

# Revised STUDENTS' COUNCIL AGENDA And LATE ADDITIONS

---

Tuesday January 6, 2004 – 6:00 PM  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

## A G E N D A (SC 2003-19)

- 2003-19/1                    CALL TO ORDER
- 2003-19/2                    University of Alberta CHEER SONG "Ring Out a Cheer"
- 2003-19/3                    SPEAKER'S BUSINESS
- 2003-19/3a                  Approval of the November 18, 2003 Students' Council Minutes.
- 2003-19/3b                  Approval of the November 18, 2003 Students' Council In-Camera Minutes.
- 2003-19/3c                  Approval of the November 25, 2003 Students' Council Minutes.
- 2003-19/4                    APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
- 2003-19/5                    PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION
- 2003-19/5a                  Presentation of the Students' Union's audited financial statements for the year ending April 30, 2003 – Presented by Tyler Botten.
- 2003-19/6                    QUESTION PERIOD
- 2003-19/7                    APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)  
  
Please see document SC 03-19.01
- 2003-19/8                    APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS
- 2003-19/9                    OLD BUSINESS
- 2003-19/10                  LEGISLATION
- 2003-19/10a                  **BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the following principles (Second Reading):  
  
1. That the Students' Union have one body responsible for the interpretation of Students' Union legislation.

2. That this body be called the Students' Union Tribunal, and that it be composed of between eight and eleven undergraduate students acting as tribunes.
3. That any undergraduate student excepting those serving as tribunes, any Students' Union constituted body excepting the Students' Union Tribunal, and Students' Council all have the authority to initiate a complaint about a contravention of Students' Union legislation and to request an interpretation of Students' Union legislation.
4. That tribunes be selected by a Tribune Selection Committee to be composed of two voting members of the Executive Committee, as selected by the Executive Committee, two voting members of Students' Council, as selected by Students' Council, and two tribunes, as selected by the Students' Union Tribunal.
5. That the Tribune Selection Committee have a quorum of five members, and that any candidate for tribune must be selected by a two-thirds majority vote of the Tribune Selection Committee.
6. That the chair of the Tribune Selection Committee be elected by and from the Tribune Selection Committee.
7. That the election of the chair and the selection of tribunes be reported to Students' Council, the Executive Committee, and the Students' Union Tribunal.
8. That there be a Chief Tribune and an Associate Chief Tribune, and that these be selected by simple majority vote of the Students' Union Tribunal, and that the names of the individuals holding these offices be reported to Students' Council, the Executive Committee, and the Tribune Selection Committee.
9. That all undergraduates excepting those serving as employees of the Students' Union or voting members of Students' Council or its subcommittees be eligible to serve as tribunes.
10. That tribunes serve until such time as they cease to be eligible, they resign, or they are removed by two-thirds majority vote of the Tribune Selection Committee.
11. That complaints or requests for interpretation must be submitted in writing to either the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
12. That, complaints or requests for interpretation must be ruled upon by a panel of three tribunes within seven days of their receipt by the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
13. That, in the case of complaints, the agreement of both the appellant(s) and respondent(s) be sufficient to extend the seven day period provided for in (12).
14. That, in the case of requests for interpretation, the agreement of the individual or body requesting interpretation be sufficient to extend the seven day period provided for in (12).
15. That the panel of three set out in (12) include exactly one of the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
16. That appeals must be submitted in writing to the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune within seven days of the ruling by the panel of three.
17. That appeals must be ruled upon by a panel of five tribunes not part of the panel of three, including exactly one of the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune, within fourteen days of their receipt by the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.

18. That any Chief Tribune or Associate Chief Tribune who is not able to hear a complaint or request for interpretation due to conflict of interest be replaced on that complaint or request for interpretation by another tribune selected by the Students' Union Tribunal.

19. That the Chief Tribune or, in his/her absence, the Associate Chief Tribune be responsible for scheduling hearings and appointing tribunes to panels.

20. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to strike down or declare of no force or effect any piece of Students' Union legislation that contradicts any other piece of Students' Union legislation.

21. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to censure any member of the Students' Union.

22. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to fine any employee of the Students' Union who reports to Students' Council or to the undergraduate student body as a whole an amount not to exceed twenty dollars.

23. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to initiate a referendum on the vacation of any Students' Union elected office.

24. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to initiate a referendum on the dissolution of Students' Council or of the Executive Committee.

2003-19/10b

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, rescind Articles I, II, III, IV, IX, and XI of the Students' Union Constitution (first reading).

Please see document SC 03-19.02

Please see document SC 03-19.03

Please see document SC 03-19.04

Please see document SC 03-19.05

Please see document SC 03-19.06

Please see document SC 03-19.07

2003-19/10c

**SMITH/BOTTEN MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, rescind Article V of the Students' Union Constitution (first reading).

Please see document SC 03-19.08

2003-19/10d

**SHARMA MOVED THAT** Students' Council amend the by-laws to change the term of office for Vice-Presidents and Presidents from one year to two years (first reading).

2003-19/10e

**SHARMA MOVED THAT** Students' Council amend the by-laws to change the term of office for the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative from one year to two years (first reading).

2003-19/10f

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, legislate the following (first reading):

(a) the Academic Affairs Coordinator;

(b) the Community Relations Coordinator;

(c) the Student Activities Coordinator;

(d) the Athletics Campus Promotions Coordinators;

(e) the Campus Crime Stoppers Committee;

- (f) the Gold Key Selection Committee;
- (g) Residents' Associations;
- (h) the General Faculties Council Student Caucus;
- (i) the Students' union Award for Leadership in Undergraduate Teaching (SALUTE);
- (j) the Programming Committee;
- (k) the Council of Faculty Associations;
- (l) the Director of Information Services;
- (m) the Director of Safewalk;
- (n) the Director of the Student Distress Centre;
- (o) the Director of the Environmental Coordination Office of Students;
- (p) the Director of Student Groups;
- (q) the Ombuds Directors;
- (r) the Director of the Student Financial Aid Information Centre;
- (s) the Director of the Centre for Student Development;
- (t) all Student Involvement Awards funded by entities other than the Students' Union;
- (u) the Strategic Planning and Business Planning Cycle; and
- (v) the Official Student Newspaper.

2003-19/10g

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve amendments to Students' Union legislation based on the following principles (first reading):

1. THAT up to 8.5% of the Student Involvement Endowment Fund be used annually to provide awards for undergraduate students who contribute to the campus community; and
2. THAT the Awards Committee be assigned responsibility for allocating these awards.

2003-19/10h

**BOTTEN MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve changes to Students' Union legislation that adhere to the following principle (first reading):

1. removal of the requirement that voting members of the Executive Committee be "registered in the equivalent of at least one (1) full-year course for credit during the Winter Session".

2003-19/10i

**DUBE/WALLCE MOVED THAT** Students' Council attendance requirements be eliminated (first reading).

2003-19/10j

**DUBE/WALLACE MOVED THAT** Students' Council proxies be eliminated (first reading).

2003-19/10k

**LO MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve changes to Students' Union legislation such that Student Councilors representing a Faculty be required to provide a regular written report to their respective Faculty Association regarding Students' Council decisions, issues and happenings (First Reading).

2003-19/10l

Late Addition

**SMITH/DUBÉ MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve the proposed political policy respecting Tuition Levels and Regulation, and THAT Students' Council rescind the existing political policies on Tuition, the Post-Secondary Learning Act, Alberta's Tuition Policy, Tuition Authority, Tuition Deregulation, and Post-Secondary Education Funding Cutbacks.

Please see document SC 03-19.09  
 Please see document SC 03-19.10  
 Please see document SC 03-19.11  
 Please see document SC 03-19.12  
 Please see document SC 03-19.13  
 Please see document SC 03-19.14  
 Please see document SC 03-19.15

2003-19/11

**NEW BUSINESS**

2003-19/11a

**BRECHTEL/WALLACE MOVED THAT** upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council appoint Jon Hechter, Liang Shen, and Erin Hibbert to the three available positions of Deputy Returning Officer for the Winter term 2004.

2003-19/11b

Late Additions

**BOTTEN MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve the Audited Financial Statements for the Students' Union Fiscal Year ending April 30, 2003.

2003-19/12

**REPORTS**

2003-19/12a

Janet Lo – Vice President Academic

Please see document SC 03-19.16

2003-19/12b

Tyler Botten – Vice President Operations and Finance

Please see document SC 03-19.17

2003-19/12c

Late Additions

Mat Brechtel – President

Please see document SC 03-19.18

2003-19/13

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

2003-19/13a

Report from Tyler Botten, Vice President Operations and Finance, regarding his attendance at the Campus Advantage Mid-Year Meeting.

Please see document SC 03-19.19

2003-19/14

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

2003-19/15

2003-19/15a

**ROLL CALL**  
**Next Council Meeting**

UPCOMING

COUNCIL

MEETINGS

January 20, 2004

February 3, 2004

2003-19/16

**ADJOURNMENT**

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

---

**November 18, 2003**  
**Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall**

**ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-17)**

<b>Faculty/Position</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present/ Absent @ 9pm</b>	<b>Vote #1</b>
President	Mat Brechtel	√	√
VP Academic	Janet Lo	√	√
VP External	Chris Samuel	√	X
VP Finance	Tyler Botten	X	Absent
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah	√	√
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych	√	√
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Tawana Wardlaw	√	Absent
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie	X	Absent
Arts	Alex Abboud	√	√
Arts	Chris Bolivar	√	√
Arts	Vivek Sharma	√	√
Arts	Erin Kelly	√	Absent
Arts	James Knull	√	Absent

Arts	Chris Laver	√	√
Arts	Terra Melnyk	√	X
Arts	Heather Wallace	√	X
Arts	Paul Welke	X	absent
Business	Adam Cook	√	X
Business	Steve Smith	√	X
Education			
Education	Allison Ekdahl	√	√
Education			
Education	Christine Wudarck	√	X
Education			
Engineering	Josh Bazin	√	√
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)	√	
Engineering	James Crossman	√	X
Engineering	David Wepler	√	√
Law	Dean Hutchison	√	√
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice	√	√
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk	√	√
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong (Alyson Jubber)	√	√
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat	√	Abstain
Nursing	Jean Abbott	X	Absent
Nursing			

Open Studies			
Open Studies			
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac	√	√
Physical Education	Holly Higgins	X	Absent
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	√	√
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube	√	√
Science	Matthew Eaton	√	√
Science	Tereza Elyas	X	Abstain
Science	Justin Kehoe	√	X
Science	Aisha Khatib	√	√
Science	Shawna Pandya	√	Abstain
Science	Elaine Poon	√	√
Science	Steven Schendel	X	Absent
Science	Duncan Taylor	√	X
Science	LeeAnn Lim	X	Absent
President Athletics			
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	√	
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo	√	

**Guests of Council:** Marc Matras, Jordan Blatz, Hailey Pinto, Stephen Congly, Chelli Kelly, Sara Katz, Stephen Kirkham, Adrienne de Montarnal, Nicholas Tam, Mike Heugen, Katt Hryciw, Jacob Fortio, Andrew Sullivan

## MINUTES (SC 2003-17)

2003-17/01

CALL TO ORDER

Speaker calls meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2003-17/02

**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA CHEER SONG “Ring Out a Cheer”**

**WEPLER** leads Students’ Council in the singing of the cheer song.

2003-17/03

**SPEAKER’S BUSINESS**

**Speaker** – Quorum call. 25 members. We’re good. Under the authority granted to me under section 10, the Residence Hall presentation will be a special order. Limit to no more than 15 minutes for the presentation and the questions can be dealt with under question period.

2003-17/5

**PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS**

2003-17/5a

**RICE** – SU council has been discussing the resident hall seat.

**HRYCIW**–We are here to present why the seat is extremely important. We are a unique kind of student. The students who don’t live on campus are affected by the discussion here. For example, dealing with the rent increase, which was initially presented at the Board of Governors presentation. Faculty councilors are not the most appropriate councilors to represent, if they were, they would need an in-depth knowledge what it is like to be a residence of all of the residences. We elect the resident to speak for all the residences. Additionally, the President to RHA must be in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of resident and have served on council for 1 year. In order to illustrate the knowledge needed, we have provided a quiz. There are no trick questions, it is a quiz to see what questions you can and cannot answer.

**DUBE** – Question about number 20, is it prior to 2 weeks ago?

**HRYCIW** – The quiz is just a tip of the ice berg. Question 18, one of the problems they are facing right now. They also don’t have a community area. Currently the RHA is working with all the residences to get that going. In brief we have a group of individuals that are selected to represent.

**RICE** – We have a petition of residents that are concerned with this issue. Although as councilors, you may see that you represent the residents adequately, but you are sending a message to the residence that they are not important. Residences make up 10% of SU's constitution. Key strategic 1.1 threw residences into turmoil. If you are interested, you can see council's minutes from that year. 1.4. New residence being built is restricted to 60 international students and the application process is intensive to get in, including submitting an essay. The residence's life is in the Dean's life of portfolio. Although the RHA does run some programs, for example attending conferences, there are few groups on campus that are directly affected by the decisions of admin as residences are. Residences don't leave campus, maybe they aren't adequately represented as they only have 1 residence councilor. Council is set up on the way it is because it intends to represent students. You probably know who your dean is and have ties with student associations. Faculty reps are the best people and most effective people to represent their faculty and selecting someone from the RHA would best represent RHA. Please consider the impact of withdrawing the vote.

**Speaker** – The next thing that I will make a special order is the approval of the agenda.

2003-17-04

#### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**TAYLOR/BAZIN MOVED THAT** the agenda be approved.

**BRECHTEL/LO MOVED TO** remove the presentation by Carl Amrhein and add item 10d, the motion for the tuition political policy.

**BRECHTEL** – There is a presentation today on the multi-year tuition, what we have today is a presentation of a product of those negotiations and approving or disapproving them is necessary, because by Dec 2, it will be too late. In negotiations, we were unable to change 1 thing, the multi-year acceptance of max tuition. We still need to debate that. To make that debate not out of order, we need to change this political policy. So instead of having a motion regarding on what we do on multi-year tuition, we'll make that statement via presentation, have that presentation in a committee as a whole. So to have that discussion, this is the only way to figure out how to do it. We have a tuition campaign, it has posters made up for it, we have been developing 2 different alternatives, we have to decide what we need to do in the next year. If the multi-year goes through, we need to decide how to use resources at a university level. With the exception of calling an extra meeting, we need to discuss this now.

**Speaker** – I am going to say that this is acceptable and will move to debate on the amendment.

**DUBE** – I don't understand what Mat is saying, but that is okay. I say we hear him out.

**SMITH** – How many minutes before the meeting did this made the late additions package. Is there also a motion to add a motion to multi-year on the agenda?

**Speaker** – There is no separate motion on the agenda tonight with adopting multi-year. My understanding is that that presentation will be made in an informal consideration when we get to that point and it will be made a special order.

**BRECHTEL** – About 50 minutes before.

**Amendment is carried.**

**Speaker** – That will fall under legislation under 10d. We will be expecting Dr. Amrhein, so this will be a special order.

**2003-17/10d**

**BRECHTEL MOVED THAT** Students Council approve the Tuition Political policy as amended.

**BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT** Students' Council move to informal consideration

**SMITH** – I don't see how it is beneficial to move from a structured debate to meandering endlessly, so I will be opposing this.

**BRECHTEL** – The purpose is not to allow the debate, but to allow the presentation to go on.

**The motion to move to informal consideration is carried.**

**BRECHTEL** – A couple meetings ago, council came up with several suggestions about multi-year tuition and whatever happens, that proposal will come back to council. We have had 3-4 budget meetings, the last of which occurred today, the product of which Dr. Amrhein has on the projector. You will be able to see what we came to. It is up to council to decide what to do.

**AMRHEIN** –We have the proposal that can be put up on the overhead. The details of the proposal are pretty short and are well known. It is a 2 year proposal where we increase tuition to the maximum. So, maximum tuition for 2 years and a revenue sharing formula agreed upon in the document we can look at. There are a whole series of things. An answer question put forward in Gateway, what's in it for the students? I can see that the tuition debate is very important, beyond the definition of just tuition. It is for students to voice agreements and disagreements. I hear a great deal of concern of tuition levels becoming a barrier to the post secondary institution. I hear that people tell me that you don't trust our motives or agree with the admin. But at the same time, you are willing to look at a different way of working with the admin. So, the proposal I think addresses most of your concerns and creates an opportunity to voice your agreements. It is an opportunity to hold senior admin accountable. We can talk about our current views of the budget situation and the magnitude of the requests. We can talk about the learning enhancements that you ask for under the revenue allocation arrangement.

But Mat and I have been upfront from the first day, going far back into my first contact with them. We expect to be taking the max tuition permitted for the foreseeable future. There will be a 2 year delay in and there will be many opportunities to us jointly to lobby the government with student leaders, Board of Governors and leaders of groups on campus. I think the success of the package is hard to predict. We can look back through 23 years of not being too successful. We can look back to what universities got out of elections for the previous government. Maybe we should try something different. We have heard the minister say things that sound supportive of post secondary learning. There are quotes from the minutes that he sees the need. We get a sense though that the message is getting through. So that is what we see is in it for you. For the admin, in the absence of an intense debate on tuition, we will be able to jointly much more aggressively and consistently push the government to reinvest in our core budget. In 1983, we get \$10 for every dollar of tuition, now we get \$2.33 for every dollar of tuition. I think there have been a lot of questions put forth as why this is a good thing to do and I hope that good things for the students as well. So, those are the opening comments.

**BRECHTEL** – I would like to ask the first question. You made it clear to me why you see coupling us agreeing to maximum tuition increase as necessary to agree to have a year off to agreeing to rest of the parts of the deal, I think this needs to be a central point that is addressed.

**AMRHEIN** – It is a package. I'm not sure I would ask a newly elected student organization to agree to maximum tuition increase. The point here is to get your agreement to a package. A package to join us in pushing the government. No question whether we get this or not, the admin will continue lobbying the government. The lobbying part to government is going very well and will be even more effective if it was one single voice. Students, staff, faculty administration, Board of Governors coming to the legislation with a single voice. The 2 years increase is necessary because the university budget is not in good shape. We have not had any announcement from the Governor or confirm the 2.5% we got last summer, if we don't get that, our deficit will go up. We can work jointly and collaboratively to help students. This is what we have to offer. How do we get from A to B, we have been told that the students would like to be assured. But it is a package. If we break the package apart, I don't need someone to pass a motion at the Board of Governors to lobby the government. I've been doing that since the day I arrived.

**KOTOVYCH** – What are the details of the revenue sharing? When the proposal was brought forward, the President was to sit as a non-voting member of EPC, has that changed? We are in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the cycle and differential proposal can only be implemented at the start of cycle so I'm not sure if this works.

**AMRHEIN** – It doesn't mean it could only be brought forward of the cycle. The EPC offer is still on the table, we haven't sent out the invitations yet, but we will do that. And details of revenue sharing, the 2.1% assumes the 2.7% from last year is confirmed. 20% to reduce tuition fee increase, 30% to support learning enhancements and 50% will go to the operating budget. The budget we are talking about does not include the trust accounts. The budget last time was about 60% government support and 26% tuition. If we get really successful and it goes above 5%, there is a different ratio of sharing - 10% for tuition, 15% to learning enhancements and 75% to the operating budget.

**KOTOVYCH** – Would the EPC remain a non-voting seat?

**AMRHEIN**- Yes.

**SAMUEL** – First of all, in reference to something you said earlier. The only pro the university would be getting from the multi-year deal is not having to deal with the annual tuition?

**AMRHEIN** - No. I'm not afraid of the annual tuition debate. I said we will have the opportunity to have more time to organize a better lobbying effort with a much complete coalition to lobby against government.

**SAMUEL** – When we do our lobbying, we use our annual tuition decision as our lobbying point and that serves us quite well. It is very useful for us and draws a lot of attention because of its perpetuity. What do you see as the alternative of the rallying in terms of an actual date and event?

**AMRHEIN** – We had 5 days, including a front page headline and it had nothing to do with the tuition debate. That was a lot of media attention. We had comments from fairly high ranking officials about the Edmonton Journal. The purpose of introducing me to these people, the twin message of reinvesting, that was the president and the meeting the editor of the Edmonton journal editorial board. We routinely talk to deputy messengers and can broaden the range of people. I guess the question back to you, if you feel looking back 23 years that we do it recently has been successful, then you don't need this package.

**SAMUEL** – Other question is about the specifics of the revenue sharing. 1<sup>st</sup> question, would it be possible, if I recall, the university receives revenue from 4 resources. Would it be possible to incorporate more streams of revenue into revenue sharing, such as investments and that would be an excellent revenue sharing model. And looking at the breakdown right there, if we are going 20% and then shifting 10% once we hit that 5.1, it is better for students to receive a 5% increase in funding rather than a 9%, maybe we should have a more elaborate formula.

**AMRHEIN** - My understanding that of that 2.1-5, this kicks, above the 5, these numbers kick in, so you are not better off. The additional revenue streams, we don't spend investments, they become a part of the endowment and is predetermined by the donor. Much of that money is flowing to students through bursaries and scholarships. In that sense, the income from the investments already flow into the pockets of the students. Our budget is less off than last we were here is because the university will have to reduce the amount from that endowment because the performance from the stock market has not recovered. The other forms of income that we didn't mention are the trust accounts. There is a much more dramatic impact on graduate students, so these are the 2 items, government money and tuition, the other ones you mentioned, legal agreements. So we can come back and give you a financing 101.

**WUDARCK** – I am wondering if there was any significance to the 5% and why that was chosen and wondering if you can justify why you are only allocating 20% to tuition when you are asking for maximum tuition?

**AMRHEIN** – The request for maximum tuition is based on the university budget. Even if we meet all of those guidelines, there is a long list of deferred maintenance and it stands about 600 million dollars. There are issues related to the pension because the same stock market behavior which has reduced our investments has also reduced this. So we are saying that if we get revenue we don't already budgeted, then there are 3 requirements, the magic of the 5% is how it came out in the discussion. There is improving the quality of the undergraduate experience and a long list of financial worries the university has to deal with. If you add up the pieces, there is a direct benefit to current enrolled students and the other benefits will pay in the long run. They were worked out at the budget meeting, just a free wheeling conversation.

**DUBE** – Sincere apologies, although I understand, I fail to understand the answer of how this will affect the students. Bullet point what the students are getting.

**AMRHEIN**– What's on the table is not maximum tuition. We will take that forward no matter what we do. The budget model needs that in meeting the multi-year requirement. Benefits to students – the revenue sharing. We been told students want to see how EPC gets their numbers so you will have a seat at that discussion. We forget that when these discussions started, Bill 43 was in question. We are committed to bound by the existing tuition cap in the university's act. The other piece is that we have the opportunity with a single message to lobby the government and that is a conversation that is more than just students.

**BRECHTEL** – One of the things council talked about entertaining a discussion at the Board of Governor level and discussed that and is a valuable benefit to students.

**AMRHEIN** – I cannot commit the Board of Governors or EPC, but I can commit myself as the top priority of the student union and do everything I can to add that to the conversation with the body.

**DUBE** – I am confused at the revenue sharing. Looking at this, admin is saying tuition is too high for students. I am unconvinced that admin couldn't do that anyways. So I don't understand why that is a benefit to us, I see it us their job.

**AMRHEIN** – My job is to provide the best quality of education for all students. What you get here is a commitment on our part. Me agreeing to this is because your student rep said that this is your top priority. Maybe the board's top priority is different - to restore some of the professors that have been lost. What you get with this, is agreement in advance that your priority will be funded at this rate. So I take your point is my job is to do the best job, but it doesn't mean that I agree what the top priority is. The Board of Governors may like to do something else. So this is what you get, outside all of the government processes and is up to you to decide how valuable that is.

**COOK** – Has the board agreed to this?

**AMRHEIN** – The board won't see this till January. This is the motion that will go to the board. I don't have any authority to approve this. However, you've all been in the university longer than I have, you tell me what the probability the Board of Governors overturning the recommendation from student group and admin.

**COOK**- Please elaborate on lobbying campaigning, will accessibility be a part of the campaign?

**CLARK** – The lobbying campaign is not flushed out yet. Parts of the campaign will be different for students from administration. So we agree on that, we are looking at public forums, meetings with MLAs, the Minister, the Premier, where we talk about that issue. We also agree on the capacity issue that we need more funding for students. There could be times that you may feel more strongly about an issue than us. So we have tossed around a lot of ideas, things like asking former SU presidents and your parents and family to come out and speak to the government. There are lots of things we can do. It is our annual time and it is an easy trick to pull off. But is there a way to use that energy and get an actual result at the end of the day. I think by getting rid of the fighting and truing the energy where it belongs, we will be further down.

**SMITH** – You were here 6 weeks ago, a brief summary of what has changed from 6 weeks ago. The only think that has changed that I understand is the revenue sharing. Also, if the SU does not agree to this, will you support the admin to decide tuition for this year and next year?

**AMRHEIN** - What has changed? We didn't have anything on paper. Now we have detail and several conversations with key members with the Board of Governors. We have a sense by talking to people in the ministry and they have reacted to that. So, basically details and much greater confidence. If you vote this down, the package deal is off the table. There will be a conversation with GSA with their concerns. What will we take to the Board of Governors? The details aren't there yet. I suspect what I will take to the Board of Governors is the history of conversations that we will recommend that this year we do max-tuition and will give the board notice if we do maximum tuition the next year as well. The budget model assumes max tuition for 2 years. So the difference of approving that now or year by year is a decision by EPC. We are still assuming we have a 2 year deal.

**ABBOUD** – To gain some of the things we are looking for, we have to make some sacrifices as well. What are the other shareholder groups asked to sacrifice in part of the multi-year proposal. Such as GCA?

**AMRHEIN** – GCA is in the same situation as you. The percentages look like this, but they reserve the right to use the money different. Since I bear the front on the tuition debate, management will speak with a single voice, but it doesn't mean that management agree on every detail.

**ABBOUD** – Question for Ms. Clark, how much of that has gone towards tuition relief for undergraduates in recent years?

**CLARK** – The first thing that happened was that the budget assumption was we get a 2% increase. If we meet that, we have some flexibility. At the EPC table, we talked about what we want to support with the extra money. But the bottom line has been a huge call in terms of extra money. In the budget package, there is 14 million dollars in extra revenue we have to find, so making the budget work is to find the 14 million dollars.

**DUBE** – Dr. Amrhein , my understanding is that it is government policy. My understanding is that the U of A should provide the students with a 3-year forecast.

**AMRHEIN**– We have multi-year forecasts, but that is not a substitute for the annual approval cycle. We have been in touch with ministry officials what this will look like. Yes, we give multi-year forecasts, but not a multi-year approval. It is up to the Board of Governors to approve these things.

**RICE** – How much of the increase revenue we get from this goes towards the debt and the \$600 million pension plan?

**CLARK** – We have a budget plan that forecasts a 1 million deficit. So the first thing we have to do is drive towards that. The government does have to approve deficits. If we don't meet our budget targets, they won't approve an unbalanced budget. Let's assume that we get what we are forecasting and meet the extra revenue target, in our budget process we know that we have a hole of 8 million dollars that we have to fill. We also have to have the discussion at EPC about the deferred pension plan.

**AMRHEIN** – Increased utility costs, pension plan, if we don't get it, it becomes part of the budget deficit.

**CLARK** – That pension number, the total is 6 million.

**AMRHEIN** – If the stock market goes up like a rocket, these things will change, but we haven't seen that. It takes a long time for the cost to go down, if the market goes up.

**WUDARCK** – About revenue sharing, if there were to be a 5% increase in funding, how much of that percentage will be offset? Also, I am wondering if you have an actual percentage for maximum tuition.

**AMRHEIN** – 1% of tuition is about a million dollars. So, we expect that a maximum tuition increase will be more than 5% or 5.5%. So five and half million dollars.

**SAMUEL** – On the Auditor's General report, from what we read from that report, there were questions about the U of A's budget calculation processes with sponsor research costs. What we gathered from the report, it wasn't deducting all the costs, we discovered that we are a lot closer to that 30% cap than we thought we were. If it turns out that we are at the cap, does that still hold? Also, about the maximum tuition, if we get under this model, a 10% increase in base funding, if it still doesn't translate to a freezing.

**AMRHEIN** – We don't have to agree with his report. The issue here has to do with treatment of individual cost recovery and we disagree with the General Auditor comment. That means the accountants have sorted it out at a staff level. At the 30% cap at a 2 year agreement, if it says we are bound by that, then we are bound by that. A deal is a deal.

**BRECHTEL** – If what he suggests that we hit the cap already and you are suggesting that we have maximum tuition, then those 2 statements in the agreement would be.

**AMRHEIN** – Then the increase would be zero. But no deal though. Maybe I should put a much finer point on that. Management may be giving up a lot of tuition. In the future, that is why we are staying with the current legislation.

**HUTCHISON** – I understand the value of this deal benefits the students and admin. My concern is about the message that goes to the public when students agree to a tuition increase. The government may think that the students don't have it that bad and give money to something else like health care. So what do you think the message sends to the public?

**AMRHEIN** – What the government thinks is a good question. I think we are not asking students to vote. We are asking you to support the package. Your representatives have many opportunities to speak to the complexity of the package. Despite our deep opposition to management's max tuition proposal, we hope you support the package. Because the administration will go to maximum tuition anyways.

**CROSSMAN** – About the unified voice - health care is more successful than university in lobbying, their internal disagreements are mutually exclusive and yet, they were still able to present this unified voice. In our example, the unified voice is there already, we both think we aren't getting enough funding from the government.

**AMRHEIN** – Nobody is asking you to lay down the tuition issue internally. This discussion is not in camera and will be recorded. There is not an internal coherence on a wide range of topics. The point is, publicly we agree with a vote from the Board of Governors to have a common front in our approach to the legislature. But once there is a package and support it, that we then agree that this is the approach we take to the government.

**CROSSMAN** – But what do we have to go through this package, this whole process when we already agree on the same issue?

**AMRHEIN** – Because there are people that still push for zero tuition, not zero increase, but zero tuition. That is the variation of the message the public has received and allows the government to say they are not clear what they should do. So why don't you bring a single message that says, "we want investment". This isn't just something that we dreamt out to finesse on you on the tuition issue. We do not have a single consistent message to the government, except that, "we want more".

**PEWARCHUK** – About maximum tuition increase, hypothetically if the deal is rejected by council and if Bill 43 allows a larger tuition increase, will the 2<sup>nd</sup> year increase be higher like 15%?

**AMRHEIN** – Can't say. I don't believe that Bill 43 will hold out that possibility. We think maximum for tuition for 2 years is what we need to bring the budget home. Everything I have said tonight, we have gone through the EPC discussion, gone through the discussion with the key folks.

**DUBE** – I can see how there are benefits. I can see how there are major drawbacks. I think this is a hard hit for us. At the Board of Governors meeting, a student group will raise that ruckus anyways. More over, I am questioning how you said you will be acknowledge that is an issue and you turn around when I ask you how you acknowledge it. We need in this deal tuition to be seen as a priority, not only for students, but for the admin. I don't think we will have a unified voice until admin says that tuition is an issue, because we don't have the same interest.

**AMRHEIN**– What you asked, if we don't have a deal, will I still agree to this? I can't bind administration and there are many pressures on the administration. So, personally, I committed to Mat that accessibility is the issue. There are a lot of costs to go into attending the university. If you are someone from rural Alberta and has to travel here, the issue is not just tuition, it is room and board. Maybe we should worry more about rural Alberta students. Accessibility is an issue, how much it all costs you to attend, relative to your ability to attend. They are related for sure, overlapped, but not identical. I can not bind administration unilaterally.

**Speaker** – This is a decision of some monument. So if you still have questions, ask them now.

**HUTCHISON** – You mentioned not being able to bind the future, are we not binding next years?

**AMRHEIN**– I said I cannot bind administration without going through the conversations that have proceeded this evening. I have had the discussion with the admin and is speaking with confidence on behalf of admin, but not for the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors has authority to make this decision. I'm happy to take back to admin any questions or additions you want to add to it. I am simply trying to be straight forwarded.

**WUDARCK** – About rural Albertans, how their tuition is not their greatest concern. How can you argue that when the student loan program has \$721 for room and board expenses, and \$57 a year and tuition will continue to increase? So how can you justify room and board is most important?

**AMRHEIN** – Room and board is a lot more than tuition. It is simply the arithmetic of it. If you have to live at the university, accessibility is greater than tuition. So my pushback on the tuition agreement, it is all in. Accessibility is defined by how much you to pay to attend the university. And 5 years from now, tuition will probably be higher and room and board will surely be higher.

**SAMUEL** - Dr. Amrhein, I thank you for coming. With regards to Bill 43, I know that one of the things the Minister of Learning has been talking about and coming forward in the new legislature is more legislated consultants - have we have considered that a multi-year is illegal?

**AMRHEIN**– Our understanding is that the U of A is the model of consultation. And when they talk about consultation, we have had no indication from the ministry that our consultative processes have found to be anything by the model. There are 2 decisions in which the year is up for discussions. In a year that tuition is predetermined, the budget still goes through. We can create opportunities, just like the Edmonton Journal editorial board created opportunities for us. Next year there will still be a budget and the consultation is here now with admin as delegated with the board.

**SAMUEL** – Would then the university budget be open for us to criticize and debate on campus in a way that it will be open to all students? Part of the thing will be all of our efforts will not really be dealing with the conflict with the admin, but conflicts with the Governor. From what you have said, the budget is still open.

**AMRHEIN**– The budget process, your access to me will be undiminished. You can summon me as you wish and I will be here. You can criticize the budget now and in the future. Absented tuition - there is still the point of the budget.

**SMITH/KOTOVYCH MOVED THAT** Students' Council move out of informal consideration.

**Carried with unanimous consent.**

**AMRHEIN** – The deal is off the table if you want it off the table. It is your choice.

**BRECHTEL/ PANDYA MOVED THAT** Students' Council go for a 10-minute recess.

**Carried.**

**Speaker** – We are still on item 10d, which is a special order. I am not going to limit debate, but keep things front and center.

**BRECHTEL/WALLACE MOVED THAT** Students' Council move in camera

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVE THAT** Students' Council move ex camera.

**Defeated.**

**DUBE/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council move ex camera.

**Carried.**

**DUBE** – I don't know if I have ever felt so torn. I am going to speak in favor of going into the negotiations. First of all, I have learned a lot in the Bill 43 campaign. We were able to pull off a media campaign even though the media wasn't aware, the students weren't aware, but today we proved that today we can accomplish whatever. I believe that if we strategize, we can make anything work. I want to get away this idea that we can get media only if we have the tuition campaign.

**ABBOUD** - You can't extrapolate the campaign in a single event?

**DUBE** - You can look at it that way, or you can look at it in the way that you get what you are willing to put in, you get what you fight for. 2<sup>nd</sup> point, why are we here as councilors? My constituents don't always know what the best action is, if they did, they would be at the legislature, voicing MLAs. I believe that is the number 1 mandate above all else. If we can say that we brought down tuition, screw how we did it, because we got something done. I moved out of camera because I don't care what people think I say. Constituents know what they want, but not how to achieve it. Don't turn it down, because Carl came down as the antagonistic. I want to say that we got tuition down. No more thoughts, it is time of action.

**RICE** – The reason why the residences approved the rent increases this year because we told them why it was increased. When Carl was in here, I lost a lot of faith I had last time. But at the same time, it is easier to convince students that taking the max this year that next year it is a 30% increase instead of a 7% increase.

**HUTCHISON** - The university is running at a deficit. What will they do? They will raise revenues any way they can, by raising tuition. So tuition is getting raised to the max, so why not get something from it. I do have a concern about publicly supporting a tuition increase, but this time we are getting something from this proposal. So it seems like a no-brainer, in my opinion.

**WEPLER** – My experience, every year council tries to do everything in their power. They think that every year is going to be year that is not going to go up. But we look at the economics. There will be no comparison. We get screwed either way. There is still going to be a lot of internal agreement here because now we can see how EPC looks like. We can argue about where these expenditures are. About media, the best way to get funding is to work with admin.

**TAYLOR** - Like Councilor Wudarck, last time this came through, I initially supported the concept of sending Mat into negotiations. And then we got the presentation here and I saw no difference. This is not a victory at all. The only we are getting from the admin is a last cigarette and it is not a gift. If we agree to this, I am seriously concerned that the one thing students care about – high tuition. If we take this, basically I see it as giving up. I don't see us choices as simply biting the bullet and taking this, or sending it back. I see it as putting the chicken suits and getting out there and saying that we are getting insulting offers from admin.

**BOLIVAR** – This type of debate, in terms of a victory or a loss, is disconcerting to me. There is no victory to be won. The university isn't coming to you saying that they want our input, they are saying that this is what they are doing. This mentality that people at the university coming in, a bunch of corporate people who are out to screw students. In our policy arena that students are even seen as an interest group. We have a substantial number of marketing dollars to put on campaign. We should consider that pragmatically. Lastly, on chicken suits. We have look at what has worked and what has not worked in the past. As nice as an effort they put in, it didn't work.

**SAMUEL** – In terms of success and failure, how are you measuring that?

**BOLIVAR**- The criteria you outline for yourself. You have university people who are coming into this room with budgetary concerns saying that this is not happening. You set your own criteria for success and our criteria wasn't achieved.

**LO** – Maximum tuition suck. But taxes suck too. Anyone that lives in this country would love no taxes. It is great to have ideology and everybody should have some. But the truth of the matter was to make decisions based on the reality that we have to deal with. What the provost came in was reality. We can tell him that we don't like this deal, but we don't have a choice. We can go elsewhere and say that post secondary suck and we need more money. Not simply, that we want a freeze in tuition, but our education is going to suffer if we say no tuition. We need to start looking at our quality

When we sat at 17 hours of gripe tables. It's not just tuition that is pissing people off, people are saying that they went to another institution that taught better. So it the tuition that they are paying a lot of tuition, or the quality of education. Having an open communication with the government, communication with EPC will help. Nothing will fix the problem, but it will help. I heard this news at 3:30 like Mat and it is not nice. We need to do what is best and I don't think this is giving up. What this is doing is opening more doors and telling the government that we are accepting something that we don't want to accept. This isn't about victory and losses. I think students want a better education and maybe this is a step that will help us get there.

**PANDYA** – What we have heard is that multi year is going to go through no matter what. I mean max-tuition is going to go through no matter what. Do we not run with it, or run with it and play the game, and say “throw us a bone here and give us what we want”. If we do go with this, what are our critics going to say? They are going to crucify us to agreeing. Carl in his own words the success of this plan is anyone's guess. That we went through, we said in the beginning and said that we are not going to agree to max tuition, we went back and changed our policy. I think we need to look at other methods. My main concern is that it is too risky to go through with the plan by which the Provost's own words aren't even close to clear.

**ABBOUD** – Seems to be a little confusion on what we are debating and voting on. Is it the policy in front of us?

**Speaker** – Voting on this change to the existing tuition policy because the proposal violates the current policy. In terms of threshold, requires a 2/3rds majority.

**SAMUEL** – Have we not exceeded our maximum time?

**Speaker** – Yes, limited to 20 minutes.

**KOTOVYCH/PEWARCHUK MOVED TO** suspend standing order 28

**Motion is carried.**

**MELNYK** – I am wondering if someone can answer how this policy be affected by Bill 43.

**SHARMA** – 2 ways to do things. There is the Mike Hudema grassroots way to do things, there is the Mat Bretchel behind-the-doors way to do things. Within the past 2 years, we may have achieved something to deal with this long term. I see this as an opportunity to gain something. Previously last year and the year before, the most productive thing we did do was engage in an ambition PR campaign. The political strategy, I see this as a crystallized gain, to ensure that in the future, the long term solution, which will be the only solution in the future and individuals will stand up and demand that funding when tuition is 8 or 9 or 10 thousand dollars. This is an opportunity to ensure that when it happens to mitigate a very weak and poor position.

**COOK** – I am opposed to this change to the political policy. About not being successful in the last 20 years, there is no such thing as success, there are short term gains. 2 separate messages are not necessary a bad thing. It can come out better to the public. Not only is it a funding issue, also an accessibility issue. Admin never said that accessibility was an issue. It says to me they are trying to dodge this whole accessibility thing. Admin is going to be the ones that make sure that quality is going to be obtained, but they are not fighting for accessibility. We as students are they only ones that will fight for accessibility. Public message needs to include that accessibility to post secondary is a huge issue.

**KOTOVYCH** – The political policy change is a good one. There is a positive way to look at it, the problem with the status quo is that we target the public to get them to put pressure on the government. Where you do that to get them to give us money, there is no guarantee that the university will put that towards tuition. So we either push them to give money to the university, as where here we have a guarantee that it will go towards tuition. Rod Fraser is lobbying for 400 million, signed off with the 4 presidents of the university, but here we have an investment formula. Well there is no guarantee that anything we do here is going to have here. This is not about re-election. The Gateway has said that maybe this is going to pursue.

**PEWARCHUK** – Said by a number of people that this multi-year thing that students want the lowest possible tuition. The only way we can fulfill that desire is to sign on to multi-year. Without it, we will have maximum tuition. With multi-year, we can have less than maximum and fulfill what students want. Now, on the topic of the political policy itself, the quality of this change in that funded tuition freezes. It has very dilatory effects on education policy. In BC, then tuition freeze decline in quality for education. The lowest possible tuition increases, fixing it to inflation – that is a good thing. Just this political policy is good itself.

**SHARMA/RICE MOVED** the previous question

**Motion to move the previous question is defeated.**

**CROSSMAN** – Quick number crunching. What Carl said about the numbers what he was using, 1% = 1 million dollars. So we agree to this framework and things stay relatively the same for the next 2 years. If the government says 10%, this translates to \$114. If they increase funding to 1%, that is \$13 per student. So is it worth \$13/student to compromise? My math may be wrong. But I don't if students care about \$13 as much as their students care about their views represented. I'm seeing a \$13 decrease, I don't think that matters.

**SAMUEL** – An increase of 0-2%, we get nothing. In that scenario, what Crossman has reflected is more of a 3%. The 2% is going to be there. We haven't seen a 3% increase in the last 5 years. If we think we are getting tones of revenue, we are likely to get nothing. Any money that the government puts in the university will be in the form that the priorities the government has laid out. Other point, when we go to the table, we are taking a look at the University and is this university spending our money in the right way that students value. We use that ability to say to the University that, "No", that is not why we are spending the money.

**BRECHTEL** – The most shocking thing that happened to me today. The Dean of Students was sitting around the table and vehemently opposed differential tuition and tuition in general. To my mind, he is the best advocate of student philosophies. He said to me, "What you are getting good, but what you are getting is better than nothing". Chris made the point that he doesn't believe that we give up our right, we are giving up our right. We will have a say in EPC, Carl also said that it is a time to comment on how the university spends the money. I don't intend to stop doing things like protesting on the steps of the legislation. I intend to keep the public dialogue. What it comes down to, what is the best way to find the smallest tuition increase for the students. As much as I want to save face, this is the best way to find the least and smallest tuition for the students.

**WUDARCK** – I wanted to address a couple things. 1 is that this deal is better than the status quo. Well there is no guarantee there will be money from the government. I honestly don't believe that the money we get from the government, through the funding formula would overshadow the money we get. The money that we do get, a portion of that doesn't even go to tuition. It goes straight to base funding. I don't think that having a seat on EPC and only after 5% - that formula sucks. People have been saying that a guarantee of max increase, but the Board of Governors decides that. And lastly, what do students want, think about students that you are representing, what they are doing when you vote.

**EATON/PEWARCHUK MOVED** the previous question.

**Carried. (19/0/0)**

**Main Motion is carried (21/10/3).**

**WALLACE/HUTCHISON MOVED** to Adjourn

**SAMUEL** – Did we just approve multi-year?

**Speaker** – What council has effectively done, is gutted the existing tuition policy. So within that guideline, council can basically pursue the multi-year proposal as it stands. We don't need another motion.

**BRECHTEL** – Can I make the motion now?

**WALLACE** withdraws motion to adjourn.

**Speaker** – No objections. Motion is withdrawn. So now, we have a member of DIE Board who was originally going to speak to us about the DIE Board ruling that was postponed from last meeting to this meeting. Would you rather proceed directly to the new policy or to the DIE Board ruling?

**RICE** – Will there be Question Period tonight?

**Speaker**- I suspect not. So, going back to the approval of the agenda.

**SMITH/EATON MOVED TO** add 10b and 10c to the agenda.

**SMITH** – They should be on there already, but it was an administration error.

**Amendment is carried.**

**BRECHTEL/KOTOVYCH MOVED TO** add the motion 10e -  
“**BRECHTEL/EATON MOVED THAT** Students' Council endorse and approve the multi-year package as proposed by the Provost and VPA.”

**Amendment is carried.**

**The agenda is carried.**

**Speaker** – I will make that a special order.

**2003-17/10e**

**BRECHTEL/EATON MOVED THAT** Students' Council endorse and approve the multi-year package as proposed by the Provost and VPA.”

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED TO** postpone item 10e to the next meeting.

**SMITH** - It is incredibly irresponsible of passing it, with no written material, none of us has seen the package, if we need another council, then I would rather have an extra council meeting than just passing this. I suspect that when we see a package, we will still vote in favor. I can't believe that council is prepared to sign this without even seeing this.

**DUBE** – I think this is a bad idea. I think we are in a position to deal with this. We know what we are voting on. I am sick of using the process in order of making decision. Vote on this tonight.

**Motion is defeated. (Smith, Eaton, Bazin and Samuel abstained)**

**SMITH** – This was 20 minutes ago, the SU giving up the major plank, giving up the \$13 change a year. The only councilor that has done any analyze in this is Crossman. Council should defeat this.

**Speaker** – About the ruling last time -if something is broad and general, it constitutes a political policy. Something that is specific and detailed will follow marching orders. So this is not a political policy.

**SMITH** - I would ask to not consider this motion this evening.

**Speaker** – In effect there is a request to read papers. When any paper is read once and be read again if members were to vote on it. This is a rule that cannot be overruled. He does have the right to see the entire motion before being forced to vote on this. The President is currently running off to photocopy the document.

**WEPLER** – I would like to amend the motion and grant the President permission to enter into negotiations.

**Speaker** – I am going to rule that out of order. The factor of us not voting on that tonight, the President already has that grant authority. So it the motion is unnecessary. In effect, it is revising the agenda. There is nothing to stop the president of doing this.

**DUBE** – Is it possible to ask for a 5 minute recess?

**EKDAHL** – We have to leave this room in 10 minutes. So can we move now.

**DUBE/POON MOVED THAT** council take a 5 minute recess.

**Defeated.**

**HUTCHISON** – Call for quorum

**Speaker** – 27 members. Yes we have quorum.

**COOK** – Can we see the overhead that the Provost had as well as the percentages?

**BRECHTEL** – It is fairly simple, it is the exact same piece of paper. I can read it to you.

**Speaker** – The tuition recommendation for academic year 2004-05 and 2005-06. Quality – The U of A’s vision, in teaching, research and community service, is to be indisputably recognized nationally and internationally as one of Canada’s finest universities and amongst a handful of the world’s best. Core commitments: the University’s mission is to serve its community by the discovery, dissemination and application of new knowledge through teaching and research. Access: the University and the Government of Alberta are committed to ensuring that talented and dedicated students who are prepared to succeed in high quality educational programs will not be denied access to a university education. Accountability: the University must recover from the deficit position that has evolved from resource restrictions of the past tow decades. If increase in base funding allocation ranges from 2.1-5%, 20% is allocated to reduce tuition fee increases, unless the Provost, on advice from the GSA allocates the receipts from the Graduate Student Tuition in a different manner. 30% to support learning enhancements and 50% to the operating budget. If an increase in base funding allocation ranges from 5.1-10%, 10% will go towards reducing the tuition fee, unless the Provost, on advice from GSA allocates the receipts from the Graduate Student Tuition in a different manner. 15% to support learning enhancements and 75% to the operating budget.

**SMITH** – What is being asked of us is to approve a document which we have not seen until 10 minutes ago. The separation of power has been deferred several times. Where is the source that we are prepared to pass this tonight without having to digest this? Most of us didn’t know this was coming forward, it wasn’t on the agenda, not on late additions, are we really prepared for this?

**DUBE** – I suck because I am a flip flopper. I agree with Steve.

**PEWARCHUK** – We have debated this policy for 4 hours.

**BAZIN** – Some of us didn’t know the exact details of this agreement. Would you concede that many students would like the details of this before they vote on this?

**PEWARCHUK** – Entirely possible. But the fact of the matter remains that we have done due process as far as council goes. It will just be the exact same thing next week.

**DUBE** – I hope that councilor Pewarchuk concedes that redundancy sucks but we have a job to do. We have been debating hypotheticals up to now. So, all of the discussions in the last 3 weeks have been hypothetical. At the very least, I would like the chance to talk to Faculte one more time. I would rather make the right decision, rather than make the decision in haste.

**BRECHTEL** – Making the decision in haste, I am willing to put a good deal of money that talking to your constituents about the hypothetical and what we have today is not that different. There are details here, but not the sort of thing you are going to put to the average student.

**PEWARCHUK** - We have considered this in almost the exact state that it sits in front of us today for almost 24 hours. It would be wise to make a decision.

**LO** – We are discussing the idea do we postpone till next week? Are we debating a motion to postpone or debating multiyear tuition?

**Speaker** – Debating the 3 pages that was passed out.

**LO/HUTCHISON MOVED** to move the previous question.

**Motion is defeated.**

**TAYLOR/DUBE MOVED TO** postpone until next meeting.

**LO** – Is there a way to put a condition that if we postpone we will call a meeting next week?

**BRECHTEL** – I can promise that.

**Motion to postpone is carried.** (Hutchison, Rice and Pewarchuk voted opposed)

2003-17/16

**EKDAHL/WALLACE MOVED TO** adjourn at 10:07 pm

**Carried**

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

November 25, 2003  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-18)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/ Absent @ 9pm	Vote #1
President	Mat Brechtel	√	X
VP Academic	Janet Lo	√	X
VP External	Chris Samuel	√	X
VP Finance	Tyler Botten	X	Absent
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah	X	X
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych	√	√
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Tawana Wardlaw	√	X
Agric/Forest/HomeEc			
Arts	Alex Abboud	√	√
Arts	Chris Bolivar	√	Absent
Arts	Vivek Sharma	√	√
Arts	Erin Kelly	X	Absent
Arts	James Knull (Anand Sharma)	√	X

Arts	Chris Laver	√	√
Arts	Terra Melnyk	√	X
Arts	Heather Wallace (Samantha Power)	√	X
Arts	Paul Welke	√	X
Business	Adam Cook	√	X
Business	Steve Smith	√	X
Education			
Education	Allison Ekdahl	√	X
Education			
Education	Christine Wudarck	√	X
Education			
Engineering	Josh Bazin	√	X
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)	√	√
Engineering	James Crossman	X	X
Engineering	David Wepler (Angela Thomas)	√	Abstain
Law	Dean Hutchison	√	X
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice (Mike Colborne)	√	Abstain
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk	√	√
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong	X	Absent
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat	√	X
Nursing	Jean Abbott	√	Absent

Nursing			
Open Studies			
Open Studies			
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac	X	X
Physical Education	Holly Higgins	√	X
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	√	Abstain
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube	√	X
Science	Matthew Eaton	√	X
Science	Tereza Elyas	X	Absent
Science	Justin Kehoe	√	X
Science	Aisha Khatib	X	Absent
Science	Shawna Pandya (Stephen Kirkham)	√	X
Science	Elaine Poon	√	√
Science	Steven Schendel	X	Absent
Science	Duncan Taylor	√	X
Science	LeeAnn Lim	X	Absent
President Athletics			
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	√	
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo	√	

**Guests of Council:** Stephen Congly, Chelli Kelly, James Meeker, Paul Reikie, Mike Hudema, Sara Katz, Anand Sharma, Kyle Kawanami, Chris Jones

## **MINUTES (SC 2003-18)**

2003-18/01

**CALL TO ORDER**

Speaker calls meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2003-18/02

**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA CHEER SONG "Ring Out a Cheer"**

**MEEKER** leads Students' Council in the singing of the cheer song.

2003-18/03

**SPEAKER'S BUSINESS**

**Speaker** – Is LeeAnn Lim here? No? She has missed 3 consecutive meeting, and is suspended from council, until she makes a presentation.

2003-18/3a

Approval of the October 28, 2003 Students' Council Minutes

**SMITH/PEWARCHUK MOVED TO** approve the October 28th minutes

**BOTTEN** - Top of page 7 - should be "Tuition Undertakings Planning and Action Committee"

Page 8 - Should be "Would Councilor Wallace concede that perhaps the reason why the tuition campaign was already underway this time last year is because there was no other political campaign going on?"

Page 15 - we need the names of whoever Seconded the motions in 11a/11b/11c

Page 15 (introduction of item 11c) - should be:

"FAB went over this yesterday. Based on the interpretation of the Chair of that Board, by Bylaw 3100, while FAB can transfer up to \$2,500 between Departments, a transfer from the Capital Reserve to the Operating Budget requires a 2/3 majority vote of Students' Council. As such this is coming to you tonight. Originally when this was approved, it was thought that a lump sum purchase could be made but we now find that it must be paid on a monthly basis so we'd like to move it into the Operating Budget so as to avoid monthly budget transfers."

Page 16 (Announcement) - "shoveling" should be "shuttling"

**Carried.**

2003-18/3b

Approval of the November 4, 2003 Students' Council Minutes

**PEWARCHUK/SAMUEL MOVED** to approve the November 4th minutes.

**Carried.**

**2003-18/3c**

DIE Board Ruling #2

**Speaker**-Michelle Kelly, Stephen Congly and Kyle Kawanami are here.

**CONGLY** – Basically, we are here to explain any questions about the ruling and what is being decided about the current motion on the table.

**Speaker** - We are not dealing with the entire DIE Board reading tonight, only the interpretation of Bylaw 1200. If DIE Board said that in order for them to do their job, there is a portion of bylaw 1200 that has to be declared void and null. So that is what we are voting on tonight. Is that a fair assessment?

**KAWANAMI** – The issue is interpretation of bylaw 1200 and found a certain portion of that was in conflict with article 6. All DIE Board rulings in regards to bylaw 1200 have to be ratified by council.

**MELNYK** – Can someone please explain what “yes” or “no” vote mean?

**KELLY** – If you vote “yes”, you are recognizing that you are not able to take council to DIE Board as a whole. Council can be brought to DIE Board to answer for breaches of rules and regulations of the Students’ Union.

**Speaker** - The interpretation is sustained. By the way, who are the members of SCAB that are here tonight? All the members of SCAB, I need you to stay tonight. I need a quick SCAB meeting when this is over.

**2003-18/04**

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**SAMUEL/WALLACE MOVED TO** approve the agenda.

**SMITH** – Add something about multi-year?

**Speaker** - Yes, the motion, “**BRECHTEL/WEPPLER MOVED THAT** Students’ Council endorse and approve the multi-year tuition package as proposed by the Provost and VPA as tabled” will appear under Old Business as item 9a.

**DUBE /HUTCHISON MOVED THAT** item 9am be a special order.

**Carried.**

**SAMUEL/COOK MOVED THAT** the late additions package be added to the agenda.

**SAMUEL** – The recommendations by the External Affairs board are important, we are voting on the issue tonight.

**LO** – The special order moved by Smith, are we accepting it or rejecting?

**Speaker** – Approving it. The 2 motions are not redundant. One is a direction from the executive committee to do something, and the other is direction from the executive committee to do nothing. If this first motion fails, the 2<sup>nd</sup> one approved, then SU has told us not to pursue multi-year.

**DUBE** – Let's not carry this because we need to have this debate and it is very important and I trust our appointed Speaker assumes he knows how to do this right, but let's talk about multi-year tonight.

**SMITH** – Whether or not we add this to the agenda, the multi-year is still a special order. If we defeat that, we can pass this.

**HUTCHISON** – If it does get pass, then this will be annulled?

**SMITH** – The Speaker will then rule it out of order.

**Amendments to the agenda are carried.**

**WELKE/LO MOVED TO** make the recently added item a special order directly after 9a.

**Amendments to the agenda are carried.**

**Main motion is carried.**

2003-18/9

**OLD BUSINESS**

2003-18/9a

**BRECHTEL/WEPLER MOVED THAT** Students' Council endorse and approve the multi-year tuition package as proposed by the Provost and VPA as tabled.

**SMITH** – Can you run through the speaking turns from last week?

**Speaker** – We didn't really have a debate, just a bunch of parliamentary points, so we will start from scratch.

**BRECHTEL** – Just a note to you, I have been given direction to bring this back to council. Decorum issues that may come up. Too much debate on this, but a fantastic amount of debate and there is no comparison on other students issue debates. I hope that councilors spent the last week with their constituents, because god knows I did. The people I talked to were fairly split down to the middle. I went around and asked people what they thought. I think unfortunately, we have a responsibility to make a decision on behalf of the constituents. I think we have done a service to students by exploring the issue. There is nothing we could have done in exploring an issue that could of hurt us. We have gained a possibility of gaining funding from our debate. We have got the commitment and that Carl made the commitment that we will have the unified lobby. We also gained some credibility with people in this building and are willing to discuss some issues that they weren't before. And finally we have captured the imagination of the people in our university and at other institutions. Other institutions have been calling to see what is going on and because this is a creative solution to an old problem. The Students' Council has been clear in laying out the benefits. TUPAC debated them for a long time. What we have on one side is getting a core value and a minor benefit. At the end of the day, we don't gain a lot of benefits and I've gone into this knowing that there were situations that we can get benefits from this multi-year agreement, but what we have right now is an agreement to be collegial. But also to give up a core value, versus a marginal benefit to students. That's how the students crystallized it and thought about it. To me, today I am going to be voting against this proposal.

**DUBE** – My understanding of is that you are not allowed to speak against your own motion.

**Speaker** – Robert's rule states you can't speak against your own motion.

**SMITH** – Would it be an order for another member of council who supports this motion to speak against it?

**BRECHTEL** – I am going to be voting for this in a way I haven't before tonight. I think we still need to sit down to have discussions. I still think having a seat on EPC is beneficial to us. Affecting what will happen is beneficial. The other thing is, we'll retain our ability to run campaigns.

**KOTOVYCH** – My understanding is, this deal does not include doing any public campaigns.

**BRECHTEL** – Right. Regardless of what happens, we are going to have tuition events in January. We will retain that ability no matter how I vote or how council votes. If we had got everything we had gone into this discussion with the goal of getting, we would be better off than we were last year than we will this year. Unfortunately we don't have that success. Correction - I didn't have that success. However, engaging in this has given us more benefit than not engaging into it. I think one way or another, we will be running a campaign. So, I'm going to be voting in a way that I haven't been voting. I came in with high hopes, but they weren't realized. I hope council doesn't see what goes on tonight as a major loss.

**WALLACE** – Although the President echoed my sentiments, I would like to discuss how I feel. I will vote against going to multi-year this evening. As a student I would like to tell you what I saw. I see defeat in the eyes of my president and I don't like it. It showed me that admin was showing that we were screwed if we did and screwed if we didn't. It is taking a mediocre solution to sacrifice our deals is not worth it in my mind. One day we will be able to say that we had a hand in the government. I know that we have what it takes to persevere this. I was momentarily swayed that we were able to lower tuition, but putting my hope into the hands of this government scares me. But the cost of that decision can only set us back if we wait. This will show campuses across the country. This deal is an insult. Bill 43 in all of its flaws has brought PSC to the forefront. It will not be easy, we will fight against rising tuition. I miss our enthusiasm I saw in all of our eyes. I have learned my lessons on campus, but the most important lesson I've had is with all with you. You have all proven to me to be exceptional leaders. Our backs are against the wall, and I hate that. We take defeat personally in council chambers. I encourage us to be strong and brave.

**DUBE** – Multi-year is a great idea. The thought of working with the admin, a unified front - hence why I voted the way I did last week. I resent the implication that anyone in this room made a better decision than I did last week. But what we voted on last week is different from tonight's. I do not believe this is a good deal. I don't like what we are offered and I don't see myself supporting it. When the idea became reality, it wasn't the reality that I liked. This is a result of the ends justifying the means. Here is the problem: The ends don't justify the means. We aren't strong if we say I'm going to bend over for you right now. We are strong if we say, your deal sucks and we'll talk to you in 2 years. But what we are doing now is better than what is put on the table. I was very sad when someone that over the course of the last 3 years said that, "I've changed because I have lost my principles". If anyone accuses me of flip-flopping, I will realm you out, this is a different debate. But we shouldn't close the door. We learned many things. Evidently our priorities are a lot different from the admin. As a student, I think their deal was ass.

**KOTOVYCH** – First thing, based on what happened last meeting, people said that they don't like the deal but they think it is going to happen anyways so they voted in favor of it. Voting in favor of multi-year doesn't speak to ideals, but disagree on the best approach. If you believe that is a better method, that doesn't mean you are sacrificing your ideals. I am in the middle and I've heard things from both sides. One concern that I had was about our ability to run campaigns. 2<sup>nd</sup> thing, a lot of these discussions were based on assumptions. I have certain beliefs that others don't have. For examples, EPC - some don't think EPC is a good idea but I think it is a good idea. If we fail with this, it is still an improvement. I think Bill 43 once it got going shows that we can run effective campaigns. I have more faith that we can do that. I disagree with the assumptions of external campaigns. It is simply a value judgment. The money value, the formula is crappy but the point of this is not to get a freeze within the formula within 2 years. It mitigates increases that will be coming. Where will we be in 2 years? Better off or worse off? Our ability to work with the university, we can affect change, the issue is are we best to work with the university or do it on our own? Some of these things can be beneficial for students. I've said everything that I wanted to say, we have 2 systems that we can look at. It is not a huge change from the strategy that we have tried. We have to weigh the pros and cons of both. It is not about principles about what everyone here thinks is the best way to get to those goals.

**REIKIE** – The Provost is a professional negotiator. The University has given nothing in this proposal. We are supposed to meet in the middle. If in a meeting we have a unified lobby front without signing the increased tuition, then that is okay in my mind. However, it sends the message that the students are agreeing to pay more and are going to pay more. This is really not a good deal. I agree with councilor Wallace that this proposal is an insult and a band-aid solution. As councilor Dube warns that we should keep this in the back of our mind, and I would caution against accepting any increase. But yes, we can benefit by working together.

**ABBOUD** – Let's look at the reality. The University's revenues are here and the expenditures are here. This big void has to be filled without sacrificing quality. So what are they doing to make up the deficit? They are raising tuition. It is a sad reality, but that is what they are going to do. A councilor raised the point that this deal may end up saving the students about \$25 a year. To students, \$25 matters. The way we are going to produce results is to shift the focus on what we do. Every year we get caught up with the tuition battle. As long as we have the decision in front of us, the media likes us to do that, gives us 1-2 days of coverage. The one way to get real change is by taking our case to the public and spending our time and money to lobby the public so that post secondary education becomes more of a priority and the voters will vote for a party that supports post-secondary education. We get it by saying that we have differences between the University and SU, but the best interest is to work together and go after a bigger piece of the pie. It is about being practical. I will be voting yes.

**SMITH** – I will be voting no. Not because I am a martyr. I am voting against this because of what the tuition is going to be in the short term and in the long term. If we have this deal, we will get 2 years of maximum increase. If we don't agree to this, we will probably still have maximum increase. In the long term, that is where there is a need to get a message to the public. The President doesn't support this deal. The people who are asking to engage in the advocacy are saying that is nice having the media talk to you. So what it comes down to, vote this down.

**PEWARCHUK** – People are suggesting that this is a band-aid solution and I disagree with that. The yearly thing in January is a band-aid solution because it doesn't address the fundamental problems. The most crucial part of this is that it is new and the other thing is, this is precedent. If we agree to this, in the future, funding to this university will increase because it has to.

**DUBE** – Would you acknowledge that we are also setting precedence that we are accepting maximum tuition.

**PEWARCHUK**- We are saying that we want an allocation, to ensure that any increase in funding will go towards a decrease in tuition. We are going to have tuition increase one way or another. The precedence that this sets, it gives us something to fall back on in the future. An increase in provincial funding means that we have to have a decrease in tuition. The other thing, it is now clear that it doesn't stop us from talking to the public. We can still continue to talk to the public about the government's funding. If we continue to attack admin in January, all we get to do at that point is milk a rock. We need to talk to the public. Through the public, we can influence the government to increase funding. For those reasons, I am going to support this and a number of people are going to support this. I think it is important to adopt this. It may help us achieve our ends.

**LO** – This issue has been tearing me apart. I did about 12 hours of outreach and talked to 50 students in depth. I hear 3 issues and 3 relations when I talk to students. 1<sup>st</sup> one is accessibility, quality of education and tuition. They are all linked, but correlation is skewed when you throw it in a big melting pot. I am really concerned because I haven't come up with any huge majority and that seriously concerns me. The problem we are looking at is 5 or 6 huge student issues into 1 yes/no question. So what is multi-year? The deal we have in front of us is not just about maximum increase. It is also about EPC and joint lobbying. But I don't think we need to agree to a maximum increase to get a seat on EPC or to get a joint lobbying. I think there is a responsibility for student government to be a clear voice on behalf of students that want to be here and to speak on behalf of principles you want to believe in. We are also an advocacy group which means we lobby for certain principles. You can't stop half way. You have to go all the way. We have responsibility to make sure we are doing everything to protect our students, not just today, but tomorrow. I am in the Faculty of Education and sometimes you get papers in which answers the principle but not the real answer. Admin is coming to us with a proposal, but I think we owe it to ourselves and take the biggest slap in the face. It is 50/50, but it is a tough question and both sides have arguments. I am going to be voting opposed.

**KOTOVYCH** – First of all, the guaranteed freeze on differential for 2 years, #2, the seat on EPC, I like it more than other people do. #3, the formula for the freeze. #4, the university has proven itself being better at getting money than the SU has. They are lobbying the government for \$400 million dollars, latching onto that is better than going with an unproven solution. #5, priorities at the university level, if we get money, we want a say at how it is spent. EPC is one way of doing and working with the university is a way. #6, we can still talk to the public, we can still lobby. #7, I have been here at the university for 7 years, every year I see Students' Council build expectations at the board meetings, students saying that "oh well, we tried", also this changes every year. To say that we know students want, you have to decide how to get into a long-term goal. #8 – long-term solution. We can work with admin to go after the problems. I had this discussion on the webboard. If we disagree on the fundamentals on how the money is spent, the only thing we can agree on is that we need more money. If that is the case, then we have to depend on the province and the government. Also, we can hope that public pressure will get the university to change its priorities. What I see here is a way to talk with the admin to go after the government - which is getting more money. You can't just say, "go to the government" and not have a say on how this is spent.

**SMITH** – Going through that list of points. The seat on EPC, I am going to argue that has very little benefit. It is something that already given to academic staff association and non-academic associations.

**BRECHTEL** – Those 2 associations aren't on EPC.

**SMITH** – They have been invited to the meetings. The formula for rollback, the funding that applies won't be there. The university is better at getting money than students - that may not be the case. We both will be seeking, if they are better, that is fine. Priorities at the university level, I didn't hear the Board of Governors offer any concrete solutions. If you can get the public on the side, that will filter down to the university level.

We can still go to the public, I don't see that being an effective message in any way. Students are disillusioned – they will always be like that until SU achieves a major victory. As the argument we don't want to be bind to next year. This idea that if more money comes in we'll somehow be better poised is fictitious. EPC already listens to us and knows what we have to say. It's no secret. Lastly, working with the admin, I agree with the BoG, we have different priorities and it will be difficult to work together. Agreeing to multi-year will compensate for the fact.

**DUBE** – I am going to say is that I have a few concerns. People are going to vote oppose or for-for the wrong reasons. If you believe in it, then do it. And don't let me, or any other influential councilors tell you otherwise. Pragmatic Zita wants to kick idealistic Zita in the ass. The formula for rollback idea – this is not it. It is a rollback on maximum tuition which admin is going to give us. Our tuition is not going down, it is going to go up. As for working with the government, don't assume that our end is going to looking for government support. This government doesn't listen. It is not a very attentive government. Our means and ends is for the government to say that they care about post secondary. That can be achieved by talking to the public. We are walking into a precious election year. Let's harvest that. Whatever you do tonight, don't do it out of fear or declaration, only that you believe it is the right course of action. Nobody will accuse of making the wrong decision. It is a very gray issue and who knows, a week from now I may vote differently. I ask that someone end this debate.

**HUTCHISON/DUBE MOVED** the previous question

**Motion to move the previous question is carried.**

**Main motion is defeated (24/6/0).**

**Speaker** – The motion from the External Affairs board (8a). You can't move a motion to not do something. So to make this motion valid, it has to say that the executive committee is disbarred from doing this.

**DUBE** – Would the action that council taken tonight to postpone until next week?

**Speaker** – It is just not properly formulated and will be struck. So that special order is squashed. We will now proceed with remainder of agenda.

**HUTCHISON** – Question for the President: Why are we having a meeting in December next week, especially since we have had back to back meetings. If there is no reason for it, then can it be postponed or cancelled?

**BRECTHEL** – It was in council's schedule. I will cancel the meeting if we deal with all the business today.

**EATON** – Do we have a policy on honorariums, if there is no such policy, can we have one?

**BRECHTEL** – What honorarium?

**EATON** – Honorariums paid out to student groups working at Dinwoodie.

**MAH** – No we don't have an operating policy for it. We have a sketchy fee schedule for it. There are a number of elements to be considered when running functions in Dinwoodie.

**DUBE** – Question for the President: He was talking about the tuition campaign that is supposed to commence in January. Why did he say it was starting in December?

**BRECHTEL** – What I was referring to were the events I will be going to in December. I will be trying to talk to students about tuition, handing out information to students while they are studying. There will be a tuition end of exam party to celebrate the end of the term. There are a number of groups across campus that are involved in the tuition campaign.

**Anand SHARMA** – Question for the President: Some concerns raised around Parkland institute. I know they sent a letter with a number of concerns, where those addressed. If not, what will the executives do to rectify the problems.

**BRECHTEL** – I would encourage the Councilor to read the minutes from 2 meetings ago. We have set out a detailed response.

**WUDARCK** – Question for the VP External: Can I please have an update on Bill 43 itself, the campaign, and on the amendments.

**SAMUEL** – I'll talk about the campaign first. There is one more event, there is a funeral for it. I'll pass these around. Put these in your faculties. The funeral is this Thursday at noon at the legislature. Meet at SUB stage at 11:30 am. We will get them down there to enjoy the funeral. In terms of Bill 43 and the amendments, it is response of ourselves and the CAUS membership that the amendments, while an improvement, still falls short of the Universities Act. The legislation is still reactive and regressive and will put us a step back from the ideal system. Breaking down the amendments, one being, the Students' Union powers - that has been dealt with. Our power has been put back into the legislation. 2 – amended slightly such that the minister does not have to power to dissolve student groups, student audit not be allowed to be triggered by the board. In terms of tuition, the propose amendments are not put back a tuition cap which was envisioned, but a tuition cap which is allowed to be surpassed. Not really a tuition cap, but a tuition guideline. CPI + 2, whichever is lower. The priorities have shifted that the government has abandoned the previously shared model and that is something that we will illustrating at the funeral and our communication with the media. In the house, Bill 43 passed 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. It is anticipating that Bill 43 will pass 3<sup>rd</sup> reading either tonight, tomorrow or day after. There was an article in the Journal from Friday, which talks about the amendments. In terms of the effectiveness of the protest, if councilors have not picked up the Gateway, they should do so, there is an article about Bill 43 and the reactions of students on the amendments.

**SHARMA** – Question for the VP Student Life: I was contacted by a rep of Lister Hall and she expressed to me the difficulty she had in getting a hold of you.

**MAH** – We try to keep up our communication with the RHA and the Lister Hall associations. Once a month I put out a bulletin on what is going on with the student life portfolio. The student leaders from all the associations receive those once a month. The RHA meetings are scheduled for 2:40 pm on Sunday and it is difficult to come back to attend a meeting for 45 minutes that is not pertinence for me to come in for. I can guarantee that I am in contact with the President of the RHA and the Lister Hall association. So if any of them need me to be present for a meeting, they more than have access to me through those channels.

**HUTCHISON** – Question for VP Student life. The Law Students' Association has been having difficulty putting on alcohol related events. We are basically being put through the ringer and it is getting to the point of ridiculousness. What steps has the SU took to move this along?

**MAH** – Welcome to my world. You think you have it bad? I have it bad. I have 2 bars, loaded with staff where these rules also apply to and for faculties that want to throw wine and cheese functions as well. I am very hard pressed to convince them that a solution can be found by compromising with us. I am a bit upset about this. We experience the exact same challenges, such as running the Dinwoodie and PowerPlant. Basically, everyone around the table has the same stake in it and it comes down to the risk to the university in terms of liability, the alcohol review committees and Alberta gaming/liquor commission rules. We meet a week from today so if you would like to join us, please feel free to. I can see if they can put you on the agenda. Also, if you have specific concerns of what you face in terms of trying to get a liquor permit, let me know what you have run into and this stands open to any student group.

**JONES-** With respect to BBQs on campus, it is a popular way for fundraising. My understanding is that the Capital Health Authority has taken particular section with the University holding BBQs. My understanding is that the SU has been looking at how to remedy the problems. What concrete steps has the SU taken to hold BBQs on campus?

**MAH** – I asked this be placed on the Alcohol committee. I have very little background on it. None of the university people are really looking up to it. With risk management and campus security, I asked that this be put on the agenda. So that is where it stands and I invite to accompany me to that meeting.

**THOMAS** – When is that meeting and do we have to do anything to be put on the list of students.

**MAH** – 2pm, next Tuesday in Lister Hall. There is usually adequate signage. I can email you before I leave.

**ABBOUD** – Question for VP Student Life. The VP Student Life said that she would be in contact with the Dean of Students within the next couple weeks. Has she contacted the Dean and what came out of those discussions?

**MAH** – Yes, I will be meeting with the Dean later.

**Speaker** – Can I have a motion to consider the re-approval of the agenda.

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED TO** reconsider the agenda.

**Motion to reconsider is carried.**

**SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED TO** add on last week's late addition package 10c.

**Speaker** –It was an administrative error and should have been in the agenda.

**Carried.**

**The agenda is carried.**

**2003-18/10**

**LEGISLATION**

**2003-18/10a**

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council strike the words "as per the Students' Union Confidentiality Policy from Article XVIII section 4 of the Constitution (third reading).

**BRECHTEL** – As council remembers, we were not able to move in camera a couple weeks ago. We created a policy that will last only till this meaning. If we don't do this, the policy expires and we won't be able to move in camera.

**Carried.**

**2003-18/10b**

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the following principles (FIRST Reading):

1. That the Students' Union have one body responsible for the interpretation of Students' Union legislation.
2. That this body be called the Students' Union Tribunal, and that it be composed of between eight and eleven undergraduate students acting as tribunes.
3. That any undergraduate student excepting those serving as tribunes, any Students' Union constituted body excepting the Students' Union Tribunal, and Students' Council all have the authority to initiate a complaint about a contravention of Students' Union legislation and to request an interpretation of Students' Union legislation.
4. That tribunes be selected by a Tribune Selection Committee to be composed of two voting members of the Executive Committee, as selected by the Executive Committee, two voting members of Students' Council, as selected by Students' Council, and two tribunes, as selected by the Students' Union Tribunal.

5. That the Tribune Selection Committee have a quorum of five members, and that any candidate for tribune must be selected by a two-thirds majority vote of the Tribune Selection Committee.
6. That the chair of the Tribune Selection Committee be elected by and from the Tribune Selection Committee.
7. That the election of the chair and the selection of tribunes be reported to Students' Council, the Executive Committee, and the Students' Union Tribunal.
8. That there be a Chief Tribune and an Associate Chief Tribune, and that these be selected by simple majority vote of the Students' Union Tribunal, and that the names of the individuals holding these offices be reported to Students' Council, the Executive Committee, and the Tribune Selection Committee.
9. That all undergraduates excepting those serving as employees of the Students' Union or voting members of Students' Council or its subcommittees be eligible to serve as tribunes.
10. That tribunes serve until such time as they cease to be eligible, they resign, or they are removed by two-thirds majority vote of the Tribune Selection Committee.
11. That complaints or requests for interpretation must be submitted in writing to either the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
12. That, complaints or requests for interpretation must be ruled upon by a panel of three tribunes within seven days of their receipt by the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
13. That, in the case of complaints, the agreement of both the appellant(s) and respondent(s) be sufficient to extend the seven day period provided for in (12).
14. That, in the case of requests for interpretation, the agreement of the individual or body requesting interpretation be sufficient to extend the seven day period provided for in (12).
15. That the panel of three set out in (12) include exactly one of the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
16. That appeals must be submitted in writing to the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune within seven days of the ruling by the panel of three.
17. That appeals must be ruled upon by a panel of five tribunes not part of the panel of three, including exactly one of the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune, within fourteen days of their receipt by the Chief Tribune or the Associate Chief Tribune.
18. That any Chief Tribune or Associate Chief Tribune who is not able to hear a complaint or request for interpretation due to conflict of interest be replaced on that complaint or request for interpretation by another tribune selected by the Students' Union Tribunal.
19. That the Chief Tribune or, in his/her absence, the Associate Chief Tribune be responsible for scheduling hearings and appointing tribunes to panels.
20. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to strike down or declare of no force or effect any piece of Students' Union legislation that contradicts any other piece of Students' Union legislation.
21. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to censure any member of the Students' Union.

22. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to fine any employee of the Students' Union who reports to Students' Council or to the undergraduate student body as a whole an amount not to exceed twenty dollars.

23. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to initiate a referendum on the vacation of any Students' Union elected office.

24. That the Students' Union Tribunal have the authority to initiate a referendum on the dissolution of Students' Council or of the Executive Committee.

**BRECHTEL** – We embarked a motion on legislative review this year. We remember the infamous separation of power debate. We passed that, and the process that is now taking place is and that IRB is looking at is to help us run the SU judicial process. We see a lot of first, second and third reading. This is our first example of moving into actual legislation in our new legislative process. We debated in IRB how we would do it. Hopefully from this, you can derive the major details. You basically appoint people for as long as they want to be part of it. As soon as SU passes this for 2<sup>nd</sup> reading, it will go to IRB and it will come back.

**DUBE/WELKE MOVED TO** collapse the motion.

**HUTCHISON** – Can we propose amendments to this?

**Speaker** – Only in the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. Sorry, we do have to have a vote on this.

**BRECHTEL** – Is there debate on this motion?

**Speaker** – No.

**Motion to collapse this motion is defeated.**

2003-18/10c

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT** Students' council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the following principle (FIRST Reading);

That “None of the Above” not be eliminated when it is the candidate garnering the fewest votes in any round of voting in any Students' Union election, and that the candidate receiving the next fewest votes be elimination in lieu of “None of the Above.”

**SMITH** – Will be moving to merge first and 2<sup>nd</sup> readings on this. The CRO said that we need to have this issue dealt with. You have all the candidates, whichever one gets the fewest votes are eliminated from the first round. What this amendment would do, if none of the above had the fewest votes, in the end, if it came down to the last 2 candidates, they would have to have more votes than “none of the above.” So it comes down to 1 candidate. Either we deal with this tonight, or we have a meeting next week or we screw the CRO.

**SMITH/DUBE MOVED TO** collapse first and 2<sup>nd</sup> reading.

**Carried.**

**Speaker** – 1<sup>st</sup> reading is complete and now moving to 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. If approved, this will move to IRB for drafting.

**SMITH** – With this amendment passing, we would always be sure that the electorate would be preferred than to the “none of the above”.

**ABBOUD** – I don’t like this. I wasn’t that involved with the farce proceedings. But my understanding is, the idea of “none of the above” is that you have x number of candidates and if they aren’t appropriate, the idea isn’t to run, my understanding the principle about that, the “none of the above” is just like a joke candidate. If essentially what this does is approval voting. For those reasons I will vote against this motion.

**DUBE** – Confusing – we may debate this. How does Joe Blow Student understand the system? If I have to hear it more than twice, the odds are the average student has to hear it twice. I don’t see why we are making it more complicated. I would assume there has been a case where the “no vote” has beat a candidate.

**COOK** – Not sure how this is works. Please elaborate.

**SMITH** – There is Candidate A, B and none of the above. With this amendment, let’s say for the first ballot you get 46% for A, 44% for B and none of the above gets 10%. “None of the Above” will be eliminated. Will students understand it? Probably not, but you are supposed to rank the candidates as you like them. I’m not absolutely married to it. It is a minor adjustment that in reality does not have much effect. But it is more democratic to me.

**DUBE** – What if there are 6 people running? I don’t get it

**SMITH** – If everyone loved 1 candidate and hated all of them, then yes. My view is, if 50% hates the candidate, the candidate shouldn’t win. This is an amendment that would likely never have an effect.

**BRECHTEL** – This significantly takes away the chance that we get no candidate at all. Whoever is lowest, their votes get redistributed. Functionally, in pure democratic sense, if you are trying to get someone in office with 50% votes, then you vote for this. In my mind, it increases the odds with ending up with “nobody” in the executive seats. I think it challenges our credibility for filling up the spots. I am in favor of finding the best candidate, so I am speaking against this.

**SAMUEL** – I don't think that this situation whereby the winner under the current system saying they rather have "nobody" than having someone elected. I think that basically this has a few effects. What it means, when you are voting, anytime you are filling it out, you can stop that "these people are acceptable and then I rather have nobody". And then even though you would have nobody, you still have to rank the people you don't want. The value call is whether or not you want a leader in an elected office that has more than 50% of the population not see them in office. I think it is more valuable to run another election than it would be to have somebody the majority doesn't want in office. I think it would be disastrous if there was an executive committee member who had less than 50% support of the students.

**DUBE** – We currently have and always had executives that have less than 50% of the vote.

**SAMUEL** – For example, you have Steve Smith and Adam cook. For example, if less than 50% of the population don't want to see Steve Smith in office, then I think Steve Smith shouldn't be in office. We don't know if you would rather have Adam Cook in office or "nobody" in office. We need to make sure another election be held.

**SHARMA** – I honestly do understand the system at hand. But your average voter may not. Adopt a level in which the average person has. In terms how you decide, not everybody thinks about things as equally as individuals in this room. So try to think like your students.

**DUBE** – I think preferential voting sucks. We are fooling ourselves thinking that whoever got put in got 50% of the votes. We get 20% of students to vote, would we lose students this way?

**SMITH** – The debate is coming down to preferential.

**Speaker** – This is a debate on a component of tweaking the system.

**DUBE** – This system to me has complications. It is important to have people fill positions. I am not comfortable on passing it because we don't have a contingency plan.

**SAMUEL** – Does that mean you would rather have no "none of the above" portion.

**DUBE**- That is not up for debate right now. I think that this would further complicate it and we shouldn't make "nobody" more important to somebody. No matter how marginal it is. "Nobody" ran a campaign and lost.

**EKHDAL/HUTCHISON MOVED** the previous question

**Carried.**

**Motion to move to second reading is defeated.**

**2003-18/14**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**BRECHTEL** – Cross out the December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. But that doesn't let you off the hook. In December we have tuition related events. The Board of Governor decision on tuition where we will be opposing maximum tuition is on Jan 16. I'll be sending emails over December on how to get involved, with helping out faculty associations and taking part in SU events. Please come out and oppose maximum tuition. Saying it in a council meeting says nothing. We are fully capable of repeating that every year. No point in screaming and yelling, let's start some meaningful dialogue.

**DUBE** – Coming up this week, members of council who are Greek - we have Greek god and Goddess on Monday. Come out to the PowerPlant on Monday for this event.

**SAMUEL** – We are having our funeral this Thursday. It is going to be awesome. It is the funeral for the tuition campaign. Also, there will be the high school leadership conference. That is taking place this Friday. We are in need of volunteers. Please contact Kimberly Williams or myself and we will put you to good use for the day.

**KELLY** – The ASA is doing a Date Auction. Mark your calendars and come out. You guys will love it. Come to the ASA banquet too.

**KATZ** – December 10, the APC tuition decision. We will be putting together a presentation on tuition. So if there is any concern you want to be brought up, come find me. Dec 10, 2pm. Way much more fun than the tuition event.

**COOK** – Business week is from January 19-24. There will be a BSA charity fashion show which is the key event for the year. Held at the Royal Glenora. Tickets sold first week of January.

**LO** – Thank you with help with gripe tables, we have 4 left. Executive power hour this Thursday, so come out 2-3:30 on SUB Stage. I really want to talk to all of your friends. I just really want everyone to come out.

**THOMAS** – The very last event of Engineering week are the Boat Races. There will be free beer. Talk to Alex for more information.

**TAYLOR** – Reminder that the BSA and UASAUS is putting a team together for Engineering week.

**Speaker** – First I would like to say, “well done”. This is my 4<sup>th</sup> council and this is the most sophisticated in terms of debate and use of the rules. The next thing is that that for those of you that have been around and new, the rest of the year will be gone in a snap. If you have initiatives that you want to bring forward, do it and bring it for January. If you have anything you want done, I am here as a resource and will be here. Dec 12 is “Happy Birthday Webboard”. We are having a brief SCAB meeting. And Merry Christmas.

**2003-18/16**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**EKHDAHL/SAMUEL MOVED TO** adjourn at 9:00 pm.

**Defeated.**

**Speaker** - 1 member short of quorum.

## **Executive Committee Report to Students' Council January 6, 2004**

- 1. The following motion was passed at the November 21, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**
  - a. BRECHTEL/MAH MOVED THAT the Students Union sponsor the International Centre the Students' Union rate for the Horowitz Theatre for opening keynote address and the closing concert, as well the use of SUB stage for a week and \$475.00 to be used for a black and white, centre placement ad in the Gateway in return for appropriate recognition.  
VOTE ON MOTION 3/1 (SAMUEL)/0 CARRIED
  - b. MAH/LO MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve a budgeted expense of not to exceed \$1600.00 to allow Bill Smith to attend a meeting in London, ON regarding Travel Cuts lawsuit.  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
- 2. The following motion was passed at the November 24, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**
  - a. BRECHTEL/SAMUEL MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve an expense of \$10,350.00 from the Special Project Reserve for the tuition campaign  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
  - b. MAH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT \$25.00 be transferred from Special Project reserve to pay for hot chocolate at the Exec Power Hour this week.  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
- 3. There were no motions was passed at the November 28, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**
- 4. The following motion was passed at the December 1, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**
  - a. BRECHTEL/LO MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve an expense of \$3,330.00 from the Special Project Reserve for the election campaign.  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
  - b. BRECHTEL/BOTTEN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve a budgeted expense not to exceed \$790.00 for two team leaders to the National Peer Support Conference.  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
- 5. The following motion was passed at the December 8, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. BRECHTEL/BOTTEN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee assign to each of its voting members and the GM, EA and relevant coordinator the task of conducting a performance appraisal of all five (5) voting members of the Executive Committee, with the appraisals of all four (4) Vice Presidents to be compiled by the President and the appraisal of the President to be compiled by one (1) Vice President, as selected by the Executive Committee, such appraisals to be completed no later than December 31, 2003

VOTE ON MOTION

5/0/0 CARRIED

- b. BRECHTEL/BOTTEN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee recommend to Students' Council that it direct its membership to undertake a performance appraisal of all five (5) voting members of the Executive Committee, with the appraisals of all four (4) Vice Presidents to be compiled by the President and the appraisal of the President to be compiled by one (1) Vice President, as selected by the Executive Committee, such appraisals to be completed no later than 31 January, 2004

VOTE ON MOTION

5/0/0/ CARRIED

**6. There were no motions was passed at the December 15, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

**7. The following motion was passed at the December 8, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. SAMUEL/BOTTEN MOVED THAT an ad-hoc committee be struck to fill the vacant Student-at-Large seats on FAB, EAB, EBC and the University of Alberta Senate, and any other committees with vacancies to be composed of the chairs of the FAB, EAB, EBC; to return recommendation by January 31, 2004.

VOTE ON MOTION

4/0/0 CARRIED

**8. There were no motions was passed at the December 15, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE I - THE STUDENTS' UNION

1. — ~~The Students' Union will be an organization composed of students of the University of Alberta and affiliated colleges and schools, and will include all organizations established under their authority.~~
2. — ~~For the purposes of this Constitution and any legislation enacted hereunder, a member of the Students' Union will be any person who has paid such amounts as are designated to entitle membership according to Article VIII, unless an alternate definition of a member is specifically stated.~~
3. — ~~The Chancellor, the members of the Board of Governors, the Faculty, the Senate, and the members of the Alumni Association of the University of Alberta will be honorary members of the Students' Union.~~

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE II - OBJECT

1. — ~~The object of the Students' Union will be to provide for the administration of the affairs of the students at the University, including the development and management of student institutions, and the promotion of the general welfare of students consistent with the purposes of the University.~~

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE III - THE STUDENTS' COUNCIL

1. — ~~The Students' Council will be the legislative, administrative and executive body of the Students' Union and will be composed of an Executive Committee and such other members as are permitted by the Constitution, provided that in no case will the total number of members be less than sixteen (16).~~
  
2. — ~~The Executive Committee of the Students' Council will consist of the President, Vice-President Academic, Vice-President Student Life, Vice-President Operations and Finance, and Vice-President External.~~

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE IV - GENERAL POWERS OF THE STUDENTS' COUNCIL

1. — ~~The Students' Council will have all the powers as may from time to time exist under *The Universities Act*, R.S.A. 1980, and will exercise these powers subject to such limitations as are set out in this Constitution.~~
2. — ~~No recognized Students' Union faculty association, departmental club, or registered student group will be denied the use of a Students' Union controlled area on the basis of the proposed event or activity being in contravention of such moral standards as the Students' Union will declare, excepting cases where the proposed event is in violation of any existing Municipal, Federal, or Provincial Law.~~

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE IX - THE STUDENTS' COUNCIL QUORUM

- ~~1. No action taken at a meeting of the Students' Council will be effective unless a quorum consisting of one-half (1/2) of the Council members eligible to vote is present.~~

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE XI - RESPONSIBILITY OF STUDENT GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS

- 1.— ~~Student groups, organizations and committees set up under the authority granted by this Constitution will be responsible to the Students' Council for the fulfillment of the objects and purpose for which they were established, for the proper management of the Students' Union finances granted them for the proper conduct of their affairs.~~
- 2.— ~~Officers of such student groups and organizations and members of such committees will be responsible to the Students' Council for carrying out the duties and responsibilities undertaken by them in assuming their positions.~~

PROPOSED

# Constitution

## ARTICLE V - POWER TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION

1. ~~The Students' Council will have the power to amend this Constitution.~~
  - a. ~~An amendment to this Constitution is valid only after being passed at three (3) meetings of the Students' Council by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the voting members present. Such meetings will be held at least one (1) week apart.~~
2. ~~A referendum will unconditionally have the power to amend this Constitution, providing that the proposed action does not apply retroactively, and that the proposed amendment is explicitly referred to within the referendum question and that the referendum motion states that such a referendum would be binding.~~
3. ~~Any amendment must comply with Article XVII.~~
4. ~~Any amendment to this Constitution, which is the result of a referendum, may only be altered or removed by a subsequent referendum. Any amendment to this Constitution which is the result of a referendum will have this fact noted in the Constitution.~~
5. ~~Section 4 notwithstanding, Students' Council will have the power to amend parts of this constitution that have been amended as per Section 2 of this article on a date no earlier than 6 years after the passage of the original referendum.~~

Jun 11/02  
Feb 13/01`  
Jan 11/00  
Jan 27/98

**PROPOSED**

**THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

<i>Policy Number:</i>	<i>Effective Date:</i> <b>November 4, 2003</b>	<i>Page</i> <b>1</b> <i>of</i> <b>2</b>
	<i>Expiration Date:</i> <b>April 30, 2007</b>	
<i>Responsibility for Policy:</i>	<b>Executive Committee</b>	
<i>Subject Matter</i>	- <i>Category:</i>	<b>POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)</b>
	- <i>Specific:</i>	<b>Tuition Policy</b>
	- <i>Topic:</i>	

~~WHEREAS education should be accessible to all students of this province, regardless of their economic status;~~

~~WHEREAS tuition is meant as a symbol of a student's commitment to their education rather than a source of revenue for a post-secondary institution;~~

~~WHEREAS tuition should be based on a proportion of the costs of delivering education, not of running the entire institution;~~

~~WHEREAS the perpetual underfunding of the PSE sector in Alberta has resulted in tuition rising well beyond what students are capable of paying or what is considered affordable to Albertans;~~

~~WHEREAS the province of Alberta has one of the best performing economies in Canada;~~

~~WHEREAS the province of Alberta is ranked 7<sup>th</sup> out of 10 provinces in terms of operating grants to universities;~~

~~WHEREAS the Alberta government surplus is projected to be \$2.2 billion for the 2003-04 fiscal year;~~

~~WHEREAS a funded tuition freeze would cost approximately \$9.7 million, or 0.44% of the Alberta provincial budget surplus projected;~~

~~WHEREAS it is in the best interest of the students of this institution to secure more funding, in order to offset the need for tuition increases and to regain the quality of education once enjoyed by students;~~

~~WHEREAS students at the University of Alberta have been subjected to a total tuition increase of 251% between 1990/91 and 2003/04; and~~

~~WHEREAS tuition increases have posed a greater threat to accessibility than to the quality of education;~~

~~BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University of Alberta Students' Union campaign for a funded tuition freeze for the 2004-05 school year;~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union engage in discussion with both the University of Alberta and the provincial government to develop a long-term goal for tuition fees;~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union work with the University of Alberta administration in securing the funds needed from the provincial government;~~

**Policy History:**

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Created	SC 02-16/12i (34/4/1)	TUPAC	November 4, 2003

# PROPOSED

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union work with the University of Alberta administration in a campaign demanding that the provincial government increase its funding to Alberta universities to a level that will provide students with affordable and accessible tuition, and a high quality educational experience; and~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union work with the University of Alberta administration to ensure a proportion of any previously unallocated or unplanned money secured goes toward the reduction of tuition.~~

## Policy History:

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Created	SC 02-16/12i (34/4/1)	Executive Committee	November 4, 2003

**PROPOSED**

**THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

<i>Policy Number:</i>	<i>Effective Date: May 13, 2003</i>	<i>Page</i>	<b>1 of 1</b>
	<i>Expiration Date: April 30, 2007</i>		
<i>Responsibility for Policy:</i>	<b>External Affairs Board</b>		
<i>Subject Matter</i>	- <i>Category:</i>	<b>POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)</b>	
	- <i>Specific:</i>	<b>Post-Secondary Learning Act</b>	
	- <i>Topic:</i>		

WHEREAS the proposed Post-Secondary Learning Act contains significant changes to the mandate, establishment and powers of Alberta Students' Unions;

AND WHEREAS these changes undermine the authority of the University of Alberta Students' Union to provide services, operate businesses and act as the official channel of communication between undergraduate students and both the University Administration and the Provincial Government;

AND WHEREAS Section 93(3) of the Act directs the mandate of the Students' Union to be "consistent with the purposes of the public post-secondary institution" rather than the direct interest of students;

AND WHEREAS Section 95(2) of the Act removes nearly all powers of the Students' Union from legislation, particularly the levying of student fees;

AND WHEREAS Section 95(3) of the Act fails to recognize the Students' Union as the official medium of communication between students and the University;

AND WHEREAS Section 97 of the Act provides the Provincial Government the authority to dissolve Students' Council solely on the basis of a financial audit;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University of Alberta Students' Union is opposed to s. 93(2), s. 93(3), s. 94(2), s. 95(2), s. 95(3), and s. 97 of the Post-Secondary Learning Act in their currently proposed form.

**Policy History:**

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Created	May 12, 2003	Executive Committee	May 12, 2003

**PROPOSED**

***THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA***

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

*Policy Number:*

*Effective Date:* **April 8, 2003**

*Page 1 of 1*

*Expiration Date:* **April 30, 2006**

*Responsibility for Policy:*

*Subject Matter* - *Category:* **POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)**

- *Specific:* ***Alberta's Tuition Policy***

- *Topic:*

~~WHEREAS a legislated tuition policy guarantees some degree of predictability of pricing for Alberta university students, and binds Alberta's universities to a degree of fiscal responsibility in terms of how much they demand from students;~~

~~WHEREAS affordability of post-secondary education is a key democratic value and is critical to maintaining equality of opportunity in Alberta;~~

~~WHEREAS the Ministry of Learning has officially committed itself to a post-secondary education system in which financial resources are not a barrier to participation or access;~~

~~WHEREAS a legislated tuition cap is an essential feature of this commitment, ensuring adequate democratic dialogue and public accountability with regard to this commitment;~~

~~WHEREAS tuition is a user fee for a public service and therefore a form of taxation;~~

~~WHEREAS levels and methods of taxation should always be decided in a fair, open, public, regulated, and democratic manner; moreover, this is not a matter for debate for other taxpayers, such as individuals, corporations, or small businesses, and the same logic, accountability, transparency, predictability, and regulation should be applied to Alberta university students;~~

~~WHEREAS undergraduate student contributions to the general operating budgets of Alberta's universities particularly the Universities of Alberta and Calgary — are subsidizing university activities that do not contribute to the quality of education, such as the indirect costs of research;~~

~~BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Alberta Students' Union lobby the provincial government to keep the tuition policy within the Universities Act, or other subsequent legislation governing~~

~~Universities, such that regulation of tuition fees remains a part of Alberta's overall policy on post-secondary education;~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the University of Alberta Students' Union oppose any move to change the tuition policy such that it can be altered via order in council, as this is a fundamentally undemocratic way to make decisions that affect the financial security and future of so many Albertans;~~

~~BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the University of Alberta Students' Union seek to actively engage Albertans on the merits of a regulated system, predictable, that fairly represents students' contributions to the cost of providing their education.~~

**Policy History:**

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Created	SC 02-24/12j (20/4/2)		April 8, 2003

**PROPOSED**

***THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA***

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

<i>Policy Number:</i>	<i>Effective Date:</i> <b>April 3, 2001</b>	<i>Page</i> <b>1</b> <i>of</i> <b>1</b>
	<i>Expiration Date:</i> <b>April 30, 2004</b>	
<i>Responsibility for Policy:</i>	<b>External Affairs Board</b>	
<i>Subject Matter</i>	- <i>Category:</i> <b>POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)</b>	
	- <i>Specific:</i> <b>TUITION AUTHORITY</b>	
	- <i>Topic:</i>	

~~WHEREAS both the rate and socio-economic composition of the citizenship participating in the post-secondary education process are clearly influenced by the costs associated with education;~~

~~AND WHEREAS post-secondary education falls under the jurisdiction of the provincial government, in particular with respect to funding;~~

~~AND WHEREAS decisions made regarding the level of increase in tuition and associated educational costs are therefore clearly matters of public policy;~~

~~THEREFORE be it resolved that Students' Council support and actively advocate that the provincial government continue to have final authority with respect to the approval of tuition fee increases;~~

~~AND BE IT FURTHER resolved that the Students' Union oppose any attempts to defer the authority determining tuition to the Board of Governors.~~

**Policy History:**

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Updated	SC 00-22/9m	Executive Committee	April 3, 2001
Updated	SC 96-23/9e (14/4)	Executive Committee	April 8, 1997
Updated	SC 92-24/6c (18/2)	Executive Committee	April 26, 1993
Created	SC 89-17/7e (24/0)	Executive Committee	

**PROPOSED**

***THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA***

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

<i>Policy Number:</i>	<i>Effective Date: July 16, 2002</i>	<i>Page 1 of 1</i>
	<i>Expiration Date: April 30, 2006</i>	
<i>Responsibility for Policy:</i>	<b>External Affairs Board</b>	
<i>Subject Matter</i>	- <i>Category:</i>	<b>POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)</b>
	- <i>Specific:</i>	<b><i>Tuition Deregulation</i></b>
	- <i>Topic:</i>	

~~WHEREAS the University of Alberta Students' Union supports equality of disciplines;~~

~~AND WHEREAS the Students' Union recognizes that all disciplines of education are valuable to both society and the economy, and should be perceived as such;~~

~~AND WHEREAS the University of Alberta Students' Union seeks to improve accessibility and affordability of post-secondary education;~~

~~AND WHEREAS tuition deregulation in other jurisdictions has resulted in inequalities between disciplines and has created the societal and economic perspective that some disciplines are of greater value than others;~~

~~AND WHEREAS tuition deregulation in other jurisdictions has had a negative impact on both accessibility and affordability;~~

~~BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University of Alberta Students' Union actively oppose any move to deregulate tuition in Alberta.~~

**Policy History:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Created	External Affairs Board	July 16, 2002 (24/5/0)

**PROPOSED**

***THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA***

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

<i>Policy Number:</i>	<i>Effective Date: October 11, 2000</i>	<i>Page 1 of 1</i>
	<i>Expiration Date: April 30, 2004</i>	
<i>Responsibility for Policy:</i>	<b>External Affairs Board</b>	
<i>Subject Matter</i>	- <i>Category:</i>	<b>POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)</b>
	- <i>Specific:</i>	<b>Post-Secondary Education Funding Cutbacks</b>
	- <i>Topic:</i>	

~~MOVED THAT~~ Students' Union, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, adopt the following as Students' Union Policy regarding Post-Secondary Education Funding Cutbacks:

~~WHEREAS~~ the current economic climate allows for the Alberta Provincial government to reinvest in post-secondary education, thereby reinvesting in the economy;

~~WHEREAS~~ the Alberta provincial government has identified post-secondary education as necessary for the prosperity of Alberta;

~~WHEREAS~~ the Alberta provincial government has stated its commitment to both the affordability and accessibility of the post-secondary system in Alberta;

~~WHEREAS~~ the Alberta provincial government has drastically reduced funding to post-secondary education;

~~WHEREAS~~ it is the responsibility of the Students' Union to represent its constituents and to protect the future of a strong post-secondary education system;

~~THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT~~ the Students' Union encourage and support the unrestricted government reinvestment into post-secondary education in order to ensure the quality, accessibility and affordability of post-secondary education in Alberta.

**Policy History:**

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Updated	SC 00-11/9a (28/2)	External Affairs Board	October 10, 2000
Updated	SC 97-07/10a (24/3)	External Affairs Board	August 19, 1997
Created	SC 93-15/11a (26/1)	External Affairs Board	November 16, 1993

**PROPOSED**

**THE STUDENTS' UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**

**POLITICAL POLICY STATEMENT**

<i>Policy Number:</i>	<i>Effective Date:</i>	<i>Page</i> <b>1</b> <i>of</i> <b>1</b>
	<i>Expiration Date:</i>	
<i>Responsibility for Policy:</i>	<b>Academic Affairs Board</b>	
<i>Subject Matter</i>	- <i>Category:</i>	<b>POLITICAL POLICY (GENERAL)</b>
	- <i>Specific:</i>	<b><i>Tuition Levels and Regulation</i></b>
	- <i>Topic:</i>	

WHEREAS Albertans ought not to have their access to post-secondary education restricted for financial reasons;

WHEREAS the benefits of an educated population and of an accessible system of education are reaped largely by society as a whole;

WHEREAS the state of Alberta's economy and public finances is among the best in Canada;

WHEREAS the present level of investment by the provincial government in post-secondary education is among the lowest in Canada;

WHEREAS tuition in Alberta has been climbing at rates well in excess of inflation for more than a decade and is now among the highest in Canada;

WHEREAS governmental controls on tuition levels have been steadily eroded during this time;

WHEREAS tuition poses a financial barrier to post-secondary education in the absence of a perfect system of student finance;

WHEREAS perfection is impossible;

WHEREAS the fact that all Canadian jurisdictions require from University undergraduate students an upfront payment of a portion of the cost of their education puts Canada in a minority of industrialized countries;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union, University of Alberta, consider the present levels of tuition to be unacceptably high and support decreases in these levels;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union, University of Alberta, support an immediate freeze on existing tuition levels as a necessary first step in an equitable and fair system of financing for undergraduate education;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union, University of Alberta, support firm, provincially legislated controls on tuition levels to reflect society's interest in accessible education;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union, University of Alberta, support an increase in base government funding to Alberta's Universities, such that the present quality of undergraduate education can be preserved and enhanced in the absence of tuition increases;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union, University of Alberta, support a meaningful exploration of alternatives to the requirement that undergraduate students pay a portion of the costs of their education in advance of the completion of their educations.

**Policy History:**

	<b>Reference/Vote</b>	<b>Board/Committee</b>	<b>Date of Council Approval</b>
Created			

**Vice-President (Academic) Report to Students' Council**  
**Current: Friday 02 January 2004**  
**Last Report: Tuesday 25 November 2003**

**Day-by-Day:**

T 25 NOV Gripe Tables @ Phys Ed  
Technology Enhanced Instructional Spaces Advisory Committee

W 26 NOV Met with Registrar Carole Byrne to discuss Bear Tracks  
CoFA (Thanks to PERCS for hosting!)

R 27 NOV Gripe Tables @ Engineering  
Executive Power Hour  
ONEcard Advisory Group Meeting

F 28 NOV High School Leadership Conference

T 2 DEC Gripe Tables @ Arts  
Meeting with Quantera (re: Bookstore)  
Budget Advisory Committee Meeting

W 3 DEC Gripe Tables @ Business

R 4 DEC AISSC Meeting

F 5 DEC Students' Union Christmas Party for Kids

M 8 DEC GFC Executive Meeting

T 9 DEC AAS:UA Teaching & Learning Committee  
Wrote my Final!

W 10 DEC Goal Setting with Chris Henderson  
Academic Planning Committee Meeting

R 11 DEC Executive Retreat

F 12 DEC Meeting with Quantera (re: Bookstore)

M 15 DEC 2003 Undergraduate Leadership Committee Meeting

T 16 DEC Executive Retreat

W 17 DEC Meeting with Quantera (re: Bookstore)  
Meeting with U-Hall/AIS/Registrar re: Bear Scat

R 18 DEC Lunch with Dean Morrison of AFHE  
Meeting with Secretariat and VPFA to discuss APPOL

**The Scoop:**

- Anybody who tries to ask me what I accomplished in November and December will likely hear a groan followed by an "I don't know." Truly, November is the month that was forgotten as it flew by faster than I could ever have imagined. Finding myself caught up in "maintenance" as well as the "wow, I've fallen behind in school" syndrome, I spent the majority of my time doing "the usual" and "studying/writing paper." December was the month that was spent re-focusing and re-energizing: finals, goal-setting, and relaxing were priorities.



**Report to Students' Council**  
**January 6, 2004**  
**Tyler Botten, Vice President (Operations & Finance)**

Members of Council,

It has been quite some time, no? Two meetings I miss while being away at the end of November and a cancelled meeting in December leaves me longing for a Students' Council meeting as I feel it has been ages since we finally spoke one on one via this report. In any case, the past two(!) months have been both eventful and not – having learned that November is the month that disappears before you know what the happened and December is the month that is over before you know it, I have nevertheless endured to keep myself busy though in retrospect I realize that little of this busy time had anything to do with my goals themselves. A lesson to those of you Exec potentials – November is the perfect month to lose sight of your focus for the year and you really don't have as much time to catch up over the holidays as you might like. Food for thought, I suppose. I meant to get a report out in December so this one wouldn't have to be so long but that too has failed and so here we are. On with the show! (tune in next report for an all new revamped 2004 format)

*The Past*

1. **website review** – all votes are in and I have had some serious discussions with the powers that be of the local interwebness of the SU. it looks as though a new setup could likely be in place before elections, which is not the timeline I originally hoped for, but it's not that bad on the whole and should last us for a good couple of years or so.
2. **council outreach & concerns** – after several still-weakly-attended meetings near the end of the term, our agenda has been set out for the remainder of the year and will focus on 3 things: working with the CRO to inform people of what the *job* of being a Student Councillor really entails; revamping the Council binders and planning a changeover retreat for Council in April; and dealing with concerns gleaned from those surveys that were distributed.
3. **org review** – I completed all the preliminary template work for the org review and provided each department head with the necessary background documentation for updating the 2002 review work or starting anew; met with all department heads over 3 blustery days in November and put them all to work. so far I have received a good chunk of the information sought and the work in most areas seems to be progressing very nicely including some departments who have already completed the work and submitted their recommendations. all will be reviewed by the executive committee at the end of this month with a full-scale set of recommendations to come packaged with the preliminary budget in march. still working on entrenching this process in the regular workings of the organization so we are thinking about what we are doing more often than once every three or four years.
4. **the university** – I had a chunk of meetings with people from all walks of University life: sat in on *Quanteria* (the *consultants*) discussions over the bookstore; talked to facilities management about the lack of tampon dispensers

- on campus; cleared up some discrepancies with the university over what they still owe the SU for the SUB expansion; talked to the real estate folks about bringing in some whitelabel ATM's with a \$1.00 transaction fee; discussed more about student fees and how they are displayed on timetable reports and the financial services website as well as the history behind the faculty student funds in Law, Engineering and the FSJ.
5. **exec quality time** – two largescale retreats in December meant some time for the five of us to regain a much-lost focus on our aims for the remainder of this year. I learned a lot about myself in that time (if I may get introspective for a moment) and it was interesting to see that while I have a list of things that I still want to accomplish this year, the bulk of my time is taken up by countless other random things (as you – loyal readers – can no doubt tell from these potpourri reports) which explains that whole *Bermuda Triangle* thing that happened in November. recognizing that you only have 1/3 of the term left, it's time to snap back to attention and quick messing around in all these nonstop meetings that pop up everywhere. as such, everything in my life is now being reprioritized with new categories to highlight what I am spending my time on. expect this to dictate the format of the remainder of these reports.
  6. **events galore** – for whatever strange reason I managed to attend a great deal of functions or largescale events of late. maybe it's because the span of this report is so large, who knows. anyhow, if you're interested, here's the list: gripe tables; birthday parties (don't even remember which or how many); high school leadership conference; CA mid-year meeting (see other report); kids christmas party; 14 not forgotten ceremony; SU Christmas party; gateway Christmas party; liberal party open house; countless breakfast/lunch/dinner meetings with exec members past present and future(?).
  7. **meetings bloody meetings** – in what could very well be the final installment of this category, let's hit the list: faculty forum in Corbett hall; bill 43 meetings (lots of 'em); TUPAC meetings (two or three); FACRA BoD x2; GSJS BoD; Quanteria x2; student groups who misspent grant money x3; audit committee; faculty forum post-mortem; council outreach workshop; bylaw review with the IRB legislation junkies x3; CA BoD; 2 days of presentations/discussion in Windsor over CA matters; access fund selection committee; tuition logistics meetings x3; touchdowns for tuition planning; ben & jerry's guy; discussion over campus pro-life shock campaign; budgeting with the ESS; chatting election/computer geek with the CRO and former SU prez; financial statement revision and cost apportionment x3; student group grant reform chat. phew...

### *The Future (the condensed version)*

1. **suite of financial reforms** – over the course of the next three months, I will be working on several finance-related projects (finally) including: formalizing the prelim/final budget process and new financial policies; reviewing our system of 'reserves'; restructuring several budget departments; executing budget days with all department heads to go over process; sorting out the delineation b/w my position and the audit committee's role; reformatting our financial statements; apportioning admin costs throughout the organization; developing a better formal system of checks and balances; a presentation on the SSCB

- agreement and the 5-year financial plan for the organization to be approved by council in February.
2. **year of the bars** – on this matter, there will be another run of the silent shopper program in the near future; a series of student focus groups; a staff survey; finally sorting things out with the GSA over Dewey's; and most importantly a full-scale business plan for both bars to be completed with the org review. oh yeah, and if you're paying attention at home, nonstop pop will be here in may along with a list of other changes to be implemented for the new fiscal year as a package in lieu of the bandaid changes we make now.
  3. **bang 4 your buck campaign** – most of the work here has been completed. a fees brochure will be rolled out this month for anyone looking to know where their money goes (something which I hope will outlive my time here); still working on getting financial services to make some changes to their lack of breakdown in the way SU fees are displayed to students; developing some solid branding internal policies for SU departments; and making sure those faculty student funds haven't run off into oblivion as they are wont to do.
  4. **organizational reform** – org review is proceeding as planned; fullscale nom comm review will be handled soon with respect to both the manner in which candidates are selected/interviewed and who is part of the process; those operating policies should be in a package near you very soon; overall salary review for the organization will happen following the CUPE negotiations; I'm working with the president & GM to establish a better system of incentive remuneration within the organization as well.
  5. **council reform** – I still hope to speed along the process of redefining committee structure for our standing committees and non-legislative committees; the council transition retreat as mentioned above is also a big priority for the CCRAP branch I am chairing.
  6. **online resource work** – see the website review through to completion is the biggest one here, this will also include the increased online delivery of services I talked about in my campaign based on what comes from the org review; also hoping to see what (if anything) can be done to improve that national webboard thing
  7. **side projects** – working with the VPA on the course curriculum idea; distributing background information and recommendations from 2 years ago on the future of the Canadian Campus Business Consortium to all member schools; helping complete a five-year strategic plan for Campus Advantage; seeing that darned energy audit through to (possible) completion; looking into the possibility of securing another info desk on campus now that ETLC looks like it is probably a *go!*

...okay, so maybe this report wasn't as long as I thought it would be. We'll see if I can change that up over the next couple of months

### Upcoming Meetings

Hrm...no *real* meetings to speak of in the next little while. Nice!

### Interesting Website(s) of the Week

<http://www.alchemica.co.uk/conspire/discover.html>

<http://homepage.mac.com/hsk/applejapan.html>

\*well, loyal readers, if you're like me and are a big fan of the television series *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* then you no doubt enjoyed the Christmas day marathon on the *Space* network. If not, perhaps you (like me, according to the *Student Life* presentation at Orientation 2003) are good at math. If so, you are indeed in luck! This week's quiz is a simple skill-testing question. All you need to do is add up every number (not individual digits – use the numbers as a whole) in this report and give me the total. First one to do so wins a free 14" pizza from funky pickle and any other coupons I can scrounge up (including the \$0.50 movie ones. lots of 'em)  
happy counting!

# MAT BRECHTEL - REPORT TO COUNCIL

Bill 43—was passed with a bittersweet conclusion. Yes we did get the powers put back into legislation, but no, there is no meaningful tuition cap, and yes, there is still the audit and dissolution clause. Since last meeting there was a funeral on the steps of the legislature, and a few readings in the leg. All three parties gave good comments to the UASU for their actions, but they didn't see fit to incorporate our suggestions.

BAC—Although multi-year doesn't exist, BAC still does, and in this context BAC met twice with the VP Academic and myself in attendance. The items of business included details on the tuition proposal and how to debate the proposal.

Quanterra—and all things related to business cases are still the biggest sink of my time. The Quanterra business case is still being conducted. It is still consuming absurd amounts of time, but there seems to be the possibility that this case isn't merely going to increase the margins on books.

TUPAC—there have been meetings, and yes, councilor Dube, those meetings have involved the passage of minutes. TUPAC was diligent and effective in deciding the tuition events for these two weeks.

The larger community—I had a couple of opportunities to talk on CBC about funding to Post-Secondary, as well as an opportunity to talk to Rutherford in Calgary about Calgary/Edmonton funding comparisons. Both proved useful, as the topics “shifted” to base funding issues. In one case I got to go head-to-head with the minister for several minutes.

APC Tuition decision—on December 10, APC endorsed and forwarded to BFPC the annual tuition proposal. This meeting was disappointing, particularly considering for the first time in many years the Graduate students voted in favor of the increase.

Lobbying Board members—for the first two weeks of December I spent a good amount of time talking to Board members about the tuition increase and about the strategic planning session that was on December 12. Those discussions provided valuable insight into the reasoning of the board in a typical year.

Writing presentations and packages—surprisingly enough, this takes a good deal of time. There are three presentations, so we did three. Three times the work. I would like to thank Duncan, Tony, Chris, Sara and Mustafa for the help.

Exec retreats—just before the last four months, it's always good to get your house in order. The Exec spent a day and a half doing just that. Ask anyone here what they are doing for the next four months, and they should have it down pat.

Planning for the tuition campaign—this took a good deal of time. Hopefully the payoff is worth the work. We'll see.

**JANUARY 6, 2004**

December events—these were disappointing. For the two days of caroling there were only two and three people in attendance, Darren Lau, a great volunteer, and myself. Janet Lo and Kimmy Williams joined us on the 20<sup>th</sup>. “A tuition carol” wasn’t put on, in the majority because there was no script provided. We can only learn from mistakes. These events only underline the importance of attendance, so that will hopefully be supported for the next week.

Other general meetings—Repeated Bill 43 and Tuition meetings, Alumni council and student life subcommittee.

FYI--Augustana “Letter of Intent” has been signed, both SUCPK and the High School leadership conference were wonderfully put on. Kudos to Anna and Kimmy. Thanks to all of the volunteers.

Studying and writing a paper—Believe it or not, exec should have a little schoolwork to do, and should do it well. I did okay in my one class. Goodness knows how.

---

Things to come:

Tuition tuition tuition!: the list...

### **Wednesday January 7:**

#### **The Game of Life - Tuition Edition**

An interactive way for students to have fun and learn about the growing costs of post-secondary education.

Ship Community Centre

7:00pm until 9:00pm

*open to Lister students only*

### **Monday January 12:**

**Bar Night at the Power Plant**—Once every month, the Greek community has a bar night. On January 10, Davin Swenson, President of IFC, Roman Kotovych, BoG undergraduate member, and Mat Brechtel, SU President chat with Greek students about tuition issues, and extend an invitation to the *Show of Support* on January 15, at 4:30  
*Open to the Greek community only*

### **Tuesday January 13:**

**FREE TUITION—A look around the world and back again:** Two speakers, Mat Brechtel, SU President and Mike Hudema, SU President ‘02-‘03 will discuss how many other countries around the world deal with post secondary education and focus the discussion back on how to achieve our goals in Canada

---

**JANUARY 6, 2004**

### **Wednesday January 14:**

**Touchdowns for Tuition:** All day, members of the Bears and Pandas will be playing football and raising money for a scholarship to support the cost of one student's tuition. Come by and watch, grab a coffee and enter the draw.

Where: Quad

### **Lister Hall Open Forum:**

Come out, meet the executives of the Students' Union and the Lister Hall Students' Association and learn more about the SU tuition campaign and how you can get involved  
Wednesday January 14, 2004

Where: Ship Community Centre

7:00pm to 9:00pm

*open to Lister students only*

### **Thursday January 15:**

**Show of Support for Affordable University:** Many students on campus believe in an affordable education. You now have the chance to show both the Board of Governors and the Provincial Government that this is an issue of importance to you, and have some fun while you're at it. There will be speeches, music and theatre. The more people that are here, the louder message we can send to the BoG and to the province. **If there is one event to come out to, this is it!**

Where: Business/Arts Quad (between Old Arts, Rutherford, Business and HUB)

When: 4:30 pm

Burgers: \$1

**Candlelight Vigil for Tuition:** All night students and community members alike are invited to join together in SUB to have a vigil for education, and await the Board decision the next morning at 8 am. We will have candles, talks, music and the special feature: *Bowling for Columbine*. Everyone is invited to bring his or her sleeping bags and stay over in SUB.

Where: SUB

When: 6:30 pm – 7 am

### **Friday January 16:**

**Pancake Breakfast:** Before the BoG meeting, after a long night, get some pancakes and get ready for the board meeting.

Where: Celebration Plaza (right by the bus loop entrance)

When: 7-9 am

**Board of Governors Decision:** Early in the morning, the Board will debate and decide the tuition levels for 2004-2005. This is the day that we will finally see some success.

Where: University Hall (beside Van Vliet)

When: Meeting begins at 8 am, Tuition likely at 9:30

**JANUARY 6, 2004**

**Campus Advantage Mid-Year Meeting**  
**November 24<sup>th</sup> – 26<sup>th</sup> 2003**  
**Windsor, Ontario**  
**Tyler Botten, Vice President (Operations & Finance)**

Here it is, the much-anticipated report on what the heck was going on in Windsor that took me from this province to that glorious blue-collared city on the verge of being swallowed by Detroit. On the whole, the Mid-Year Meeting was a great refresher for Campus Advantage as an organization, and being a member of the Board of Directors it was a good opportunity to gain some perspective on the feelings of some of our less active shareholders. I can think of no better way to break this report down than a day-by-day account of the proceedings. Shall we proceed?

*Monday, November 24<sup>th</sup>*

While other delegates and guests rolled in to Windsor, the Board of Directors spent the day holed up in a meeting room in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarterly Board meeting of 2003/2004. This time consisted of a thorough review of our progress so far this year, including: our relationship with a marketing company who has failed to deliver two years in a row on a sample pack program; the final preparations for rolling out the whitelabel ATM program at various schools; progress with the online national housing registry program; a heavy discussion on the general liability insurance program we have in place for student associations that was to be a large topic of discussion the following day; strategizing a new focus for our National Program Director (the one staff member who holds everything together and works as our PR person as well) in the coming months; discussing briefly and then planning a timeline for completion of a five-year strategic plan for Campus Advantage; review of the financial statements and our financial position which is behind our fiscal plan (budget) for the year because there was no revenue from the sample pack program and shareholders who expressed a great deal of interest in programs in May have been silent since and our projections at that time were based largely on the enthusiasm seen at the AGM in Halifax.

This day was certainly a draining one (who *really* likes being in an 8-hour meeting starting first thing in the morning after enjoying a few beverages the evening before?) but was leaps and bounds from where the July Board meeting found us as the new student Directors were still working to adjust to their roles. This time around we had some very frank conversations that – I believe – have paved the way for a more solid focus and approach to the corporation's future endeavours and relationships both with shareholder and non-shareholder student associations as well as with any third-party companies we enter into agreements with.

*Tuesday, November 25<sup>th</sup>*

As mentioned, this day focused primarily on the liquor liability and general liability insurance. After campus bars were shut down in Ontario last year and the fight to have them reinstated was a long one, it was also discovered the week before this meeting that McGill's general liability insurance had run out and they were forced to close their student centre for 17 hours while they made arrangements with their

administration to extend coverage. As it turns out, the problem is not getting any easier to find companies that are willing to cover student associations on liquor liabilities, primarily because this coverage also extends to every registered club and their events insofar as they are allowed by the given campus' regulations. Here at the UofA, the Alcohol Policy Review Committee sets out the guidelines that cover what *is* and what *isn't* covered by insurance for alcoholic events. Still, in a worst-case scenario world, it would be possible for the Powerplant and RATT to have insurance pulled because the Cookie Cutting Club had a kicker where something tragic happened. But I digress; suffice it to say, we are still good for coverage and our premiums this year have increased by less than we had previously thought they would (adjusted in the Final Budget already).

Following a large discussion on liability insurance and liquor liability insurance, we saw several presentations, including: *Diageo* (distilling company) brought forward the first installment of its responsible use training program which CA has worked to be aimed at helping student associations in training their serving staff; *nID Solutions* outlined their products including a digital ID scanner that will verify age ID and also keep some wicked-cool stats about the crowd in the bar at any given time; *BACCHUS* gave a presentation on the programs they offer and support that they are able to provide in promoting alcohol awareness and safe use – portions of their program are in place with the Peer Health Educators here at the UofA already; a representative from the Ontario Liquor Board was also on-hand to explain how the Province was dealing with the issue of student-run bars on campuses. The last presentation was somewhat *Ontario-centric* but the remainder of the presentations brought out some good discussion points and foci for future workings, particularly between our shareholders and CHMA (Campus Hospitality Managers Association) on more stringent regulations to ensure we are abiding by the guidelines of the *powers that be* so as to avoid running into the trouble of having our bars closed.

*Wednesday, November 26<sup>th</sup>*

The second *real* day of the general meeting saw all of the non-shareholder guests who had arrived for the liquor discussion the day earlier depart, which put a kink in the hope of promoting some CA programs to non-shareholders as that was the topic du jour for Wednesday. Presentations were conducted for the shareholders who were present to provide more details and testimonials from shareholder delegates who had signed on to the various programs. The presentations included: the national housing registry program; whitelabel bank machine program; as well as a long discussion on marketing initiatives and the role of CA as a gatekeeper for corporations to market products to a broad base of clientele (students). In addition, the past, present and future of the Canadian Campus Business Consortium (CCBC) was discussed with a decision made amongst those there that at CCSA in Manitoba in May 2004 the issue should finally be resolved when (hopefully) all members of the organization would be present. This day was a great opportunity – as mentioned earlier – for members of the Board like myself to gain some perspective on where our other shareholders sit with regards to the CA programs and head office functioning. At the same time, I was bored to tears during the presentations as (again being a Board member) I had heard the details of them several times.

### *General Thoughts*

On the whole, I believe the Mid-Year Meeting was the kind of thing which was perhaps not as *informative* to us as it would have been if we did not have two members of the Board of Directors for Campus Advantage here at the UofA (myself and our General Manager) – we had already been somewhat involved in working on the various programs so there was little there that we could learn.

At the same time, I think it was terrific to gain perspective (as both a fellow shareholder and as a Board Member) on the opinions from the other shareholders, including some delegates I knew from CCSA and many that I had never met before. It goes without saying that the opportunity to connect with my peers once again was terrific as a refresher and a reminder that we deal with the same frustrations throughout the year. Still, the focus of most of the discussion was Campus Advantage and the future, and I believe great strides were taken towards developing better communication between shareholders and (especially) between shareholders and the head office. That communication is – in my opinion – one of the key improvements the organization needs to reach success in the future. Contribution to a five-year vision will also be interesting to see as I have been able to fully represent (from a UofA Students' Union perspective) the things that are weak and strong with Campus Advantage and offer suggestions for their improvement.

I would say that, without a doubt, so long as we are shareholders in Campus Advantage, sending at least one delegate to the Mid-Year Meeting is critical. I have seen what poor communication between a shareholder and the head office can create and I would hate to see someone in our Students' Union's future look upon our investment of time and money into Campus Advantage as something to be anything other than proud of. Perhaps at times we have delved a little too deeply, in the same manner that the UASU has a good tradition of taking the lead reins in organizations that involve our counterparts at other institutions (the Council of Alberta University Students comes to mind). By attending we are involved in the process, and I see a future where the needs and desires of the shareholders are what drives the organization in a given direction. We can only hope to benefit more and more from our association with CA so long as we continue to be part of the process.

### *The Cost Breakdown*

Here are the costs that were incurred during the trip:

Flight (EDM-TOR return)	– \$297.55
Train (Windsor – Toronto)	– \$ 54.57
Taxi (Toronto to Airport)	– \$ 44.00
Accommodations (3 nights in Windsor)	– \$309.12
Delegate Fee	– \$186.92
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>– \$892.16</b>
<i>(approved budgeted amount)</i>	<i>- \$1,260.00</i>