Tuesday February 28, 2006
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ORDER PAPER (SC 2005-23)

2005-23/1 CALL TO ORDER
2005-23/2 SPEAKER’S BUSINESS
2005-23/2a Announcements – The next meeting of Students’ Council will take place on Tuesday March 14, 2006.
2005-23/3 APPROVAL OF THE ORDERS OF THE DAY
2005-23/4 PRESENTATIONS
2005-23/5 NOMINATIONS
2005-23/6 REPORTS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
2005-23/6a Mathieu Johnson, Vice President (Academic)
Please see document SC 05-23.01
2005-23/6b Justin Kehoe, Vice President (Student Life)
Please see document SC 05-23.02
2005-23/6c Executive Committee – February 21, 2006
Please see document SC 05-23.03
2005-23/7 QUESTION PERIOD
2005-23/8 BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS
2005-23/8a Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board – Case 11: Relating to Election Material
Please see document SC 05-23.04
2005-23/8b Audit Committee - February 8, 2006
Please see document SC 05-23.05
2005-23/9c Awards Committee – February 3, 2006

Please see document SC 05-23.06

2005-23/9 GENERAL ORDERS

2005-23/9a POWER MOVED THAT Bill #28 be read a first time.

Bill #28 Effective Political Policy Reform (sponsor; POWER)
Principles (first reading)
1. The existing legislative provisions regarding political policy are repealed.
2. Political policies are directives from students’ council to the exec committee outlining where students’ unions advocacy efforts should be directed.
3. For each political policy passed the exec committee is required to develop an implementation plan, which will outline the actions to be taken and resources required in a given year.
4. Are adopted, amended or rescinded by two simple majority votes of students’ council occurring not less than 7 days apart.

2005-23/9b TOBIAS MOVED THAT Bill #30 be read a first time.

Bill #30 – Repeal of Bylaw 700 (sponsor; TOBIAS)
Principle (first reading)
1. Repeal of redundant legislation in Bylaw 700 (A Bylaw Respecting the Privileges of Students’ Union Members).

2005-23/9c TOBIAS MOVED THAT Bill #31 be read a first time.

Bill #31 – Repeal of Bylaw 3200 (sponsor; TOBIAS)
Principle (first reading)
1. Repeal of redundant legislation in Bylaw 3200 (A Bylaw Respecting the Honoraria and Salaries paid by the Students’ Union to Term and Elected Employees).

2005-23/9d TOBIAS MOVED THAT Bill #32 be read a first time.

Bill #32 – Repeal of Bylaw 3300 (sponsor; TOBIAS)
Principle (first reading)
1. Repeal of redundant legislation in Bylaw 3300 (A Bylaw Respecting the General Manager of the Students’ Union).

2005-23/10 INFORMATION ITEMS
Taskforce Land

As most of you hopefully know, Justin and I have been taking a critical look at how advocacy is done on campus and what should be done to improve it. Our taskforce has decided that an increase in capacity for work, the need for continuity, the need for an understanding of the process of advocacy, and the need to ensure that resources intended for university advocacy do not get subsumed by external advocacy is the defining objectives for any solution.

Our recommendation to Budget and Finance Committee is therefore a restructuring of the advocacy department to hire a new permanent staff tasked to university advocacy, and move the UPIO into the advocacy department. The org chart looking something like this:
Where the advocacy director is intended to work with the executive committee as a whole. The thick dotted lines are intended to show direct working relationships as well as the flow of direction; however, it should remain clear that the advocacy director will be the managers of all staff in the advocacy department. The thin dotted lines are only to denote probable working groups not to show any short of work flow or direction flow. The currently before BFC and is being considered, and a full proposal will be forwarded to council with the budget. Of course if you have questions please ask either in question period or anytime.

Announcements

The Writing Task Force, is sponsoring an instructional expert to put on a seminar for university professors. Toby Fulwiler is an expert in using writing to learn a technique used to better engage students in the learning that is supposed to be happening. The seminar is on Thursday, April 27th, 2:00 – 5:00 p.m. and is for all professors and grad students from all departments. If you know of a professor who you think might be interested or would benefit from the seminar please inform him or her of the opportunity and direct them to http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/wtf/index.htm
Good Evening Council,

Vice President Johnson and I have continued to work with our University Advocacy Task Force, and the members have contributed greatly to our efforts of improving our non-external advocacy. Recognizing the need for increased capacity, continuity, and knowledge/experience, the Task Force has unanimously recommended a proposal to create a full-time permanent position to provide this support to our University advocacy (tentatively titled “University Affairs Officer”).

Organizational structure was a more contentious issue due to concerns of University advocacy resources being co-opted for external advocacy purposes. The final Task Force recommendation is to restructure our Advocacy Department to include a University advocacy stream of this new University Affairs Officer and the current University Policy and Information Officer (a researcher). Having a separate stream should create a balanced symmetry that will ensure resources stay true to their intended purpose. The current organizational chart can be found in the VPA report. After BFC, this proposal will ultimately return to Council.

Services: We are implementing further structural improvements. The Academic Guidance Centre will merge into Information Services, creating a stronger unified service. After lengthy interviews, we should have our two new CSD Managers in March.

Events: The Revolutionary Speakers Series is undergoing an operational overhaul to involve more student/Councillor/community input, and less 2-900 staff domination. A speaker selection committee will be posted in March. Our last installment, with Wade Davis, sold out. Wellness Week has not been entirely eliminated, but it will not be continuing in its traditional format. I have convinced those involved that a repeat of last year would be a mistake, and our SU commitment to the event will be scaled back.

I met with the Residence Halls Association President to work on the SU-RHA relationship. I discussed with the Director of Campus Security plans to create a formalized structure for communication with the SU. There was a General Faculties Council meeting on Monday, and today I presented the SU Rising Star Award to two very deserving students at the Senate’s Beyond These Halls Recognition Ceremony.

Upcoming:
March 2: Campus Law Review Committee
Residence Council
March 8: Campus Food Bank Board meeting
UHC Pharmacy Advisory Committee
March 10: Bar Safety meeting w/ Councillors Leibovici and Krushell
March 13: Edmonton Community Services Committee
Council on Student Affairs

vp.studentlife@su.ualberta.ca
492-4236
Executive Committee Report to Students’ Council February 28, 2006

1. There were no motions passed at the February 3, 2006 Executive Meeting.

2. There were no motions passed at the February 7, 2006 Executive Meeting.

3. The following motion was passed at the February 14, 2006 Executive Meeting:
   a. LETTNER/TOBIAS MOVED THAT the Executive Committee call an
      emergency meeting of Students’ Council on Thursday February 16, 2006
      at 3:00 pm to deal with a significant development regarding the Travel
      Cuts lawsuit.
      VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

4. There were no motions passed at the February 17, 2006 Executive Meeting.

5. The following motion was passed at the February 21, 2006 Executive Meeting:
   a. TOBIAS/LETTNER MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve
      the proposed settlement agreement relating to the TravelCuts lawsuit.
      VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
The Discipline, Interpretation, and Enforcement Board have made the following rulings:

**Re. Campaign Materials**

**Ruling:** #11

**Date heard:** February 17, 2006

**Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:**
- **Presiding Chair:** Jaimie Gruman,
- **Tribunes:** Alan Cliff, Kanchana Fernando

**Referring Party:** Rachel Woynorowski – Chief Returning Officer

Intervenors present: None.

**Case summary:**

The referring party asks whether material produced by the elections office containing information about candidates, slates, and plebiscite sides (e.g., the Gateway supplement) constitute campaign materials. The panel finds that, in general, they do not. The panel further rules that costs associated with such materials are not considered to constitute campaign expenses. The panel also determines that the elections office is not restricted from distributing these materials during voting.

**RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS**

- **Bylaw 2100 s.2(d):** defines campaign activity as “any act, planned or organized on behalf of any candidate or slate, that is calculated to draw attention to that candidate or slate’s candidacy.”

- **Bylaw 2100 s.2(n):** defines campaign materials as “physical or electronic media produced or distributed as part of campaign activities.”

- **Bylaw 2100 s.2(f):** defines campaign expenses as “expenditures incurred in engaging in campaign activities.”

- **Bylaw 2100 s.106:** states that “during voting, candidates shall not encourage members to vote or engage in any campaign activities.”

**REFERRED QUESTIONS AND SHORT ANSWERS**

**Question 1:** Are materials produced by the Elections Office considered campaign materials where each candidate (campaign side) in a race is given an equal opportunity to participate?

**Short Answer:** No.
Question 2: Are the materials mentioned above considered to be campaign expenses, and should these be included in a candidate’s final budget?
Short Answer: No.

Question 3: Can the Elections Office distribute these materials during voting?
Short Answer: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS
Under Bylaw 2100 s.2(n), campaign materials are “produced or distributed as part of campaign activities,” which, under s.2(d) are “planned or organized on behalf of any candidate or slate [and] calculated to draw attention to that candidate or slate’s candidacy.” As long as materials produced by the Election Office are calculated to draw attention to the election as a whole, or a particular race, rather than any single candidate or slate, they are not campaign materials. As the production and dissemination of these materials does not constitute a campaign activity, costs incurred are not campaign expenses and need not be included in candidates’ budgets.

Bylaw 2100 s.106 restricts candidates from “encourag[ing] members to vote [and] engag[ing] in any campaign activities” during voting. As long as the elections staff are not candidates, s.106 does not prevent them from distributing election information and encouraging members to vote.
Audit Committee

Wednesday, February 8, 2006

ATTENDANCE: Theresa Chapman  Cam Lewis
Prem Eruvs  Tim Schneider (guest)
Bryce Kustra  Eugene Lee from APIRG (guest)

CALL TO ORDER: 2:04 pm

NEW BUSINESS: Eruvs/Chapman motion to approve the disbursement of the APIRG DFU. (0-2-2(Eruvs, Lewis))
We were joined once again by Eugene from APIRG to discuss the disbursement of the APIRG DFU. What we hoped would be a short meeting once again turned into an episode in frustration. During our previous meeting with Eugene we had outlined three concerns that would need to be resolved before the DFU was dispersed: an official copy of the Audit, a plan of action to reduce the contingency fund and a plan of action for investing the contingency fund. While the APIRG Board of Directors had discussed these, Audit Committee did not feel that ‘discussion’ was a strong enough commitment. We thus requested written commitment from the APIRG Board of Directors that the contingency fund would be reduced and that the funds would be invested. Furthermore, we did not yet have a copy of the signed, official APIRG audit from the auditors. Audit Committee also brought its concerns about APIRG’s accounting to Eugene’s concern. APIRG does not currently implement Generally Accepted Account Principles and there are examples of shifting in the year-end statements to equate revenues and expenses. Audit Committee did not feel that the resources necessary to correct this were an effective use of students’ money but we reinforced that in future years the disbursement process would be much simpler if this issue was resolved.

Audit Committee will reconvene and its earliest possible convenience (including reading week) once Eugene has been able to obtain all necessary documents.

NEXT MEETING: TBA

ADJOURNMENT: 3:46 pm
03 February 2006 @ 15:30 - SUB 306

Present: Amanda Henry, Omer Yusuf, Nancy Jacobsen, Joanna Jagiello, Simina Ionescu-Mocanu, Cameron Elliott, James Montgomery

Attached: 2005/06 SU Award Winners

Meeting begins at 3:24

1. Review of Procedure

HENRY: Hopefully everyone has given a read over the criteria for the awards. We are still missing the criteria for the Subway Award. Also, we have another SALUTE nomination. Is that acceptable to the committee?
(unanimously accepted).
The Royal Bank Involvement award is only ONE award for $500, not two.
The awards that have a GPA requirement are met for those that are in the binder.
The transcript binder contains all the transcripts and might not be in alphabetical order. We will refer to them as needed.
There were 5 applications that were disqualified right away because some people checked more than three awards. There were also a handful of applications with more than 2 ref letters. We’ll address them when the time comes.
Simina: I have to leave at 7:00 and I’ll be back in 2 or 3 hours.
Henry: How late do we want to go tonight? Seems like we’ll be going late. Do we want to start at 9:00 tomorrow morning?
(unanimously agreed to go until midnight)
Nancy: We should divide into groups to figure out who we like the most, and then debate on them
(unanimously agreed to use this strategy for awards with larger applicant pools, with the exception of the Award for Excellence)
Henry: We can still move them around too.
(unanimously recognized the committee’s right to consider applicants for awards that they did not apply for but were eligible to win)
Also, Omer and I will be non-voting members
(Committee accepts our non-voting status, and are willing to hear our thoughts and opinions until we actually come to a vote).

2. Awards Selection

Do we want to start with a smaller award?
Went in camera at 3:36

Recessed for sleep

February 4, 2006
Award selection process continued at approximately 10:30 am

Out of camera at 12:54pm.

3. Assessment and Wrap-Up

Henry: what can be improved regarding this process? Any general comments about how things went?
- strictly follow the 3 awards ONLY check
- doing the small awards first (so that we can eliminate them from the larger ones)
- doing the ones with overlapping criteria one after another
- starting early on Friday afternoon was great
- Tighten up the descriptions between bylaw (as part of bylaw 4000 reconciliation) and the descriptions given to the public.
- Remove the inclusion of the medal from the SU Award for Excellence description
- More food for the later hours (on Friday night).
- Make it so that future meetings will consist of one 8-hour meeting and another 5 hour meeting, occurring on a Friday and subsequent Saturday
- Its certainly easier getting the 8-hour one done on Friday, if possible.
- MUCH better to have selections early in February (before midterms, elections, reading week).
- Binders were great for early perusing
- Email communication/voting is appropriate for the minutes (and last minute changes that need to occur, like the medal).

Awards ceremony on the 27th of March.

Meeting adjourned at 1:07pm.
The Students' Union, The University of Alberta

2005/06 Award Winners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Winners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cristal Mar Memorial Award</td>
<td>Amanda Laycock, Doshi Shirmee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jave Jive Award</td>
<td>Graeme Wicentowich, Sarah Yusuf, Kelli Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter A. Dinwoodie Award</td>
<td>Sharon So, Ali Grotkowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene L. Brody Award</td>
<td>Rhett Taylor, Pat Gamez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Treasury Branches Involvement Award</td>
<td>Terrence Fung, Melissa Reindhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Bank Financial Group Involvement Award</td>
<td>Wing Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Wilson Memorial Volunteer Recognition Award</td>
<td>Kristy Baron, Muntaka al Shah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorne Calhoun Memorial Award</td>
<td>Aisha Khatib, Roman Kotovytch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lancaster Award</td>
<td>Stephen Kirkham, Sheena Aperocho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tevie Miller Involvement Award</td>
<td>Kyle Kawanami, Spence Nichol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooper Munroe Academic Award</td>
<td>Susan Lee, Yuan Hao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway Sandwiches Award</td>
<td>Catrin Berghoff, No employees of the Subway locations eligible applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funky Pickle Pizza Award</td>
<td>Karri Roswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Bank Student Faculty Association Involvement Award</td>
<td>Gary Wicentowich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Randy Gregg Athletics Award</td>
<td>Louis Bezuidenhout, Christopher Fung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Louise Mundell Humanitarian Award</td>
<td>Jennifer Au, Kenman Gan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Mortenson Award</td>
<td>Alisha Petryshyn, Pat Stratton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maimie Shaw Simpson Book Prize</td>
<td>Jodie Gauthier, Winne Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU Award For Excellence</td>
<td>Ariana Barer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALUTE</td>
<td>Dr. Wendy Gati, Dr. Peter A. Smith, Dr. Zbigniew W. Gortel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gold Key and Coca-Cola Achievement Award Winners are selected by different committees. As such, they are not included in this report.