

STUDENTS' COUNCIL LATE ADDITIONS

Tuesday December 2, 2008
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

LATE ADDITIONS (SC 2008-17)

- 2008-17/1 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS
- 2008-17/2 PRESENTATIONS
- 2008-17/3 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
- 2008-17/5 BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS
- 2008-17/6 GENERAL ORDERS
- 2008-17/6l **DOLLANSKY MOVES** That Bill #22 on the recommendation of CAC based on the following principles:
- Any member (s) of the Students' Union Executive Committee is eligible to serve as campaign managers of referenda/plebiscite sides without taking a leave of absence from their position as an executive.
Members of the Executive Committee must not use resources that are unavailable to all other opponents when campaigning or dealing with any matter directly related to the referenda/plebiscite question.
- 2008-17/6m **EASTHAM/QUEVILLON MOVES** to accept the drafted referenda question.
Please see document LA 08-17.01
- 2008-17/6n **EASTHAM/QUEVILLON MOVES** that Students' Council, upon the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, approve Bill #10 in second reading.
- Principle
- The Students' Union shall abolish the Capital Equipment Fee for full-time students as of April 30, 2009.
The Students' Union shall increase the SU Dedicated Fee for full-time students by \$2.73 / semester as of April 30, 2009.
LA 08-17.02
- 2008-17/7 INFORMATION ITEMS
- 2008-17/7f CAC Election Review

Please see document LA 08-17.03

2008-17/7g

Janelle Morin, President- Report

Please see document LA 08-17.04

2008-17/7h

Beverly Eastham, VP External- Report

Please see document LA 08-17.05

Date of Submission: Monday, November 17, 2008

Under Bylaw 2000 Section 13(3), Bylaw Committee must draft and approve a petition question by December 1, 2008 (fourteen days from submission).

Intent of Question:

To create a social justice committee within the Students' Union to critique firstly the Students' Union's and secondly the University's actions and policies through a social justice lens. The committee will ensure that the University and the Students' Union are actively and proactively considerate of the social and environmental consequences of their administrative decisions. The University of Alberta should be a model example of an educational institute that develops ethical global citizens and the Students' Union should be a model advocacy organization for this in order to better represent the interests of the caring and compassionate undergraduate student population.

Principles:

Social justice should be an internally driven pursuit and an integral part of every organization's daily functioning. An external group should not be needed to continually coerce an institute to be socially conscious.

Every institute, especially an educational one should be conscious of the social and environmental consequences of their actions.

An exposure to socially just practices especially in a post-secondary institute is vital to developing compassionate and thoughtful global citizens.

Mandate:

To have the Students' Union represent the Students' interest in eradicating poverty, creating a more sustainable environment, and combat human rights abuses by creating a Social Justice Committee administered by SU officials that will:

- Research and recommend policies to the Students' Union Executive which strive to make the Students' Union a model of global citizenship
- Attend the bi-weekly meetings of the Student Umbrella for Social Justice and contribute to the planning and execution of the main events if the Student Umbrella for Social Justice is in existence. Otherwise, collaborate with the individual social justice-focused groups on campus.
- Evaluate the Students' Union 's and the University's sources of funding, resources and purchases and gauge the ethicality of the sources and the products.
- Research and suggest alternative sources of goods and funding that are more ethical in terms of global environmental and social consequences.
- Look into opportunities for curriculum enhancement to bring a more global and socially just perspective to courses.

Do you support the creation of a Students' Union Social Justice Committee subject to the following conditions?

1. The Social Justice Committee would:
 - a) be a Standing Committee of Students' Council;
 - b) consist of five (5) members, at least three (3) of which would be members of Students' Council
 - c) be chaired by a member of the committee who is also a member of Students' Council

2. The Chair of the Social Justice Committee would:
 - a) attend meetings of the Student Umbrella for Social Justice so long as the Student Umbrella for Social Justice continues to exist

3. The role of the Social Justice Committee would be to:
 - a) critique the ethicality[†] of the Students' Union's and University's actions and policies;
 - b) research and recommend policies to the Students' Union Executive;
 - c) contribute to the planning and execution of the main events of the Student Umbrella for Social Justice so long as the Student Umbrella for Social Justice continues to exist;
 - d) collaborate with other social justice-focused groups*on campus in the event that the Student Umbrella for Social Justice ceases to exist;
 - e) evaluate the ethicality[†] of the Students' Union's and University's funding sources, resources, and purchases
 - f) research and recommend alternative sources of ethical[‡] goods and funding to the Students' Union and the University; and
 - g) look for opportunities to suggest changes to the University curriculum that would promote the study of social justice issues;

*social justice-focused groups shall, for the purpose of this question be defined as groups that aim to eradicate poverty, create a more sustainable environment, and combat human rights abuses

[†] Ethicality shall, for the purpose of this question be defined as practices that support sustainability, human rights and the eradication of poverty.

[‡]Ethical shall, for the purpose of this question be defined as the support of sustainable practices, human rights and the eradication of poverty.

Schedule to the Bylaw Respecting Students' Union Finances

Class A Fees				
<i>Reserve</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Indexing</i>	<i>Augustana</i>	
Eugene L. Brody Fund	F: \$0.37 P: \$0.37 S: \$0.00	CPI	Yes	
Access Fund	F: \$17.02 P: \$17.02 S: \$7.48	Tuition	Yes	
Capital Fund	F: \$2.73 P: 0 S: 0		No	
Class B Fees				
<i>Reserve</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Indexing</i>	<i>Augustana</i>	<i>Joint Consent</i>
Refugee Student Fund	F: \$0.43 P: \$0.43 S: \$0.00	CPI	Yes	World University Service of Canada Refugee Student Sponsorship Committee
CJSR-FM Fund	F: \$1.89 P: \$0.68 S: \$0.00	CPI	No	First Alberta Campus Radio Association of Directors
Golden Bear and Panda Legacy Fund	F: \$3.79 P: \$3.79 S: \$0.00	CPI	No	University Athletics Board of the University of Alberta
Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund	F: \$3.53 P: \$3.53 S: \$3.53	CPI	No	Recreation Action Committee of the University of Alberta
Student Legal Services of Edmonton Fund	F: \$0.65 P: \$0.65 S: \$0.00	CPI	No	Student Legal Services of Edmonton Board of Directors
Alberta Public Interest Research Group Fund	F: \$3.06 P: \$1.52 S: \$0.00	CPI	No	Alberta Public Interest Research Group Board of Directors
Gateway Student Journalism Fund	F: \$3.09 P: \$3.09 S: \$0.39	CPI	No	Gateway Student Journalism Society Board of Directors

Sept 9/08

Apr. 10/06

March 21/06

April 12/05 – Implemented May 1/05

April 5/05 – Implemented May 1/05

Class C Fees				
<i>Faculty</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Indexing</i>	<i>Expiry</i>	<i>Type</i>
Augustana	F: \$62.50 P: \$62.50 S: \$0.00	None	2009	FAMF
Engineering	F: \$4.00 P: \$4.00 S: \$0.00	None	2010	FAMF
Nursing	F: \$3.75 P: \$3.75 S: \$0.00	None	2012	FAMF
Business	F: \$7.50 P: \$7.50 S: \$0.00	None	2012	FAMF
Law	F: \$50.00 P: \$0.00 S: \$0.00	None	Does not expire	FMF
Engineering	F: \$25.00 P: \$0.00 S: \$0.00	None	Does not expire	FMF

Reserve: This is the reserve to which the fee is allocated, in accordance with Section 7 (8) of The Bylaw Respecting Students' Union Finances.

Level: This indicates the level of the fee, in accordance with Section 7 (3) of the Bylaw Respecting Students' Union Finances. "F" indicates the fee payable by each full-time student per Fall or Winter Term, "P" indicates the fee payable by each part-time student per Fall or Winter Term, and "S" indicates the fee payable by each student per Spring or Summer Term.

Indexing: This is the indexing provision of the fee. "CPI" denotes that the fee is indexed in accordance with Section 7 (7) of the Bylaw Respecting Students' Union Finances. "Tuition" denotes that the fee increases each year at the same rate as the increase in tuition and non-tuition fees charged by the University of Alberta.

Augustana: This indicates whether or not the fees are assessed to students at Augustana Faculty in accordance with Section 7 (7) of the Bylaw Respecting Students' Union Finances. "Yes" denotes that students at Augustana Faculty are assessed the fee at the same rate as all other undergraduate students. "No" denotes that this fee is not assessed to students at Augustana Faculty.

Joint Consent: This identifies the body which must consent to the amendment of the fee, as set out in Section 7 (6) of the Bylaw Respecting Students' Union Finances.

Sept 9/08

Apr. 10/06

March 21/06

April 12/05 – Implemented May 1/05

April 5/05 – Implemented May 1/05

Expiry: This indicates the year that a fee will cease to be collected in accordance with the provisions of the Bylaw Respecting Faculty Association Membership Fees.

Type: “FMF” denotes that the fee is a Faculty Membership Fee and is subject to the provisions of the Bylaw Respecting Students’ Union Faculty Membership Fees.
“FAMF” denotes that the fee is a Faculty Association Membership Fee and is subject to the provisions of the Bylaw Respecting Faculty Association Membership Fees.

Sept 9/08

Apr. 10/06

March 21/06

April 12/05 – Implemented May 1/05

April 5/05 – Implemented May 1/05

This is an intended rough backgrounder I have written up to help give context to the motions that are coming onto the council agenda for Tuesday.

These motions are on the order paper but I do have to issue a couple amendments on the floor (sorry :-)

Recommendations from Michael Janz: Election Review 2008-2009

Hello Council,

There is definitely need for a full FARCE 2.0 review of our elections system again and I would recommend Council looks into that in the future.

The motions that you see in front of you do not come from CAC but are being moved by me individually. CAC has discussed many topics related to the elections process throughout the year resulting in the motions in front of you. Process wise, this may seem rushed, but this is a result of poor scheduling with the long weekend and the cancellation of the Dec. 9th council in finals. It may seem like a rushed process, but I am doing my best to ensure that these discussions are as transparent and accessible as possible.

If you disagree with how this is being done, I will gladly step down as chair of CAC and allow you to facilitate the committee from here on at our next meeting in January.

CAC did do some trouble shooting with regards to elections on issues such as online voting, polling stations, discussions about adding additional forums (Augustana), the way votes are counted, joke candidates, and much more. Some of these discussions led to the upholding of the status quo, some led to heated debate that the committee felt should be heard by council. At the last meeting I said that I had been asked not to present all of the motions in a filibuster (or one set of motions) but rather introduce them individually so as more transparent discussion in front of students

council could take place.

This issue is very time sensitive as the Elections handbooks are being printed on January 23rd. If we waited to recommend these motions from CAC again it would not allow time for the changes to be processed. We want to allow as much time as reasonable for the CRO to implement changes.

I would like to thank the members of CAC and those keen councillors who came out to participate, the previous CROs Turner and Woynorowski who volunteered their time and brains, and of course, our CRO Patrick Wisheu who came to council meetings and lent their previous experience to the matters at hand. They in no way endorse or do not endorse these motions, but merely have acted as a resource.

The SU is a fluid organization that allows for continuous input of new ideas and should never be afraid of discussion. I am not particularly attached to any of these motions that I am moving, but I feel that because they have to do with our elections, they are best decided in full public view in front of the Gateway and the public at the meeting of Students' Council. I would hate to leave anyone with the impression that SU insiders are gerrymandering the electoral process or something like that.

My last caution: Think Big! The SU Should not be afraid of tinkering, changing something and trying out a new process: if it does not work for the elections, next year Council can always restore the process!

So please remember that we are **debating ideas not people, grab a copy of bylaw 2000, and follow along!** If you want to make edits, I will post them on michaeljanz.ca so even the non-facebook participants (Cough DEHOD) can participate.

1.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
Students' Union elections shall have anonymous voting.

The issue here is that nowhere in our Bylaws does it say that the voting should be anonymous. Students should be able to cast their ballot with the knowledge that their decision is a secret.

This bill would allow bylaw to make an addition clarifying that voting should be anonymous. An individual is still forbidden from voting twice, but now with online voting the CRO can remove their votes, without knowing who they voted for.

2.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
The CRO on is eligible to vote in plebiscites and referendum in the case of a tie.

WILL BE AMENDED TO:

**JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
The CRO is eligible to vote in plebiscites and referendum in the case of a tie.**

In the definition of a referendum and plebiscite the CRO is forbidden from voting, but later on in bylaw they are instructed to vote in the case of a tie.

This bill would clarify the discrepancy between our bylaws.

3.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
D.I.E. Board timelines and timelines for rulings by the CRO must be uniform during the election period. When conflicting, the shortest required time period shall take precedence.

The timeline for all D.I.E. Board rulings (whether in regards to Bylaw 2000 and elections or not) during the election should be uniform. All rulings by the CRO should also be uniform

68. (4) No appeal shall be considered by the D.I.E. Board unless it is received within twelve (12) working hours of the C.R.O.'s ruling being posted.

(5) Where a complete appeal is received, the D.I.E. Board shall convene a hearing within twelve (12) working hours of the appeal being submitted.

There have been confusions in the past on rulings during an election. If the hearing is in regards to bylaw 2000, there are different timelines than if the ruling is with regards to D.I.E. Board usual practices. What timelines should take precedence on a ruling: should it be the D.I.E. Board timelines? In the world of elections, the difference between 24 and 72 hours is very important and must be clarified. DIE Board is on notice to rule during elections within a shorter period, this is merely clarifying what those timelines are. An ordinary candidate might get quite confused when they can expect a ruling back from the CRO/D.I.E. Board and the hope with this bill is it would clarify this process.

This bill will force bylaw committee to unify the timelines between the CRO Rulings, and all D.I.E. Board rulings to an easily understandable format and when there is a conflict, Bylaw committee is to yield to the shortest required time period for the CRO or DIE Board to issue a ruling.

4.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles: Each candidate, campaign manager, **volunteer** and slate shall act reasonably and in good faith, and specifically shall

a. ensure that each volunteer engaging in campaign activities on his/her/its behalf

is aware of all bylaws, rules, regulations, and orders;

b. ensure that each volunteer is in compliance with all bylaws, rules,

regulations,
and orders while engaging in campaign activities on his/her/its behalf;
and
c. report any contravention of a bylaw, rule, regulation, or order to the
C.R.O.
immediately.

WILL BE AMENDED TO:

**JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
Each volunteer shall act reasonably and in good faith in
accordance with all bylaws, rules, regulations, and orders.**

From 2000:

- q. “campaign activity” shall be any act, planned or organized by or on behalf of any candidate, slate or side , that is calculated to convince members to vote in a given way;
- r. “volunteer” shall be any individual who assists in campaign activities;

This bill will allow volunteers to be held to the good faith principle instead of just candidates, the campaign managers and slates. Rarely do we have organized vandalism to candidates posters or materials, but this suggestion was recommended so that the CRO can hold volunteers of a side accountable for their actions.

If a volunteer for "Coke Yes" and put up extra posters for "Coke No" so that they get penalized, this bill gives the CRO the ability to penalize the malicious volunteers. Its about not just making sure volunteers are AWARE of bylaws, but also that they must be held accountable to them.

5.

**JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
During voting, candidates, campaign managers, members of sides and
volunteers can encourage members to vote.**

Currently reads:

56. Limitations During Voting

(1) During voting, candidates, campaign managers, members of sides and volunteers shall not encourage members to vote or engage in any campaign activities.

We have despicably low voter turnout and this is one of the most important issues facing the SU. Candidates spend a ton of time and SU money campaigning but when it actually comes to trying to get busy students to turn up at the ballots, we have legislatively tied our hands behind our back. This rule came from an attempt to over-regulate fairness in our process and I believe it is doing more harm than good to the elections.

The reason for this was you didn't want someone to have the chance to go and keep campaigning under the guise of getting out the vote. I do feel however that candidates and their teams should be able to go and classroom speak, talk to friends, talk to students and generally behave in good faith at trying to get the vote out for the elections. You can control candidates from campaigning because the stakes are too high for them. Just one classroom speech that was deemed not to be getting out the vote but campaigning, could resort in me getting disqualified (after weeks of hard work) from the election.

If a candidate still has time and energy to talk to people after the campaign period, they should be able to say "have you voted today?". This is considerably different from a platform speech.

This bill would allow candidates to say "I am not allowed to tell you who to vote for, but I can tell you to go and vote" A few years ago this used to be the case but then was changed to the current system where people are unable to say anything during the voting days about the election, period.

6.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:

Any member (s) of the Students' Union Executive Committee is eligible

to serve as a campaign manager or candidate without taking a leave of absence from their position as an executive if the race is uncontested. Members of the Executive Committee must not use resources that are unavailable to all other opponents when campaigning or dealing with any matter directly related to the election.

There is no definition for running unopposed but a win by NOTA or a Joke Candidate is handled as such.

(14) Where "None of the Above" is declared victorious, no further candidates shall be declared victorious.

(15) Where a joke candidate is declared victorious, the seat to which that joke candidate has been elected shall be considered vacant.

If a sitting member of the executive committee wishes to serve the student body for a second time they are required to take a leave of absence, surrender their keys, not check emails, and not come into the office for the three weeks they are contesting a position. When they are in a race with another student or executive, I absolutely agree with this rule as it continues to show fairness and deny anyone an unfair advantage. When an SU exec only has a few months before handing over the keys to their successor, losing 3 weeks of work is a serious hindrance to both the organization and the activities that the Exec can do for the student body.

A formal "leave of absence" is much different than "taking time off to campaign". The former requires a written letter, hand over of keys, complete digital email lockout, and a ban from the office. The latter requires the Exec to use their discretion when they are working as an Exec or as a Candidate.

While the SU has a "None of the above" option on their ballots, many municipalities and elections run on an acclamation system, where if a person puts their name forward, and is uncontested, they automatically win. I prefer the "NOTA" system that we have.

What does not make sense to me is when an incumbent exec is running unopposed for a position, that they are forced to take three weeks off to campaign against no one. Let's say there was a VPA running unopposed for BOG. That VPA would still be seen by

students as the current VPA, the students would know that the individual was running unopposed. Now the restriction against the use of non-universal resources still applies. The VPA could not use the su.ualberta.ca as a campaign platform or any other non-universal resource. They would have to have separate campaign materials, emails etc, and if they wanted to campaign for BOG, they would have to do it by taking time off of work, just as if they wanted to go and catch an afternoon matinee.

As a personal aside, when I was campaigning unopposed for BOG, students wouldn't believe me why I wasn't at work and they thought that I was just vacationing and taking time off. When I asked them if they thought I should be able to go into work and deal with issues, they said of course because I was running unopposed.

7.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:
Members of Students' Council and its standing committees are not required to take a leave of absence from those duties.
Members of Students' Council must not use resources that are unavailable to all other opponents when campaigning or dealing with any matter directly related to the election.

WILL BE AMENDED TO: JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:

Members of Students' Council and its standing committees are not required to take a leave of absence from those duties when they are contesting a position.

Members of Students' Council must not use resources that are unavailable to all other opponents when campaigning or dealing with any matter directly related to the election.

This is another one of those places where I believe council previous was overly attentive to procedure and not to pragmatism. Right now if you are a councillor who is planning on re-running for

Students' Council, you are required to take a leave of absence and not come to your council or committee meetings at what can be one of the most vital times of the year.

Should a councillor have to take a leave of absence to re-contest their position? Should a councillor have to take a leave of absence to run for GFC? Right now they would have to take leave to contest either positions.

If a councillor had to vote on something that had to do with their current candidacy, they would have to declare a conflict of interest and abstain. There are restrictions on media that they can use and if in any official capacity as councillor they used their website or anything, to their advantage they would be in contravention of the other bylaws.

This would forbid councillors from using resources unavailable to other students, but would not require the councillor to have to miss committees and Tuesday night meetings.

8.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:

Elected members of the Students' Union shall be free to act as volunteers for or endorse any candidate, plebiscite or referendum question, or slate.

Elected members of the Students' Union must not use resources that are unavailable to all other opponents when campaigning or dealing with any matter directly related to the Election.

There is an important distinction between Elected members of government and the Bureaucracy. In the SU there is a big difference between elected members of the Executive committee or Council and permanent staff or student staff positions. The bureaucracy should remain neutral during elections as they are not the elected side of the organization. The elected side of the organization is temporary in nature. serves for a short term, represent one in a line of many

leaders, and has different recall mechanisms and disciplinary structure than a permanent staff member.

One councillor speaks for themselves, not the SU. This is an important distinction must be kept in mind.

I see this as a significant problem for our organization. The elected members of the SU should be able to voice their thoughts regarding this a candidate or platform and if the students think they have credibility, they might listen. Of course on the other hand, the students might disagree with what the current incumbent stands for and then vote for someone else. The "election dissection" every year arbitrarily picks people they think 'know' the SU and readers are influenced by their writings. I do not believe that arbitrary selection should be the only 'informed' advice for voters. If candidates could list endorsements from councillors that would show that they have sought out current decision makers and have support for their ideas.

When I ran for President, there were quite a few former executives who still held sway around campus. Lettner, Power, Blatz, Kehoe, Johnson, D and many more were still around campus. I know that a couple did not support me (at the time. I converted them :-P), but that did not matter to my campaign because other executives were there who balanced out the competing opinions. And at the end of the day, I believe students are smart enough to make up their own minds!

Our SU needs to realize history goes beyond a one year snapshot. Who cares if Bush endorses McCain: if the people want Obama, they will get Obama.

If the VPX chooses to support candidate A over candidate B and C in a race, that is not a problem. With or without the VPX comments, the students are still free to make up their mind how they voted. If they thought that that particular VPX did a good job, they might care about their endorsement, but contrarily if they disapproved of the VPX, they may actively oppose the candidate that they sponsored.

If a VPA and a VPX are running for President and the

incumbent President is asked who has done a better job this year, the Incumbent president should be able (but not have to) to answer one way or another who they support. If executives know that they might want their coworkers endorsement for an election, they will be more likely to be amiable in the office- an added benefit for an executive team. If they answer one way or another it has no bearing on the working of the organization, the actions of the CRO, or anything else. If the President feels that someone's platform is a trojan horse, they should be allowed to say as much and campaign against it- *so long as they do not use resources that are unavailable to all other opponents.*

This bill will allow elected members of the students union the freedom of speech they should have at elections time, but it will ensure that the elected members do not use avenues of communication that are not accessible to other opponents. This will make for a more fair and accountable electoral system.

9.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:

No slate or slate candidate's campaign budget shall accrue more than four hundred and forty dollars (\$440) in expenses, including both slate and slate campaign expenses, all of which shall be paid by the Students' Union.

Slate financing is very unclear. There are certain advantages to running with a slate: You can pool resources, volunteers, candidates can share resources and plan elections strategy together, and much more. To counterbalance those suggestions and to prevent our SU from falling into a cycle of "Slate vs. Slate" elections that prevent newcomers from participating, the rules were changed so that slates could still operate and run accordingly, but they would be slightly financially penalized. Because you are promoting all of the candidates for a slate, you do not need to have the same financial resources

because there are some economies of scale.

The spirit of the legislation throughout bylaw seems to be that Slates should not be set up to have an excessive advantage over individual candidates, but they should also not be penalized too much. The concern with slates is that too often slate dominated elections can cause problems for individual candidates and the "jane student" who just wants to put their ideas forward and have a shot at winning. The resulting change would be from \$550 to \$440 to ensure our bylaws are reflective.

The question is, how should elections be held that do not stifle an independent candidates ability to compete.

This change was my attempt at giving the slates a slight financial disadvantage while maintaining their ability to compete and campaign.

10.

JANZ/KUSTRA moves Bill # based on the following principles:

The pre-campaigning period would be from thirty days before the plebiscite or referendum in the case of a plebiscite or referendum being initiated by a member via petition. The pre-campaigning period for Students' Council initiated plebiscites or referenda would begin with Students' Council's initiation of a plebiscite or referendum.

For clarification on this timeline please see:

12. Dates - Plebiscites and Referenda

Where the C.R.O. receives a valid petition or where Students' Council initiates a plebiscite

or referendum, then the plebiscite or referendum in question shall be held on the dates of the next general election not occurring within thirty (30) days of receipt of the valid petition or initiation by Students' Council of the plebiscite or referendum in question.

13. Plebiscite and Referendum Initiation

(1) Where a member wishes to initiate a plebiscite or referendum via petition, that member

shall submit to the C.R.O.:

..... Continued.....

This bill is to clarify when the pre-campaigning period starts for Referendums and Plebiscites. D.I.E. Board has ruled that currently the period is 113 days and I believe this is contrary to the spirit of the bylaws. This would change the 113 to 30 days.

This would allow you to go around and gather support for your question, but once you turn in the documents to the CRO then this becomes official. For Council initiated questions, the pre-campaign period would be when council initiates the question.

Feel free to email me or contact me anytime with questions that I can attempt to respond to. If you would like to amend them, please email me and I will help you out. I would hope that if we can give them to one another in writing instead of arbitrarily moving them on the floor of council. Like I said, some of these I like, some of these I am moving because CAC discussed them and I was searching to find something that would fit the discussion we had (like volunteer restrictions).

See you at my convocation party tomorrow night in RATT!

Michael Janz

Report to Council Edition 15.0

Janelle Morin, President 2008-2009

December 2, 2008

Dear Council:

It's been quite a semester – I can hardly believe it's over. I look forward to continuing to work with you all in January! This will be an incredibly important month for our advocacy efforts, so please continue to keep on top of your emails over the holidays. Best of luck with exams, and I hope you take some well-deserved time to yourselves following finals!

Minister Horner Meeting

Through CAUS, Bev and I attended question period on December 1st, followed by a meeting with Minister Horner. (Incidentally, this was a rousing day to be in the Legislature due in large part to federal upheavals.) During question period the NDP asked a set of post-secondary related questions in response to the media coverage we got on the front of the Edmonton Journal last week. In our meeting with the Minister, we had four primary asks: a rollback on tuition; increase to scholarships and bursaries; resources allocated to deferred maintenance; and support for residences. We received a positive response to several of these asks, and will continue to follow up on these priorities both at the government and institutional levels.

New Chancellor Installation

The SU sends a warm welcome to new Chancellor Linda Hughes. A former publisher and editor of the Edmonton Journal, head of Edmonton's task force on homeless, and an accomplished community leader, Chancellor Hughes brings a wealth of knowledge and a fresh perspective to the UofA. We look forward to working with her, and wish Chancellor Emeritus Newell best of luck in his future endeavours.

Budget, Finance and Property Committee

Of note, we were given some documentation at this committee related to rent increases, although not sufficient documentation as to answer all of our questions. We will continue to request information until our questions have been fully satisfied.

NASA/ AASUA/ GSA Stakeholder Meeting

Our respective groups met to look for areas of collaboration. We will continue to meet on an ongoing basis for the remainder of the year, and have identified some key priorities that we can jointly push to accomplish.

Joint Newsletter

The final joint newsletter of the semester was sent late last week. For next semester, please let me know if you have any thoughts/ ideas/ areas you see that could be improved for this initiative. (It should be in your ualberta account.)

Communications Plan: Winter Term

Our Marketing Director was undergoing transition this summer, followed by an extended medical leave. He is now back and functioning at full capacity, and we are working with him to develop a comprehensive outreach strategy for January, coupled with a long-term communications plan to recommend for future years. Our current long-term plan is becoming somewhat out of date, and lacks the resources to make substantial progress. We hope to have many updates in January regarding communications.

General Faculties Council

Our last GFC meeting of the semester was November 24th. Despite the convocation charge controversy, GFC did not have a motion on such for us to debate, and we anticipate further updates in January.

Institutional Access Plan

The University will be providing government with their institutional access plan in the next two weeks. We have had the opportunity to provide feedback through the committee structures, but will be providing recommendations for an improved student consultation process for next year's IAP. Of interest, there are planned enrollment expansions for all undergraduate faculties, but they are somewhat modest compared with expansions to our grad student population. Further, there is an emphasis on international student expansion. Finally, there are strong recommendations for residence spaces in the IAP.

Edmonton Alliance of Students

Bev and I had another interesting meeting with the EAS, at which we discussed municipal property taxes on residences and transit (in terms of U-Pass negotiations and expansion of the services).

Social Justice Brainstorm

As many of you will be aware, we've been talking with several of our social justice groups across campus to discuss how the SU can improve its ethicality and sustainability long term in terms of the products and services we provide. Starting in January, we will be meeting regularly to discuss what the SU can do to make strides in improving both areas. If there is any interest from Councillors in attending these meetings, please do not hesitate to contact me.

January Blitz

There is a lot of affordability work to come in January for which we will require Council and stakeholder support. You will all be receiving updates via email over Christmas, so please check!

Human Rights Office

There has been a substantial amount of discussion about the restructure of this office, and not enough information. As such, we will be holding an informational session either for Council or in the form of a town hall, in January or December, with University representatives to answer questions. I will take a straw poll to see which format and time Councillors would prefer. We are working on an official response to the restructure. Ultimately, embedding the Human Rights office in Audit can prevent potential conflicts of interest within the University, and the restructure was based at least in part on student recommendations to improve the current system. However, the process, timeline and communications have been problematic to say the least. We have had several meetings just recently to begin addressing these concerns. Of note: according to the University, there were no students with human rights cases at the beginning of the restructure, there have been no new student applicants since, and there are external government-trained human rights representatives to serve students and staff until the new structure is in place in January. Our Ombuds staff will not be asked to shoulder this responsibility in the interim, as has been rumoured.

Cheers,
Janelle

Report to Students' Council

December 2, 2008

Beverly Eastham, Vice-President (External)



Hello Council,

Since we last met...

Meetings, Meetings, Meetings!

Nov 19: NASA/ASUA/GSA (Non-Academic Staff Association/Academic Staff Association/Graduate Student Association) Meeting

Nov 19: Fall Convocation and Installation of Chancellor Linda Hughes

Nov 20: Student Finance Board

Nov 20: Honorary Degree Recipients Mr. Preston Manning and Dr. Bartha Knoppers Reception

Nov 21: I Study Arts because ___ !

Nov 25: DIE Board Request for Interpretation

Nov 16: EAS Meeting

Dec 1 – Dec 3: CAUS Budget Submission meetings and Open House

New ECAA (External Communications and Advocacy Advisor)

Our past ECAA recently left to pursue another career opportunity, and we have just rehired for the position. I am very excited to welcome Mr. Justin Kehoe to the advocacy team and am fully confident that he will do an amazing job of the position of ECAA which has recently undergone several changes. Please join me in welcoming Justin to the advocacy team and back to the SU family!

ASUA/NASA/GSA Meeting

Janelle, Kristen and I attended a meeting with representatives of ASUA, NASA and the GSA to talk about areas where we have similar concerns and discuss ways that we can work together in the future. It was an interesting meeting and we may continue meeting and we are considering meeting again in the winter term to further discuss some of the issues that were brought up.

Convocation and Installation of Chancellor Linda Hughes

Chancellor Linda Hughes was formally installed as the Chancellor of the University of Alberta at the convocation ceremony on November 19th. This of course, was also the day that our very own Governor Janz finally convoked. Congratulations to both Chancellor Hughes and Governor Janz, and a warm farewell to our newest Chancellor Emeritus, the very distinguished Chancellor Eric Newell!

CAUS UPDATE

Student Finance Board

Along with Duncan Wojtaszek (CAUS ED), and Adam Boechler (ACTISEC ED) and I presented to the Student Finance Board on November 20th on scholarships and student financial aid reform. The presentation was well received and appeared to be reasonably in line with the changes that SFB is hoping to work towards.

Budget Submission Reports

As was mentioned in a previous report, CAUS drafted a budget submission that we sent to all three provincial political parties. CAUS met with Harry Chase (Liberals) on Monday, November 17th, with the Honourable Minister Horner yesterday, and will be meeting with Rachel Notely

(NDP) today to discuss our submission and the direction that we would like to see the provincial government move in, in regards to Post-Secondary Education. The two meetings that we have had so far were quite good, and our suggestions were reasonably well received. Hopefully these meetings and our submission will help us to find a few more student-friendly measures introduced in the provincial budget.

EAS Update

The EAS had yet another very productive meeting on November 16th. We discussed issues that have come up on each of our campuses and for each of our Student Associations/Unions that we should all be aware of. We also discussed areas that our three SAs would like to work on together, and worked on the very initial planning steps for the EAS presentation that we are hoping to give to City Council in the winter term. I am very happy with the meetings that EAS has had so far this year. While there was some difficulty getting everyone together, things seem to be running much more smoothly lately and the possibility for real collaboration grows each time we meet.

CASA Update (and chaos in Ottawa)

Most of my work with CASA is still through my involvement with the Policy Committee, as well as staying in contact with the CASA home office staff as to the possible developments that we may see in terms of leadership changes within the next week or so. CASA is also re-evaluating a number of different issues in light of the collapse of global capitalism. This has created a number of changes for a number of demographics and has some dramatic impacts for both students and the families/parents trying to support their students.

The annual CASA Lobby Conference appears to be up in the air again, as instability at the federal level continues to reign chaos on us all. Keep posted – we should know more by next Monday, but until then it seems that things will remain in a state of constant flux. These are interesting times, my friends!

We Want YOU!

Are you thinking of running in the exec elections? If not, now is a good time to start thinking about what you might want to be doing next year. If being and SU executive seems like something you would be interested in, please come and talk to myself or any of the other executives. We would be more than happy to entertain your questions and provide you with any information that you may need.

As always, feel free to email, call or schedule a coffee meeting if you have questions.

Cheers,
~ B