



**2003-17/6b**

**SMITH** - Last year, steps were taken to investigate the feasibility of a lawsuit on the grounds that the public members of the University Board of Governors are not "representative of the general public" as required by provincial legislation. Will the President and/or the Vice President (External) comment on the current state of this lawsuit?

**2003-17/6c**

**SMITH** - In March of this year, an item came forward from in the Executive Committee report mandating the removal from the Students' Union building of the Video Information Display System (VIDS). This represented the viewpoint of four of five members of the Executive Committee (the fifth abstained) that, given the various options available in dealing with VIDS, the best and most cost-effective solution was to remove them entirely. Three members of the current Executive were, at the time, voting members of Council - the President (who was at the time the Vice President (Academic), and who provided the abstention on this vote in the Executive Committee), the Vice President (External) (who was at the time a Science Councilor), and the Vice President (Academic) (who was at the time an Education Councilor). All three of these opposed the removal of VIDS, on the grounds that there was a way to make them useful to students without pouring large sums of money down a metaphorical drain. Approximately one half of the Executive Committee's term has now elapsed, and VIDS continues to be useless. What action, if any, will any member of the Executive Committee make to ensure that they will either be made useful at little or no cost, as was committed to last year in Students' Council, or remove them, as was unsuccessfully proposed by the last Executive Committee?

Please see document SC 03-17.02

**2003-17/6d**

**SMITH** - Media coverage of the current multi-year tuition debate has often quoted the President. However, he has not drawn attention in any of this coverage to the Students' Union's current legal incapacity to accept any tuition increase, by virtue of the currently existing political policy calling for a tuition freeze. Is the lack of attention to this point a function of the President not addressing it in any of his comments to the media, or of the media not covering any of his comments on this matter? If the former, will the President commit to drawing attention to this political policy in all future interviews on the subject?

Please see document SC 03-17.02

**2003-17/6e**

**WELKE** - On Remembrance Day this year, I attended the ceremony at the Butterdome, and was pleasantly surprised to hear that the S.U. was called to lay a wreath. As I was escorting one of the veterans residing at the Mewburn Veterans' Centre, my view of those laying wreaths was partially obscured by the cenotaph. I am wondering which member of the S.U. laid the wreath, and if there wasn't one, why not.

Please see document SC 03-17.02

**2003-17/7****APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)**

Please see document SC 03-17.03

2003-17/8

**APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS**

2003-17/9

**OLD BUSINESS**

2003-17/10

**LEGISLATION**

2003-17/10a

**BRECHTEL MOVED THAT** Students' Council strike the words "as per the Students' Union Confidentiality Policy from Article XVIII section 4 of the Constitution (third reading).

Please bring supporting documentation from the October 28, 2003 meeting.

2003-17/11

**NEW BUSINESS**

2003-17/12

**REPORTS**

2003-17/13

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

2003-17/14

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

2003-17/15

**ROLL CALL**

2003-17/15a

**Next Council Meeting**

UPCOMING

December 2, 2003

COUNCIL

January 6, 2003

MEETINGS

2003-17/16

**ADJOURNMENT**

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

---

October 28, 2003  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-15)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/ Absent	Vote
President	Mat Brechtel		
VP Academic	Janet Lo		
VP External	Chris Samuel		X
VP Finance	Tyler Botten		
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah		X
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych		
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Tawana Wardlaw	X	absent
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie		
Arts	Alex Abboud		X
Arts	Chris Bolivar		absent
Arts	Vivek Sharma (Anand Sharma)		X
Arts	Erin Kelly (Shawn Hildebrant)		X

Arts	James Knull		X
Arts	Chris Laver		
Arts	Terra Melnyk	X	X
Arts	Heather Wallace		X
Arts	Paul Welke (Samantha Power)		X
Business	Adam Cook		X
Business	Steve Smith		X
Education			
Education	Allison Ekdahl		abstained
Education			
Education	Christine Wudarck		
Education			
Engineering	Josh Bazin		
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)	X	absent
Engineering	James Crossman		X
Engineering	David Wepler	absent	absent
Law	Dean Hutchison		
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice		
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk	X	absent
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong	X	absent
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat		
Nursing	Jean Abbott		

Nursing			
Open Studies			
Open Studies			
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac		
Physical Education	Holly Higgins		
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth		
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube		
Science	Matthew Eaton		
Science	Tereza Elyas (Justin Kehoe)		absent
Science	Aisha Khatib	X	absent
Science			
Science	Shawna Pandya		
Science	Elaine Poon		
Science	Steven Schendel		
Science	Duncan Taylor		
Science	LeeAnn Lim	X	absent
President Athletics			
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow		
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo		

**MINUTES (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<sup>nd</sup>, 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 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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** – Perhaps the tuition campaign happened last year because there were no other political campaigns 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 5<sup>th</sup>.

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 undealt with. The ones that are still undealt 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 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 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 chair of that board of bylaw 3100, while FAB has the authority to transfer \$2500, we would have approved this straight off. But bylaw 3100 reads that this must be approved by a 2/3 approval by council. So, this needs 2/3 approval from council. At the time we thought we could make a lump sum payment, but now we will be making monthly payments.

**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, Councilor 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 shoveling 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 met know. There will be an additional forum on the 7<sup>th</sup>, 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.

**2003-15/16**

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Motion is carried.**

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

---

November 4, 2003  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-16)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/ Absent @ 9pm
President	Mat Brechtel	
VP Academic	Janet Lo	
VP External	Chris Samuel	
VP Finance	Tyler Botten	
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah	
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych	X
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Tawana Wardlaw	
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie	X
Arts	Alex Abboud	
Arts	Chris Bolivar (proxy)	
Arts	Vivek Sharma	
Arts	Erin Kelly	
Arts	James Knull	
Arts	Chris Laver	

Arts	Terra Melnyk (Samantha Power)	
Arts	Heather Wallace	
Arts	Paul Welke	
Business	Adam Cook	
Business	Steve Smith	
Education		
Education	Allison Ekdahl	
Education		
Education	Christine Wudarck	
Education		
Engineering	Josh Bazin	
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)	
Engineering	James Crossman (proxy)	
Engineering	David Wepler	
Law	Dean Hutchison	
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice	
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk	X
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong	
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat	
Nursing	Jean Abbott	X
Nursing		
Open Studies		
Open Studies		
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac	X

Physical Education	Holly Higgins	
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube	
Science	Matthew Eaton	
Science	Tereza Elyas (Justin Kehoe)	
Science	Aisha Khatib	
Science		
Science	Shawna Pandya	
Science	Elaine Poon	
Science	Steven Schendel	
Science	Duncan Taylor	
Science	LeeAnn Lim	X
President Athletics		
General Manager	Bill Smith	X
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo	

**Guests of Council:** Stephen Kirkham, Chelli Kelly, Adrienne D., Sara Katz, Tara Thompson.

### MINUTES (SC 2003-16)

2003-16/01

#### CALL TO ORDER

**Speaker** calls meeting to order at 6:07 pm.

2003-16/02

#### UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA CHEER SONG “Ring Out a Cheer”

**TAYLOR** leads council in the singing of the cheer song.

2003-16/03

#### SPEAKER’S BUSINESS

**Speaker** – There will not be a meeting next Tuesday – It is Remembrance Day. Any appointments to council tonight?

**SCHENDEL/PANDYA MOVED TO** nominate Justin Kehoe as a Science Councilor to Students' Council for the remainder of the 2003-2004 term.

**SCHENDEL** – We have a number of resignations in September so we went through our entire election list and offered positions to the people who didn't win at that time. Justin Kehoe didn't run in that election, but I would like to nominate him.

**KEHOE** - I didn't run in the elections during the Spring. I talked with several of you about being appointed to council and tried to think of as many democratic methods to be appointed to council. I am willing to take on the responsibility of council. I'll be here either way, as a guest.

**TAYLOR** – If you become a councilor, who is going to be a proxy for me?

**KEHOE**- If possible, I will find a proxy for me and then proxy for you.

**Carried with unanimous consent.**

**Speaker** – There are some vacancies in the student ruling board. When Meeker resigned, one seat opened up for science. I need a motion to appoint someone in science to SCAB.

**SCHENDEL** – I am on SCAB.

**Speaker** – Never mind, then we do have a full SCAB. Under our existing legislation, when they interpret the DIE board bylaws, those interpretations must come to SU for ratification. In effect, DIE Board has said that the Clause in the bylaw which prohibits Students' Council to take action to DIE board is in conflict with the existing bylaw. DIE Board is the court of first instance in the Students' Union. Their decisions are appealable to Students' Council. Anyways, the bylaw that creates this court - no action from Student Council can be taken to DIE Board for questioning. DIE Board has said that it is impossible to carry out its duties, upholding all SU bylaws says that it can't bring student council hearings. There is no way that DIE Board can actually uphold the reasoning. We are not voting on a whole whether their ruling was correct, only voting on their interpretation of the die board by law. (Bylaw 1200).



**WALLACE** – What is the result of this vote?

**Speaker** – Henceforth, Students' Council can be brought for DIE Board breaches of bylaw and constitution. Students' Council can be named as a defendant.

**SMITH** – By endorsing this, we will also be endorsing that die board can overrule scab, and effectively overruling council?

**Speaker** – No, it is the first paragraph, under point 4.

**SMITH** – So DIE Board has ruled under bylaw 1200, they can overturn decisions made by Students' Council.

**Speaker** – Yes, but that is not the portion of the ruling that we are voting on.

**EATON/WELKE MOVED THAT** Students' Council endorse the Thursday, October 30th, 2003 ruling of Jones vs. Harlow, Reikie and Students' Council in so far as their interpretation of bylaw 1200 regarding the jurisdiction of DIE Board in hearing complaints specifically regards to Students' Council and that hence forth, DIE Board has such jurisdiction.

**SMITH** – Bylaw 1200 stipulates if is force council to consider a decision that is already made. But by overturning scab, the question never even got to council, they have effectively overturned council's question by saying that it never happened. I am all about independent judiciary, therefore we need to strip down this interpretation.

**DUBE** – SCAB exists in order to make sure that DIE Board is accountable. SCAB was under the impression that DIE Board screwed up, but they didn't. If SCAB is above DIE Board, how can die board overrule it?

**Speaker** – That is not what we are voting on today. We are not voting to uphold or return its decision, only voting on the portion that outlines their interpretation of bylaw 1200, which would give them the rights of judiciary action. In the future, if this is appealed, Students' Council will have an opportunity to deal with the big picture whether this was made correctly or not.

**HUTCHISON/WALLACE MOVED TO POSTPONE** until next Students' Council meeting.

**Motion to postpone is carried.**

**Speaker** – I would like to introduce Stephanie Van Orman. She is the Executive Assistant to the Executive Committee. She is here tonight to get an idea on how we operate in these chambers. Now, a quick comment from Director of the ECOS office:

**RAE** – A Post conference update - financially, we actually made money. It is a meager sum of \$450. We are still waiting for some bills to come in, so we may break even. It was \$28-25 dollars for tickets and we offered subsidies to 10 students. As well, SOC 260 used our conference as their class assignment and will be writing a report on what they learned for course credits. We had 32 volunteers and we were on CJSR radio show and received coverage on SEE and VIEW. We also had a window mural painting. Some of the outcomes - we were able to uphold our mandate by providing people with a venue to come to and meet different groups. It was a great network-building weekend. One of the sessions we had was on campus sustainability. What came out of that is we got 3 people on the task force to support this. They had 120 students involved, students received credits on everything. I want to thank Councilor Wallace and Janet Lo for coming. We appreciate strengthening the ties between SU and ECOS. I brought everyone on council a gift - vegetable seeds and some conference guides. This guide has everything from getting the media's attention, how to plan a stunt. I will leave some here.

**2003-16/3a**

**BAZIN/TAYLOR MOVED TO** approve the minutes.

**PANDYA** – Page 7, under Question Period, the first number for Samuel's answer should be, "621.58". Page 12, the motion was seconded by "Smith", not "Pandya", and where it says "AEB" in the minutes, it should be "AAB".

**BRECHTEL** – Page 7, first comment under Question Period should read, "Last year's VP Student Life submitted his report", instead of "Last year's President submitted his report". Page 16 should read, "We lost one of our individuals in our advocacy department, and hence also currently retooling."

**Motion is carried.**

**2003-16/3b**

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT** Students' Council move in camera.

**Carried.**

**HUTCHISON/WALLACE MOVED THAT** the in camera minutes be approved.

**Carried.**

**HUTCHISON/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council move ex camera.

**Carried.**

2003-16/04

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**BOTTEN/BAZIN MOVED THAT** the agenda be approved.

**ABBOUD MOVED TO** add item 10b to agenda.

**BRECHTEL** – 10d and 10e on the late additions they can coexist on the agenda.

**Speaker** – Before, as soon as 1 gets passed, the other gets void. The Speaker now looks to Students' Council for guidance on the issue. If there is an item on the agenda that isn't pressing and urgent, then it won't be added to the agenda.

**WELKE** – Is there any way of getting council to follow the rules for late additions?

**Speaker** – For me to rule anything out of order - I have let so many things go by that I don't see a distinction anymore.

**BOTTEN** – Given that you are talking about moving the bar back further, so the agenda items come in a chronological order?

**Speaker** – There are limited abilities for the speaker, these tend to come in between noon and 5 before the day of council. I could do it now, but I am not going to engage in that at this point. I will leave it to council to arrange the agenda as they feel.

**ABBOUD** – From the email I received from the Board of Governors, the tuition undertaking committee is taking our tuition campaign rolling, so it is important to know what our tuition policy is.

**Speaker** – So, given that the tuition policies that have come, is that the university needs to know what our decision is so they can make their own decisions.

**WELKE** – Rise on a point of order on 10d and 10e. We already have a good policy, we don't need a new one.

**Speaker** – So 10e is not on the table, so limited on 10d only.

**TAYLOR** – Thinking about what Welke just said about our tuition policy that is in place that is already good, would Councilor Abboud's motion still be in order since we don't have a policy that is relevant to this year.

**Speaker** – So what you are asking is do we have a policy that is effective? The 2002-2003 heading is a typo, so we do have a policy that is in effect.

**Speaker** – Given the times given throughout and not just in the title, there is no current policy on tuition. Disregard my comments. I rule both ways. So the question, does this question meet the requirements of standing order 12, the Speaker has ruled that it meets the requirement.

**Defeated.**

**BRECHTEL/WALLACE MOVED TO** add 10 d to the agenda

**BRECHTEL** – So it speaks to what was implemented last year for tuition for 02-03 year. That was the wording as applied last year. So we do not have something this year, TUPAC has debated and will be meeting, almost done the imaging, should be done by the Monday after that and sent to print so that as the bill 43 campaign wraps up, we will have a tuition campaign waiting to go.

**Speaker** – Given the precedence just set, it no longer meets the bar, under requirements under standing order 12.

**WALLACE** – Given the explanation from our President, this is urgent and needs to be dealt with and we need to have that debate tonight.

**Speaker** – This is distinguished from the previous motion because this is a committee that has been looking at this for a long time.

**Defeated.**

**BOTTEN/BRECHTEL MOVED TO** add the presentation, 11a, 11b and a pair of reports to the agenda.

**BOTTEN** – I would like to give a presentation before council loses interests. The items under "New Business" are here because of a twitch in the system, and the reports are fun to read.

**Speaker** – These are all out of order. The faculty forums are out of order; they can be handled at the end of the agenda. The dismissal has already occurred and she has already started working.

**BOTTEN** – Would it be possible for someone to bring this body to a disciplinary board given that we have hired or dismissed someone without approval of council?

**Speaker** – It is possible, but unlikely. DIE Board will find one of 2 things, either council is still not in violation, or council is in violation for not doing this earlier. So no, I don't see that as being relevant.

**BRECHTEL** – So on 11a and 11b, I wish to challenge the chair. The reason it is pressing, is because it is important which of the individual in the office gets the pay cheque. We need the official endorsement from council so the person can get paid.

**Speaker** – I believe there is enough flexibility in the budget to make that happen, so we can put this to a later date.

**Chair is defeated.**

**PANDYA** – Does that mean item 5 under presentations on the late additions was ruled as being struck?

**Speaker** – Yes.

**BOTTEN** – Wondering if you can clarify, what is the deadline for late additions to you? Or is it mainly the pressing and urgent nature?

**Speaker** – Deadline is Thursday at noon. Anything after that is a late addition. So it should not be added to our agenda unless it is pressing and urgent such that it cannot be postponed to the next council meeting. I came to the meeting today that I had this bar too low. Acting on that bar, council preceded to lower that bar again. So, I'm left with where I was again. Until I see some backbone to reject somethings from council from time to time.

**Agenda is carried.**

**BAZIN** – Can I make the presentation from the Engineering Week Judge a special order? He's been here and waiting.

**Speaker** – That is what is up next.

**KELLER** – I am the head judge for Engineering Week 2004. Engineering Week is a week of competitions between different engineering clubs. We've invited other faculties to come out and play but nobody has accepted yet. Bazin said that maybe council may be interested and would like to play. So, if you put in a team, you would be treated the same way a first way club is, so you would be exempted from planning events. It really is a blast. Just be warned that if council puts in a team and competes in the events, it would take about 20 people to get this done. There are 15 events, such as a scavenger hunt, battle of the bands, dance group performance, design competition, tug of war, toboggan races...etc. Also food drives - clubs get points on how many donations they can get. There are also blood drives - CBS comes in and does a drive. If council were to enter, you can participate in any or all of the events. If you decide to enter, appoint several coordinators so I can go over the rules.

**SCHENDEL** –Is there an entrance fee?

**KELLER** – No. It starts in the 2nd week of classes in the winter term.

**Speaker** – One final note on the agenda, I think my biggest concern is that I believe that lot of people voting on their motions to strike down the items they didn't want to see tonight, it was based mainly on a convenience, strike them on the agenda, don't use the late additions rule to take them off.

**EATON** – In the case of overturning a decision of the chair, can you have a vote to reconsider?

**Speaker** – No. It is final and finished. I try my best to be just and fair. If you vote against the chair, vote against the chair because you think it is fair, not because it is convenience.

**WELKE** – In regards of Councilor Eaton's question, can we reconsider the approval of the agenda?

**Speaker** – At the end of the meeting, that would be acceptable, but not right now.

**SMITH** – When I created a provision for written questions, I submitted a written question 2 days ago, the VP OP/Fin has responded and has submitted his answer, but the other 3 members of the executive committee has yet to submit them to me.

**BRECHTEL** – Yes, this won't happen again.

**DUBE** – I am wondering where the minutes for the TUPAC meeting are and when should we expect a report on that?

**BRECHTEL** – Council can have those at the next meeting, haven't been approved by TUPAC. Report on TUPAC's progress; things such as political policies, if TUPAC decides those minutes should come back, it is amendable as well.

**PEWARCHUK** – Question for the President - Is the Executive, or is it true that Past-President Hudema received money for his report even though he didn't submit his report? Any disciplinary action against this?

**BRECHTEL** –At this point, there has been no intent to try to push corrective action. If council wishes to suggest that they would like to take that course of action, then we will take it.

**KELLY** – Question for the President – Has he talked to the staff about Parkland Institute and why has SU not followed up with promises? When Parkland decided to take SU as sponsors, staff at the Parkland has been trying to get hold of the President. A letter was addressed to the SU President. Why has SU neglected their end of the bargain and why has the President's communication been lacking?

**BRECHTEL** – The Executive Assistant sent an email to Parkland. There are concerns which Students' Council has to follow through on from previous agreements and request to sponsor the Parkland conference. The letter came to my office last week, as such I did the appropriate thing, which was to send it to staff members and asked why those things didn't happen. They came to our meeting with a written response as to why those things weren't done. For the concerns that were brought forward, those concerns reported to me, I am going to draft a letter and send it tomorrow responding to what those concerns are. The email I sent today on expanding sponsorship, the staff took a look on it, it didn't include a budget or a statement as why it benefits students. As such, we wanted to talk about that tomorrow at our exec meeting. That will be what the institute has for that night. One, there are a list of concerns, for that concern, the staff member discussed, and those will be forthcoming in a letter, we would like to see our execs entertain the expanding sponsorship.

**THOMAS** – I received an email from the Assistant Dean with a notice that they will not approve any more BBQs. Is there anyway deal with L'express so we can still have BBQs on campus?

**MAH** – This is the first time I heard about this. I have not received any email, so didn't know if this was occurring. I basically can't answer your question, because I don't know anything about it. I have a feeling that the VP of Op/Fin can help you.

**WUDARCK** – Question for the VP External. What is going on with the Bill 43 campaign and what is going on with trying to get volunteers for it?

**SAMUEL** – The status of the Bill 43 campaign is right in front of you. The report is included. One final event on November 19 is going to be promoting that event through our usual channels, emails, the usual ways we disburse information. In terms of volunteers, one of the first group we looked to are in this room so if anyone can volunteer time, please stop by my office. I think the answer to that question is to keep on going with what we have been doing.

**COOK** – Question for the VP External. I heard on CJSR yesterday, that there was a conference held. A representative from CAUS was there and why is there no representation from the Students' Union?

**SAMUEL** – Again, turn to my report. In terms of what I have envisioned where to go from federal lobbying firms. I personally haven't received an invitation to the event from CASA. I'm not sure if our organization received one.

**KATZ** – Question for the Board of Governors - he voted in favor for a rent increase. Please tell us why.

**KOTOVYCH** - In terms of rent increase itself, revenues need to be maintained, so this rent increase is still insufficient for the numbers they need to maintain. I voted in favor because the Residents' Hall Association supports the increase in a sense that they are working with the residence people to see how that money will be dispersed. I guess in a sense, the residences see the need for this increase.

**BRECHTEL** – It is not an expediential increase, it is up to 3%. The reason why they feel this is more desirable, there will be no utilities, no buildings. What will first get cut if the budget goes down is the programming - the quality of life of the residences. It is under what CIP was last year. I made sure to ask at the HRA on the decision on how that rent increase was broken down.

**WELKE** – About the missing report from last year's President - why has the President decided to wait and asked for these rules to be enforced?



**BRECHTEL** – Simply that, it is a decision made, relative benefits to relative costs. I don't believe we have the power to withhold things like graduation if there are outstanding debts to the Students' Union. Also, because, it would seem merely vindictive for one executive to go after another executive.

**EKDAHL** – Question for the VP External. Considering you are in need for volunteers, why haven't you put them on your contact list?

**SAMUEL** – I was under the impression that everyone that was on the list was already on the list. This subscribe command has been fairly straight forward. I guess this is something to look at and I will do that when I get back into the office.

**WALLACE** – I would like to know where the President's council report is and what happened at the meeting when he went to Carl Arnheim and gave him the follow up with the multi-year tuition.

**BRECHTEL** – I'll do the report tomorrow. The response from the Provost - I brought forth the concerns that certain things be up kept, such as, the tuition increase be separate from multi-year tuition. The Provost will go back and examine it. It will be what verifies or denies us. Since then, I've spoken with him and both have told me how they are unwilling to make it 50% to entertain the proposal. As TUPAC outlined, 50% was in our proposal. I have been in discussion with the Provost, the VP Finance and Operations and the VP External Relations on some possible alternatives on the tuition campaign. So that is where we stand and where we are meeting.

**PANDYA** – Question for the VP of Operations/Finance. For the faculty forums, what time do the volunteers show up?

**BOTTEN** – I would say that noon is a good time to be there. These rooms need to be cleared out between 11:50-noon. Allot the same time that university does to travel from one place to another.

**DUBE** – Question for the President. The day of action on Bill 43 was an important event, but why there were no executives at the AGM? I know that not all members of the executive were at the day of the action.

**BRECHTEL** – Our notification of the AGM was after the Day of Action. At the Day of Action, from noon to 3:30, I was there when I could be, but I had already committed to the day of action.

**TAYLOR** – With respect to the MP bus drive thing, how many members of the media were contacted?

**SAMUEL** – We sent out our press releases through group send, which means all the newspapers, what that means is that all the major outlets were notified of the event. We also ask our exec communications office to do a media call around and try to sell the story. As to why no media showed up, who knows what goes on around the media rooms, it could have been a failing of the press release, or a busy day at the press. It was also Halloween that day.

**DUBE** – Question for VP Student Life. Wondering why she wasn't present at the Day of Action and could she have made the AGM?

**MAH** – I was off campus for another meeting and preparing for the food bank meeting and the chancellor search committee. I don't really remember, just that I was really busy.

2003-16/9

**LEGISLATION**

2003-16/10a

**BOTTEN/BAZIN MOVED THAT**, upon recommendation of the Internal Affairs Board, Students' Council repeal Article X of the Students' Union Constitution. (Third reading)

**Carried with unanimous consent.**

2003-16/10b

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT**, upon recommendation of the Internal Review Board Students' Council rescind bylaw 600 ad Bylaw 2100 be amended as tabled.

**BRECHTEL** – This is getting rid of those general meetings, which aren't really general meetings, but candidate forums. The changes within 2100, just take out the actual definition and reference to it. So the meeting can be whatever we want it to be.

**Motion is carried.**

2003-16/10c

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council strike the words, "as per the Students' Union Confidentiality Policy from Article XVIII section 4 of the Constitution (second reading)."

**BRECHTEL** – This is part of rectifying that situation. For this meeting and next meeting we will have a policy that exists.

**Carried with unanimous consent.**

2003-16-10e

**BRECHTEL/WALLACE MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Tuition Undertakings Planning and Action Committee, approve the proposed changes to the Political Policy regarding Tuition.

**BRECHTEL** - TUPAC has been going through a process about what our tuition should reflect, what we see the tuition system at the U of A should be. What you see in this policy is a reflection of all those steps. What we have done is try to put together, an argument that we believe in these principles. TUPAC has discussed this, and students have made a statement that they want to be in post secondary and are willing to put with the costs. This is a step down from the ideal, what you pay up front is only a symbol of what you believe, however in the long term, the final number that students pay should be somewhat reflective of what they get. We also got into things such as the current environment, this takes the argument that the first line here, we are not meeting that. The next 4 clauses are support for the first 3 statements.

Whereas accessibility has been threatened, that statement is meant to reflect that we need money to support the education at the University of Alberta. However, we need to put those 2 values against each other and judge which one is in a dire situation. So, it gives some reorganization that they are both valuable, between the 2, tuition is more pressing. Tuition freeze, may not be the final outcome, they will be trying to have a long-term goal. The SU worked with the funds needed from the provincial government, we developed a campaign, this is speaking not to the demand of a tuition freeze, we actually developed a campaign to do it. Also, the money that comes in should go towards tuition. As the students' representative, we need to see some return for students.

**WELKE /HUTCHISON MOVED TO adjourn.**  
**Motion to adjourn is defeated.**

**SMITH/WELKE MOVED TO strike, "WHEREAS tuition is meant as a symbol of a students' commitment to their education rather than a source of revenue for a post-secondary institution"**

**DUBE** - Basically we decided as a committee that it was important for students to have a contribution to their education. Thus, we tried to decide what would be an appropriate number for tuition. Students should commit themselves financially to their post-secondary education. We should not be seen as a source of revenue.

**SAMUEL** – I must vote against this amendment. I see the point, but I think a more productive way to make the amendment, replace with "should be", instead of "whereas".

**WALLACE** – I think tuition is a symbol committing to their education, instead of paying operating costs. Students came for their education, not to run buildings. That is the principle behind this. What this is supposed to do, education is not a commodity in itself and it speaks against it. Educated people are the commodity that the government should make an investment to.

**WEPPLE** – On the off hand, in case someone read our political policy, whereas, when they read for the 2nd thing, I am going to stop reading here. Tuition is a way that it funds all the benefits, what it actually costs, we are talking about photocopying some assignments to give out, tuition is not just saying that I really want this, it is putting up an institution where people can get their degrees from.

**HUTCHISON** – If you read this, it is meant as a symbol. I would hope that this symbol is obtaining a degree. There is no value in having this part of the political policy.

**BOTTEN** – I'm reading the 3rd whereas where it covers, the costs of delivering education. Tuition is only a symbol because of the annual tuition fight.

**BRECHTEL** – I think right now we are looking at striking an amendment. I would suggest that if it is poorly worded, we change the wording. But some people don't believe in this as a principle. There are 2 different ways how tuition should be set. You should charge, instead of delivering the costs up front. It should be merely enough that people don't hang around here for 20 years and then just bankrupt themselves. It prevents people from abusing them. So it is merely meant as that. If you believe that it should be enough that people don't hang around and abuse the system. I am personally voting against the amendment.

**SMITH** – My interpretation is, if you believe that facts have a place on political policy, then you should vote in favor of this amendment. If we form a political policy on what tuition should be, that is a full policy that shouldn't be happening.

**DUBE** – Is there any mechanism to extend debate?

**Speaker** – Yes, to move to informal consideration.

**DUBE MOVED TO** suspend the standing orders.

**DUBE** – I think that discussing this amendment, I would not feel comfortable voting on this under the current standards, we should be free to discuss this.

**Motion to suspend standing order 28 is carried.**

**The amendment is carried.**

**WALLACE/DUBE MOVED TO** amend the whereas to say, "WHEREAS tuition increase have posed a greater threat to accessibility than to the quality of education."

**Amendment is considered friendly.**

**COOK** – 2 things, try to avoid the debacle where the political policy didn't actually expire, but would like to amend the expiration date to say Sept 2004.

**BRECHTEL** – Maybe take out the first “be it resolve”.

**COOK/PANDYA MOVED TO** strike the words, “2003-04 school year” from the first “BE IT RESOLVED”

**Main motion is carried.**

**2003-16/11**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**2003-16/11a**

**BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve the dismissal of the current Safewalk Director for the period of November 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004.

**Carried.**

**2003-16/11b**

**BRECHTEL/RICE MOVED THAT** Students' Council ratify the hiring of Samantha Maxson as the Safewalk Director for the period of November 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004.

**BRECHTEL** - The good news is, we hired an individual who is highly competent. She is a fantastic individual.

**Motion is carried.**

**2003-16/14**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**TAYLOR** – I would like to thank everyone who showed up to science banquet and people who showed up during other science events.

**WEPLER** – I would like to give a huge thank you to everyone who shaved my head. Kyle Kawanami did a fantastic job. In total, 36 people shaved their head and in general raised \$12,000.

**DUBE** – The Faculte St. Jean will be having their legendary party at the Velvet Lounge on Nov 14.

**SCHENDEL** – Wanted council to know that UASUS and BSA is getting together for Engineering Week.

**SAMUEL** – I would like to highlight one thing in my report, in the bottom, that is a little vague, when we went to the MLA offices, Lord Blaken who also came out to the U of A Seniors day, she is having an event that is going to be a lot of fun this Friday. Bill 43 will be a topic and there will be live music and entertainment.

**BRECHTEL** – The 2nd week of January is also tuition week. As TUPAC, we hope to get involvement from all of council, student groups, everybody. I would love to have students involved in Engineering week.

**2003-16/16**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**HUTCHISON/SMITH MOVED TO ADJOURN** at 8:50 pm  
**Carried.**

## Bylaw 1200

### A Bylaw Respecting the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board of the Students' Union

- Short Title** 1. a. This Bylaw may be referred to as the "Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board Bylaw".
- b. Throughout this Bylaw, "D. I. E. Board" will mean the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board.
- Start-up** 2. An ad hoc committee will be struck before September 15 of each year for the purpose of selecting the members and alternate members of D.I.E. Board from applications submitted, and for selecting the Chair and the Alternate Chair of the D.I.E. Board.
- Ad Hoc Committee To Select D.I.E. Board Members**
- a. The ad hoc committee will be comprised of:
- i. President, as Chair;
  - ii. the Chair or Alternate Chair of the D.I.E. Board, and one other member of the D.I.E. Board, as selected by that Board;
  - iii. one (1) Students' Union Ombudsperson;
  - iv. a Vice-President;
  - v. two (2) voting members of the Students' Council as elected at a regular meeting of Students' Council.
- b. Quorum at meetings of the ad hoc committee will be five (5) members.
- c. To be selected to D.I.E. Board, candidates will be:
- i. objective and impartial;
  - ii. where possible, from different faculties;
  - iii. available on short notice.
- Mandate** 3. a. A Board called the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board will be established annually by Students' Council for the purposes of enforcing and interpreting the Constitution and Bylaws of the Students' Union, and motions of Students' Council.
- b. The D.I.E. Board will be responsible for the interpretation of the Constitution and Bylaws of the Students' Union, or any portion or portions thereof, or motion of Students' Council, except that interpretation of Bylaw 1200 (D.I.E. Board Bylaw) must be ratified by Students' Council before any action may be taken thereon.

June 18/02  
May 2/01  
Sept 16/97  
May 14/96

- c. The D.I.E. Board will be responsible for the enforcement of the Constitution and Bylaws of the Students' Union and may:
  - i. censure any Students' Union member, Students' Union committee, task force, board, or any registered club;
  - ii. suspend Students' Union privileges for any period of time up to and including twelve (12) calendar months, where such a suspension may not result in the removal of a sitting Student Councilor or member of the Executive Committee;
  - iii. recommend to Students' Council that a sitting Student Councilor or member(s) of the Executive Committee be recalled pursuant to Article XIII;
  - iv. declare null and void any motion of a Students' Council committee, task force, board, commission or registered club which is found to be in conflict with or outside the terms of the Students' Union Constitution and Bylaws;
  - vi. require that any Students' Council motion which is found to be in conflict with or outside the terms of the Students' Union Constitution and Bylaws be reconsidered at the next regular or special meeting of Students' Council immediately following the published D.I.E. Board decision. Any motion to be reconsidered as per a D.I.E. Board decision will have no effect until it has been duly reconsidered, and once reconsidered, will be beyond the enforcement capabilities of the D.I.E. Board.
  
- d. The D.I.E. Board will select two (2) outgoing members of the D.I.E. Board, who will be returning as members of the Students' Union, to serve on the ad hoc committee to select the Deputy Returning Officer(s) for the upcoming term. These members will be selected after the Students' Union General Election and before November 30 of each year.

**Composition**

- 4. The Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board will be composed of:
  - a. Five (5) members of the Students' Union in their second or further years of study, who will serve as regular members;
  - b. Five (5) members of the Students' Union in their second or further years of study, who will serve as alternate members and will sit as Board members when regular members are absent or disqualified pursuant to section 6.d. of this Bylaw.

June 18/02 (IRB)

May 2/01

Sept 16/97

May 14/96



- Chair**
5. a. The Chair of the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board will be chosen by the ad hoc committee, as outlined in Section 2 of this Bylaw.
- b. Should the Chair be absent, the Alternate Chair will be Chair, and in the absence of the Alternate Chair, a member of the Board will be elected as Chair at that meeting.
- Conduct of Business**
6. a. Quorum at all meetings of the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board will be five (5) members.
- Limitation on Membership**
- b. No person will concurrently hold a position on the D.I.E. Board and a position on Students' Council, including any of its standing boards, committees or commissioners; and furthermore will not be a paid employee of the Students' Union.
- Duration of Appointment**
- c. Members of the D.I.E. Board will hold office from October 1 of each year to September 30 of the following year.
- Incompetence of Members**
- d. In the event that a charge is laid against a regular member of the D.I.E. Board or they are otherwise deemed unfit, that person will not be competent to adjudicate and will be, for that meeting, replaced by an alternate member of the D.I.E. Board. In the event that the Chair is so deemed, the Alternate Chair will replace them.
- Initiation of Action**
- e. A complaint, request for interpretation, or request for enforcement proceeding must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the D.I.E. Board with a description of the facts upon which the complaint or request is based, and may be initiated by:
- i. any person who is a member of the Students' Union;
  - ii. any Students' Union committee, task force, board or commission, with the sole exception of the D.I.E. Board;
  - iii. any club registered with the Students' Union;
  - iv. the Students' Council; or,
  - v. the Students' Union Chief Returning Officer.
- Jurisdiction**
- f. A complaint or request to the D.I.E. Board may be laid against:
- i. any member of the Students' Union thought to be in breach of a provision of the Students' Union Constitution or Bylaws, or a motion of Students' Council;
  - ii. any Students' Union committee, task force, board, or commission, with the exception of Students' Council, thought to be in breach of a provision of the Students' Union Constitution or Bylaws, or a motion of Students' Council.

June 18/02 (IRB)

May 2/01

Sept 16/97

May 14/96

- Service of Complaint** g. A copy of the complaint must be served on the person or organization charged not less than three (3) days before the hearing, excepting complaints brought under Bylaw 2100 (Elections Bylaw), where a meeting of D.I.E. Board will be convened within twenty-four (24) hours of notice having been served.
- Call of Meeting** h. Upon receipt of a complaint, request for interpretation or request for enforcement, the Chair will issue written notice to the members of the D.I.E. Board, calling a meeting within the seven (7) days following.
- Public Meetings** i. Meetings of the D.I.E. Board will be open to all members of the Students' Union, except that any meeting or part of a meeting may be closed to all persons other than those requested to appear, at the discretion of the Board.
- Refusal to Hear** j. The D.I.E. Board may decide upon consensus that there are no grounds for deliberation and refuse to hear the complaint.
- k. An interpretive decision by the D.I.E. Board will be binding on the Board until the Section or motion so interpreted is amended by Students' Council.
- l. A copy of all interpretive decisions of the D.I.E. Board will be sent to the Chair of the Internal Review Board for inclusion in the Master Copy of the Constitution and Bylaws.
- m. A copy of the judgment delivered by the D.I.E. Board will be kept on file at the Students' Union office and will be available for all Students' Union members to examine upon request.
- Publishing of Decisions** n. A full and complete copy of all decisions of the D.I.E. Board, unaltered in any manner as to content, will be published in the Official Student Newspaper not later than two (2) weeks after the decision is made or at the earliest opportunity.
- Procedure for Hearings** 7. The D.I.E. Board will follow such procedures and make such findings of fact as are necessary to ensure a fair hearing and a just decision, provided that each party has an opportunity to present an argument to the Board and to question the opponent or the opponent's witness(es).

June 18/02 (IRB)  
 May 2/01  
 Sept 16/97  
 May 14/96

- a. The following outline should be followed, at the discretion and through the direction of the Chair, at all meetings of the D.I.E. Board:
  - i. the Chair will invite the Appellant to state their case and call any witnesses they may have;
  - ii. the D.I.E. Board and Defendant will then have the opportunity to individually cross-examine the Appellant and any of their witnesses;
  - iii. in a similar manner to (i), the Chair will invite the Defendant to present their case and call any witnesses they may have;
  - iv. the D.I.E. Board and Appellant will then have the opportunity to individually cross-examine the Defendant and any of their witnesses.
- b. The D.I.E. Board may request any person to appear at a meeting of the Board whose evidence would assist the Board in making a decision.
- c. All parties appearing before the D.I.E. Board will be entitled to be represented by counsel.
- d. In the event of absence of one of the parties to the hearing, the D.I.E. Board may proceed with the hearing notwithstanding the party's absence.
- e. In hearing a request or complaint, excepting complaints brought under Bylaw 2100 (Elections Bylaw), a meeting of the D.I.E. Board may be adjourned at the pleasure of the Board, but such a meeting will be reconvened within seven (7) days of adjournment to complete adjudication of the matter.

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Appeal</b>       | 8. Decisions of the D.I.E. Board may be appealed to Students' Council through the Students' Council Appeal Advisory Board, pursuant to Bylaw 1300, excepting decisions of the D.I.E. Board related to a Students' Union election as set forth in Bylaw 2100 (Elections Bylaw). |
| <b>Final Report</b> | 9. The Chair will annually submit to Students' Council a final written report of activities and recommendations.   |

June 18/02 (IRB)  
 May 2/01  
 Sept 16/97  
 May 14/96

## President's Responses to Questions from Steve Smith

*1. It is my understanding that last year's President did in fact submit a written report of sorts and that, in the absence of any criteria defining what constituted an acceptable written report, was paid his salary in full, and that this payment was not, as the current President recently indicated in Council, an error on the part of a Students' Union staff member. Will the President confirm or deny this version of events?*

In looking into the state of the report of the previous president, I asked the personnel manager if she had received a copy of the report, she replied that she had not. I then asked the EA if she had, and she replied no, as well. I also did not receive any report from the ex-president. As such, I don't believe that he submitted a report to any individual. This report may exist, but no member of the SU staff that I asked. I do also know that this individual did receive full pay.

*2. In March of this year, an item came forward from in the Executive Committee report mandating the removal from the Students' Union building of the Video Information Display System (VIDS). This represented the viewpoint of four of five members of the Executive Committee (the fifth abstained) that, given the various options available in dealing with VIDS, the best and most cost-effective solution was to remove them entirely. Three members of the current Executive were, at the time, voting members of Council - the President (who was at the time the Vice President (Academic), and who provided the abstention on this vote in the Executive Committee), the Vice President (External) (who was at the time a Science Councilor), and the Vice President (Academic) (who was at the time an Education Councilor). All three of these opposed the removal of VIDS, on the grounds that there was a way to make them useful to students without pouring large sums of money down a metaphorical drain. Approximately one half of the Executive Committee's term has now elapsed, and VIDS continues to be useless. What action, if any, will any member of the Executive Committee make to ensure that they will either be made useful at little or no cost, as was committed to last year in Students' Council, or remove them, as was unsuccessfully proposed by the last Executive Committee?*

This issue was discussed at the executive committee, and exec decided that it was best examined by a single member of the executive in consultation with the tech department. As such we assigned this task to a single member, and to this point there has been no specific recommendation.

*3. Media coverage of the current multi-year tuition debate has often quoted the President. However, he has not drawn attention in any of this coverage to the Students' Union's current legal incapacity to accept any tuition increase, by virtue of the currently existing political policy calling for a tuition freeze. Is the lack of attention to this point a function of the President not addressing it in any of his comments to the media, or of the media not covering any of his comments on this matter? If the former, will the President commit to drawing attention to this political policy in all future interviews on the subject?*

At the point that this question was asked, I had only referred to my inability to accept any tuition increase greater than a freeze. After this point I have referred it several times. However, a statement that I am bound by political policy is significantly weaker than to say that it is unacceptable and inappropriate is a stronger statement and response. As such, mention of the political policy is not paramount, but supportive of any stance and initiative of the Students' Union.

#### **Presidents' Response to Question from Paul Welke**

*4. On Remembrance Day this year, I attended the ceremony at the Butterdome, and was pleasantly surprised to hear that the S.U. was called to lay a wreath. As I was escorting one of the veterans residing at the Mewburn Veterans' Centre, my view of those laying wreaths was partially obscured by the cenotaph. I am wondering which member of the S.U. laid the wreath, and if there wasn't one, why not.*

There was no member of the Students' Union to lay a wreath. To the best of my knowledge (and I have double checked with my EA, who is also the supervisor of the support division of the SU) there was no invitation extended to any member of the Students' Union this year. I was originally informed of this ceremony and how the SU is generally invited, and I fully intended to attend, waiting with anticipation for the invitation. However, that never came, and although I was in the office and ready (with proper attire, as can be attested by the VP OF) on the morning (a holiday day off) I confirmed that day with my EA that there had been no invitation extended.

**Executive Committee Report to Students' Council November 18, 2003**

**1. The following motions were passed at the November 3, 2003, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. LO/BOTTEN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve an expenditure of not to exceed \$105.00 for the necessary tools and promotion materials for the November run of Gripe Tables.

VOTE MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED

- b. BOTTEN/LO MOVED THAT the Executive Committee adopts the proposed plan for completion of the 2001/2002 Organizational Review with a full set of recommendations to be presented to Students' Council no later than March 9th, 2004.

VOTE MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED

**2. The following motions were passed at the November 5, 2003, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. LO/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE amend the agreement with the Law Students' Association such that the costs they incur for Faculty Association handbooks not exceed half the Design+Administration+Assembly costs for a total of \$1450.00

VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

- b. BOTTEN/LO MOVED THAT the Executive Committee rescind Operating Policy 14.05 relating to employee travel.

VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

**3. The following motions were passed at the November 12, 2003, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. MAH/BOTTEN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the hiring of a MUGs (My Undergraduate Groups) COORDINATOR for the period of November 24, 2003 to March 31, 2004.

VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

- b. BOTTEN/SAMUEL MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve an expenditure not to exceed \$1,000.00 for the materials required for the promotion and execution of the Bill 43 Campaign events on the 17th and 18th of November, 2003

VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED