



University of Alberta Students' Union

**POLICY
COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, June 8th, 2016

6:00PM

SUB 6-06

AGENDA (PC 2016-02)

- | | |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 2016-02/1 | <u>INTRODUCTION</u> |
| 2016-02/1a | Call to Order |
| 2016-02/1b | Approval of Agenda |
| 2016-02/1c | Approval of Minutes |
| 2016-02/1d | Chair's Business |
| 2016-02/2 | <u>QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD</u> |
| 2016-02/2a | Policy Review Timeline |
| 2016-02/3 | <u>COMMITTEE BUSINESS</u> |
| 2016-02/4 | <u>INFORMATION ITEMS</u> |
| 2016-02/5 | <u>ADJOURNMENT</u> |

2016-02/5a

Next Meeting:

**POLICY
COMMITTEE**

Wednesday May 11, 2016

6:00 pm

SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Victoria Dejong (Chair)		Y
Michael Sandare		Y
Franchesca El Ghossein		Y
Marina Banister		Y
Sandy Brophy		Y
Jason Wang	Nik Viktorov	Y
Delane Howie		N
Kyle Monda		Y
Ben Angus		Y

MINUTES (PC 2016-1)

2016-1/1

INTRODUCTION

2016-1/1a

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 6:02 pm.

2016-1/1b

Approval of Agenda

Dejong added the item "Standing Orders" under Committee Business.

DEJONG/GHOSSEIN moved to approve the agenda for May 11, 2016 as amended.

Vote 8/0/0

CARRIED

2016-1/1c

Approval of Minutes

Postponed till the next meeting.

2016-1/1d

Chair's Business

Individual Goal Setting

DEJONG: We're going to talk about individual goal setting. Let's do a round table, and see what people's goals are.

My first priority is to get a sexual violence policy passed this year. Another priority is to establish a formal consultation process for all policies. This was something that Councillor Wang was passionate about as well. So, let's wait till he gets back in the fall semester. My last goal is to be an effective chair. I want to make sure that I'm here to answer anyone's questions and make sure we're all in the same page.

GHOSSEIN: I'm with Councillor Dejong on the sexual assault policy. Vice-president Paches and I also sit on the University committee reviewing the sexual assault policy. Things will also come up relating to residences as well as other sporadic events.

MONDA: I'm interested in the Students' Union's (SU's) residence policy and our advocacy efforts relating to that.

BROPHY: First, I want to know specifically about what issues are under the purview of the Policy Committee. I'm interested in the residence issues; especially issues relating to the East Campus Village where a lot of my constituents live. In addition, there are students who get treated differently as employees. Student casual employees working for the University don't get a transit pass. This is more relevant during the Spring/Summer period.

VIKTOROV: Councillor Wang said he wanted to look at policies expiring this year. He also wanted to look into what he called internationalization. This includes provisions for more students to go abroad and tuition fee more predictable for international students.

SANDARE: The sexual assault policy is on the radars of most executives

including me. Tuition is up for review. This will be interesting as we have a new government. I'm interested in the residence policy as well. I just became president of the Edmonton Student Lines (ESL). So, residence is something we'll be bringing up to the city as well. Furthermore, I also want to work on the mental health policy.

BANISTER: I'm all up for the sexual assault policy which needs to happen. I want to conduct more of a support role in answering people's questions. So, I won't really be bringing in any unilateral policies.

ANGUS: The sexual assault policy, residence policy, and the tuition policy are big things for me.

DEJONG: These are fantastic suggestions. I don't know everything about what everyone talked about. So, I'll be educating myself on them. I'll be happy to help you out with anything you'd like to bring forward. We may also need to call more meetings as there are lots of things going on.

2016-1/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

Sexual assault policy

DEJONG: I wanted to talk about where I'm at on the first principles of the sexual assault policy. I have been doing some research and there is no clear direction where I'm going to take this yet. I feel that expanding it to sexual violence is important. I have a timeline for the sexual assault policy that I'd like your feedback on. Today, I'm going to talk about consultations with the stakeholders. Ideally, I'd like to bring forth first principles at our next meeting, and bring them to Council on June 14. At the subsequent Policy Committee meeting on July 13, I'd like to bring in the second principles. Consultations would be ongoing during the entire time. If we have done sufficient consultation, I would like to bring the second principles to the Students' Council meeting on August 23. I really like to have this policy before the school year starts. But, depending on our consultation process, we may not be able to get it done on time.

BANISTER: That sounds good. But, none of the executives will be here on July 13.

DEJONG: We can decide on changing the meeting date when we're a little closer because we'd want to get executive input.

BANISTER: Are there any policies expiring in the Summer?

DEJONG: The policies will expire at the end of April. We should also establish a firm schedule to review each policy. The tuition policy will need a lot of work. So would public transit. The management and instructional fee policy is another one that the previous

executives made a lot of progress on. Last year, there were about 4 policies which were passed as they were because there wasn't enough time. I'd love to revisit those if we get a chance to see whether there are things we missed because we rushed through them.

After this meeting wraps up, I'd like to send introductions to the different stakeholders on campus and in Edmonton. There was a proposed sexual assault policy at the University of McGill which ended up falling through. There was a group of students working on this for over a year. They made a highly inclusive policy that talked about the different demographics that are especially susceptible to sexual violence. The Dean of Students and Vice-provost there were also working on this, and the Vice-provost ended up rejecting it because she thought that that wasn't an appropriate part of the policy. That is something I want to pursue here, but I want it done right. The Dean of Students coming in was the Dean of Students at McGill who rejected that policy. So, I don't know whether we'll get resistance from him. But, we'll definitely have to meet with him to discuss it.

So, after we draft first principles, we can reach out to the different stakeholders and demographics to get their inputs, and the same with the second principles. While most of these can be done via email, I would like to have meetings with campus based groups.

GHOSEIN: Off the top of my head, I can think about around 5 different organizations we can talk with. With regards to what happened at McGill, we can look at integrating intersectionality better in our policy.

ANGUS: Is this North Campus focused?

DEJONG: I would like to expand it to Augustana and Campus Saint Jean as well.

BROPHY: The Dean of Students has already rejected a policy that he saw certain flaws with. That gives us an indication of what things we should change or explain better.

MONDA: We should consult with residence life too because their staff are always responding to sexual violence.

DEJONG: We should reach out to residence services and also to students working in residences as they have more firsthand experience.

BANISTER: We should also look at the intent of this policy. What message are we trying to get across, and how will this get implemented in practice?

SANDARE: We should be sticking more towards political policy. Once we tread over to operational policy, things may get messy. A lot of this should be about how we advocate against sexual assault.

ANGUS: To counter that, I feel that this may be something that we might have to get messy in. If we have to go into that territory, we should.

BANISTER: When we talk with the stakeholders, they would probably ask why they should care. That's something the person talking with them should properly answer.

DEJONG: My idea is for this to be a political policy to outline the SU's stance on the issue, and what the University should be doing better.

BROPHY: I agree that it should be about advocacy on how the University handles things. But, there should be two prongs to it: preventative and responsive. Both are major issues.

DEJONG: There was a study done by the Canadian Federation of Women. While about 96% said consent was absolutely necessary, only 36% could define consent. That's just something that people don't know, and aren't given the opportunity to learn about. So, preventative education is extremely important.

ANGUS: I'd like to see a discussion on more at-risk populations.

DEJONG: In the McGill policy, I didn't see very many direct consultations. We should really focus on direct engagement.

This is going to be a lot of work. To follow the timeline, I guess we would need something like a form/letter or a survey to send to the stakeholders. What would you think about forming a small working group to talk about this?

GHOSSSEIN: The University is developing its own policy at the same time. We should make sure the students are not confused. It's scheduled to happen over the next 6 months. So, if we do it now, it'll be totally fine. We don't have to wait for them to do it.

DEJONG: Yes. So, if we do send out a survey, we should clearly notify that it's a Students' Union one. We can also share our findings too.

BANISTER: Are we asking the stakeholders really broad questions? As I understood, we were going to send them the draft of the first principles, and get their opinions about it.

DEJONG: I was thinking of doing both. I would like to immediately reach out to them, make a connection, and ask them whether they have any concerns off the top of their heads.

ANGUS: Will we get the ideas for the first principles from the stakeholders or from here?

DEJONG: I'd like as much input as I can.

BANISTER: I believe that you'll get stronger feedback if you provide them content to critique. That also minimizes having to sieve through all the data too.

GHOSSSEIN: Is the survey for the student population?

DEJONG: Yes, and the draft principles. I just wanted to make a connection straight off the bat and ask them whether they wanted to be part of the consultation process. I agree that they may be confused if we ask them what their opinions were without sending them something to consider. But, it's important to connect with them before we start sending documents.

BANISTER: That's a good idea. We have a somewhat limited capacity to send things to the entire student body. I'm not saying we can't do it, but we must be selective in what we do. We should consider whether we are consulting only the stakeholder groups or the entire student body.

GHOSSEIN: We may want to reserve the mass surveys for things we want to prove. I don't think there will be such a question for this one though.

DEJONG: I wanted to get general student input on what they thought about the policy. I wouldn't ask to use the mailing lists. I envisioned using the social media which is difficult in itself. I'm happy with just engaging with groups.

SANDARE: So, in terms of direct consultation, are we going to take a top-down approach?

DEJONG: I'd like to do that. First, we'll ask them whether they want to get involved. Once we have a solid collection of groups, we can send them our drafts.

So, would anyone want to meet up for a couple of hours next week?

BROPHY: I'm in.

MONDA: I can too.

BANISTER: I'll come to the occasional meeting, but can't commit to all of them.

SANDARE: Send me what the times are, and I'll try to make it even for a short while.

ANGUS: We can do a google doc, and have less in-person meetings. We can use something like a Google hangout. We can have an in-person meeting when we have more concrete stuff to do.

DEJONG: I'd like an in-person meeting because I don't want to delegate stuff in this situation.

BANISTER: Typically, committees that are successful have a lot of action items. While I agree that it's an achievable timeline, it's rather tight. So, we need to have our goals lined out before each meeting.

DEJONG: I'll start a Google drive folder and start putting in information relating to our stakeholders.

Standing Orders

DEJONG: Under Section 7, Legislative Process for Political Policies, it says that only an executive can bring a policy before Council for second principles. I have issues with that. It's limiting the power of a councilor to bring something before the Council. I talked with Speaker Sumar about this, and he agrees that this is not constitutional for Council. It's something in the Standing Orders of a committee that affects Council as a whole.

BROPHY: In addition to the things you outlined, our executives are busy with other things. There's no reason why there should be an extra thing on their plate.

BANISTER: I agree that this doesn't make too much sense. But, being with the Students' Union for several years, I know that is some sort of historical precedent for this clause to be there. I'm not saying that that's a good enough reason to keep it. But, I'd be curious to hear why it's there.

SANDARE: There may have been a conflict in the past between the operational side of a policy and what was decided at the committee. There are limits to what we can do. As an executive, we know the limits we're working within.

BANISTER: You may also want to reflect about whether you want VP Student Life, VP External, and VP Academic being here because we're mandated to.

DEJONG: I believe there's a lot of value in having executives in the committee. It enables checks and balances so that committee members don't bring something unreasonable to Council. If there have been conflicts between political and operational policies, I see value in having the VP Operations & Finance here too.

GHOSEIN: Although it seems restrictive, I'd want to ask around more.

BROPHY: One compromise would be to have the second principles endorsed by an executive instead of being drafted by an executive. Having a bit of oversight could be useful.

DEJONG: I believe that having 3 executives in the committee already provides that oversight.

BANISTER: If I were to speculate, this clause has been put there to prevent someone from bringing forward a policy that doesn't have approval from the executives.

ANGUS: If we have a consensus based approval, this would make the line obsolete.

DEJONG: I don't really agree with consensus based decisions. There's value in debate. I don't believe a policy is not fit to be brought forward just because a few people disagree.

BANISTER: Another alternative is to have an executive bring it forward unless voted against it by a majority of the committee.

MONDA: We need to think about whether we want this in our Standing Orders or not.

SANDARE: Before we bring forth a motion, we can maybe ask Marc why this line is there. My personal opinion is that we should move it to the next meeting and discuss it there when we know why. We can always change Standing Orders at any time.

BANISTER: Yes. I'm just curious to know why this line is there before removing it.

DEJONG: I personally would like to have a motion now, as we shouldn't be basing our decisions on what happened in the past.

BROPHY: Because it's heavy handed, I believe we can strike it for now so that we don't get bogged down by it.

MONDA: What's the potential harm of striking it?

ANGUS/BROPHY moved to strike "who is also a member of the Executive Committee" from Section 7) 1) a) of the Policy Committee Standing Orders.

Vote 5/0/3

CARRIED

BROPHY/VIKTOROV moved to change "the assigned member of the Executive Committee" to "the assigned member of the Policy Committee" in Section 7) 1) b) of the Policy Committee Standing Orders.

Vote 5/0/3

CARRIED

ANGUS: I want to discuss something about attendance. We discussed this in the Council Administrative Committee too. Actually removing councilors from Council is a hot topic. But, I see the possibility of removing councilors from committees after a certain number of absences.

BANISTER: We can have something where you can be considered as having abandoned the committee if you miss 3 meetings in a row without a proxy, and not informing the Chair.

BROPHY: That's really fair.

2016-1/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-1/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

*ANGUS/BROPHY moved to adjourn the meeting.
Vote 8/0/0
CARRIED*

2016-1/5a **Next Meeting:** June 8, 2016 at 6:00 pm.

2016-1/5b Meeting adjourned at 7:01 pm.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
<i>DEJONG/GHOSSEIN moved to approve the agenda for May 11, 2016 as amended.</i>	8/0/0 - CARRIED
<i>ANGUS/BROPHY moved to strike "who is also a member of the Executive Committee" from Section 7) 1) a) of the Policy Committee Standing Orders.</i>	5/0/3 - CARRIED
<i>BROPHY/VIKTOROV moved to change "the assigned member of the Executive Committee" to "the assigned member of the Policy Committee" in Section 7) 1) b) of the Policy Committee Standing Orders.</i>	5/0/3 - CARRIED
<i>ANGUS/BROPHY moved to adjourn the meeting.</i>	8/0/0 - CARRIED