

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL LATE ADDITIONS

---

Tuesday May 17, 2005 – 6:00 p.m.  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

2005-02/6

## NOMINATIONS

2005-02/6a

**MOTION BY TOBIAS, RESOLVED THAT** Students' Council elect members to sit on:

- a. The Access Fund Board (seven members),
- b. The Audit Committee (five members),
- c. The Budget and Finance Committee (seven members),
- d. The Bylaw Committee (five members),
- e. The Council Administration Committee (five members),
- f. The External Policy Committee (seven members),
- g. The Grant Allocation Committee (seven members),
- h. The Student Affairs Committee (seven members),
- i. The University Policy Committee (seven members).

Please see document LA 05-02.01

Please see document LA 05-02.02

2005-02/7

## REPORTS

2005-02/7a

Graham Lettner, President

Please see document LA 05-02.03

2005-02/7b

Mathieu Johnson, Vice President (Academic)

Please see document LA 05-02.04

2005-02/7c

Samantha Power, Vice President (External)

Please see document LA 05-02.05

2005-02/7d

Justin Kehoe, Vice President (Student Life)

Please see document LA 05-02.06

2005-02/8

## QUESTION PERIOD

- 2005-02/8a Schneider – Question for the President: why is it that the CRO position has been re-posted on the SU website and advertised in the May 12, 2005 edition of the Gateway until May 17, 2005, when no authorization has been legally given by Students' Council and, if given, will re-post the position until May 24, 2005?
- 2005-02/8b Schneider – Question for the President: how many applications, if any, have been received in light of the illicit reposting of the CRO position?
- 2005-02/10 **GENERAL ORDERS**
- 2005-02/10i **MOTION BY KAWANAMI, RESOLVED THAT** Students' Council re-open applications for selection to the Senate, that a hiring committee for the selection of Senators be created, containing at least two former or current Senators, and which shall include as part of the selection process the interviewing of shortlisted candidates.
- 2005-02/11 **INFORMATION ITEMS**
- 2005-02/11b Letter from M. Mustafa Hirji regarding Nominations for the University of Alberta Senate.
- Please see document LA 05-02.07
- 2005-02/11c **SCHNEIDER MOVED TO** amend item 2005-02/3c section 34 by inserting new point a. i. "Meetings to consider first reading and second reading must be a minimum of one (1) week apart".
- 2005-02/11d **SCHNEIDER MOVED TO** amend item 2005-02/3c under 'Procedure for electing a new Speaker', by inserting new point 4(b)(8) "In Case of a Tie, Presiding Member Votes" which would read as follows: "Only in a case of a tie does the presiding member vote", furthermore, the currently listed point 4(b)(8) will be relabeled 4(b)(9) and the currently listed point 4(b)(9) will be relabeled 4(b)(10).
- 2005-02/11e **SCHNEIDER MOVED TO** amend Bill #4 by striking principle one and replacing it with the words "That Students' Council set quorum to always sit at a simple majority of the current membership of Students' Council, and to be no lower than 18".
- 2005-02/11f **KIRKHAM MOVED TO** amend 2005-02/10c by replacing the words "1 July 2005" with "1 September 2005" and inserting the words "with the exception of SUBmart where tobacco products may not be sold as of 1 May 2006."
- 2005-02/11g **MOTION BY KAWANAMI, ORDERED THAT** item 2005-02/6g be struck from the order paper.

# Students' Council

## Committees Ballot

### Access Fund Board – Select 7 members

- Prem ErUvs
- Sylvia Shamanna
- Jason Tobias
- None of the Above

### Audit Committee – Select 5 members

- Prem ErUvs
- Bryce Kustra
- Cameron Lewis
- Trevor Panas
- None of the Above

### Budget and Finance Committee – Select 7 members

- Brian Ceelen
- James Crossman
- Cameron Lewis
- Trevor Panas
- Shawna Pandya
- Tim Schneider
- Jason Tobias
- Rachel Woynoroski
- None of the Above

### Bylaw Committee – Select 5 members

- Catrin Berghoff
- Stephen Kirkham
- Cameron Lewis
- Tim Schneider
- Jason Tobias
- Rachel Woynoroski
- None of the Above

### Council Administration Committee – Select 5 members

- Sheena Aperocho
- Catrin Berghoff
- Stephen Kirkham
- Cameron Lewis
- Shawna Pandya
- Tim Schneider
- Rachel Woynoroski
- None of the Above

### External Policy Committee – Select 7 members

- Catrin Berghoff
- James Crossman
- Kyle Kawanami
- Bryce Kustra
- Cameron Lewis
- Jamaal Montasser
- Samantha Power
- None of the Above

### Grant Allocation Committee – Select 7 members

- Cameron Lewis
- Jason Tobias
- None of the Above

### Student Affairs Committee – Select 7 members

- Sheena Aperocho
- Prem ErUvs
- Jack Gordon
- Justin Kehoe
- Suneil Khanna
- Lillian Patz
- None of the Above

**University Policy Committee – Select 7  
members**

- Catrin Berghoff
- Jack Gordon
- Mathieu Johnson
- Suneil Khanna
- Cameron Lewis
- Shawna Pandya
- Tim Schneider
- None of the Above

Hello Executive, Speaker, and Stephanie;

My name is Jack Gordon. I am one of the many new science councillors beginning this year. I thought it would be efficient to inform all of you that I am unable to attend council meetings from May to August. Like many students at the U of A, I am working in my home town (Kelowna, BC) for the duration of the summer. If there were any way for me to have stayed in Edmonton, would have.

I thought it best to inform you of my absence now rather than have you question whether or not I even exist. I do fully intend in fulfilling all my obligations as a councillor when I return at the end of August. I plan to attend the August 23rd meeting thus mark the end of my absenteeism. I still intend to serve on the committees for which I have applied; however, I will not be attending any of those meetings until August as well.

In the mean time, I will be reading the minutes, and agenda packages to keep myself up to date.

Thank you for your patience and understanding. I look forward to working with all of you. If you have any questions or comments please feel free to email me at this address, or call me at 250-763-9981.

Sincerely,

Jack Gordon  
Science Councillor

---

---

## President's Report to Council

---

---

Date: May 14<sup>th</sup>

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Major items for the first week in office were the annual Executive retreat and the annual Council of Alberta University Students (CAUS) retreat. Both were highly successful and many plans and ideas, along with fresh perspectives, emerged from each. Also, the first of many meetings have taken place with the University and have focused mainly on outlining upcoming budgetary issues for the new academic year.

<h3><b>ONGOING/ EMERGING/ CRITICAL ISSUES:</b></h3>
---

- Advocacy

This past weekend the advocacy side of the Students' Union met with our counterparts from Calgary, Lethbridge and Athabasca along with the director from CAUS, Duncan Wojtaszek. The new lobby policies for 05-06 were debated and should be finalized by this week. Of note, Liberal MLA Dave Taylor and ex-Provost Dr Doug Owsram joined us for discussion and debate for portions of the conference.

Ongoing discussions have taken place in our own department about the specific implementations of our advocacy goals. Planning should be completed in a large part by the end of this week.

- Board of Governors

Mr Adam Cook and I met to discuss the Board of Governors and our role in it. Timelines for presenting student oriented proposals and reports will be discussed further. It should be noted that we were reminded in clear but good-natured terms that as Governors we are responsible for the University of Alberta as a whole, and should not endeavour to be a two-man special interest group.

- Operations and Finance

The issue of the University Health Services (UHS) fee is an ongoing concern of both Mr Tobias and myself. Progress on the issue has slowed, and I will be speaking to Provost Amrhein personally to develop a solution to the issue.

As well, Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) convened on Thursday to discuss the implications of the provincial budget announcement on the University's spending. There will be considerable leeway in the upcoming years, and with money being held in reserve for the demands of the new academic plan—headed up by incoming President Indira

Samarasekera—there is considerable opportunity to develop undergraduate spending priorities.

- Academic Planning

The Academic Planning Committee (APC) was attended by Mr Mat Johnson on my behalf. After reading both his and Ms Zita Dube's reports on the meeting, two important issues should be named: a desire for an interdisciplinary focus in teaching, and also a move to establish beneficial research-teaching linkages. I leave it to Mr Johnson or Ms Dube to expand on these ideas further.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Confirmation of registration fee for incoming medical students increased from \$175 to \$1000 by ratification of the Board of Governors.

**Mathieu Johnson VP (Academic)**  
**Report to Students' Council**  
**May 17, 2005**

---

**Follow-up on Past Projects**

**Update on Current Projects**

**SURVEYS:**

**The statistical analysis for the SU survey is complete and the report is being written. The major full length report will be completed by the end of May with the abridged version for public consumption will follow shortly.**

**The sampling for the Academic survey was completed on May 1<sup>st</sup>, and the initial statistical analysis is underway.**

**Information on Upcoming Projects:**

**As would be expected I am still getting my feet around the office and the university community in general. However I have been meeting with various people trying to further develop my plans to work on TA professional development.**

**Also I have been contacting FAs and trying to set up meetings with them separately over the summer to try and better institutionalize the relationship of FAs with the SU, including more functional COFA events.**

**Announcements:**

**As some of you may know there is a huge taskforce underway by the university to develop a strategy on the integration of teaching and research at the U of A. As part of this a student, Shawn Drefs, is conducting student focus groups. If you would like to take part and add your input to this new initiative please contact Shawn at [sdrefs@ualberta.ca](mailto:sdrefs@ualberta.ca).**

**Smoking question:**

**Due to demand I am releasing the information on the smoking question before the rest of the report.**

**Background**

As stated, the Students' Union administered this survey in the Fall of 2004 to a total of 2,484 students from classrooms which were chosen in order to best represent the actual demographic breakdown of the University (particularly in terms of year of study and



Faculty.) The results are considered to be accurate 98 times out of 100, to an interval of +/- 2%.

The survey was broken down into several different headings (Participant Profile, Personal Information, Student Life, Student Government, Technology and Academics.) The questions that are pertinent to this issue fall under "Student Life".

Particulars:

The first question regarding smoking asked respondents to identify their own particular smoking habits.

*Question 15:  
Do you smoke?*

*Regularly*       *Occasionally*       *No*

The results of question 15 are as follows:

*Of 2,484 respondents:*

*89% do not smoke  
7% smoke occasionally  
4% smoke regularly*

The second question focused on the particular issue of Campus Bars going non-smoking. As most of you are no doubt aware, last year's Students' Council voted to implement a smoking ban in our campus bars that took effect on May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005. Though this question may appear unimportant given the fact that the decision to go non-smoking has already taken place, it can, nonetheless, indicate tendencies within the student population's opinion regarding issues pertaining to smoking.

*Question 16:  
If campus bars (RATT and the Power Plant) were to become non-smoking, what effect would this have on your attendance at the bars?*

*I would attend more*       *No effect*       *I would attend less*

The following results include the cross-tabulations of smoking habits to opinion on whether or not campus bars should go smoke free.

<b>A- I would attend more</b>	<b>Raw #</b>	<b>% of Group Total</b>
• Regular smokers	N=3	2.8%
• Occasional smokers	N=10	5.3%
• Non-Smokers	N=1169	47.2%

**42.6% of the total of respondents would attend the bars more**

**B- No effect**

- |                      |        |       |
|----------------------|--------|-------|
| • Regular smokers    | N=39   | 36.4% |
| • Occasional smokers | N=142  | 74.4% |
| • Non-smokers        | N=1279 | 51.6% |

**52.6% of total of respondents would not attend the bars more or less**

**C- I would attend less**

- |                      |      |       |
|----------------------|------|-------|
| • Regular smokers    | N=65 | 60.7% |
| • Occasional smokers | N=38 | 20.0% |
| • Non-Smokers        | N=30 | 1.2%  |

**4.8% of the total of respondents would attend the bars less**

Analysis

Knowing that statistical interpretation is not the hobby of *most* councilors, the following provides an interpretation of the data. Please note, that while this is not the *only* possible interpretation, it is the most consistent with the data available to us. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS ANALYSIS IS BASED ON INFERENCE, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE RAW DATA AND THE INFORMATION WE HAVE ON HAND. IT IS NOT, AND SHOULD NOT BE, VIEWED AS A SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS.**

Firstly, it is important to note that the survey results may be slightly skewed in light of the fact that we did not ask the respondents whether or not they currently attend the campus bar. This largely affects the results of how we perceive those who would attend the campus bars as non-smoking establishments. That said, these results should not affect the analysis of student perception on smoking. However, it is important to note this inconsistency in the original data.

In completing an analysis of this data, it is equally important to note that the majority of students' (57.2%) indicated that, should the campus bars go non-smoking, their attendance at the campus bars would not be affected. We also know that most students on our campus are currently non-smokers. This leads us to conclude that a large percentage of non-smokers and occasional smokers were indifferent to the change, either because they do not care (or are ideologically opposed to the change due to political beliefs) or do not attend the bars in the first place. We can infer that those who do not attend the bars would forward the same opinion on the selling of tobacco products in Students' Union venues: if it does not affect them directly, they don't care. It can also be inferred that those who are politically or ideologically opposed to the imposition of a smoking ban, as well as those who simply have no opinion on the matter, would hold the same position in terms of tobacco sales. **Thus, we can infer that 52.6% would hold no opinion on the sales of tobacco products overall, but might disprove of the**

**elimination of these sales in the face of a financial hit to the Students' Union. 4.8% would likely reject the move towards eliminating these sales, regardless of the Students' Union's economic status.**

This leaves 42.6% of students who indicated that they would attend the bars more should they become non-smoking. Again, while there may be a large array of individual reasons for the respondents' individual answers, we can logically assume that there are three predominant opinions that arise: those who ideologically or morally oppose smoking in all its forms, those who, given that they are non-smokers, do not want the physical side effects of smoking (both in terms of health and of superficial characteristics like smell) to affect them and those who concluded that since the City was going non-smoking, the Students' Union should follow suit. Here we can see that, in general, these concerns are "bar specific" and do not lead us to believe that those who supported the move towards non-smoking bars would support the removal of tobacco products from Students' Union services, especially in light of the financial implications associated with this move. **This does not indicate that the 42.6% would NOT support the removal of tobacco products. All that it indicates is that we can not rely on the 42.6% supporting the removal of tobacco products with as much assurance as we can rely on the 57.2% identified above who would likely have no preference or would be opposed to the move.**

## Council Report:

Over the past two weeks I've spent a total of one day and one half in the offices of 2-900. This may seem a great injustice to students' dollars at some point, but I assure you the time out of the office was of some quality and importance.

The first week of office we spent on Exec Retreat. I held opposition to this week out of office going in, and going out I have little to add, simply that I learnt a great deal from Jordan Blatz and to him I tip my hat. The week was spent in sessions from 9am to 9pm at night, we were inundated with all the knowledge about the SU, that you could possibly cram in such a time.

The second week was spent at the Council of Alberta University Students changeover retreat, unfortunately located at the Fantasyland Hotel. It was lovely to meet Jen Smith the VPX from UofC and our new CAUS chair, and to connect with her on many details. We spent a lot of time discussing the new tuition policy that CAUS will adopt to lobby the government on their new tuition policy in the Affordability Review, which will be taking place over the summer. I hope to further connect with Jen and collaborate on campus campaign ideas.

After two days of discussing the tuition policy, as individuals we each came to the principles we saw as important in the policy but continued to be caught on the conflicting logistics of implementation. It was decided to take the principles back to our respective institutions for further vetting with our research departments, and that is the process we are now undergoing. Our policy, out of the UofA office, will be finished by the end of the week and we will be discussing the policies and principles proposed by each group over the CAUS listserv where we'll decide on the policy and hopefully by the end of the month we will have a policy to lobby on, making our Executive Director very happy.

So the external department's focus is on creating that tuition policy and the lobby efforts around it. We're also beginning preliminary planning on the advocacy efforts for the year. The job posting for the CCC was up last Monday and hiring will hopefully occur in the next week and a half. (deadline to apply is Friday) The AVPX has also been doing some great work, she was a great help in development of the discussion at the CAUS conference, she's working hard to put together the Chancellor's Cup (May 30) and she's looking into the benefits of a rural tour.

I'm also putting together an External Advisory Committee to help implement the groundwork of the campaigns we'll be working on. My view is that there has been little attention to the outreach aspect of external campaigns, that necessary connection with students and so we can't properly implement our goals. The AVPX, CCC and the External Advisory Committee will all be working to improve this. If you know of anyone with an interest in political events and the post secondary environment tell them to drop me a line at [vpexternal@su.ualberta.ca](mailto:vpexternal@su.ualberta.ca)

Samantha Power

**Justin Kehoe, Vice President (Student Life)**  
**Report to Students' Council**  
**May 17, 2005**

---

Good evening Council,

After the first few days of feeling the warm thrill of confusion, that space cadet glow, I am now beginning to find my groove. Some things are still eluding me, and it's not exactly what I expected to see, but I'm clawing my way through.

First, I must apologize to Council for not having my first report prepared in time for publication in the main agenda package. As a former Councillor, it always bothered me when Executive reports were in the Late Additions because there is not enough time to read them before Question Period. There may be times throughout the year where my work schedule will impede me from accomplishing this, but I am sure you will understand if some submissions are in the Late Additions.

Now on to the show...

1. Webboard: On my very first day in the office, I had a meeting with Marc Dumouchel about the removal of the webboard, what instructions he was left with, and what our options at this point are. I am continuing this analysis, and will prepare a recommendation for Executive Committee shortly.
2. WOW: I have had several meetings with Peter Haggard, the AVPSL, and Steve Derpack, the Sr. Manager of Programming and Licensed Activities. We have a timeline set, and will get our planning committees kickstarted tomorrow.
3. Campus Food Bank: Over the last two weeks, I've attended a CFB Board of Directors meeting and talked extensively with CFB Director David Feldman about recurring issues with space, resources, and organizational structure.
4. Council Retreat: Last Saturday. 'Twas a good time. Thanks to Councillor Wallace, Gregory Harlow, et al.
5. Service Directors: I've had introductory meetings with several of them—most extensively with the ECOS Director to discuss environmental initiatives—and will continue to see the rest in the near future.
6. GSA: The Executives from both organizations met informally to discuss plans and expectations for the year ahead.
7. BoG Reception: Very classy. The Chancellor has awesome stories. I still do not own a suit, except for my snazzy \$5 sports jacket from Value Village.
8. Meetings with Managers: We've had some early all-morning meetings with the Managers to learn about the different departments and discuss our goals.
9. Handbooks and RSS: I spoke with Dan Costigan, Manager of Marketing, regarding publication of the SU Handbooks and a long-term vision for the Revolutionary Speakers' Series.

**Upcoming:**

This week      More training sessions  
                    Webboard investigation

May 18          SU GSA meeting  
                    SLAC, WOWPC, PC

May 19          Meeting with Christian Tremblay, King of SL at CSJ  
                    Meeting with LHSA Exec  
                    Star Wars (a Goon night out)

May 20          ECOS Garden Coordinator interviews

May 24          Executive retreat

May 25          Meeting with Dr. Bill Connor, Dean of Students

May 26          Meeting with Service Directors

May 27          President Rod Fraser's farewell celebration  
                    Meeting with SDC – Crisis Chat

I hope to develop a more aesthetically pleasing format for my future reports to Council. I will also include some prizes for those dedicated Councillors who take the time to read through my reports. The requirement will usually be deciphering some sort of hidden message, answering a question, or naming a song from which I've integrated lyrics into my report. It should be obvious.

Thank you for your time.

April 28, 2005

M. Mustafa Hirji  
14709 43A Avenue  
Edmonton, Alberta T6H 5T8  
mustafa.hirji@ualberta.ca

**To:** Students' Council

**Re:** Nominations for the University of Alberta Senate

From reading the Agenda for the Students' Council meeting of April 30, 2005, it has come to my attention that the Students' Union's nominees for the University of Alberta Senate have been tentatively selected, subject to their ratification by Students' Council, and that I am one of those recommended nominees (SC 2004-24/10c [second item numbered as such]). While I am, of course, pleased to have been selected, I have serious concerns over the process used to select me for recommendation to Students' Council.

In past years, the recommendations for the Senate have been made by the same nominating committee that recommendations for all the other external committees (External Affairs Board, Eugene Brody Committee, etc.). This process involved consideration of the applicants' application, interviewing the best 5-7 candidates, and then recommendation of three to Students' Council. The process was known beforehand, the consideration of applicants rigorous, and the committee members well-versed in the external portfolio and the role of the Senate by virtue of having training, heavy exposure to the external portfolio, and a Senator present as chair of the committee for advice.

This year, Students' Council eliminated the nominating committee removing the old process for selecting recommended nominees. I have no disagreement with this decision. However, Students' Council did not specify a new mechanism for recommending new Senate nominees. Because of Students' Council's negligence in this matter, the Committee on Council Reform and Progress met in the late evening after a meeting of Students' Council and quickly chose the recommended nominees without any further process.

I believe that this process was deeply flawed.

1. Every position within the Students' Union is selected on interview. Virtually every position in most organizations are selected with interviews as part of the process. The only exception to the nominee rule in the Students' Union is in the case of selection of Councillors to Council committees, and those selections involved an opportunity to ask questions of the candidates so they are effective substitutes for interviews. Until this year, the selections of recommended nominees for the Senate was no different. However, this year the interviews were forgone. This is grossly inconsistent with Students' Union practice elsewhere and practice in general. For a position as important as that of Senator, it is unacceptable that the Students' Union have such a weak process.
2. The Committee for Council Reform and Progress has no quorum requirements. Quorum rules exist to ensure a democratically represented sample when decisions are made. One of the consistent problems with the Committee for Council Reform and Progress, one which Students' Council has addressed twice this year (once in a stand-alone motion to create a Council Administration Committee, and once in the committee system

overhaul), is that this committee has no quorum rules. Therefore, decisions cannot be made with any confidence of true democratic representation. Having the Committee for Council Reform and Progress make the decision of recommended nominees for Council thus smacks of potential illegitimacy.

3. One of the known problems in selecting Senators is that because of the high profile of being a Senator, students often apply for the position of Senator to embellish their resumés. Interviews have always been seen as a key part of vetting out these individuals. Since interviews were not conducted this year, there can be much less confidence that such individuals were filtered out.
4. Members of the Committee for Council Reform and Progress lacked any training in the role of the Senate nor explanation of how it fits into the broader picture of the external portfolio. It is unclear whether the Committee was properly briefed on for what they were making selections.

In any political organization like the Students' Union, process in hiring people is established to ensure that decisions are not the product of political favouritism or cronyism. Process ensures that people are selected on the basis of merit only. Indeed, a friend of mine who has applied for several Students' Union jobs and been rejected every time has come to believe that these selections are biased to select those already "in the system." However, I can point to process to show that the selections are, in fact, fair. Students' Council's foregoing of process in this instance is very worrying because the process of recommending Senators may now may be construed by some as being a political appointment, rather than a principled selection of the best individual. This would be a dangerous precedent to set. If the student population comes to believe that a committee of the most political body within the Students' Union makes patronage appointments to the Senate would greatly harm the reputations of the Students' Union and the University of Alberta Senate, not to mention the Students' Union's nominees to that body.

I therefore recommend that Students' Council reject the recommended nominees to the Senate and recommence with a truly rigorous process of selecting recommended nominees to the Senate. In particular, Council's negligence to ensure a sound procedure for recommending Senator nominees should not be accepted as reason to use a substandard process. Doing so devalues the reputations of the Students' Union and the Senate, cheapens the position of Senator, and casts doubt on Council's integrity.

Yours Sincerely,



M. Mustafa Hirji