

Call to Order – 12:33 pm February 25, 2015 | Build SFU Think Tank

The Events and Promotions Committee acknowledged that the meeting was being conducted on Unceded Coast Salish Territories, which included the Squamish, Musqueam, Stó:lo, and Tsleil-Waututh people to the current knowledge of the Society.

1. Roll Call of Attendance

Committee Composition

Vice President Student Life (*chair*) Kayode Fatoba
Board of Directors Member Katie Bell
Board of Directors Member
Board of Directors Member Shadnam Khan
Board of Directors Member
Councilor
Councilor Erwin Kwok (*late*)
Student At-Large
Student At-Large
Student At-Large

Society Staff

FBS Promotions Coordinator *vacant*
Minute Taker Dion Chong

Guests

Reinvest in Our Future Deven Azevedo
Reinvest in Our Future Mary Lovell
SFU's Got Talent..... Archit Bansal
Golden Key SFU..... Colin Walker
SFU's Got Talent..... Baqar Hassan

Regrets

Student At-Large Anson Wong

2. Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION EPCOM 2015-02-25:01

Bell

Be it resolved to adopt the agenda as presented

Discussion item and canon added

CARRIED AS AMENDED

3. Ratification of Regrets

MOTION EPCOM 2015-02-25:02

Bell

Be it resolved to ratify regrets from:

Student At-Large Anson Wong

CARRIED AS AMENDED

4. Matters Arising from the Minutes

MOTION EPCOM 2015-02-25:03

Bell

Be it resolved to approve the minutes of 2015-02-18

CARRIED

5. Discussion

a. Committee Membership

Kwok entered at 12:36pm

Hassan expressed disappointment with the Events and Promotions Committee, as a result of a lack of notification prior their removal and loss of voting privileges on the committee. They did not send regrets but had a casual meeting with the chair regarding their academic conflict with the meeting time. It was expressed that volunteers should have received follow up prior to ejection from a committee. Such issues impact motivation and passion from volunteers, reiterating that volunteers are unpaid and contribute their time and efforts to the Society. This was seen as an opportunity to enhance the policy. The committee did not formally vote on the issue, and the administration. There were cases where the committee was extremely lenient in following policy and ejecting members.

At present, policy does not require the organization to notify individual members if their position is deemed abandoned as per SO-2. There was a desire to ensure the even application of the policy across the Society, as well as equality in the follow-up mechanisms in the organization. The Society was working towards more even application of policy through multiple avenues.

A board member expressed regret in the lack of notification, on both the professional and personal levels.

Committee members recognized that this was an oversight.

Hassan was extended a formal invitation by multiple members of the EPCOM to reapply and rejoin the committee. They indicated that they could not personally commit as a result of this issue, but they would consider the offer.

Hassan left at 12:48

6. Updates

b. SFU Got Talent—Post Event Report

The committee was thanked for their financial contribution to the event. SFU Got Talent 2015 had 2000 live votes, 300+ individuals inside the theatre, with 60+ volunteers, sponsorship from a number of groups. The event provided opportunities for community building across the three SFU campuses, including Woodward's in particular.

Each event executive has listed recommendations within their reports. These included concerns of the lack of time to plan the project—which impacted volunteer personal lives and the scale of the project.

\$5000 was approved for the meeting, and not all the funds were used. A committee member commended the quality of the event, and the degree of community support for the event. Concern was raised around the recommendations for additional time in planning, as communications material had already been circulated prior to Open Mic Night in the fall semester, with Open Mic Night being used to promote the event.

The event had been approved in principle by the Committee, but was not formally approved until the event plan and budget were produced, which was not completed until two weeks prior to the event. This resulted in issues with booking venue. Additional, delays ensued during the review by the Communications Coordinator of volunteer positions to avoid positions and tasks

under the purview of Society departments. The Committee was reminded that staff positions are formed by the employer, and that the Employer and Union collectively determine the Collective Agreement, as opposed to “union laws” being unilaterally imposed upon the Society. It was expressed that the Committee had approved the event months in advance, with support through resources to enable continued planning until a budget and event plan are produced. Confusion had been expressed by the event organizing team of the degree of planning that had ensued at different phases of the project.

Concerns were raised by various members:

- Lack of updates to the committee, particularly as the funding body for the event.
 - Constant updates were added to the agenda for EPCOM.
- Members were not allowed in auditions
 - As a result of the video auditions, it was important to provide the privacy for members to take critique without others in the room. This was particularly important to enhance confidence of audition members and enable shy members to participate.
- Society resources were not used in many cases.
- SFSS was not mentioned at the event, while non-society organizations that the SFSS was not directly affiliated were being advertised.
 - Skynation was a sponsor (which provided and developed the website infrastructure for the event) while Fashion Week was an SFSS club
 - It was expressed that the sponsors should be thanked at the event for their contributions
 - Relay for Life was provided with an opportunity to have the winners perform at their events.
 - Desire to make the Society a central space for event planning and talent
 - SFSS banner was present on stage, with a backdrop on the red carpet. They were also mentioned in the opening of the event
- Invasion of board space and volunteers engaging in direction of staffs—clarity should be provided by the project manager
- Money was expended before the budget was approved
- Prizes were an extremely high cost.
 - Initially, the \$20,000 was requested for the event, and then a reduction to \$10,000, followed by a reduction by the committee down to \$5,000. The committee continually identified prize costs as an issue. Even before the finances were approved, the prizes were already being advertised which was a legal issue for the Society.
 - It was expressed that the cash prize was an incentive for quality participants, which was seen to result in a significant increase in the number of viewers, auditioners, participants etc.

182 tickets were sold. Sponsors including SFU Relay for Life boosted attendance numbers. \$5000 was allocated by EPCOM, and revenue was also used to cover expenses. The event broke even with a small surplus.

\$610 revenue was generated at the event. There was confusion around where ticket revenue went.

The executive team was involved in the initial budget for an event with 1000 to 2000 members already significantly expanded. It was expressed that the community was now interested in the larger version of the event, outside performers were involved

7. New Business

a. Reinvest in our Future Funding Proposal

Reinvest in our Future was a series of events in collaboration with a number of campus organizations. This would begin and continue discussions on a sustainable future, such as the matter of the Kinder Morgan pipeline, sustainable jobs etc. The event series formed part of a greater dialogue leading into the Climate Talks and the federal elections. The organizers sought to enhance the events through continuity events.

Issues were raised that EPCOM has minimal funding left. While the Society could provide support via through labour assistance and promotion, the funding was no longer available.

Student Visioning for a Working World needed facilitators, and more volunteers and facilitators of Kinder Morgan Dialogue. There was a desire to enable opportunities for students to interact with local leaders. Confusion was thus expressed around the validity of the approved event plans for the two events being funded by EPCOM if these additional costs were needed.

It was indicated by the presenters that the Divest as a Case Study discussion panel was the primary area of the funding request. SFU350 was a club and the one running the event and therefore should have submitted their request to the Granting Committee.

Green Jobs Fair was an initiative of the SFSS Vice President Finance, and the Student Visioning for a Working World and the Kinder Morgan Dialogue were Advocacy Committee initiatives.

b. Golden Key SFU—CANCON 2015

Requesting \$553 to fund t-shirts, as per the conversation at the previous EPCOM meeting.

It was not seen as prudent to commit more funds at this point given the limited funding within the EPCOM line item. Further concerns were raised because the event was not on campus.

It was raised that it would have been desirable for the committee to provide information to the members in the future before they have to sit through the majority of multiple meetings.

8. Discussion

a. Promotional Enquiries

Events Calendar was not seen as effective. It was recommended to invite the Communications Office.

9. Adjournment 1:29pm

DC /CUPE 3338