



University of Alberta Students' Union

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday, January 29, 2019

6:00PM

Telus 150, Telus Centre

We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students' Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory.

We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students' Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00PM.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS (SC-2018-18)

2018-18/0 SMUDGING CEREMONY

a2018-18/1 SPEAKERS BUSINESS

2018-18/1a Announcements - The next meeting of the Students' Council will take place on **Tuesday, February 5, 2019** at 6:00PM in **3-04 in Pavillon Lacerte**, at Faculty Saint Jean.

2018-18/2 PRESENTATIONS

2018-18/3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Reed LARSEN, President - Report.

Adam BROWN, Vice President (External) - Report.

Akanksha BHATNAGAR, Vice President (Academic) - Report.

2018-18/4 BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORT

Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation Committee - Report

Audit Committee - Report.

Bylaw Committee - Report.

Council Administration Committee - Report.

Executive Committee - Report.

Finance Committee - Report.

Nominating Committee - Report.

Policy Committee - Report.

Board of Governors - Report.

2018-18/5 OPEN FORUM

2018-18/6 QUESTION PERIOD

2018-18/7 BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2018-18/7a **BILAK/BROWN MOVED**, on behalf of Policy Committee, to approve the second reading of the Experiential Learning Political Policy.

See SC-2018.18.05.

FLAMAN MOVED to omnibus items *2018-18/7a,7b,7c.*
FAILED

BILAK: Established that no changes occurred since First Reading. Confirmed that the Policy's renewal updates relevant stakeholders and definitions. Outlined that Fact 4 was updated to reflect new research, Resolution 1 now provides for advocacy, and Resolution 3 expands the scope of advocacy. Noted that Resolutions 5 and 6 were also updated. Noted that the Policy reflects the results of consultations with the Undergraduate Research Initiative, the Community Service-Learning Initiative, and students engaged in work experience projects.

LEY: Commended the detail and quality of the Policy renewal.

MOGALE MOVED to amend Fact 5 to replace its numeric ordering with an alpha-numeric listing.

Carried as friendly.

BROWN: Considered that the Policy relates to a broader goal, initiated by the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations, Conference Board of Canada, the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, that every student have access to experiential learning. Suggested that 100% work integrated learning is possible.

BHATNAGAR: Noted that the consolidated repository referenced in the Policy will be complete within a year.

CARRIED

2018-18/7b **BHATNAGAR/BROWN MOVED** to approve the second reading of the Quality Instruction Political Policy.

See SC-2018.18.06.

BHATNAGAR: Established that changes relate to defining including instructors and tenured professors in the Facts, recognising the Strategic Institutional Plan in Fact 1, encouraging instructors to update their course philosophies, and advocating for the provision of professional development. Noted that Resolution 8 and 9 expand the scope of summative and formative instructor evaluation and advocate for an accessible and digestive Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) database, respectively.

BILAK: Supported the use of student ratings in deciding whether to present tenure to instructors.

LARSEN: Inquired into whether there are elements of the Policy to which the University expected to express concern.

BHATNAGAR: Responded that the most contentious item is the sustainability of the USRI database. Expressed concern that the USRI's may have racial and gender bias. Noted that, nevertheless, these same issues affect RateMyProfessor which students use. Identified that other universities are moving away from the USRI model.

AGARWAL: Suggested that research courses also have a feedback mechanism.

CARRIED

- 2018-18/7c BHATNAGAR/BILAK MOVED** to approve the second reading of the Students in Governance Political Policy.

See SC-2018.18.07.

BHATNAGAR: Established that changes include: a stronger Fact 1 to affirm that students know their needs best, Resolution 2 to support increased training and support of undergraduate student representatives, Resolution 5 advocates against the elimination of student representative positions, and Resolution 6(a) recognises the importance of using the Student Participation Handbook to consult students in policy change.

LARSEN: Inquired into why Fact 5 uses the term 'autonomous' when representative associations report to the Students' Union.

LARSEN MOVED to replace the term 'autonomous' with 'self-governing'.
Carried as friendly

BHATNAGAR: Noted that the University often fails to consult students adequately but has been improving over time. Noted the creation of the Council of University Affairs Committee is a positive step.

CARRIED

- 2018-18/7d KIM/BILAK MOVED**, on behalf of Bylaw Committee, to approve First Principles of Bill 6: Changes to Student Group Oversight.

See SC-2018.18.08.

BILAK: Established that Bylaw Committee reviewed and supports Bill 6. Clarified that, in particular, Bill 6 relates to increasing the amount of control the Students'

Union has in hosting student group events.

BHATNAGAR: Inquired into under what committee classification the Student Group Committee would receive.

RIPKA: Responded that the Student Group Committee will be an operational committee open to persons other than members of Council.

LARSEN: Supported the Bill. Commended the amount of preparatory work involved in creating the oversight system. Suggested that the Bill will create a reliable and consistent feedback system for student concerns.

RIPKA: Supported Bill 6 as it expands a limited Bylaw 5600 to inform students of their rights and the processes by which they are governed.

CARRIED

- 2018-18/7e RAITZ/BHATNAGAR MOVED**, on behalf of the Policy Committee, to approve the First Reading of the Engagement Policy.

See SC-2018-18.014.

RAITZ: Established that changes dualistically expand the definition of engagement and ground the Student Participation Process Handbook in policy. Noted that no provisions were removed. Emphasised that the Policy centres around both engaging students and demonstrating how the engagement influenced the issue to which it related. Recognised that much research and consultation that was not able to be reflected in the Policy.

RIPKA: Supported the Policy as comprehensive and aligning well with the Strategic Plan. Inquired into the extent to which the Handbook applies narrowly or respectively.

BHATNAGAR: Inquired into whether the Policy recommends changes to the Handbook.

RAITZ: Responded that the Handbook provides direction and guidance by outlining multiple pathways for engagement. Recognised, in future, the use of the Handbook may reveal possible improvements to include.

BHATNAGAR MOVED to amend Fact 6 to replace the phrase '2013' with '2015'. Carried as friendly.

CARRIED

- 2018-18/7f STATT/BILAK MOVED** to appoint two (2) members of Students' Council to the Audit Committee.

FLAMAN nominated TSE: accepted.
LEY nominated SUNDAY: accepted
CUTARM nominated FLAMAN: declined.

TSE, SUNDAY are declared appointed to Audit Committee via acclamation.

2018-18/8 GENERAL ORDERS

2018-18/8a RIPKA/LEY MOVED to establish an ad-hoc committee on Executive Compensation.

RIPKA: Established that the Committee will meet to set executive compensation in relation to the standard rates of compensation for similar positions in other Canadian universities. Suggested that the Committee will reduce the barriers to entry by setting fairer compensation. Noted that the Committee will meet during the development of the budget and be composed of the Vice-President Operations and Finance and four members of Council. Emphasised that, while impossible to mandate, councillors planning on running to become an executive should not sit on the Compensation Committee due to potential conflicts of interest.

BOSE: Proposed assigning the responsibilities for the review of executive compensation to an existing committee, such as Audit Committee, rather than creating a new one.

SUNDAY: Inquired into whether the motion to establish the Compensation Committee includes the Committee's draft Standing Orders.

RIPKA: Responded that there are no draft Standing Orders.

FLAMAN: Suggested that compensation review occur more regularly than annually via an ad hoc committee. Noted that the Council of Chairs supported Bose's proposal in a past discussion. Expressed concern that his request for a written outline comparing the compensation of Canadian executive Students' Union positions was never fulfilled.

SUNDAY: Expressed concern that, without Committee Standing Orders, there the proposed Committee has neither a defined membership, purpose, quorum, nor chair.

SPEAKER: Confirmed that Standing Orders must be provided before nominations can be made to populate the Committee.

LARSEN: Suggested approving the Committee in the present meeting and approving the Standing Orders at a later meeting.

FLAMAN/RIPKA MOVED to postpone the item to *SC-2018-19*.

FLAMAN: Expressed concern that approving the Committee without its Standing Orders would be putting the cart before the horse.

CARRIED

2018-18/8b RIPKA/BILAK MOVED to approve the Students Spaces referendum question as follows:

"It would cost over \$1 billion to address all maintenance needs on campus. Government funding for updating university facilities usually leaves out student spaces, such as study and community areas across campus.

A potential student spaces levy would cost \$9/term in Fall 2019, would increase by up to \$9/term in both Fall 2020 and Fall 2021, and would match the rate of inflation afterward. The resulting student-controlled fund would help maintain and renew the SUB and other student spaces that are not eligible for government funding.

Augustana will be exempt from this levy.

Would you support this levy?"

French version:

"Il en coûterait plus d'un milliard de dollars pour répondre à tous les besoins de maintenance sur les campus. Le financement gouvernemental pour la modernisation des installations universitaires laisse généralement de côté les espaces réservés aux étudiants, tels que les espaces d'étude et les espaces communautaires du campus.

Un frais potentiel pour ces espaces coûterait 9\$ par session à l'automne 2019, augmenterait de 9\$ par session à la fois en automne 2020 et en automne 2021, et correspondrait au taux d'inflation par la suite. Ces fonds contrôlé par les étudiants chercherait à maintenir et à renouveler le SUB et d'autres places d'étudiants qui ne sont pas admissibles au financement gouvernemental.

Seriez-vous favorable à ce frais?"

RIPKA: Established that, last year, the SU ran the Student Events Initiative (SEI) to collect a fee whose goal was renovating a deteriorating Myer Horowitz Theatre. Noted that the SU completed a post-referendum survey after SEI failed. Expressed concern that there is no plan for sustaining capital assets. Recognised that the deferred maintenance debt prevents the University from funding non-essential renovations such as relaxation spaces. Noted that the Student Spaces Levy aims to address this gap. Noted that the Levy is participatory as

students submit proposals for the use of the funds. Clarified that the phrase "increase by up to \$9" allows Council the opportunity to decrease the fee if possible. Confirmed that the full report on the Levy will be available February 5th. Noted that the project is in its final stage of consultation.

SUNDAY: Opposed the motion. Expressed concern that the Native Studies Faculty, as the smallest faculty, would receive less funding than larger faculties. Expressed concern that voting on the Levy before receiving the final report related to it would breach the oath of office which states that councillors should know the facts before voting.

FLAMAN MOVED to suspend Standing Orders to allow guests of Council to speak.

Ruled out of order.

LEY: Requested that Ripka detail the positions of the faculty associations with whom she consulted.

MOGALE: Opposed the motion. Expressed concern that consultations did not extend to students at large but only student leaders. Expressed concern that the phrasing of the question obscures the size of the fee increases.

DUMOUCHEL: Clarified that the concept appealed to students at large polled in the SU General Survey. Suggested that the Levy is required to redevelop spaces when the University will not otherwise fund their updating. Considered that the Levy proposes an appropriate fee amount while respecting the need to keep student fees low. Noted that the Levy question cannot provide all the relevant facts in detail as it becomes confusing to students. Suggested that allowing all students to vote on each specific expenditure would result in larger faculties receiving all the support. Emphasised that the motion concerns offering students the chance to vote on the Levy, not whether councillors wish to see it introduced.

BOSE: Inquired into whether the fee is opt-outable.

RIPKA/BROWN MOVED to enter into committee of the whole.
Carried.

RIPKA: Responded in the negative. Noted that all students stand to benefit from the Levy as space is collective.

DUMOUCHEL: Added that the Levy cannot be opt-outable as financing large projects requires a dependable stream of revenue.

LEY: Inquired into the character of the responses Ripka received from the faculty associations she consulted.

RIPKA: Responded that no faculty association outright opposed the Levy. Noted

that a number had concerns which were taken into consideration.

TSE: Proposed using the phrase 'would increase up to 27' rather than relying upon students to do the math. Expressed concern that certain buildings will be privileged recipients of the Levy.

DUMOUCHEL: Suggested that the Levy is designed to accommodate many buildings, including SUB. Anticipated that the fee would exist for ten to fifteen years. Clarified that the Levy could be used for general improvements, like increasing the number of power outlets, in addition to specific improvement.

RIPKA: Considered that, even in new spaces like DICE 8th floor, improvements can be made via the Levy.

LARSEN: Supported improving the clarity of the question. Expressed concern that members are asking questions as to the permissibility of the Levy rather than whether the question is suitable for students to consider in a vote.

LEY: Noted that he and a number of councillors developed an alternative draft question. Suggested that the question include more specifics on the governance of the Levy fund disbursement and that it reference the full fee of \$27.

RIPKA: Expressed concern that councillors did not voice their concerns when the Levy was discussed in other meetings, starting September 4th.

MOGALÉ: Expressed concern that councillors had limit opportunity to consider and discuss the Levy. Inquired into the plan for engaging students with the proposed Levy.

RIPKA: Responded that there is a guerilla marketing campaign and social media campaign planned.

FLAMAN: Noted that the Capital Projects Policy Resolution 6 states that "a dedicated student fee for a capital project shall not be implemented until such a time as students have the ability to receive benefits from their contribution." Expressed concern that students would pay without receiving benefit and that the Levy contravenes the Policy.

DUMOUCHEL: Suggested that there would be some immediate benefits from the Levy and that, over time, more benefits would accrue.

BELCOURT: Inquired into the procedure for removing the fee.

RIPKA: Reiterated that the Levy can be evaluated by referendum on each occasion that a long term substantial loan is settled.

DUMOUCHEL: Emphasised that, whatever the case, the Students' Union must

meet its long-term debt obligations.

BELCOURT: Expressed concern that students would still have to pay for committed projects even if the Levy was later reconsidered.

RIPKA: Emphasised that it is a duty of the Students' Union to provide space for students and maintain SUB. Noted that the fee must be tied to the Consumer Price Index.

TSE: Inquired into whether the need for new SUB furniture is pressing.

RIPKA: Confirmed that faculty associations disagreed with the five-year plan that included the furniture purchasing.

TSE: Inquired into which areas students wanted to see redeveloped.

RIPKA: Responded that these spaces include CJS cafeteria, group work space, ECHA quiet lounges, Tory basement, Humanities basement and lounges, lockers, tables in CCIS.

BELCOURT: Inquired into whether the Levy would fund the Horowitz Theatre redevelopment.

RIPKA: Responded that she was asked "if students do not want the theatre, will you still give them the theatre" in a consultation. Confirmed the answer as no. Considered that students may not know the value of the theatre. Noted that the Levy may or may not fund the theatre depending on what students request.

DUMOUCHEL: Considered that the Levy would allow for more accurate and effective renovation planning in SUB. Suggested that some decisions, for example the Theatre renovation, are sufficiently complex that they should not be voted on via referenda. Suggested that informed student representatives should decide these issues rather than students as a whole. Suggested that students rejected the SEI and not necessarily the Theatre redevelopment.

RIPKA: Expressed concern that deteriorating assets, such as the Theatre, begin to draw money in maintenance costs.

LEY: Inquired into whether executives could, with the support of Students' Union staff, draft proposals to use the Levy funds. Expressed concern that allowing the SU to propose projects to itself would lead to abuse. Emphasised the need for grassroots engagement rather than internal proposals being reviewed by an internal committee.

RIPKA: Responded that executives are students and that they would likely, in future, submit proposals.

DUMOUCHEL: Responded that the SU is best suited to submit proposals for the renovation of SUB.

SUNDAY: Requested Ripka confirm, as she noted this Levy is not the SEI 2.0, that the Levy will not fund the Theatre.

DUMOUCHEL: Responded that whether the Levy fund the Theatre will be a decision for the Council of next year.

BILAK: Inquired into whether the proposal provides for an event wherein there are multiple long-term commitments paid for by the Levy and, therefore, paying off one loan would not result in a referendum because there are further debts to be settled.

DUMOUCHEL: Responded that Council can lower incrementally or remove the fee.

RAITZ/BOSE MOVED to return to committee of the difference.
CARRIED

HADDOUCHE: Proposed including additional facts relevant to the Levy in the question, even if it results in greater complexity.

CUTARM: Expressed concern at the phrasing of the question, opt-outs, fee inflation, accommodation of ESL students, and the fact that the University has not confirmed that the SU could undertake renovations with the Levy in its property.

SUNDAY: Expressed concern that the SU will not provide complete and impartial information to students to vote on the Levy.

LEY MOVED to amend the question to read "It would cost over \$1 billion to address all maintenance needs on campus. Government funding for updating university facilities usually leaves out student spaces, such as study and community areas across campus. A potential student spaces levy would cost \$9/term in Fall 2019, would increase by up to \$9/term in both Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 to a maximum of \$27/term, and would match the rate of inflation afterward. The resulting fund would be student-controlled. Students would be able to create proposals for a student space they would like created or changed, which would be finally decided on by elected members of the Students' Council. Proposals must be to maintain or renew student spaces across campus or in SUB that would not be eligible for government funding. Augustana will be exempt from this levy. Would you support this levy?"
Carried as friendly.

TSE: Inquired into the Levy Report will be made publicly available.

RIPKA: Responded in the affirmative.

BHATNAGAR: Proposed that the question use the phrase "up to" in order to provide Council flexibility in determining the amount charged.

FLAMAN/SUNDAY MOVED to extend the meeting by fifteen minutes.
Carried.

DUMOUCHEL: Proposed that including the cost options of \$9, \$18, and \$27.

RIPKA: Clarified that the phrase "up to" only applies in 2020. Noted that the fee will be \$9 in the first term.

BHATNAGAR: Noted that Bylaw 2200 Section 5 states "where Students' Council initiates a plebiscite or referendum, then the plebiscite or referendum in question shall be held on the dates of the next general election of the Executive Committee and Undergraduate Board of Governors not occurring within thirty (30) days of receipt of the valid petition". Identified that the campaign begins on February 25.

SPEAKER: Noted that the item cannot be postponed without contravening bylaw.

FLAMAN: Expressed concern that the Levy referendum question is already being considered within the 30 days specified in Section 5 and, therefore, is contravening bylaw.

BHATNAGAR: Suggested that the item can be postponed in reference to the voting days of the upcoming election.

LARSEN: Suggested that the election occurs on March 6.

SPEAKER: Confirmed that the cutoff according to Bylaw 2200 Section 5 is Monday, February 4th.

DUMCHEL: Proposed that the Levy question outline the fee as \$9 in 2018, \$18 in 2020, \$27 in 2022 and emphasise that the SU will make every effort to reduce the fee through soliciting donations. Considered that Council could amend the referendum after initiating it.

FLAMAN: Expressed concern that Council is misinterpreting the date of the election as its voting days rather than the beginning of the campaign

FLAMAN/BOURGEOIS MOVED to extend until the conclusion of the present motion.
Carried.

SPEAKER: Confirmed that Monday, February 4th is the cutoff for passing the

Levy without contravneting bylaw.

BHATNAGAR: Suggested that Council may contravene bylaw with good reason.

SUNDAY: Considered that only the DIE Board can authoritatively confirm whether the Levy question is or is not within the 30 days notice period as per Bylaw 2200 Section 5

SPEAKER: Suggested there are no repercussions for contravening bylaw as determined by a DIE Board ruling.

RIPKA: Proposed that Council meet on Sunday, February 3rd.

LEY: Inquired into whether Council can grant itself an exception to Bylaw 2200.

SPEAKER: Responded in the negative. Suggested that bylaw is the boss of Council.

LARSEN: Suggested that Council is, in fact, the boss of bylaw.

RIPKA: Expressed concern that DIE Board could prohibit the Levy referendum question from being on the ballot if it contravenes bylaw. Inquired into whether it is possible to amend bylaw in the present meeting.

SPEAKER: Responded in the negative.

RIPKA/RAITZ MOVED to table item *2018-18/8b* until the next meeting and call a meeting, yet to be determined, that will occur before Monday, February 4

BELCOURT: Expressed concern that many members will not be able to attend a Sunday meeting.

MOGALÉ: Expressed concern that Sunday is a religious holiday.

RIPKA: Emphasised that there are no attendance repercussions if members cannot attend the special meeting.

RIPKA: Suggested that the postponement provides time for members to propose amendments to improve the Levy question clarity and allows time for members to receive and collect more information.

BELCOURT: Expressed concern that the Levy is receiving unfair special support and rule exemptions, which a similar proposal advanced by a non-Council party would not be granted, only because it is an internal proposal.

RIPKA: Suggested that any question can receive approval with a sufficient amount of dedication from and support for the proposer.

CARRIED

- 2018-18/8c** **LARSEN/**MOVED to go in camera to discuss political strategy.
- 2018-18/9** **INFORMATION ITEMS**
- 2018-18/9a** President - Report.
See SC-2018.18.01.
- 2018-18/9b** Vice-President, Academic - Report.
See SC-2018.18.02.
- 2018-18/9c** Vice-President, External - Report.
See SC-2018.18.03.
- 2018-18/9d** Vice-President, Operations and Finance - Report.
See SC-2018.18.04.
- 2018-18/9e** Vice-President, Student Life - Report.
See SC-2018.18.05.
- 2018-18/9f** Students' Council - Attendance.
See SC-2018.18.06.
- 2018-18/9g** Students' Council Motion Tracker.
See SC-2018.18.07.
- 2018-18/9h** Executive Committee Motion Tracker
See SC-2018.18.08.
- 2018-18/9i** Students' Council, Votes and Proceedings (SC-2018-17)
See SC-2018.18.09.
- 2018-18/9j** Political Policy on Experiential Learning Second Reading.
See SC-2018.18.10.
- 2018-18/9k** Political Policy on Quality Instruction Second Reading.

See SC-2018.18.11.

2018-18/9l Political Policy on Students in Governance Second Reading.

See SC-2018.18.12.

2018-18/9m Bill 6: Changes to Student Group Oversight First Reading.

See SC-2018.18.13.

2018-18/9n Engagement Policy - First Reading.

See SC-2018.18.14.

2018-18/9o CAC - Chair(s) Report.

See SC-2018.18.15.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:36.