**GRANT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

2013 – 2014 #17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>January 30(^{th}) 2014</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>5.03 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**In Attendance:**

- JESSICA NGUYEN (Chair)
- BASHIR MOHAMED (Proxy for JOSH LE)
- JAMES HWANG
- TAIMUR MALIK
- CORY HODGSON (Proxy for WILLIAM LAU)
- SAMANTHA LAM

**Excused Absence:**

None.

**Others in Attendance:**

- HAILEY MARKOWSKI
- SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

---

1. **Call to Order:**

   The meeting was called to order by NGUYEN at 5.03 pm.

2. **Approval of Agenda:**

   HODGSON moved to approve the agenda for January 30, 2014 as tabled. The motion was seconded by MOHAMED.
   
   Vote 5/0/0
   
   CARRIED

3. **Approval of Minutes:**

   HODGSON moved to approve the minutes for January 23, 2014 as tabled.
   
   The motion was seconded by HWANG.
   
   Vote 4/0/1 (Abstention by MOHAMED)
   
   CARRIED

4. **Announcements:**

   None.
5. Old Business

Update on the future of the Access Fund

MARKOWSKI: I don’t have any update for you. I’ll let you know when we hear anything new. The Access Fund will continue as usual for the time being.

Changes to Standing Orders RE: SU Awards

Note: Councilor Hodgson did not participate in this discussion.

MARKOWSKI: There were 2 things we talked about regarding Standing Orders. One was about the student loan and grant money being exempt. The other was to include the additional expenses. I’m not sure if you actually want to put them in Standing Orders. I think it’s more for this year. The GPA calculation would be good to have in the Standing Orders though. I have come up with a wording for that.

NGUYEN: I think we agreed on the last 24 credits. What were the other options we discussed?
MARKOWSKI: We discussed about having the last 2 terms and the last 30 credits.
HWANG: What if someone took more than 24 credits in a term? Do we take the best 24 credits?
MARKOWSKI: So, hypothetically if someone took 22 credits on one term, how would we take the remaining 2 credits? Would it be the best credits?
HWANG: I think it would be fair.
MARKOWSKI: Another option would be to take the average of last term.
LAM: Medical students don’t have GPAs.
MARKOWSKI: We do it differently for Medical students. We have had Medical students apply to us in the past. When it came to first year students, we thought that they won’t be eligible candidates. However, a Medical first year student can be an eligible candidate. I will investigate how we should handle this.
LAM: You can contact the University and check how they handle this situation for their own awards.
MARKOWSKI: Yes, I can do that too.
NGUYEN: So, does everyone approve the wording?
MALIK: Is it the last 24 credits from this university?
MARKOWSKI: It could be from any university.
MALIK: For engineering, the credit system is weird. How do you handle this?
MARKOWSKI: We are going with the last 24 credits. How do you guys want to handle a situation where only a certain amount of credits needs to be considered from a term? Shall we take the highest or the average of the previous term? An example would be a student who did 22
credits in the last term, and needs 2 additional credits from the previous term.
MALIK: If they have taken more than 24 credits in a term, we can take the whole term. In such a case, we can be more student friendly, and take the best 24 credits of the term.
NGUYEN: Let’s take the best.
LAM: As long we are consistent, it should be okay. We will never achieve something totally fair.
MARKOWSKI: So, is everyone okay with taking the highest credits in such a scenario?

**NGUEYN moved to approve the changes to Standing Orders as stated below.**

“77) h) For those awards that require a GPA calculation: GPA will be determined based on an average of the last 24 credits. These will not include credits obtained from spring or summer courses.”
The motion was seconded by HWANG.
Vote 4/0/1 (Abstention by MOHAMED)
CARRIED

Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund Reserve

NGUYEN: I want to know what to do next with this. In the Standing Orders, there’s nothing to guide us on what we should do with all the money in the reserve. The original referendum question states that 20% of the fund should be allocated to the reserve each year. There was a clause in the referendum question saying that the reserve is to save teams from cuts. We were trying to figure out whether that meant budget cuts or team cuts.
HODGSON: My opinion was that there is no point in saving a team which is being axed. There may be no point in having a certain team anyway. An example would be the field hockey team where there were no other teams to play with. Regarding budget cuts to teams, for how long do we provide funds? It’s not sustainable to keep funding them for multiple years.
If both the Council and Athletics agree, we can change the referendum question.
NGUYEN: Is that allowed?
HODGSON: Yes. You can technically run into some problems with the PSLA (Post-Secondary Learning Act) though. But, our bylaw does state that we can amend it with the consent of the relevant parties. Maybe Ian of Athletics has an idea on how to use it.
NGUYEN: Why would it be there in the first place? Maybe if a team’s travel money gets cut, they can get that funding if they prove that they will receive that money from the next year.
HODGSON: That’s a question I would like to ask Ian. Would there be any chance of their funding being restored? I really question the purpose of it.
NGUYEN: The money is just sitting there right now.
HODGSON: It’s accumulating too.
HWANG: What if we make it an application process?
HODGSON: We can roll it back into the pot of money and fund more teams. We can give it to a team which has a funding reduction. But, would the funding reduction be permanent?
NGUYEN: I’m wondering if there have been significant cuts to teams. If not, there’s no point.
HODGSON: I think this started when the football team was about to be cut. However, I don’t know if it was worded correctly. My opinion is that we should get rid of it.
LAM: Where does the money actually go?
NGUYEN: It would be for the different teams. For example, to cover travel costs. Anyway, someone may argue that that emergency funding may be needed one year.
LAM: If emergency funding is given, it would be expected that the team should be self sufficient after a certain number of years.
HODGSON: I totally agree with that. That’s how it should be if we fund them.
Should we invite the representatives from Athletics in order to have a discussion?
LAM: It would defeat its purpose if they become dependent on our emergency funding.
NGUYEN: I’ll see if Ian and Vang could come to one of our meetings.

6. NEW BUSINESS

Nomination of one GAC member for the GBPLF Committee

NGUYEN: There will be two 3 hour meetings. Basically, you will be looking at applications for funding, and approving which ones go to GAC (Grant Allocation Committee) for ratification. Everyone in GAC is eligible to apply.

NGUYEN nominated MALIK. MALIK accepted the nomination.

MOHAMED nominated LAM. LAM declined the nomination.

MALIK nominated LE. LE was not present.

MOHAMED nominated NGUYEN. NGUYEN declined the nomination.

MALIK was selected as the GAC member of the GBPLF committee.

7. CLOSED SESSION

NIL
8. NEXT MEETING  

February 6, 2014 at 5 pm.

9. ADJOURNMENT  
The meeting was adjourned by NGUYEN at 5.37 pm.