

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL LATE ADDITIONS

---

Tuesday September 30th  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

## LATE ADDITIONS (SC 2010-18)

2010-18/1

### SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

The nomination package deadlines for the Executive and Board of Governor Elections will be February 11, 2011 with the elections occurring on March 9th and 10th. The Myer Horowitz forum will occur on March 7th and campaigning will commence on February 28th. The nomination package deadlines for the Councillor and GFC elections will be March 14, 2011 with Council and GFC elections occurring on March 24th and 25th.

2010-18/2

### PRESENTATIONS

2010-18/2b

Fall Reading Week Presentation - Presented by President Dehod, sponsored by President Dehod.

2010-18/2c

Canadian Alliance of Student Associations- Presented by National Director Zach Dayler and Jessica Séguin. Sponsored by Aden Murphy, VP External.

As part of CASA's prairie campus tour, National Director Zach Dayler and Member Relations Officer Jessica Séguin will present on CASA's advocacy work this year, its communications, and its internal governance.

2010-18/3

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

2010-18/4

### BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

2010-18/5

### QUESTION PERIOD

2010-18/6

### BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2010-18/6b

**HANSRA/KAAI MOVE THAT** Students' Council approve Bill #24 in second reading based on the following principles:

- 1) that the rank order of candidates on ballots shall be rotated at random for each ballot.
- 2) that the option to vote None of the Above shall always be listed after the complete list of candidates on the ballot.

Please see document LA 10-18.01

**2010-18/7****GENERAL ORDERS****2010-18/7e**

**DEHOD/TIGHE MOVE THAT** Students' Council appoint two members of Students' Council to the Office of Sustainability's Sustainability Advisory Committee.

**2010-18/8****INFORMATION ITEMS****2010-18/8e**

Bylaw Committee- Report

Please see document LA 10-18.02

**2010-18/8f**

Zach Fentiman, VP Operations and Finance- Report

Please see document LA 10-18.03

**2010-18/8g**

ERC- Final Report

Please see document LA 10-18.04

**2010-18/8h**

James Eastham, VP Academic- Report

Please see document LA 10-18.05

**2010-18/8i**

Nick Dehod, President- Report

Please see document LA 10-18.06

## 22. Candidate and Plebiscite/Referendum Registration Meeting

- (1) The C.R.O. shall hold a meeting for all candidates, referenda and plebiscite sides following the nomination deadline but prior to the commencement of the campaign.
- (2) All candidates and campaign managers shall either attend the candidates meeting in its entirety or designate, in writing, an agent who will do so.
- (3) Where a candidate or campaign manager contravenes Section 22(2), that candidate or campaign manager shall be disqualified.
- (4) The C.R.O. may, at his/her discretion, grant exemptions to Section 22(3) to candidates, but shall do so only where
  - a. the candidate requesting the exemption does so in writing at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the commencement of the candidates meeting; or
  - b. the candidate informs and provides satisfactory evidence to the C.R.O. of an emergency for which no notice could be given.

## 23. Content of the Candidate and Registration Meeting

At the candidate and registration meeting, the C.R.O. shall, at minimum

- a. review all relevant bylaws, rules, and regulations, including this bylaw, and respond to questions about same;
- b. announce the time and date of any forums scheduled;  
~~conduct a random draw to determine the order of appearance of candidates' names on the ballot;~~
- c. determine and announce which candidates are joke candidates as set out in Section 2 (n);
- d. where two (2) or more candidates have asked to appear on the ballot under names that are either identical or so similar as to be effectively indistinguishable, determine and announce under what names each of the two (2) or more candidates shall appear on the ballot;
- e. announce any methods that will be regularly used to communicate with candidates;
- f. take attendance for the purpose of verifying compliance with Section 21;
- g. For the Executive Committee and Board of Governors and Plebiscite/Referendum campaign
  - i. announce the times, dates, and locations of daily meetings,
  - ii. create a register listing the members registered for each plebiscite and referendum side as well as the campaign manager for each.

## 24. Commencement of Campaign Activities

The C.R.O. shall determine and announce the time and date of the commencement of campaign activities, to occur no fewer than seven (7) days before the date of any vote prior to the end of November each year.

## 25. Myer Horowitz Forum

**58. Right to Vote**

- (1) Each member shall be entitled to cast one (1) ballot, except the C.R.O. who shall be entitled to cast a ballot only under the circumstances set out in Sections 63(9) and 65(2).
- (2) Where a member is found to have a cast more than one (1) ballot, only one ballot shall be counted.
- (3) All votes cast shall be by secret ballot.

**59. Voting Days**

- (1) Voting shall be conducted at times determined and advertised by the C.R.O.
- (2) No voting, other than a maximum of one (1) advance poll, shall be conducted prior to the D.I.E. Board ruling on all appeals covered by Section 73.

**60. Voting**

- (1) The C.R.O. shall conduct balloting by any means that provide precise, accurate results, and may use multiple methods in any combination.
- (2) At each polling station, there shall be a notice to voters that candidates are elected individually to each position, which shall also explain the balloting procedures.
- (3) On each ballot, there shall be an explanation of the balloting procedures, which shall include, at minimum, the following
  - a. that “None of the Above” shall be considered a candidate;
  - b. that voters shall rank each candidate according to their preferences;
  - c. that a portion of the ballot shall be considered spoiled where any of the conditions set out in Section 61(4) are met; and
  - d. that voters shall be permitted to rank as many as all or as few as zero of the candidates for each position.

**61. Limitations During Voting**

- (1) During voting, candidates, campaign managers, members of sides and volunteers shall not encourage members to vote or engage in any campaign activities.
- (2) During voting, candidates, campaign managers, and registered members of sides shall not be within twenty (20) feet of any polling station except to vote themselves.

**62. Ballots**

- (1) For each ballot the rank order of candidates, except for “None of the Above”, shall be rotated randomly.
- (2) After listing the candidates names on the ballot, the candidate “None of the Above” will be listed. Ballots shall list each candidate running for each position, followed by, in each position, the voting selection “None of the Above.”

- (3) For the purposes of Section 60(3) (b) "None of the Above" Shall be considered a candidate.
- (4) Where a referenda or plebiscite question(s) is/are on the ballot, the ballot shall list "yes" followed by "no" for each referendum or plebiscite question.
- (5) Where a voter's intention is clear, that voter's ballot shall be counted.

**63. Balloting and Counting— Executive, Board of Governors and Councillor Elections**

- (1) Balloting shall be conducted by preferential balloting, in which each voter shall rank his/her choices for each position using natural numbers with one (1) representing the first choice, and increasing numbers representing less desirable choices.
- (2) A candidate shall require a majority of voters to indicate him/her as their first choice in order to be elected.
- (3) Voters shall be entitled to mark as few as zero candidates for any given position or as many as all of them.
- (4) A section of a voter's ballot shall be considered spoiled where
  - a. that voter has indicated the same number for more than one (1) candidate;
  - b. that voter has not included the number one (1) next to any candidate;
  - c. that voter has indicated more than one (1) number next to the same candidate;
  - or
  - d. that voter has used non-consecutive numbers.
- (5) In the event that no candidate receives a majority of first place votes in a given race, the candidate with the fewest first place votes shall be eliminated.
- (6) Any voter who has indicated an eliminated candidate with a number shall have the candidate marked with the next highest number following the number by which the eliminated candidate has been indicated take the place of the eliminated candidate, and so on, in such a way that all candidates indicated by that voter as less desirable than the eliminated candidate are registered as being one (1) step more desirable than originally indicated.
- (7) Where a ballot is left with no first place vote for a given race, the section of that ballot in question shall be considered spoiled.
- (8) Where all remaining candidates have an equal number of first place votes, or where the remaining candidate with the fewest first place votes is tied with another remaining candidate, the candidate that had the fewest first place votes on the first count in which a differential existed shall be eliminated.
- (9) Where all remaining candidates have an equal number of first places votes, or where the remaining candidate with the fewest first place votes is tied with another remaining

# (BY)LAW & ORDER

*“du dunn”*

---

Starring: Ngina wa KAAI (proxying for Jenn PARSONAGE), Natalie COX, Farid ISKANDAR, Sangram HANSRA, and Petros KUSMU as Chair.

MIA: James EASTHAM and Malori STAN

Featured Guests: Kim FERGUSON

This week on Bylaw:

- Bylaw's November 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting received a presentation from Councillor PARSONAGE about how other universities deal with Impeachment. She made an extremely impressive presentation and report.
  - In conclusion, most Universities either have a very specific criteria for impeaching councillors and executives, whereas others would have a very specific procedure of impeachment. The none universities researched had a perfect balance between 'critiria' and 'procedure'.
- Additionally, we focused a lot of our time working with Bylaw 2000 and Bill #24.

Next week on Bylaw:

- We'll finish up some work to send over to Council for 2<sup>nd</sup> reading.
- We'll discuss about forming Discussion Meetings over the Winter Break to further talk about the Impeachment Process Bylaws and related Bylaws (i.e. replenishment, etc...)
- Our next meeting is on December 2 (upcoming Thursday!) @ 5PM in SUB 6-06.
  - FYI: The best attendees get free Orange Juice Boxes.

---

*"In the Students' Union, the students are represented by two separate yet equally important groups: the Executives, who get remittances and free food, and the Students' Councillors, who only get the free food (and some scholarship money, too—but that's barely anything C'mon.). These are their bylaws."*

November 29, 2010

To: Students' Council

Re: Report to Council

---

Given the weekly council meetings, and the events coming up, this report will inevitably be rather brief. As always if you have any questions about what I've been up to, feel free to ask at any time.

**PAW Centre Planning Committee**

The PAW Steering Committee will be meeting Tuesday, November 30, 2010 @ 9:00am.

**Student Group Granting**

Another round of student group granting occurred from 3:00 – 5:00pm on Monday, November 29, 2010.

**Grant Allocation Committee Meeting**

The Grant Allocation Committee will be meeting Thursday, December 2, 2010 @ 5:00pm in the Lower Level Meeting Room. We will likely finalize our review of GAC standing orders at this meeting.

**Budget and Finance Committee Meeting**

The Budget & Finance Committee will be meeting Tuesday, December 7, 2010 @ 5:00pm in 6-06 SUB. We will complete our departmental review and be ready for budget principles discussion in January!

**Access Fund 2<sup>nd</sup> Fall Selection Committee**

The Access Fund Selection Committee will be taking up the majority of my time December 2 & 3. Both days have a four hour time blocked off for this process to occur.

Yours,  
Zach

# FINAL REPORT TO STUDENTS' COUNCIL

NOVEMBER 2010



## Introduction

The Elections Review Committee, formed by Students' Council in 2009/2010, is composed of 5 members of Students' Council, with the C.R.O. holding an ex-officio, non-voting position.

As per Bylaw 100 §18(6), the Elections Review Committee:

- (a) shall review the Bylaw Respecting the Elections, Plebiscites and Referenda of the Students' Union;
- (b) shall solicit feedback from key stakeholders on the Bylaw referenced in (a) and the elections process it prescribes;
- (c) shall submit a report to Students' Council detailing their findings and recommendations by the last meeting in November.

Through consultation with a wide range of stakeholders, from current members of Students' Council to Alumni of the University, and taking into consideration the work done by the two previous committees, FARCE and the Bylaw 2000 Review Committee, the Elections Review Committee has assembled this report of recommendations for Students' Council.

This report consists of three key recommendations, followed by a series of further recommendations to Students' Council. The key recommendations are outlined in the following manner: the status quo is described, the process by which the committee determined their recommendations is delineated, the committee's recommendation is presented along with arguments for and against the recommendation, and an alternate recommendation is presented along with arguments for and against the recommendation to be considered if Students' Council is not favorable to the initial recommendation. Throughout this document, the term "the committee" refers to the Elections Review Committee and the term "C.R.O." refers to the Chief Returning Officer of the Students' Union. The recommendations of this report are in no way binding, but rather are submitted to Students' Council for further consideration.

Any feedback may be directed to Thomas L'Abbe, chair of the committee, at [tlabbe@ualberta.ca](mailto:tlabbe@ualberta.ca), or Jaskaran Singh, the Chief Returning Officer, at [cro@su.ualberta.ca](mailto:cro@su.ualberta.ca).

Regards,

The Elections Review Committee

# Recommendations

## SINGLE TRANSFERABLE VOTE

### **Status Quo**

Our current ballot counting system, established following the recommendations of the Committee for the Finding And Realization of Changes to Elections (FARCE) in 2002, uses a form of non-proportional instant runoff voting. Instant runoff voting is a form of preferential balloting designed and generally used to elect one candidate. This form of voting was adopted by Students' Council to replace a First Past the Post system for executives and appointment of Councillors by Faculty Associations.

### **Process**

In order to determine best practice for ballot counting procedure, the committee reviewed past minutes and reports to council of both the Bylaw 2000 Review Committee (2009) and FARCE. Bylaw 2000 Review Committee did not address balloting systems and FARCE did not consider Single Transferable Vote. FARCE discussed preferential balloting system for the Executive and Board of Governors elections exclusively. The committee also reviewed academic materials on elections theory. In this exploration, the committee reviewed elections processes for countries, such as Ireland and Australia, and those proposed in the British Columbia Single Transferable Referendum of 2009. The committee also reviewed rulings of the Discipline, Interpretation, and Enforcement (DIE) Board regarding ballot counting and tie-breaking. Finally, the committee consulted with current and past members of council.

### **Recommendation**

The committee recommends that the Students' Union adopt the following form of Single Transferable Vote, hereafter UASU-STV, which is based off of the British Columbia Single Transferable Vote Referendum. This change should be in place for the 2012 General Elections.

The committee also recommends that the C.R.O. prepare documentation that explains UASU-STV to candidates and voters, to be approved by the committee.

Description of UASU-STV:

Balloting shall be conducted by preferential balloting, in which each voter shall rank his/her choices for each position using natural numbers with one (1) representing the first choice, and increasing numbers representing less desirable choices.

Voters shall be entitled to mark as few as zero candidates for any given position or as many as all of them.

Once the total number of valid ballots is established for each race, the minimum number of votes ( $v_m$ ) required for a candidate to be elected is calculated. This minimum number of votes shall be determined by the sum of one plus the quotient of the total number valid ballots ( $b$ ) cast divided by the sum of the number of seats ( $s$ ) being contested plus one, with remainders being ignored.

$$v_m = 1 + [b/(s + 1)]$$

All ballots shall be counted and each ballot is allocated as a vote to the candidate who is indicated to be the voter's first preference.

If a candidate on the first count has a number of first preference votes exactly equal to the minimum number of votes needed to be elected, that candidate is declared elected.

If a candidate on the first count gains more than the minimum number of votes needed to be elected, the candidate is declared elected, and the number of votes in excess of the number needed to be elected is recorded as a surplus. All of the elected candidate's ballots are then re-examined and assigned to candidates not yet elected according to the second preferences marked on the ballot at a fractional transfer value. The transfer value ( $T$ ) shall be determined by the quotient of the surplus votes cast for the elected candidate ( $v_s$ ) divided by the total number of votes received by the elected candidate ( $v_r$ ).

$$T = v_s/v_r$$

If two or more candidates on the first count gain more than the minimum number of votes needed to be elected, all of those candidates shall be declared elected. The ballots of the candidate with the largest number of first preference votes will be re-examined first and assigned at a transfer value to candidates not yet elected according to the second preferences marked on the ballots, or the next available preference if the second preference candidate has already been elected. The ballots of the other candidate(s) will then be re-examined and their surpluses distributed in order according to the number of first preference votes each candidate received.

If a candidate reaches more than the minimum number of votes needed to be elected as the consequence of a transfer of votes from an elected candidate, the number of votes in excess of the number of votes needed to be elected will be transferred to other candidates. This transfer will be to the next available preference shown on all of this candidate's ballots. The transfer value for the candidate's first preference ballots is the quotient of the surplus votes cast for the elected candidate divided by the total number of votes received by the elected candidate, and the transfer value for each ballot previously received from one or more elected candidates ( $T_2$ ) is the quotient of the product of the surplus votes cast for the elected candidate ( $v_s$ ) multiplied by the transfer value of the ballots ( $T_1$ ) received by the previously elected candidate, all divided by the total number of votes received by the candidate ( $v_r$ ).

$$T_2 = (v_s)(T_1) / (v_r)$$

In the event that no candidate has more than the minimum number of votes required to be elected, the candidate with the smallest number of votes is eliminated. All ballots cast for that candidate are transferred to candidates who have not been elected or eliminated according to the next available preference shown on the eliminated candidate's ballots. The eliminated candidate's first preference ballots are transferred to the next available preference at full value, while ballots received from previously-elected or eliminated candidates are transferred at the transfer value at which the ballots were received.

The ballot-counting process shall continue until such a point as all but one of the candidates to be elected have been elected, and only two candidate remain in the count. At this point, the candidate with the most votes is declared elected.

If, during the transfer of preferences, a ballot does not indicate an available preference, the ballot is put aside as exhausted. This can occur because:

- (i) the voter only indicated one, or a small number of preferences; or
- (ii) all the preferred candidates have already been elected or eliminated.

Where two or more candidates have the same number of first preference votes at the end of the first count, and this number is more than the minimum number of votes necessary to be elected, the candidate whose surplus votes are re-distributed first will be decided in the following manner:

If the C.R.O. is a Students' Union member eligible to vote in that race and has ranked one of the tied candidates as the first preference on the C.R.O.'s ballot, then that candidate's surplus votes shall be redistributed first.

If the C.R.O is ineligible to vote in the race, or has not ranked one of the tied candidates as the first preference, then the candidate whose surplus votes are re-distributed first shall be determined by a random or quasi-random method selected by the C.R.O.

Where no candidate has a number of first preference votes equal to or greater than the number of votes necessary for election at the end of the first count, and two or more candidates have the same number of first preference votes, this number being the smallest number of first preference votes gained by any candidate, then the candidate who is eliminated first shall be decided in the following manner:

If the C.R.O. is a Students' Union member eligible to vote in that race and has ranked one of the tied candidates as the first preference on the C.R.O.'s ballot, then the candidate who was not indicated as the first preference of the C.R.O shall be eliminated.

If the C.R.O is ineligible to vote in the race, has not ranked one of the tied candidates as the first preference, or in the event that more than one candidate remains tied following the provision below, then the candidate who is eliminated first shall be determined by a random or quasi-random method selected by the C.R.O.

If, at any stage of the count other than the first count, two candidates have the same number of votes, the candidate who is declared elected first, or who is not excluded will be:

(i) the candidate with the larger number of votes in the first count in which a differential existed between the number of votes received by each candidate,

(ii) the candidate whose name is ranked highest on a ballot cast by the C.R.O, if the C.R.O is a Students' Union member eligible to vote in that race, and no differential in the number of votes has existed between the candidates at any preceding count, or

(iii) the candidate whose name is selected by a random or quasi-random method selected by the C.R.O, if the C.R.O is ineligible to vote in the race and no differential in the number of votes has existed between the candidates at any preceding count.

The C.R.O. shall fill out a paper ballot at the commencement of voting, as if their capacity as C.R.O. did not restrict their voting privileges. The C.R.O. shall put his/her ballot in a sealed and signed envelope and give to the Deputy Returning Officers before any results from the election are available to the C.R.O. The envelope shall be opened if and only if the C.R.O.'s vote is needed in order to break a tie. At this point, a D.R.O. shall open the envelope and oversee the C.R.O. implement the tie breaking mechanism as outline above. If this procedure is not followed, the C.R.O.'s ballot will be considered spoiled.

### **For**

Academic consensus indicates that STV is a mathematically superior methodology for ballot counting that ensures each person's vote counts for the same weight for elections in which there are multiple seats per position. Our current system gives stronger weight to the non-first place preferences of those voters which happen to indicate a winning candidate as their preference. This creates scenarios in which seats can be won by low-ranked preferences over high-ranked preferences. Our current voting system is not designed for electing multiple seats for a position; whereas, UASU-STV is. In addition, our current voting system gives advantage to organized voters, in particular for slates. This is due to the fact that votes get transferred to lower-ranked preferences at full value once a higher-ranked preference has been elected.

In regards the recommendation that this should come into effect in time for the 2012 General Election, this will allow for proper implementation of the recommended STV mechanism. This timeline will allow for the C.R.O. to communicate with WhiteMatter on a timeline that ensures that UASU-STV will be accurately implemented, will allow for the cost of the implementation to be accounted for in the budget, and gives candidates and voters time to comprehend the implications of UASU-STV. The recommendation that the C.R.O. create a document to assist candidates and voters is imperative as UASU-STV is more complicated than other systems.

### **Against**

UASU-STV is challenging to understand as the details of the transfer values and other intricacies are quite complex.

As such, voters require more information and time to comprehend the implications of their vote, if they chose to vote strategically. In addition, by postponing the implementation of this system, the 2011 General Election will still be subject the current rules.

### **Alternate Recommendation**

The committee recommends that Students' Council clarify Bylaw 2000 §63 as per DIE Board's ruling (Ross v. C.R.O.). This entails a clarification of the terms "position" and "seat" and a clarification of the tie breaking rule. "Position" should refer to the job to which one is being elected, for example, "Science Councillor" and "seat" should refer to the individual spot that each councillor takes. In regards to tie breaking, "the first count in which a differential exists" refers to the first count in the race for a position, not the race for a seat. Although DIE board indicated that this is currently the case, this should be clarified in Bylaw 2000.

### **For**

This recommendation is the direct result of DIE board's recommendations. The committee would like to ensure that if Students' Council chooses not to implement UASU-STV, the current wording of Bylaw 2000 §63 is revised so that there is a clear directive in regards to ballot counting.

### **Against**

The committee could not come up with reasonable explanations not to clarify this section of Bylaw 2000.

## **STUDENT SENATORS**

### **Status Quo**

Currently, there are four positions on the University Senate granted to students by the Post-Secondary Learning Act. The Act grants the authority to fill these spots to Student's Council, which, in term, delegates the ability to recommend students for the positions to the Council Administration Committee. The Council Administrative Committee, in conjunction with the Vice President (External), provides, from pool of applicants, the names of three (3) students which are recommended for the positions. (The fourth position is granted to the Vice President (External)). Traditionally, the Vice President (External) has formed a committee to help him/her determine which applicants' names to recommend.

### **Process**

Through discussions with current and previous members of the University Senate, including the current and past Vice Presidents (External), as well as consulting past Senate employees to gain further understanding of how Senate membership works, the committee has looked into whether or not the current system is the most suitable. Additionally, the interest that Students' Council expressed in the process, this year, indicated to the committee that it was an issue worth investigating.

### **Recommendation**

The committee recommend that the Vice President (External) have an ex-officio Students' Council appointment to the University Senate. The other three (3) Students' Council appointed Senators shall be selected in the following manner: The positions shall be advertised for in a manner analogous to the DIE Board Tribune positions. A Senate Selection Committee will then be struck to choose, from these applicants, which three (3) to recommend to Students' Council for nomination to the University Senate. The composition of the Senate Selection Committee will be the current Vice President (External) as chair (only voting only in the event of a tie), the four (4) student Senators from the previous year (if available and willing; barring any Senators seeking reappointment), and two (2) Students' Councilors as selected by Students' Council. If no student Senators from the previous year can sit on the Senate Selection Committee, the positions on the Senate Selection Committee will be open to student Senators from earlier years. The Senate Selection Committee shall recommend their three (3) preferred candidates and Students' Council shall be responsible for ratification of the student Senators.

### **For**

As discussed, the current procedure is very unclear and lies chiefly in the hands of the Vice President (External). This recommendation delineates a clear and fair process by which student Senators are selected. With an established system in which recommendations come from a committee of qualified individuals, concerns (legitimate and otherwise) about lack of transparency and diligence are lessened. The composition of the committee is composed of people who have a good understanding of how the University Senate functions and ensures that the committee has ties to Students' Council. As the number of eligible past student Senators may vary, and as such, may the composition of the Senate Selection Committee consist of an even number of people, the sitting Vice President (External) shall vote only in the event of a tie. This recommendation does not change the status quo regarding the Vice President (External)'s seat on the University Senate as there is great value in having this seat be ex-officio.

### **Against**

This recommendation does not provide student Senators with a democratic mandate from students to represent them.

### **Alternate Recommendation**

To implement a system whereby the student Senator positions (excluding the position given to the Vice President (External) which shall be ex-officio) be filled through an election process analogous to the elections for General Faculties Council positions.

### **For**

The three highest governing bodies of the University, are, technically, the Board of Governors, General Faculties Council, and the University Senate. Student positions are mandated, by the PSLA, on all three of these bodies. On



each body, there are a number of positions delegated to Students' Union executives, and then a remainder of positions open for students-at-large. It is the assigning of students to these positions, however, that varies. The Board of Governors Representative is elected through a process analogous to the of Students' Union executives. The General Faculties positions are filled through an elections process analogous to, and concurrent with, Students' Council elections. The Senate positions, however, are determined by the Vice President (External) and the Council Administrative Committee and approved by Students' Council. Though consultation with a committee formed for the purpose of selecting student Senators occurs, it is, essentially, the Vice President (External) who makes the decision. Having the student positions elected would be in line with the process for the other similar bodies.

### **Against**

Though technically one of the highest governing bodies of the University, the University Senate, presently, has a minimal authority delegated to it through the PSLA, with the exception of the ability to confer honorary degrees. As such, there is little, if any, amount of representation of students required by the student members of the Senate. Appointing candidates, as is the procedure with numerous committees and task forces, University-wide, would be most appropriate. By running unnecessary elections, the Students' Union thins the importance in and interests of its current elections. In addition, the Students' Union would have to spend resources, such as money and the C.R.O.'s time on the elections.

## **FUTURE OF THE ELECTIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE**

### **Status Quo**

As of 2009/2010, a standing committee of Students' Council has been struck with the mandate to:

- (a) review the Bylaw Respecting the Elections, Plebiscites and Referenda of the Students' Union;
- (b) solicit feedback from key stakeholders on the Bylaw referenced in (a) and the elections process it prescribes; and
- (c) submit a report to Students' Council detailing their findings and recommendations by the last meeting in November.

### **Process**

The committee consistently discussed the merits and weaknesses of the current mandate of the committee.

**Recommendation**

The committee recommends that the Elections Review Committee become a committee to which the Council Administrative Committee, Bylaw Committee, and Students' Council can delegate elections related work to. In addition, during elections, the committee should provide informal, impartial, and universal support and advice to candidates.

**For**

Currently, there is some confusion surrounding the responsibility of editing Bylaw 2000. This recommendation would clarify this confusion. Although elections procedure and Bylaw 2000 merit thorough reviews, this should be done less frequently than annually as bylaws and elections procedures should remain relatively stable. The Bylaw Committee is charged with consistently reviewing all other bylaws and as such, should review Bylaw 2000 as well. This allows for all Students' Union bylaws to be complimentary and comprehensive. By having a committee to which the Council Administrative Committee and the Bylaw Committee can delegate work to, the workloads of said committees become stabilized. The Bylaw Committee and the Council Administrative Committee often become overtaken with elections related work in the lead-up to elections. This recommendation ensures the functioning of other committees remains uncompromised during elections season.

**Against**

With this recommendation, Students' Council will not be receiving annual reports on Bylaw 2000.

**Alternate Recommendation**

The committee recommends that the Elections Review Committee be dissolved.

**For**

The tangible result of the committee is a report to Students' Council on Bylaw 2000. This requirement becomes increasingly redundant every year. It is unclear what the report should entail and it is unclear how the solicitation of stakeholder plays into the report. However, investing resources into an annual report on one bylaw is a poor allocation of resources.

**Against**

Without the committee, there is a lack of designated Students' Council support for elections. As Bylaw 2000 still needs to be evaluated and re-worked, dissolving may lead to Bylaw 2000 remaining unclear. In addition, the committee serves as an avenue of communication between the C.R.O. and Students' Council. This will be lost upon the dissolution of the committee.

## Further recommendations

### **In addition, the committee recommends:**

- (i) that the terms election, by-election, General Election, and special election are defined in Bylaw 2000 and consistently applied. Although DIE board ruled (Cox vs. C.R.O.) that the definitions are clear, the committee sees no harm in further clarifying the definitions;
- (ii) that the Vice President (Operations and Finance) investigate the cost and appropriate mechanisms of providing the C.R.O. with additional administrative and transitional support in time for the next open posting of the C.R.O. position;
- (iii) that the Council Administrative Committee investigate - and, if need be, determine – if officers of Students’ Council (specifically the C.R.O.), as employees of the Students’ Union, are bound by Operating Policy and that the Executive Committee delineate the will of Students’ Council accordingly;
- (iv) that the Executive Committee evaluate the operating policy in reference to Bylaw 2000 §39(3);
  - (a) Regulations regarding the endorsement of electoral candidates by Students’ Union employees not referenced in §39(2) shall be subject to the Students’ Union operating policy.
- (v) that, as per results of Bylaw 2000 Committee’s elections survey, campaigning be allowed on election days;
- (vi) that the Bylaw Committee correct the erroneous numbering in Bylaw 2000, especially in the circumstances where sections of Bylaw 2000 are incorrectly referencing other sections of Bylaw 2000 or sections of Bylaw 2000 that do not exist; and
- (vii) that, as is standard procedure for votes of Students’ Council, for the “yes” side of a referendum to be declared victorious, the “yes” side must receive more than fifty percent of the votes. In the event of the “yes” side and the “no” side receiving an equal number of votes, the “no” side shall be declared victorious. This would replace the currently outlined method, which has the C.R.O. cast a vote before the election occurs, place it in a sealed envelope, and, in the event of a tie, open the envelope and count the vote.

Good Evening Council. Here is an update of what has happened over the past week, as well as my plans for December.

### **Undergraduate Research:**

The Vice President External, University Policy and Information Officer and myself traveled to Calgary last Wednesday to see the U of C Students' Union's undergraduate research symposium. It was an impressive two days, and we have returned with a great number of ideas that can help guide a vision for undergraduate research here at the U of A.

Over the next month, I plan to write a document that will help to outline the path that undergraduate research at the U of A could take, and will submit it to the senior administration in January.

### **COFA:**

COFA met last Thursday, we talked about Student Group event approvals, and strategies to combat student apathy.

Over the Christmas break I will be putting the finishing touches on the bylaw 8000 changes and will be bringing them to council in the new year.

I will be meeting with the NSSA today to discuss new conditions of probation. It is my hope that we can sign them shortly and have the NSSA off probation near the end of next semester.

### **GFC:**

At GFC yesterday, we received updates on President Samerasekera's trip to India, Google mail (I've attached the update) and Access Copyright. GFC passed the residence community standards and the new human ethics research policy. GFC also discussed the U of A's new visual identity. It is worth noting that the University will be planning on regulating the use of the U of A logo more closely than it has before, so this may impact some student groups.

November 30th, 2010

To: Students' Council

Re: Report to Students' Council

---

Greetings Council,

Just a quick reminder again that we will be presenting our mid-term reports at the first council meeting back in January. Please fire me an email if anything pressing happens during the break.

### **Tuition & Rent**

This has already been raised in previous Council meetings but as a reminder, I will be voting against both the tuition and rent increases this year. My position is that the base level is too high and access to the University of Alberta remains a concern, especially given the current high levels of student unemployment and the fact that the province cut \$56 million worth of grants in the last provincial budget.

Again, as a follow-up to some of the discussions I have had with councilors, there will be no campaigns this year around the tuition or rent votes at the Board of Governors for several reasons. In the last three years, I have been a part of the Restricted Access and the March to the Legislature campaigns and while these campaigns are important, making them annual events makes exercises of this nature lose some of their impact when you are facing incredibly large increases (like the ones we saw last year). Additionally, given the amount of initiatives that our Executive team has already committed to completing this year that are also important in providing support to students, there simply not enough staff time to launch a large campaign at this time.

Additionally, with the University no longer getting base operating increases from the province and with that unlikely to change in the near future, you will likely see more advocacy directed at Albertans and the province who can make decisions that have bearing on funding. A provincial election is likely going to take place in the next year and with our provincial partners in the Council of Alberta University Students (CAUS), we are already beginning conversations about what CAUS should be doing in the next twelve months to encourage students to vote as well as what can be done to ensure that Post Secondary Education is a top three issue for Albertans in the next elections.

That said, I am not ruling out the chance that there will be a campaign this year related to PSE or any other unforeseeable circumstance that arises. I am saying that all things considered I believe that there may be a more opportune time to conduct a campaign in the second semester.

### **Meal Plan**

Vice President Tighe and I are working together on addressing concerns related to the meal plan. Obviously the major concerns are about getting rid of the lowest level of the food plan when 55% of

Lister Student currently buys into the plan. At Council we should be able to give an update on some of our efforts thus far.

### **Strategic Planning Committee**

On Saturday the Strategic Planning Committee met and completed our draft of a new Mission, Vision and Values for the Students' Union. You can expect to see a presentation to Council when we return in the New Year.

Although the process is not complete, I would like to thank the committee members for giving up their weekend time to work on something that I believe that is critical to the long term success of the SU.

### **Sustainability Assessment**

Although the hope was to have the Sustainability Assessment done by the end of this semester, it will also have to wait to be present to Council at the beginning of the next semester. Now that the end of the semester is here and now that people have aside from work academics piling-up, we are going to wait until after exams to finish the document.

### **End of Fall Term**

Again, I want to remind everyone that it is going to be a busy few weeks for the Executive and our staff as we try to prepare and finish some projects before the end of the term as well as juggle our own needs to be successful in our academic classes.

That said, I would encourage you in the coming weeks to contact myself if you have any thoughts, questions, or concerns. Also, if you or anyone you know is interested in running for an executive position, I would also encourage you to set-up a time and meet with me sometime in the coming month.

**If you have any further questions, suggestions, or concerns**, please do not hesitate to follow-up with me, either in person at SUB 2-900, by phone at 780-492-4236, or by email at [president@su.ualberta.ca](mailto:president@su.ualberta.ca).

*To hell with circumstances, I create opportunities – Bruce Lee*