

Call to Order – 11:32 am, August 13, 2015 | MBC 2296

### 1. Territory Acknowledgement

The Granting Committee acknowledged that the meeting was being conducted on the traditional and unceded territories of the Coast Salish peoples, which included the Squamish, Musqueam, Stó:lo, and Tseil-Waututh people to the current knowledge of the Society.

### 2. Roll Call of Attendance

#### Committee Composition

Vice President External Relations (*chair*) ..... Kathleen Yang  
Vice President Student Life ..... Deepak Sharma  
Board of Directors Representative ..... Arr Farah  
Board of Directors Representative ..... Christine Dyson  
Councilor ..... Blaise Crisologo  
Councilor .....  
Out On Campus Representative ..... Russell Kanim (*late*)  
Women’s Centre Representative .....  
Senate Representative ..... Arjan Mundy  
Student At-Large ..... Muhsin Suleiman

#### Society Staff

Campaigns, Research, and Policy Coordinator ..... Pierre Cassidy  
Minute Taker ..... Dion Chong

#### Guests

Councilor ..... Karen Abramson

#### Regrets

Vice President University Relations ..... Brady Yano  
Board of Governors Representative ..... Deven Azevedo  
Student At-Large ..... John Ragone  
Councilor ..... Erwin Kwok

#### Absence

Councilor ..... Jesse Velay-Vitow

### 3. Adoption of the Agenda

#### MOTION ADV 2015-08-13:01

Sharma

*Be it resolved to adopt the agenda as presented.*

**Action Item:** Cassidy would contact the previous Communications Coordinator in relation to the Advocacy Table Cloths.

*All agenda items were added at the day of the meeting as the items were submitted to the*

### 4. Ratification of Regrets

#### MOTION ADV 2015-08-13:02

Farha

*Be it resolved to ratify regrets from:*

Vice President University Relations ..... Brady Yano (*conference*)  
Board of Governors Representative ..... Deven Azevedo (*out of town*)  
Student At-Large ..... John Ragone (*out of town*)  
Councilor ..... Erwin Kwok (*academic*)

## 5. New Business

### a. Outreach Tablet

Discussions ensued around the type of tablets available to the committee. It was raised that electronics depreciate rapidly, and concern was raised around warranty. Concerns around usability of the devices as well as issues of cost-effectiveness/fiscal responsibility between the different devices were discussed.

Typically such a purchase would begin with a needs analysis, followed by a Request for Proposal or Request for Quotation. It was requested that such a process go forward in the future for such a purchase.

The committee was reminded that the tablets were sought to create greater potential for outreach and awareness.

A director put forth the following workflow proposal

1. Member contacts Advocacy Chair.
2. Advocacy chair signs out tablet on behalf of the member from the Communications Office
3. Member retains tablet at all times and returns tablet to the Office.

*Kanim entered 11:47am*

The committee was reminded to consider the total cost of ownership, which would not be reflected within the cost of the device itself.

### **MOTION ADV 2015-08-13:02**

Farah, Amended Sharma

*Be it resolved to allocate up to \$2,200 from line item 820/20 Advocacy for the purchasing of 4 iPad mini 16Gb tablets for advocacy outreach initiatives.*

*Be it further resolved to house said tablets in the Communications Office.*

A director raised that the devices are for the exclusive use of advocacy outreach initiatives. It was expressed that oversight of the committee chair over the devices was desired.

The desire of the devices was to optimize the outreach capacity of the organization.

It was recommended that the Executive Director be contacted around the operationalization of capital investments.

Concern was raised that the purchase may be within the mandate of the Finance and Administrative Services Committee as it was a capital expenditure. It was expressed that the budget was approved for the committee to fulfill its function and therefore this may not be necessary. The committee opted to approve the motion, with the chair seeking clarification on whether the matter would have to be brought to FASC for consideration.

**MOTION AMENDED**

Abstention noted: Suleiman, Crisologo

**MAIN MOTION CARRIED**

Abstention noted: Suleiman, Crisologo

**b. Advocacy T-Shirt Purchases**

Be it resolved to allocate up to \$1000 from line item 820/20 Advocacy for the creation and purchase of t-shirts from \_\_\_X manufacturer\_\_\_ with the following slogans:

**6. Discussion**

**a. Get Out the Vote**

**7. Attachments**

**8. Adjournment 12:03pm**

---

DC | CUPE 3338

Disclosure:

-all the information presented is factual information confirmed from all sources accessible on internet when comparing specifications of the hardware except where my opinion was stated.

-note that I do not receive any benefit whatsoever from our potential purchase from NCIX, and I have also confirmed that given the products are being sold at-cost to us (meaning the price NCIX purchases the products from their respective manufacturers which is the same for all retailers), that there is no benefit whatsoever for the individual providing this opportunity for us. This is being done as a favour given my personal relationship with the individual at NCIX.

-note that warranty is an intangible good provided in addition to the purchase of these products, and therefore NCIX as a company, but not the supervisor aiding us, receives profit from warranty

Comparison Matrix

Tablet Models	IPad Mini 2/3	Google Nexus 7	Google Nexus 9	Samsung Galaxy Tab S 8.4
Our cost (7% tax included)	\$1970 total (based on what Apple quoted us)	\$267.072/unit 2 YR: 58.84/unit 3 YR: 90.94/unit	\$453.68/unit 2 YR: 74.89/unit 3 YR: 112.34/unit	\$384.13/unit 2 YR: 74.89/unit 3 YR: 112.34/unit
Screen size	7.9 inches	7 inches	8.9 inches	8.4 inches
Max battery life (Approximate)	11-12 hours	9-10 hours	9-10 hours	11-12 hours
Display quality	2048x1536, 324 ppi IPS-LCD backlit	1920x1200, 323 ppi IPS-LCD backlit	1536x2048, 288 ppi IPS-LCD backlit	1600x2560, 359 ppi AMOLED backlit
Processing power	A7 chip, dual core, 1.3 GHZ	Snapdragon S4 Pro, quad core, 1.5 GHZ	NVIDIA Tegra K1, dual core, 2.3 GHZ	Exynos 5 Octa 5420, eight core, 1.9 GHZ
Storage capacity	16GB or 32GB	32GB	32GB	32GB
SD card storage upgradable	no	no	no	yes
RAM	1GB	2GB	2GB	3GB
Interface	iOS	Android	Android	Android

Remarks:

-iPad 2 is the same in specifications as the iPad 3 with the exception of a Touch ID sensor, a gold colour option, and 64GB or 128GB options. iPad 2 is \$100 cheaper than the iPad 3. Of the metrics used in the provided matrix, iPad 2 and 3 specifications are the same, and were therefore put together in one column. Please note that the metrics chosen to be assessed is based on personal views about relevant hardware for our outreach and survey usage but the actual specifications are fact.

-Note that of all the differences, albeit the Android tablets having higher performance specifications, these differences are not substantial enough for casual and outreach use to notice

-personally, I feel that storage capacity is not an issue even if we choose to go with the Ipad 2/3 in 16GB which is smaller than the Android alternatives, given the availability of online storage for both and that we could at least store 100s of thousands of survey files before filling up the minimum storage capacity option on all of the above tablets

-tablets with SD card slots are a big plus in my opinion, given that it allows easy transfer of data between computers and the tablets

-battery life is dependent on mAh ratings for the tablets' internal batteries. Although the iPad 2/3 will have longer battery life prior to a recharge, note that all of the above have a non-stop usage battery life of 6-7 hours at the minimum.

-Of the processors in each, the A7 is used in both iPad 2 and 3 and only now are Apple products sporting the A8 chip. In independent benchmarks and testing by multiple parties, the above Qualcomm and NVidia chipsets generally outperform the A7, but again, is insufficient to notice for our purposes

-In comparison runs of Apple software versus Android, Apple hardware optimization is superior, but I have not looked sufficiently to see for which specific variables do the Apple or Android tablets surpass each other (and in any event, will be insufficient to notice for our purposes)

-in laymen's terminology, RAM is essentially temporary space programs can use to enhance processing, so more RAM means faster reading and writing speeds

-1920x1080P for screen resolution is known as HD and is the general benchmark to meet for being considered sufficient by technology enthusiasts. Anything above is excellent.

-ppi values refer to pixel density, with higher values indicating a wider range of colour displays and quality

-weight was not considered given they were all within approximately 50-60 grams of each other