



POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2013 - 2014 # 10

Date: September 17, 2013

Time: 6:10 PM

In Attendance:

Kareema Batal (Chair)

William Lau

Dustin Chelen

Adam Woods

Colin Champagne

Kelsey Mills

Dylan Hanwell

Excused Absence:

Braiden Redman

Natalia Binczyk

Others in Attendance:

**1. CALL TO
ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by *BATAL* at 6:10 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF
AGENDA**

MILLS moved that the *September 17* agenda be approved as *tabled*.

Seconded by *WOODS*.

Vote on Motion 7 / 0 / 0

CARRIED.

**3. APPROVAL OF
MINUTES**

LAU amended minutes to change “a requirement to graduate” to “not a requirement to graduate” in p.5.

BATAL amended minutes to change “BIFRT The SU will advocate for self help during introductory courses” to “BIFRT The SU will advocate for self health to be incorporated into introductory courses” in p.4.

BATAL moved that the *August 20* minutes be approved as *amended*.
The motion was seconded by *LAU*.

Vote on Motion 5 / 0 / 2
CARRIED.

- 4. ANNOUNCEMENTS** BATAL announces that the committee will be using Lower Level Meeting Room for the whole semester.

BATAL notifies the committee that CAC requested a policy report the night before. She refused based on the lack of time. But CAC needs it so she sent CAC a brief report.

WOODS adds that there is a requirement for doing this as the committee acts as a whole.

CHELEN comments that the CAC standing order has the timeline at the end of each trimester. And the committee should have expected the policy report.

MILLS states that CAC only need something brief.

- 5. PRESENTATIONS** BATAL did not arrange any presentation because the committee could not make a decision on the presentations in the last meeting. It is better to discuss them in detail in this meeting.

**6. EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE
REPORT**

a. VP Student Life

LAU mentions one of the issues in Affordable Housing. One residence is somewhat outside their scope of view – that is Missioner Park. Most of the residents are mature students. Half of them are graduate students, some of them are undergraduate students, and they have family. Not much communication with them was conducted until late last week for the meeting today. Their rent rates are quite high but the spaces they are renting are not up to standard. LAU wants to look into this issue.

b. VP Academics

WOODS reminds the committee about election campaign on October 17th. The voting station will be on Alumni room. There is difficulty in moving the couches in the room. Training will be on October 12th. He met with some MPs and had a day with a lot of travel but they were good meetings. He met with MP Blaine Calkins in Ponoka and gave a dinner presentation with Alberta Caucus. He also met with MP Michael Chong in Calgary, talking about pre-budget submission, which is getting attraction now.

WOODS explains that when people lobby they will provide federal advocacy pre-budget submission. Interest group on federal level will provide 3 asks for the government: this is what we want, this is what they cost, this is how you do to implement them. It is essentially a quick guide for the government to look at how to implement these things.

CASA has 3 asks. First, setting work exemption. Currently if a student has student loan and has a part-time job, the earning from the job will be exempted from the student loan. The issue is that the liars are rewarded as they will get the money but the honest ones are the ones being punished. Second, vehicle exemption. If a student has a vehicle worth around \$5000, the amount will be exempted from student loan. The amount of RSP saving and certain amount of parents' income will also be exempted from the loan. Third, setting weekly loan limit. Weekly loan limit is set at \$210 per week for student loan in 2007/2008. But with inflation increase, it should be raised to \$245.

7. QUESTION PERIOD

HANWELL asks WOODS if there is a goal for the election. WOODS answers that he only has one goal – that is the election works well, such as good crowd control, good volunteers, efficient polling station running throughout the day. He is trying to find confident individuals who can commit and take it seriously. The city is excited and will do whatever to accommodate the election. This is a pilot project. Furthermore, there will be CROs with federal or provincial jurisdiction to watch over, so this will be a test for voting on campuses across Alberta. If it goes wrong, the blame will be on SU.

BATAL asks about advertisement for the election. WOODS answers he is still working with MacEwan and NAIT, and the campaign materials will be released next week. By then the campus will be full of posters for the forum and election. The forum will be held on October 6th at 7pm at MacEwan University.

BATAL asks about volunteer recruitment. WOODS asks council and Fas, also posts on Facebook and on other social media. He now only needs two more people. Volunteers will receive \$135 at the end.

MILLS asks if the lobby trips worthwhile. WOODS thinks they worth the effort. Ponoka meeting is crucial. And CASA never meets with Michael Chong before, so it is an opportunity for CASA to talk to MP who they never talks with before and see if he would like to see them in the future. Besides, he is receptive.

BATAL asks CHELEN about the Academic Materials section of his report – who is responsible of the external review of the Bookstore's operation. CHELEN explains that the supervisor of administrative unit can request a unit review every 5 years. The Bookstore belongs to administrative unit and its supervisor the Chief Librarian requested to conduct a unit review. Due to budget situation, the unit review is on the pause. But CHELEN thinks it is worthwhile for the Chief Librarian to compare the Bookstore with the other bookstores. A couple of experts from the field of academic materials suggest

the Bookstore to look into ebooks.

BATAL continues to ask is this operation make to public. CHELEN answers that it is more on the high level, like directing how to spend the revenue, so only experts are in the view. And CHELEN adds that the Bookstore did not conduct a review since 2004.

BATAL asks about Experiential Learning section – what is proposing new leadership initiative. MILLS explains the idea of leadership college. It is to take 144 students from various faculties in the university and incorporate them into a college. There will be a residency and so they will have a building unit. They will have graduate student mentors and principal of the college. It will be in self-sustaining funding model, it comes out from the operating grant of the university, from sponsorship and fund-raising. Professors from different faculty will teach courses on leadership to these students or modify their courses containing leadership training. It is an admission programme for second year university student, they either in the faculty or being nominated but nothing was decided about the requirement. So it is an elite leadership school where its student can afford to live on campus. They are thinking of what the business school is currently doing, like the leadership cohort and leadership certificate, but bigger in scale. It is an expensive initiative and they want to name it after Peter Law, like Peter Law College of Leadership.

CHAMPAGNE asks what they expect to come out of this leadership college. CHELEN says they want students to have access to special leadership opportunity, leadership courses, residence, mentors, networking, study abroad, and better living experience. It is a more restrictive and formalize programme of leadership. It is a lot of investment.

8. OLD BUSINESS

a. Health & Wellness Policy

BATAL attaches the drafted principle; it was drafted by BATAL, BINCZYK and LAU out of scratch. She wants to hear the opinion of the committee.

WOODS comments that the principles are all fine.

CHELEN recommends it is better for the Council to know what they will expect from the second reading. He recommends some specific directive to the Exec.

BATAL explains that what they want to do is to take the WHEREAS clause and adjust them to read as a principle. She would like the suggestion from the committee. MILLS suggests thinking about something like second reading then generalizes and simplifies them.

BATAL says when they went back to the records when this policy was passed in Policy Committee and in Council 2 years ago. There were no

principle, all were BIFRT and WHEREAS clauses passed in the first reading. This is strange as it is not the way Craig instructed to do it. So she is confused.

WOODS points out that not everyone wants to be educated in health and wellness.

HANWELL and MILLS suggest including the financial implications of eating healthy. LAU suggests adding a principle that the SU shall advocate for promoting a health option. MILLS suggests showing people how to have a more health option.

BATAL asks the committee to look into last year's Health and Wellness Policy and asks if it is sufficient. CHELEN comments that it is specific in some cases.

MILLS wants to talk about the finances. She addresses her concern on student debt and wants to show student how to manage their money so that they are not stressed and can actually focus on school.

BATAL explains that the executives execute these action items. From her perspective, when talking about health and wellness it is from a holistic approach. And this policy lacks the holistic view as it touches on certain things but misses certain things. She does not want the policy to be lengthy but get to the point.

LAU wants to keep the principle somewhat general, but he realizes there are some specific asks that they have to include in the principle, but not personal project ideas.

WOODS comments on last year's policy – they are not specific enough. He defines good policy as specific enough but not too specific that it tells the VPs exactly how they do it, so they can achieve it whatever way they want to.

LAU will review the more specific but not too specific action items that could be typed in the principle, especially incorporating accessibility and financial health.

b. Internationalization

WOODS had made edits from External point of view and wants to discuss it with the committee. He made additional WHEREAS and BIFRT clauses in the policy.

WOODS states that the multiple entry visas and off-campus working permits are the two biggest injustices. These are the two lobby asks CASA working on. And he wants to discuss it with the committee.

LAU comments that he does not see the harm in allowing all international students to have off-campus working permits but he sees the benefit of current system of maintaining GPA 2.0 before they could work. He talked with 3 international students and asked how it has been trying to get working permits. And they answered that it is easy, just to maintain GPA 2.0.

WOODS brings up the conservatives argument that the international students are taking jobs from Canadians. But it is not the case.

MILLS also sees the benefits of the GPA requirement. And she suggests to find something more definitive, like the application materials for the permit before the committee start the discussion on this issue.

WOODS' addition of the clauses mainly focuses on tuition and differential rates, multiple entry visas. He further explains that some students in certain countries can a multiple entry visa which allows him to come and go the country as he pleases. But the visa is not issued to some nations, so students from these nations have to pay \$132 every time they come to Canada. Another issue is that it is discriminatory. Especially when students who cannot get a multiple entry visa are the ones who have hard-enough time to finance education.

LAU with CHELEN's support is trying to figure out the stat of International Student Services and what SU wants with them. Most of their work has been around what action should they take with ISS, the International Centre, and what international students are asking from them.

BATAL asks if it is appropriate for the executives or committee like Policy Committee to have a focus group discussion with some random international students and ask what are their issues and what do they face, to give them the idea. CHELEM supports this idea. He recommends to collect bigger data from international students.

BATAL thinks they need to gather the right data to make sure they have the right information to present to the Council. She asks WOODS to send the edits he has, to call it the first draft; and LAU if he has edits, to call the second draft. And discuss the information in the next meeting.

9. NEW BUSINESS

a. Scholarships & Bursaries

CHELEN is currently in the Student Financial Task Force for the past 6-8 months, meeting with Registrar Office about student awards and scholarships. They drafted 5 recommendations a month ago.

CHELEN concerns that the task force never decide to tell him that in August/September when they did not put the application online for

scholarship competition. Also, currently the Registrar Office spends 85% of its money on new students versus 15% of its money on the other three year of students. It is difficult for old students to get scholarships.

BATAL points out that if the last BIFRT clause CHELEN mentioned is going to be outdated, why not change the word “pursue” to “support.” CHELEN recommends to keep it for now.

CHAMPAGNE suggests the scholarships to be awarded by different faculties. It is better for each faculty to handle their own scholarships. CHELEN agrees the current system is confusing.

LAU suggests to change the centralized office to a single point of entry. It can be something like a website.

BATAL suggests during the transition period, it might be helpful there is some body to help student to refer them to the right station where they can submit application.

BATAL asks what happen if the committee not have any changes in the policy but let it expire in their term. CHELEN suggests to make some changes to the policy based on focus group structure.

**10. DISCUSSION
AND INFORMATION
ITEMS**

WOODS announces that if anyone in the committee able to spend some time on 12th and 17th of October helping him to run the polling station, he will be appreciated. And he only needs two more people.

11. REPORTS

**12. CLOSED
SESSION**

13. NEXT MEETING *October 1st, 6 PM.*

14. ADJOURNMENT *CHELEN* moved that the meeting be adjourned.
The motion was seconded by *MILLS*.

Vote on Motion

7 / 0 / 0

CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7:38 PM.



POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY REPORT TO COUNCIL

<i>Date: September 17, 2013</i>		<i>Time: 6:10 pm</i>	2013 – 2014 <i>MEETING #10</i>
Motions			
1.	<i>MILLS moved that September 17 agenda be approved as tabled.</i>		<i>CARRIED 7/0/0</i>
2.	<i>BATAL moved that August 20 minutes be approved as amended.</i>		<i>CARRIED 5/0/2</i>
3.	<i>CHELEN moved that the meeting be adjourned.</i>		<i>CARRIED 7/0/0</i>