



University of Alberta Students' Union

**FINANCE  
COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday August 30, 2016**

**6:00 PM**

**SUB 0-48**

**ATTENDANCE**

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Robyn Paches (Chair)		Y
Victoria Dejong		Y
Francesca El Ghossein		Y
Dorsa Nahid		Y
Brandon Prochnau		Y
Nicole Hammond		N
Reed Larsen		Y
Saba Al Hammouri		Y
Levi Flaman		Y

**MINUTES (FC-2016-06)**

**2015-01/1      INTRODUCTION**

**2015-01/1a      Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 6:01 PM.

**2015-01/1b**

**Approval of Agenda**

PACHES

Requested to amend the agenda: to move the committee business up before the presentation to accommodate some members that has to leave early.

***PACHES/PROCHNAU moved to approve the agenda for August 30, 2016 as amended.***

***Vote 8/0/0***

***CARRIED***

**2015-01/1c**

**Approval of Minutes**

**2015-01/1d**

**Chair's Business**

**Access Fund Presentation**

FIONA HALBERT

Presentation was sent to the Finance Committee. It covers the history of the Students Financial Support, the effects of ISP on the unit, changes to the application for the Supplementary Bursary over the years, and the review committee.

LARSEN

You mentioned intended university for strategy and engagement to come. Does that engage with students in any way or just with the SU or how that looks?

HALBERT

We are good at acquiring data at who we are funding with the resources that we have to identify the gaps and opportunities. Consultation with faculties will help in determining where the university wants to allocate their resources. There are budget restrictions, and limitations that we are facing, ensuring that we are being competitive in Alberta in showing our support for students. There will also be consultation with the SU. Consultation with students have not been talked about yet. The university is also looking to doing surveys every two years with incoming students and prospective clients. Hopefully, surveys specifically for financial

support will be created in the future.

LARSEN

Is it standard that there are no students for reassessment?

HALBERT

Directed the question to Sirina Hamilton.

SIRINA HAMILTON

Previous to the amalgamation, both the supplementary bursary fund and the access fund would have 6 appeals in the year. There is selection committee. Appeals Committee made up of 2 different Finance Committee members to get a different set of eyes on the application.

LARSEN

Was there an old process for the university?

HAMILTON

Supplementary Bursaries used to open from around December 1st to January 15th. They will also run an appeal process.

The Access Fund was a decision by a committee almost because Finance Committee will be going through everything with us and ratifying the students we want to support.

With the Supplementary Bursary Program, it was the university bursaries and Emergency Funding which was managed by the Dean of Students before 2014. Staff was making the decisions, collecting GSA, SU, and other student representatives to look at this appeal.

LARSEN

Would they only reassess as needed for the Supplementary Bursaries?

HAMILTON

Students would have to provide. They would be notified that they were not given funding, the reason, and the appeal process. The decision of the committee would overrule whatever the staff has.

LARSEN

Does the SU sit on one now?

HALBERT

There is a member of the review committee now for the Supplementary Bursary Access Fund.

One of the biggest changes was eliminated the amount of students that had to appeal and review, but if circumstances had changed and we could reassess them without enforcing them to go through a formal appeal.

LARSEN

I am curious about why there is no appeals. Has there been an uptake in reassessment and then no appeals?

HALBERT

Students will always ask us questions. If they fall outside the guidelines (i.e. academic requirement), we cannot make the decision for them. We don't have to call for the review committee.

LARSEN

Is there a 50% management in it? Is there an ability for students to say that a student should have access to that fund? Are the students aware enough that they have an appeals process where they could have another set of eyes to look at the application?

HALBERT

If there was a student who escalated to that, we would struck the review committee.

PACHES

Finance Committee is not as involved in Access Fund anymore is because SFAIC was in the SU. SU issued the Access Fund and brought applicants to the table at Grant Allocation Committee to ratify the applicants. It was identified that students is applying for both Supplementary Bursary and Access Fund. SFAIC was amalgamated with Supplementary Bursary, creating Student's Financial Services.

HALBERT

To summarize, you want people to continue the process? So, you would like them to to know that there is reassessment?

LARSEN

Yes.

HALBERT

To clarify in terms of transparency, is it the ability disagree with the guidelines?

LARSEN  
Yes.

GHOSSEIN  
That is something to decide later on. It is more fair when a decision has another set of when it escalated to that level.

HALBERT  
The university is increasing their annual maximum from \$3,000 to \$5,000 which resulted from the additional money that was promised to the university from the Provost as part of the Campus Alberta Grant increase.

**2015-01/2**

**QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

**2015-01/3**

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**2015-01/3a**

**SU Award Ratification**

HAMILTON  
SU Awards Program are funded entirely through SIEF (Student Involvement Endowment Fund). We have 450 applicants for the program.

The awards are made up of some money received from the Access Fund about five years ago. After that, we created additional awards with financial need as a secondary criteria. The committee was not able to award all of the awards in the financial need pocket of money. They were wondering if it is okay to give some of those awards to the non-financial need applicants. If not, we will sit on about \$6,000 that would not go out to students.

LARSEN:  
Is this one time or continuous?

HAMILTON  
Ideally, we will have enough financial need applicants to have a good enough pool.

We used to use the financial need criteria to expand the pool of applicants. Over the years, staff now think it shrinks the number of applicants.

PACHES

This is similar to last meeting I brought up regarding using financial need as an element to an award. Right now, we have to make a decision. We have all the students in financial need with the awards, but we have some financial need awards left. There are runners-up that are not as in as much need as the students awarded. After the decision, we will discuss on keeping financial need as a requirement to these awards.

Is everyone comfortable to allow the Adjudication Committee in awarding the runners-up?

DEJONG:

I would rather hold on to the money since the awards are dedicated to students in financial need from the beginning.

FLAMAN:

I don't see any harm in keeping the money another year for more eligible applicants.

LARSEN:

I am in favour of releasing the funds. Having sat through the Adjudication Committee meeting, there were multiple students who would either put that they have financial need in their statement but may not have made criteria under financial need systems. It does not make sense not to hand out as many scholarships as feasibly possible.

PACHES

Just to clarify, the committee felt that the students who were runners-up felt they were not in as much as financial need, correct?

LARSEN:

There are two levels of financial need: Yes 1, and Yes 2. One of these levels are in need of money right away while the other does not need the money right away. 50% of all the awards are awarded to those persons who have Yes 1 and Yes 2.

HAMILTON

Financial need is a secondary criteria not a primary criteria.

PACHES

Don't worry about holding funds over per year. SIEF generates the funds for SU awards every year on interest. There will be this amount of money every single year.

**PACHES/LARSEN move to approve the SU awards ratification with the modifications as explained by Sirina Hamilton.  
3/0/3 (PACHES, PROCHNAU, DE JONG ABSTAINED)  
CARRIED**

2015-01/4      **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2015-01/5      **ADJOURNMENT**

2015-01/5a      **Next Meeting: TBD**

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

<b>MOTION</b>	<b>VOTES</b>
<i>PACHES/PROCHNAU moved to approve the agenda for August 30, 2016 as amended.</i>	<i>8/0/0 - CARRIED</i>
<i>PACHES/LARSEN to approve the SU awards ratification with the modifications as explained by Sirina.</i>	<i>3/0/3 - CARRIED</i>