and how we are working to improve
- About the process of the AGM:
 - Noah: It was passed democratically, and we would have to say the process was illegitimate despite the budget being passed without all the information
 - Claire: Even though it is very impractical to pass a new budget, we did not pass it according to our own rules; it is unclear whether this even passed the Committee
 - Roni: We should accept the result and explain our being uncomfortable with this and just fielding questions
 - Grant: At three minutes to 2:00pm, this was forced through despite it needing to continue as a conversation; we should redo the budget
 - Erin: People chose to leave and to end discussion and this was passed; we have an opportunity to apologize for the lack of information and make good on things without just redoing everything; we can alleviate the problems in a better way
 - Noah: The process was democratically okay and peoples perceptions about the process do not derogate from the fact that it was passed; we can put out a much more details and reasoned budget is a good way to address issues is worth figuring out because people need the full financial picture
 - Jo: This was not a very democratic process; people felt intimidated to vote against the budget and we did not create alternatives and a safe place for people to vote their conscience; how to we let this stand knowing how it was arrived at
 - Claire: Students have used words like, bullied, silenced, sham, etc. and we have lost confidence of students; people have inquired about impeachment processes
 - Roni: The amount of people at the meeting is heartening and concerning because people are becoming acutely aware of the problems
 - Grant: We can make this a positive thing

- Roni: Being open and honest and not sweeping this under the rug can let us come out of this; we need to own up to our mistakes and move forward
- Erin: On dealing with the rugby club, a public apology would be appropriate and dealing with it silently is probably not good enough
- Martina: Survey responses reflect a concern about intimidation; it is certainly more than 15 people complaining
- Claire: Complaints can be made to Martina or to the Assistant Dean of Students
- Roni: Ben and Pam are very supportive of our commitment to make valuable changes
- ILSA has a much greater problem with the perception regarding the process, despite some disappointment with the amount received
- Jo: The issue is the meeting, not the budget proposal itself
- What to do:
 - Erin: apologies, expression of support, consultation sessions
 - Faculty can reprimand them
 - We as the LSS can cut their funding
 - Are we holding our clubs to their constitutions?
 - No clapping at AGMs
- Claire: I cannot in good conscience support this
- Vote on accepting the budget:
 - In favour: 6
 - Opposed: 2 (Claire and Grant)
 - Abstaining: 1 (JoAnne)