



commerce
undergraduate
society

CUS GRT Force Minutes

Sept 5th, 2011

Start Time: 12:43pm

Present: Jackie, Graham, Johannes, Julie, Riki, Tim

Late: -

Regrets: Chris, Jacky, Klazina

Minutes Approval

- For future meetings, the board will approve the minutes for the GRTF meetings and then attached to the regular board meeting minutes
- *Previous minutes are approved*

Updates

- Riki: I completed five interviews- four board members, one exec, and the rest are Frosh members. I've been sending emails and then calling them. I highlighted significant items. Many were unimpressed with the effectiveness of the current board. Some people wrote about what they think the board is. Most feel the board is very operational and a board consisting of alumni and faculty members would work if explained properly to the student body. Some said the board isn't a confident one and doesn't enhance value. Due to annual changes it is difficult for the board to be effective. There were a few surprises in the interviews, some did think that this board was strategic, more hands-on involvement from board members and more connection between the board and executive council would be a positive thing. The board needs more operational guidance
- Graham: when we have elections, students aren't given in-depth training about how to be on this board
- Julie: I remember when we had a CUS executive retreat and we had transitional events, did we have that for board?
- Johannes: we did for some, it was very poorly done
- Graham: Not everyone said the board wasn't functional in the interviews; I don't know if there's a clear consensus amongst board members that this structure needs to be fixed
- Johannes: I've seen this for the last few years and I made a presentation to the board with my thoughts on this matter and the consensus was to put this committee together.

It was feeling like there was lack of task identity and purpose- some people clearly think we're operational versus structural

- Johannes: we have an elected executive and appointed board, this is what is similar to what there used to be a few years ago. I was talking with alumni for feedback. I talked to Connor and he said the board isn't functioning and it's vital we bring alumni on and have an appointed board and elected executive. Same votes for Connor Topley and Alex Monegro and Lucas Ramanowitz.
- Tim: Would they suggest having an exec council and no student representatives?
- Johannes: the president and one of the elected executives on the board
- Graham: I wonder if it's the people on the board or the board structure itself that isn't functioning- this year's board structure is a little bit different
- Tim: if it is the people, we can still step up and say what can we change in the structure so that despite the elected individuals, there still will be consistency. I think it's unavoidable, you'll always have students who don't know as much and are elected but that's the nature of democracy. We're trying to create a structure where it's easier to turn over positions. If we have a lot of experienced people on the board, it would work very well and we might be a bit stretched for committees but it'd still work. We need to have a structure where ten years of work doesn't get thrown away. I'm very much in support of having experience long-term people with two-year terms
- Johannes: I mentioned this to the alumni affairs crew and they're very excited for this; our first priority however is the students
- Tim: I talked to past board members as well as will be talking to Chad within the next week
- Graham: I was going to talk to Cole and Conor but they were a bit busy this weekend
- Johannes: so we still want to finish the assignments that we have, what are the next steps? I think it'd be valuable to read the old constitution and be asking ourselves if this makes sense. An ideal way to do this is take a blueprint and integrate the changes so we have something to work with.
- Riki: one thing about doing the interviews and giving the surveys out, I had to wonder how we were going to summarize it, there are so many different answers
- Johannes: I think this is a good start, now that we have a general idea of what some people are saying. I think as a committee we can propose the alumni idea and discuss different models. Maybe we can come up with a good list of questions
- Tim: my original take on this process was this was an informal overview of what peoples' view on this is; I don't think collecting quantitative data fits with what we're doing. I think we should propose an actual draft and a questionnaire to deliver to people. I think for the purposes of consultation you want to make it as concrete as possible. If the model doesn't work, we can tweak it.
- Johannes: what are the most important things we need to focus on?
- Tim: we have the board, then the execs and service council
- Johannes: for the board, we're looking at their size, membership, term, how they get onto the board (elections/ being appointed), their power, financial and policy power versus operational and strategic power
- Tim: I don't know about policy

- Graham: I wonder how different the power will be; right now the board isn't fulfilling it's power as a board, it's not what the board has the ability to do or what the board approves
- Johannes: I would disagree to be honest, I think mainly the operation versus the strategic spectrum is an issue at hand and we're more operational right now; this is because of the makeup and the policy power that they have (what they can and cannot approve); many things go back and fourth between execs and board in terms of what can be approved
- Tim: I think it wouldn't hurt to review how the board's power plays a role in their overall effectiveness
- Riki: I was reading the constitution, and on paper it looks like the framework is there, the people inside it aren't executing however
- Tim: there will be committees on the board, how do we decide where those fit- how the committees are structured, meeting times, etc
- Johannes: in terms of size, the board seems to be almost too small. We cut the size of the board because we thought it wasn't working, and perhaps we misdiagnosed this as the key problem
- Tim: it could've been the chemistry of the people as well
- Johannes: this is just a smaller sample of the same people; we went from 22 to 11; now it's hard to meet quorum
- Tim: and one person can affect the entire voting process; if we have two people that don't know what's going on making decisions, it could be a problem. I think the committees aren't delivering, not just because of commitment of the people, but the sizes
- Graham: what if we determined who we want to have on the board (the president, at least one exec, one elected rep, etc)
- Johannes: we could look at the committee sizes
- Riki: how important are the committees? Can we not delegate these tasks to people on the service council? Shouldn't committees be made based on strong demand?
- Graham: *(writes on the board- see attached)*
- Tim: I think we need freedom to add people onto the board so we have some power over who goes in
- Graham: I think we need a member at large
- Johannes: we could have this service council member voted in at the service council meeting and a MAL
- Tim: I feel like the service council and MAL are very much the same thing; what is the added benefit of separating alum and professionals?
- Johannes: different perspectives
- Tim: will there be any non-voting positions? I think faculty should be non-voting
- Tim: how many non-UBC professionals do you need?
- Graham: one?
- Johannes: most boards are around 15-16 people; I'd err for smaller and you can make it bigger if it becomes necessary- we need to ensure there are enough people to have interest in this. Are there any other areas we're not covering yet?

- Graham: the more people we add, the more complicated appointments and elections will be
- Tim: lets say these ideas go through, alumni will have power over the executives, etc. What do we as students do IF the alumni are doing things that aren't in the interest of the students?
- Graham: lets say the students don't feel like they're being represented
- Johannes: the executives are representing the students I think
- Graham: but what about things like CSSEC? What if alumni didn't see the need for CSSEC?
- Tim: what if the alumni just don't understand the need for things? Would it be less attractive to the alumni and professionals if we make it a majority of students?
- Johannes: they want to have some control
- Tim: what would be the difference between us doing a board of advisors and a board of directors? A board of advisors would still have oversight; my concern is we're throwing a position with a lot of work onto alumni
- Johannes: I think they're fine with that
- Graham: what happens if I'm alumni and I have to suddenly leave and can't commit to the board anymore?
- Johannes: then there are going to be measures in place to fix this
- Tim: we need to consider what the board currently does that we can throw onto the exec's portfolio. I think the alumni will meet maybe once a month, every two weeks is too operational
- Johannes: I'd say once a month, every two weeks there'd be a board or service council meeting
- Graham: I'm not sure how efficient it'd be to have a service council meeting that often
- Riki: we have to decide what the execs can approve; the board doesn't want to have say, six presentations every month
- Johannes: If the request is over a certain amount of money, the execs can approve this
- Johannes: for committees, what should be kept and what shouldn't be?
- Tim: Policy, BoC, and then CSSEC and Building Committee are ad hoc
- Johannes: what about strategic committees? In terms of strategy, who manages the strategic outlook?
- Graham: I'd say that's the board's job in general; lets say we have six committees, how many in each committee?
- Tim: do we want them to be mixed (not just board)?
- Graham: yes
- Tim: we could have all students, then 1-2 board members per committee
- Graham: I'd say we should have more alumni than professionals
- Tim: we should have 10 non-students; we should give ourselves flexibility
- Julie: does once a month work for meeting times?
- Johannes: I think so
- Tim: 12 meetings a year is doable
- Graham: all students are on a one-year term for this
- Tim: what would stop us keeping alumni for say, 10 years?
- Graham: nothing

- Johannes: for terms, we can have a staggered turnover. There's also usually a contingency plan to extend peoples' terms. There's also a maximum term length
- Tim: How should we nominate the first group of alumni? That'll be different than how everyone else is nominated. The students should have the majority of power to control who is nominated
- Johannes: we need to make sure whoever is interviewing has a greater intuition of how this is run

Next Action Items

- Term length research (draft policy from other board constitutions)- Johannes
- Regurgitating everything that we talked about into a summary for the board- Tim
- Research on initial board startup- Graham

- *Tim will be chairing the next meeting in Johannes' absence*

End Time: 2:07pm