University of Alberta Students' Union

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday March 18th, 2014
TELUS 134

We would like to acknowledge that our University and our Students' Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students' Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge continuing colonial violence and respect Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

ORDER PAPER (SC 2013-23)

2013-23/1 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

2013-23/1a Announcements – The next meeting of Students' Council will take place on Tuesday, April 1st, 2014

2013-23/2 PRESENTATIONS

2013-23/2a International Student Services Presentation. Presented by Dr. Indira Samarasekera, President; Dr. Carl Amrhein, Provost and Vice President Academic; and Lisa Collins, Vice Provost and University Registrar. Sponsored by Petros Kusmu, SU President.

The University President, Provost, and Registrar will present to Students' Council on International Student Services. This presentation stems from discussion among the Board of Governors surrounding international student support and services.

2013-23/3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

2013-23/3a Executive Committee Report

Please see document SC 13-23.01

2013-23/4 BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

2013-23/4a Ruling 2013-05 of the DIE Board (Woods vs. Lau/CRO)

Please see document SC 13-23.02

2013-23/4b Ruling 2013-06 of the DIE Board (Woods vs. CRO)

Please see document SC 13-23.03

2013-23/4c Ruling 2013-07 of the DIE Board (Hanwell vs. CRO)

Please see document SC 13-23.04

2013-23/4d Ruling 2013-08 of the DIE Board (Lau vs. CRO)

Please see document SC 13-23.05

2013-23/5 QUESTION PERIOD

2013-23/5a Question to President Kusmu from Councillor Mohamed

In light of the LSHA suspension, has the SU been approached to assist the LSHA in its appeal and have we been asked to provide fiancial assistance?

2013-23/5b Question to VP Lau from Councillor Mohamed

What was the "incident" that lead to this suspension?

2013-23/5c Question to VP Chelen from Councillor Mohamed

What is the time frame for an appeal?

Response:
Thank you for the question Councillor Mohamed.

My understanding is that the time limit for an appeal to the University Appeal Board is set out in section 30.6.1 (1) of the 2013 Code of Student Behaviour. It reads "The written appeal must be presented to the Appeals Co-ordinator in the University Secretariat within 15 Working Days of the deemed receipt of the decision by the Student."

Sincerely,

Dustin Chelen

2013-23/6 BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2013-23/6a **BINCZYK/BATAL MOVE THAT** upon the recommendation of the Policy Committee, Students' Council approve the Transit Policy in first reading based on the following principles:

Public transit is a common and important mode of transportation used by University of

Alberta students that improves the quality of life of all members in the community and helps reduce our carbon footprint;

The post-secondary transit pass (U-Pass) provides a more affordable public transit option for students than a regular monthly adult pass;

The U-Pass is to be implemented in the academic years consistent with the referendum conditions;

Public transit expansion would allow improved access to commute within the service area for University of Alberta students;

Smartcard technology would reduce the possibility for U-pass fraud and reduce the need for a U-Pass replacement fee;

Students enrolled in Spring and Summer classes spend a significant amount of time commuting to and from Campus and therefore should be able to take advantage of the

Spring and Summer U-Pass regardless of their full-time or part-time enrolment status.

2013-23/6b **CHELEN/BATAL MOVE THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Policy Committee, approve the Merit Based Awards policy and the Needs Based Awards policy (formerly referred to collectively as the Scholarships and Bursaries policy) in second reading based on the following principles:

The University of Alberta should increase the number and value of awards to undergraduates in order to be consistent with the number and value of entrance awards.

The University of Alberta should increase the relative and absolute amounts of scholarships and bursaries based on students' financial need and involvement on campus.

The University of Alberta should disclose annually the ratio of need to merit based aid, and distribution of awards between years of study.

That donors support students from diverse backgrounds and with diverse skills via scholarship and bursary funding.

That the University of Alberta centralizes information and applications relevant to scholarships and bursaries.

That the Government of Alberta recognizes the importance of non repayable student aid compared to scholarships

That the Government of Alberta fund bursaries at an equal or higher level than merit based scholarships.

Please see document SC 13-23.06

2013-236c **BATAL/CHELEN MOVE THAT** upon the recommendation of the Policy Committee, Students' Council approve the Internationalization Policy in first reading based on the following principle:

The number of international students in Canada increased by 120 percent from 2002 to 2011, and those transitioning from temporary to permanent resident status increased by only 16 percent from 2002 to 2011. The rate of international students transitioning from temporary to permanent resident status in the past decade has not kept up with the pace of international student enrollment in

Canadian post-secondary institutions*

The University of Alberta clearly recognizes the importance of international students

A diverse student body and institutional internationalization is a fundamental feature of a high-quality university education

Although post-secondary institutions may charge international students more than domestic students, international students should not bear the burden of an institution's financial deficits

The International Student Differential Fee limits the geographic diversity of our international students because it selects for students in regions where more affluent families can afford education aboard

The International Differential Fee is a fabricated fee by post-secondary institutions and is not regulated by the Government of Alberta or the Public Post-Secondary Institutions' Tuition Fees Regulation

International students have less access to Scholarships and do not have access to Government Student Loans. Furthermore, scholarships available to international students are of complex requirements and difficult to renew and/or regain if lost

It is increasingly difficult for many international students to continue their post-secondary education in Canada because the Federal Government issues multi-entry visas only for students from a select number of countries.

An enhanced campus experience may increase engagement and retention of international students. Research has shown that the lack of integration with domestic students, little accessibility of on-campus housing, and the inadequate quality of career-related programming are the top three issues for international students studying in Canada*

Employers in Canada value cultural awareness and global experiences as important attributes in a multicultural work environment

Building strong relationships between Canadian and international post-secondary institutions is important for the internationalization of our campus and the global education of our students. Studying abroad is a unique and highly valuable experience that all University of Alberta students should be able to access.

2013-23/7 GENERAL ORDERS

2013-23/8 INFORMATION ITEMS

2013-23/8a Dustin Chelen, VP Academic- Report

Please see document SC 13-23.07

January 28

WOODS/KUSMU MOVED TO approve a conference request expense not to exceed $500 for the purpose of the Executive Committee to go to the Council of Alberta University Students' Roundtable being held in Calgary on January 31, 2014.

4/0/0 CARRIED

WOODS/KUSMU MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve a project allocation not to exceed $300.00 for the purpose of running the SU Political Speaker Series Event featuring MP Michael Chong in February 2014.

4/0/0 CARRIED

KUSMU/CHELEN MOVED TO call a special meeting of Students' Council on February 3 2014 for the sole purpose of voting on the Athletics and Recreation Fee Plebiscite Question.

5/0/0 CARRIED

CHELEN/KUSMU MOVES THAT the Executive Committee approve a project allocations request not to exceed $400 for the purpose of Discover Governance's ALES project.

5/0/0 CARRIED

February 6

KUSMU/CHELEN - move to approve a project allocation of $800 for the purpose of conducting a code review of washroom capacities on main and second floor SUB.

4/0/1 CARRIED

CHELEN/WOODS - move to approve a project allocation of $2500 for a legal opinion on the CoSSS fee.

5/0/0 CARRIED

February 11

LAU/CHELEN - move to approve Safewalk's proposed policy change to allow the walking of clients where alcohol is involved.

4/0/0 CARRIED

February 13

WOODS/CHELEN Move to approve a PA not to exceed $2000 for the ERC survey.

4/0/1 CARRIED

DIE Board Ruling # 05 2013/2014

HEARING DETAILS:

Style of Cause:	Woods vs Lau/CRO
Hearing Date:	March 5th, 2014
Hearing Number:	Ruling #05 2013/2014
DIE Board Panel members:	Harvir Mann, Associate Chief Tribune, Chair
	Cian Hackett, Associate Chief Tribune
	Zafir Kanji, Tribune
Appearing for the Applicant:	Adam Woods, Applicant
Appearing for the Respondent:	William Lau, Respondent
	Mario Babic, Agent

BACKGROUND:

Candidate Lau injured his ankle during the pre-campaign period and was provided a motorized scooter by Specialized Support and Disability Services (SSDS) for the purposes of compensating for his injury. The Chief Returning Officer (CRO) approved the request and also gave permission for Mr. Lau to affix campaign materials to his scooter in his campaign for SU President by accepting the scooter as an extension of himself (CRO Ruling #9). According to this ruling, he was determined to not be in contravention of Bylaw 2200 section 45 concerning services provided to candidates and charging fair market value in return.

Candidate Woods, running against Mr. Lau in the election, sought to appeal the CRO's ruling and requested clarification of Mr. Lau's use of his scooter for campaign activities. Mr. Woods claimed in his application for a hearing that Mr. Lau's scooter was used in campaign activities beyond personal mobility. A campaign activity is defined by Bylaw 2200 as "any act, planned or organized by or on behalf of any candidate or side that is calculated to convince members in a certain way." Evidence submitted by Mr. Woods included two pictures posted on Facebook depicting students sitting on his scooter with a campaign sign affixed to the front reading "Lau for Life." One picture in particular, uploaded by one of Mr. Lau's volunteers, came with the accompanying text: "Who wants a ride in the #Laumobile? Share this picture and you can be the next lucky person to roll in this beauty." Mr. Woods and his campaign volunteers also claimed to see Mr. Lau's volunteers operating his scooter around campus with campaign signage affixed to the front.

Mr. Woods believes these actions constitute attempts to sway voters in a particular way, beyond the use of his scooter for personal mobility. While he believe Mr. Lau has the right to affix campaign materials to his scooter and use it to compensate for his injury, he feels it is being unfairly used as a resource for campaign activities and he should be charged fair market value for its use, as cited in Bylaw 2200 section 45 subsection 1.

According to Mr. Lau and his agent, his campaign never intentionally utilized his motorized scooter for the purposes of campaigning. In their opinion, all activities and pictures taken with his scooter were done in playful jest rather than a serious attempt at swaying voters. In regards to the pictures, Mr. Lau argued that they were uploaded without his consent. According to Mr. Woods, the pictures were posted on Thursday February 27th by one of Mr. Lau's supporters. When Mr. Lau received a notification from the DIE Board for hearing on Monday March 3rd he subsequently took the pictures down. His agent mentioned that all activities concerning his scooter were unplanned and he could not control individuals wishing to take pictures with his scooter. Mr. Lau reasoned that he never explicitly advertised scooter rides as a means of campaign activity and should not be held accountable for the actions of his supporters without his knowledge. Instead, Mr. Lau argued that he was placed at a disadvantage by his injury and lack of mobility in comparison to other candidates.

Mr. Woods countered that such activities were not necessarily unplanned since individuals other than Mr. Lau were using a resource sanctioned only to Mr. Lau by SSDS. In his opinion, riding a scooter with Mr. Lau's promotional materials attached constituted solicitation and merited a decision from the DIE Board.

ISSUES:

[1] Should the CRO's decision in Ruling #9 be upheld?

[2] If Mr. Lau's scooter activities are considered a campaign resource, should he be charged fair market value for its use?

[3] If Mr. Lau is found in violation of Bylaw 2200 section 45, what fine should he be subjected to?

RELEVANT BYLAWS:

[4] **From Bylaw 2200 Section 27:**

27. Third Party Activities

(1) A candidate or side in a Students' Union election may distance themselves from a third party in the event the third party effectively conducts campaign activities under the following conditions:

a. the candidate or side must demonstrate to the C.R.O. that the third party acted without consent of the candidate or side; and

b. the candidate or side must demonstrate to the C.R.O. that steps have been taken to distance themselves from the third party and to attempt to halt unauthorized campaign activity by that third party.

(2) Should a candidate or side demonstrate the conditions specified under Section 27(1) to the C.R.O.'s satisfaction, the candidate or side would not be subject to punitive fines as a result of the third party's actions, but could still be subject to counterbalancing fines.

[5] **From Bylaw 2200 Section 31:**

31. Restrictions on Campaign Activities

(1) No candidate or side shall, without the permission of the C.R.O. engage in any campaign activity

a.in any business or service operated by the Students' Union;

b.in a University library;

c.in a classroom during a class unless he/she first obtains the permission of the professor responsible for that class;

d.in any residence; or

e.in any building or on any land not owned or operated by the University or the Students' Union.

[6] **From Bylaw 2200 Section 32:**

32. Campaign Materials

(1) All campaign materials shall be approved in form, content, and cost by the C.R.O. before they may be used in campaign activities.

(2) Candidates and side wishing to have campaign materials approved shall

provide the C.R.O. with2200 (12)

a. a written estimate of the cost of the proposed campaign material, including the source of that cost; and

b. the complete contents of the proposed campaign material, including text, images and layout.

(3) The C.R.O. shall provide in confidence a written approval or refusal of campaign materials within eight (8) working hours of receiving a request as set out in Section 32 (2).

[7] **From Bylaw 2200 Section 45:**

45. Fair Market Value

(1) Where a product or service has been provided to a candidate or side for no consideration or for consideration that is less than the official list price of the service provider, that candidate or side shall be considered to have incurred a campaign expense at the fair market value of that product or service, as determined by the C.R.O.

DECISION:

The panel was unanimous in their decision.

[8] The Panel finds that Mr. Lau violated Bylaw 2200 section 45 subsection 1, by failing to provide fair market value for a service unintentionally used as a campaign resource.

[9] The Panel finds that although Mr. Lau never intended to his scooter as a campaign tool beyond its use for personal mobility, his volunteers did and one of the pictures posted on social media unfairly provided an advantage to his campaign. This act clearly connected the scooter with Mr. Lau's campaign beyond its approved role as Mr. Lau's personal mobility device, and hence constitutes a form of solicitation of campaign support.

[10] Mr. Lau admitted the mistake and the picture was from Facebook once he became aware of the transgression. Though the violation was done by one of his volunteers, Mr. Lau recognizes his responsibility for Third Party Activities as outlined in Bylaw 2200 section 27 subsection 1.

[11] Since Mr. Lau took steps to halt unauthorized activity by the third party, he will not be subject to punitive fines but will be subject to counterbalancing fines (Bylaw 2200 section 27 subsection 2). In light of the fact that Mr. Lau has been paying $10/day for the use of the scooter for personal mobility, this Panel hereby fines him $10/day for each of the five days the picture in contention was online, totaling $50.

[12] This Panel is unable to assess a fine for instances where other volunteers may have been riding on his scooter as these may have occurred on the same days as the aforementioned fine.

The following is the opinion of the Associate Chief Tribune Hackett:

[13] I concur with the decision of the other Tribunes. I would like to add that although I agree that campaign material may be attached to the scooter as an extension of candidate Lau's person, the scooter should only be used for the purposes of his personal mobility while campaign material is affixed to it. Another individual may ride the scooter, however if the scooter is not to be a campaign material, there should be no association with this activity and candidate Lau's campaign.

DIE Board Ruling 2013-6

Hearing Details:

Style of Cause: Woods v CRO

Hearing Date: March 4th, 2014

Hearing Number: Ruling # 06 2013/14

DIE Board Panel Members: Sean Wallace, Chief Tribune

Ryan Berget, Tribune

Nakul Bhatia, Tribune

Issues:

[1] Did the CRO err in not issuing a penalty to Candidate Lau in CRO Ruling #10 regarding the "Use of posters during the Lister Forum in Lister Hall"?

[2] If so, what is the appropriate remedy?

Relevant Legislation:

[3] From Bylaw 2200

> ***18. Myer Horowitz Forum***
>
> *(2) The C.R.O. shall chair the Myer Horowitz Forum and shall enforce the following rules;*
>
> *…*
>
> *d. no campaign materials shall be distributed during the Myer Horowitz Forum in the room in which the Myer Horowitz Forum is held.*

31. Restrictions on Campaign Activities

(1) No candidate or side shall, without the permission of the C.R.O. engage in any campaign activity

…

d.in any residence;

[4] From CRO Ruling #9

During the pre-campaign period, William Lau obtained permission from the CRO to use a mobility device during the campaign period because of a broken ankle. ***Candidate Lau was also given permission to affix campaign material to this mobility device for the purposes of campaigning for the position of President during the campaign period****. This material is considered to be similar to candidates dressing in costume, or wearing poster-boards as part of their campaign activities.*

[5] From CRO Ruling #10

Bylaw 2200.31(1.d) does prohibit campaign activity in the residences on campus. However, if this bylaw were to apply to all areas in Lister Hall during the campaign period, the Forum itself could not take place, since the hour of speeches by candidates are intended to convince members of the audience to make voting decisions during the upcoming elections. ***Since the Lister Forum is a campaign event, it would not be reasonable to permit some campaign activities such as speeches, and prevent other activities such as carrying posters.***

Decision:

The Panel was unanimous in their decision

[6] All parties agreed that Candidate Lau was observed entering the Lister Cafeteria, where the Lister Hall forum was being held with campaign materials affixed to his mobility device.

[7] The Panel finds that Bylaw 2200(18)(2)(d) is not applicable in this instance. This subsection refers only to the Myer Horowitz forum.

[8] The Panel finds that the term "residence" includes Lister Hall cafeteria.

[9] The CRO found that "[s]ince the Lister Forum is a campaign event, it would not be reasonable to permit some campaign activities such as speeches, and prevent other activities such as carrying posters." The Panel does not agree with this interpretation. While speeches are a necessary part of campaign forums, it would not have been unreasonable for Candidate Lau to remove his poster or cover it up while at the residence.

[10] Therefore, the Panel finds that Candidate Lau did unfairly engage in campaign activity in a residence. The CRO erred in his interpretation of Bylaw 2200(31).

[11] However, the Panel does not find Candidate Lau in contravention of Bylaw 2200(31). The explicit wording of the Bylaw states that "[n]o candidate or side shall, **without the permission of the C.R.O.** engage in any campaign activity… in any residence."

[12] CRO Ruling #9 clearly states that Candidate Lau obtained permission from the CRO to affix campaign material to his motorized scooter. The CRO was also present at the Lister Hall

forum, and did not object to the campaign material at that time.

[13] Although Candidate Lau did unfairly engage in campaign activity in a residence, he did so with the permission of the CRO. Therefore, the Panel agrees that Candidate Lau is able to rely on the CRO, and on that basis no penalty can be assessed.

DIE BOARD RULING 2013-07

HEARING DETAILS:

Style of Cause:	Hanwell vs CRO
Hearing Date:	March 6th, 2014
Hearing Number:	Ruling #07 2013/2014
DIE Board Panel Members:	Cian Hackett, Associate Chief Tribune, Chair
	Nicholas Trofimuk, Tribune
	Taylor Wong, Tribune
Appearing for the Applicant:	Dylan Hanwell, applicant and candidate for VP External
	Kelsey Mills, witness
	Erin Borden, witness
	Dawson Zeng, witness
Appearing for the Respondent:	Navneet Khinda, respondent and candidate for VP External
	Avril Fisher, witness
	Sangram Hansra, witness
	Dongwoo Kim, witness
Intervener(s):	None

BACKGROUND:

Mr. Dylan Hanwell, candidate in the race for Students' Union VP Academic, submitted an appeal of CRO Ruling 14. In Ruling 14, the CRO ruled that the actions in question did not reach the standard of maliciousness or substantial prejudice against Mr. Hanwell's campaign required for disqualification under Bylaw 2200 section 49 subsection 1b.

Hanwell's complaint was against Ms. Navneet Khinda's campaign. Hanwell alleged the activities of Mr. Dongwoo Kim, a volunteer for Khinda's campaign, fit the criteria of Bylaw 2200 section 49 subsection 1b. Hanwell believed these activities were malicious, attacking Hanwell's work ethic, character, and professionalism as well as Zeng's ethnicity and country of origin.

Hanwell cited several pieces of evidence for consideration:

1. An exchange between Kim and Mr. Dawson Zeng, a volunteer for Hanwell's campaign, on Facebook. Zeng had edited one of his own Facebook post supporting Hanwell, to which Kim replied "is this the Chinese firewall?". The conversation continued in private messages in which both individuals apologized and Kim's comment was removed.
2. Twitter posts by Kim referencing Hanwell's campaign, many of which were deleted after prompting.
    a. During the Myer Horowitz Forum, the following tweets were made while Hanwell was speaking:
        i. "@dylanhanwell emphasizes his 'hard work' but he has yet to show anything for it #uasuvote"
        ii. "@dylanhanwell saying other candidates didn't work hard? #uasuvote"
        iii. "@dylanhanwell 2-page platforms doesn't count as hard work to me #uasuvote"
    b. "Shortness ≠ 'conciseness' or 'clarify'; it's more so a reflection of unprofessionalism and condescension votenavneet.com/2014/03/su-ele…#uasuvote"
    c. "Fun fact #2, just because it's short, it doesn't mean that it's concise. Let us not confuse conciseness with laziness #uasuvote"
    d. "Fun fact: putting together a bunch of clichés doesn't count as a "policy brief" #uasuvote #ualberta #pols101"

Khinda argued that this was not malicious, that this was an election and this was fair and appropriate to criticize an individual. She argued there is a very high standard to prove an activity malicious and that these activities were not malicious. Khinda stated that she had always intended to run a clean campaign that she was sorry that any activity had hurt Hanwell. She stated that all candidates should be able to handle this level of criticism and critique during a campaign.

Zeng, when questioned, stated he did not accept Kim's apology for the Facebook comments.

Kim has 816 followers on Twitter. "Tym", a Twitter user asserted as a volunteer for Khinda's campaign, retweeted tweets (c) and (d) above, with a reach of 291 followers.

Hanwell asked for disqualification of Khinda, or as an alternate remedy should the panel decide the activity did reach a sufficient standard, for a fine against Khinda's campaign of $0.10 per person that the messages reached. Hanwell stated he believed the panel should decide either that all the comments were malicious, that at least one of the comments were malicious, and that the behaviour in general was malicious behaviour.

Khinda's side also challenged the DIE Board's jurisdiction to rule on the interaction between Zeng and Kim, as an issue between two individuals rather than campaigns or candidates.

ISSUES:

[1] Should the CRO's decision in Ruling #14 be upheld?

RELEVANT BYLAWS:

[2] **From Bylaw 2200 Section 49:**

(1) A candidate shall be disqualified where he/she/it is guilty of a contravention that

a. cannot be counter-balanced by a lesser penalty;

b. is malicious or substantially prejudicial to another candidate or slate; or

c. involves tampering with ballots, voting procedures, or counting procedures.

[3] **From Bylaw 2200 Section 48:**

(1) Where a candidate, side manager or volunteer has contravened a bylaw, rule, or regulation, regardless of the cause or the intent of the parties involved, and that contravention has provided an unfair advantage to a candidate, the C.R.O. shall assign a penalty that

a. fully counter-balances any advantage gained; and

b. where the contravention was intentional, penalizes the candidate or campaign manager who was or whose volunteer was guilty of the contravention.

DECISION:

The following is the decision of Tribune Nicholas Trofimuk:

[4] The applicant contended that the respondent violated section 49 of Bylaw 2200. The applicant submitted that a penalty should be imposed under sections 48 and 49. This panel finds that both of these sections describe penalties that can be imposed for contraventions of the rules. They are not rules that can be contravened in and of themselves. The applicant did not provide evidence of any independent rule that was contravened. Therefore there is nothing for section 49 to apply to. As there was no breach of any Bylaw, it is not necessary to address any of the other issues that the parties raised. This panel upholds the CRO's decision in Ruling #14 that there was no contravention. Therefore no penalty can be imposed.

The following is the decision of Associate Chief Tribune Hackett:

I concur.

The following is the decision of Tribune Wong:

I concur.

DIE BOARD RULING 2013-08

HEARING DETAILS:

Style of Cause:	Lau vs CRO
Hearing Date:	March 12th, 2014
Hearing Number:	Ruling #08 2013/2014
DIE Board Panel Members:	Cian Hackett, Associate Chief Tribune, Chair
	Harvir Mann, Associate Chief Tribune
	Nicholas Trofimuk, Tribune
Appearing for the Applicant:	William Lau, applicant and candidate for President
	Qingyan (Rissa) Cao, witness
	Siyang Chen, witness
	Linh Lu, witness
	Sangram Hansra, witness
Appearing for the Respondent:	None

Note: One response was received. The respondent requested to remain anonymous and did not attend the hearing. The written response was read during the hearing and can be found in Appendix 1.

Intervener(s):	None

BACKGROUND:

Mr. William Lau, candidate in the race for Students' Union President, submitted an appeal of CRO Ruling 16. In Ruling 16, the CRO levied a counter-balancing fine on Lau's campaign of $403.70. Lau had previously reported $346.62 in campaign expenses. With the additional fine, Lau exceeded the budget limit by $200.32 and was disqualified according to Bylaw 2200 Section 42.

The activities in question can be found in the CRO's Ruling 16. Two posts were made on February 27, one at 4:51 pm and one at 11:35 pm by the Chinese Students and Scholars' Association (CSSA) on its Renren page. The first post was of two images used by Lau's campaign, images which were obtained

from the Lau Facebook campaign page by Mr. Chen who made the posts. The second post was translated from Chinese as follows by Ms. Cao during the hearing:

> He is the one who is leading the international student tuition fee and participates in our national gala playing a song on the erhu. He is 'you are the one' [a reference to a role Lau played at a past CSSA event]. He is William Lau. This year he will run for President of the SU again. For more information, see his campaign FB homepage http://rrurl.cn/5jdJmD [a link to Lau's Facebook campaign page]. This year voting will be on March 5 and 6. I hope everyone will participate in the voting, make your serious decision before you vote.

Lau stated that the complaint was submitted an hour before the polls closed, about 6:00 pm on March 6. This timing was confirmed by the CRO. Lau submitted that because the activities in question took place on February 27, there was a violation of Bylaw 2200, Section 47.

Secondly, Lau argued that Bylaw 2200, Section 30 implies that endorsements are an exception to campaign activity, and that the activities in question were at most an endorsement and should not be considered third party campaign activities under Bylaw 2200, Section 27.

Lastly, Lau argued that he had been cautious to avoid contraventions of bylaw and regulations throughout the campaign. At roughly 1:30 pm on March 6 Lau received communication that there were concerns about an email sent by a student group. Mr. Hansra testified that as a candidate in the race for Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative, Hansra received some text messages about an email endorsement that had been sent. Shortly following that, he observed Lau making several phone calls to volunteers, including those within the CSSA. Lau stated the volunteers he called were not aware of the any social media activity or email. The CRO sent an email at 3:06 pm on March 6 to alert candidates that the Chinese Students' Club was encouraging members to vote in support of certain candidates, and that more information was needed before action was taken.

Following this email, Lau contacted the CRO to clarify that the Chinese Students' Club was not the correct organization, but in fact this was the CSSA. Lau at this point was aware of the posts on Renren, having seen them briefly on a friend's computer, and communicated this to the CRO. Lau sought guidance from the CRO to see if distancing might be required from what might be deemed a third party activity under Bylaw 2200 Section 27. Lau was told to wait for further instructions. At this time of the day, Lau became busy with takedown of campaign materials around the university. Lau did not receive further communication from the elections office until Monday night when he received Ruling 16.

Lau argued he did everything he could to be in close communication with the CRO and DRO and listen to instructions. The CRO was unavailable until approximately 6:00 pm on March 6.

Ms. Cao, a Vice President of the CSSA, stated that Renren is not a private mailing list, it is social media, akin to Facebook for Chinese users. She stated that the status on the public page was not an endorsement of Mr. Lau, but rather a promotion of democracy and an encouragement to viewers to exercise the right to vote. Ms. Cao stated she used the names of candidates who had attended CSSA events in the past to promote the elections.

Mr. Chen, Vice President Marketing for the CSSA stated that Renren was a public social media page not an emailing list. Chen made the two posts on February 27. Chen asserted that he wanted to promote the SU elections, not Lau specifically. Chen stated that he was a friend of Lau's and that many members know Lau while they do not know other candidates, and therefore the references to Lau made the reference to elections more recognizable for members. Chen obtained the photograph from Lau's Facebook page and did not ask anyone before posting the photograph. Chen stated no one had told him to make the posts.

The text of the respondent's submission can be found at the end of this document. It was read aloud during the hearing's proceedings.

In his closing, Lau argued there is nothing to define an endorsement in bylaw, nor are there restrictions on a student group's ability to make endorsements. Lau provided evidence of other student groups making posts on social media supporting other candidates. Lau stated that sharing of approved campaign material on social media was difficult for a candidate to control, and that he took reasonable steps to contact the CRO and DRO once he was made aware of the potential issue. Lau argued that the activity in question was not campaigning but rather sharing of a campaign material.

ISSUES:

[1] Should the CRO's decision in Ruling #16 be upheld?

RELEVANT BYLAWS:

[2] From Bylaw 2200 Section 2:

> p. "campaign activity" shall be any act, planned or organized by or on behalf of any candidate or side that is calculated to convince members to vote in a given way;

[3] From Bylaw 2200 Section 27:

> (1) A candidate or side in a Students' Union election may distance themselves from a third party in the event the third party effectively conducts campaign activities under the following conditions:
>
> a. the candidate or side must demonstrate to the C.R.O. that the third party acted without consent of the candidate or side; and
>
> b. the candidate or side must demonstrate to the C.R.O. that steps have been taken to distance themselves from the third party and to attempt to halt unauthorized campaign activity by that third party.
>
> (2) Should a candidate or side demonstrate the conditions specified under Section 27(1) to the C.R.O.'s satisfaction, the candidate or side would not be subject to punitive fines as a result of the third party's actions, but could still be subject to counterbalancing fines.

[4] From Bylaw 2200 Section 28:

No individual candidate or side shall make use of any resource that is not

a. available to all candidates and sides;
b. general volunteer labour or expertise; or
c. accounted for as part of that candidate's or side's campaign expenses

[5] From Bylaw 2200 Section 30:

(1) Any member with the exception of the C.R.O, the D.R.O.s, and incumbent members of the Executive Committee who are not also candidates shall be free to endorse any candidate.
(2) Any member with the exception of the C.R.O, the D.R.O.s, candidates, and incumbent members of the Executive Committee shall be free to act as a volunteer for any candidate.
(3) Notwithstanding Section 30(1), regulations regarding the endorsement of candidates by Students' Union employees not referenced in Section 30(1) shall be subject to the Students' Union operating policy.
(4) Notwithstanding Section 30(2), regulations regarding the capacity of Students' Union employees not referenced in Section 30(2) to act as a volunteer shall be subject to the Students' Union operating policy.
(5) Incumbent members of the Executive Committee and the incumbent Board of Governors Representative are allowed to endorse sides in a Students' Union election.

[6] From Bylaw 2200 Section 35:

The C.R.O. shall be kept privy to elections-related social media and public internet ventures undertaken by candidates, and reserves the right to penalize candidates for any violation of this bylaw or related regulations

[7] From Bylaw 2200 Section 47:

(2) Where a complaint is received within twelve (12) working hours of the alleged contravention, and where the original complaint form is provided to the C.R.O., the C.R.O. shall rule on that complaint.

[8] From Bylaw 2200 Section 47:

(4) Where a complaint is received and is found to be complete as set out in Section 47(1), the C.R.O. shall rule on the complaint within twelve (12) working hours of receiving the complaint.

[9] From Bylaw 2200 Section 49:

(5) The C.R.O. shall be empowered to investigate and rule upon every contravention of this bylaw or any other bylaw, rule, or regulation related to the election, plebiscite or referenda.

DECISION:

The following is the unanimous decision of the panel:

Issue 1: Binding Nature of Precedent

[10] Though DIE Board panels may find it useful to read past decisions of the CRO and of DIE Board panels, the DIE Board is not bound by any precedent actions or rulings.

Issue 2: Alleged Contraventions

[11] The alleged contraventions occurred on February 27 at 4:51 pm and 11:35 pm. Other posts were made by the CSSA on its Renren page referencing Mr. Lau after voting had concluded, and therefore were not deemed to be material to this hearing.

Issue 3: Bylaw 2200, Section 47 subsection 2

[12] Under Bylaw 2200, section 47 subsection 2, where a complaint is received within 12 working hours of the alleged contravention, the CRO shall rule on that complaint. Although over 12 working hours had elapsed from the time of the contravention to the time of the complaint, there are no regulations in Students' Union Bylaw that refer to complaints after these 12 hours have elapsed. Where bylaw is silent, the CRO is empowered to make decisions relating to elections as manifested in the CRO through Bylaw 2200 section 49 subsection 5.

Issue 4: Bylaw 2200, Section 47 subsection 4

[13] The CRO did not rule on the complaint within 12 working hours as directed by Bylaw 2200, section 47 subsection 4. However, again bylaw is silent with respect to direction should Bylaw 2200 section 47 subsection 4 be violated, and again, the panel rules that a decision may be made by the CRO to rule on complaints after these 12 working hours have elapsed. As with any other CRO ruling, the ruling may be appealed to the DIE Board. If the CRO does not issue a ruling within 12 working hours of receiving the complaint and should 12 working hours elapse without a ruling, a complainant may submit an application for a DIE Board hearing under Bylaw 1500, section 3 subsection (a) to challenge the contravention of Bylaw 2200, section 47 subsection 4.

Issue 5: Bylaw 2200, Section 50(3)

[14] The respondent contended that this appeal should not be taking place, as section 50(3) of Bylaw 2200 states that:

> All appeals of the CRO's rulings, with the exception of those arising out of voting and Election results, shall be heard and ruled upon by the DIE Board prior to the commencement of voting.

[15] The current Student's Union bylaw available on the organization's website does not contain this provision. This appears to be a provision from a previous version of the bylaw. The DIE Board only uses current Student's Union bylaws. Therefore this argument of the respondent has no merit.

Issue 6: Bylaw 2200, Section 28

[16] The respondent contended that the candidate violated section 28, which states:

> No individual candidate or side shall make use of any resource that is not
>
> a. Available to all candidates and sides;
> b. General volunteer labour or expertise; or
> c. Accounted for as part of that candidate's or side's campaign expenses.

[17] In this case the appellant was not aware of the actions of the CSSA. Upon finding out that there were posts related to him on Renren, the appellant immediately contacted the CRO for advice on how to proceed.

[18] This panel finds that the appellant did not "make use" of this resource. The endorsements made by the CSSA were made without the consent or knowledge of the appellant. The CSSA made use of Renren, a media platform that for all intents and purposes is available only to the Chinese community. The candidate was not involved. Therefore this panel finds that there was no violation of section 28.

Issue 7: Bylaw 2200, Section 27

[19] The respondent contended that the appellant violated section 27, which states:

> A candidate or side in a Student's Union election may distance themselves from a third party in the event that the third party effectively conducts campaign activities under [certain] conditions.

[20] Bylaw 2200, Section 2(p) states:

> "campaign activity" shall be any act, planned or organized by or on behalf of any candidate or side that is calculated to convince members to vote in a given way.

[21] This panel finds that the actions of the CSSA were not planned or organized by the appellant as the appellant's campaign had no knowledge of their actions. At issue is whether the CSSA acted on behalf of the appellant. The CSSA posted the appellant's name, and shared photos from the appellant's Facebook page without his consent or knowledge. The CSSA witnesses contended that this was not an endorsement of the appellant, but was merely an attempt to convince their fellow students to vote for any candidate.

[22] The posts specifically referenced the appellant and did not reference his competition. Only photos of the appellant were posted. Therefore this panel finds that this was an endorsement of the appellant, even if this was not the intention of the CSSA.

[23] The appellant's campaign did not direct the actions of the CSSA or have any knowledge of them. The CSSA was not connected to the appellant's campaign in any significant way. This panel finds that there must be a significant pre-existing campaign related connection between the candidate or campaign and the CSSA in order to find that the CSSA acted on behalf of the candidate. In this case, the panel acknowledges that there was a personal association between the appellant and the CSSA due to past participation at events, existing friendships and campaign volunteers who are CSSA members. However, there was no significant pre-existing communication or association connecting the appellant's campaign and the actions of the CSSA. Therefore this panel finds that the CSSA was not acting on behalf of the candidate. Furthermore, this panel accepts the submissions of the CSSA that the posts were not "calculated" to convince members to vote in a given way, even if they may have had that effect.

[24] The actions of the CSSA do not constitute "campaign activity". Section 27 which deals with third parties who conduct campaign activity, is not applicable. Therefore this panel finds no breach of Section 27.

Issue 8: Bylaw 2200, Section 30

[25] Bylaw 2200, section 30 subsection 1 states that any member, excluding the CRO, DRO and incumbent Executive Committee members, is free to endorse any candidate. Member is defined by Bylaw 2200 as "anyone who is an undergraduate student currently enrolled in at least one course for credit at the University of Alberta." Since the bylaw is silent with regard to organizations, the respondent cannot claim that organizations are prohibited from endorsing candidates. Therefore, the CSSA's endorsement of Mr. Lau is not prohibited by bylaw.

Issue 9: Section 3.17 of the March 2014 General Election of the Executive Committee and the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative Nomination Package

[26] The panel agrees with the appellant's assertion that section 3.17 of the nomination package does not apply as the activities were not emails.

Issue 10: Section 3.18 of the March 2014 General Election of the Executive Committee and the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative Nomination Package

[27] Section 3.18 of the Nomination Package states:

> Facebook, Twitter, etc. may only be used for campaign purposes within the campaign period. Like physical materials, campaign materials used on Facebook, etc. must be approved by the CRO before being made public.

[28] Section 2(s) of bylaw 2200 states:

> “campaign materials” shall be any physical or electronic media produced or distributed as part of campaign activities.

For the reasons discussed above, this panel finds that the actions of the CSSA were not part of campaign activities. Therefore the posts cannot be considered “campaign materials” and as such, section 3.18 does not apply.

Issue 11: Bylaw 2200, Section 35

[29] Bylaw 2200 section 35 refers to social media and public internet ventures “undertaken by candidates.” Though Renren is reasonably defined as a social media interface, section 35 does not apply to this hearing as the activities in question were not undertaken by the appellant, but instead occurred without his knowledge.

Issue 12: Contraventions and Penalties

[30] This panel finds that the appellant’s campaign did not contravene any Students’ Union bylaw nor elections regulations as defined in the nomination package. Therefore, this panel overturns the CRO’s Ruling 16. No fines shall be levied on the appellant’s campaign. Since the appellant’s campaign expenses did not exceed the allowed budget, he shall not be disqualified.

Appendix 1

Response to 2013-08 Lau v. C.R.O.

March 12, 2014

Under Section 50 (3) of Bylaw 2200, this appeal should not even be taking place, as Section 50(3) states that:

> All appeals of the C.R.O.'s rulings, with the exception of those arising out of voting and Election results, shall be heard and ruled upon by the D.I.E. Board prior to the commencement of voting.

As this ruling does not deal with voting or election results, the D.I.E. Board should not be convening to discuss it, as voting has already commenced. The illegality of the application notwithstanding, regarding Mr. Lau's first point, in which Mr. Lau claims that

> The evidence provided does not indicate a mass emailing, but rather a social media post, like any other (see attachments 1, 2 and 3).

Under Section 30(1) of Bylaw 2200, bylaw states that

> Any member with the exception of the C.R.O, the D.R.O.s, and incumbent members of the Executive Committee who are not also candidates shall be free to endorse any candidate.

In part 2 of the preamble to Bylaw 2200, "Definitions," a "member" is defined as "anyone who is an undergraduate student currently enrolled in at least one course for credit at the University of Alberta." Mr. Bill Pickering and Ms. Katherine Melnyk (the people who are making endorsements in attachments 1, 2, and 3 of Mr. Lau's application) are both undergraduate students taking at least one course for credit; consequently, their endorsements are protected under the bylaws of the Students Union. In comparison, the CSSA is not an undergraduate student, nor is it currently enrolled in any courses for credit. Consequently, the CSSA's activities are not protected by bylaw.

Moreover, although the CSSA's activities could be (wrongly) construed as social media, under bylaw, Section 3.18 of the executive nomination package must still be followed for the activities to be legal. Both aspects of Section 3.18 were violated; the CRO was not made aware of the activity nor appointed an administrator on the Renren page. Ultimately it was impossible for the C.R.O. to monitor the page. We can see under Section 3.17 of the executive nomination package that

> The use of forums, webboards, or any other similar Internet-based mediums for the purposes of campaigning are prohibited without the express permission of the CRO. Requests will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

As Renren was not expressly permitted by the CRO, its use is prohibited. A proper treatment of the Renren page falls under Section 28 a. and b. of Bylaw 2200, as Renren was not (effectively) available to all candidates and sides due to an early decision by the CSSA to restrict their support to Mr. Lau.

Furthermore, Mr Lau did not demonstrate Section 27(1) of Bylaw 2200 to the C.R.O.'s satisfaction; as Section 27(1) specifically establishes that it is up to the C.R.O.'s satisfaction to determine whether or not a third party has "acted without consent of the candidate," and Mr. DeFehr has ruled that Mr. Lau has

not established that fact to his satisfaction, the D.I.E. Board must uphold the C.R.O.'s decision and reject the appeal. Precedent was set in the D.I.E. Board's ruling in 2013-6, Woods v. CRO, which held that even though the D.I.E. Board disagreed with the C.R.O.'s decision, the board was forced to uphold the ruling as the bylaw left the decision as to which campaign material was to be permitted up to the discretion of the C.R.O.

Another relevant area of Bylaw 2200 is part (2) of Section 27, which states that:

> Should a candidate or side demonstrate the conditions specified under Section 27(1) to the C.R.O.'s satisfaction, the candidate or side would not be subject to punitive fines as a result of the third party's actions, but could still be subject to counterbalancing fines.

Even if Mr. Lau was not aware of the third party campaigning and took no part in it, he can still be made subject to counterbalancing fines at the C.R.O.'s discretion, making the C.R.O.'s ruling legally defensible. A precedent for the C.R.O.'s ruling in the current case can be seen in Ruling 12 of the C.R.O. in 2013, where an email was sent out endorsing Mr. Petros Kusmu that Mr. Kusmu was not aware of. The then C.R.O. imposed counterbalancing fines equal to $10 plus $0.10 per person reached by the email, as was done by the current C.R.O.in the current case.

Scholarships & Bursaries
First Reading Principles:

The Students' Union will advocate on the following principles:

The University of Alberta should increase the number and value of awards to undergraduates in order to be consistent with the number and value of entrance awards.

The University of Alberta should increase the relative and absolute amounts of scholarships and bursaries based on students' financial need and involvement on campus.

The University of Alberta should disclose annually the ratio of need to merit based aid, and distribution of awards between years of study.

That donors support students from diverse backgrounds and with diverse skills via scholarship and bursary funding.

That the University of Alberta centralizes information and applications relevant to scholarships and bursaries.

That the Government of Alberta recognizes the importance of non repayable student aid compared to scholarships

That the Government of Alberta fund bursaries at an equal or higher level than merit based scholarships.

Below is the original Scholarships and Bursaries Policy. Policy Committee feels the need to separate this policy into two: Merit Based Awards and Need Based Awards. For each policy, track changes have been shown on the original policy ash shown below:

SCHOLARSIPS AND BURSAIRES ➔ Merit Based Awards
WHEREAS the cost of a university education has increased;

WHEREAS this cost increase poses a great disincentive to accessing a university education, as well as a considerable barrier to finishing a degree;

WHEREAS ~~scholarships and bursaries are~~ merit based aid is an integral part of the student finance system, without which motivated and outstanding individuals could not afford a university education;

WHEREAS the University of Alberta should not only aim to attract talented students, but demonstrate a commitment to realizing the full potential of current undergraduate students;

~~WHEREAS financial need can be detrimental to academic and extracurricular student achievement by diverting student focus and effort to employment;~~

WHEREAS the current scholarship and bursaries applications process is inefficient and time consuming;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall lobby the University of Alberta and the Government of Alberta to increase the number and value of merit based awards granted to continuing undergraduate students in order to be consistent with the number and value of entrance awards;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall lobby the University of Alberta and the Government of Alberta to increase the relative and absolute amounts of ~~scholarships and bursaries~~ merit based aid awards that are awarded based on the students' financial need and/or involvement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union pursue a single point of entry to the scholarship and bursaries application process.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall advocate that the University of Alberta disclose annually the ratio of need to merit based aid, and the distribution of awards between years of study.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall advocate that donors support students from diverse backgrounds and with diverse skills via scholarships and bursaries.

SCHOLARSIPS AND BURSAIRES ➔ Need-Based Awards

WHEREAS the cost of a university education has increased;

WHEREAS this cost increase poses a great disincentive to accessing a university education, as well as a considerable barrier to finishing a degree;

WHEREAS financial need can be detrimental to academic and extracurricular student achievement by diverting student focus and effort to employment

WHEREAS the current need-based aid awards application process is inefficient and time consuming

WHEREAS ~~scholarships and bursaries~~ need-based aid awards are an integral part of the student finance system, without which ~~motivated and outstanding individuals~~ students in financial need could not afford a university education;

WHEREAS the Government of Alberta has provided more funding for merit-based awards than need-based aid in recent budgets;

WHEREAS the University of Alberta should not only aim to attract talented students, but demonstrate a commitment to ~~realizing the full potential of current undergraduate students;~~ supporting undergraduate students with financial needs and assist them in realizing their full potential

WHEREAS merit based aid awards target students who are less likely to have dire need of financial aid;

WHEREAS financial need can be detrimental to academic and extracurricular student achievement by diverting student focus and effort to employment;

WHEREAS the University of Alberta Students' Union recognizes that some students require part or full time employment in order to finance their education;
WHEREAS students partaking in part or full time employment do not have the same opportunity for academic achievements as those who do not require employment to finance their education costs;

WHEREAS students who do not receive financial assistance for their education may be required to take out large amounts of debt.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall lobby the University of Alberta to increase the number and value of need-based aid awards granted to continuing undergraduate students in order to be consistent with the number and value of entrance awards;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall advocate that the Government of Alberta recognize the importance of need-based student financial aid;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall ~~lobby~~ advocate that the University of Alberta and the Government of Alberta ~~to~~ increase the relative and absolute amounts and number of ~~scholarships and bursaries~~ need –based aid awards that are awarded based on the students' financial need and/or involvement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union pursue a single point of entry to the ~~scholarship and bursaries~~ need-based aid awards application process.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall advocate that the University of Alberta disclose annually the ratio of need to merit based aid, and the distribution of awards between years of study.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Students' Union shall advocate that donors support students from diverse backgrounds and with diverse skills via scholarships and bursaries .

March 14, 2014

To: Students' Council 2013-2014

Re: Report of the Vice President Academic

Hello Council,

My sincerest apologies for missing the last Council meeting – I was enjoying a week off with my family. Below you'll find a summary of my progress over the past month.

I. Executive Elections

Congratulations to all who participated in Executive elections, or who are currently participating in Council elections. It takes courage, stamina, and intelligence to put yourself and your ideas in front of your peers for scrutiny. To those who were unsuccessful, I hope you remain motivated and engaged with student governance. Losing my first Students' Council election was the best motivation for me to beat my competition in an SU Executive election. Transition with the VPA-elect, Kathryn Orydzuk, is well under way.

II. SU Discussion Paper on GFC

After substantial concerns from undergraduate students have been raised over the past two years regarding the exclusivity and bureaucracy of GFC, the SU submitted a paper on GFC reform for discussion by GFC. The paper was based on feedback from undergraduate students who have served on GFC since 2009, and included perspectives from grad students, faculty, staff, and administrators. Unfortunately, the agenda-setting committee for GFC declined to put the report on the GFC agenda, citing concerns that it might conflict with an upcoming President's report on GFC and that the paper didn't appear to comprehensively or concisely summarize concerns with GFC. I am hopeful that other members of the academy will continue to call for reform of GFC, the highest academic governing body of the University.

III. Miscellaneous

I attended meetings of the CSL Advisory Committee, the Leadership Academic Coordinating Committee, GFC Executive Committee, Council of the Association of Academic Staff University of Alberta, the Academic Planning Committee, and the University Research and Policy Committee. I met with the Provost and Vice President Academic, the Student Group Risk Management Coordinator, the GSA Board, the Coalition of Constituency Associations, the President's GFC Audit Task Force, the Deputy Provost, the Vice Provost and University Registrar, the Vice Provost Academic Programs and Instruction, the Vice Provost and Dean of Students, the GSA VP Academic, the Director of the Student OmbudService, the Director of the

Office of Safe Disclosure and Human Rights, the Chair of the AASUA Teachning and Learning Committee, the Director of the Bridging Program, the Centre for Teaching and Learning Interim Director and the Provost's Advisor on Aboriginal Issues. Internally I participated in a review of SU departmental operating plans, attended a CSD visioning meeting on behalf of the VPSL, and chaired a meeting of the COFA Finance and Administration Working Group.

If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to call me at 780-492-4236, or email me at vp.academic@su.ualberta.ca.

Sincerely,

Dustin Chelen

University of Alberta Students' Union

STUDENTS' COUNCIL VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday March 4th, 2014
TELUS 134

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS (SC 2013-22)

2013-22/1 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

Meeting called to order at 6:08

2013-22/1a Announcements – The next meeting of Students' Council will take place on Tuesday, March 18th, 2014

2013-22/2 PRESENTATIONS

2013-22/2a Presentation to Students' Council from the Canadian Alliance of Students' Association (CASA) Executive Director (ED), Jon Champagne. Sponsored by President Petros Kusmu.

CASA's ED will be presenting to Students' Council an overview of CASA's work. This will be the CASA ED's first time visiting the University of Alberta since he was hired nearly a year ago.

KUSMU/CHAMPAGNE MOVED TO increase the presentation time by 15 minutes

Motion: CARRIED

2013-22/2b SUB Renovation Budget Update by Marc Dumouchel, sponsored by Petros Kusmu

An update on the budget for the SUB Renovation will be presented.

LE/KUSMU MOVED TO Suspend the relevant standing orders to allow for item 2013-22/2b and 2013-22/7a to be dealt with in the same meeting

Motion: CARRIED

LE/KUSMU MOVED TO increase the presentation time by 15 minutes

Motion: CARRIED

Automatic recess at 7:41pm

Meeting called back to order at7:55pm

2013-22/3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Petros Kusmu, President- Report

Josh Le, VP Operations and Finance- Report

2013-22/4 BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chloe Speakman, ERC Chair- Report

Abdullah Hamid, Nomination Committee Chair- Report

Josh Le, BFC Chair- Report

2013-22/6 BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2013-22/6a LE/ZENG MOVES THAT upon the recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee that Students' Council approve the 2014/2015 Budget Principles.

Speakers List: Le, Hamid, Kusmu

Motion: CARRIED

2013-22/6b HAMID/DOUGLAS MOVE THAT, upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council nominate Dylan Hanwell, Samer Sleiman, Helen Cashman and Cole Goshulak to sit on the General Faculties Council.

Motion: CARRIED
Schiavone Abstain

2013-22/6d HAMID/DOUGLAS MOVE THAT, upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council nominate the next years President and Vice President(Academic) to sit the Presidents Selection Committee for the term 2014-2015

LE MOVED TO amend the motion to read:
HAMID/DOUGLAS MOVE THAT, upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council nominate the next years' President and Vice President(Academic) to sit the Presidents' Selection Committee for the term 2014-2015

Motion(Friendly): CARRIED

Main Motion: CARRIED

2013-22/6d HAMID/DOUGLAS MOVE THAT, upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council nominate the next years President and Vice President(Academic) to sit the Presidents Selection Committee for the term 2014-2015

Motion: CARRIED

2013-22/6e HAMID/DOUGLAS MOVE THAT, upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council nominate Ruojin Bu and Rebekah

Adams to sit on the GFC standing committees

MILLS/LE MOVED TO amend the motion to read:
HAMID/DOUGLAS MOVE THAT, upon the recommendation of the nominating committee, Students' Council nominate Ruojin Bu and Rebekah Adams to sit on the GFC standing committees for the 2014/2015 year.

Motion: CARRIED

Main Motion: CARRIED

2013-22/7 GENERAL ORDERS

2013-22/7a LE/KUSMU MOVE TO authorize an additional allocation of up to $400,000 from Unrestricted Reserves to be applied to the SUB Expansion and Renovation Project.

Speakers List: Le

Motion: CARRIED

CHAMPAGNE/MILLS MOVED to adjourn

Motion: CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 9:08pm

Councillor Attendance Records

2013-2014

Council Seats (40 total)	Name	Attendance							
		1/7/2014 SC 12-17	1/21/2014 SC 12-18	2/3/2014 SC 12-19	2/4/2014 SC 12-20	2/11/2014 SC 12-21	3/4/2014 SC 12-22		
Ex-officio Members (6 voting seats)									
Ex-officio Members (6 voting seats)									
President	Petros Kusmu	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
VP Academic	Dustin Chelen	Y	Y	N	0.5	Y	N		
VP External	Adam Woods	Y	Y	0.5	Y	Y	N		
VP Operations & Finance	Josh Le	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
VP Student Life	William Lau	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
Undergraduate Board of Governors Rep	Brent Kelly	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Faculty Representation (32 voting seats)									
ALES	Kareema Batal	Y	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	N		
Arts	Erin Borden	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
Arts	Kelsey Mills	Y	Y	Y	0.5	N	Y		
Arts	Dylan Hanwell	Y	Y	Y	Y	0.5	N		
Arts	Marina Banister	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Arts	Stephen Schiavone	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Arts	Bashir Mohamed	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
Augustana (Faculty)	Stephanie Gruhlke	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		
Business	Ralph Mlynarski	Y	Y	N	0.5	0.5	N		
Business	Rafael Valdez	Y	0.5	N	N	N	N		
Education	Stephanie Corbett	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Education	Katie Horvat	0.5	Y(p)	Y	Y	Y	0.5		
Education	Vacant								
Engineering	Braiden Redman	N							
Engineering	Taimur Malik	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	0.5		
Engineering	Abdullah Hamid	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		
Engineering	Vacant								
Law	Sangram Hansra	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		
Medicine & Dentistry	Samantha Lam	Y	0.5	N	Y	N	0.5		
Native Studies	Harley Morris	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Nursing	Dan Sim	N	0.5	N	0.5	N	N		
Open Studies	Vacant								
Pharmacy	Jessica Nguyen	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		
Phys Ed & Rec	Vacant								
Saint-Jean (Faculty)	Vacant								
Science	Colin Champagne	Y	Y	0.5	Y	Y	Y		
Science	Chloe Speakman	0.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Science	Cory Hodgson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		
Science	James Hwang	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Science	Dawson Zeng	N	0.5	Y	Y	Y	0.5		
Science	Eric Grehan	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		
Science	Natalia Binczyk	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y(p)		
Science	Maxwell Douglas	Y	0.5	Y	0.5	0.5	Y		
Ex-Officio Members (2 non-voting seats)									
Speaker	Craig Turner	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
General Manager	Marc Dumouchel	N	N	N	0.5	N	Y		