



POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2014 - 2015 # 12

Date: October 30, 2014

Time: 6:33 pm

In Attendance:

Stephanie Gruhlke (Chair)

Bo Zhang

Colin Champagne

Navneet Khinda

Justis Allard

Kathryn Orydzuk

Marina Banister

Surya Bhatia (Skype)

Excused Absence:

Nicholas Diaz

Others in Attendance:

**1. CALL TO
ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by *GRUHLKE* at 6:33 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF
AGENDA**

ALLARD moved that the *October 30* agenda be approved as *tabled*.
Seconded by *ZHANG*.

Vote on Motion 8 / 0 / 0
CARRIED.

**3. APPROVAL OF
MINUTES**

**4.
ANNOUNCEMENTS**

5. PRESENTATIONS

**6. ORAL
EXECUTIVE
REPORTS**

1. VP Student Life

DIAZ sent his report online.

2. VP External

KHINDA shared exciting news. She attended CAUS meeting in Edmonton on Tuesday, in which they planned a protest on November 17th. This day is significant as the minister will make the decision and the first day when all the MLA will be present. It is important that the protest has more students to attend, so the University of Calgary and the University of Lethbridge will be busing students from their respective cities. KHINDA would like to have the Council's help to mobilize more students to participate in this protest for the University of Alberta. The protest is about two issues. The first one is the market modifier and the second one is more general about post-secondary education. The protest will show that the students care so that the government should put post-secondary education as priority. And it also reminds the minister not to break another PC promise.

ALLARD asked about when this plan will be made public. KHINDA answered that it will be on Monday or Tuesday next week. She wanted to make sure the message is consistent so she wanted the committee to keep it secret until it is publicly announced next week.

BANISTER suggested the SU provide bus service for students at Augustana. KHINDA will consider it.

CHAMPAGNE asked what the protest will focus on. KHINDA answered that it depends on the narrative as the market modifier and post-secondary education are tightly tied to each other.

BANISTER suggested that the protest must be respectful or it will look bad, and make sure the risk minimized. KHINDA agreed.

3. VP Academic

ORYDZUK reported that the Be Book Smart campaign went well. The Su sent out letter to all the professors, encouraging and informing them alternative methods to reduce textbook cost. And a lot people applied the Students' Union and Centre for Teaching and Learning Award for Innovation and Academic Materials. The prize will be directly awarded to the professor or if they wish they can donate it to Campus Food Bank. The winner usually donates the money.

ORYDZUK also report the good progress of access code this week.

**7. QUESTION
PERIOD**

8. OLD BUSINESS

I. Student Financial Assistance Policy Second Reading

KHINDA rearranged a lot of the Whereas clauses to make them in order, grouped related clauses together and deleted one of the Whereas clauses, and she explained that the phrase “relative and absolute” and recommends keeping it.

CHAMPAGNE asked about the consistency of the entrance awards. KHINDA explained that since entrance awards are mostly based on merits, this means to make sure giving out the same amount of awards based on needs.

BANISTER asked about the requirement of financial needs. KHINDA answered that the definition varies amongst institutions, but generally it means the difference between the cost and what one owns.

ORYDZUK moved that on the recommendation of the Policy Committee the second reading of the Student Financial Assistance Policy be moved to the Council.

The motion was seconded by KHINDA.

Vote on Motion 8 / 0 / 0
CARRIED.

KHINDA commented generally that committee members can take on more role in the writing of policies. She thinks that councilors should not leave the Execs to write them as they can write as they wish and that policies should come from the committee. ZHANG agreed.

9. NEW BUSINESS

I. Deferred Maintenance First Principles

ORYDZUK commented that the policy expired but the only change from the old one is the amount of money, so the policy is very similar to the old one.

The committee discussed the first principles as follows:

Point One: the committee agreed.

Point Two: ALLARD asked how it is represent the failure of government but not of the university. KHINDA answered that it is the failure of both parties. While the government can claim that the university does not use the fund properly, the university can claim that the government does not give enough funding. Since deferred maintenance is a big issue, SU will lobby to the government, especially the university does not have money to cover it.

Point Three: the committee agreed.

Point Four: the committee discussed about the wording and generally agreed to its idea.

Point Five: ALLARD asked about how to fund the historical deferred maintenance. ORYDZUK explained that it can be a big amount of lump sum

or fund allocated yearly. CHAMPAGNE and GRUHLKE suggested using “accumulative” instead of “historical” and the committee agreed.

Point Six: the committee agreed.

Point Seven: the committee agreed.

The committee agreed the current wording of the first principles of the policy.

ORYDZUK moved that on the recommendation of the Policy Committee the first reading of the Deferred Maintenance Policy as amended be moved to the Council.

The motion was seconded by GRUHLKE.

Vote on Motion 8 / 0 / 0

CARRIED.

II. Research First Principles

ORYDZUK introduced the policy that it does not have many changes from the expired one; she deleted one point and separated another point into two.

Point One: ALLARD commented that he like the second part but he is not sure if the first part is correct. ORYDZUK explained that the University of Alberta has a moral to provide a comprehensive way of study that includes high quality education as well as research. ALLARD questioned if the term “comprehensive higher education institution” a proper classification. ORYDZUK and KHINDA clarified that it is a proper classification.

Point Two: the committee agreed.

Point Three: the committee agreed.

Point Four:

DIAZ suggested breaking this long point into three.

- First point: indirect costs of research are necessary expenses not covered by research funding and are therefore covered by the University operating budget. The committee agreed to this point.
- Second point: when the indirect costs of research compete with undergraduate education for funding, it encroaches on the quality of education delivered to undergraduates. ALLARD questioned if this point always true. ORYDZUK explained that tuition not only covers the cost of instruction but also the cost of research conducted by professors. KHINDA further explained that the indirect cost of research is massive; it includes lighting, waste disposal, professors’ time on doing research. However, they do not directly impact the instruction but they impact the institution, so tuition should not cover that. ZHANG suggested clarifying the definition of indirect costs of

research and putting them in footnote. GRUHLKE suggested putting the definition in the Whereas clause of second reading.

- Third point: the University of Alberta should contextualize researching a manner that maximizes the quality of higher education within the intuition. The committee agreed.

Point Five: the committee agreed.

Point Six: the committee agreed.

Point Seven: the committee agreed.

ORYDZUK moved that on the recommendation of the Policy Committee the first reading of the Research Policy as amended be moved to the Council. The motion was seconded by *GRUHLKE*.

Vote on Motion 7 / 0 / 0
CARRIED.

10. DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION ITEMS

11. REPORTS

12. CLOSED SESSION

13. NEXT MEETING November 13, 2014 at 6:30pm at SUB 606

14. ADJOURNMENT *CHAMPAGNE* moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by *BANISTER*.

Vote on Motion 7 / 0 / 0
CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.