

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday October 3, 2006
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ORDER PAPER (SC 2006-12)

- 2006-12/1 **SPEAKER'S BUSINESS**
- 2006-12/1a Announcements – The next meeting of Students' Council will take place on Tuesday October 17, 2006.
- 2006-12/2 **PRESENTATIONS**
- 2006-12/2a Bill Smith, General Manager presents on the Single Source Cold Beverage Agreement.
- 2006-12/3 **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**
- 2006-12/3a Executive Committee – September 29, 2006

Please see document SC 06-12.01
- 2006-12/4 **QUESTION PERIOD**
- 2006-12/5 **BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**
- 2006-12/6 **GENERAL ORDERS**
- 2006-12/6a **COURNOYER MOVED THAT** Students' Council adopt a Political Policy based on the following principles:

That the University of Alberta Students' Union advocate for a financial aid system that:
- produces lower levels of public debt by delivering a greater proportion of non-repayable assistance up front, including but not limited to grants and bursaries;- is accessible to all Albertans based on demonstrated academic standing and addresses the real financial need,
- recognizes the complete overhead costs of education to the learner including, but not limited to rent and utility costs, textbook costs, transportation costs, food, personal care, and learning technology costs;
- better recognizes the diversity and individuality of the learner by accounting for varying living situations affected by geography, household configuration and alternate modes of study;
- includes adjustments to all forms of financial assistance to reflect rapidly changing market realities as related to the student 'basket of goods,' especially housing;

And that the University of Alberta Students' Union advocate for immediate changes to the student loan system to include:

- the removal of the part-time earning exemption;
- the enhancement of scholarship exemptions and spousal working exemptions;
- the removal of the parental contribution requirement;
- to improve the remission program to be more predictable, transparent and accessible;
- to lower interest rates on the Alberta portion of all new and outstanding student loans.

Please see document SC 06-12.02

2006-12/6b

COURNOYER MOVED THAT Students' Council adopt a Political Policy based on the following principles:

That the University of Alberta Students' Union oppose the introduction of an income-contingent loan repayment scheme for the Alberta Student Loan Program that:

- Seeks to permit institutions to further increase tuition at Alberta universities;
- Through the use of annual interest rates ensures that lower-income Albertans pay more for their education than higher-income Albertans;
- Erodes the commitment of government to funding public post-secondary education or transfer the responsibility for funding from government to students and their families.

Please see document SC 06-12.03

2006-12/6c

HENRY MOVED THAT Students' Council adopt a Political Policy based on the following:

Student Space: study space (varying from study space on the main floor of SUB to study space on the fourth floor (quiet) of Cameron library), activity space for student groups, administrative space for student groups.

The University does not provide adequate student space as defined above. Building development and space allocation policies must accurately anticipate the needs of not simply a cross-section of students that currently attend U of A, but also a reasonable approximation of the demographic of students the building might eventually serve over its lifespan. The arrangement of student space provided by the university must take into consideration student needs for gathering, studying, evolving and learning from one another.

2006-12/6d

HENRY MOVED THAT Students' Council adopt a Political Policy based on the following:

A great University is built by providing an enriched academic environment, which includes top quality research as well as excellent classroom instruction. However, research must always be considered an aspect of the University valued as equally important when compared to undergraduate education. The Students' Union shall endeavor, through all possible avenues, to ensure that research at the University of Alberta is appropriately contextualized within the larger framework of the institution's structure.

2006-12/6e

HENRY MOVED THAT Students' Council adopt a Political Policy based on the following:

The quality of instruction in the classroom, especially at the undergraduate level, is of paramount importance to every member of the University community and essential to the future of the institution. The Students' Union should endeavor to create and support programs and conditions that serve to promote the importance of teaching, reward excellent practice and emphasize education in pedagogical improvement.

2006-12/7

INFORMATION ITEMS

2006-12/7a

David Cournoyer, Vice President (External) – Report

Please see document SC 06-12.04

2006-12/7b

Amanda Henry, Vice President (Academic) – Report

Please see document SC 06-12.05

Executive Committee Report to Students' Council October 3, 2006

- 1. There were no motions passed at the September 26, 2006 Executive Committee meeting.**
- 2. There were no motions were passed at the September 28, 2006 Executive Committee meeting.**

U of A SU Issue Background Brief

Public Student Financial Assistance in Alberta

September 2006

A many-splendoured aid

A number of different forms of student aid, administered by different agents, are available to Alberta students. Perhaps the most high-profile form of aid is the public student loan; however, in tandem with publicly-administered repayable aid, there is also a mix of public needs-based non-repayable assistance (government grants/bursaries) which are administered under the Alberta Student Financial Assistance program – Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation grants and the Alberta Opportunity Bursary, for example. It bears mentioning also that there are government merit-based academic scholarships, such as the Alexander Rutherford, Jason Lang and Louise McKinney awards, though these merit awards are not strictly understood as aid, which is usually understood to be in some way ‘needs-based.’

Institutions may also administer repayable short-term emergency loans and bursaries, as does the U of A (and even the U of A SU vis a vis the Access Fund), in addition to the institutional merit awards you would expect. Finally, students who have either maxed out their public student loans or who are ineligible for same, can turn to private loans from financial institutions. From a public policy standpoint, however, the main area which can reasonably be lobbied is the public aid component; it bears considering, however, that poorly-considered changes to the public aid system could simply force more students toward private commercial (bank) financing solutions which are substantially less forgiving than public loans.

How public student aid is administered to Albertans

First of all, it is important to note that Albertans receive loans from their home province even if they study elsewhere. Similarly, if a resident of Saskatchewan choses to study in Alberta but maintains Saskatchewan residency, his or her student aid will be administered by the home province. Nevertheless, there is significant commonality between most Canadian students since 60% of any loan comes from the Canada Student Loans (CSL) Program.

The Alberta Student Financial Assistance Program, like most of its provincial counterparts, handles the application for both provincial and federal assistance, and delivers 40% of the initial loan. Both levels of government may deliver some of the assessed aid on non-repayable terms, as with the Millennium Scholarship Foundation bursaries on the part of the Federal government. The provincial program also delivers some targeted non-repayable aid for high-need, northern and rural students.

Until very recently, the process was completely paper-based, but in the last year the province has managed to launch and de-bug the on-line loan application system at alis.gov.ab.ca.

Who is eligible, and for what?

The Alberta Student Financial Assistance program notes the following principles for delivering aid:

- The cost of post-secondary education is a shared responsibility among students, parents, spouses/partners and government.
- Assistance is intended to be supplemental to student and family resources. Assistance is awarded based on financial need.

Source: http://www.alis.gov.ab.ca/pdf/studentsfinance/SFCC_FAQ.pdf

This means that students should be dependant on family/household resources if the family/household is of sufficient means. It also indicates that aid is awarded on an inversely proportionate basis to those available resources – that is, aid calculations are based on a ‘means test.’ This is rendered thusly in the Alberta Student Financial Assistance literature:

The student financial assistance a student receives is the shortfall between your eligible expenses and your resources, ie. **your allowable expenses – your resources = your assistance (loans and grants).**

‘Allowable expenses’ consist of:

- 1) **Direct costs of education:** tuition + mandatory fees + books, supplies and instruments
- 2) **Allowable overheads:** living costs + child care (if required)

The allowable overheads are deemed as follows:

- Single student living with parents: **\$362***
- Single student living away from parents: **\$787** (based on shared accommodation)
- Single parent with one child: **\$1,361 + child care**
- Married/common law couple: **\$1,565**
- Married/common law couple with children: **\$1565 + \$376 per child + child care**

*Single students out of high school less than four years whose parents reside within commuting distance of the schools (ie. Public transit is available) are expected to live in their parent’s home.

‘Your resources’ may include the following:

- 1) An ‘expected contribution’ of either savings or part-time earnings
- 2) Part-time earnings during study (the first \$400/mo being exempted)
- 3) Academic awards (scholarships – the first \$3500 being exempted)
- 4) Bursaries and stipends
- 5) Government agency funding
- 6) Other Income (e.g. children's benefits, pensions, rental property)
- 7) RRSPs (with some exemptions)
- 8) Assets (including spouse/partner assets)
- 9) Vehicles (less a \$5000 exemption)
- 10) Spousal contributions (spousal earnings less \$200/mo, if applicable)
- 11) Parental contribution:
 - is required from parents of single students unless you have been out of high school four years or more or you have been available to work full-

- time for 2 or more years
- if more than one student in the family is attending a post-secondary institution, parental contribution is divided by the number of children attending
- sources of parental contribution may include a Registered Education Savings Plan (RESP) and Canada Scholarship Trust Fund

There are maximum loan amounts federally and provincially: the maximum loan a student can obtain each year (\$12,440); similarly, there are lifetime loan limits by program (\$50K for most undergraduate programs, more for professional programs and subsequent degrees, to a max of \$95K for Medicine & Dentistry).

Loan Relief:

The first type of loan relief is **interest relief**: while continuing enrolled in full-time study, no interest accrues on the loans accumulated to that point. Similarly, no interest is applied to the loan in the six months immediately after graduation. These provisions hold for both the federal and provincial loan components.

The other type of loan relief is direct debt reduction, or 'remission' as we know it in Alberta. Alberta applies remission relief at two points in the course of study: 1) after the first year, the "**Alberta Student Loan Relief Benefit**" – for first-time, first-year, full-time, post-secondary students with at least \$7,140 in debts; and 2) the "**Loan Relief Program Completion Payment**" – for completing post-secondary students (for four-year degree recipients this requires a minimum debt level of \$22,140 to qualify for remission).

CSL also offers a small debt relief program, but only for extreme need cases. Incidentally, since 1997 it has been illegal to declare bankruptcy on a student loan. The dubious constitutionality of this was unsuccessfully challenged in a Canadian Federation of Students lawsuit.

For what it's worth, the interest paid annually on an outstanding public student loan is eligible for a tax credit worth 25.5% of the interest for that tax year.

Repayment:

Normally the loans are repayable immediately upon expiry of the six-month interest-free grace period after graduation. A loan holder may select between two punishing interest options: 1) a fixed interest rate of prime plus 5% at time of negotiation; or, 2) a floating interest rate of prime plus 2.5% at time of negotiation. At the moment these are the same provincially and federally, though the province has given some indication that this could change (reduce) in the near future; the trouble is that because of significant remission programs from the province, the provincial loan amounts are much smaller than the federal ones, 40% or (more often than not) less of the total, ergo interest relief doesn't do much.

Challenges to the system:

Living costs are escalating much faster than the loan calculation allowances. Further, living costs have increased substantially more in some parts of the province than in others (e.g. Fort McMurray more so than Red Deer) and there are substantial disparities in cost between the large urban centres and smaller rural settings; either way, the averages amounts are generally considered to be insufficient almost anywhere in the province.

Despite the design of the aim of the system to extend opportunities for participation in spite of economic situation, participation in post-secondary education continues to be dominated by students who come from wealthier families, with 83.4% of youth from families in the highest income quartile attending post-secondary education, compared to 53.3% for youths from the lowest income quartile.⁷ [Statistics Canada, *Access, Persistence and Financing: First Results from the Post-Secondary Education Participation Survey*. (Statistics Canada, 2003)]

The current student financial aid system is failing students on both ends of the equation. Many students are not receiving enough financial aid to complete their program, or even to meet their basic living costs while they study. Limitations in the monthly living allowance calculation, as well as thresholds on part-time earnings, scholarships, and spousal and parental contributions, all contribute to the loss of financial aid accessible to students and do not correspond to students' life circumstances. And at the other end of the spectrum, students (particularly those who don't fit the mould in one way or another, for instance being part-time learners) are stuck with both insufficient resources and punishing debt loads.

Again, however, the provincial government's capacity to alter the system is limited by the fact that 60% or more of a students' loan burden remains under federal jurisdiction; and, so far at least they refuse to apply remission to the federal portion of the loan. Consequently, the idea of pulling out of Canada Student Loans altogether and administering student assistance wholly on a 'Made in Alberta' basis surfaces from time to time. It was thought to have been dismissed during the Learning Alberta process, but seems to have resurfaced with Minister Herard's appointment. The upside would be that remission programs could be expanded to tackle a greater portion of the debt, or the whole system could more easily be realigned towards offering a progressively higher grant/loan mix according to need. The downside is that the system could also be perverted much more easily into a high debt model operating on an elaborate income-contingent basis (imagine the Brick's gimmicky 'don't pay a cent event' meshed with the tenacity of a Columbia House contract).

Finally, there is a difficulty in requesting adjustments to reduce the resources (such as reductions in parental contribution thresholds) and increasing the allowable expenses (increased living allowances, or greater part-time earning and vehicle exemptions) since without other changes – such as increasing the ratio grants to loans – this simply functions to increase students' debt levels, which we have traditionally opposed.

U of A SU Issue Background Brief

Income-Contingent Loan Repayment (ICLR) Schemes

September 2006

Summary

An idea hatched by Milton Friedman over 50 years ago, the scheme in its purest form involves receiving a loan to cover the full cost of post-secondary studies, repayable upon graduation as a percentage of income above a certain exempt threshold. However, there are several dangerous pitfalls regarding how the principle loan would be determined and how the repayment calculations post-study would be determined. But more concerning to students is that income-contingent loans increasingly transfers education costs to students and their families, a trend that has increased the financial barriers to Alberta's colleges, universities and technical institutes over the past decade.

Determining an award under an income-contingent loan repayment scheme is often similar to our current system, however fewer restrictions on parental income and included resources may be involved. In determining the total debt load of students upon completing their studies, income-contingent loans rarely include contingency programs such as remission or other debt forgiveness. Students are expected to pay back the total amount loaned out as the starting principle.

Repayment is based on a percentage of income, either as a flat-rate or on a sliding scale. As well, interest is charged against the principle, which means those who take longer to pay off their loan ultimately pay far more for their education. Those who take longer, by definition, are those whose income is low – the poor will pay more for their education than the rich.

Student debt is a real problem for Albertans – and income-contingent loan repayment is not the solution. Real debt by graduates will increase, and paying that debt back will often will become a lifelong endeavour.

Detailed analysis

The case for some form of ICLR scheme is seductive in part because the adjectives 'flexible' and 'equitable' are often found in the same sentence. But the need for loans that are more flexible and equitable is the result of dipping funding and rising costs to students, while ICLR is simply a financing scheme, not a meaningful funding and affordability remedy.

Furthermore, while it is true that there are incarnations of ICLR that may in fact be decidedly more flexible and substantially more equitable than our current loan system, our specific objection to the implementation of ICLR is the very real possibility of an inflexible and inequitable incarnation of ICLR. Perhaps the most often-quoted cliché applied in the debate is that 'the devil is in the details.' And thus, further on, we shall address the details of ICLR systems.

Before discussing the particulars, however, it must be clearly understood that we harbour a number of philosophical objections to the very consideration of ICLR, and these should be understood as the underpinning of our position:

1. Radical reforms to the loan system have arguably only come to the fore because education is no longer seen as affordable thanks to grievous increases in costs. There is demonstrable cause and effect at play here, and loan reform only seeks to change the effects, and does not itself address the root cause.
2. No amount of tinkering with the student loan reform will fill the premier's promise for the country's most affordable tuition policy. When you buy a fridge at the Brick for \$1000 and pay for it next year it is effectively the same fridge at the same price as if you bought it today. 'Flexible' payment absolutely does not affect the substance of the transaction.
3. The underlying philosophical basis of ICLR that the individual who shall benefit (financially) most of their education should be the main bearer of that cost is anathema to us.

To expand upon the first and second points, it is our belief that the very fact that loan reform is in question amounts to an admission that the costs of education have skyrocketed well beyond the capacity of the loan system meant to help students manage those costs. **And since we generally do not accept that those costs are fair as they stand, to accept loan reform would be inconsistent with our firmly held position on tuition rates.**

Though we recognize that each student certainly has a stake in their future, we do not see this as a closed system. The future relies as much on having skilled graduates. To conceive of cost and benefit in ICLR's atomistic philosophical terms is ignorant of the pivotal role of higher education in the development of societies. **Furthermore, it is our position that students' stake in their education is already significant enough in terms of the opportunity costs, hardships and time investment of studying as opposed to working.** Why then, other than for the sake of fiscal expediency, is it necessary to make students pay significant sums on top of this already significant commitment?

Nevertheless, it is perfectly understandable that ICLR is being considered (although we hope it is just part of a complete spectrum of possibilities) since the idea has taken root in a number of international jurisdictions, and found traction in both Quebec and Ontario more recently. With respect to the Rae Review's findings in Ontario, it is easier to understand their position on ICLR since a deficit-wracked government is in no position to feasibly relax the tuition burden on students. In their case, finance reform may be the only feasible option. But since the 'there's no money' excuse really has no basis in fact in the Alberta context, the more viable and to-the-point option of addressing affordability at the point of initial cost cannot be dismissed. **This is a political climate of opportunity, not one of compromise, so why be seduced by the desperate confabulations of other jurisdictions who have been forced to compromise?**

To restate, then, in other words: ICLR or any other radical reform of the loan system is a reactive solution to an artificial problem; that artificial problem is the cost barrier born of

the injurious tripling of tuition over the last fifteen years, a problem this jurisdiction could easily attack directly.

Specifics:

Since the question has been raised, we saw fit to carefully consider the whole of the ICLR landscape and discuss some of the essential strengths and weaknesses of the phenomena. Understand, however, in no uncertain terms that the following comments should not be construed as an endorsement of any kind of ICLR. Given all this qualification, however, it comes to this: ICLR is just an idea. Contrary to what some student groups would have us believe, it is not inherently evil, though it does have philosophical underpinnings that are unpalatable to some. Like any public policy, however, it can look good on paper and turn out poor in implementation; or worse, fundamental characteristics that initially made said policy palatable are sometimes subject to change, rendering it woefully disagreeable.

In respect of the elements of a hypothetical good ICLR system, there are a number. There are usually six facets to a so-called 'hard' or 'true' ICLR system, which we shall recap and then consider point by point:

1. An income threshold below which no payments are required
2. A fixed rate of repayment of marginal income above the threshold
3. A lengthy repayment period
4. No real interest on the loans
5. Universal coverage (all can and do participate)
6. Loan collection through the income tax system

In respect of the first three, obviously the minimum threshold and the proportional payment on income above it are the defining characteristics of income-contingency; likewise a lengthy repayment period is understood as implicit given the so-called 'flexibility' afforded to low-income grads.

In point four enters the rub – real interest neutrality. In a number of jurisdictions (most notably New Zealand) ICLR was introduced as real interest-neutral – i.e. that the full cost of real interest (beyond CPI) would be subsidized for the length of the loan. That promise lasted three years. A system of ICLR which fails to guarantee a real interest subsidy is an unfair and regressive system; by the same token, one which does would represent an improvement over the current system. It is important to note that for an ICLR system to be truly equitable it must not compound the loan by any more than overall inflation, otherwise there is an implicit benefit for those who pay sooner – i.e. those who earn more, which would be regressive. In order that a prospective student, who may not even anticipate the impact of long-term interest rate uncertainty, much less understand it, be protected from compounding debts outpacing payments, the interest rate neutrality of an ICLR loan must be guaranteed. It is true that such a guarantee would represent a major benefit to student borrowers, but the significant benefit comes at significant public cost, particularly during a period of high real interest, and as such would require a serious and unswerving public commitment. **To be absolutely clear, an equitable ICLR system**

would have to entrench this real interest neutrality; any exception to or departure from this would render the system implicitly unfair for lower income graduates and as such would be completely unacceptable to us.

The question of universal coverage has two dimensions in our view: firstly, it means that all persons would have access to the loans regardless of means tests and, in particular, expectations of parental contribution, since the basis of the system is the post-degree financial position, not that at time of entrance. Secondly, **universality would mean that benefit would be equally shared, meaning that those who can afford to completely discharge the loan upon graduation should receive absolutely no financial break or incentive for doing so, as this would almost universally represent an inequitable subsidy to the wealthy.** Although we are, on the one hand, troubled by the implications of permissive lending and high debt as poor socialization (and again dispute its very need), a useful ICLR system must make room for everyone regardless of circumstance.

As for loan collection through the tax system, this is one plus for 'hard' ICLR since this is a much more direct and efficient way to collect payment than the existing separate collections apparatus, though it has been criticized in some jurisdictions for creating animosity and undermining the self-reporting 'honour' basis of the tax system. Whether this could be implemented for Alberta probably depends on whether ICLR is adopted nationwide and hinges on the integration of Canada Student Loans and the federal tax collection system, which seems unlikely in the short term. It also bears mentioning that if the implementation of this system were to coincide with a tax cut, then the message would be that graduates can expect to effectively pay a higher tax for a period after their graduation, while non-grads and former-grads enjoy the tax benefit; people will see right through this. Tangentially, and on a more pragmatic note, were Alberta to adopt ICLR it would be better to do so in tandem with CSL and other jurisdictions, or for Alberta to opt out of CSL entirely in order to avert borrower confusion over two different systems.

Make no mistake: an implementation of ICLR would represent a tectonic shift – it would represent a change in the 'social contract' between government and citizens, most especially prospective students and their parents. The reason for putting it in these terms is that for student advocates to be able to hypothetically accept any ICLR system it would not only have to embrace the critical attributes noted above, but government would need to declare and promise in no uncertain terms that these terms were enshrined and fully above political whim. These promises would include:

1. A fair and reasonable minimum payment threshold, itself adjusted to CPI
2. A fair and reasonable set marginal rate of repayment above the threshold
3. Full and irrevocable real interest subsidy for all time, no ifs ands or buts
4. Universal coverage and equal benefit for all participants
5. No early discharge discount
6. An unqualified commitment to ongoing cost-based regulation of tuition

With respect to the final point, palatability of an ICLR implementation would ride overwhelmingly on the unequivocal guarantee that tuition rates would continue to

be regulated, unlike a number of jurisdictions (including Britain, Australia, & New Zealand) where tuition rates have exploded in tandem with ICLR implementation.

Under these hypothetical circumstances, *and these circumstances only*, an ICLR scheme would represent an improvement over the current loan system. Any abbreviation or reversal of even one of these foundational conditions would render the system a step sideways or backwards. Again, though, this should not be construed as an outright endorsement of ICLR since we continue to advocate for a philosophically different approach. We still ardently maintain that the best course of action includes conversion of core aspects of the loan system to grants in tandem with removal of the parental contribution expectation, plus a rollback and subsequent cost-based regulation of tuition.

UPDATES

CAMPUS CAMPAIGNS!: On September 27, we held a tuition payment event titled the "March for Affordable Tuition." We made a statement on SUB Stage and then marched to the Admin Building with our **GIANT CHEQUE** with a total \$2030.28 – what would be a much more affordable cost of tuition that U of A students would see today had the Provincial Government implemented their soon to be CPI increased tuition policy before the massive tuition increases of the 1990's. **Thanks to the Exec Members, Councillor Dollansky, and SU volunteers who came out!** We received media hits from the Gateway, Global TV, CBC Radio, and VUE Magazine.

IMPORTANT! On Thursday October 5 from 11am to 1pm, we will be holding a **Town Hall Discussion** in the **SUB Alumni Room** on the future of Post-Secondary Education in Alberta. Invited Guests include the Minister Denis Herard, Liberal MLA Dave Taylor, an NDP MLA, Public Interest Alberta's Bill Moore-Kilgannon, and much more. I will be doing classroom speaking to promote the event.

It's really important that Councillors show up and participate in this broad discussion on PSE issues. It will be a great way to learn more about the issues affecting students at the U of A. TELL YOUR FRIENDS!

EXTERNAL POLICY IS IMPORTANT: Where do you think the SU should be externally heading? **Share your ideas!** Chat with me, EPC Chair Chris Samuel, or other EPC members. *Let's get those creative juices flowing!* 😊

HIGH SCHOOL LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE: AVPX Pam Aranas is looking for **volunteers** to be part of this year's High School Leadership Conference on November 24 & 25 – contact Pam at avpex@su.ualberta.ca.

NEW TUITION POLICY: I was expecting Minister Herard to announce the new "affordability" package before the end of September, but it may now be announced in October. The draft of the policy included tying annual tuition increases to CPI, setting tuition at 2004 levels, and decreasing interest rates on student loans. Though it includes some positive baby steps, it does not go nearly far enough in ensuring that PSE in Alberta is truly affordable.

STUDENT FINANCE BOARD: On September 21, I made a presentation to the Student Finance Board. The presentation spanned issues from the affordable housing crisis for students to the future of the Millennium Scholarship Foundation.

U-PASS: We are continuing to negotiate with the University for their investment in the U-Pass project. Negotiations are taking place at the Budget Advisory Committee.

Advocacy Director Don Iveson and I have been meeting with the University Administration to figure out what the administrative framework of a U-Pass would look like if a question were to be brought forward and passed by a referendum next spring.

UNITED WAY EVENT: This year, the SU has joined forces with the GSA to hold an event for the United Way. It will be a music night on **October 13 at 7:30pm** at **Dinwoodie**. **Trevor Tchir** will be displaying his musical talent! Tickets are \$10. Email Pam Aranas for tickets (avpex@su.ualberta.ca).

FACT OF THE TWO WEEKS: In the last fifteen years (since 1991), tuition has more than tripled from \$1413 to \$4537.

Upcoming:

September 29	Grand Opening of the Faculty of Native Studies U-Pass Meeting
September 30	Breakfast with the Chancellor at the Lister Centre Safewalk Volunteer Orientation
October 2	CAUS Conference Call
October 4	Budget Advisory Committee U-Pass Meeting
October 5	PSE Town Hall Discussion from 11 to 1 in SUB Alumni Room
October 10	Public Interest Alberta PSE Task Force Meeting
October 11	LEAF Breakfast
October 13	SU/GSA United Way Concert
October 16	Meeting with the Alberta Chamber of Commerce
October 17	Meeting with the Alberta Teacher's Association
October 23-25	Rural Outreach to Grande Prairie & Peace River
October 26/27	Gone to Calgary – U of C SU Political Action Week!
November 24/25	High School Leadership Conference

Questions about this report? Got an external issue? Let me know in person, by phone -492.4236, or by email vp.external@su.ualberta.ca.

Amanda Henry, Vice President (Academic)
Report to Students' Council
September 29th, 2006

Updates

It's been seven days. If you're really so bored that you need to read a report of mine, read last week's.

Seriously.

Ok fine. Here's the highlights in 55 words or less.

Professor of the Week! – THIS IS IMPORTANT.

First winner to be announced in October 5th's Gateway.

Now, onto the other important stuff.

CoFA – Went well. Thanks to the ESA for hosting. October meeting is on student space.

The ACADEMIC PLAN...

A big deal.

GFC – Took 13 hours of my life this week.

Word Count: 55. Ha!

Professor of the Week

Excellent **teaching** is the foundation of an **outstanding undergraduate education** and the university community needs to begin to value everyday achievements in undergraduate teaching. The Students' Union is looking to recognize professors who demonstrate sincere enthusiasm for teaching undergraduates and a willingness to go above and beyond what is normally expected of a professor. We're looking for professors with interesting and innovative methods of engaging students in the learning process and an exceptional grasp of the subject that they teach.

Professor:

Course for which they are being nominated:

Reasons for nomination (attach additional space if necessary)

Nominations can also be picked up/submitted at any Faculty Association office or InfoLink desk, or at the SU Executive Office front desk. Nominations can also be emailed to the Associate VP-Academic Tasneem Karbani at avpa@su.ualberta.ca.