



POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES

2011 - 2012 # meeting number

Date: September 20, 2011

Time: 6:16 PM

In Attendance:

PETROS KUSMU (Chair)

FARID ISKANDAR

COLTEN YAMIGISHI

ANDREW FEHR

RAPHAEL LEPAGE FORTIN

ADAM WOODS

AVINASH KARUVELIL

EMERSON CSORBA

NAVNEET KHINDA

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:

CHAKA ZINYEMBA

NIKKI WAY

DAVID HE

KIM FERGUSON

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by *KUSMU* at insert time 6:16pm.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA *CSORBA* moved that the *September 20, 2011* agenda be approved as amended.

The motion was seconded by *FEHR*

Vote on Motion 9 / 0 / 0

CARRIED.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES *LEPAGE FORTIN* amended minutes to change all occurrences of "FORTON" to "FORTIN".

YAMAGISHI amended minutes to *change all occurrences of “YAMAGASHI” to “YAMAGISHI”*.

ISKANDAR amended minutes...(3of10) to say “*Coss Fee*” instead of “*Cost Fee*”.

WOODS amended minutes...(4of10) to say “*What is wrong with doing what other universities are doing*” instead of “*What is wrong with doing that with the other universities*”.

ISKANDAR amended minutes...(4of10) to say “*ISKANDAR*” instead of “*ISKKANDAR*”.

ISKANDAR amended minutes...(6of10) to say “*leeway*” instead of “*leeWAY*”.

FEHR amended minutes...(7of10) to say “*food preparation resources*” instead of “*to*”.

KUSMU amended minutes...(8of10) to say “*food*” instead of “*cold*”.

ISKANDAR amended minutes...(9of10) to exclude “*If you go to the provincial government, you will get a no.*”

FEHR moved that the *September 8, 2011* minutes be approved as *amended*. The motion was seconded by *ISKANDAR*.

Vote on Motion 9 / 0 / 0
CARRIED.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS *None.*

**5. EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE
REPORTS**

To VPX – ISKANDAR

ISKANDAR: Nothing to add to my report.

KUSMU: any questions?...no questions for Farid.

To VPA – EMERSON CSORBA

KUSMU: Any questions?

To VSPL - YAMAGISHI

YAMAGISHI: We had 59 lead points instead of 60, 60 is gold. I wasn't there for this. They said they want to have a 5 point buffer. We have to be safe to bucket it to 64, just to be safe. I looked at the budget. They have a surplus this year but that is because they could not fix Mackenzie windows.

LEPAGE FORTIN: On the u pass, I talked to the lady on the CSJ - all the new students got them at orientation. The girl that is distributing said it isn't too much work, it's worthwhile.

FEHR: This is not really related to your report: it mentions the smart card technology...

YAMAGISHI: It is really expensive, 26 million just for the busses and the ETS sent a proposal to the university for that. We told them that we fully support them.

FEHR: So it will not be the one card?

YAMAGISHI: No it will be in the one card? They are on the right track for it

WAY: Have you discussed smart card technology with ETS recently?

YAMAGISHI: They would still have to do a coin-op, people won't have to buy bus passes, they will just put money onto the card.

KUSMU: Is that it? Close the floor for discussion?

6. OLD BUSINESS

9. NEW BUSINESS

ACADEMIC MATERIALS POLICY

KUSMU: For the Academic Materials Policy, Farid is going to have that for us next meeting.

FOOD POLICY

YAMAGISHI: Basically, we just simplified a lot of sentences. We said that 2013, if we review it at the end of the year, I don't think there would be a ton of change, we should give it two years. We called the vendor levy.

WAY: It's a debit card levy, nothing to clarify, maybe we should just put at footnote.

YAMAGISHI: As far as organic, there are a lot of dictionary.com definitions, we can just choose one.

ISKANDAR: I didn't read the paper. So I am not comfortable passing this policy today. I would like to move to strike the ecological impact because it is in the WHERE AS clause, but that is a wording thing. Principle 5, I think it belongs in a WHERE AS clause and not the principle. But I would argue that in the second reading.

YAMAGISHI: I think you are right. Would you be passing it if we brought it up?

ISKANDAR: I would be okay passing it now.

WAY: Would you be okay passing the fair trade?

ISKANDAR: If you can explain it to me really well.

YAMAGISHI: I e-mailed a copy.

KUSMU: Oh yeah, Should we take five minutes reading it then?

ISKANDAR: So what is the difference between capital Fair Trade and the lower case one?

KHINDA: It's a certified thing.

WAY: The products that they are selling are considered fair instead of letting the product choose the price.

YAMAGISHI: There is also free trade but I don't think that is the same.

KUSMU: Let us just spend a min or two reading it.

ISKANDAR: Do you know what is the ratio for the capital Fair Trade and fair trade?

WAY: I don't know.

WAY: You know what you are getting with a capital F capital T where as you don't know what you are getting with the normal F and T. There is a Canadian organization that regulates fair trade.

ISKANDAR: So you are cool with the normal one?

WAY: No we are not, that is why we are regulating. You can look at it as a consumer and know what is happening.

FEHR: Are there any criticisms of upper case Fair Trade and what are they?

KHINDA: Some people are just opposed to it.

WAY: You have to pay to get the certification. Some people say that you have to be rich to get it. They really try to reach the small farmers but they tend to go for the large operations.

KHINDA: Can we bring in somebody who is more knowledgeable? I feel like if we were all in the same page of knowledge...

KARUVELIL: yeah, I don't really know...

YAMAGISHI: I just don't know what else they would tell us.

WAY: we are already selling fair trade products in SUB

YAMAGISHI: if you are not comfortable, I don't know how much a of a difference it would make if we left it out.

WAY: UBC is a fair trade certified campus. They have commuted to selling fair trade. Vancouver is a fair trade certified city. It's a huge movement. We are one of the last.

FERGUSON: Would you say that there is enough diversity that we would have a good selection to choose from?

WAY: There is selection. There are a lot of companies. There are huge companies like Cadbury so the diversity is forming. There is selection but not as much as desired. There are competitors but they are not big brands.

WOODS: I am in favor of a presentation. There isn't much sense in going lower case fair trade, we would go upper case.

WAY: Would you prefer someone local or from Vancouver?

WOODS: whichever is suitable. Someone who can just explain it.

WAY: maybe someone from UBC then. It is well established there.

ISKANDAR: I am comfortable about voting for capital Fair Trade. I suggest everyone does their own research and we can come back next meeting.

KUSMU: Is everyone ok with that?

WAY: Regarding organic: certified organic is similar to fair trade but at a higher price. 3000 dollars a year to be certified. There are tons of local farmers (100%) who aren't certified. So I say that we can take the certified standards and summarize them.

ISKANDAR: When you lobby this, are you going to take that document with you and bring that up every time you mention organic?

FEHR: You probably don't need to summarize the standards so you can just

footnote it.

ISKANDAR: What kind of risks do we run into if we don't define what organic means?

WAY: I think it is just the clarity. We could just say: organic is defined by the Alberta standards.

ISKANDAR: Would that be limiting yourself?

WAY: I know what you mean by limiting yourself. But there is a general Alberta definition for anyone who is serious about it.

KUSMU: So I guess we will make a footnote.

CSORBA: I have an amendment point 6: remove "providing more choices for students who wish to eat...and put that on a where as clause". I think it will make the sentence a lot easier to read.

ISKANDAR: Remove "students who wish to eat on campus".

YAMAGISHI: If anything has the effect of what we are doing, it needs to be in a WHERE AS clause.

KUSMU: I just missed some stuff because we are having technical difficulties.

ISKANDAR: why does it expire in two years rather than three months?

YAMAGISHI: I thought it was volatile.

FEHR: I think it makes sense to renew it in two years.

KUSMU: Can you guys read the changes?

FEHR: For the first point: it doesn't make sense to have healthy alternatives and diverse food options because healthy is included in diverse. I think it is redundant. Put it in a WHERE AS clause.

WAY: I don't think so, because diverse mainly means cultural.

YAMAGISHI: I think it is bolder to have two separate clauses.

WAY: I think "healthy alternatives" is a key point in that sentence. Healthy fits into diverse but diverse doesn't fit into healthy.

CSORBA: I have a suggestion for an amendment: "diverse and healthy food options".

ISKANDAR: So does that mean diverse unhealthy food options are allowed?

Vote for older clause: 4 in favor.

Vote for new clause: 5 in favor.

CSORBA amended the clause to include "*diverse and healthy food options*"

ISKANDAR: I think people should know what they are voting on before they do.

WOODS: if we were voting, I would be in favor. But I don't like it when we rush through policies. I want to know the research before we pass policies.

YAMAGISHI: I need help with the footnotes.

KUSMU: I will e-mail this to you guys. And let's move on to the most exciting part of the meeting, the smoking policy. Chakka will present on this.

He used the questions from the former chair as a guideline for his presentation.

A SMOKING POLICY

ZINYEMBA: Many of the questions are redundant. So what I did was, I outlined it in a document. I contacted Rochelle Howard from the smoke free campus initiative. This is generally well known info (if you google). Second hand smoke is a major contributor to health issues. There are certain things that are preventable, and smoke is a major preventable contributor. It is a preventable leading cause of disabilities. On the second page, answering the question “what is the goal?” The U of A currently doesn’t have its own legislations regarding smoking. The U of A follows the provincial legislation. Other universities such as Grant McEwan have their own policy. A potential policy that we can lobby can be: creating designated smoking areas.

I think many of us will agree, most people smoke next to doorways. Results have shown that effects of second hand smoke can be the same as smoking in inside. Even if you can’t smell it, the particles are still in the air.

No level of second hand smoke is safe. The U of A is a leader and innovator in health research. We got a major health facility. So this can be a major ethos.

Second hand smoke contributes to air pollution, certain amounts of sustainable issues.

Of course, 20 years ago, profs and students used to smoke in class. Previously 80 % of the people used to smoke, now it has become more de normalized to 20%. We need to make sure that this culture change doesn’t go the opposite way.

The U of A would not be the first to go smoke free. I attached the smoking policy in Grant McEwan. What I am advocating for is similar to the Grant McEwan policy.

The U of A board of governors would be the one we would want to lobby to. U of A doesn’t have a policy. Nothing in my knowledge is stopping it from creating its own policy.

Students wanted to ban smoking on campus in 06 but nothing was done about it

ISKANDAR: That is untrue.

ZINEYMBA: Well, there is no tobacco sold on campus , is that right?

ISKANDAR: Well I will talk about it once you are done.

ZINYEMBA: Thank you. That is well taken. There are different bodies on campus, that can take a different role of enforcement, campus protective services. Answering question 6: I wasn’t too clear on what this question means. I think the health issue speaks in abundance by itself ; that is what makes this policy a serious one.

That is all I had to say, and Mr. chair, over to you.

ISKANDAR: My comment about that issue is that the U of A started a discussion about a smoke free campus. They talked to all four stake holders on campus. GSA and NASA, said that they will be doing a dis-service if a smoke free campus was provided, that is why it stopped right there.

ZINYEMBA: What is the disservice?

ISKANDAR: I can't say on behalf of the stake holders.

YAMAGISHI: I know you said 20% people smoke, do you know what percentage on campus?

ZINYEMBA: Give me five minutes to find out.

WOODS: I am in favor of the designated spaces. I believe it is 4 – 5 m for the air to be clean. 80% voted in favor, 20% weren't, it is just a majority vs. minority deal.

FEHR: I am generally in favor of a smoking ban or designated smoking areas. I know it is annoying walking behind smokers; it is blowing in your face, especially if you are asthmatic - As long as we can find a student justification to this.

ZINYEMBA: Sorry Colt, I can't find an answer to that.

YAMAGISHI: I wanted to know if it was mainly older people.

CSORBA: Good job with the research, my concern is what executive would this fall under? It is not feasible to advocate to the government, so not the VPX. So advocating the U of A, in terms of the VPSL, I don't know how that will fall. The only stake holder that this would apply to is the board of governors, the others are students. I have trouble seeing how this would fall under the SU's jurisdiction.

ZINYEMBA: my initial thoughts would be VPSL.

CSORBA: I see VPSL, I don't see how we could advocate to the U of A health center. I don't see how that would lead to a policy being created. I would be interested to see what Rory things.

LEPAGE FORTIN: You would be going through the sub committees, not directly to the board of governors. We could have a discussion.

ISKANDAR: I am uncomfortable with that.

LEPAGE FORTIN: U of A is a communal area. The LRT: it does affect the academic staff and the non-academic staff. I like this idea. The only thing that really impressed me is that we researched in our policy in how that advocates towards our health.

ISKANDAR: Can I move in camera?

Closed Session

FERGUSON: I have problems with the research and the way that studies get used: You can smoke in the car: you have to consider distance. Talk to people who smoke, you are limiting the rights.

ZINYEMBA: Your first point about research is well taken. The extent of the policy: my thinking, they main policy would be drive second hand smoke away from high traffic areas. I do acknowledge that you can sit in your car and smoke. Initially drive second hand smoke from high traffic areas. I don't know about after that.

LEPAGE FORTIN: Publicites do require a lot of signatures. It has been five years - we don't know what the game is anymore. Having past numbers is not relevant to us anymore.

FERGUSON: I would say that that had to happen before a policy. Another issue is telling people they have their own area. They are not allowed to be on campus freely.

ZINYEMBA: I agree, part of the research I did last summer is the effect of de normalization of smoking. This is something that should be taken into consideration while making the policy. On the other hand, the right to having clean air is greater than having the right to smoke.

KUSMU: It seems like a unanimous consent. Seems like the water is warm.

LEPAGE FORTIN: I would also push that if Chakka could talk to them and see if they can make a publicite about it.

ISKANDAR: I didn't talk to about this. I also think that we should contact ASUA and NASA, not on behalf of the SU to know what happened to the conversation, why they feel that this is a dis service to students. You need their support to back up the policy.

CSORBA: Pretty much what Farid said, I think we should get Rory's opinion. Chakka perhaps you could talk to them and gage their appetite.

LEPAGE FORTIN: Just logistically speaking it might be nice to have a publicite about it.

KUSMU: Who is going to bring this up to Rory?

ISKANDAR: I can, but I would prefer if Chakka talked to Rory.

KUSMU: If you could get back to us on that?

10. REPORTS

None.

11. CLOSED SESSION

ISKANDAR moved that the meeting be moved into closed session at 7:10 pm to discuss *The Smoking Policy*.

INSERT NAME moved that the meeting be moved into open session at 7:20pm.

12. NEXT MEETING

Date: *Tuesday, October 4, 2011*. Time: 6:00-8:00pm.

13. ADJOURNMENT

KARUVELIL moved that the meeting be adjourned.
The motion was seconded by *FEHR*

Vote on Motion 9 / 0 / 0
CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:48 pm.