Date: January 16th 2014                                      Time: 5.10 pm

In Attendance:
JESSICA NGUYEN (Chair)
JOSH LE
WILLIAM LAU
ABDULLAH HAMID
JAMES HWANG
CORY HODGSON (Proxy for SAMANTHA LAM)

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:
SIRINA HAMILTON
HAILEY MARKOWSKI
SUSAN AMER
SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by NGUYEN at 5.10 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

NGUYEN added “Ratification of Students’ Union Awards Adjudicating Committee Members” to the agenda.
HAMID moved to approve the agenda for January 16, 2014 as amended.
The motion was seconded by HWANG.
Vote 6/0/0
CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HODGSON moved to approve the minutes for January 09, 2014 as tabled.
The motion was seconded by HWANG.
Vote 5/0/1 (Abstention by LAU)
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

NGUYEN: Pat Schultz from the Registrar’s Office is coming to our next meeting.

5. OLD BUSINESS

Note: HODGSON excused himself from the meeting during the discussions: “Ratification of Students’ Union Adjudicating Committee Members”, “SU Awards Program: Allowable Living Expenses”, and “SU Awards Program: GPAs”.

Ratification of Students’ Union Awards Adjudicating Committee Members

AMER: There are 4 applicants, and at least 4 members are needed. All the applicants have sound resumes, cover letters and referees.
LAU: Student Digest seems to have worked well.

LE moved to ratify Alec Forest, Zizhao Wang, Chris Beavington, and Alexandra Vu to the Students’ Union Awards Adjudicating Committee. The motion was seconded by NGUYEN.
Vote 5/0/0
CARRIED

SU Awards Program: Allowable living expenses

AMER: Last time, Sirina had recommended 33%. I think that’s a good idea. There were around 70 applicants with financial need. Most of them had expenses which were modest. When I first went through them, I used the base amount of $1058. Even then, most didn’t get disqualified. If you are trying to decide between 25% and 33%, there’s only a marginal difference.
MARKOWSKI: We can’t give the numbers for last year because they are in a different computer system.
NGUYEN: I wanted to know whether 33% was the best.
LAU: With the 33%, will it still be competitive?
MARKOWSKI: It will be more competitive than last year.
AMER: There are only a handful of applicants who are not considered to be in financial need.

SU Awards Program: GPAs

MARKOWSKI: We wanted to know how to handle the GPA for awards which include it as a criterion. Do we take the cumulative GPA, last year’s GPA, or the GPA for the last 24 or 30 credits?
AMER: The easiest would be to take the last calculated GPA.
HAMID: For engineers, 24 credits are roughly 1 term for us.
LE: How about taking the GPA for the previous year except for the Spring and Summer terms. Is the GPA important for part-time students as well?  
MARKOWSKI: The awards applicable for part-time students don’t have the GPA criterion.  
LAU: What if we take the last 30 credits?  
NGUYEN: Then, they may need to go back more than 1 year in some cases.  
LE: We want to give out the money, but we still want to make sure that they pass a certain level of excellence.  
MARKOWSKI: If it’s the last 24 credits, we can work it out.  
NGUYEN: I’m good with last 24 without Spring and Summer.

Updates on the future of the Access Fund

MARKOWSKI: There are no new updates.  
On a separate note, the awards night is happening on the 31st of March.

Letter of Expectation RE: Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund : Approval of changes to the Standing Orders

NGUYEN: From the version I sent out, I don’t think there are too many changes except 34). For 34) g), the representatives from Athletics decided that it wasn’t necessary. 
LAU: For the fund distribution, does it have to stick to the referendum?  
LE: What would you want to do? 
LAU: It came from the discussion about whether we can hire a part-time staff member from the Legacy Fund money.  
NGUYEN: The percentage allocations are not exact. It’s a guideline that they use. I don’t know how hiring a staff member would work. I don’t think that this should be addressed within this round.  
HODGSON: I think 34) h) is bizarrely worded. I know what it’s trying to say, but the wording is not good.  
LE: Yes. We can do a friendly amendment.  
HODGSON: Should this be a blanket clause, or should there be exceptions.  
LE: I think that they always match it regardless. We can look at it again later if needed.  
HAMID: Regarding 34) c) isn’t it redundant? Shouldn’t every application be given serious consideration?  
NGUYEN: It’s just to clarify, and look back on.  
HODGSON: Ian from Athletics emphasized a lot on that. I think it’s a very important criterion.
NGUYEN moved to amend Standing Orders regarding the principles and operation of the Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund. The motion was seconded by HWANG. Vote 5/0/0 CARRIED

Letter of Expectation RE: Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund: Approval of the Letter of Expectation

NGUYEN: This is the cover letter that we are going to give them. There are no changes to this since last time except the last paragraph.
LE: This will be used as a record for documentation purposes. It’s a wrap up of what happened.

NGUYEN moved to approve the letter of expectation regarding the Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund. The motion was seconded by HAMID. Vote 6/0/0 CARRIED

6. NEW BUSINESS

Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund Application Form review

HODGSON: As long as it fills all their criteria, it should be ok. If anything, I would include a 1-page summary.
LAU: How about having a checklist or a Q&A?
HODGSON: Right now, it’s big. There may be a lot of confusion if we just give people this.
LE: Yes, it’s kind of vague right now.
NGUYEN: We’ll go with that.

Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund Reserve

NGUYEN: There’s a point in where 20% of the fund would be kept in a reserve fund. The purpose would be to maintain a base amount of money in the fund, and in the long run to save teams from impending cuts. The representatives from Athletics asked us what should be done about the reserve fund as the money keeps accumulating. We are trying to interpret what this clause is saying. Would impending cuts mean budget cuts, or a cut of the whole team?
LE: If you announce you are going to cut a team, no self respecting athlete will be going to a school like that even if it was saved through the legacy Fund.
HODGSON: You can’t perpetually save the team too.
LE: Yes. Also, to access this reserve, you will have to announce a cut. That
HODGSON: If a team is having budget cuts for a year, we can put in some money. However, I don’t like this to be a dependent thing. The money should have to be refunded some way.

LE: There is a minimum balance for the reserve. Anyway, even if a team was bailed out in a certain year, it will die eventually.

HODGSON: So, if there is a budget cut for a team, do we prop them up forever? Or does it only alleviate the situation for a year? I don’t see the point of doing it. We are only prolonging the problem.

LE: Small budget cuts are more manageable than a whole team cut.

7. CLOSED SESSION    NIL

8. NEXT MEETING     January 23, 2014 at 5 pm.

9. ADJOURNMENT      The meeting was adjourned by NGUYEN at 5.57 pm.