



STUDENTS' COUNCIL

**December 13th, 2022
6:00 P.M.
Council Chambers/Zoom**

The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacîswâskahikan (Beaver Hills House), on Treaty 6 territory. From time immemorial, the banks along the river valley have been known as the Pehonan, a meeting place for the nêhiyawak (Cree), the Niitsítapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesüłiné (Dene), Ojibway/Saulteaux/Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and others. The University, the Students' Union and much of the city are located on the unlawfully stolen land of the forcibly removed Papaschase Cree.

We acknowledge that sharing this land gives each of us the responsibility to research the historic contexts of Treaty 6, to reflect on our personal relationships to the land, the Nations we've named, and to our roles in upholding justice on this territory. Since they began, the Students' Union and the University have benefited from historic and ongoing dispossession of land and resources from Indigenous Peoples. As a result, it is our responsibility to seek the restitution of this land and its resources. Finally, we seek to do better by working to make our learning, research, and governance align with the histories, languages, teachings, and cultures of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples in the land presently occupied by the Canadian state.

We encourage critical reflection by asking the following question. In relation to the territory on which you are situated, what role do you play in strengthening the resistance and resurgence of Indigenous students within your communities?

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS (SC-2022-18)

2022-18/I SPEAKERS BUSINESS

Speaker started the meeting at 6:06 P.M.

Join Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85666007012>

Meeting ID: 856 6600 7012

Councillor Ali resigns effective January 1, 2023.

Speaker SPECIAL ORDERS agenda item 3d to the top of presentations.

2022-18/1a Council Scholarship Nominations

FLAMAN and BROOKS are approved to receive this trimester's scholarship via unanimous approval.

ALI/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO suspend Standing Orders to include agenda items 8b, 8e, 8f, 8g in the Consent Agenda.
CARRIED 20/00/00

ALI: States that the agenda is packed and notes his intention to leave at 7PM.

FLAMAN: Notes that the BSA item has some potentially unresolved questions, but is fine with the other three items being placed on the Consent Agenda.

ALI: Happy to remove item 8b.

SPEAKER: The fastest way would be to simply proceed to a vote, and then individual members can remove items from the Consent Agenda by the normal process.

FLAMAN removes item 8b from the Consent Agenda.

2022-18/2 CONSENT AGENDA

2022-18/2a Students' Council Votes and Proceedings (SC-2022-17) Tuesday, November 29, 2022

See SC-2022-18.01

APPROVED

2022-18/8g **FLAMAN / ARSLAN MOVE UPON** the recommendation of the Bylaw Committee to approve the following plebiscite and referendum questions to appear on the 2023 General Election ballot.

APPROVED

2022-18/8e **DHILLON/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO** refer the LHSAs SRA Fee proposal to the Bylaw Committee to draft a ballot question.

See SC-2022-18.12

APPROVED

2022-18/8f **DHILLON/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO** refer the LSA's SRA Fee proposal to the Bylaw Committee to draft a ballot question.

See SC-2022-18.13

APPROVED

2022-18/3 PRESENTATION

2022-18/3d **KAUR/MONTEIRO MOVE TO** allow a presentation from the acting Vice Provost Learning Initiatives regarding Student Perspectives of Teaching (SPOT).

See SC-2022-18.08

CARRIED 20/00/00

LIU: Asks whether some students would prefer to have open-ended text fields in the SPOT questionnaire.

KARSTEN MÜNDEL: The intent, as with the current USRI, is to have a comment box after each question. The research indicates that a general comment box at the end produces comments that are not productive (e.g. comments on instructors' appearance).

MONTEIRO: Very happy to see the SPOT survey as a major improvement over the USRI. One frequent comment from students is that the information they provide appears to go into a void, and so they turn to places like Rate My Prof. What is being done to close the loop for students so they know what is being done with the information they are providing?

MÜNDEL: I don't precisely know what is planned for public release, but will get back to you on that. These new questions will allow reporting in a more nuanced way.

MONTEIRO: Questions the use of the word 'collegiality' in the survey, as it may be opaque to students.

MÜNDEL: If the question turns out not to work, to be interpreted in different ways, that will show up in our data validation and we'll revise it.

ARSLAN: Asks why the platform was changed for the USRIs. Why the shift toward an external software?

MÜNDEL: Can't speak to the procurement process. Often the in-house development of software creates a certain kind of liability, so the University has been moving away from in-house products.

DHILLON: Two questions from students listening in. How do we mandate or suggest that profs read their reviews and take that feedback? Are the average reviews published and, if not, why?

MÜNDEL: Every year, as an instructor, I fill out an annual report and reflect on this precise feedback, along with input from peers; this is done across all faculties. We are still working on how we do the reporting. The purpose is to give feedback rather than to rate what is going on. We are going to focus more on frequency distributions than on producing an average.

LIU: Notes that students get frustrated when they send in feedback and it appears to produce no change. Is there a way to incur consequences if there is a pattern of no improvement?

MÜNDEL: That is precisely why we have re-done the questions: so that instructors can get better feedback and we can expect changes. Feedback on the SPOT development and implementation process can be sent to tleininput@ualberta.ca

- 2022-18/3a **DHILLON/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO** allow a representative from ESA to present their FAMF Renewal Proposal.

See SC-2022-18.05

CARRIED 19/00/00

- REGMI/FLAMAN MOVE TO** extend the presentation by 10 minutes.
CARRIED 21/00/00

REGMI: Notes that the ESA sets a good example among Faculty Associations regarding the opportunities they provide to students. Supports the proposal. Has ESA considered events or programs to further inform first- and second-year students about the ESA?

ESA: We have a plan for increasing new-student awareness next semester.

FLAMAN: Asks what alternative revenue sources and what percent of the budget will come from the fee.

ESA: We receive grant funding based on student membership. 75-80% of our budget is from the FAMF.

ARSLAN: Notes that the ESA's website is very good, but has no financial statements or budget documents. Are there plans to make those public?

ESA: Students are able to attend monthly meetings that include financial reporting, but we do have room for more financial transparency.

DHILLON: Supports putting the proposal before the student body for a vote.

- 2022-18/3b **DHILLON/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO** allow a representative from NUA to present their FAMF Renewal Proposal.

See SC-2022-18.06

CARRIED 20/00/00

- 2022-18/3c **DHILLON/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO** allow a representative from HCA to present their FAMF Renewal Proposal.

See SC-2022-18.07

CARRIED 21/00/00

LIU/FLAMAN MOVE TO extend the presentation by 10 minutes.

CARRIED 20/00/01

FLAMAN: For the LHSA, around half of their expenditures are remuneration, and around 57% of their revenue is from their Residence Association fee, so their percent of revenue coming out of students' pockets is lower and their percent of revenue going into executives' pockets is lower. Expresses concern that the HCA's executive remuneration is higher than the LHSA's executive remuneration. Objects to the HCA's highlighting of issues around finding executives. Argues that fees should not make up most or all of a given association's revenue.

HCA: Our assessment of the problem of finding executives realistically reflects our experience and the experience of other Residence Associations. As for why most of our revenue comes from the fee, most of our work and time go into advocacy, and advocacy is not a revenue-generating operation. For example, the HCA needs to spend much of its time on security issues.

LIU: Notes that one of the consultation mechanisms reached only 17 respondents.

HCA: Hub Mall does not have a great sense of community, because there are no great community spaces and there are persistent safety concerns and obstacles, especially at night. Lower sense of community impacts uptake of consultation mechanisms.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: Asks how many residents are paying the fee this year?

HCA: Roughly 530 residents, based on numbers from the University's housing department.

LIU: Do you intend to renew the Hub Vault? It would cost approximately as much as the money you intend to collect. Also, how do you plan to increase awareness that the Vault exists?

HCA: Housing Services offers a funding stream that we are currently using, and we will use it to address that.

MONTEIRO: How do you see the fee correlating with the plans that you have described?

HCA: Advocacy does not generate revenue, but honoraria are necessary. The programs budget is low because turnout is very low due to the community issues we mentioned, but we are doing programs within our capacity.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: Based on your numbers, around \$21,000 would go to honoraria, so around \$2000 would be left for programming. At ASA, the budget was around eight times higher than HCA's, but the honoraria were at a similar level.

HCA: Contests that this is a fair characterization. Program expenses are low because of low turnout for everything related to Hub Mall, not just HCA. The honorarium was set years ago. We can reexamine it, but the purpose of the honorarium is to attract people, and all of residence is struggling with that. Decreasing the honorarium means that we will be less likely to attract people to join; for example, they might take minimum-wage Residence Assistant jobs instead.

DHILLON: We need to vote on this either today or at the next Council meeting in January. This is our last FAMF presentation.

MONTEIRO/LIU MOVE TO extend the presentation by 10 minutes.
CARRIED 20/00/00

FLAMAN/CARBAJAL VELEZ MOVE TO forego recess for this Council meeting.

CARRIED 17/00/03

FLAMAN: Notes that Council still needs to undertake significant work at this meeting, including the audit.

2022-18/4

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Executive Team - Report

In addition to presenting written reports, the Executives combined their time for the following statements.

FOGUE: I hold it as a personal goal to empower and support Black individuals in governance knowing that this is a space where there are not a lot of us and our voices are often limited. I recognize that there is a racial aspect to the issues that folks around the table have experienced or feel. But it is also very important to recognize the gender issues that yet again continue to negatively affect governance. Three years ago past female Execs spoke about their experience and treatment they received at the hands of Councillors, often times male Councillors. They highlighted the difference that they experience due to their gender. When a female Executive doesn't rebut, isn't assertive or "pushy," they are looked more favourably upon than an assertive, vocal, no nonsense taking Executive. Three years later we still face the same thing. But this experience is not limited to female Executives. On our council right now, women Councillors have asked for respect in committee meetings, had their authority or leadership position questioned, targeted for the "tone" they use even though their male counterparts have taken harsher tone and faced lesser retribution. In this Council, in our committees, or during one-on-ones, there have

been moments where a fact or information presented by a female Councillor or Executive is dismissed or doubted until presented by a male counterpart. Look at the data on our speaking turns, see who uses a platform, see who is given the opportunity to take up space and ask yourself is this really an equitable space. We have a packed agenda, and it's finals and the break is fast approaching. So we can't address this issue immediately nor anytime soon. But we have to do something about it. We have to talk about it. There cannot be another year next year of the same speech, the same complaint and the same culture.

MONTEIRO: I want to thank Joannie for sharing a very important message that all of us need to be thinking about, being ready to have that conversation so we can make this a space where everyone is welcome. I want to share my reflections on this past semester, and also acknowledge the challenges, hard work, and accomplishments we have all experienced over these last four months. Serving students as a Council is our mission and priority as a body, and due to that pursuit, many of you have taken on immense responsibility. At our best, I have witnessed Councillors work incredibly hard to support SRAs through their fee presentations, leading the overhaul of our bylaw structure, and leading and chairing some extremely difficult meetings in CAC, to engaging with constituents and pushing along the work of your respective committees. So I just want to, from the bottom of my heart, thank you for all the work you have already committed to doing for Council and for students. We are where we are on many important goals and objectives because of the hard work you all do to keep this body running. However, throughout this process, many of you have expressed feeling silenced during a debate or put in a position where you were asked to support something that you knew nothing about or weren't given any information on. Many of you have also expressed that you feel that you have been targeted and even insulted for trying to follow our processes, wanting to foster an environment of respect, and wanting to do what's right, not what's easy. Thank you all for your courage to come forward with your experiences and share them with me. This is not the Council that I want, nor the experience anyone should have to go through being involved in student governance and committing your time to being part of this space. Students' Council is a space where we all want to practice democracy. That means many ideas will flow through this space, and not all of us are always going to agree. But what matters is that we can disagree and still respect each other, whether that be staff, Executives, or Councillors. We can work together to be a better body, and the body we know we can be for students. We can make this a space where everyone belongs, but creating that space will need work, just like Joannie has said; it will need each and every one of you, working hand in hand, to actualize that goal. I am optimistic for the new year, where we can make this a possibility and a future for us.

2022-18/5

BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORT

Dhillon - Audit Committee - Report

Flaman - Bylaw Committee - Report

Wattamaniuk - Council Administration Committee - Report

Monteiro - Executive Committee - Report

Dhillon - Finance Committee - Report

Steinbusch - Nominating Committee - Report
Fotang - Policy Committee - Report
Dorschied - Board of Governors Representative - Report
Fogue - ARRC - Report
Steinbusch - SCFC - Report
Brooks - Student Group Committee - Report
Steinbusch - Sustainability Committee - Report
Liu - Member Statement

LIU raises concern about approving the LHSAs fee due to prior experience of racism and mistreatment and an unsatisfactory response to these concerns by the LHSAs.

2022-18/6 OPEN FORUM

NO QUESTIONS

2022-18/7 QUESTION PERIOD

LIU: Regarding the selection of College Deans, notes that his college will have opportunities to meet and hear from students; it's important that other colleges have similar opportunities.

REGMI: Thanks the Executives for highlighting that Councillors have come forward about issues of comfort and people feeling attacked. We have had this discussion in CAC, that this has happened multiple times in Council. We have had several Councillors step down. We have implemented a Code of Conduct, but problems becoming worse is something we all need to reflect on. While I'm sure everyone here has good intentions, we need to take a step back and realize that sometimes, even when we don't intend things, the impact can be detrimental. As someone from a very privileged background, I'm often guilty of not checking my privileged, and if anyone here has felt victimized by my comments, I'm very sorry and take full responsibility. I would like to take steps in the right direction to ensure I am not causing harm.

BROOKS: Highlights a head-shaving fundraiser.

HUANG: Expresses thanks to everyone for a great trimester. It has been rocky but has created great memories.

WATTAMANIUK: Speaks to the years-long discussion over General Faculties Council's mandate, and is intending to put together a timeline next semester, to hand over to next year's GFC Student Caucus and improve transition.

MONTEIRO: Going back to Lionel's comments, the University is interviewing College Dean candidates soon and students play an important role there. If any of you are available to be part of that process, please let me know.

DHILLON: Commends the Execs, particularly FOGUE, for their statements. This

year has been difficult regarding Council culture, and we have all been affected. These difficult situations can affect us in serious ways. At the end of the day, we are a team, but - as discussed at CAC today - we don't always act like a team. We leave meetings to mess up quorum because we don't agree with things. If we have concerns, if we don't feel comfortable, we need to address that and I hope we can become comfortable having those conversations.

LIU: Could the UASU make social media posts to make students aware of opportunities to participate in the College Dean selection public forums when they happen? Administrators have noted low student turnout at some related items.

MONTEIRO: Affirms that that will happen, and notes that a University administrator appreciated Lionel's efforts to promote it.

KAUR: Library advisory committee is seeking new student members, with an application deadline in January.

REGMI: To continue previous comments, if I have offended or caused harm, please let me know so I can learn to do better. Based on the Executives' statements and the tough conversation in CAC earlier, we need to reflect on how we can do better. We should be working together and not against each other. Everyone should have equal opportunities for their voices; it shouldn't be one person taking up all the time. We need to be better at not taking critiques as personal attacks.

DHILLON: Thanks REGMI for his comments, and Council for their work going through the seven FAMF proposals.

- 2022-18/8 **BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS**
- 2022-18/8a **DHILLON/ARSLAN MOVE TO** nominate 1 member of council to the Audit committee.
- CARRIED 19/00/00
- ARSLAN nominates USSERBAYEVA, who accepts.
- USSERBAYEVA is declared appointed to the Audit Committee via acclamation.
- 2022-18/8b **DHILLON/WATTAMANIUK MOVE TO** refer the BSA SRA Fee proposal to the Bylaw Committee to draft a ballot question.
- See SC-2022-18.11
- CARRIED 17/01/01 LIU ABSTAINS
- DHILLON: The BSA had one of the most comprehensive presentations and addressed many concerns. They have shown immense progress over the past few years over financial management and did a good job on consultation.
- ARSLAN: The BSA still needs to do work around financial transparency, but the plan made sense. It should go to a student vote for students to make the choice.
- LIU: Will abstain, has concerns around the consultation, but agrees with ARSLAN that the decision should go to students.
- KAUR: BSA has been great to work with and has done hard work. Speaks in favour of FAMF proposal.
- FLAMAN: Aside from concerns voiced previously, what we are approving today is not whether we feel the BSA is deserving of a fee or whether students should have their say, it is whether the presentation we received meets all the requirements for us to approve it. Quotes a DIE Board ruling from several years ago indicating that these presentations should meet a checklist of details found in Bylaw. Council should only approve a presentation if it meets every one of these details. Very few of the presentations have, including this one.
- DHILLON: Having audited the BSA for the past two years, she notes that the BSA has made major improvements around financial transparency. She also speaks in favour of the BSA's consultation efforts, and indicates that she believes the proposal has met Bylaw requirements, but also notes that a year without the fee would have a major negative impact on students.
- 2022-18/8c **DHILLON/ARSLAN MOVE TO** approve the KPMG Students' Union Audit for 2022.

See SC-2022-18.09

CARRIED 19/00/00

FLAMAN: Compared to previous years, this audit has many more control observations, including items that need Students' Council approval. Notes that the recent disagreement over the water feature was something that Council should have foreseen when it approved that feature seven months ago. Indicates concern that Council may rubber-stamp the report without taking appropriate actions.

DUMOUCHEL: Those are fair comments. The notes that they make are advice, and he has some follow-up questions for the auditors about a few of them. Others are about pandemic challenges and we are working to clean those up. Happy to answer any more specific questions. Notes that the accountants have been happy with the UASU's internal practices.

DORSCHEID: Reiterates that there are many control observations and determines, due to accounting classes, that this is concerning. Notes that the recommendations are largely for management to address and that Audit Committee should help oversee.

DUMOUCHEL: Notes that management is happy to work with Audit Committee on these items. Explains the context for various items; for example, the auditors would like them to update the amortization lists for some office equipment, and address technicalities related to pandemic adaptations around software. Follow-up discussions with the auditors are ongoing. We need to do a better job distributing money from SIEF (the Student Involvement Endowment Fund). We agree with the auditors' recommendation around internal budget reporting and are changing the process this year, but this will require changes to Finance Committee Standing Orders. We share their concern around reserve balances and are looking into this, but are not making any large transfers of funds there.

DORSCHEID: Informal request to get back to Council with what management needs from Council to move forward. Provides interpretation of one of the auditors' recommendations regarding fraud prevention. Asks which of the recommendations management does or does not want to adopt.

DUMOUCHEL: Every year management reviews all recommendations and makes a plan to address them; one requires discussion with Controller; another requires further engagement with Finance Committee. Council is welcome to engage further.

WATTAMANIUK: Proposes creating a progress tracking spreadsheet incorporating responses from auditors and management, so Council can understand what will see changes and what is fine as is. Hopefully this would reduce management's workload regarding keeping Council up to date on the details.

DUMOUCHEL: This might not be the right instrument, as the accounting details could be confusing for Council, but will look at ways to keep Council in the loop.

DHILLON: Notes potential ways to improve all this, and thanks WATTAMANIUK and others for bringing further work to Audit Committee at a moment when it had little to do.

DORSCHEID: Expresses trust in management to do as they see fit with the recommendations. The informal request is only to ensure that Audit Committee eventually gets some sort of answers regarding the auditors' recommendations.

DUMOUCHEL: Thanks Council for feedback and collaboration. Shout-out to accounting department, three people doing tens of thousands of transactions per year, and every year KPMG finds that the books are solid.

WATTAMANIUK/MONTEIRO MOVE TO extend the meeting until 9:30 P.M.
CARRIED 16/00/03

SPEAKER special orders agenda item 9d to immediately occur.

2022-18/9d **MONTEIRO/FOGUE MOVE TO** discuss Mandatory Non-Instructional Fees.

See SC-2022-18.17

CARRIED 19/00/00

MONTEIRO: Explains categories of MNIFs and what services they support. The University is proposing a new fee model removing the off-campus rate entirely, so a \$200 increase for off-campus students. Under the current MNIF agreement, signed in 2016, every year the University can increase these fees by the Academic Price Index (API), currently 4%, so these fees will grow by 4%. What the UASU needs to decide is whether we agree with the principle of differential rates for off-campus students, and there are alternatives. We could say we want to continue with off-campus rates, or we could work toward an increase lower than 4% - which would be an increase for off-campus students, but a decrease for on-campus students, of which there are many more. We would love Council's input, tonight or later.

WATTAMANIUK: Is from a faculty with off-campus practicums, would not want to see the off-campus rate eliminated, and the fact that the off-campus rate is as high as it is, is ridiculous. Could potentially get behind a flat fee where the fee for on-campus students decreases, but the impact of the change would vary by faculty. (For example, Engineering students have five work terms and would not have access to basically any of the services they would be paying for.) Keeping an off-campus fee is important.

MONTEIRO: There is also the potential for looking at these as separate fees; for example, off-campus students can access virtual counselling services.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: Supports keeping off-campus option, but there is also the potential to fragment the fees by service based on which services on- or off-campus students use.

REGMI: Asks whether the UASU has considered advocating for opt-out options for off-campus students, or partnerships with other organizations (as with the Health and Dental Plan) so students can still get the benefit of the fees they are paying even if they are not able to use the University's services.

MONTEIRO: Outlines existing partnerships (e.g. around childcare and mental health supports). No direct partnerships have been explored. As for opt-outs, the University is unlikely to accept that on grounds of stable funding at basic levels to make the service functional.

WATTAMANIUK: The Student Academic Support Fee's description and service envelope has some vagueness, so a lot of students off-campus see little value to them in the list involved. The fee is also a bit high.

2022-18/8d **STEINBUSCH/REGMI MOVE TO** nominate (1) member of council to the Ad-Hoc Sustainability Committee.

See SC-2022-18.10

TABLED

2022-18/9 **GENERAL ORDERS**

2022-18/9a **ABBASI/CARBAJAL VELEZ MOVE TO** discuss low engagement in the elections and how to increase engagement in future elections.

TABLED

2022-18/9b **REGMI/LIU MOVE TO** discuss recent student concerns regarding transit safety.

See SC-2022-18.15

TABLED

2022-18/9c **REGMI/STEINBUSCH MOVE TO** discuss the Alberta Sovereignty Act Within a United Alberta

See SC-2022-18.16

TABLED

2022-18/10 **CLOSED SESSIONS**

2022-18/10a **ALI/LIU MOVE TO** direct the Executive Committee to organize watch parties for the 2022 World Cup.

Motion automatically carried forward from previous agendas but unaddressed during this meeting due to adjournment and mover's departure.

TABLED

2022-18/11 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2022-18/11a Students' Council Votes and Proceedings (SC-2022-17) Tuesday, November 29, 2022

See SC-2022-18.01

2022-18/11b Executive Reports

See SC-2022-18.02-04

2022-18/11c Students' Council Submissions

See SC-2022-18.05 - 18.23

2022-18/11d Students' Council - Attendance

See SC-2022-18.24

2022-18/11e Executive Reports

See SC-2022-18.25 - 18.26

2022-18/11f Board of Governors Report

See SC-2022-18.27

2022-18/11g Students' Council Submissions

See SC-2022-18.28 - 18.32

SPEAKER adjourned the meeting at 9:32 P.M.