

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL MINUTES

---

Tuesday January 27, 2004 – 6:00 p.m.  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

## ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-21)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/absent
President	Mat Brechtel	√
VP Academic	Janet Lo	√
VP External	Chris Samuel	√
VP Finance	Tyler Botten	√
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah	√
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych	√
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice	√
U of A Athletics Board Executive Officer	Kevin Petterson	X
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reike	X
Arts	Alex Abboud	√
Arts	Chris Bolivar	X
Arts	Erin Kelly	√
Arts	James Knull (McLachlan)	√
Arts	Chris Laver	√
Arts	Terra Melnyk	√
Arts	Vivek Sharma	√

Arts	Heather Wallace	√
Arts	Paul Welke	√
Business	Adam Cook	√
Business	Steve Smith	√
Education	Allison Ekdahl	√
Education	Christine Wudarck	√
Engineering	Josh Bazin	√
Engineering	Paige Smith	√
Engineering	Nicholas Tam	√
Engineering	David Wepler	√
Law	Dean Hutchison	√
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong	√
Native Studies (School of)	Matthew Wildcat	√
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac	√
Physical Education	Holly Higgins (Tim Frances)	√
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	√
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube	√
Science	Matthew Eaton	X
Science	Tereza Elyas	√
Science	Shawna Pandya	√
Science	Elaine Poon	√
Science	Duncan Taylor	√
President Athletics		
General Manager	Bill Smith	X

Speaker	Gregory Harlow	√
Recording Secretary	Sarah Kelly	√

## MINUTES (SC 2003-21)

2003-21/1

### CALL TO ORDER

2003-21/2

### University of Alberta CHEER SONG "Ring Out a Cheer"

2003-21/3

### SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

**Kwong** has been suspended as of the previous meeting.

**Crossman** has resigned his seat on Council.

**Abboud/Lo** moved that **Tam** be appointed as Engineering Councilor for the duration of the 2003-2004 academic year.

### Consensus

**Kotovych** alerted Council to the lack of quorum. No further business was conducted until quorum was recovered.

The Chair informed Council that he would be imposing strict limits on business and debate throughout the course of the meeting, given the great length of business to be dealt with before the end of the term, and the fact that so few meetings were scheduled. At this point, he reiterated several rules:

- (a) Any Points of Order must be accompanied by a rule stated by the rising member.
- (b) Points of Information must be used for their intended purpose only.
- (c) Individual speakers will be allowed to indemnify themselves from Points of Information when they take the floor, if they so choose.
- (d) Points of Parliamentary Inquiry should be used judiciously, and recourse to them will be denied to any member of Council who is seen to abuse them.

2003-21/3a

### Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board Ruling #9

The Chair informed Council that the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board (hereafter the DIE Board) has instructed Council to reconsider its motion to reappoint **Reikie**. This motion, therefore, will come to a vote to either reinstate him, or deny him reinstatement.

**Brechtel**: Is the vote on whether or not to reconsider Council's previous motion, or specifically whether or not to reinstate **Reikie**?

The Chair informed **Brechtel** and Council that it was the latter decision that Council was to undertake.

**Smith/Wildcat** moved that **Reikie** be reinstated to Students' Council as a councilor for the Faculty of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics.

**Wallace:** If **Reikie's** reinstatement was in contravention of Bylaw 100 to begin with, there is no reason for Council to reinstate him. Given that **Reikie** was a valuable member of Students' Council, this should extend to a wider debate on the necessity of attendance regulations.

It was noted at this point by **Abboud** that **Wallace** was speaking to a different motion.

**Weppler:** There is no option but to vote against reinstatement.

**Rice:** If **Reikie** is not reinstated, an entire Faculty will suffer without representation on Students' Council.

**Dube:** This is a difficult situation, a time when enforcing the law is an unsavory measure and one that Council undertakes with some reluctance. However, the law being in place specifically for this purpose, it must be followed.

**Botten** stated that there are moments when breaking the law is permissible and even necessary. He leveled that there must be times to make exceptions to rules, and this is one of the moments when Council should ignore regulations for the sake of the body itself.

**Reikie** thanked Council for its careful deliberation, and asked for leave to select a successor.

**Samuel** expressed distaste at the idea that Council might simply come to a decision based on what takes the least time. As a judicial body, Council must uphold the law, although he elicited dismay at the idea of **Reikie** being forced to leave Council.

**Smith** pointed out that Council is a legislative body rather than a judicial one, but leveled all the same that its capacity does not give it license to break the law. When informed that he was speaking against his own motion, he retracted these comments.

**Taylor:** The law does not address the spirit of this matter. It is proper that the students in Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics are entitled to be represented by the councilor they elected. **Reikie** has made every effort to be cooperative within the system, and it is unfair that he should be dismissed from Council.

**Kotovych/Melnyk** moved to call the question.

**Carried**

**Main Motion Failed**

The Chair expressed his regret in expelling **Reikie** from Council, urging him to continue his valuable contribution to the Students' Union.

**Reikie** thanked Council and left with this statement: *Please be swift, and remember that we were given one mouth and two ears, so we should listen twice and speak once.*

2003-21/3b

**Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board Ruling #8**

The Chair informed Council that this ruling is to implement a censure on the Executive Committee and demand an apology to Council. Since the ruling can be appealed, the sentence will not be implemented at the moment.

2003-21/8

**APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS**

2003-21/9

**OLD BUSINESS**

2003-21/10

**LEGISLATION**

2003-21/10a

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

**Brechtel** introduced the motion.

18/1/1 **Carried**

2003-21/10b

**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 (second reading).

**Brechtel** introduced the motion by explaining that each of the articles specified in the motion is either redundant or unnecessary, and thus their removal is housekeeping only.

**Carried**

2003-21/10C

**BRECHTEL/PANDYA MOVED THAT** the Students' Council upon the recommendation of Committee for Council Reform and Progress amend Students' Union legislation such that the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative position be given to the VP Academic and the executive portfolios be reapportioned accordingly (first reading/notice of motion).

**Brechtel** introduced the motion.

There are two seats on the Board of Governors that are held by students, and by law, both of these student representatives are appointed by Students' Council. One is specifically elected to the purpose, and the other, the Students' Union President, is elected by default.

This motion offers the notion that the seat currently held by the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative could be better held by the Students' Union Vice-President Academic; this would more consistently and effectively represent the interests of the Students' Union.

**Kotovych/Brechtel** moved that the motion be collapsed.  
**Consensus**

**Dube** opposed the motion, stating that no effort towards direct democracy is ever wasted. This position, she continued, should serve the best interests of the students, not the Students' Union; the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative is duly elected just as the President is, and therefore reflects the wish of students for him to serve. Besides which, she concluded, the Vice-President Academic does not have the time to dedicate to any additional responsibilities. This is overuse of power on the part of the Students' Union, and should be voted down.

**Botten:** The election of the Vice-President Academic lends the same credibility as that of the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative. The motion specifies that Executive duties would be reapportioned accordingly, specifically so the Vice-President Academic would have the time to dedicate to such an undertaking. Such a move should not be considered dangerous. Students' Council is also elected by students, comprising an equal representation of viewpoints from across campus. Concern about direct democracy is absolutely unwarranted.

**Pandya:** The position of the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative is arbitrary and confusing at best, and this at a time when every effort should be made to make Students' Union elections less confusing. The position makes little sense in any case; moving it into the portfolio of the Vice-President Academic would institutionalize it and bring it closer to the Students' Union, and by so doing lend it more legitimacy.

**Abboud:** First-year students know little, if anything, about what they vote for in Students' Union elections. All positions on the ballot are initially confusing, and perhaps this means that the profile of the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative should be heightened, rather than eliminated. Students are not necessarily aware, when they vote, that the President they elect will be representing them on this board, so having a Board of Governors representative is simpler and more direct.

Rice **seconded the sentiment expressed by Abboud. Students should, and do, appreciate the clarity of voting for a position such as the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative.**

**Samuel:** Efforts to raise the profile of this position have been fruitless. Voters rarely know anything about the positions enumerated on the ballot, and thus it is an arbitrary point. However, the President is bound by legislation to seek the lowest possible tuition increase, for example, whereas the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative is not, which is potentially dangerous.

**Kotovych** rose on a Point of Order, informing the Chair that both the President and the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative are bound to do what is best for the University of Alberta, a responsibility which supersedes Students' Union policy.

**Samuel:** The first priority of this body should be the Students' Union, which represents students: it is dangerous to have a representative on the Board of Governors who is forced to consider the University first and students second. If the two representatives on the Board were to disagree, the message sent to the Board itself would be lethal. However, if the Vice-President Academic were the second representative, a united front would be enshrined and ensured in perpetuity.

**Kotovych** opposed the motion, claiming that discussion thus far had evidenced that no research had been done prior to submitting the motion. Having two members of the Executive Committee on the Board of Governors would constitute a conflict of interest: *viz* the interests of students versus the interests of the organization. The Board can predict the position of the Students' Union, whereas an external voice does not carry such baggage. If the arguments made for this motion are valid, then there is no reason that all Council seats should not be held only by the executive members of faculty associations. Qualms about the relationship between **Mike Reid** [Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative 2002-2003] and the Executive Committee of that year should not be a reason to alter the system itself.

At this point the Chair halted debate, as the twenty-minute limit had been passed.

5/25 **Failed**

2003-21/10d

**SHARMA/TAYLOR 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/notice of motion).

**Sharma** introduced the motion, stating that voting in favor would address a need for consistency that discussion has indicated is lacking within the Students' Union. The organization suffers from a lack of institutional memory and political direction; resolutions and policies are short-term and unreliable. Such a motion would both improve and extend the legacy of Students' Council: the maintenance of a critical mass of individuals is essential to the success of the organization. Finally, such a resolution would force individuals to consider their candidacy more carefully.

Council moved to collapse the motion

### **Consensus**

**Ekdahl** opposed the motion: very few people would run for the position under such a provision, and the attractiveness of the position would be reduced, making it more likely that some unsavoury sort would win by acclamation.

**Kotovych** spoke in favour of the motion. The Board of Governors, he began, is a far more complicated body than Students' Council, and the undergraduate representative consistently takes his or her seat at a disadvantage owing to the fact that all the other members have been sitting for some time. The University works on a much longer timeframe than the Students' Union, and given the traditional position of Board members in opposition to students, the learning curve on the Board is crippling to effective representation.

**Brechtel**: It could well be a law of physics that one is more effective in his or her position at the end of it than at the beginning: this is true for all the Students' Union's term representatives. What prevents the organization from capitulating to the idea inherent in this motion is *opportunity*: voting in this motion would prevent many students from becoming involved in representation, and there is no way of knowing that it would not exclude the best people for the position. The representative, by necessity, would be younger and less experienced. Finally, student opinion, as history tells us, can change with terrifying speed. Students certainly suffer at the hands of the Board, but members are relatively forgiving, and if the student representatives approach their work with diligence, they are ultimately treated with some measure of gravity and respect.

**Dube**: The very strength of students, and by extension student representatives, lies in their ingenuity, and keeping representatives in a "rookie year" is essential to this ingenuity. Besides which representatives should be accountable to students on an annual basis, not a biannual one.

**Sharma** spoke in conclusion. An educated representative who understands the workings of the Board would be a better vehicle for student interests. The sanctity of student opportunity pales when compared to the efficacy of quality representation: this would serve students far better.

**Pandya/Wudarck** moved that the two-year term be subject to annual renewal.

**Failed**



12/15/1 **Failed**

2003-21/10e

**SHARMA/WILDCAT MOVED THAT** Students' Council amend the bylaws to (first reading/notice of motion);  
 a) change the term of office for councilors from one year to two years;  
 b) holding elections for half of seats (rounding up) available per faculty each year;  
 c) Faculties with one seat would remain elected annually.

**Sharma** provided the same introduction as that provided for Item 2003-21-10d, with the proviso of his opinion that the motion addressed the concern of student opportunity.

**Weppler/Smith** moved that the motion be collapsed.  
**Consensus**

**Tam** spoke against the motion, stating that resignations and attrition on Students' Council are enough of a problem as matters currently stand.

**Weppler/Pandya** moved to call the question.  
**Carried**

5/26 **Failed**

2003-21/10f

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, de-legislate the following (first reading/notice of motion):  
 (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 Association;  
 (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.

**Brechtel** introduced the motion. The bylaws in question are either a) not important enough to merit a bylaw; b) redundant, as the Students' Union has no control over said matters; c) redundant, as the bylaws do not serve the matters in question in any case; or d) dealing with matters for which the money is directed in any case, and thus the bylaw has no true control over them.

**Brechtel/Mah** moved that the motion be collapsed.  
**Consensus**

**Cook:** The Students' Union has certain requirements of *The Gateway*: what happens to these requirements if their bylaw is delegated?

**Smith:** The bylaw has no bearing on these requirements; it has virtually no content.

For Council's edification, **Samuel** read *The Gateway's* bylaw aloud. Following this, Council was briefly instructed on the implications and results of delegation.

**Kotovych:** Will this affect the quality of transition manuals in the future?

**Smith:** The bylaws had no bearing on these to begin with.

**Wepler** spoke in favor of the motion, stating that operating policies would be more flexible.

**Dube** also spoke in favor.

**Abboud** opposed the motion, leveling that bylaws lend continuity and clarity to the subjects they cover.

**Botten:** The bylaws have very little net effect on the powers of the Students' Union.

**Botten/Samuel** moved that the construction of operating policies be added to the body of the motion, to be created no later than April 30, 2004.

**Carried**

25/1/2 **Carried**

2003-21/10g

**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/notice of motion):

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.

**Bazin/Botten** moved that the motion be collapsed.  
**Consensus**

**Consensus**

2003-21/10h

**WUDARCK/PANDYA MOVED THAT** the Residents' Hall Association seat and the University Athletics Board be removed from Students' Council (first reading/notice of motion).

**Wudarck** introduced the motion, explaining that the Committee for Council Review and Progress (hereafter CRAP) concluded that these positions were tantamount to arbitrary double representation for certain groups within the student body.

**Pandya/Wudarck moved that the motion be collapsed.  
Carried**

**Rice/Smith** moved that this motion be postponed until the next meeting of Students' Council.

**Consensus**

2003-21/10i

**BOTTEN/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve changes to Students' Union legislation that adhere to the following principle (first reading/notice of motion);

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".

**Botten** introduced the motion by stating first that the traditional arguments against it are insubstantive, viz that individuals who are not students could be eligible to run in the General Election for positions on the Executive Committee: this logic is proven faulty by the stipulations found in Bylaw 2100. Only students who convocate during their terms on the Executive Committee will be affected by this motion.

**Weppler/Bazin** moved that the motion be collapsed.  
**Consensus**

**Kehoe** stated that this motion contravenes the policy of the General Faculties' Council. The Chair in turn reminded Council that it is not governed by the General Faculties' Council or its policy.

**Brechtel** spoke against the motion, expressing his view that it would be imprudent to allow members of the Executive Committee not to be students, disagreeing also that only graduating students would be affected.

**McLaughlin:** How would such a motion affect the academic careers of individual members of the Executive Committee?

**Weppler** spoke in favor of the motion, claiming that the existing requirement burdens members of the Executive Committee to attempt to carry a class and the superhuman hours and responsibilities demanded by their positions. The provision suggested by this motion could perhaps even widen the field of those willing to run in the election.

Feeling pithy, **Smith** offered this maxim of his own: *You can lead a course to water, but you can't make it a drink.* By the same token, he continued soberly, the credit requirement currently attendant on these positions very rarely benefits anyone involved: often the member in question does poorly in the class, thereby making his or her assumption of the position a serious academic liability.

**Wallace:** If the Executive Committee consistently does poorly in the one course required of them, perhaps effort should be spent re-examining what their positions require of them, rather than eliminating the credit requirement.

11/12/1 **Failed**

At this point Council moved to adjourn the meeting.

**Consensus**

2003-21/14

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Wallace** reminded Council of the Cross-Canada Day of Action against rising tuition fees. The event needs volunteers, and will offer such delicacies as Steve Smith playing Ralph Klein, Freeze for the Fees, and a march.

**Dube:** The Faculte Beach Party is Friday, January 30. Population: 80% women.