



ATTENDANCE

Present: Aaron Loewen, Alireza Kamyabi, Alison McClean, Andrew Zang, Axel Hauduc, Daniel He, Devarsh Bhonde, Edgar Liao, Gillian Glass, Jenny Lee, Jin Wen, Julia Burnham, Kimani Karangu, Kira Vandermeulen, Maria Jose Athie Martinez, Maryam Tayyab, Mostafa Hagar, Nevena Rebic, Nicolas Romualdi, Perrin Waldock, Sarah Park, Shiva Zargar, Taryn Scarff, Teesha Luehr, Tayo Olarewaju, Virginia (Ginny) Pichler, Younus Ahmed, Yundi Wang, Charlotte Alden (Ubyssy), Ezra Yu (Ordinary Member), Remzi Xhemalce-Fuentes (Ordinary Member), Ritwik Bhattacharjee (Ordinary Member), Sofie McComb (Ordinary Member)

Regrets:

Absent: Adenike Adelokun, Alejandra Botia, Arezoo Alemzadeh Mehrizi, Bethany Adair, Charfeddine Khalifa, Delarem Shojaei, Hannah Green, Jeanie Malone, Leila Matte-Kaci, Max Holmes, Mohammad Karimi, Rachel Philips, Saud Lingawi, Tarique Benbow, Torin McLachlan, William Canero, Zhenyang Xu

Quorum: 19 Councillors

CALL TO ORDER AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting will be called to order at **7:50 pm**.

SPECIAL RULES ADOPTION

WHEREAS the Council has not yet established in the policy suspending of Roberts Rules of Order and,

WHEREAS a similar decision has been made in the past and proved fruitful,

BIRT the Council adopts the following special rules of order for this Council meeting:

- Each member’s speaking time limit per speaking turn is 3 minutes unless extended by the Council or otherwise specified in the agenda.
- The time limit of debate for each motion is 20 minutes unless extended by the Council; and
- There is no limit on how many times a member can speak on each motion.

MOVER: Kimani Karangu

SECONDER: Jin Wen

RESULT: Carried

AGENDA ADOPTION

BIRT the agenda be adopted as presented.

MOVER: Andrew Zang

SECONDER: Shiva Zargar

RESULT: Carried

FOR (19): Kimani Karangu, Perrin Waldock, Andrew Zang, Nevena Rebic, Younus Ahmed , Ginny Pichler, Julia Burnham, Shiva Zargar, Gillian Glass, Taryn Scarff, Sarah Park, Jin Wen, Jackson Schumacher, Mostafa Hagar, Jenny Lee, Maria Jose Martinez, Aaron Loewen, Yundi Wang, Alireza Kamyabi



DISCUSSION

Sarah: I'd like to amend the agenda to add a matter for discussion for 10 minutes for everyone to fill out the EDI audit survey that was circulated.

MOVER: Sarah Park **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried, none opposed

TERRITORIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

President: I would like to acknowledge that UBC Vancouver Point Grey campus is situated on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the Musqueam people. I would also like to acknowledge that you are joining us today from many places near and far and acknowledge the traditional owners and caretakers of those lands. But I think I would also want to extend my gratitude to everybody who has joined this meeting, despite having another meeting before this, so you're great people.

INTRODUCTIONS

[Introductions]

1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1.1 GSS COUNCIL MINUTES

BIRT the following GSS Council minutes be approved:

- [February 18, 2021](#)

MOVER: Alireza Kamyabi **SECONDER:** Jackson Schumacher **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (19): Shiva Zargar, Jackson Schumacher, Perrin Waldock, Younus Ahmed , Alireza Kamyabi, Alison McClean, Kimani Karangu, Edgar Liao, Aaron Loewen, Mostafa Hagar, Andrew Zang, Axel Hauduc, Maria Jose Martinez, Sarah Park, Nevena Rebic, Taryn Scarff, Jenny Lee, Yundi Wang, Jin Wen

1.2 COMMITTEE MINUTES

BIRT the following GSS Committee minutes be approved:

Academic & External Committee:	January 27, February 19	House Finance Committee:	February 2, February 9, February 23
Code and Policy Committee:	February 3, 2021	Human Resources Committee:	
Elections Committee:		Services Committee:	



Executive Committee:	February 12, 2021	AMS Caucus:	
Executive Oversight Committee:		Graduate Council Caucus:	
Governance & Accountability Committee:		Strategic Planning ad-hoc Committee:	February 5, 2021
All-Chairs Meeting:	February 12, 2021		

MOVER: Jackson Schumacher **SECONDER:** Maria Jose Martinez **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (15): Perrin Waldock, Andrew Zang, Gillian Glass, Jackson Schumacher, Shiva Zargar, Edgar Liao, Mostafa Hagar, Axel Hauduc, Maria Jose Martinez, Kimani Karangu, Yundi Wang, Tayo Olarewaju, Aaron Loewen, Jin Wen, Jenny Lee

2 SEATINGS

2.1 NEW COUNCILLORS

BIRT the following Seating of new Councillors be approved:

Name	Department
Aditi Nallan	Bioinformatics
Axel Hauduc	Genome Science and Technology

MOVER: Maria Jose Martinez **SECONDER:** Aaron Loewen **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (18): Kira Vandermeulen, Shiva Zargar, Sarah Park, Alison McClean, Bethany Adair, Andrew Zang, Kimani Karangu, Teesha Luehr, Jackson Schumacher, Taryn Scarff, Gillian Glass, Younus Ahmed, Jin Wen, Alireza Kamyabi, Mostafa Hagar, Jenny Lee, Maria Jose Martinez, Yundi Wang

2.2 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
------------------	---------	----------	-----------



AMS Caucus	Ashni Gill	Representative	2
Graduate Council	Alison McClean	Representative	1
Health and Dental Plan Caucus		Representative	0

MOVER: Alireza Kamyabi **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (16): Nevena Rebic, Jackson Schumacher, Mostafa Hagar, Kimani Karangu, Andrew Zang, Sarah Park, Taryn Scarff, Kira Vandermeulen, Maria Jose Martinez, Gillian Glass, Shiva Zargar, Jenny Lee, Yundi Wang, Edgar Liao, Bethany Adair, Alireza Kamyabi; **ABSTAIN (1):** Alison McClean

2.3 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	2
		Ordinary Member	2
Elections		Councillor	1
		Ordinary Member	5
Executive Oversight		Councillor	3
		Ordinary Member	4
Governance & Accountability		Councillor	0
		Ordinary Member	2
House Finance		Councillor	2
		Ordinary Member	2
Human Resources	Kira Vandermeulen	Councillor	2
		Ordinary Member	4
Services		Councillor	1
		Ordinary Member	2

MOVER: Aaron Loewen **SECONDER:** Maria Jose Martinez **RESULT:** Carried



FOR (18): Jackson Schumacher, Sarah Park, Kimani Karangu, Ginny Pichler, Andrew Zang, Mostafa Hagar, Teesha Luehr, Perrin Waldock, Alireza Kamyabi, Aaron Loewen, Yundi Wang, Shiva Zargar, Daniel He, Maria Jose Martinez, Kira Vandermeulen, Bethany Adair, Taryn Scarff, Jenny Lee

DISCUSSION

Tayo: I nominate the new councillor Axel.

Axel: I respectfully decline, I'm on two committees.

Kira: I'd like to nominate myself for the HR Councillor seat.

3 MATTERS FOR DECISION

3.1 AFFILIATE ORGANIZATION RECOGNITION

WHEREAS the following organizations have submitted a petition for recognition as an Affiliate Organization,

BIRT the following organizations be recognized as Affiliate Organizations for one year, ending at the meeting of Council in March 2022:

Name of Affiliate Organization	Representative
Disabled Graduate Student Association	Haley Branch
Acadia Park Residents' Association	Eric Douglas

MOVER: VP Students **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (22): Daniel He, Kimani Karangu, Sarah Park, Aaron Loewen, Shiva Zargar, Jackson Schumacher, Bethany Adair, Teesha Luehr, Maria Jose Martinez, Taryn Scarff, Perrin Waldock, Axel Hauduc, Nevena Rebic, Yundi Wang, Gillian Glass, Andrew Zang, Alison McClean, Kira Vandermeulen, Julia Burnham, Edgar Liao, Jenny Lee, Mostafa Hagar

3.2 2021 ELECTIONS RESULTS

Responsible: Elections Committee

Description: 2021 GSS Election Results presentation, appeal discussion, then motion

Proposed objective: To present election results, review appealed disqualification, and ratify election results

Relevant Materials: 2021 Election Results.pptx; 2020-Preliminary Announcement of Election Results.pdf; [VP External – Final Appeal.pdf](#); [On the Disqualification of Remzi Fuentes.pdf](#)

WHEREAS an appeal was filed by a candidate disputing their disqualification by the Elections Committee, and

WHEREAS the disqualification was previously appealed unsuccessfully to the Elections Committee and the Governance and Accountability Committee, and



WHEREAS according to Policy 12.9.2 Council is the final appeal body for election results,

BIRT Council accepts/rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate, and

BIFRT Council ratifies the results of the 2021 GSS Elections.

DISCUSSION

Motion to amend item to insert presentation before motion.

MOVER: Mostafa Hargar

SECONDER: Andrew Zang

RESULT: Carried, none opposed

[Presentation on election results and disqualification]

[Mostafa sponsors Remzi Xhemalce-Fuentes to speak during this item]

Remzi: I'm going to focus on the FB post, which I'm being disqualified for. I think there's a whole background story on the things above. We've been discussing this for a while. I think the elections committee and account-administrative committee [Governance & Accountability Committee] know I'm not being disqualified by other things. I think I've provided in the past, I can provide it to any member if they want, my arguments for the previous post, the first post on the student graduate forum. I asked Mostafa for his permission to post it, I received partial permission of that post, that was made before I was a candidate. It was before elections process. Think its very questionable. This has been used traditionally by tons of candidates to promote their campaigns. In my post I never promoted my campaign. I just invited people to talk to me about what they wanted for the future of the GSS and invited them to be candidates. You can signalize it if you want. Would appreciate if you could go back, regarding the Facebook post, this has really bothered me; I received an email from Mostafa on the 26th to take down the Facebook post. So it was taken down, and I can prove it was, in the respected 24-hour period. Then I received an email days later saying you've been disqualified because you had a Facebook post. I received specific instructions on an Instagram post after the whole Facebook post ordeal to retract from an Instagram post, which I did, because I've always followed every single instruction from the Elections Committee. I received an email four days later after I already removed the Facebook post as instructed on the email on the 26th of February. I not only removed the post as Mostafa asked me to take it down. He asked me to take it down. He asked me to take down the public social media post. I took it down and I can prove it wrong-

Speaker: Sorry, three minutes. I need an extension.

Motion to extend discussion time by 3 minutes.

MOVER: Alireza Kamyabi

SECONDER: Jin Wen

RESULT: Carried, none opposed

Remzi: The bottom line is I received an email on the 26th that I should take down a social media post without saying what social media post. First I made the Facebook post and the Instagram. Then I went there and took down the Facebook post. I received an email days later saying "We noticed you had made a Facebook post. But we just found out until now." When I asked proof about this, I get a screenshot that Mostafa showed earlier that said the screenshot was taken two hours after I made the post. So the Elections Committee has provided me a



screenshot taken two hours before the post. And it's letting me know days later that I made a post that I didn't want to rescind. So it doesn't carry any logic, right? Mostafa, it says two hours. I made that post two hours- you sent me the screenshot two hours-

Speaker: No "you", thank you.

Remzi: That screenshot was taken the day I made the post, then it was told to me that I made it. Apart from that you say you want to go by the book, well if you want to go by the book, then laws have an order, to avoid all these types of problems, you should apply the first law that would allow me to retract the post-

Speaker: Remzi, I'm sorry, I have to because it's getting emotional. So please address anything to me. You can yell at me. [Interrupted]

Remzi: Madame Speaker it doesn't make sense to me. For me it seems someone sat on this screenshot for days because the post was not even there. I received an instruction, I took down the post, and then for my surprise a day later somebody says "You didn't take down the post". Since it's been more than 24 hours since the first time you posted a post, you're automatically disqualified. For me and the people with me at the time, this was just ridiculous. At the end of the day, I knew by the time I was disqualified, I was up in the polling, in the votes, I was disqualified without notice. Found out because someone tried to vote for me, and they told me. Without any warning. I think it's pretty unfair, for the people who voted for me. I find it really hard to believe that the Elections Committee and Elections Policy Panel, when they have my social media and they send me an email 2 hours after I posted on Facebook telling me to take down a post, then say they didn't find out until 4 days later.

Speaker: 3 minutes is up, I need an extension.

Motion to extend discussion time by 30 seconds.

MOVER: Maria Athie Martinez **SECONDER:** Jin Wen **RESULT:** Carried, none opposed

Remzi: Just for a little more context, after I agreed to withdraw the Instagram and replied I shouldn't have said that. To be honest at the time, I think it's a common thing to do, probably not as common in Canada to say you won a debate. I acknowledge I did post it. But I retracted it. I retracted also from the Facebook post. Not only before erasing it, I also edited it so it didn't say I won-

Speaker: 30 seconds is up. I need an extension.

Motion to extend discussion time by 2 minutes.

MOVER: Tayo Olarewaju **SECONDER:** Sarah Park **RESULT:** Carried, none opposed

Remzi: I challenge that the Elections Committee found out 4 days later about a post when it's in their mandate, in policy, to be monitoring these things. The post was at least 2 days already it had been eliminated before it got reported to the GSS with a screenshot from 2 hours after the post. It doesn't add up. Possibly thinking the Elections Committee did find out to the end of this, I think I should've gotten a chance to rescind and retract. That's what the policy states, you get a chance to do these types of things. I know that I received an email from



the Elections Committee after the Instagram post, they said, "Oh, it's fine. We're just creating the EPP, we're learning on the go." I was like, okay, everything's fine. There's not a problem, right? So I continued campaigning. And then I just received the notice that I was disqualified. So just to finish this, at the moment I was disqualified, even though you can argue you can use this policy, at the moment I was disqualified, I had already been acquitted for anything else. You can't really judge a person two times for the same thing, when he has rescinded and been acquitted. That's illegal in Canada. You can't also disqualify someone without letting them know without the chance to speak against it. I didn't really get a chance for a fair trial with an appeal that would have stated that my name was not withdrawn at some point. Right now, the elections are over and everything, and here I'm trying to appeal to you right now-

Speaker: 2 minutes is up again [interrupted]

Remzi: [inaudible] respectable graduate students, and I was winning before that when they cancelled my participation.

Speaker: I'm going to be stricter if you don't follow my rules. [Interrupted]

Remzi: Thank you Madame Speaker.

Speaker: 2 minutes is up. Do you still want me to call for extension of time, Remzi?

Remzi: No Madame Speaker, I think I'm done.

Nicolas: I would like to speak on the motion, actually, because I understand that this is question period. We're far away from the rules, presentations should be followed by question periods, and positions should be declared during the discussion of the motion and not the presentation. Am I incorrect?

Speaker: Yes this is the question period. I think the intention, as I understood, is so that we have a freer forum to discuss this matter before going to the motion, which is more strict, and I will be strict.

Nicolas: In that case I'm going to use my time. I'm going to start, if council will oblige, that my speaking time be extended to 5 minutes on the grounds that I am the recognized expert in GSS policy and the longest serving student member of this Council. I have a couple things to say that will take slightly more than 3 minutes.

Speaker: I have a seconder already for this motion to set your time to a total of 5 minutes. Any opposed? Okay, please go ahead.

Motion to extend discussion time to 5 minutes.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi

SECONDER: Andrew Zang

RESULT: Carried, none opposed

Nicolas: Thank you. There's a number of points I want to make to this situation we're faced with. Number one, I received, as all council members, an email notifying us of the disqualification. This email contained the policy items as evidence. Found this was grounded in policy and fact with sufficient evidence to reach a reasonable conclusion towards disqualification. It's going to be difficult to walk through the point he made, so instead I'm going to refer to the written appeal submitted to Council which I took the time to read. It's a very long appeal so I want to draw attention to several pieces here. First of all the member continues to speak about a three-strike rule, and a change of rules, or second trials and that he was acquitted. This is factually incorrect. There are no



trials, this is an administrative process of a registered society under the BC Societies Act. Nobody's on trial and I want to dispel that right away. Second, the EPP didn't create a three-strike rule. I'm going to quote exactly from the policy manual, 12.9.3: [quotes] Therefore, it is the correct procedure for the Elections Committee to review the actions of the former candidate and if the former candidate was found to be in breach of a policy, it is perfectly within the purview of the Elections Committee to disqualify that candidate. Furthermore, as to questions cited in the appeal about jurisdiction, the member is actually obligated to inform himself about policies regarding election. One said policy is 12.5.15. This brings me to policy 12.1.1 where it clearly states [quotes policy]. Several breaches of policy have been illustrated and we don't need to get into the minutiae of which one was the one that disqualified the candidate. In terms of policy, one breach is enough for disqualification even though there were several, and as has been noted a general disregard for election [inaudible]. Also I'm very concerned, and I don't think this is minor, that the appeal references UBC and AMS rules, a clear attempt to [inaudible] the integrity and independence of the GSS electoral process as a separately incorporated society. Furthermore, the member wrote and I open quote, "leads me to believe that this disqualification could be based upon my person, especially in my political beliefs, because my public support show for student movements like the CJI UBC, I understand that to be Climate Justice UBC, and political parties like the BC Green Party and the NDP." I find no basis in the email written by Elections Committee that could reach the conclusion that disqualification is based on political affiliation or leanings. I find this accusation of discriminatory behaviour baseless and in line with accusations raised by the member towards the President, which were found to be fictitious in our previous council meeting. Furthermore, the member states in his written appeal to Council, "neither the EPP, EC, G&A" – I understand the member attempted to write governance and accountability here – "have provided any evidence of having been in violation of GSS policy." This is patently false. We just looked at evidence and it's also attached to this presentation. We're not yet in the motion, but in terms of disqualification, I find the Elections Committee acted in line with policy, it was applied on the basis of fact. And just to put this into context, to my knowledge, no other candidate has incurred not even a single violation of policy. Thank you.

Mostafa: I would like to answer Remzi. I'm not sure what order these were brought up, but with regards to not being notified of disqualification, we went through pains to make sure to do everything at the exact same time, so we did not disqualify until they were emailed. We did so, the member just didn't check, not our fault they didn't check it. I'd really like to emphasize that disqualification was not because the post- it was specifically because there was no new posts made on Facebook. There had to be a new post, and there was no new post, we didn't see that. Last thing is that the complaints, I do concede the EPP could do a better job of monitoring all candidates, the idea was candidates would not post if not approved in the first place, this rule has broken by the member many times. But I would like to respond to that challenge. Not to proving we didn't know about the Facebook post the whole time, I can't do that without violating confidentiality of people who reporting, who sent the screenshots. That image was taken 2 hours after it was made, but it wasn't sent to us until after. It wasn't taken by EPP or EC, a member provided it. And then we saw a screenshot that proves the post was made, yet we don't see a retraction statement on Facebook as we requested, or instructed in the takedown notice. That's it.

Kimani: I would want to speak as a candidate in this particular issue that has been appealed here, wanted to speak not in support of the appeal itself. As a candidate, once I did nominate myself, I was sent the guidelines on what to follow, and one of the things I want to read verbatim, "please note, any post made on social media accounts, any personal design material must conform with the GSS campaigning material rules." With this in



mind, I believe as we are supposed to prepare ourselves to be leaders in this society, one thing we must always try to value is honesty. If we cannot be honest to ourselves, who can we be honest to? Can we even uphold fiduciary responsibility given by our society? Madam Speaker, I want to speak and say, I see other candidates in this election, I think one repeated mistake is too much for anybody to overlook. I think we need to understand that GSS is not any other thing on the streets for anybody to stumble upon. It has a legacy to be protected by all means possible. It can only be done so by people who understand what they are likely to do. One key important thing I'm going to insist on is honesty. I find a lot of dishonesty in this situation. To be on the record, it is important to note that we are given policies or rules to follow. As leaders, we may not play games how to break them and who is going to catch me doing so. And if you do want to break those rules, you must therefore understand the role of investigation, and the investigation goes back in time, and if it finds me in the wrong, should I accept or not?

Gillian: I'd like to reiterate a point made by Mostafa and Nicolas that any of these rules is enough to allow for disqualification. As Kimani brought up, this society has a legacy, it has policy, it has procedure and someone who is campaigning to be an elected official needs to know all the policy, they need to know all the rules, need to be held to the highest of standards. Disqualification is not unreasonable when there is a pattern of repeated breaching of various protocols. And I wish here to add something that hasn't been brought up, in that the member who is contesting this disqualification, in their communication, emailed all the chairs of all the committees of the society with their documentation and their grievance. I find that to be quite disturbing, in that to my knowledge that is not the correct procedure and protocol, it circumvents the democratic process and procedures of the society. As chair of HR Committee, I shouldn't be getting that sort of email. It is equally disturbing to me that in an attempt to, as they have the right to do, appeal the decision, this member attempted to circumvent the protocols, procedure, and ultimately undermine the democratic process of the system.

Remzi: Emailing your council members being not democratic, I just find it ridiculous. Arguments made by Kimani and Nicolas trying to focus on me being a dishonest person for posting on Facebook that I considered I won a debate is just uncalled for, it's exaggerated. I want council members to really take this as an opportunity to see what's going on. Do you think I'm being treated unfairly? I do. I've been thinking about this a long time, one of the first things that really makes me feel I've been treated unfairly is the fact that a lot of people in this Council won't refer to me by my Arabic name, which is Xhemalce, they refer to me by Mr. Fuentes all the time. I can't explain this. I've sent emails asking for people to refer to me by my name and it's something that they just don't want to do. This is very disturbing for me. I would go back to my argument, if I receive an email saying you have to take down a Facebook post, a post on social media, that's what I did. I took it down. Later I received an email saying to retract an Instagram post, which is a different post. I have followed all the rules by the time of my disqualification, and I'm going to sustain this, I was not violating any rule. Time is a very big component here. I really ask council to take that into account, and I can provide any proofs as necessary.

Mostafa: I'm going to share my screen. I've got the email right here, this is what was sent. I urge the member to rescind the claim, there was no winner... "This unapproved campaign material will shortly be processed by the EPP and you may receive another warning depending on the panel's decision." So I feel the member knew that this matter wasn't resolved just by taking it down. It's quite clear looking at this, this is engagement that was achieved through dishonest means, and more importantly, it was not submitted for approval. Having the system where we require all candidates to send their stuff in for approval, I don't think it's fair to violate that rule and then say "It's your fault you didn't catch me, because I didn't send it to you." A lot of this would've been



avoided if the member had just abided by rules and sent everything for approval before posting. Several people who were candidates could probably tell you how fast that process was. It's not fair they all had to do that and this member didn't. It's not really like the matter was resolved, it was very clear there was a process. I was just asking for the polite courtesy of taking down the post to minimize the damage of misinformation.

Devarsh: I would request all the speakers [inaudible], because it's getting a bit difficult to understand all the different points going on. Just to facilitate the conversation it might help if we go through the points one by one instead of making a case over, since we're in the Q&A section. For me it's getting difficult to understand what's going on. On the same note, want to invite Ritwik who has made a request to speak. Just a comment, thank you.

[Mostafa sponsors Ritwik to speak]

Ritwik: Thank you for giving me the opportunity, and to Devarsh, Jackson and Mostafa for sponsoring me. I'll be very brief since I'm not too versed with Council rules and bylaw, all I can address to being a candidate in the election. Something Remzi said, that it was not dishonest of him to post online – I'm only learning about all this now – that he won the debate on YouTube. As a fellow candidate I think that is certainly a very dishonest thing to do. I don't know whether that should have automatically disqualified, can't speak to that, I don't know bylaws etc. But at least as a fellow candidate, I would definitely say and support any decision which says that was a dishonest move on your part, that you won a debate that was not a debate to begin with, it was a question answer session with live audience, that was about it. So I don't know why you would think you had won something and even question someone when they're saying that that was a dishonest move, because it was clearly not in good faith. Thank you, everyone.

Kimani: I'm back again with two questions. One is regarding the submission I made before about what we had been directed to do by Elections Committee and the Electoral Officer about any materials that need to be used by us must be approved. Were these approved? I think that's a very valid question. Can we get that answered? Secondly, talking about the issue of trying to look like, someone trying to play victimhood here, I don't think that is appropriate, because I think this was one of the best diverse elections we have had for some time, very inclusive I would say. Therefore anybody trying to take advantage of any situation, I do not think that is fair. I want to commend Ritwik for those comments, having been an outsider and also wanting to participate in this elections. It is not fair.

Mostafa: Those posts were not approved. The candidate had a history of posting things prior to approval, sort of a "do first apologize later" type thing. Sorry that's conjecture. Those posts were not approved.

Andrew: I wanted to speak strongly in agreement with Mostafa in terms of the rules of the election. I believe the approval process, as a bystander with no horse in the race, looked very fair. I do know it was conducted in a fast manner. I think it's important to consider here. It's been brought up before but I'd also like to allude to the document that was sent as well, because there were a lot of claims in there that I found to have inconsistencies that weren't necessarily founded in truths. If an example is needed, his belief that he was disqualified on the basis of political beliefs, such as his support of Climate Justice UBC. I think in this situation, I would caution the member to please deliver information only firmly rooted in truths. From my perspective, any assertions that have the potential to benefit the person in question and yet are not firmly grounded in truths, that can only be viewed as dishonesty.



Nicolas: I would like to start by apologizing to the member if I've misnamed him at any occasion, I will continue to refer to him as the member as is his appropriate term in the society, and I would ask that in kind he refer to me as the Vice President University and Academic Affairs, which is my title in this assembly. Moving forward from that point, I was very happy to hear from Ritwik because what the elections policies are there for, is not to punish the person who infringes them, they're to protect the integrity of the election, and to ensure a level playing field for every single candidate. This is exactly what the elections policies did. intended to level playing field for every candidate, this is exactly what EPP did. Listening to Ritwik, it was not his job to be aware of false or misleading statements made by other members. His job was to run his campaign, which he did in a dignified manner. He accepted the results, whatever that may be. I want Ritwik to be assured that these decisions were made by the Elections Committee and these policies were put in place precisely for this, so every member that chooses to run for a GSS race has a level playing field and a fair opportunity to win the election. It is clear to me that this is exactly what the policies did, that is exactly what the Elections Committee achieved, this is why the appeal was rejected by Elections and G&A. I am confident we will vote today to ratify this election and put an end to these constant vexatious complaints about the election procedure that are not rooted in any form of truth.

Remzi: I would just add that I did not have a history of posting without approval. If you go back in the documents, I actually asked Mostafa to post the first post I made before I was a candidate. Second thing, there's an opinion around here about the fact that the policy trying to establish a level playing field. That's what I'm actually arguing here. I followed the policies, I was not in violation by the time I was disqualified. If we're going to start putting a lot of interpretations of policy, we're not going to get anywhere. We have to read the policy and state what it is. "The candidate has 24 hours to withdraw." That's the first policy that you must follow. And somebody else, another member of the GSS was saying that the Council has all the right to inflict this policy if it thinks there's been a violation. What I'm going to say is yes, but there's first a forum called the EPP, and they have a policy of 24 hour retraction. I was not asked to retract from this post. I wasn't even asked to retract it, but I took it down and I actually retracted and I retracted all the posts. So I followed the policy. Thing is people are saying I didn't follow policy and they're not providing any proof. So please provide proof I didn't take down the post on time. I did when I received that first email from Mostafa saying I need to rescind, I don't need you to explain the meaning of the word rescind. If you're going to apply things that have happened like this, if you're going to convict someone with disqualification, you need to have a strong case. I'm going to urge the committee to follow policies, and we need to have elections for this race.

Aaron: Just want to keep this brief. I'm here to talk in favour of Mostafa and the Elections Committee's decision. I would like to point out all the evidence given by the Elections Committee has been legitimate and in that matter, because of policy 12.9.3, they have the power to disqualify based on a breach of any of the policies in this section. Therefore, they have followed this and have presented the evidence to Council, they have fulfilled policy, and the disqualification should be valid.

Kimani: Going to the same thing I was pointing to, I'm making this statement knowing I was running unopposed as a current President, but I didn't want to use any of that to advantage my candidacy. In fact, I asked people to represent me to the Elections Committee because I didn't want to be part of making decisions. So I delegated my presidential duties to interpreting policies related to elections to the VP External who was my proxy in that committee and one very independent officer that I admire a lot. In this case Madam Speaker, I want to point out a few issues that I feel are being raised here, and I don't think they're sitting well with my soul. When you talk about policies, in the letter that was sent to every candidate that nominated themselves, it was



clearly indicated that it was a long email that somebody had sat down and thought about it. And it says, attached below is our 2021 GSS policy manual with the policies and regulations regarding the elections process and the candidate responsibilities that must be followed. Please familiarize yourself with it, as it will be useful throughout the process. So when we talk about policies and someone says when we talk about policies we're going nowhere, I'm very disturbed because anybody who has big disregard of policies and is supposed to implement the same policies, then we do not have a society. On that thing, I would want to put the question. Did the candidate receive an email after they had nominated themselves that told them how to behave and what to do whenever they are called upon?

Gillian: I have two points and a clarification. Clarification, I didn't mean to imply members should not contact committee chairs. Members should comment to committee chairs germane to their work. Feel free to email me with HR matters whenever necessary. My two points are about, first of all, the fact that violations stand. The fact that a post is withdrawn or not, especially when it is withdrawn, doesn't change the fact that the policy was in fact violated. Whether or not the Elections Committee decides a single violation is enough to disqualify a member is a different question to whether or not the violation actually happened. As the chair of Elections Committee has shown, through extensive data and collection of facts, there were numerous violations of various aspects of the election policies of our society. Which brings me to my second point, there were numerous violations of the election policies of the Graduate Student Society of the University of British Columbia. While on the one hand, debating the validity of any one of them is an appropriate thing and that if they were individually shown every one of them to be invalid, then fine, the case doesn't stand. But as many people who have spoken here tonight have been convinced based on the evidence provided and the policy in which they are rooted, we have here not any one individual problem, but rather a largely painted picture of a series of violations of various aspects of policy. While I understand the desire to refute any given point, I urge council to think in the large picture, and what has emerged from an ongoing and really quite disturbing repeating pattern of violating various aspects of policy.

Mostafa: I'd like to clarify that the member was disqualified for a specific violation. Any other violations that I bring up, that is not the reason they were disqualified, whether like Gillian said, maybe they should have been disqualified. That's a separate discussion. They were disqualified for the Facebook post, thought I would clarify that. Regardless of history, that's a separate discussion.

Kimani: Point of information, I asked the candidate a question or the Elections Committee, did the candidate receive an email after they nominated themselves outlining responsibilities or not?

Speaker: That's a point of privilege. Mostafa and Remzi, could you answer that briefly.

Mostafa: I can't speak to that, I feel that would have been done by the ESEO.

Kimani: Candidate can answer themselves.

Remzi: Of course I received the GSS policy, and I know it, I studied it in detail, and I followed it. Now there's people here talking about multiple violations and trying to make this a huge ordeal-

Speaker: [Receives point of order from Kimani], please answer the question and no other. It's a yes or no question. Do you have anything else to say about that question?

Remzi: Can I speak now?



Speaker: Just the question.

Remzi: I studied the policy manual.

Speaker: Did you get the email, that was the question.

Remzi: I don't know what email you're talking about, but I did get an email with the policy manual, I'm aware of that. If you make a statement that is not approved it has to be removed within 24 hours, that's the policy of the EPP.

Speaker: Kimani, does that answer your question?

Kimani: No, the candidate doesn't understand what I'm asking. After every candidate nominated ourselves, the electoral officer sent an email thanking us for doing that and explaining what was our responsibility. That was the initial point of contact, did the member receive that email or not?

Remzi: I already responded, I received info with the policy manual. Don't understand what's the question.

Speaker: Okay, I'll leave it at that. No more back and forth.

Perrin: Would just like to ask the member what they mean by retract their post because I believe the Elections Committee chair has requested they issue a retraction, I believe it's possible the member has expressed they have retracted. Can they clarify if they mean just remove or delete the post, or if they issued a retraction statement.

Remzi: On the 26th of February, I posted on Facebook, "I believe I won the debate". I received an email two hours later from Mostafa, saying I had posted something, and had to rescind from it. I edited the post, removed the part that I said I won, and left the post for some hours. Then I deleted the Facebook post. When I received the notification to issue a retraction, was from the Instagram post. I did. Touched base with mostafa, he said retraction is fine. He actually issued me a warning. If you make another mistake you'll be disqualified. At the moment I said ok. I didn't consider at the time like this. That's what happened, that was stopped. It was two different posts. One had a specific retraction because they told me for the Instagram post, do a retraction, I did. But the first email was the email from Facebook that did not ask me to rescind the post. From that post, what I did was I edited, I didn't say I made a mistake, just eliminated the part that said I won, I don't remember exactly, then I just deleted that post at some point. But I did edit it. Then received specific "you need to retract from it". Which I obviously challenged at that time, because policy says you need to take down the post or otherwise retract from, the policy is very clear in the GSS policy, you must take down the post or otherwise retract within 24 hours.

Devarsh: I would again encourage all people attending to use the format in a Q&A way, if you have any questions, any concerns, can ask directly to the person. With that being said, since the member made an appeal to the Council, I will address my question to the member. Are there any concerns that aren't addressed yet? Are there any specific things you want to ask to any of the members here present in Council? That is the question for the member so we can have a directed conversation instead of going around and people speaking on different topics.

Remzi: [inaudible] not asking a question. I don't understand, Madame Speaker.



Devarsh: I'm just trying to help you, man. If you want to ask any question just direct it to anyone so that we are on the topic. If you want to go your first question, the Facebook post, we can discuss that. Because right now, sometimes we discuss Facebook, sometimes we discuss email, sometimes something else, it gets very confusing.

Speaker: The recommendation is to help Remzi to direct a question specifically to something so it's more structured, essentially a debate recommendation. I always recommend and teach new councillors, make your three points clear, more succinct, that's more effective than other ways.

Nicolas: I move that we limit the debate to an additional 2 minutes since given we've started moving in circles and we should move to the motion in my opinion.

Speaker: So you know, when you're doing discussions I have no right to limit discussion, only motions. I have a 2 minutes limit.

Motion to limit discussion to 2 more minutes.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi

SECONDER: Jackson
Schumacher

RESULT: Carried, none opposed

Alireza: I'll keep it quick and remind councillors that according to policy manual 12.9.2, the role of Council is just to decide whether to appoint an ad-hoc committee not to discuss the matter at depth. This is for Elections Committee to rule on.

Remzi: I was trying to understand what Tayo [sic, Devarsh] was saying, if I can ask a question. My question to Mostafa I would ask if he's completely sure that I didn't follow instructions on the first email from the post, because I did. How can he be so sure I didn't follow it when I have provided evidence that I rescinded from that post.

Mostafa: To be absolutely clear, the member was disqualified because they didn't make a separate retraction post on Facebook as they were instructed in the email - sorry I just hijacked the screen - in the email it specifically says, because of the nature of Instagram, simply deleting the post would not suffice, retraction must include that you were mistaken in claiming to have won the debate, which the edit didn't even do, so I don't know why the member thinks that's sufficient, and that there is no such thing as a winner. To reiterate, if you don't take down the post and make a new retraction post within 24 hours of this email, you will be disqualified. A new retraction post was not made on Facebook. That is the reason the candidate was disqualified. It's not really that complicated. That's it, so whether I personally told you please rescind the debate victory claim, the candidate asked if it was a formal notice. They get that a day later telling them exactly what to do, and they didn't abide by it till they were disqualified. That's basically what happened.

Speaker: 2 minutes is up, if we want more discussion we need an extension. Hearing none, over the years, pretty good at feeling the room whether they want to or not. Going to proceed to the motion.

[Motion reposted below:]

WHEREAS an appeal was filed by a candidate disputing their disqualification by the Elections Committee, and
WHEREAS the disqualification was previously appealed unsuccessfully to the Elections Committee and the Governance and Accountability Committee, and



WHEREAS according to Policy 12.9.2 Council is the final appeal body for election results,

BIRT Council accepts/rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate, and

BIFRT Council ratifies the results of the 2021 GSS Elections.

DISCUSSION

Speaker: Before I move and second, this motion is out of order, sorry I didn't check it before. Mostafa did you propose it? Can you pick one, accept or reject? It has to be one or the other.

Mostafa: Rejects the appeal.

Speaker: Do you want two motions in one or separate it? It's together right now.

Mostafa: I'm not sure about the logic.

Speaker: These are two different matters.

Mostafa: Should be separate, then.

Speaker: Given the proposer of the motion has separated the motion, I'm going to do it a little more formally this time. This is my proposal. This is the motion we're going to do: BIRT Council rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate, and take out the end. If Council accepts this motion, then you move and second.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi

SECONDER: Jackson
Schumacher

RESULT: Carried, none opposed

Speaker: Any debate on this motion?

Nicolas: Point of parliamentary inquiry, what are we voting on? On the amendment or on the motion as you're showing it now?

Speaker: "BIRT Council rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate. I am using my speaker's position to recommend a more feasible and in order motion. This is what I propose. If the Council accepts my proposal, you just move and second. If you don't, you tell me no. This motion has been moved and seconded, so this is what we're talking about now.

Devarsh: Just a point of appeal to the VP External candidate since we're going to vote on the motion. If there are any last points you want to make, this would be an opportunity. Just want to put it out there so that you understand what's going on. I want to try to clarify where I'm coming from. Just tried to clarify where I'm coming from. Appeal had been made to Council that the person be heard. Just want to ensure everyone had appropriate speaking time. That's why I'm making my point.



Speaker: Taking this as an invitation for Remzi to speak to this motion.

Remzi: I think there's a big point here that is trying to raise confusion. I received instructions to retract the first post, I rescinded and deleted it. Then I received instructions to retract Instagram post, which is a different post and I did that too. It would seem here that the thing for the Instagram post had to happen for a different post that didn't exist at the time. For me it just didn't make sense, the logic. Logic is that you would've been seen the post, I would've been allowed to retract it? I'm not a multiple policy violator as it's trying to be presented by some people here. I think that's a really unfair way of saying it. It's hard to be here against the world, but I just want Council to make the right decision. This was unfair. It was made when I was winning the elections, when I had more votes on my favour, and I think it's totally unfair. I think there should be changes in the future regarding the policy. If there is policy specific to public media posts, it should be followed. But no, going to the hardest available policy that you can apply, that's not common practice. Somebody else had said at some point, well the GSS can apply whatever policy they want, the Elections Committee. Well yeah, but first you have to go to the EPP, and they have a specific policy about these types of violations. Just moving forward, I think I would really like to have what I consider fair elections. To be honest I haven't felt welcome for a long time. I tried to explain it, I tried to explain why members don't even call me by my Arabic name which is my real name. You know, if I were going to ask something about that, well I do feel that's treating somebody-

Kimani: Point of order. I think Madame Speaker, we are not talking on the motion, we are talking about different things other than the motion.

Speaker: Yes, thank you. Remzi, I'm sorry, English is my second language, so if I call you by a name you do not wish to be called, please let me know.

Remzi: Thank you, Madam Speaker, but I haven't ask you in the past to do so, and I've asked the Elections Committee. [further discussion on name with Speaker]

Speaker: Time is up and I apologize. The point of order is we're not talking about names, and I derailed you because I think I didn't address you right too. But the point is about the appeal. I will be strict about focusing on topic.

Julia: I would just ask that Mr. Xhemalce, apologies for mispronunciation, not refer to elections as winning before the elections had concluded. You've made several references tonight that you were in the lead, and you were winning before the disqualification, which is not something that anybody, not even Elections Committee would be able to verify, and I would ask that that be corrected, since it's not a fact that anyone could verify for the record.

Nicolas: Even though I believe the Elections Committee acted within policy and followed it to the letter, I move that we amend the motion to read: BIFRT Council ratifies the results of the 2021 GSS Elections by special resolution. Oh, we're in the first part of the motion, apologies. BIRT Council rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate by special resolution. If I'm seconded I can motivate. I think I have to wait for a seconder. I would like to add the name of the candidate, and add by special resolution. The reason I want to add the special resolution threshold to this motion, this means that it changes the threshold or a vote from simple majority to two thirds majority is because the policy manual, which the member claims to have interpreted in a different way or claims that we're misinterpreting even though he has absolutely no interpreting powers of the



policy manual, the responsibility lies with the President and ultimately Council, brings me to my point. Because Council has the power to change the policy manual by special resolution, and has the power to overrule presidential interpretations of the Council of the policy manual by special resolution, it follows that if we vote on this matter by a two thirds threshold, it is truly the will of Council, the ultimate interpretation of the policy manual that is completely unimpeachable within the rules of the Society, that this is the decision of the GSS collectively that we have rejected the appeal. And as a preface, I'm going to move a similar motion on the elections just so that we do this cleanly beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Amendment: BIRT Council rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate, Remzi Xhemalce, by special resolution.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (21): Nicolas Romualdi, Alireza Kamyabi, Kimani Karangu, Kira Vandermeulen, Shiva Zargar, Yundi Wang, Axel Hauduc, Jackson Schumacher, Nevena Rebic, Julia Burnham, Andrew Zang, Jin Wen, Gillian Glass, Jenny Lee, Aaron Loewen, Mostafa Hagar, Younus Ahmed , Maria Jose Martinez, Edgar Liao, Perrin Waldock, Taryn Scarff

Speaker: Back to main motion.

Remzi: I just question why did this member want to add this in red. He says he –

Nicolas: Point of order, we already discussed the amendment, we're already in the motion.

Speaker: Received. I can explain this. This makes it harder to pass because you need more votes. I'm going to the vote.

[Motion reposted below]:

BIRT Council rejects the appeal from the VP External candidate, Remzi Xhemalce, by special resolution.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (16): Gillian Glass, Kimani Karangu, Julia Burnham, Axel Hauduc, Ginny Pichler, Perrin Waldock, Shiva Zargar, Aaron Loewen, Younus Ahmed , Nevena Rebic, Jenny Lee, Nicolas Romualdi, Maria Jose Martinez, Andrew Zang, Taryn Scarff, Edgar Liao ; **ABSTAIN (3):** Jin Wen, Tayo Olarewaju, Mostafa Hagar

Speaker: Next, BIRT Council ratify the results of the 2021 GSS elections.

MOVER: Maria Athie Martinez **SECONDER:** Jackson Schumacher **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (22): Nevena Rebic, Kira Vandermeulen, Tayo Olarewaju, Perrin Waldock, Gillian Glass, Sarah Park, Jin Wen, Aaron Loewen, Shiva Zargar, Jenny Lee, Axel Hauduc, Nicolas Romualdi, Yundi Wang, Taryn Scarff, Maria Jose Martinez, Andrew Zang, Jackson Schumacher, Julia Burnham, Younus Ahmed , Edgar Liao, Alireza Kamyabi, Daniel He ; **ABSTAIN (2):** Kimani Karangu, Mostafa Hagar

Nicolas: I would like to congratulate the winners of the election.



Speaker: Congratulations on the incoming and I'm sure in the later part of the agenda we could put in some place to speak. Thank you Nicolas.

3.3 RECONSTITUTE STRATEGIC PLANNING AD-HOC COMMITTEE

Group responsible: G&A Committee

Subject description: Reconstitute the SPAHC committee

Proposed objective: To reconstitute the SPAHC committee

Relevant Materials: [Terms of Reference – Strat. Plan Committee 2020.pdf](#)

WHEREAS the Governance and Accountability Committee has revised the strategic planning ad hoc committee terms of reference, and

WHEREAS the current strategic plan cycle is coming to an end,

BIRT the GSS Council ratifies the new terms of reference as reviewed by G&A and the CPC, and

BIRT the GSS Council ratifies the new terms of reference as reviewed by G&A and the CPC, and

BIFRT the GSS Council strikes the Strategic Planning ad-hoc Committee. BIFRT the following seatings to the Strategic Planning ad-Hoc Committee be approved: (Councillors) Jackson Schumacher, Shiva Zargar, William Canero, Azrezoo Alemzadeh (G&A representative + Chair) Axel Hauduc

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Jenny Lee **RESULT:** Carried
FOR (15): Alison McClean, Daniel He, Aaron Loewen, Nicolas Romualdi, Maria Jose Martinez, Andrew Zang, Sarah Park, Mostafa Hagar, Yundi Wang, Gillian Glass, Taryn Scarff, Jin Wen, Perrin Waldock, Alireza Kamyabi, Jenny Lee; **ABSTAIN (3):** Jackson Schumacher, Shiva Zargar, Axel Hauduc

DISCUSSION

Jin: would like to amend with the following: BIFRT the following seatings to the Strategic Planning ad-Hoc Committee be approved: (Councillors) Jackson Schumacher, Shiva Zargar, William Canero, Azrezoo Alemzadeh (G&A representative + Chair) Axel Hauduc

MOVER: Jin Wen **SECONDER:** Aaron Loewen **RESULT:** Carried, none opposed

Speaker: Part of the main motion. Hearing no further debate, let's vote.

3.4 APPROVAL OF MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR THE GRADUATE LIFE CENTRE

Responsible: VPUAA, Nicolas Romualdi

Purpose: To approve that the GSS enter into a MOU with UBC regarding the Graduate Life Centre

Time: 10 minutes

Relevant Materials: (to be provided)



BIRT the GSS Council authorizes the GSS executives to enter into the Memorandum of Understanding for the development of the Graduate Life Centre as presented to Council.

DISCUSSION

Nicolas: Before I present, I would like to move in-camera as this pertains to the relationship between UBC and the society.

Speaker: Typical to go into camera for this type of agreement.

[Speaker, Admin Assistant, Devarsh Bhonde (HF Chair) invited to stay]

Motion to move discussion in-camera.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Shiva Zargar **RESULT:** Carried, none opposed

[Discussion continues in-camera]

Motion to continue discussion in-camera.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Jackson Schumacher **RESULT:** Failed, none in favour

Motion to amend wording from MOU to Letter of Intent.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried, none opposed

Speaker: Back to motion to sign LOI.

Motion:

BIRT the GSS Council authorizes the GSS executives to sign the Letter of Intent for the development of the Graduate Life Centre as presented to Council.

MOVER: Nicolas Romualdi **SECONDER:** Andrew Zang **RESULT:** Carried

FOR (22): Kimani Karangu, Daniel He, Ginny Pichler, Alison McClean, Nevena Rebic, Aaron Loewen, Shiva Zargar, Julia Burnham, Yundi Wang, Nicolas Romualdi, Jackson Schumacher, Taryn Scarff, Axel Hauduc, Andrew Zang, Jenny Lee, Gillian Glass, Jin Wen, Mostafa Hagar, Maria Jose Martinez, Sarah Park, Edgar Liao, Alireza Kamyabi

4 MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

4.1 SMART GOAL PRESENTATION

Group responsible: G&A Committee

Presentation time: 15 minutes

Presentation description: G&A will present on the standing committee SMART Goals for 2021-

Proposed objective: To present GSS Council with an overview of SMART Goals for 2021.

Relevant materials: [2021-2022 SMART SettingGoals.pptx](#)



4.2 FEBRUARY 2021 GSS FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

Group responsible: Financial and Executive Oversight Officer

Presentation time: 10 minutes

Presentation description: February 2021 GSS Financial Overview

Proposed objective: Update on GSS Revenues and Expenditures

Relevant materials: to be provided

4.3 EDI SURVEY

Sarah: Hi everyone, I know it's 10:30pm but what better time to fill out the EDI internal survey. I'll repost it in the voting members chat so you have easier access to it, but this is super helpful and an initiative spearheaded by Vivian and Kimani, I'm helping out. More responses the better for our audit, reflective of how we're doing in terms of EDI. Please take time to fill it out.

5 MATTERS TO NOTE

Time reserved for questions regarding updates below.

5.1 UPCOMING EVENTS

- [Spring Haiku Competition](#) (Mar 8-26)
- [UBC Science Communication Week](#) (Mar 29 - 31)
- Virtual Games Round 2: Jackbox Night! (Apr 5, 5:30-6:30pm)

5.2 EXECUTIVES

5.2.1 President

- **Graduate Studies Senate election voting is open until March 19th @ 4pm:**
<https://facultystaff.students.ubc.ca/graduate-student-representative-vancouver-senate-2021-election>
- **Staff update to Council:** implementing new timesheets system, elections support, budget preparation, undergoing Organizational Coaching Project as client, undergoing internal EDI audit, received funding for 9 Worklearn positions, including new Archives Assistant
- **Councillor Awards** will be presented in April Council - submit nominations here
- Winter Term 1 Planning Discussion with Provost office and VP Student office
- GSS Executive Team & Santa Ono
- Online bullying and racist regime
- Requested involvement of the GSS in the UBC's upcoming Dean searches slots for GSS in the search committees.
- Held 2 different meetings with the GSS GM
- It been a slow campaigning period.
- Together with the Victoria (AA) Planning for the two upcoming AGMs (2020/2021)

5.2.2 FEOO



-
- Organised a meeting between EOC and outgoing executives.
 - Oversaw financial transactions at the GSS.
 - Collaborating with the GM and EOC to organise orientation activities for incoming executives.

5.2.3 VP University & Academic Affairs

- **Academic Integrity Working Group:** The academic integrity working group has been assembled through the Centre for Teaching and Learning Technology (CTLT). The group's work is at its early stages and more updates will be available in the future.
- **Food Insecurity:** The "Share Meal" pilot program has been developed and will be rolled out. The program reached capacity fairly early and the results are being analyzed to develop more targeted approaches.
- **EDI Bridging Initiatives:** In line with the priorities laid out in the funding roadmap, EDI bridging initiatives are being discussed. There is finally a sense of urgency in recognizing that we have to move from talk to action, and in that spirit, significant effort is being put into designing initiatives that can be implemented in the short term to bridge access to graduate education for members of minorities. These will be piloted for a limited time and long-term implementation will likely be contingent on success.
- **AMS/GSS Mental Health Coverage:** An increase from 500 to 1000 \$/years retroactive to September 1st, 2020 has been implemented. The risk analysis of the change indicates that additional cost can be absorbed into the current financial structure of the program.
- **Quarantine Streamlined Bursary:** A low barrier streamlined bursary has been set up for students coming into Canada who require to self-isolate. This is primarily beneficial to graduate students at this point. The bursary covers 34 dollars out of the 79 dollar daily fee for isolation and only requires to indicate financial need. No other information is required. More information here:
<https://www.housing.ubc.ca/self-isolate/vancouver/accommodation/>

5.2.4 VP External

- **UBC-GSS Elected as Chairperson of Graduate Student Societies of British Columbia:** GSSBC was officially ratified by all four graduate student societies (UVIC, UBC, UNBC, and SFU) with unanimous support (not a single nay vote). GSSBC Executive Committee met on Friday and elected Alireza as the inaugural Chairperson of GSSBC.
- **Graduate Students' Letter to Federal Government on 3-day mandatory hotel stay:** UBC-GSS partnering with 7 other graduate student societies, sent a letter to federal government calling for the use of residence isolation plans as an affordable alternative to 3-day mandatory hotel stay. Our university residence isolation plans have proven to be safe and effective means of quarantine for a lot of incoming students so far. By using them as an eligible alternative to mandatory hotel stay, we can protect public safety without imposing inequitable policies.
 - Read [Graduate Student's letter](#) to federal government on 3-day mandatory hotel stay here.
 - Watch [GlobalTV interview with Alireza](#)
- **ThinkGrad:** UBC-GSS is organizing meeting with ThinkGrad members to discuss future of the organization with delegates. ThinkGRAD is a group comprised of graduate student representatives who are focused on spearheading research to strategically address pressing problems affecting higher education in Canada, especially graduate studies.



-
- **Graduate Student Societies of U15:** The UBC-GSS continues to lead the work on letter to federal government with U15 GSS's. The 2nd General Meeting of U15 GSS's took place Feb 22nd. The group is currently discussing an MOU and framework to establish and maintain our collaboration into the future.
 - **Graduate Education & Public Good Report:** Continuing our work in writing and preparing the 'Graduate Education and Public Good Report.'
 - **GSS Privacy Policy:** The first draft of the revised and revamped GSS Privacy Policy is finished . We are working on a Privacy guideline that would outline the practical steps and new practices that are necessary to implementing the new GSS Privacy Policy.
 - **GSS Council Restructuring:** Working with G&A to finalize list of academic units and the recalculation of departmental representatives based on the sizes of the academic units. Once the list is finalized, VP Students will begin reaching out to academic units with missing representatives to ensure we have adequate and democratic representation in GSS council in accordance with the GSS bylaws.
 - **Muddling Through the Pandemic – Cocktails with Alireza:** Hosted a fun event on cocktail making with graduate students. Big thanks to VP Students, Sarah, and Admin Assistant, Victoria, for organizing and inviting me.

5.2.5 VP Students

- (none submitted)

5.3 COMMITTEES

5.3.1 Academic & External Committee

- AcEx hosted a successful Advocacy Workshop in February that equipped committee members with the contexts and tools to navigate university and government advocacy. We learned about the Senate, the Board of Governors, as well as the scopes of the VP UAA and the VP External. Thanks to all of our guests for attending!
- AcEx met twice since the last Council meeting and has spent considerable time focusing on the development of SMART goals for the upcoming year.
- AcEx approved two letters to the federal government on behalf of the U15 GSSes, of which the GSS is member. The first letter addresses the need for students to be allowed to quarantine on-campus and the financial burdens associated with the federal mandatory hotel quarantines, it has since been released to the press and garnered media attention. The second forthcoming letter addresses further federal supports for graduate education in Canada. AcEx thanks the VP External for their leadership in these graduate student collectives that have enabled our voices to be heard in federal advocacy in unprecedented ways for the GSS.

5.3.2 Code & Policy Committee

- CPC has finalized their SMART goals for 2021 and started working towards those goals - CPC has been working with G&A regarding projects around conflict resolution as well as departmental representative calculations



5.3.3 Elections Committee

- (none submitted)

5.3.4 Executive Committee

- (none submitted)

5.3.5 Executive Oversight Committee

- (none submitted)

5.3.6 Governance & Accountability Committee

- We are currently working on our backlog of minutes and will provide them prior to the March 16th deadline. We are submitting now because we would like the G&A SMART Goal presentation as well as the motion to reconstitute SPAHC to show up higher in the agenda.
- G&A reviewed and provided feedback on standing committee 2021-2022 SMART Goals. We met for an emergency meeting on March 10th to review an Elections appeal. G&A is currently working on our own SMART Goals for the calendar year.

5.3.7 House Finance Committee

- SMART Goals for the committee year 2021-22 are drafted and submitted to G&A Committee
- Uber Eats Vouchers will be provided to attendees of GSS Committee and Council Meetings starting April 1
- Discussions for an increase in executive pay are ongoing between the EOC and HF Committee

5.3.8 Human Resources

- (none submitted)

5.3.9 Services Committee

- (none submitted)

5.3.10 Strategic Planning ad-hoc Committee

- Over the past month, SPAHC has been performing a SWOT analysis of our conversations with various stakeholders inside and outside of the society in order to produce Organizational Goals and Proposed Strategies within the framework of the Themes that have been created in the past year. SPAHC expects to complete this by next month and move into reviewing and soliciting feedback for our Goals and P.S.'s. The committee chair is further working on developing a presentation for the 2020/2021 AGM as well as updating SPAHC ToR's with the help of the CPC and G&A Committees.

5.3.11 AMS Caucus



- AMS Caucus members Jackson and Nevena have been primarily working with the AMS Ad Hoc events restructure committee to brainstorm a new models for events department oversight. This committee now meets weekly so if you have any input on AMS events please email Jackson and we would be happy to bring it up with the committee that week.

5.3.12 Graduate Council Caucus

- (none submitted)

5.4 SENATORS AND BOARD OF GOVERNORS

5.4.1 Senators:

- (none submitted)

5.4.2 Board of Governors Representatives:

- (none submitted)

6 NOTICES

6.1 NOTICE OF NEXT MEETING

Date: Thursday, April 15th at 5:30 pm

Location: Online Via Teams

6.2 NOTICE OF UNSEATINGS

- Erik Frieling was unseated as Councillor from Services Committee.
- Erik Frieling was unseated as Representative from Grad Council Caucus.
- Kouther Nouredine was unseated as Ordinary Member from Executive Oversight Committee.
- Tarique Benbow was unseated as Councillor from Executive Oversight Committee.

7 ADJOURNMENT

BIRT there being no further business the meeting be adjourned at **10:39 pm**.

MOVER: Sarah Park

SECONDER: Nicolas Romualdi

RESULT: Carried, none opposed