Date: January 14, 2012          Time: 6:05 PM

In Attendance:
Natalya Binczyk
Dylan Hanwell (Vice Chair)
Adam Woods
Kelsey Mills
Dustin Chelen
Colin Champagne
Bashir Mohamed
William Lau

Excused Absence:
Kareema Batal (Chair)

Others in Attendance:
N/A

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by HANWELL at insert 6:05 PM.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA WOODS moved that the January 17, 2014 agenda be approved as tabled. Seconded by BINCZYK.
   Vote on Motion
   8/0/0
   CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES CHAMPAGNE moved that the October 15, 2013 minutes be approved as tabled. The motion was seconded by HANWELL.
   Vote on Motion
   8/0/0
   CARRIED

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS HANWELL: Reads out BATAL’s announcements.
   BTW HANWELL is chair today since BATAL is absent.
5. PRESENTATIONS  N/A

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHELEN: I’m working on the University Governance Report in response to a letter from students in February of 2013. I am also working on the Leadership College dossier. The SU was asked for feedback, and then we got told we didn’t have time. Demolition for the area is supposed to happen eventually. Also job shadow day on February 30th, 2014.

WOODS: Mandatory Non Instructional Fee campaign is going to run on Monday January 20th, 2014. We will utilize classroom talks and SUB TV to encourage students to look at exactly what they are paying for in those fees. I have not received confirmation but Trudeau might be coming to campus. I will be doing a Job shadow day in February. I am waiting for a busy day to show people the cool stuff not just paperwork like policies. I will propose to do a pre-campaign by taking pictures of our fees.

LAU: I will have a Job Shadow day on February 30th, 2014.
About Services: The Peer Support Center is getting a full time position, not finalized yet. Sustain SU will be creating online waivers to better collect user information. The Bike Library: Are thinking of establishing a Membership Fee perhaps for bikes. Sustain SU is also looking for volunteers. SafeWalk is writing up a policy for intoxicated clients. At the moment they are not accepting any intoxicated clients. There has been a cost-value discussion about the SafeWalk service. So now, they are considering taking in intoxicated clients. Services Staff are putting together a survey. Putting together the 2015 Leadership Conference
ISA : Everyone agrees on the mandate but not the structure. Glad to have an open and public debate on the structure to give everyone the chance to give input.
Advocacy : Community kitchen is going good. I missed a meeting for Residence Services, and they closed the file on the resident’s agreement. Our [the SU’s] opinion is we understand liability but we want it to be as fair as possible by adding an appeals process (unfortunately, there doesn’t seem to be any other working model elsewhere so it’s difficult to build one). Very difficult to get appeals on the table.

7. QUESTION PERIOD

BINCZYK to WOODS: Regarding Class Talks for the MNIF campaign: Who’s going do them?
WOODS: We got someone, Navjot, who is going to be managing these campaigns, but we will also be asking Councilors.
BINCZYK to WOODS: The MNIF Campaign is starting next week? Can we sync this with the Councilor class talks?
WOODS: Yes, Yes, and most class talks will start on the second week I believe
which will probably sync.

BINCZYK to WOODS: Can you share your volunteers with Council? How did I not know about this?

MILLS: is the timing considered?
WOODS: Yes, we want this to coincide with when students are paying their fees.

BINCZYK: General comment: let’s finish these newsletters so we can send them at the same time as the class talks.

CHELEN: We follow the Registrar’s timeline. We finished it last week and we are waiting for the Registrar’s Office at their end. We are currently waiting for the Registrar to send us a list of students’ emails because right now we don’t have any way to communicate with students other than through the Registrar’s Office.

WOODS: There will be four posters with catchy titles.

MILLS to WOODS: Can you go into details about the numbers regarding MNIFs?
WOODS: Yes there is this thing called Kabo, where public institutions give their numbers and that’s what we are going to be using. Probably some graphs, costs compared to services, etc. Quality doesn’t seem to be going up whereas costs are.

BINCZYK to LAU: Who are you expecting ISA submissions from?
LAU: A few individuals that have been involved with the process all along but we are also giving the public opportunity to submit a proposal.
BINCZYK to LAU: So what is the deadline? How will you assure this is over during your term?
LAU: lots of things jumping now and then, so there is no hard deadline yet because I don’t want to screw up. I haven’t been able to find a meeting time which works with everyone so we’re going to attempt that one more time, hopefully this weekend.

8. OLD BUSINESS

a. Scholarships & Bursaries: Second Reading Review

WOODS: I sent a new one.
HANWELL: What about the one in the agenda package?
WOODS: Ok it has them split. It clearly reflects the principles. Both are the same but the one I emailed is one after the other. They have the same WHEREAS clauses and BIR clauses.

HANWELL: let’s discuss splitting it first; I don’t have a ton of knowledge but I know how CHAMPAGNE feels.
WOODS: Allow the committee to take a few weeks and think it over.
MILLS: Can we hear pros and cons?
WOODS: The Government thinks of them as one same thing, they are not though; they slash bursaries and add a little in scholarships. Then they say: Oh we give money to scholarships. Bursaries are more needs-based than scholarships so it’s different. Then we should split the policies.
HANWELL: French?
MILLS: We should just advocate on two fronts, use our policies in contrast with what the university and the province is doing.
HANWELL: So far I’m on the side of separating. At the same time, there is too big a chance that since funding for both in total wouldn’t change we wouldn’t have as much of a foothold to advocate for both fronts. Should we change it to “Needs based, not repayable aid”
LAU: Question: as I ran through the international students policy. Should their component on scholarships and bursaries be added to this policy? Should the international differential fee be added to the tuition policy rather than in the international student’s policy?
MILLS: Would there be confusion if we intermix some stuff?
HANWELL: I feel like it should be more specific to international students. And is it changing too much from first reading or can we sneak it in? In my opinion it may change where the policy is going, where its focus is… I think it would work better in international student’s policy. We don’t have specific tabs for rural or aboriginal, etc. and thus we shouldn’t have a specific section in this one.
CHAMPAIGNE: I think they are there in an underlying manner anyways.
BINCYK: I believe it’s better to have it all in the same place, not have links to other policies.
LAU: I think we should have hash tags in our policies…
HANWELL: What I was thinking is when we talk about scholarships and bursaries we’re talking about all students and all specialty groups or interest groups if you prefer, such as low income, aboriginal or rural students. If we are going to add a specific international students section we should do it for all the other ones, too. In any case, I believe they are already in there without being students
MILLS: Also, I believe it might be too specific. We need to give execs room to advocate depending on the political climate and the times.
HANWELL: Question, did you draft the second principles WOODS?
WOODS: Yes. That’s what you are looking at… Yes. Ok so?

CHELEN: First let’s change the “bur-sa-ri-ies” to “bursaries”.
WOODS: No that’s right!
CHELEN: No its not!
CHAMPAGNE: Think of Aries the god of war.
WOODS: Ok so now what are we doing?
HANWELL: I would like to amend to split them. WOODS, you’re making the edits?
CHELEN: another edit, every period except for the one at the end should be a semi-colon.
HANWELL: Ok, so now if we wanted to add international students in there we would have to redraft first principles, approve them, draft second principles, and approve those.

LAU: MOHAMED is visiting family and says: Could it be introduced as an amendment? There is always going to be overlap and so we need to figure out how can we organize our principals for now and the future.

CHELEN: We had his discussion last year in policy. Policies are not for leisure reading and are for our execs to lead. As such, they are assumed to be alllllllll read. The decision they made was to remove duplication.

WOODS: Guys, there is a point missing, but the copy I sent you is the copy we will be passing tonight.

HANWELL: Unless someone wants to move to amend, we will leave it in the international policy. Let’s move to the scholarship policy.

BINCZYK: What’s wrong with that spell-check?

HANWELL: All right so the policies are now called Need based Aid and Merit Based Aid.

CHELEN: Not to throw a wrench in here but the UofA does not distinguish between merit and need based awards. They just speak of awards. Since the ratio is a key issue we need to address this.

WOODS: I’m tired of people going on vacation on scholarship money.

CHELEN: I’m going to Mexico!

MILLS: I don’t see a problem with that.

CHELEN: What we’ve done is broken the policy into two and now there are things missing, things we should be advocating on in both.

After a bunch of talk we will be deciding on the policy via email

b. Health & Wellness Policy Update:

HANWELL: Read comments from agenda. All good to go.

c. Tuition Policy Update:

HANWELL: Please respond to Doodle Poll ASAP to set up a meeting time for Task Force.

d. Internationalization Policy Update:

HANWELL: Students deserve predictable tuition and predictable fees as that’s what is being changed.

MILLS: Third principle from bottom, question: Could you explain how that would be an advocating tool?

LAU: The principle expands three WHEREAS clauses: WHEREAS the rate of international students transitioning into residents status has not been ______

We should advocate in favor of it.

MILLS: Ok, so are students forced to move back home or do they want to live here? What do they want?

LAU: There are a few government programs that give opportunities to
international students to stay or get a taste of staying and we could expand those.

CHELEN: Let’s change “deserve predictable fees” to “with predictable fees, students can budget for yearly expenditures and the full cost of their degree”.

HANWELL: I’m wondering if instead of “budgeting” we should change budgeting to “uptake” or “retention”?

MILLS: I think it would be stronger to have them separate.

CHELEN: What I was trying to say is it was a really moral point and that’s hard to have in a WHEREAS clause because it has no rational.

MILLS: Question about Multiple Entry Visas: Would they allow students to go home for Christmas, for example, and come back without having to pay extra fees? Right now that’s not the case?

WOODS: Yes. And, just for certain countries. Students have to go through crazy hoops to get in the country but some people from other countries are treated differently and have more fees (ex: new visa for re-entry).

MOHAMED: What is the process for working off campus?

LAU: If your GPA is under 2.0 they don’t want you to work they want you to focus on school. So if it’s above 2.0 you can get a work visa. And that’s the Government not the university.

WOODS: So, if a student’s GPA is like 1.7 and struggles to raise their GPA how are they going to buy the things they need and raise their GPA? I believe it’s a cumulative GPA.

MILLS: I think it shouldn’t be cumulative: For example, if one had a 1.7 first semester, a 2.1 second term, then cumulative it’s still lower than 2.0. It should be per term.

WOODS: I have to do more research on the visa issue.

MOHAMED: Is it possible to have reduced hours for people lower than 2.0?

LAU: Also, international students can only work 20 hours a week.

BINCZYK: if they fail don’t they have to return to their country anyways?

HANWELL: Ok, so WOODS has to do more research.

LAU: This policy might be obsolete anyways next year because the UofA is writing one up that is looking very similar.

9. New Business

N/A

10. Discussion

a. Appeals Policy.

HANWELL: Temp checks guys? MOHAMED, you’re probably still interested in this?

MILLS: My concern is time. We need proper research.

HANWELL: It seems to depend on MOHAMED. It will be a miracle if we get through all the policies we need to get through.

MOHAMED: I could definitely prepare something.

LAU: Ok MOHAMMED come talk to execs about it as well.

MILLS: Try and get a temp check from the University as well.

CHELEN: We can tie the hands of next year’s policy committee by just getting it ready for them. I don’t think we should rush or give up on it just because
we’re running out of time.

Mohamed: I will come back with principles.

Hanwell: Form it as well as you can, it’s probably only got one shot in our meetings.

b. Leadership Policy.

Chealen: Well, I think it’s too late right now. University does not care about what U of A students think. They are going ahead with the Leadership College, anyway.

Mills: Can we maybe make a policy to expand this college?

Lau: They probably will, it’s in their best interests.

Hanwell: I don’t think it’s worth creating a policy this year.

Mohamed: I don’t think we should compromise. I agree with Dylan but there should be merit in having some structure for advocating.

Mills: Do we already have a policy about experiential learning?

Chealen: (I think he said yes).

Lau: I think we should contribute to the report that VPA is creating. It would give feedback. I don’t think a policy at this time would be the best use of time.

Mohamed: It is a bit frustrating how there is already signage on the leadership college. They are trying to appease us by slightly raising the admission to the college.

Hanwell: Let’s move on.

Task forces:

Hanwell: Health and Wellness, is it possible to have 1st principles for next meeting?

Binczyk: Not looking good for me… but we can try.

Hanwell: Ok so let’s say February the 11th. Ok so Tuition ➔ waiting for doodle poll. Beyond that we have like… seven policies that are expiring.

Feb 28th Internationalization
Feb 11th tuition
Feb 28th mandatory non-instructional fees

Mohamed: How do we renew expired policies?

Hanwell: Simple renewal meeting, it only takes one reading if there aren’t any amendments. So we should have a grip on things by the end of February.

11. Next Meeting January 28, 2014 at 6:00 PM

12. Adjournment Hanwell moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Chealen.

Vote on Motion
8/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7:52 PM.
**Date:** January 14, 2013  
**Time:** 6:05 PM

### MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WOODS/BINCZYK moved that the January 17, 2014 agenda be approved as</td>
<td>CARRIED 8/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tabled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHAMPAGNE/HANWELL moved that the October 15, 2013 minutes be</td>
<td>CARRIED 8/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approved as tabled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HANWELL/CHELEN moved that the meeting be adjourned.</td>
<td>CARRIED 8/0/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>