EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
October 13, 2010
9:30 am

ATTENDANCE: Nick Dehod President
Zach Fentiman Vice President (Operations & Finance)
Aden Murphy Vice President (External)
James Eastham Vice President (Academic)

REGRETS: Rory Tighe
Marc Dumouchel

ABSENT: n/a

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by DEHOD at 9:38 am.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: EASTHAM/MURPHY MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the October 13, 2010 agenda as tabled.
   4/0/0 CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MURPHY/FENTIMAN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the October 7, 2010 minutes as tabled.
   4/0/0 CARRIED

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS: Dehod: It is James Birthday today. As well Rory and Marc are both away at conferences.

5. ACTION ITEMS: Reviewed and Updated.

6. STUDENTS’ COUNCIL:
   a) Bill 33

   Dehod: Zach last year you created Bill 33, can you clarify what it is?

   Fentiman: It clarifies what the scope and mandate is when collected said fees.

   Dehod: That is the theory how does it practically work?

   Fentiman: If a cause plans to go to referendum and there is a good case for it to violate that bill depending on when the application to DIE Board is, it will either delay them or just take them out completely or if it is completely legitimate and it does not conflict with the bylaw they can be run.

   Eastham: My question is how many students benefit? I don’t think it accomplishes what it sets out to do because it is so open ended.

   Fentiman: The primary objection is to directly benefit U of A students. If it’s primary objective is to raise funds for a charity that has nothing to do with
benefiting students then no it will not be passed.

Dehod: People can argue this however they want though.

Fentiman: DIE Board makes the call when they receive and interpretation request.

Murphy: Why does it go to DIE Board to make the decision instead of it going to referendum?

Fentiman: People think students can go to referendum about anything. The SU is here for students.

Eastham: I am not opposed; I just don’t think this bill works.

Dehod: Is the access fund a charity?

Fentiman: Yes it is because it directly helps students.

Eastham: Maybe if you have the language of the Bill more clear…

Fentiman: I am open to rewording it. Opt outs I like.

Eastham: Mandatory online opt outs is a problem.

Murphy: I don’t think we should restrict what goes to referendum. The wording should be changed.

Fentiman: The SU is not a charity vehicle. External groups can not use student groups. That is not why we exist at all.

Eastham: I agree with Zach we should not allow other bodies to leverage our money out of here.

Fentiman: So how do we word this so that the money stays for causes on campus?

Dehod: Super majorities?

Eastham: We need to find a way to word it so the money is kept on campus.

Dehod: Organizations must be student run and stay on campus, no political parties.

Fentiman: I am not married to the language from last year. The reason these things can not get out of hand is because we appreciate the way we are constituted. If we start letting this get out of hand and something crazy happens like external sources suck student money out.

Dehod: The student group exec team must be a student majority. Part of the problem is students should be executive’s not external sources.
Fentiman: we could have councilors sit on the potential panel.

Dehod: The issue is a small percent of councilors are keen on this issue and I am also getting emails from students. We know in spirit what you were trying to do Zach but we need a space where this can be debated, possibly a task force for referendum and possibly a task force for the establishment of dedicated unit fees.

Fentiman: I don’t know how you would do it. There is a group of councilors stewing and are to afraid to talk to anyone about it and this is going to pop up and objectives will not be achieved.

Eastham: Should we do something informal with councilors that have strong feelings on this? Like a meeting with 6 councilors and us?

Fentiman: Send councilors an email about referendums in general not Bill 33 specifically.

Eastham: Referendums are not just about money.

Discussion ensued in regards to ideas about criteria that could be changed to make Bill 33 more effective.

Fentiman: Nick are you getting a lot of questions about this?

Dehod: Yes.

Fentiman: I would feel comfortable getting a forum together for this.

b) October 12 Meeting

Dehod: Any thoughts on this?

Eastham: I think people were worn out by the presentations.

Fentiman: I agree. We checked and all the presentations they require an abstract unless we are presenting.

7. OLD BUSINESS: n/a

8. NEW BUSINESS: n/a

9. DISCUSSION PERIOD:

a) Call for Agenda Items: Next SURO Meeting

Dehod: I need to get some feed back about what we would like discussed at the next Registrar Meeting. Zach any thoughts?

Zach: How about the bear tracks fee update?

Dehod: I would like to discuss an update/stats on student’s registration. Zdena
could you please email the 2 discussion items to them.

10. REPORTS:

a) President
   • Working on the PAW Agreement there are still some items to figure out
   • Sector plan meeting, discussed what North campus would look like
   • Met with Councilors
   • Working on sustainability agreement
   • CAUS teleconference call yesterday
   • I’m also contemplating a conference suggestion I got for 3 weeks from now

b) VP Academic
   • Met with Law Students on Friday, most of their execs support tuition increase
   • Ombuds meeting on Tuesday, concerned about what to do with it
   • SFRT on Tuesday, it went okay
   • Students’ Council on Tuesday

c) VP External
   • Gateway interview
   • Working on USchool stuff which is run by the senate
   • Conference call today
   • Blogging today
   • CAUS stuff
   • I had an APRC meeting yesterday

d) VP Operations & Finance
   • At 11am I have a Gateway meeting regarding their contract
   • Tomorrow I have the Access Fund Selection Committee meeting

e) VP Student Life
   • n/a

f) General Manager
   • n/a

11. CLOSED SESSION:

12. ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.