<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present/Absent</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mat Brechtel</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Academic</td>
<td>Janet Lo</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP External</td>
<td>Chris Samuel</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance</td>
<td>Tyler Botten</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Student Life</td>
<td>Jadene Mah</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoG Undergrad Rep.</td>
<td>Roman Kotovych</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta Athletics</td>
<td>Tawana Wardlaw</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Exec Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric/Forest/HomeEc</td>
<td>Paul Reikie</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Alex Abboud</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Chris Bolivar</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Vivek Sharma</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Erin Kelly (Shawn</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hildebrant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>James Knull</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Chris Laver</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Terra Melnyk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Heather Wallace</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Paul Welke (Samantha Power)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Adam Cook</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Steve Smith</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Allison Ekdahl</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>abstained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Christine Wudarck</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Josh Bazin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>James Crossman</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>David Weppler</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Dean Hutchison</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls Association</td>
<td>Kyla Rice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine/Dentistry</td>
<td>Jesse Pewarchuk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine/Dentistry</td>
<td>Tony Kwong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Studies (School of)</td>
<td>Matthew Wildcat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Jean Abbott</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Erica Skopac</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Holly Higgins</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Medicine</td>
<td>Sarah Booth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculté Saint-Jean</td>
<td>Zita Dube</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Matthew Eaton</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Tereza Elyas (Justin Kehoe)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Aisha Khatib</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Shawna Pandya</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Elaine Poon</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Steven Schendel</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Duncan Taylor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>LeeAnn Lim</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Bill Smith</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Gregory Harlow</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Secretary</td>
<td>Shirley Ngo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M I N U T E S (SC 2003-15)**

2003-15/01 **CALL TO ORDER**
Speaker calls meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Councilor Wildcat leads council in the singing of the “U of A Cheer Song”.

**2003-15/03**

**SPEAKER’S BUSINESS**

**2003-15/3a**

Speaker - Quick note on the recent DIE board reading - Jones vs. Harlow and basically, vs. Students’ Council. Well, I lost. The outcome of that lost is that at the moment we do not have the right to move in camera. We might have an opportunity here that we might have to go in camera. We will deal with late additions, item 10b, under Speaker’s Business.

**2003-15/10b**

**BRECHTEL MOVED THAT** Students’ Council reinstate for three Students’ Council meetings the Political Policy Relating to Confidentiality and In Camera Proceedings

**BRECHTEL** – That motion reads on the recommendation of the Internal Review Board. What you see in your late additions package is a detailed confidential in camera. It expired without anybody noticing. So IRB found 2 solutions, that this policy be reinstated for 3 meetings. So this policy is the quick fix. But IRB will change this, change the constitution, so we will always in the future have a set of rules.

**SMITH** – An amendment that I assume will be friendly.

**SAMUEL** – When would the confidentiality policy be enforced if passed?

**Speaker** – As soon as it is passed. I don’t see how we have a choice this evening.

**ABBOUD**- Are amendments in order, as we don’t have quorum at this point.

**Speaker** – Are you calling quorum?

**ABBOUD** – Yes.

**Speaker** – We have 27 voting members. We are good for quorum.

**SMITH** – The substantive portions are the numbered bullets.

**Motion is carried.**

**2003-15/10c**

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students’ Council strike the words “as per the Students’ Union Confidentiality Policy” from Article XVIII section 4 of the Constitution.

**BRECHTEL** – This allows council to create rules to govern its functioning.
Motion is carried.

2003-15/04

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

SMITH/TAYLOR MOVED THAT the agenda be approved.

BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT the late additions, presentation by Janet Lo, question period, reports to legislation, reports of the execs, motions of FAB be added to the agenda.

BRECHTEL – DIE Board is important because council needs to know how DIE Board ruled. Gripe Tables – it is an initiative SU is taking on, revamping it. Christmas is the deadline, so the VP Academic would like to get this off the ground. Question period – info items, legislation should have been in the original package. FAB report needs to be approved for our bars to run. It is pressing enough that we should deal with it.

Speaker – Speaker is satisfied

The addition of the late addition package to the agenda is carried.

COOK – I would like to move to adopt the policy on multi-year tuition decisions.

Speaker – This will be the new 10b, since the other 10a and 10b was under speaker’s business.

COOK – Since this meeting was called mainly dealing with multi-year tuition, the motion isn’t clear whether or not SU is favor or opposed to it.

HUTCHISON/BOTTEN MOVED THAT item 9a be made a special order.

Speaker – carried.
Main motion is carried.

2003-15/9a

BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT upon the recommendation of TUPAC Students’ Council approve the opening of negotiations with the University of Alberta regarding multi-year tuition subject to the Students’ Council approved conditions.

BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT Students’ Council move to informal consideration.
BRECHTEL - We moved out of informal consideration because we ran out of time. I believe this is the most important decision. So whether council does this or not, we should allow full debate.

SMITH – I am against this motion. Likely like last time, if we move into information consideration, that means I get to speak to it again, if we don’t, then I don’t get to speak to it again.

DUBE – People feel at ease with this issue and need to ask questions. We should have that opportunity. This is the biggest issue that we will hit.

HUTCHISON – I’m against this. I don’t see a reason to do this again. We spent the time that is spent on this, let’s move on.

The motion of moving to informal consideration is defeated.

BOTTEN – Do proxies assume the speaking rights of the councilor from last week?

Speaker – They do.

BRECHTEL – Since the presentation, I’ve seen several Gateway articles which are not sure where we stood. The first misunderstanding that needs to be clarified is that we as the SU are not agreeing to maximum tuition and will not be to agreeing to maximum tuition. That is not an option for discussion at this point. The decision of what we are going to do, whether we debate it a year or every two year is what we are deciding, not the actual numbers. We are deciding the change of time period. If the admin says that it is necessary to have maximum tuition, we walk from the table. If they insist on it, there is no discussion. Another misunderstanding, people didn’t see what they get from this. So, 1, if we agree to this, we will receive a proportion of money from the provincial government, the number itself is what is negotiable. 2\(^{nd}\), you may walk the walk, but to get things done in the province, you got to talk the talk. If we get the university to say that “we think tuition is higher than it should be”, it will be a benefit to us. We will have a statement in the immediate future, if money comes in, it will go to that. If we don’t get this, that is fine, we will walk away from the table. But if we get these things, if we agree with university and they agree with us and they put money towards it, we have the house in order. A commitment taking action, we have a true marriage, we go and focus. But before we need to do that, when we focus on the government that it will go back to students. Right now even if we are successful in the province, we are not sure they money will be returned to students.

DUBE – Would it be in order to call people’s attention to a document in the late additions-point 7. There are some comments on it.

HUTCHISON – What does TUPAC stand for?
BOTTEN – It stands for, “Tuition Undertakings Planning Action Committee”.

SHARMA – I wanted to bring up strong concerns regarding issue of negotiations and multi-year. I don’t think we are looking at the time of this - we have an election coming up and I think we are going to get some money. The government has been moving on education. I was told that education was outside the top 10 of government priorities, but that is no longer the case. We know for fact that Albertans are finding post secondary education unaffordable. We know that 2005 is also the centennial, there is something coming forward. The focus on tuition is a key point. The media comes here, wants to know what is going on and looks good on us. If we lose that, we lose our ability to really make this an issue in Alberta. Influencing the voters is key to make this an issue and make more funding to us. Admin does have a role in tuition increases. We know that admin lobbies government on research and expansion and this is how they will give us more money. We don’t have the power to negotiate, we have nothing to give them that they can’t take already. That is the understanding of their power dynamic between SU and the University. There is all kinds of indications on those issues. We kill the momentum that we have built the last several years. The struggle of other organizations across the country, have helped us. We have to look at the facts that the politics have shifted to a national level. I urge councilors to strongly oppose this.

SMITH – Wondering what this motion means, the effect motion passes, does not pass and the difference between them

Speaker – Set of direction and guidelines for the president to embark upon. If it were not to pass, well the Speaker doesn’t have to deal with the hypothetical.

PANDYA – If it does go though, does this come back to student council?

Speaker – That is up to someone.

TAYLOR – I don’t think the issue is whether tuition is too high. The question is not whether the government thinks this is an issue. I can read the newspaper. One of the concerns that Mr. Sharma brought up, was when he was talking about the provincial government. What I am not seeing that adopting a multi-year tuition would tie our hands in fighting the provincial government. If we go through this, we can dress up in chicken suits, do whatever we want. We are just giving up the number of the day. The 2nd issue, by refusal to enter into negotiations, it reflects badly on us.

SHARMA – Don’t you think it reflects worse if president comes back with a proposal and is rejected after months of negotiations?
TAYLOR – Well it depends what comes back. In the past, tuition has always gone up. What we have tried hasn’t worked, so maybe it is time to try something new. If we can get a fraction of the funding the university has, that will help us. We go into negotiations on our terms and then bring it back here and see what we think of it.

WALLACE – The one thing that is slowing us down, we don’t have a tuition campaign. The longer we sit in this body and talk about it, this whole multi-year agreement is slowing us down. All we have is our membership and the people who we represent. Yes, I’ve thought about letting our President enter negotiations, and where does that get us? Last year at this time, we already had press releases on the tuition campaign.

BOTTEN – 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?

WALLACE - What we are doing, I am not against becoming better aligned with admin. We can do it without at multi year process. This multi year deal doesn’t give us that option. We have a very charismatic leader. Without this multi year tuition, we can still get a lot of things down. Right now, this institution is inaccessible. You can’t get in here if you don’t money, student loans and work at least part-time. I really do think that there may have been bridges burn, but that was last year. So tonight, we decided this is not in the best interest of our students. We do not have negotiating power, we can build a tuition campaigning that does not make them the bad guy. The faster we get started, that is where our focus should be.

BRECHTEL – Will you concede that our marketing department is continuing to work on the imaging and messaging for our tuition campaign, despite the fact that we are still debating multi year tuition?

WALLACE – I think they are very basic, We have been slowed down. It is not in the press. It is still in the process in being done. This negotiation is slowing us down.

WUDARCK – The admin has stated they want to raise money to their deficit. Having a guarantee going to tuition can be a benefit to students. Over the past few years, I’ve seen when tuition has gone to BoG. The amount proposed by the university was lowered by a half a percent. It is time to see if there is something we can do to lower tuition. Tuition is getting to the point where it is too high and we know that. Not to say we are agreeing to multi year tuition, just saying we are willing to explore it.
PANDYA/BRECHTEL MOVED TO amend by inserting, “terms of negotiations will come back to council for approval before being finalized if the policy is passed” at the end of item 9a

PANDYA – What we are going with is not what we are going to come out with. What constituents may or not agree on may change their minds and that we will need to do a lot of outreaching. Having talked to Mat and been on TUPAC, I am in favor of this policy, having listened to the arguments, they have their merits. Having the opportunity to speak with my constituents, they are pretty much split, leaning towards the against side, because they aren’t informed of what it entails. I am in favor of this motion but my constituents tell me “no”. So if I can present something more concrete to my constituents and can perhaps get a more concrete response. The point of contention is, “how it is going to look” if we go through all this time and in the end rejecting them, well my answer is, “that is not our responsibility”.

BRECHTEL – There was never an intent not to bring this back to council. I am tempted to say that this is friendly. I want council be forewarned it might include an unscheduled council meeting because it is discussed in January, so it means at a special time.

Speaker – No objections from council, so the amendment is friendly.

KOTOVYCH – I spoke in favor of this last week. About what Sharma said, that we will be getting money in the election. They see a battle, as soon as they see that the battle is gone, the media will become very disinterested. As long as we have this meeting every January, this basically ties our hands. It frees us up by saying that this is the time we need to be protesting. Admin has a role in tuition increases. Admin is offering things to us that they have never offered to us before. And it has been brought up, why can’t we do what we have been doing. But the point is, they have never offered to work with us before. Another point about killing our momentum, things change over the years, the factor of 1 year overlooked is ridiculous. Do we have to agree to maximum tuition? – No. One last point, this idea that we can get the Board of Governors and the university to list tuition as a priority. We’ve always been voting after the priorities. If these priorities are so important, we get a say what the priorities should be, put tuition in there.

SAMUEL – This idea of the fight, argument has been made an off campus fight is to unite with admin. But the best way to fight the off campus fight is to make the most of our resources. Which is our annual tuition campaign. As for the on-campus campaign, the tuition campaign will look very similar to the off campus years.

DUBE – TUPAC nor Mat has never said we will not have a fight in a off-year?
SAMUEL – He said, instead of both fight the provincial government for more funding, the point is, we both are already fighting the provincial government. I think the point is, we are both currently fighting the provincial government for funding, period. As far as rollback, it is a great idea, it is only the salient point he proposal has, do it because of the rollback. From the admin’s point of view, it is sometimes to their benefit to argue for funding that doesn’t involve tuition. We aren’t losing the battle, we are doing some things right, we shouldn’t resign ourselves to this. As far as this whole, “try something new”, I strongly disagree with “trying something new because it is new”.

DUBE – I don’t think there is someone in this room that doesn’t know where I stand. We are behind in our campaign for tuition the same way we are behind in our campaign for Bill 43 because we are not organized. We have not been getting our stuff done. Secondly, government funding - I highly think we are getting government funding. I would like something concrete on paper that says that this money will go to students. We are asking for 50%, we have never gotten 50%. I have spent so much time talking to students and I see it as my duty that both sides are represented. In 45 documented conversations with students, there is not one that opposes multi-year tuition. I challenge that our students are uninformed. I think that we have a responsibility to represent. We are proposing to represent, not for the sake for trying something new. To do something worth doing and do it right and if we say “no” at the end of the day, at least we know we tried and fought.

REIKIE – I was misleading in a point I wanted to convey. I am in favor of going into negotiations, but I feel that we don’t have to agree to tuition increase to come to an agreement. I agree with Wudarck that we need to try a new strategy, not because it is new. I agree with Wallace that we need to come into alignment with the university administration and will clarify the lack of funding in the public eye. Back and forth, it clouds the issue. I would agree with the Board of Governors that we do have leverage with the university that it makes sense they are coming to us. They don’t like being heckled and it is important to them. I think we should seize this opportunity that they have motivation to come to us. I would agree with councilor Dube that we do want to have a say where this money goes. I don’t think we should go into this and counter our own standing of political policy to go into negotiation. I feel we should not pass up this opportunity to basically put in a safety net to protect our students. If Bill 43 does go through, it would be our best interests right now.

CROSSMAN – My understanding is this, the president and council is bound by political policy. We can only agree to tuition increases or freezes. There are 2 possible outcomes - 1) they freeze or decrease tuition. The whole list produced by TUPAC would be thrown into the garbage. I anticipate that is what would happen in that, but I don’t believe that is going to happen, a freeze or decrease.
BOTTEN – Do you believe we would ever get a tuition freeze or decrease from admin?

CROSSMAN – No.

BRECHTEL – Would you concede that when the university decides the level of tuition, nowhere in this proposal that comes out will there be an actual number? This is about the frequency where tuition is decided. Nowhere does it discuss the actual number of the tuition whether freeze, decrease or increase.

CROSSMAN – So what we are just negotiating the proposal of multi-year. If we have to walk out of the negotiations, or if council turns down the agreement, it reflects poorly on council. Because we have this big list of issues that we want, it shows how much we care about the issues. Another thing, how the prospect of negotiation was presented to us. We need to ask ourselves if admin’s intentions are sincere or sinister. I think what they are trying to do is shut us up because we get really loud every January. What they are basically saying that this is the one thing we students have and we can negotiate with.

COOK – I agree that multi-year has a potential. One good thing is that it sets the number. But what it doesn’t have going for us, is the effort to lobby externally. I think it is in our best interests to see what it has on our external lobby campaign. Our external lobby campaign is not done overnight. The media always comes out, and records us saying that we do not like our tuition going up. Number one on our agenda points to a lack of provincial funding the media comes out and is getting to the mindset of Albertans. There is an increase in the minds of Albertans that postsecondary tuition is going up. I do not believe that multi-year is going to be effective on long-term strategy. If we want effective change, we need to look at long-term solution. Lobby and those types of dates, is just not feasible. I know that the best media coverage we have is when we have specific news worthy events and the provincial budget is not that. I urge you to vote this down. Ultimately, multi-year is a bad thing.
BRECHTEL – Several things. I believe in this proposal. I don’t want you to vote in favor of this if you know you don’t agree to this after it comes back. Look at the points. Clarifications – we have been using the wrong word, we wouldn’t be “binding” ourselves to anything. If the board voted on it, then we would be binding on it. This is about trust and being about to run an effective campaign. Whether admin is being sincere or sinister. If you believe these things, we are never going to move beyond this point. So if you don’t trust them, you never will. But I think this handicaps us. What we put into the agreement, we trust. About our ability to run an effective campaign - Do we get media in January because of the number, date and 2 sides or do we get it because we are running a campaign? If you think we are incapable of getting attention, then don’t vote in favor of this. I don’t think we are limited by January. If you agree with me on those points and there are some benefits by this proposal, vote on this point. Thirdly, I feel where we have been for so long isn’t getting anywhere, I want to get our house in order on campus. Let’s move to a vote.

Motion is carried (20/13/1).

LO – We’ve been working together to come up with “Gripe Tables”. In each of the faculties, there will be at least 1 SU executives at the table. The bottom of the form has a requirement to fill out. If you are a proxy, please forward it to the councilor. COFA is having a food bank drive, it is all going to the campus food bank. The deadline for that is November 5th.

2003-15/06

QUESTION PERIOD

SMITH – Can I take my questions off?

BRECHTEL – I would like to congratulate Councilor Wallace for bringing this up and I congratulate Councilor Smith for using it.

HUTCHISON – About the GFC meeting, the provost mentioned the government is making some changes to Bill 43 and students will be very happy about them, has the VP External heard about it yet?

SAMUEL – Yes. There was a meeting between CAUS and Minister of Learning on Oct 21 and the minister gave CAUS some proposed amendments. But they haven’t gone through caucus. So nothing really is finalized until the amendments go through caucus. Some of the things that were objectionable things has been changed, but most have remained. Specifics include the removal of distance education, also the powers of GFC and student associations are being restored. As far as the campaign about the tuition cap, something will be moved into legislation.

SHARMA – Has CAUS discussed if we are going to continue with the defeat of Bill 43 or accept the amendment? That was some good lobbying to get the changes done.
BRECHTEL – We have three major concerns that we have put forward and they are only suggestions that one would be sufficiently dealt with, leaving two undelt with. The ones that are still undelt with are the audit provision still being in and the tuition cap not actually protecting students. And we will continue doing everything we are doing now, including visiting MLA’s and doing media events.

COOK – Given the weather we are having, what are the rain-out plans do we have?

SAMUEL – Basically what we have is, from 12–4pm, we are having our big tent set up in quad. It looks like the tent will sustain the weather. In terms of rain-out provisions, I don’t see conditions where we will have to move.

DUBE – Question for VP external. Where are we at with the tuition campaign?

BRECHTEL – Talked to TUPAC where we see tuition going. Talked about some of the messaging that will be using. Talked about some slogans, how we can express them in images. 2 meetings with the marketing department, they are trying to …will have them to me by Friday. And we will meet with TUPAC. We have begun planning. I would like to roll the tuition campaign out in mid-November. As soon as we have some decision and conclusion, we should have the tuition campaign ready.

WUDARCK – The provost was saying that a commission on post secondary wasn't important or a necessity, what is your stance on that?

BRECHTEL – It isn't important because we already understood where PSE was, and why it was there. We didn't really need to be told these issues and the source of them. Plus the results won't come out until after the election.

RICE – Last week when SUB was opened for midterm week, Java Jive closed early one day. Why did that happen?

BOTTEN – Failure on my part to address the issue in the past, where Tim Hortons and Java Jive were a tag team to remain open during the 24 hrs midterm week. I will make sure something will be in place during the 24 hr period when the building is open for that period again in December.

HUTCHISON – Question for the VP External. There was an email saying that you would come to the faculties and do a presentation on Bill 43, are you still willing to do so?

SAMUEL – Please speak with my scheduling secretary – the VP Op/Fin.
SCHENDEL – Regarding point 1a of the Executive Committee report, would the university be charged for using the Horowitz Theatre?

BRECHTEL – Yes. There will be wear and tear in the classroom. We don’t want it to make any worse as a theatre venue. So they will for all those things. We have yet to hear a response from them.

2003-15/08

APPROVAL OF STUDENTS’ UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS

BRECHTEL – We are looking at doing some Student Council forums, an initiation from the VP Operations/Finance and Councilor Wallace. It will be a good way for students to understand what is going on in council.

2003-15/8a

BOTTEN – The Financial Affairs Board is by bylaw 3100 allowed to make transfers up to $2500. Because of bylaw 3100, 11c is on the agenda, instead of in this report.

Speaker – Report from CRAP - we met last Thursday evening and debated on having proxies and attendance and moving a bunch of motions, so there was no point and would come back with specific proposals the next time we meet. We then discussed council compositions. We had a guest from the Aboriginal Students’ Council. The difference between that and GFC and the Aboriginal Students’ Council is that GFC has a seat. The Aboriginal Students’ Council has requested a seat. The committee voted on the first time to remove the RHA and university appeals board seats.

SAMUEL – It wasn’t to remove the seats altogether, but just to remove voting privileges altogether.

Speaker – It came up for the first time, it will come back to Crap again.

2003-15/10

LEGISLATION

2003-15/10a

BOTTEN/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT, upon recommendation of the Internal Affairs Board, Students’ Council repeal Article X of the Students’ Union Constitution (second reading).

BOTTEN – The motion should read, “Internal Review board”. I have nothing further to say on it that I’ve said in the past.

Motion is carried with unanimous consent.
2003-15/10b Speaker – This motion will automatically be removed from the agenda, due to a previous motion that was passed.

2003-15/11 NEW BUSINESS

2003-15/11a BOTTEN/BAZIN MOVED THAT Students' Council direct the Academic Affairs Board to prepare a report including both a definition for political advocacy at the University level and the necessary resources to effectively implement its political advocacy efforts, with said report to be submitted to the Executive Committee no later than 18 November 2003.

2003-15/11b BOTTEN/BAZIN MOVED THAT Students' Council direct the Executive Committee to include recommendations, based on a report from the Academic Affairs Board, outlining any staff and administration changes needed for more effective political advocacy, in its report to the Financial Affairs Board pursuant to item 2003-14/11c.

BOTTEN – I would like to omnibus 11a and 11b. They are contingent with each other.

Speaker – So they are they same, so you don’t have to omnibus.

Motion is carried.

2003-15/11c BOTTEN MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Board, approve a transfer of $2,000 from the Capital Equipment Reserve to Account 8870-400 (Capital Expense < $200 - Music) of Department 832 (Room at the Top) for the monthly payments of a DJ music subscription.

BOTTEN – 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.

Motion is carried.

2003-15/14 ANNOUNCEMENTS

SCHENDEL – It is science week. Tomorrow morning we have a free pancake breakfast in CAB. We are doing it until we are out of pancakes and we bought enough mix for 1200 people. Friday, we are doing “chic to be a geek” day. I also see a lot of support for the science banquet.
MAH – I received an invitation from John Barry who invited members of students’ council to see if they would like to have a tour of the new Saville Centre. Just send me an email if you are interested.

TAYLOR – The what?

MAH – The new tennis center/curling rink/gymnastic center, south of Foote Field, it will have a gym, a curling rink and not sure what else.

SMITH – People of have been complaining about lack of volunteers for Bill 43 volunteers. But the people complaining haven’t been out to volunteer.

BRECHTEL – We get an ETS bus and go around MLA offices and go around to visit them and talk about them. For those individuals that want to join us, Councillor Wallace is modeling the free t-shirt and toque you will get. It is from 10am-5pm this Friday. We are looking for at least 20 people.

ABBoud – Which 5 MLAs are we visiting? Is it determined yet?

BRECHTEL – I have a list in my office. 4 conservative MLAs and 1 liberal MLA. We are meeting at the SU office at 9:30. I need confirmation that you are coming.

CROSSMAN – Is this limited to SU types or can we tell anybody?

BRECHTEL – Anybody.

BOTTEN – I will be shuttling people to and fro the city if you can’t make the entire day. If you are a student group, and would like us to show up and speak about Bill 43, please let me know. There will be an additional forum on the 7th, 12:30 pm at the Faculty St. Jean. The best part is that we are going as a group, meeting in the executive offices, leaving at 11:45. If you have a class and want to leave later, I will be driving at 12:15. The folks at the faculty are very open and friendly.

SAMUEL – We are having our day of action on Bill 43 tomorrow. The event is starting at noon. We need help setting up the event. We are going to be having a large tent in quad. It is going to awesome. At the conclusion of this council meeting, we are meeting with some people to help set up the stage. If you have anytime during the day 12-4, ask us what needs to be done. MacLean’s magazine is coming, it is going to be national exposure. It is my displeasure to announce the death of online question period. I spoke to the tech departments about it and we tend to switch over servers a lot. It takes a lot of time to switch over the mp3s.
ADJOURNMENT

SCHENDEL/WALLACE MOVED TO adjourn at 8:32 pm.

Motion is carried.