

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday September 9th, 2014
ETLC E1 008

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 2014-11)

2014-11/1 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

2014-11/1a Announcements – The next meeting of Students' Council will take place on Tuesday, October 21st, 2014

2014-11/2 PRESENTATIONS

2014-11/2a University of Alberta Budget Primer, presented by President Lau, Vice President Khinda and Vice President Orydzuk; sponsored by President Lau

In advance of the presentation by the University of Alberta Provost and Vice President Finance & Administration, the Students' Union executives will present on recent developments in the university's budget plans. This presentation will cover the University's timeline and other important information related to the university's budget situation.

2014-11/3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

2014-11/4 BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

2014-11/5 QUESTION PERIOD

2014-11/6 BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2014-11/6a ZHANG/HODGSON, upon the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, moves to approve bill 5 in first principle:
1) Given that the Social and Environmental Responsibility Committee (SERC) is a sub-committee of the Students' Union Executive Committee, it should not

submit reports to Students' Council.

- 2014-11/6b** **ALLARD/HUDSON**, upon the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, moves to approve bill 6 in first principle:
1) Standing Committees may adopt standing orders that do not conflict with SU legislation
2) Students' Council has authority to determine the membership (voting and non-voting) of its' standing committees
3) Standing Committees do not have the authority to appoint councillors to its own voting membership
4) Standing Committees do not have the authority to remove councillors from its own voting membership
- 2014-11/6c** **KHINDA/GRUHLKE MOVE**, upon the recommendation of policy committee, that the Student Financial Assistance Policy be approved in first reading based on the following principles:
1. Education is a public good;
2. The cost of attaining a post-secondary education includes tuition, fees, the cost of educational materials, and living expenses;
3. The cost of a post-secondary education should be affordable;
4. Attaining a post-secondary education should be accessible;
5. Education is a shared investment between the government and students;
6. Though student debt is sometimes unavoidable, it should not become uncontrollable and unsustainable;
7. Financial assistance should help students get into, and stay in, university;
8. Government money is best spent on targeted, up-front funding for students who need it;
9. Financial assistance includes a combination of scholarships, bursaries, grants, and loans; some of which are based on need where others are based on merit;
10. An easy to understand financial aid system improves the application process and connects more students to funding.
- 2014-11/7** **GENERAL ORDERS**
- 2014-11/8** **INFORMATION ITEMS**
- 2014-11/8a** DFU TF Final Report
Please see document SC 14-11.01
- 2014-11/8b** Wall of Gold operating policy change
Please see document SC 14-11.02
- 2014-11/8c** Audit Committee Summary Report
Please see document SC 14-11.03
- 2014-11/8d** Kathryn Orydzuk, VP Academic- Report
Please see document SC 14-11.04
- 2014-11/8e** Navneet Khinda, VP External- Report
Please see document SC 14-11.05

2014-11/8f

Nicholas Diaz, VP Student Life- Report

Please see document SC 14-11.06

Students' Union Dedicated Fee Unit Review Task Force

September 2014

Students' Union Dedicated Fee Unit Review Task Force

Section A: Introduction and Summary

1. Dedicated Fee Unit Review Task Force
2. Scope of the Task Force
3. Background on DFU Reform
4. DFU Reform: Problems and Solutions

Section B: Creation, Regulation and Oversight of DFUs

1. DFU Creation Concerns
2. Possible Solutions and Regulations
3. DFU Oversight Concerns
4. Possible Solutions and Regulations
5. Potential Drawbacks/Issues Relating to DFU Creation, Regulation and Oversight

Section C: Mandates

1. Concerns
2. Possible Solutions
3. Potential Drawbacks/Issues

Section D: Referendum Cycle/Online Opt-Out

1. Concerns
2. Possible Solutions
3. Potential Drawbacks/Issues

Section E: Recommendations of the Task Force

1. To move all mentions and processes involving DFUs to a newly created 6000 series of bylaws
2. To create two categories of DFUs, Operational and Granting
3. Clarify timelines and responsibilities around DFU referendums
4. DFUs that are opt-out as part of the referendum question should have the process online
5. Move all DFUs onto a 5-year plebiscite cycle
6. To conduct a review of mandates individually with each DFU

Section A: Introduction and Summary

1. Dedicated Fee Unit Review Task Force

For the second year, the University of Alberta Students' Union has struck a task force, under the direction of Students' Council, to examine Dedicated Fee Units or DFUs. As almost two million dollars in dedicated fees are collected from students every year by the Students' Union for the seven existing DFUs, it is imperative that this money is spent both transparently and responsibly. Currently, the structure of dedicated fees within the SU is not well defined and this has led to a number of issues surrounding fee management, collection and disbursement.

The DFU Task Force was given an aggressive mandate, leading to the release of this report with recommendations on DFUs within the UASU. The Task Force was asked to examine other student associations and their protocols regarding DFUs, review categories of SU fees, determine discrepancies, risks, and ambiguities within SU bylaw regarding DFUs, and review and formalize DFU's Audit and Financial Review Standards by August 30, 2014.

The Task Force has aimed to more clearly structure how dedicated fees are managed. To do so, the Task Force separated discussion between the two types of DFUs: granting and operational, and examined how current SU bylaws apply to them.

The first thing the Task Force realized was that the term DFU is never properly defined in bylaw, despite processes surrounding DFUs being referred to in multiple bylaws, including the 2000, 3000 and 6000 series. The DFU creation timeline in the 2000 series is vague and convoluted with unspecific timelines. Bylaw 3000 discusses restrictions and classes of fees that would apply to DFUs, but this is in a separate series than the creation bylaw. Further, bylaw 6000, which discusses audit reporting requirements and oversight of DFUs is the only bylaw that exclusively deals with DFUs. The question of managing operating and granting DFUs separately was also discussed.

DFU mandates were examined by the Task Force, which found that only the four DFUs currently reviewed by the audit committee have mandates. While mandates allow Audit Committee to assess these DFUs, there is currently no formal process to update or change mandates, a key concern in an ever-changing campus environment.

With the rational that students need to have a voice in the fees that they pay, regulations have been put in place by Students' Council to ensure that any current DFU that experiences a fee increase beyond CPI, along with any new DFU, will need to have a successful referendum result every five years along with an online opt-out. While this is a way to ensure that students actually support the fees they are paying, there have been concerns that this process creates risk and uncertainty for existing DFUs, providing them with little time to transition from losing a referendum to dealing with a significant loss of fiscal support. The online opt-out clause also has caused concern among DFUs, particularly among campus media DFUs such as The

Gateway and CJSR radio as the services that both provide would still be accessible to students that opt-out of paying their fee. On the other hand, current opt-out rates for APIRG and the Access Fund suggest low rates of students following through with opt-outs.

The Task Force has attempted to address all of these concerns and propose recommendations on how Students' Council can create a situation that is fairer and more transparent to both fee-paying students and the student-run DFUs those fees support.

The task force developed the following recommendations:

- 1. To move all mentions and processes involving DFUs to a newly created 6000 series of bylaws*
- 2. To create two categories of DFUs, Operational and Granting*
- 3. Clarify timelines and responsibilities around DFU referendums*
- 4. DFUs that are opt-out as part of the referendum question should have the process online*
- 5. Move all DFUs onto a 5-year plebiscite cycle*
- 6. To conduct a review of mandates individually with each DFU*

2. Scope of the Task Force

The Task Force was charged with providing recommendations to Students' Council before August 30th, 2014 with input that would seek to address the following issues:

- Examine other student association fee collecting structures
- Review categories of SU fees
- Determine discrepancies, risks, and ambiguities within SU bylaw regarding DFUs
- Review and formalize Audit/Financial Review Standards

3. Background on DFU Reform

While a DFU Task Force did meet last year, our previous Task Force did not reach a place where they were able to issue recommendations to council in a final report. However, the previous Task Force had four meetings last year and after discussing the nature of DFUs and DFU funding they were largely content with the current process of granting DFUs.

As a follow-up, under the direction of Students' Council and the new Task Force's mandate, the SU's research department looked at other schools to compare processes for DFU equivalents and determined that the UASU actually has more structure than many other student associations in regards to DFUs. This summer, the DFU Task Force was given a much more aggressive mandate. The Task Force was tasked with

coming up with a report with recommendations by the end of summer, and was asked to discuss the reasonableness and appropriateness of the current DFU bylaw.

In the discussions, the Task Force separated the current DFUs into two categories: the granting DFUs and the operational DFUs. The Task Force voiced a need for DFUs and their relationship with SU bylaw to be clarified.

4. DFU Reform: Problems and Solutions

In the Task Force's discussions, the primary concerns and issues discussed clustered around the creation, regulation and oversight of DFUs, DFU mandates, and the current regulations with a 5-year referendum cycle and online opt-outs.

Below, these primary issues are discussed in Section B, C and D, with the concerns noted and possible solutions (and potential drawbacks) explained. These are just the deliberations of the task force. The formal recommendations with explanation by the task force follow in Section E.

Section B: Creation, Regulation and Oversight of DFUs

1. DFU Creation Concerns

The term DFU is used very sparingly in bylaw, and is never properly defined. DFU creation, organization and structure are referred to in multiple bylaws, and obtaining a clear picture of what DFUs are is difficult.

The current DFU process is outlined in Bylaw 2200 Sections 6 and 7. The creation timeline is quite vague and convoluted, and can lead to confusion. With no absolute or suggested dates, it is not clear how early the process must be started in order for a referendum question to successfully make it onto the ballot. Additionally, Bylaw 2200 in point 6.3.c essentially creates the DFU by establishing a committee, but does not outline how that committee works within the potentially already existing organization.

Bylaw 3000 separates DFUs into different classes of fees, and places restrictions on what DFUs can exist. It would clarify the regulations surrounding DFUs to have these requirements alongside the Bylaw that oversees the creation of the DFUs.

Bylaw 6000 outlines reporting requirements to the Audit Committee and the oversight that is required of DFUs. This is the only bylaw that deals exclusively with DFUs and has the only mention of the term DFU.

2. Possible Solutions and Regulations

Creating 6000 series DFU Bylaws would clarify the regulations around DFUs. Students' Council could remove referendums involving non-SU fees from Bylaw 2200, the oversight and regulation of fees from Bylaw 3000 and everything from Bylaw 6000, and create a new 6000 series of Bylaws. Bylaw 6100 would deal with DFU formation, Bylaw 6200 would deal with DFU structure and oversight, and

Bylaw 6300 would contain all the DFU mandates. This would centralize all mentions of DFUs in Bylaw in one place, making it easier to understand and answer potential questions. One important thing to ensure is that the ability to initiate a referendum on an existing DFU is preserved.

3. DFU Oversight Concerns

As there are varying kinds of DFUs (The Gateway being quite different than The GBPLF) should there not be different governance/organizational structures for each? For organizations like The Gateway their DFU acts as an operational grant, while GBPLF is a granting pool multiples parties can apply to for funding.

Another issue that has arisen in the recent years is whether one organization can have more than one DFU. This creates the potential for multiple oversight committees being formed for one organization, and would likely put restrictions on what a DFU acting as an operational grant could be used for.

4. Possible Solutions and Regulations:

Two different kinds of DFUs could be formed depending on the purpose of the DFU. One type would be an operational grant for an already existing organization, and the other would be the use of a DFU for the establishment of a granting pool.

For operational grant DFUs, the stipulation could be added that they must already exist as a student group, registered society or SU service and limit one DFU per organization to ensure that one organization equals one DFU equals one fund. Another stipulation to consider is that an operational grant DFU must transition to a registered society under the Alberta Societies Act, as it would provide an extra level of oversight, and all current operational DFUs are already registered societies with the exception of WUSC. Oversight of granting DFUs would follow the same process that is already in place for DFUs reviewed by Audit Committee.

For granting DFUs the membership of the committee overseeing the DFU must be clearly defined in the electoral question creating the DFU. A Council representative would also sit on this committee with voting responsibilities. The committee will solicit applications for it's granting purpose, but the Finance Committee will reserve final decision on disbursement of the funds. In this model, granting could happen as many times per year as deemed reasonable, but granting must only be given to U of A individuals or registered groups. The Finance Committee reserves the right to request proof of expenditures from grants.

To clarify the timeline for the formation of a DFU, exact dates could be included in bylaw. Certain steps of the process could also have their timeline extended. Requirements of Bylaw Committee and Council in drafting the referendum question should also be clarified, and a definition of fiduciary responsibilities should be added. Time should be allowed in deadlines for Bylaw and Council consideration of the question. If Bylaw should fail in drafting the question in a timely manner, a contingency is needed — council may be able to amend the question if it is time

sensitive.

Lastly, the oversight requirements such as how many SU representatives sit on the board of a DFU, and yearly reports to Council could be clarified and standardized.

5. Potential Drawbacks/Issues Relating to DFU Creation, Regulation and Oversight

The definition of DFU needs to be very clearly outlined that it is for a referendum involving a fee external to the SU. This would leave referendum questions without fees in Bylaw 2200, and it would also raise the question: where do referendum questions that involve SU fees go? Instead of one referendum process there are now potentially three, which could arguably be more complicated. These different processes will need to be clearly differentiated.

Bylaw 3000 may have to be gutted and entirely restructured, as a large amount of it deals with fee categorization. This could be a difficult process.

Section C: Mandates

1. Concerns

Mandates under Bylaw 6000 are the primary mechanism through which the Audit Committee assesses DFUs. Only the four of the seven DFUs that are reviewed by Audit Committee have mandates. This is due to the split in oversight on DFUs between the Audit Committee and the Finance Committee. The mandates vary significantly in length and detail as well.

Mandates also have no process through which they can be updated. While they are bylaw and would simply require a motion through Council to change, any changes should be done in collaboration with the DFU in question. Mandates should be regularly reviewed since the campus environment in which the DFUs operate is constantly changing. Mandates should also be made more specific so there are clear goals to achieve and the review process by Audit Committee is less ambiguous.

2. Possible Solutions:

A mandate review could be undertaken over the next year, where a small committee from Students' Council meets with a DFU to review and update their mandate.

3. Potential drawbacks/issues:

What happens if the DFU and the SU disagree on a mandate?

Section D: Referendum Cycle/Online Opt-Out

1. Concerns

Any current DFU that has their fee increase beyond CPI, either by referendum or joint resolution with Council, will transition to a five-year referendum cycle and mandatory online opt-out capability. Any new DFU that is created will also be under

these requirements.

These requirements were put in place to add additional layers of accountability and opportunity for student voice. Similar to how the SU advocates for increased student choice in mandatory non-instructional fees, students need to have a say in the fees they pay. There is also a significant difference in capabilities for a group to go through the process of a referendum question being posed on a DFU, as opposed to an individual student. A group of students posing a question has historically been about the creation of a DFU or an increase to a DFU, while it is more likely for a question about the elimination of a DFU to be posed by an individual student. These changes were initiated with the intention of helping to overcome the barriers an individual student would face in posing a question about DFUs.

Unfortunately, these changes also have the downside of creating significant risk and uncertainty for DFUs, as they could lose a referendum in March, and not receive DFU money in the Fall semester. This would give an organization only six months to mitigate financial disaster, which is an unrealistic timeline to undergo the kind of restructuring that would be needed. This risk has prevented a number of DFUs from contemplating going to referendum for an increase, due to the fear of losing their fee without warning while on the referendum cycle.

The online opt-out clause provides additional drawbacks for DFUs such as the The Gateway and CJSR, as the service they provide is readily accessible to students regardless of whether they have paid the fee or not. Opt-out rates from APIRG and the Access Fund suggest that opt-outs would not be overly large. The online opt-out would also need to be presented in a way that was fair to the DFUs. Arguments would be presented on the merits of a DFU and a student would have to make the choice to opt-out from each DFU individually, and not wholesale.

2. Possible Solutions

A possible solution to mitigate the risk of the referendum cycle could be to have referenda on the 4th year of the 5-year cycle. That way the DFU would not lose their fund until a full year after the referendum occurred. This would give the DFU sufficient time to plan their financials for the upcoming years accordingly. Another possibility would be for DFUs to run a second referendum, or a “reconsideration of the question” in the 5th year of the 5-year cycle. There may be issues with the perceived fairness of this possibility, as well as with the weight the initial referendum would hold.

Another possible solution is to implement a plebiscite cycle instead of referendum cycle. Every 5 years, a DFU would go to plebiscite during the March elections. The plebiscites would be staggered so not all DFUs were on the ballot at the same time. A plebiscite is a non-binding vote, and would work as a good indicator of general support for the DFU. This de-politicizes the process and also averts the potential risk of a DFU becoming suddenly defunded.

3. Potential Drawbacks/Issues:

A possible drawback with the 4 of 5-year referenda solution would be an increased and confusing number of referenda happening each year. The referenda would almost certainly need to be staggered, and timelines would need to be tracked accurately. A potential upside of having an increased number of referenda could be increased voter turnout.

A plebiscite vote can be confusing to voters unless it is made explicit in the question that it is non-binding.

Section E: Recommendations of the Task Force

1. To move all mentions and processes involving DFUs to a newly created 6000 series of bylaws

Having heavily discussed the role of DFUs in SU bylaw at the U of A, the Task Force feels confident proposing key modifications to SU bylaw to improve the rules surrounding DFU structure and formation.

First, the ambiguity of DFU discussion residing in multiple bylaws could be improved by moving referendum and oversight provisions in regards to DFUs from bylaw series 2000 and 3000 to create a bylaw 6000 series solely focused on DFUs. The 6000 series bylaw would include references to formation, oversight and structure of DFUs, also preserving the ability to initiate referendums on existing DFUs.

2. To create two categories of DFUs, Operational and Granting

Within this consolidated DFU bylaw, two different kinds of DFUs should be created. Granting DFUs — which would have council oversight and only grant to U of A individuals or registered groups — and operating DFUs — which must already exist as either a student group registered society, or SU service, and must only have one DFU per organization. The distinction used to classify these two types will be whether or not the DFU uses 100% of its funds for granting. If so it will be classified a granting DFU, while if any money goes to administration, etc. it will be classified as an operational DFU. Operational DFUs would also be required to transition to a registered society under the Alberta Societies Act within a year of a successful referendum.

Oversight requirements for both types of DFUs, such as requiring publicly posted meeting minutes and financial statements, may also be clarified and standardized. Voting membership of a Councilor on the board of Operational DFUs and on the committee overseeing Granting DFUs will also be required.

3. Clarify timelines and responsibilities around DFU referendums

To rectify current ambiguities regarding the timeline for DFU formation, specified dates could be included within bylaw along with requirements for the various parties involved, including Students' Council. Council and Bylaw Committee's role in the process should be clarified, as well as a contingency added incase deadline are not

met. A definition of fiduciary responsibilities should be added. Time should be allowed in deadlines for Bylaw and Council consideration of the question. If Bylaw should fail in its role to draft the question in a timely manner, a contingency is needed. Council may be able to amend the question if it is time sensitive. Representation by Council on DFU boards and granting subcommittees should also be clarified.

4. DFUs that are opt-out as part of the referendum question should have the process online

The Task Force found that a majority of DFUs are unable to prevent students from accessing their services if a student has opted-out. DFUs should not be mandated to be opt-out, and if a DFU chooses to be opt-out as part of the original referendum question then this process should be conducted online. Having the process take place online allows for streamlined administration that can be handled by the SU, thus taking an administrative load off of the DFUs.

5. Move all DFUs onto a 5-year plebiscite cycle

By moving to a five-year plebiscite cycle as opposed to the referendum cycle, DFUs will not face the risk of losing a referendum in March and being defunded two months later, as a plebiscite is a non-binding vote. It also maintains regular student input in the fees they pay, as well as satisfying all the regulatory requirements that were associated with the referendum cycle. By not legislating on a specific outcome of a plebiscite, it allows for an organic process to take place that can encompass the uniqueness of each situation.

6. To conduct a review of mandates individually with each DFU

The current lack of structure around DFU mandates should be rectified, and could be with a one-time mandate review process where members of a DFU and Students Council could review and possibly update said DFU's mandate. This process will take place over the next year and will strive to clarify mandates.

The Task Force feels that these recommendations meet the committee's mandate, and come after examining other student association fee collecting structures, reviewing the different categories of SU fees, determining the discrepancies, risks, and ambiguities within SU bylaw regarding DFUs, and reviewing and proposing the formalization of Audit and Financial Review Standards. It is the belief of the Task Force that these recommendations, if followed, will continue to ensure that the two million dollars in dedicated fees collected from students at the U of A will be spent in a most transparent and responsible matter.

HODGSON/LAU moves to amend Operating Policy 2.09 “Wall of Gold” as follows:

2.09 Wall of Gold

- ~~a) The ‘Wall of Gold’ shall only be used in the promotion of Students’ Union services, advocacy efforts, elections, or executive projects.~~
- ~~b) There shall be no more than one (1) project on the wall at any given time.~~
- ~~c) Scheduling of the material placement and removal shall be coordinated by the Senior Manager (Marketing & Communications).~~
- ~~d) All material that appears on the wall must first be approved by the Vice President (Operations & Finance).~~
- a) The ‘Wall of Gold’ is reserved for the promotion of Students’ Union services, advocacy efforts, elections, or executive projects.
- b) The Wall of Gold is exclusively reserved for Student Elections from the beginning of February to the end of the third week in March.
- c) At the sole discretion of the Executive, the Wall may be used by other parties for projects that directly relate to specific goals of the Students’ Union.
- d) No more than one (1) project may be on the wall at any one time.
- e) The Senior Manager (Marketing & Communications) will coordinate all Wall of Gold bookings.
- f) The organization using the Wall is responsible for mounting and removal of promotional material and also for any damage done to the Wall while they are using it.
- g) Although material that appears on the wall is not reviewed before hand, the SU reserves the right to remove any material it considers unsuitable or inappropriate.

AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY REPORT TO COUNCIL

Date: September 30th 2014	Time: 7.09 pm	2014 – 2015
---	----------------------	-------------

Motions		
1.	<i>SLEIMAN/GARG moved to approve the agenda for September 30, 2014 as tabled.</i>	<i>CARRIED 4/0/0</i>
2.	<i>GARG/SLEIMAN moved to approve the agenda for September 16, 2014 as tabled.</i>	<i>CARRIED 3/0/1</i>
3.	<i>FAROOQ/SLEIMAN moved to approve the financial review of the Interdepartmental Science Students' Society.</i>	<i>CARRIED 2/0/2</i>
4.	<i>SLEIMAN/FAROOQ moved to adjourn the meeting.</i>	<i>CARRIED 4/0/0</i>



October 2, 2014

To: Council

Re: October 7th Council Report

Hi Council,

I hope the beginning of the semester is treating you well, and that midterms aren't getting you down!

It's been another busy two weeks in the SU. Despite a devastating cold that took out just about the whole office, things have moved along.

We have a new person in the office! Our new executive assistant's name is Robyn Fenske and she will be helping out around here with scheduling and institutional memory. That means if you want to schedule a meeting with any of the execs, you should email robyn.fenske@su.ualberta.ca and she will set you up.

The Be Booksmart awareness campaign has officially come to an end. I am considering it a success based on the number of hits we got on the webpage (hundreds and hundreds), and the great media attention we got. That being said, there are some improvements that could be made for next time. In the next run, I would like to include a more professor-focused campaign. I hope to do some kind of recognition for professors that already do great things for students in terms of academic materials. Also, there were some... well... interesting statistics out of SUBtitles. The Be Booksmart campaign did not help SUBtitles. The numbers for the last three years are as follows:

August 15th - September 15th, 2014 - Consignment Sales: \$90,501.25 (\$40,618.52 lower than 2013)

August 15th - September 15th, 2013 - Consignment Sales: \$131,119.77 (\$31,645.49 lower than 2012)

August 15th - September 15th, 2012 - Consignment Sales: \$162,765.26

So it seems like used book sales are steadily dropping and the Be Booksmart campaign did not help. Why are the numbers dropping so drastically? I would speculate that there is a growing prevalence of desire to purchase digital textbooks, this is also having an impact on the bookstore. There also could be less students using the service, which could be due to the change in location. My bet is on the online materials.

Speaking of online materials, there is an issue that is of growing concern to the SU and that is online access codes. I've been getting a couple of student complaints about these things, and the essence of what they are is a code that you have to purchase that gives you access to something online that your professor uses as part of your grade. Since tuition should be already going towards instruction and assessment, we see this as students being charged twice for the same thing.

One question that I've gotten is, why is it acceptable to charge for a textbook but not an online access code? The answer is that the textbook is not so directly tied to assessment. Yes, you do need to do readings to succeed in the classroom, but the tests and assignments are directly worth a percentage of your grade. The line is not blurry. It is either worth part of your grade or it is not. The most insidious part of access codes is that there is no way to mitigate the cost or get around it. You can't share with your



classmate, you can't resell it afterwards, and you don't usually get to keep it longer than six months. Our research thus far shows that an access code that comes with an ebook costs between \$66 and \$117, and an access code with a hard copy book will cost somewhere between \$111 and \$290.

Recently, University of Calgary has bought a subscription to TopHat, which is one of the companies that provides the online assessment services. This institution-wide subscription means that students can access it for their classes for free. The provincial Ontario government has instituted a regulation that prevents any instructor from assigning an access code that costs more than \$50. This is an issue that is starting to pop up across Canada.

Navneet and I are working together on this one. She will be working on getting CAUS on board with making a policy around this to lobby the provincial government for something like Ontario has, and I will be lobbying internally to see what the possibilities are for getting something like Calgary has.

The highlights of this week for me were related to undergraduate writing and the Festival of Teaching. I sit on a committee called University Writing Committee and right now, this is an orphan committee with no place in central reporting structure or real capability to collectively effect change in writing on campus. I think this is a poor show for something as integral to undergraduate education as writing. I would really like for writing to have a place in university governance to represent its place at this university. Over the last two weeks I talked to a bunch of people and put the gears in motion to make it report to CLE.

Relatedly, the theme for the Festival of Teaching this year is writing. An interesting thing to note about the FoT is that it isn't a festival in the conventional sense, rather, it is a series of related events that happen throughout the year. My role in organizing is the "student voices" aspect. Much like last year, we will be asking students questions on camera and compiling a video, we will also probably be putting chalkboards up everywhere with questions on them that students can answer. Interactive signage has worked well in the past, I'm pretty interested to see how it goes in this context.

Probably the most fun thing I did in the last two weeks related to work was attend the Celebrate! Teaching, Research, and Learning awards. I was on the selection committees over the summer for a bunch of the awards that were given out, so I got to come to the ceremony. I was so inspired by the work that people at our institution have done, especially the student award recipients. I saw more than one crying parent in the audience and it just about brought me to tears myself.

The Engineering Student Society was nice enough to invite me out to their Board of Directors meeting. This is a meeting with the members of the ESS and the presidents of all their Departmental Associations. It's kinda like COFA. I was so impressed by how organized it was and how they spoke about tackling real advocacy issues that they faced in their department. I'm hoping to work with BoD to help them tackle advocacy issues and make sure they have all the resources and help they could want.

Anyways, that is probably enough for now, see you Tuesday!

All the best,
Kathryn Orydzuk

October 2nd, 2014

To: Students' Council

Re: Report to Council (for October 7th meeting)

Introduction

The time since our lovely meeting in Augusta has flown by! Thankfully though, I got to spend some time out of the city last weekend, which was a really nice refresher. I don't have too many updates for you this week, despite the many meetings, readings, and the writing I've been doing.

CAUS/Provincial advocacy

We're having our **second quarterly meeting with the Ministry of IAE** on Monday. It'll be many of the student leaders' first time interacting with the new Minister, Don Scott, and asking him questions in person. I'm really looking forward to this, even though they moved it to Calgary last minute ...

Thus far, I am seeing good signs in terms of **relationship building with the Minister**. He has reached out to myself and other CAUS executives and had a brief phone call with us. I also just called back Marcia Nelson today who is the Deputy Minister. They seem very eager to start off on a positive path!

Market modifiers are definitely *the* topic we'll be talking about at the Quarterly. Internally, not much has changed in regards to proposals and our Faculty Associations. As you know, the LSA is conducting a survey now that they have more time to do so. This is also a positive step forward.

All CAUS schools are working on letters to the Minister highlighting our concerns with the process thus far.

I did an **interview for the Globe and Mail**, which resulted in this September 30th article: "Will students pay more for economics than English? University to find out".

I'm on a subcommittee (for IAE) of the Tuition and Fees Stakeholder Working Group known as the Subcommittee on Definitions and Guidelines. The whole purpose of this subcommittee is to review the PSLA and the Tuition and Fees Regulation and **discuss the various definitions of fees**. It can get very, very technical and time-consuming, but the policy wonk in me does enjoy it. On a related note, both VPA Orydzuk and myself have been talking about the unfortunate use of online program codes and the fees we have to pay (like the programs used in Math and Stats classes, where you have to purchase these codes in order to get your assignments graded).

Feminism and Women in Politics

Now that I've had a few months to think about this (other than most of my life-time haha ...) I'm getting the ball rolling on a project that is very important to me. Long story short – I want to do *something* akin to a conference or a series of events that focuses on two general areas: (1) exploring how gender impacts involvement in student politics/public positions of leadership; (2) having meaningful, inclusive, and productive discussions about feminism on campus.

As you should have received by now, I included a survey in our monthly "State of the Union" newsletter titled "Does gender impact your campus experience?" I would really appreciate it if you filled it out and encouraged your networks to do so as well! The results of this survey will help inform my next steps.

Long story short, I want to create something on campus that includes workshops, focus groups, media (podcasts, videos, radio), the traditional lecture, and art to bring life to these topics. At the end of it all (I'm thinking it will be

a week sometime in January or February) I'm hoping to have both qualitative and quantitative data, which can help the Students' Union in the future.

I'll leave it at that for now, since this is still in the very early formative stages. If this intrigues you and you want to help out, *please* let me know! The strength of this project relies on volunteers and passionate students!

Conclusion

If you're reading this before the weekend, remember to come out to the Bears Hockey game against Lethbridge on Saturday! Meet in RATT at 4:30 on October 4th and then we'll head over to the game.

Cheers,



Navneet Khinda

Vice President External 2014-2015 // University of Alberta Students' Union
Chair // [Council of Alberta University Students](#)

P: (780) 492-4236 // **E:** vp.external@su.ualberta.ca

Twitter: [@uasuvpexternal](#)

September 23rd, 2014

To: University of Alberta Students' Council 2014/2015

Re: Vice President Student Life Council Report

*"My mission in life is not merely to survive, but to thrive; and to do so with some passion,
some compassion, some humour, and some style."*

Maya Angelou

Hi Council,

This report will cover from September 19 through October 2.

Advocacy

The **Residence Feedback Form** has had roughly 20 respondents. It has resulted in tangible action on two larger cases, and has influenced policy discussions both with Residence Associations and Residence Services through the Residence Advisory Committee (RAC).

The **Residence Budget Advisory Committee (RBAC)** is going well. Rent at the University increases according to a version of CPI, plus a percentage to account for service improvement projects like furnishings and wireless access. The proposals before us seem reasonable.

The **Residence Halls Association** discussions are ongoing. I have met with both the LHSA president and staff at Residence Services regarding potential ways forward.

Council and Governance

After some discussion with staff, and a visit to bylaw committee, I have begun work on **Bylaw 5600**. Bylaw 5600 is the bylaw regarding student groups. Updates will come via bylaw committee, as Councillors Kwan and Allard and I work on it together.

Student Groups and Associations

Prayer Space mapping is ongoing. A meeting is arranged between Safewalk, the Muslim Students' Association, and I.

I have recently had communications with Phys. Ed. and Rec. regarding **facility bookings**. We know, now, that groups that “duplicate” existing services offered by Recreation Services may not book facilities managed by the faculty of Phys. Ed. As such, East Campus Dodgeball will now be held in Lister Gym, and that gym is managed by Residence Services. I will advocate for a more inclusive rental policy in the coming months.

Events

Green and Gold Day was a blast! The sock fight was actually a lot of fun. Kudos to the Alumni Association for their weekend of events.

On September 19th, I spoke at the **Student Assembly for Campus Health**. Congratulations to the Student Health Committee on a successful forum for discussion amongst student group leaders. On September 30th, I dropped by the **Fine Arts Gala** held by the Encore! Musical Theatre student group. I'm happy to see them developing their campus musical student group is a sustainable way through community outreach.

Congratulations to **The Landing** for an amazing launch party! The new meeting rooms downstairs were a perfect venue, and the Landing office is looking phenomenal. The executive committee was happy to sponsor the food for this event. The executive committee has also sponsored the **Long Night Against Procrastination**. Once again, check out the details at fb.com/longnightagainstprocrastination.

Our **comedy night** and **free movie night** were really successful compared to last year at this time! For more info on UASU events, check out uasuevents.ca, and for my events calendar, check out uasu.ca/vpslcalendar.

Best,

Nicholas Diaz
Vice President Student Life 2014-2015

STUDENTS' COUNCIL VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday September 23rd, 2014
Augustana

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS (SC 2014-10)

2014-10/1 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

Meeting called to order at 7:18pm

2014-10/1a Announcements – The next meeting of Students' Council will take place on Tuesday, October 7th, 2014

2014-10/2 PRESENTATIONS

2014-10/2a The Augustana Students' Association (ASA) and Augustana Campus by the ASA Executive: Hans Asfeldt, Shaun Dubash, Carolina Malloy, Bhavin Patel and Justin Draper, Sponsored by Governor Hansra and Councillor Gruhlke.

The ASA is the Campus Students' Association for Augustana Campus, University of Alberta. The ASA and its elected bodies are mandated to ensure a high quality university experience for Augustana students through innovative and responsible representation, advocacy, and the provision of services and activities.

The Augustana Campus is a faculty of the University of Alberta located in Camrose. The Campus, previously known as "Camrose Lutheran College" merged with the University of Alberta in 2004. Approximately 1000 full-time students study at the Campus. The Faculty has four departments: Fin Arts, Humanities, Science and Social Science. The Campus also runs an after-degree Bachelor of Science in Nursing through the Faculty of Nursing and a Masters of Science in Physical Therapy through the Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine.

GRUHLKE/BANISTER MOVED TO extend the presentation time by 15 minutes.

Motion: CARRIED

2014-10/3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

William Lau, President- Report

Cory Hodgson, VP Operations and Finance- Report

Navneet Khinda, VP External- Report

Nicholas Diaz, VP Student Life- Report

2014-10/4

BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Sangram Hansra, BoG Rep- Report

Stephanie Gruhlke, Policy Committee Chair- Report

Umer Farooq, Audit Committee Chair- Report

Tymothy Jaddock, CAC member- Report

2014-10/5

QUESTION PERIOD

2014-10/7

GENERAL ORDERS

JADDOCK/GRUHLKE MOVED TO appoint one member of Students' Council to the Council Administration Committee

Nominations: To

Nominations Closed

Appointed: To

Meeting adjourned at 8:46pm

2014-2015

Attendance

14-09-Sept 9

14-10-Sept 23

Council Seats (40 total)	Name
--------------------------	------

Ex-officio Members (6 voting seats)

Ex-officio Members (6 voting seats)

Faculty Representation (32 voting seats)

<p>Ex-Officio Members (2 non-voting seats)</p>

Speaker	Saadiq Sumar	Y	Y			
General Manager	Marc Dumouchel	N	N			