



## ATTENDANCE

**Present:** Aaron Loewen, Abdullah Hassan, Alireza Kamyabi, Andrew Zang, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Arwa Nemir, Axel Hauduc, Erik Frieling, Ginny Pichler, Hannah Green (proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Jenny Lee, Jackson Schumacher, Jin Wen, Jonathan Summers, Jordan Hamden, Kimani Karangu, Lihwen Hsu, Maria Jose Martinez, Mina Rigby-Thompson, Mostafa Hagar, Nicolas Romualdi, Oluwakemi Oke, Tarique Benbow, Tayo Olarewaju, Sarah Park, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang).

### Regrets:

**Absent:** Airu Ji, Alejandra Botia, Cody Brown, Joseph Garen, Judith Valerie Engel, Kiana Yau, Larissa Peck, Mollie Holmberg, Negar Ghahramani, Nevena Rebic, Raphael Debert, Rio Picollo, Skicy Liu, Teesha Luehr, Thomas Smith, Yangfan Zhang.

**Quorum:** 20 Councillors

## CALL TO ORDER AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting will be called to order at **5:43 pm.**

### AGENDA ADOPTION

**BIRT** the agenda be adopted as presented.

**Mover:** Tarique Benbow

**Seconded:** Alireza Kamyabi

**Result:** Motion Carried

### DISCUSSION:

**Jonathan:** Last I checked there were 2 items labeled "Academic Freedom Statement", which are 3.2 and 3.3, just a minor correction would be in order for this.

**Speaker:** Kimani, I'm just going to rename it, is this ok?

**Kimani:** Yes, that should be G&A and this is friendly.

**Sara:** I wanted to move a motion to switch the order of section 3.2 and 3.3. This motion that we brought would be a lengthy discussion, so I wanted to first discuss all decision matters on this first.

**Speaker:** No opposed? Seeing none, motion carried.

### VOTES

**FOR (20):** Sarah Park, Tayo Olarewaju, Alireza Kamyabi, Jonathan Summers, Jackson Schumacher, Mina Rigby Thompson, Jenny Lee, Tarique Benbow, Kimani Karangu, Andrew Zang, Nicolas Romualdi, Arwa Nemir, Jordan



---

Hamden, Mostafa Hagar, Axel Hauduc, Maria Jose Martinez, Aaron Loewen, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Ginny Pichler, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi.

## TERRITORIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

---

**President:** On behalf of UBC GSS, I would like to acknowledge that the UBC Point Grey Campus is situated in the traditional, ancestral and unseeded territory of the Musqueam People. I would also like to acknowledge that you're joining us today from many places, near and far and acknowledge the traditional owners and care takers of those lands, this meeting may start.

## INTRODUCTIONS

Introductions.

**Kimani:** Given that we've been waiting for some time for members to join, I would raise that we skip this part of introductions.

**Speaker:** Any objections? Seeing none, I'm moving on.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 1.1 GSS COUNCIL MINUTES

---

**BIRT** the following GSS Council minutes be approved:

- May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2020

**Mover:** Arwa Nemir

**Second:** Jin Wen

**Result:** Motion Carried

## DISCUSSION

---

**Tarique:** I'd just like to clarify so, I noticed that there's a few committees that haven't submitted minutes from the previous months and I just wanted to ask the Chairs, what the reason was?

**Speaker:** Would you like to point to a certain committee?

**Tarique:** So, there are 5 committees that have not submitted mainly AcEx, Elections, EOC and HF.

**Sara:** We had our monthly meeting but because of a little problem we had with the minutes, we couldn't approve it so we wanted to postpone it to the next meeting.

**Tayo:** I'd like to speak for EOC. We couldn't meet last month due to quorum.

**Jonathan:** Point of order. Are we still in GSS Council minutes or Committee minutes?

**Speaker:** Good point. Sorry Tarique, we will talk about this when we talk about GSS Committee minutes.



**Tarique:** Fair enough.

## VOTES

**FOR (20):** Tayo Olarewaju, Maria Jose Martinez, Arwa Nemir, Alireza Kamyabi, Sarah Park, Tarique Benbow, Jonathan Summers, Jackson Schumacher, Jin Wen, Aaron Loewen, Ginny Pichler, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Andrew Zang, Kimani Karangu, Jordan Hamden, Axel Hauduc, Mostafa Hagar, Jenny Lee, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Abdullah Hassan.

## 1.2 COMMITTEE MINUTES

**BIRT** the following GSS Committee minutes be approved:

<b>Academic &amp; External Committee:</b>		<b>Human Resources Committee:</b>	Apr 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2020 & Apr 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2020
<b>Code and Policy Committee:</b>	May 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2020 & May 25 <sup>th</sup> , 2020	<b>Services Committee:</b>	Apr 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2020
<b>Elections Committee:</b>		<b>AMS Caucus:</b>	
<b>Executive Committee:</b>	May 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2020	<b>Graduate Council:</b>	
<b>Executive Oversight Committee:</b>		<b>House Finance Committee:</b>	
<b>Governance &amp; Accountability Committee:</b>	May 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2020 & May 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2020	<b>Strategic Planning ad-hoc Committee:</b>	May 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2020 & May 19, 2020

**Mover:** Tarique Benbow

**Second:** Jordan Hamden

**Result:** Motion Carried

## DISCUSSION

**Speaker:** Tarique if I may go back to your question, is it ok if I call the empty spots?

**Tarique:** Yes, that's fine, I'll spare the theatrics and won't repeat the question. Pretty sure everyone remembers. So, you can proceed.

**Speaker:** Election Committee Chair are you here today? AMS Caucus Chair or AMS Member?

**Jackson:** Well the AMS Caucus doesn't have an official chair, and we haven't met but, in the past, we have been taking committee minutes. I think there's a motion adjusting this, but we haven't been an official committee.

**Mostafa:** Sorry I was waiting to see if the Committee Chair would respond but I think she's not here. We did have a meeting on May 11th, but I guess the minutes weren't uploaded but we did have a meeting.

**Speaker:** Graduate Council?



**Nicolas:** Maybe I can clarify. Not sure if there are other members from Grad Council here. I'm an Ex Officio member and Grad Council met but Grad Caucus hasn't or at least I wasn't invited to the meeting. I think Yangfan is temporarily chairing in some informal capacity and I'm happy to provide any updates on the meeting. There's a lot of issues quite relevant being discussed including the employment opportunities for international students who may not be able to return, issues for students who can't get their study permit. It was quite an informative meeting about issues that students will be facing starting September so I'm happy if at any point anybody wants to propose an amendment and include an issue for discussion there to ask questions on the matter, I'm happy to provide an update.

**Speaker:** House Finance?

**Maria Jose:** I'm from the committee but I'm not the chair. We had 2 meetings and I don't know why the minutes weren't submitted but we have been meeting.

**Jin:** I also want to inquire whether Services Committee met at the end of April and in May because it seems like the last-minute minutes submitted was April 10<sup>th</sup>.

**Andrew:** Those are the last approved minutes. I think we met 2 weeks ago, and those minutes will be approved and submitted in the next meeting.

## VOTES

**FOR (18):** Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Jordan Hamden, Kimani Karangu, Jenny Lee, Alireza Kamyabi, Mina Rigby Thompson, Andrew Zang, Mostafa Hagar, Ginny Pichler, Axel Hauduc, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Abdullah Hassan, Jonathan Summers, Maria Jose Martinez, Arwa Nemir, Aaron Loewen, Jin Wen.

**ABSTAIN (2):** Tayo Olarewaju, Nicolas Romualdi

## 2 SEATINGS

### 2.1 EXTERNAL REPRESENTATIVES SEATINGS

All GSS Councillors are required by the bylaws to sit on at least one committee.

[Committee descriptions and meeting times can be found here.](#)

**BIRT** the seating of the following external representatives be approved:

Committee/Caucus	Nominee	Position	Vacancies
S Caucus		representative	2
Graduate Council		representative	
Faculty of Arts Council		representative	
Health and Dental Plan Caucus		representative	



**Mover:** Jordan Hamden      **Seconded:** Jackson Schumacher      **Result:** Motion Carried

**DISCUSSION**

**Nicolas:** Perhaps we can ask any member of the AMS Caucus to motivate?

**Jackson:** The AMS Caucus is the members of the Graduate Student Society that represent students at the Alma Mater Society which is the general student government. And the GSS and AMS work together in some of the issues that affect Graduate Students the month, being that Health and Dental Plan or the U-Pass agreement, which is a timely issue right now. So actually having Grad Student representation in the AMS is extremely important and right now we have 2 out of the 4 Caucus members so if you want to do something impactful in the GSS, this is a really good way to do it.

**Speaker:** Any takers? I always like to mention that AMS handles 1.5 million of the Grad Student money so having representation there really matters. We do need to do a vote because the motion is there, but because there's no nominations, no matter what you vote, it won't have any impact.

**Jonathan:** Another point of order. I believe there's 3 other committees or caucus that we haven't heard about?

**Speaker:** I saw that there's no vacancy, can I double check? Do you have any vacancies? I presume they don't have any, they're placeholders.

**VOTES**

**FOR (14):** Jenny Lee, Andrew Zang, Jin Wen, Axel Hauduc, Kimani Karangu, Sarah Park, Maria Jose Martinez, Jackson Schumacher, Tayo Olarewaju, Jonathan Summers, Arwa Nemir, Abdullah Hassan, Aaron Loewen, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen).

**ABSTAIN (1):** Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi.

**2.1.1 Committee Seatings**

*All GSS Councillors are required by the bylaws to sit on at least one committee.*

[Committee descriptions and meeting times can be found here.](#)

**BIRT** the following Committee seatings be approved:

Committee/Caucus	Nominee	Position	Vacancies
Academic & External		Councillor	1
		Ordinary Member	0
Code & Policy		Councillor	1
		Ordinary Member	4



Elections		Councillor	2
	Abdul Ahad Ahmady	Ordinary Member	3
Executive Oversight	Abdullah Hassan	Councillor	3
	Abdul Ahad Ahmady	Ordinary Member	4
Governance & Accountability		Councillor	0
	Maryam Tayyab	Ordinary Member	4
House Finance		Councillor	4
		Ordinary Member	0
Human Resources		Councillor	3
	Kevin Gonzalez	Ordinary Member	4
Services	Mostafa Hagar	Councillor	1
		Ordinary Member	0
Strategic Planning Ad Hoc		Councillor	0
		Ordinary Member	1

**Mover:** Jin Wen

**Seconder:** Maria Jose  
Martinez

**Result:** Motion Carried

## **DISCUSSION**

**Sara:** I want to say that according to the ToR of AcEx, we double with resources to provide support for Graduate Students so what I mean by this is that we detect issues and we have discussion and brainstorming to find out what are the solutions to these problems. They can be University Affairs or related to any external issues that would affect Grad Students. We do provide support to VPUAA and External by doing research regarding their advocacy and this is a really great opportunity for any Councillor who wants to be in main discussion around Grad Student issues.

**Jordan:** As everyone can see, CPC currently has several vacancies and we anticipate having even more in the coming months. By summers end, CPC expects to only have 2 members left which by our bylaws, will not allow us to hold committee meetings so we will definitely need more people to join the committee soon and why you should do this is that if you're a new person to the GSS, it's a great place to start out. We work with every other committee to change policies and get matters done so you get to learn the workings of the GSS as well as work with the executives. We currently have active projects working with every single executive as well as G&A and Elections. So, it's a great place to learn the workings of the GSS and if you're a more veteran member of the GSS, it's a great place to come and show your expertise so come join us and help us be the best committee we can be.



---

**Mostafa:** I wasn't really prepared for this but essentially, we had a bunch of issues from what I understand. I actually just joined so I wasn't there at the time but moving forward what we're trying to do is working the system a little bit to account for other potential problems that could arise in the future and it seems like a very important committee for the overall function of the GSS because it's how people get into a lot of the other position so it's important to get this right.

**Tayo:** The EOC oversees the executives and we support them and hold them accountable. It's a good place to get a better idea of the GSS and understand what is required from executives and how to support them. It's a great place to join and are currently in need of 3 Councillors so please consider joining.

**Jin:** Basically we deal with matters about governance and identify areas that the GSS could improve in terms of their internal functioning as well as dealing with accountability, so making sure that all other committees are operating optimally in addition to giving support to any committees that need additional help.

**Tayo:** Since the chair is not here, I can speak on behalf of them. This is a very important committee because they basically control the funds. Usually the GSS executives as well since they have funds to pay for services and staff members and so the HF Committee is actually in need of Councillors right now, we only have 1 Councillor currently and the current chair already indicated that she wants to step down so we're actually in need of members for HF and so it helps understand the financial statements and project management, because that's what we talk about whenever we meet. How we budget and how we're using the funds. As a Councillor it would be great to join the GSS.

**Arezo:** HR is responsible for oversight to the employees both full and part time. So, our ToR say that we set a vision for them as well as setting policies in the HR manual and oversight to see if these are followed correctly. We also relate to matters of hiring, evaluation and other matters. We're responsible for hiring and firing and do a lot of interview processes which really help. Myself, I always learn how to better improve my own applications and interviews. When we do an interview, you learn how to present yourself. We're working on a lot of interesting projects like updating and polishing the HR manual which is an immediate need of the Society and look at the supervisory structure and to do so, we're conducting a survey and gathering information from employees and executives as well as committees and we'll analyse this to reach conclusions. There's a lot of interpersonal leadership skills involved when you're involved with this committee. Join us, it's a fun committee.

**Andrew:** Services Committee focuses on the events and fun things we can do for and with Graduate Students at UBC, so we focus on building this community. We work closely with our Events Manager and VP Students, both great people, very exciting meetings so if you're interested in planning events and being a part of the community, this is the committee for you for sure.

**Timothy:** We only have 1 spot currently open for an OM so if there are any OM here or if one of the Councillors knows of an OM interested, let them know. For the rest of you, we do have openings coming up periodically so keep an eye out because I think Strategic Planning is one of the most interesting committees out there. It's an AdHoc Committee so it's been created for a very specific purpose and that the drafting of the next 5-year Strat Plan for the GSS, so it's a roadmap or agenda for the GSS for the next 5 years and this makes this a unique opportunity. It's also a great learning experience for any person that wants to get in this committee, organizations are always putting together these plans, they're popular and effective so I think at some point in



your future career I suspect you will be in an organization that is drafting one and understanding how one is put together, what is effective what is less effective, can be really beneficial. So, consider joining at some point if you can!

## **VOTES**

**FOR (19):** Nicolas Romualdi, Arwa Nemir, Tarique Benbow, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Axel Hauduc, Abdullah Hassan, Tayo Olarewaju, Andrew Zang, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Jonathan Summers, Sarah Park, Jin Wen, Mina Rigby Thompson, Aaron Loewen, Alireza Kamyabi, Jordan Hamden, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Jenny Lee, Jackson Schumacher.

**ABSTAIN (1):** Mostafa Hagar.

## 3 MATTERS FOR DECISION

### 3.1 POLICY 7.7 CAUCUSES

**Group Responsible:** Code and Policy Committee Chair

**Description:** The graduate council caucus represents graduate students at Graduate Council, the legislative and administrative body for the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Policy 6.1.1 indicates that Graduate Council Representatives are councillors, and 6.3 discusses the selection of these representatives and of a Head Representative, but the manual does not address the co-ordination of these representatives as a Caucus, nor for the co-ordination of the similar AMS representatives and their Caucus. December 2018 Council established an unseating mechanism for these representatives and referred the issue of establishing the Caucus as an official entity to CPC. In consultation with the caucus head representatives ("chairs"), and with Governance & Accountability Committee, we have drafted the above policy to incorporate both the Graduate Council and AMS caucuses into the existing GSS committee structure. Caucus chairs already perform a significant amount of work on behalf of the GSS, and we believe the above policy will both properly recognize these contributions, and also provide additional mechanisms to ensure that caucuses consistently communicate with the GSS regarding their projects and relevant issues in the Graduate Council and the AMS.

**Proposed Objective:** To list Caucuses as an official entity of the GSS and declare Caucus heads as "chairs" in the Policy manual. Listing Caucus in the Policy manual.

**Time:** 10 minutes

**Supporting Documents:** [Policy 7.7 Caucuses.docx](#)

**WHEREAS** the Policy Manual currently allows for the existence of Caucus and their supervision by the Governance and Accountability Committee, but does not have clear guideline for the formation and operation of Caucuses,

**BIRT** Policy 7.7 Caucus be added to the policy manual to establish clear guidelines for the formation and operation of Caucuses as official bodies of the GSS.





**Mover:** Alireza Kamyabi

**Seconded:** Maria Jose  
Martinez

**Result:**

## DISCUSSION

---

**Jordan:** Hi everyone. Since this policy was submitted for decision to Council, I've heard from some executives and Councillors and we would like an opportunity to further improve the policy before this is voted on so today I'm asking Council to vote against policy 7.7 as is presented so we can go back to our committee meetings and invite anyone to our meetings who would like to help us improve this policy. If you have any comments today, I'd love to hear those or if you'd like to be invited to the meeting let me know now or email me and I'd be happy to invite whoever wants to come and give feedback and help us make this policy the best we can. Thank you.

**Maria:** I just wanted to know the exact reason why you didn't want this to be passed. It seems that is the guidelines for formation and operation of the Caucuses, correct?

**Jordan:** Correct. This is to deal with getting the Caucuses into our policy manual, I think after hearing from a couple of executives and Councillors, I think the policy could use improvement.

**Nicolas:** I would like to suggest a less violent outcome than a defeat, I move that we refer the matter to the CPC Committee.

**Mover:** Nicolas Romualdi

**Seconded:** Jonathan  
Summers

**Result:** Motion Carried

**Speaker:** The motion at hand is to refer it back to CPC and not this Council.

**Nicolas:** I believe defeating the motion doesn't reflect the intent. The intent of the CPC Chair and the committee is to approve the proposed policy amendment based on the feedback they've received and a referral to committees more closely reflects the intent of the decision we're making vs. A defeat of the motion which is why I move this.

**Speaker:** We're trying to have this motion back to the committee? And this is a policy that we need the Councils approval if I'm not mistaken?

**Jordan:** Yes, so we will send it back to the committee and then it will be brought back to Council next month.

**Speaker:** So, this is what I understand. The motion at hand that we moved and seconded is to adopt this motion, and policy 7.7 to be added to the manual. But there is a discussion in maybe further improving it so Nicolas has moved to do that. Any further discussion on this?



---

## **VOTES- REFER BACK TO COMMITTEE**

---

**FOR (19):** Andrew Zang, Tayo Olarewaju, Arwa Nemir, Mina Rigby Thompson, Tarique Benbow, Mostafa Hagar, Aaron Loewen, Jackson Schumacher, Jin Wen, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Axel Hauduc, Abdullah Hassan, Jenny Lee, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Jordan Hamden, Maria Jose Martinez, Alireza Kamyabi, Nicolas Romualdi, Jonathan Summers.

---

## **3.2 TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT FOR COMMITTEES**

---

**Group Responsible:** G&A Committee

**Description:** The motion was proposed to address concerns of increased number of vacancies of ordinary members in committees. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic has created further barriers for ordinary members to attend GSS Council as we have transitioned to holding it virtually.

**Proposed Objective:** The current motion will grant Committee Chairs the ability to temporarily appoint ordinary members to their committees.

**Time:** 10 minutes

**Supporting Documents:** GSS Policy Manual, GSS Bylaws

**WHEREAS** During the committee chairs meeting in June several chairs expressed concern about an increased number of vacancies of ordinary members in their committees, and

**WHEREAS** Low committee membership can lead to committee issues such as difficulty holding quorate meetings or low work capacity, and

**WHEREAS** Policy 7.3.1 establishes that "Committee members are appointed by ordinary resolution at Council", and

**WHEREAS** the COVID-19 outbreak has made it more challenging to engage ordinary members of the Society in Council meetings, where committee seatings normally take place, and

**WHEREAS** Bylaw 13.3.2 empowers the GSS Council to temporarily amend GSS Policy for up to 30 days by special resolution.

**BIRT** the GSS Council, by special resolution, temporarily amends Policy 7.3.1 to read: "Committee members are appointed by ordinary resolution at Council. Additionally, ordinary members of the Society, who are in good standing, may be appointed pro tempore by the Committee Chair. The Committee Chair must notify the GSS President within 24 hours of the appointment taking place and, in any case, before 48 hours prior to the subsequent Council meeting. Appointments by Committee Chairs shall expire at the immediately subsequent Council meeting." Effective at the adjournment of the current Council meeting and until July 13th.

**BIFRT** the President shall report to Council on all appointments made by Chairs in the following Council Meeting.



---

**BIFRT** notwithstanding general policy, decisions reached in Committee meetings where pro tempore members were present shall become effective at the moment the minutes of the meeting are ratified by Council.

**Mover:** Jordan Hamden

**Seconded:** Jonathan Summers

**Result:** Motion Carried

## DISCUSSION

**Sara:** This is a very right moment policy change, but I have some concern regarding the wording. It's written that the OM should be in good standing and what is the meaning of this here? And the other question is mainly, are we doing to move another motion later after July 13<sup>th</sup> to come back to the previous policy?

**Jin:** I'll respond to the second point. In terms of the reason why we want to revisit it every month it's because this is a temporary measure and we don't want this to necessarily be how things go once Council meetings resume back in person or when things kind of return to some sense of normalcy so essentially we would just vote to extend this at a subsequent Council meeting.

**Kimani:** I would want to address the question asked regarding good standing. Basically, how we understand this situation is that good standing is a member of the GSS.

**Speaker:** Good standing is defined as a paying member. If you're expelled from GSS, you're not in good standing. It's in the bylaws.

## VOTES

**FOR (21):** Oluwakemi Oke, Alireza Kamyabi, Jonathan Summers, Jackson Schumacher, Sarah Park, Jin Wen, Axel Hauduc, Nicolas Romualdi, Maria Jose Martinez, Tarique Benbow, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Jenny Lee, Mostafa Hagar, Aaron Loewen, Kimani Karangu, Ginny Pichler, Andrew Zang, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Abdullah Hassan, Jordan Hamden.

**ABSTAIN (1):** Tayo Olarewaju.

## **3.3 ACADEMIC FREEDOM STATEMENT**

---

**Group Responsible:** AcEx Committee

**Description:** Professor Santa. J. Ono issued a statement of solidarity against racism, and some UBC students have written a letter to Professor Santa. J. Ono laying out their concerns regarding the current UBC statement on Academic Freedom. They believe this statement has been used by some groups to justify hosting white supremacist speakers on campus. They are asking for the GSS support to gather as many signatures as possible.

**Proposed Objective:**



---

**Time:** 5 minutes

**Supporting Documents:** [UBC Academic Freedom Statement Amendments](#)

**WHEREAS** Professor Santa. J. Ono issued a statement of solidarity against racism, and some UBC students have written a letter to Professor Santa. J. Ono laying out their concerns regarding the current UBC statement on Academic Freedom,

**BIRT** GSS council supports the Academic Freedom Statement Amendments letter by permitting this letter to be shared on social media in order to gather more signatures.

**Mover:** AcEx Committee

**Seconded:** Jackson  
Schumacher

**Result:** Motion Failed

## **DISCUSSION**

**Nicolas:** Thank you Sara for introducing the matter. I would like to add some more context based on my involvement with previous engagements on Academic Freedom. To begin with, the Academic Freedom Statement is not controlled by Santa, it's controlled by the Senate. The Academic Freedom Statement as is, was passed in the 70s by the Senate, quote on quote because the Vancouver campus was the only campus so there was only one Senate. Currently there are two Senates even though it's a kind of implicit understanding that the Okanagan campus is working under the same statement, so this is just for context. There has been a lot of discussion as to whether the problem is the statement itself or the problem is how UBC Administration is interpreting the statement and that's also being discussed several times with people falling on both sides of the argument. The Academic Freedom Statement last year, there was a working group setup to review it of which I was a part of, and this working group made several recommendations to the Academic Policy Committee of Senate. The Academic Policy Committee of Senate only accepted one of our recommendations which it's the only one I can share because unfortunately all the work was done in camera so everything else that was accepted, has become public record and can't be shared. That recommendation was to transform the statement in its current form, or in its old form better said, which is the form more like English common law into the new form of UBC Senate policies. Which would include a section that clarifies the definition of the wording used in the statement. Which is one of the origins of the confusion in particular one of the aspects that allows for misinterpretation in my opinion is the fact that the statement says that Academic Freedom is extended to all members of the community and their guests and it's not clear who is a member of the community and who's capable of inviting someone to academic forum so one would assume that it the Senate Academic Policy committee where to, well one wouldn't assume as this recommendation has been approved, and the policy committee would work on this, that apart would be clarified. So that's procedurally to give context on the review of what Academic Freedom is. There's a number of other initiatives that have been pushed through other angles that was found not to be sufficient which particularly lead to the issue of controversial speakers on campus which is actually the root of this whole conversation and the particular speakers that have been particularly controversial in my short recollection has been Dukane and Gen Smith, one of the white nationalist front and the other of the transphobic front, I think. The Board owns the rental policy and this policy will also go up for review, in particular a focus on how to assess the impact of commercial



---

bookings of the University, in terms of speakers what would or not be allowed and how, in more general terms, bookings may affect the University. A third point I want to make is the AcEx Committee has been working for several months on the GSS Academic Freedom position statement. This is a position statement that is pivotal and it's a key product that the GSS needs to produce. It's my opinion that the GSS needs to come up with its own position statement on Academic Freedom through its own consultation process and I believe that first of all, this letter's content implicates endorsement which means that the threshold for this motion should be 2/3 but even if this is not agreed in procedural terms, it will give the impression or I fear, it communicates that the GSS doesn't care about this enough to produce its own position statement and it just sends out a letter. I think the letter makes an excellent point and we should inform our own discussion through that letter but we should not send a third party letter as something that the GSS is saying: "Well if you have a problem with racism, just sign on to this letter". I think this is grossly insufficient and sends a fundamentally wrong message about the level of engagement that the GSS has had and should have in these conversations. So, I think I spoke way too much, so I'll stop and let somebody else comment.

**Mostafa:** I guess first, I was wondering, Sara your apprehensions about this letter or at least voting to distribute it is that they said that they might rewrite it or rework it? Not sure if I heard right. Did they explain what they plan on rewriting exactly?

**Sara:** We haven't communicated with them regarding the issues that we have right now due to lack of time. They didn't give us enough time to discuss it in the committee truly. So, I don't know at this point if they will change the letter based on our recommendations or not.

**Mostafa:** But I guess we're voting to see whether we would distribute this letter, but they didn't say how they would change this exactly. And I guess, I also want to make the point, I guess what Nicolas was saying, that the GSS shouldn't just send out a letter to everyone but I also kind of, don't think this is mutually exclusive with other more important actions. It's just a little thing we could do on the side in addition to more concrete stuff.

**Arezo:** Nicolas, thank you for bringing up all of these points and somehow, I agree with you. I still have one question that's juggling in my mind. While I understand your point on why the GSS should have a statement on Academic Freedom and I agree with this but I'm still not clear that if we create our own statement, as an organization it's appropriate that we do this and there's no argument on this. But I'm not clear, because somehow, we want to influence the decision making so it's not clear for me how the GSS making a separate statement would bring the change. If we wanted to make any changes to the current Academic Statement or if we want to have influence on that final draft of Academic Freedom, so how by the GSS making its own statement, would be more effective than a joint effort? Not sure if my question is clear.

**Nicolas:** There's parts to what you asked. To be clear, I'm not talking about producing an Academic Freedom statement that controls Academic Freedom in UBC. We can't do this, that's the purview of the Senate. What I'm proposing we do is create a position statement on what Academic Freedom should be in UBC and the limits of what they are particularly as it interacts with EDI. Because that's the root of this issue, where are the limits to the freedom of one person at the moment that they start infringing on particularly, the dignity of other people. And it's important that the GSS is clear, what does the GSS think of this. Do we think that anybody gets to say whatever they want or do we think that people should stop, and I know I'm putting the argument in a way that it implies and answer, or should there be limits to academic freedom the moment that the exercise of this



---

freedom starts challenging the dignity of people and this challenge of dignity can take many forms. It can take the form of racism, when we question whether people of certain races have the same capacity as other, which to be clear, I find gross or whether people who are non-binary have the same right to feel safe on campus because we host events that invite oppositions who are likely to be violent to these people. So I think in my perspective, it's clear that Academic Freedom at some point needs to meet a limit and it's also clear in Canadian jurisprudence that this limit exists because, and this is quite different that the USA so you have to be quite careful when you take cases from USA, in Canada human rights are at the same level as freedom of expression. They're not this holy grail first amendment that allows you to say whatever you want, that is not the case in Canada. In Canada, freedom of expression and human rights are way equal to the Canadian supreme court and if there's any law student in this meeting, please feel free to correct me. I had to try to learn jurisprudence in the last couple of months. So, what I think is important is that the GSS takes a strong and informed stance in what we think, as Graduate Students, these limits should be. And the fact that we've been working on this for months and still haven't reached an agreement on what this stance should be, shows how complex that issue is and I'd be very careful about jumping into a letter that we haven't had the chance to really think through and that is not to say that there's anything wrong with it, just something that we haven't thought through and I think we can take it and it can inform our work but it has to inform our work, it should be a GSS Statement. You ask about advocacy, this is not advocacy, this is sending a letter with some effect, but this is not the way I would go about making change. Number 1 because it's addressed by the president and the president has no purview on the Academic Freedom Statement. They have purview on the interpretation but not the wording and actually Santa Ono is not the one, sorry for the colloquialism, is not the one that has been interpreting the statement favourable in terms of denying or accepting bookings, this has been done by the Provost office. You could argue that he's the president so he's responsible for everything and that's usually how I tend to think about Presidents but I don't think that a letter that is addressing the changes and statement is best addressed at Santa. This should be addressed as the Senate as a whole or at the academic policy committee of Senate. And even if we were to send a letter, I still don't think this is effective advocacy. I think effective advocacy looks different. It comes up with a plan, and a way to engage with these bodies to try to produce change and I say this, regardless of the fact that I tried this last year and was nowhere near as successful as I wanted to be, but we managed to get the academic policy to agree that the statement needs to be revised and turned into policy form, which took a lot of work and it's something but it's not everything and the question of what that would look like it's still up in the air. I'll put something else on the table for all of us to consider that is what I find most outrageous in this whole conversation is that the Senate still refuses to ratify and engage in the conversation of ratifying the equity and inclusion action plan. And we're in this constant battle where the Senate says what the executive does and does not apply to us and equity and inclusion needs some policies that are born outside the scope of Senate, do not apply to the Academic areas of the university because only Senate can control that. So it's actually the executives who have tried to do something and I just don't think this is the level of advocacy or structure of advocacy that the GSS should be engaging in, particularly when we have 2 Senators that could engage with Senate in a more meaningful way than just sending a letter. That's the response.

**Kimani:** Thank you to those that have spoken before me. I think when I look at the letter, the spirit of the letter is quite clear, the intentions very solid. However, I think as Sara has mentioned and Nicolas has alluded to, I think we need to do more than this. Why do I say so? As you all know, we're gathered here as the top decision-making organization of 10k students. And therefore, we have our own responsibility and direction that we should give to our membership. And I think it would be shooting ourselves on the foot if we don't come out



---

truly to defend what we think is supposed to be defended. However, that one should be directed in the right channels because we have the capacity and manpower to do what we need to do. What I'm saying is that GSS and this house or sitting should come up with one strong stand of our own. Other members can join our stand and walk the way because as GSS we have our own fiduciary mandate and responsibilities should anything go south and I think Nicolas mentioned about fearing and people thinking that GSS does not support and I don't think this even constitutes fear because having this motion brought to Council does not in any way sound like we fear that people will do anything in any way, we might be deciding and the deciding that will happen is in good faith because we're the GSS. The other thing you mention as to who the letter is directed to and I agree, yes, it is just like people gathering out there and directing a letter to me to do things on behalf of GSS, as President. Unless these things are brought like a place like this and you don't ask me to that then it might not be fruitful in any way. However, I think this letter is in good faith and spirit, but I think GSS should do something bigger than this and this is having our own stand. In any way, I would want to make this house know that the current GSS President and VPUAA are working around, given the experience he has in the previous capacities, to formulate a group of people, could be even former executive team members, to join hands and inform stronger positions that GSS would want to have inherited to people that come after ourselves and with this I think I will stop.

**Jonathan:** Thank you Nicolas once again for providing us with very valuable context as to what is happening at the Senate. I agree with most of Nicolas's points. This issue of Academic freedom is one that I'm particularly passionate about and I've spoken about it in Council before. I'm working with AcEx on this issue and have already signed this letter on my own behalf as an individual, which you might think of doing on your own behalf. We did discuss in AcEx the possibility of asking Council as a whole to sign this letter and determined that no, this would not be the best course of action because it might inhibit our ability moving forward to draft our own statement on Academic Freedom and I agree with this position so it's not something I'm pushing for. But if you look at the mention on the table, the one we're voting on, it's minimal. It's stating merely that we're going to circulate this letter on social media, and I think this is the least we can do. I don't think it inhibits our ability moving forward to draft our own statement. We can circulate it on social media saying that: while the GSS is working on its own statement, here's an initiative started by members of the GSS that you may wish to support and I think given the historical moment that we're in, in terms of anti-black racism and have GSS members that are coming to the GSS and asking for our supports, I think it would be terrible for us to not at least make this minimal gesture of circulating on social media and saying that the GSS is taking this issue seriously and that this is an initiative that's been started by GSS members while Council or AcEx committee is working on drafting a more complete statement and again, it's not going to be binding on anyone but it's a statement that we can bring forward to the university and make our voices heard. So, I would urge everyone to vote in favour of this very again, minimal gesture, circulating this letter that a lot of students have put a lot of effort into. Thank you.

**Sara:** Thank you everyone for your explanation on the other aspects of this motion. I just wanted to say that there's been a misword on the supporting documents and it says: "UBC Academic Freedom Statement" which is wrong. It should be "UBC Academic Freedom Statement Amendment Letter". Just wanted to point this mistake out so it wouldn't confuse some Councillors. Thank you.

**Nicolas:** I'm sorry if I spoke a lot before. I might be slightly traumatized by the history of advocating on this issue. I take Jonathan's point. We agree on some fundamentals so we're just not going to see eye to eye which





---

is, I interpret circulating a letter at the very least as an implicit endorsement which is why at the very minimum, I would suggest the 2/3 threshold for this vote. There's no way that the GSS circulating a letter and asking for signatures, does not constitute implicit endorsement at the very least. Furthermore, it has been my experience in this role but most of all in my prior role as President that supporting a cause, must be done very carefully because you're also implicitly saying that you don't support other causes. So if we're ever to put out a statement on race based issues, I would like that statement to be all encompassing and if we would be circulating anything it would have to be all encompassing because the fact that it would look to third parties that are not privy to these discussions, in a statement saying the GSS is fighting for antiblack racism, and indigenous students could immediately go: Oh they don't care about indigenous issues or a trans-student saying: Oh they don't care about trans. And I learned this the hard way, so I would also be very cautious about putting out any non-fully thought, carefully developed, all-encompassing letter/statement or any sort of social media publication. If this were most other issues, I would not be so careful but I'm very worried about the message of an implicit endorsement of a letter and very worried about the fact that we took months and we couldn't reach a conclusion and then all of a sudden we send something out that we didn't even produce. This could be read as the GSS doesn't even care enough to write their own letter. Which would be an awful message to send out. The fact that it targets a specific number of issues around the compromises between EDI and Academic Freedom can make any member who is not a part of that particular group that is being addressed in this letter, feel like the GSS does not care about them and this could be extremely traumatizing. So, my bottom line, I don't think this is thought through enough to be even voted on at any level to take any action. It's extremely premature and without a full grasp of exactly what we're doing and the intended and unintended consequences of what we're doing, I must very strongly advise against this course of action.

**Jackson:** Thanks to Nicolas and everyone else for providing all this context, I think it's been a very productive conversation. Some of the things that Nicolas brought up are all these potential consequences and negatives, but just one thing I would like to highlight is that there are potential consequences and harms to doing nothing. If the GSS is totally silent, it sounds like that doesn't send a message and while I appreciate that by advertising this letter, the message that we're sending perhaps isn't as nuanced as we want it to be, I think that potentially the message of saying nothing at all, could be even worse. That's all I'd like to say.

**Nicolas:** I just wanted to say that we weren't silent of the issue. We did circulate a statement that is based on the EDI statement that Council did approve. And I'm not suggesting that we're silent, I suggest we take our own position. That we get our own stuff together and take our own position.

**Mostafa:** I'd like to echo Jonathan and point out that this is basically just a motion asking permission for us to share a petition and petitions are more convincing the more people sign them and they're just asking for our help to help them reach the Graduate Student body and it seems we're the most reasonable people to help them. It's such a tiny action or favour essentially, they're just asking for a favour. You allotted 5 minutes for this because you probably didn't think like it was that big of an action either.

**Tarique:** So again, I've heard a lot of conversation in Academic Freedom in my time as VPUAA. That was one of the things I was working on in AcEx to come up with a position statement on Academic Freedom and we went ahead and did a lot of consultations and then COVID-19 kind of derailed that, right in the middle of us putting together the document. As is regard to this letter, I'm kind of in the fence because there's pros and cons at the same time. I would however want to ask the question, has the AcEx Committee, together with GSS policy





---

assistants, VPUAA, the whole research and policy team, reviewed the actual amendments that this letter is proposing and are there any other better outcomes or amendments that could holistically capture what we're trying to do. I share the same sentiment that Academic Freedom is not really a complex issue, the problem comes in how it's interpreted. I still feel as if the amendments that are proposed here need to be fleshed out a little bit more. I would be apprehensive therefore to sign on to this as a body, the GSS, and circulate it. If anyone else in Council shares the same concern that I have, I think either of those actions is saying that we support and agree with the content of this letter. So, I don't share the same sentiment of, it's a little thing that's posted on our website or just circulate it, not. We're non for-profit organization, and we have a mandate and any action that we carry out, really speaks volumes so I would be against doing that.

**Sara:** I think that Tarique pointed out my concern, right now, we're saying that this is the least the GSS can do as a body but the problem here is that when we circulate and promote this letter, we are actually supporting the statement and letter so it means we're taking a position and accepting the statement as is. This is not, as a GSS Body, this is not a least action, this is a lawful position that we're taking.

**Kimani:** I want to agree that, as I said and I will repeat again, this body represents over 10k students and we can't afford to take sides on who we want to support and who we don't. We're all in the same team. What I would want to see and continue representing, the GSS must have its own voice. If other people want to support it, that's fine. As I said initially, if I want to swing a bit as a person that is seriously concerned, this matter I personally think, I should be the one championing it loudly since I could be a victim anytime. So, I would want to have something so strong that it actually makes an impact. I know Nicolas alluded that this has been taking ages to see the light of day and therefore I think if GSS was to do whatever we're doing, because for those who are not aware, we just released a newsletter I think at the beginning of June, also putting our position on how we feel with issues due to racism and dismantling of racism at UBC. This was the first initial stage and we received some feedback on this and that was our communication to our members on what we think we stand for. However, we know that that is not enough. What is the thing that we're going to do to take this to the next level and that's where we are at the moment? Having a representation to the people who change policies: Senate and BOGS, depending on how issues and matters will be represented, and the committees in charge of this. And I want to be so clear that we go by GSS, because going with a third party, might not go well with us. For example, we support and circulate this, and we might have other groups wanting the same from us. And I think we're here for a purposed and reason and we should be always clear on what we're doing for all of us. Therefore, I suggest that it is good, it's a good letter to support and if people want to support it individually, they're at liberty to do so. But as GSS, I do not wish to use our platforms to do the circulation of this letter specially because the GSS has a mandate which is almost like this. What will happen in two weeks' time when we ask people for the same letter to sign. So, I strongly believe that this can be done at an individual level but as GSS we should come out for the 10k students.

**Jonathan:** Considering this was labeled to be a 5-minute discussion, with no disrespect to Jackson, I would like to call to question.

**Speaker:** So, I need a vote on this. For those new councillors, this is a type of motion that's undebatable. We must vote right now, and it means that everyone on the speaker list, won't be able to vote. And this requires a 2/3 vote.



## **VOTES- CALL TO QUESTION (SPECIAL RESOLUTION)**

**FOR (8):** Arwa Nemir, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Jackson Schumacher, Jenny Lee, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Axel Hauduc, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Jonathan Summers.

**AGAINST (11):** Alireza Kamyabi, Abdullah Hassan, Tarique Benbow, Aaron Loewen, Jordan Hamden, Ginny Pichler, Maria Jose Martinez, Kimani Karangu, Andrew Zang, Nicolas Romualdi, Mostafa Hagar.

## **DISCUSSION:**

**Speaker:** Motion failed so back to the speakers list.

**Jackson:** I just wanted to say that I didn't mean to imply that the executives weren't doing anything. I think what was in the newsletter was a great first step. I think the only other question I had considering that we might not advertise this letter, do we have any idea on what the timeline for the position statement is? Is it something that might come out soon or did we anticipate that it might take several more months of work? I think this would be a question for either Sara or Nicolas.

**Nicolas:** Academic Freedom statement is in AcEx SMART Goals so Sara might have a better idea but to answer from another perspective, not advertising this letter, doesn't mean that we can't send our own letter to the administration without adding to it. You can empower us to do this and chose to see this as a letter presented to council in the next meeting. That's an alternative course of action, the fact that we don't do this doesn't mean we don't do anything else.

**Jin:** Thank you. I guess where I kind of see this, as Jonathan and Mostafa's point, as GSS and as Kimani said, we represent 10k students. I feel like doesn't GSS have the responsibility to at least make this letter know to the people that we represent and let them make the decision? I feel at the very least we should be able to spread awareness that this letter is circulating.

**Nicolas:** Also, to address the point Jin just made, the GSS has the obligation to represent it's 10k in the most effective way possible. This is definitely true, but it doesn't mean that this means that we do whatever students ask us to do. That's why we have Council and executives, to make these decisions. And to go back to what we could do, I believe that a much better course of action is instead of distributing this letter, and I am happy to have this made a motion or to be left spoken about, I think we all know that I do what you tell me to do, is to write our own letter, not gathering signatures but a GSS Letter addressed to the Academic Policy Committee of Senate with copy to the executives of the university, expressing similar views to what is expressed in the letter and what we would like to see in a Policy review of the Academic Freedom Statement. This is a bit of a grey line because it has been mentioned before, the GSS Executives don't take positions for the Society, they use the existing ones and advocate for that to be realized, so that's why I keep insisting that it's important to get our own Academic Freedom position statement done so we can show the executives what they're supposed to be trying to achieve. But I believe that our existing Equity, diversity and inclusion statement which was passed a



couple of months ago, does give us enough room for us to write our letter to the University, asking this part of the issues to be addressed. And I believe we can frame this correctly and within the terms of the processed that have been ongoing. I don't think either course of action is going to make a massive difference because this is going to make sense for us to engage at the appropriate time which is when the policy goes into review and I can guarantee you one way or another we're going to get a seat in that committee and we're going to be able to work on the table when the review is happening but I don't see absolutely any problem of the GSS writing a letter to the relevant bodies, expressing similar views. If the concern is communicating this issue upwards.

**Nicolas:** Point of parliamentary inquiry. I think I've raised this before; I believe this constitutes implicit endorsement which must meet a 2/3 threshold. I believe you have to rule on this, or the President might need to.

**Speaker:** I would like to ask the President's opinion on this because for me it's a bit grey. Is this position statement?

**Kimani:** That's what we would be doing because we're being asked to take a position on this.

**Speaker:** So, this would be a special resolution. For new Councillors, usually I would rule on this but because this is grey to me, the President has the final ruling on this.

## **VOTES-MAIN MOTION (SPECIAL RESOLUTION)**

**FOR (4):** Arwa Nemir, Jackson Schumacher, Jin Wen, Mostafa Hagar.

**AGAINST (12):** Axel Hauduc, Aaron Loewen, Andrew Zang, Abdullah Hassan, Jenny Lee, Kimani Karangu, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Maria Jose Martinez, Ginny Pichler, Jordan Hamden, Alireza Kamyabi, Nicolas Romualdi.

**ABSTAIN (6):** Oluwakemi Oke, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Sarah Park, Tayo Olarewaju, Jonathan Summers, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi.

## **DISCUSSION:**

**Nicolas:** Feel free to vote me down, I move to amend the agenda to include a new item for decision. A motion to mandate the VPUAA to send a letter to the relevant UBC bodies saying the following:

**BIRT** the GSS Council mandates the VPUAA to send a letter to the relevant UBC bodies to expressly ask issues of race-based discrimination to be considered in any future revisions of the Academic Freedom Statement.

**Mover:** Nicolas Romualdi

**Seconded:** Jordan Hamden

**Result:** Motion Carried



---

## **DISCUSSION:**

**Nicolas:** I'll just make a brief motivation. The reason why I'm asking to do this as opposed to asking for permission, is because there's a bit of a gray area as we don't have our own Academic Freedom statement and it's unclear within its in my mandate to advocate about this to the University. However, with the express consent from Council, I'm very happy to write this letter to the University.

**Arezoo:** I have two questions for Nicolas. We already discussed that one of the un-useful parts of supporting that letter was that, the main academic Freedom thing is on the hands of the Academic Policy Committee of Senate, so the whole big point of the previous discussion was, ok we don't have power over Senate and specially this committee and the other point is that UBC admin doesn't have power over this statement because again it's in the hand of Academic Policy, so I was wondering how sending to these bodies would be helpful and second, I was wondering if the letter you will send, if the motion passes, if the letter is going to be approved by Council or will anyone either AcEx or Council, would review or vote on this letter before it's sent out?

**Nicolas:** To answer your questions, while I don't think this will make a massive difference in terms of what the policy review would look like, it's not a bad opportunity also to start this conversation from our side with the chair of the AcEx Committee, the chair of Senate and Senate Caucus and Equity and Inclusion office, etc. It again, comes down to me asking for permission because we don't have a clear position. If you give me leeway, I'm having to go full force on this with any UBC relevant body where I can pursue this. And again, this is not simply sending a letter, this is sending a letter and as part of an overarching advocacy effort that I could take forward. If we would rather wait until we have our statement, sure, but I proposed this because my general sense on our previous discussion is that we wanted to do something more and I think I have the opportunity to start the conversation and start moving things with a bit of leeway to go on this direction. As you all know, in previous years, I'm generally quite conservative in not going outside of my mandate which is why I'm asking for permission., but to be clear I'm not at any point implying that I have control over what Senate does or anybody at UBC. But I'm managed to create some changes, so it's about creating an advocacy strategy.

**Arezoo:** Could you answer my second question if whenever you're ready to send that to the bodies, if it will be approved by Council or AcEx?

**Nicolas:** Not in the current motion and that's not how we normally do it either. We write to the University without it going through Council unless we have a position statement, as long as it's aligned with the positions of the Society. However, if you would like to amend that and add more people into revision and put it through cycle, that's fine. It's just a matter of expediency.

**Arezoo:** Can I mandate to this motion that the letter needs to be discussed and approved by AcEx?

**BIFRT** the letter be approved by AcEx Committee.

**Mover:** Arezoo Mehrizi

**Seconded:** Jordan Hamden

**Result:** Motion Amended



## **VOTES- ADDING CLAUSE TO MAIN AMENDMENT**

**FOR (16):** Axel Hauduc, Ginny Pichler, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Maria Jose Martinez, Abdullah Hassan, Andrew Zang, Mina Rigby Thompson, Aaron Loewen, Jenny Lee, Mostafa Hagar, Sarah Park, Tayo Olarewaju, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Jin Wen, Jordan Hamden, Jackson Schumacher.

**AGAINST (1):** Tarique Benbow.

**ABSTAIN (4):** Kimani Karangu, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Jonathan Summers, Nicolas Romualdi.

## **DISCUSSION**

**Jordan:** Basically, wanted to inquire who would be involved in writing this letter and if it would be approved elsewhere. Originally, I wanted to suggest that it receives Council approval, but I hear your concerns about the time sensitive nature of this and I agree, so I think with that last motion added, it satisfied my concern.

**Kimani:** Can I request to add one thing to the main motion, that the GSS Council mandates the VPUAA AND the Executive Committee. The rational for this is to add an extra layer before we send it to AcEx.

**Speaker:** Just for motion writing, if you have two bodies of people responsible for the same thing, usually, nobody is responsible. My recommendation is to add this in the second amendment which means that both committees would be reading and approving it either way. But it's up to you.

**Kimani:** Sure, let's move it down.

**BIFRT** the letter be approved by AcEx Committee and the Executive Committee.

**Mover:** Kimani Karangu      **Seconded:** Arezoo Mehrizi      **Result:** Motion Amended

## **VOTES- ADDING CLAUSE TO MAIN AMENDMENT**

**FOR (16):** Lihwen Hsu, Aaron Loewen, Mina Rigby Thompson, Andrew Zang, Mostafa Hagar, Abdullah Hassan, Sarah Park, Tayo Olarewaju, Maria Jose Martinez, Erik Frieling, Jackson Schumacher, Jordan Hamden, Arwa Nemir, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Jenny Lee, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi.

**AGAINST (1):** Jonathan Summers.

**ABSTAIN (4):** Kimani Karangu, Jin Wen, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Nicolas Romualdi.

## **VOTES- MAIN AMENDMENT**

**FOR (19):** Axel Hauduc, Oluwakemi Oke, Erik Frieling, Aaron Loewen, Maria Jose Martinez, Tayo Olarewaju, Abdullah Hassan, Alireza Kamyabi, Andrew Zang, Hannah Green (Proxy for Gloria Mellesmoen), Kimani



---

Karangu, Mostafa Hagar, Mina Rigby Thompson, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Jenny Lee, Jin Wen, Jackson Schumacher, Jonathan Summers, Sara Hosseinirad (Proxy for Nancy Yang), Jordan Hamden.

**ABSTAIN (1):** Nicolas Romualdi

## 4 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

### 4.1 GSS FINANCES AND 2020/21 BUDGET

**Group Responsible:** Financial and Executive Oversight Officer

**Description:** Overview of GSS Finances and 2020/21 Budget

**Proposed Objective:** Discussion

**Time:** 20 minutes

**Supporting Documents:** [GSSFinances.pptx](#)

#### **DISCUSSION**

**Jonathan:** Thank you to the FEOO and Committee for this. Last month's Council I was critical of the presentation and really appreciate you taking the effort and time to come back with another thorough and very clear presentation and I'm confident that our finances are in good hands.

**Tarique:** Echoing again what Jonathan said, compared to last month's presentation, this is definitely several notches upwards and going in the right direction. The FEOO also took the opportunity to explain a lot of terminologies and what was being presented and I really appreciated that. And I believe all the new Councillors sitting today will also appreciate the FEOO providing so much context. I would also like to thank the HF Committee for going back and forth in adjusting the budget where necessary, in response to the whole COVID crisis and I hear the concerns they have. However, I don't think that it's being reflected on paper. If we're concerned that a lot of our revenues were going to be cut, I think the more appropriate action to do and correct me if I'm wrong and although the budget might change, but from the numbers presented today for the proposed budget for 2020-2021, the VPUAA, VP Students and External budget figures are above the previous year and if we're concerned of the negative impact that COVID will have on our revenues, then I believe that's there's some amount of disconnect with the figures and what we're trying to do. In my experience working in the organization, if there's a concern about revenues, what we do is we budget below and if the situation arises that we become better, then we adjust the budget thereafter but we don't budget above as if it were normal. I'm sorry, I'm not sure if I'm making any sense. I won't pick on it much today but thank you, and good work Tayo.



---

**Tayo:** HF is also aware of your concerns so that why I say that we'll continue to monitor this. But there's a reason why we allow the executives to have similar budgets to last year. Last year we had over 800k and this is in liquid cash, so I think our view is more at the very least, what we will suffer from this, would be an impact of around 150k so we'll still have over 600k as buffer in the very worst scenario. Even though we'll continue to watch the budget and try to ensure that it doesn't get to such level, we felt we should at least try to allow the executives to attain their goals while continuing to watch this. We still have the flow of cash to ensure that the GSS keeps on walking.

**Nicolas:** Thank you Tayo for the presentation and everyone for the questions and comments. I just wanted to put, as I did last year when we presented our budget, to put the surpluses in context because sometimes they get decontextualized and we lose sight of what's going on. Tayo is quite correct and in how he points that the decision making was made by the HF Committee and I think all the executives, I don't want to speak for all of them but I guess I am when I say that we appreciate the amount of leeway that they have given us to be able to advocate and to get the resources we need in order to be effective advocates even when we're facing a potential decrease in income. While we realize that we're facing a potential drop in income at the same time, this is the moment when we need to be really strong and active as advocates, to make sure that Grad Students don't get shorthanded as we navigate the COVID outbreak. And I think the general sense is that if we were to happen to have a short deficit which is not predicted but is a possibility, that if we're having it, it's this year that we should have it so that we have the resources to support Grad Students during the COVID Outbreak. Instead of the restructuring and financial liquidity of the Society, which I put myself a lot of work into with the prior FEOO, now current president, I want to put in context those numbers and there's 2 significant risks to the long term financial viability of the Society that are related with the Grad Life Center Project. Even if we were not to pay a cent for the Grad Life Center Project which is what I'm trying to get to and everything is on hold for COVID, but it still a possibility in the horizon. Once this project is realized, there's a clear future in which we no longer have the income from the Sauder School of Business, from the rental of the Ballroom, because this room would have to be repurposed. This would come in hand with having more offerings for Grad Students which is what we want but it would also mean that there would be a substantial impact to the annual income of the GSS. And the GSS needs to prepare for when this moment arrives and one of the long-term goals of structuring the financial backbone of the society was to be able to create investment vehicles that would be able to offset the loss in income from rentals at least partially because if we were to lose these, and Tayo correct me if I'm wrong, 80k or something of the sort. I'm not sure but let me look it up, yes, 87k per year. This would send us into a short deficit but if we were to take advantage of the years, we're in surplus to be able to build a backbone and create relatively solid investment vehicles, once we lose that rental, we can use the return from the investment to close that gap so we're able to offer more rooms and services to students without necessarily creating any increase in fees. So that's the long-term goal and why there's a certain level of liquidity in the Society. Also, we need to be careful with liquidity because I think we've had a couple of lawsuits in the past, and I'm going to word this in hypotheticals, and in the event of a lawsuit you're very easily talking about a couple of hundred thousand dollars gone just in legal fees, not even talking about a verdict. And there's any number of reasons why we need to be very careful with our liquidity. Our income is very close to our expenses and our guaranteed income which is basically student fees which is not really guaranteed because enrolment could drop for several causes, thus create a thread for the long term viability of the Society which is why I always want to advise everyone to be very careful with money and don't get too happy with surpluses. That's the point I wanted to make.





## 5 MATTERS TO NOTE

Time reserved for questions regarding updates below.

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Arezoo:** I don't know if in this part we stick to Roberts Rules or can we ask multiple questions?

**Speaker:** It's still Roberts Rules. You can ask multiple questions at once and if you want to ask another question, then put your name down again.

**Arezoo:** Ok I want to first give a little bit of background for my question, so it makes more sense. So, we have two types of Grad Students, one course-based Master's and the other are research based and from those research-based ones, some of them have scholarships and the others are paid by their supervisor grants. And when COVID hit how the financial situation looks like, and I want to focus on the research students, the government of Canada provided CERB and others, those students that get stipend from their supervisors, are not eligible for this government help. But the students who get tri-agency scholarships, since they're not considered income, they are eligible. So, I wanted to give this brief note, and also, when the research curtailment happened, this affected a certain number of students who couldn't continue working on their lab and this doesn't include all Grad Students because as mentioned, some of them are course based, some of them have written their thesis. But this curtailment caused the progress to stop and entered them into a lot of difficulty. This curtailment will bring a lot of problems because the only solution that the University is providing is saying be flexible and reducing some thesis aims. So, this leads to the students graduating with a doctoral thesis that is less than a normal one or a master's thesis that is also less than normal. Kind of diminished effect and this is many ways affects their success in the future whether they want to continue in academia or to continue in an industry. I can list what the potential problems could be, but I don't want to spend time on this and if anyone is still thinking about which problems they would face, I am happy to list this. With this said, I honestly haven't seen any clear answer from the University as to how they want to tackle the circumstances of this curtailment. And even if students are back on the lab, it's based on shifts. So, you have 5-6 hours in the lab, and this is not going to be the same for a long period of time. So, it's really going to effect in financial burden, which is one big part, because if you are forced to extend your studies and pay more tuition, the other part if that you're going to be graduate, if the situation stays as is and the University if not going to really do anything specific, the students are going to graduate with very low quality degrees. All of us that have been affected by this research curtailment, we're paying a lot and have done a lot of work and our hope and dreams were that by coming to this University we would graduate with an outstanding research because this is a great University, and all of us, we're still paying a big amount of tuition but still graduate with a low quality thesis. There are 2 aspects to this curtailment. One financial and the other educational. And the quality of the degree and when you graduate, the difficulty to find a job because people see that you graduated with not good results. Regarding some financial aspects, I see some efforts and I will get into this as well. But I haven't seen any advocacy effort or when I read these updates from the executives, I haven't noticed. I haven't noticed any update or effort that this has been discussed by any of the executives. No discussion about the effects and how the University is handling these effects. I have not seen this in any advocacy efforts of the executives. This is my





---

main concern and why nobody has touched this. There's nobody like GSS that has access to university administration meetings, not even Senators. I haven't seen anything, so I'm keen to hear why nobody is working on this or if you are, explain what you've done and what the answer of the University was. I believe that you can do a lot specially because the government is giving money to extend grants etc, and it's not clear how the extension is going to be done, who gets the extension, how we can get help from UBC to continue research and prevent the premature graduation of the students. So again, this is very important, and I haven't seen any effort from the GSS regarding this. The other part is that I would say, as a Senator myself, I haven't started working at the Senate committee yet, they haven't invited us so since we were just approved at the committee seating in May. I'm in the learning and teaching committee and as much as I can, I will do my best. I believe GSS has a big impact because GSS executives are invited to a variety of UBC Administration meetings and they can make an impact. My second concern is about the letter that was sent from Nicolas to BOGS. My concern with this letter is that this letter is mentioning that this is the main concern of Grad Students and I'm afraid that I don't agree with this and how this letter was worded. This is his prerogative. This letter starts thanking the Provost for listening to Grad Students and myself as a Senator, the Faculty of Grad Students hasn't contacted either Tarique or me. This is the right thing to do, especially since COVID 19 and the Faculty hasn't reached us for any consultation. And from the Provost office, not being involved in consultation was a big concern of the senators and we only had 1 meeting with the Provost and there was 50 pages of documents and only 1 of them raised issues about Grad Students. All I want to say is that when I look at this letter thanking them, maybe they've done more than enough with consultations with GSS but I don't find this right because we as Senators, we're grad students and they didn't listen to us. Not sure if they've listened to anyone aside from GSS Executives, but again, this is his prerogative. When the priorities were listed, I look at the wording of extension of major scholarship and extension of funding was. From extension of major scholarship the letter says that "the urge of learning and research committee, at a 1-time allocation of funding, enables the possibility of extending more scholarships a this one term" It also says it needs to come to an extension of granted funding.

**Jonathan:** Point of privilege. I would just like to request that the Councillor try to summarize what they'd like to say in a couple of sentences and maybe reach out directly to the Executive that would be the appropriate person. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Arezoo, could you sum it up?

**Arezoo:** I think that the wording urging for major scholarships vs. Extension of grants was just a recommendation and again the major scholarships are already extended by the University and Tri-agencies. I think for one or half year, I can't remember exactly because I remember at the Senate level something mentioned about that.

**Speaker:** Can you summarize this in a couple of sentences?

**Arezoo:** Yes, I'm summarizing. So, my issue about the housing assistance is that it was asking for help for those on campus. A lot of students who live off campus, they don't get the BC rent, because they don't qualify. They need to qualify for CERB. My point is that this letter, doesn't represent how big the issue is. I think it's targeted more specifically to some people rather than looking at the broader lens, vs like I found that asking for housing assistance on campus is not...



**Speaker:** Arezoo, that's several paragraphs. I must respect the next person on the Speakers List.

**Arezoo:** Ok, yes, those are my concerns. And I appreciate the answer or any direction from Council on this.

**Jonathan:** I'll be rather brief. Following up on our discussion about Academic Freedom and anti-racism which is also in the President's comments, I just wanted to ask if there's been any attempt to reach out to the student that was affected by the recent incident, I believe Savoy Williams is a Graduate Student, has there been any attempt to reach out to him.

**Nicolas:** I can answer that. We did think about this a little bit. One of the concerns we have is that the student hasn't reached out to us and the only way we would have of reaching out to him would be with the database that was provided to us, and this would be a breach of privacy. It's giving me a headache as well so if you have any suggestions, please say so. Any student that reaches out to us directly, but to be aware of a problem that a student is having, news article or whatever other matter, and the GSS to actively reach out by the database that we have which is not intended for that, is problematic, but I do take the point that perhaps we can go a bit more out and say, if you're experiencing any of these issues, please reach out to us. And how we can target this a little bit better.

**Speaker:** Any more questions? Ok, this is the end. Notice of next meeting is July 16<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 pm, if nothing changes, still on Teams. BIRT that the meeting adjourns at 8:44pm.

**Arezoo:** Can I ask a question?

**Speaker:** Sure, it will be the last question because I already read the motion.

**Arezoo:** First, my question wasn't answer. And second, I don't know how you can end the meeting if there's no answer to this. I'm surprised that they don't have one and surprised that Councillors don't care. So, my question is that.

**Speaker:** Well try to refrain saying that people don't care. Refrain to use that language and putting it in people's mouths.

**Arezoo:** Sure. My question is that GSS is sending out a survey, so why are they not waiting for these results and then send the letter to BOG's.

**Speaker:** Who are you directing this question to?

**Arezoo:** I think the letter was sent by Nicolas.

**Nicolas:** I'll try to answer these concerns as succinctly as possible. To answer the questions about timing, we can't wait until the end of July to start advocating for student issues. This is an ongoing effort and we run services to better inform our advocacy efforts but there's problems that are evident with or without surveys, so we advocate on those either way. And there's many students that do reach out to us with concerns and then we raise them and that's how this functions. I think this is as succinct as I can be without getting in too much detail.



---

**Speaker:** Ok, maybe you two should connect afterwards. This is to be respectful of everyone's time and if there's anything that is more detailed, we should bring this offline.

**Tayo:** Perhaps I can try to respond to Arezoo's question. It sounds to me like there's some complaints about the actions of specific executives, so I think our bylaws and manual has a procedure to follow. I don't think as it stands, the reason why most members of Council are silent is likely because we're not aware of such issues. In summary, the proper procedure would be to speak to the President about the concerns and then after that, maybe the FEOO. I would suggest this procedure to be adopted.

**Speaker:** This is the first couple of times we've tried to allow questions regarding to updates below. We didn't do that before. These kind of agenda items, aside from having Roberts Rules, this only works to have an efficient meeting, if we have a motion in hand. If we have a time reserved for anything, that could go forever like AMS. This is up to you guys, how you want to run the meeting. But I would like to ask that we only ask questions about the updates below, otherwise I'm going to rule you out of order. Thank you for all questions and please executives, please follow up with Arezoo and any other people with further questions. Let's just please respect their concerns.

## 5.1 UPCOMING EVENTS

## 5.2 EXECUTIVES

---

### 5.2.1 President:

- Heath Matters:
  - Collaborated with the GSS VPUAA and acting on advice by Studentcare, and the AMS/GSS Health & Dental Committee have made changes to the admissions period to allow graduate students who enroll in the summer to have immediate access to the extended plan if they opt to.
- Student Issues:
  - The President and VPUAA are collaborating with the UBC VP Students office to prepare a strategy document on student facing issues in the COVID-19 context, such as Student Housing, Health and Wellness and student engagement.
- Dismantling Racism on Campus:
  - Further discussions have been brought to the attention of the VP students office, following the recent racial incident on campus. Meeting date have been set to source and facilitate an ongoing and concrete dialogue on systemic racism in all its manner and shapes.
- Transportation:
  - Held several consultations meeting on the U-pass (AMS, UBC and GSS)
- GSS Committees:
  - Successfully held a joint GSS Committee Chairs meeting. As a result, a motion is presented in this seating. Regular meeting schedule is on the finalization phase.



---

## 5.2.2 FEEO

- The FEEO, House and Finance Committee, General Manager and Accountant are discussing applying for Canada Emergency Business Account and Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance for small businesses to assist in ameliorating impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

---

## 5.2.3 VP University & Academic Affairs

- Advocacy
  - A submission ([https://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2020/06/8\\_2020.06\\_GSS-Correspondence.pdf](https://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2020/06/8_2020.06_GSS-Correspondence.pdf)) was prepared for the Learning and Research Committee of the Board, addressing the presentation on the impact of COVID-19 on Graduate students. The presentation, in general, captured the main issues facing graduate students and provides reasonable recommendations of potential paths forward. The GSS submission informed priorities, raising concerns around students with dependents, extension of scholarships, guaranteed funding, and tuition relief. An additional submission, with similar priorities was made to the full Board in collaboration with UBCSUO addressing issues of graduate students of both campuses ([https://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2020/06/1.7\\_2020.06\\_GSS-and-UBCSUO-Submission-re-Impact-of-COVID-19-on-Graduate-Students.pdf](https://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2020/06/1.7_2020.06_GSS-and-UBCSUO-Submission-re-Impact-of-COVID-19-on-Graduate-Students.pdf))
  - Additionally, a submission was prepared in collaboration with the AMS ([https://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2020/06/1.7\\_2020.06\\_Submission-to-the-UBC-Board-of-Governors-Regarding-Student-Consultation.pdf](https://bog3.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2020/06/1.7_2020.06_Submission-to-the-UBC-Board-of-Governors-Regarding-Student-Consultation.pdf)) highlighting some positive changes in student consultation, as well as gaps that have been identified by both students' societies.
- Research on COVID-19 Impact
  - A survey was launched in collaboration with UBC and AMS to survey graduate students on the impact of COVID-19. At the time of writing this update, the survey has already had almost 1000 responses, which is a record number for a GSS survey, highlighting the advantage of this strategy. As a result of the collaboration with UBC, we are also able to easily link the responses to the full administrative data, to have accurate demographics. The collaboration with AMS allows fluid data sharing between both societies as well and makes so students can fill only one survey instead of one per society. The survey structure is branches so questions relevant to graduates or undergraduates only are asked to the relevant group. The survey will run until the end of June.
- Additional Support for Students
  - The VP UAA and the President are collaborating with the UBC VP Students office to prepare a strategy document on student facing issues in the COVID-19 context, such as Student Housing, Health and Wellness and student engagement. A public draft is not yet available.
- Long Term Considerations of Online Teaching
  - The office of the VP UAA has been closely collaborating with the office of the Provost and the Associate Dean's Academic to develop guidelines for online teaching, particularly on issues that affect graduate students. A ~60 page first draft has been consolidated and is available in the supporting documents for feedback. The guidelines will be distributed to all faculty once they have been finalized.



- 
- Changes to the AMS/GSS Health & Dental Admissions
    - By the recommendation of the VP UAA, in collaboration with the GSS President, and advised by Studentcare, and the AMS/GSS Health & Dental Committee have made changes to the admissions period to allow graduate students who enroll in the summer to have immediate access to the extended plan if they wish to, which was not previously possible. Graduate students are now able to opt-in with a directly prorated fee for the coverage period. This has been communicated to graduate students who started in the summer.

## 5.2.4 VP External Relations

---

- U-Pass
  - We've been working closely with the AMS to find a suitable solution to the problem of student transportation without the U-Pass. For background, the U-Pass is provided as a service to all fee-paying post-secondary students across the Lower Mainland. The U-Pass was suspended with mutual agreement between TransLink and post-secondary institutions across Lower Mainland as a direct result of COVID-19 - with many students no longer commuting to campus or living in TransLink serviced areas, TransLink's implementation of free ridership on buses and reduced services across Metro Vancouver. Along with the AMS, we are currently in the process of implementing a subsidy program to help with the cost of transportation throughout the summer.
- Unifying Graduate Student Societies across BC (SFU, UVIC, UNBC and UBC)
  - One of my SMART goals for this year is to develop an alliance of graduate student societies across BC and Canada so that we have a unified voice representing graduate student interests across levels of government. After an initial meeting with graduate student societies across BC, we mutually agree on the needs and benefits that such an alliance would provide. Currently, and as a first step, we are working on writing a joint letter on behalf of all of BC's graduate student societies to the Province to 1) highlight the graduate student narrative and the important role graduate students and their work plays in socioeconomic development of society and 2) specific asks to support graduate students during COVID-19 and beyond.
- Meeting with Minister Mark – BC Ministry of Advanced Education
  - In late May, I had meeting with Minister Mark along with ABCS Chairperson and a representative from UVIC to articulate the needs of post-secondary students during COVID-19 and ways the Ministry can support students going forward. We highlighted the need for support for students with dependents and students struggling with housing amongst other asks. The Minister welcomed our recommendations and emphasized her commitment to support students during this time.
- BC Budget 2021 Consultation - Presentation to BC Standing Committee on Finance
  - We have secured an allocated time to present to the BC Standing Committee on Finance as part of the BC Budget 2021 Consultation process later this week. This is an important step towards promoting the important role that graduate students and graduate education plays in socioeconomic development of the society to government officials.
- Hiring a new policy assistant



- We are in the process of hiring a new Policy Assistant. I have revamped and updated the job description and we are working with HR in the process.
- Advocacy Panel
  - Along with AcEX, I'm working on finalizing the ToR for the Advocacy Panel and recruiting the first team for the panel which is tasked with developing a policy report on various sources of graduate student funding from provincial and federal government and recommendations for advocacy going forward.
- Food Security Initiative
  - The VP AUA and I are working closely as part of UBC's Food Security Initiative to address the currently high levels of food insecurity on campus. The Initiative is currently at its early stages.

## 5.2.5 VP Students

---

## 5.3 COMMITTEES

---

### 5.3.1 Academic & External Committee

---

- GSFA:
  - The committee received some concerns regarding the GSFA policy and webpage. A working group has formed and will report to the committee next month.
- Academic Freedom and Freedom of Expression:
  - A group of UBC students has written a letter to Santa. J. Ono laying out their concerns regarding the current UBC statement on Academic Freedom. They believe this statement has been used by some groups to justify hosting white supremacist speakers on campus. They are asking for GSS support. Here is the link to the letter:  
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1M53sZggz1aW2bYGMpqYImBbhR5u4Y\\_Mc\\_DMgdgXQYFk/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1M53sZggz1aW2bYGMpqYImBbhR5u4Y_Mc_DMgdgXQYFk/edit)
  - Since this matter is time sensitive, the committee is decided to bring the matter to the council."

### 5.3.2 Code & Policy Committee

### 5.3.3 Elections Committee

### 5.3.4 Executive Committee

---

- Held multiple meetings with Dr. Ono, VP students, G+PS highlighting matters that are core to GSS such as affordability, childcare, graduate with dependants, financial support. Further, consulted on the ongoing online classes, where we highlighted possible challenges graduate students may be facing internationally and locally.

### 5.3.5 Executive Oversight Committee

---



- EOC has requested for executives SMART goals and is scheduled to commence meeting and reviewing executive goals this month.

### 5.3.6 Governance & Accountability Committee

---

- G&A is currently compiling a list of current councillors and which departments are missing representatives in Council.
- G&A is discussing creating the ToR for an ad-hoc committee to promote more inclusivity and increase minority representation within GSS.
- G&A is working with communications to create a common form for chairs to submit KPIs.
- Our main priority this year is committee support. We will be reviewing the workload across everyone, supporting chair transitions by creating documentation, and assessing any gaps or issues we may have in committees. Areas of concern are high and low workloads for committees (ie. AcEx, Services).

### 5.3.7 House Finance Committee

### 5.3.8 Human Resources

### 5.3.9 Services Committee

### 5.3.10 Strategic Planning ad-hoc Committee

### 5.3.11 AMS Caucus

### 5.3.12 Graduate Council Caucus

---

## 5.4 SENATORS AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS

---

### 5.4.1 Senators:

### 5.4.2 Board of Governors Representatives:

---

- Committee meetings were held on June 1st and 2nd. [Dockets can be found on the Board website.](#) It was a busy cycle of meetings, which included:
  - The Board received presentations on [plans for online learning](#) in the fall as well as the [challenges that graduate students and post-doctoral fellows have been facing](#) during the pandemic.
  - The Board briefly discussed ways to action the [statement against racism and injustices](#) made by President Ono.
  - Proposed [amendments to the Sexual Misconduct Policy](#) (SC17, previously 131) were passed.
  - The Board [received an update and discusse](#)d process towards divestment.



- Full Board will be held on June 16th. Agendas, materials, and links to the streams will be posted before the meeting.

## 6 NOTICES

### 6.1 NOTICE OF NEXT MEETING

**Date:** Thursday, July 16th at 5:30 pm

**Location:** Online Via Teams

### 6.2 NOTICE OF UNSEATINGS

- Nicholas Najy was unseated as Councillor from the Elections Committee.
- Nicholas Najy was unseated as Departmental Representative from Master of Management.
- Xuejun Ryan Ji was unseated as Departmental Representative from Department of Educational, Counseling Psychology, and Special Education.
- Xuejun Ryan Ji was unseated as Councillor from Academic and External Committee.
- Sara Izadi was unseated as Ordinary Member from Executive Oversight Committee.
- Tayo Olarewaju was unseated as Councillor from the House Finance Committee.
- Parsa Arabi was unseated as Ordinary Member from the Human Resources Committee.
- Erika Tian was unseated as Ordinary Member from the Human Resources Committee.
- Nafise Faridi was unseated as Departmental Representative from Mechanical Engineering.
- Arash Shadkam was unseated as AMS Council Representative.

## 7 ADJOURNMENT

**BIRT** there being no further business the meeting be adjourned at **8:49 pm**.

**Mover:** Abdullah Hassan

**Seconder:** Sarah Park

**Result:** Meeting Adjourned