University of Alberta Students' Union

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Saturday, February 2, 2019
4:00PM
SUB 0-51, Students' Union Building

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

CALLED TO ORDER AT 4:00PM

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS (SC-2018-19)

2018-19/0 **SMUDGING CEREMONY**

2018-19/1 **SPEAKERS BUSINESS**

2018-19/1a Announcements - The next meeting of the Students' Council will take place on **Tuesday, February 5, 2019** at 6:00PM in **3-04 in Pavillon Lacerte**, at Faculty Saint Jean.

SPEAKER: Established that items *2018-19/2,3,4,6* will be skipped as a meeting occurred in the last week and another meeting will occur in the next week.

2018-19/2 **PRESENTATIONS**

2018-19/3 **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

2018-19/4 **BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORT**

2018-19/5 **OPEN FORUM**

2018-19/6 **QUESTION PERIOD**

2018-19/7 **BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2018-19/8 **GENERAL ORDERS**

2018-19/8a **RIPKA/BILAK MOVE** to approve the Students Spaces referendum question as follows:

"It would cost over $1 billion to address all maintenance needs on campus. Government funding for updating university facilities usually leaves out student

spaces, such as study and community areas across campus.

A potential student spaces levy would cost $9/term in Fall 2019, would increase by up to $9/term in both Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 to a maximum of $27/term, and would match the rate of inflation afterward.

The resulting fund would be student-controlled. Students would be able to create proposals for a student space they would like created or changed, which would be finally decided on by elected members of the Students' Council. Proposals must be to maintain or renew student spaces across campus or in SUB that would not be eligible for government funding.

Augustana will be exempt from this levy. Would you support this levy?"

See SC-2018.19.05.

RIPKA: Established that the attached report answers questions and provides greater clarity to councillors. Emphasised that the executive endeavoured to be open as possible in consulting councillors since September 4th. Suggested that the proposal supports the Students' Union Building and the comfort of the Campus community. Noted that the University has agreed to work with the Students' Union on the proposal. Emphasised that Council is to vote on whether students should consider the question and not on the character of the proposed Levy.

SUNDAY/FLAMAN moved to enter the meeting into a committee of the whole. Carried.

MOGALE: Inquired into whether Council may have a break to review new information coming from surveys since the last meeting.

SPEAKER: Responded in the affirmative.

SUNDAY: Identified that page ten of the report, under the heading "why not make it possible to opt-out of the fee", it reads "some of the projects are anticipated to be substantial". Inquired into which projects, specifically, are intended to be substantial.

RIPKA: Responded that substantial projects will occur in SUB. Considered that renovations could include whole floors, entrances, or Dinwoodie Lounge. Clarified that the Levy provides for substantial projects elsewhere depending on the proposals student submit.

TSE: Inquired into whether there is a difference between the terms 'semester' and 'term'.

RIPKA: Responded in the negative.

LEY: Recognised that the University provided verbal support for the Levy and its programme. Inquired into whether the University expressed its support in a formal written agreement.

RIPKA: Responded in the negative. Suggested that written agreement was not possible due to time constraints. Noted that verbal agreement exists in minted meetings.

HUSSEIN: Expressed concern that the Levy will result in the students taking on the responsibility for deferred maintenance.

RIPKA: Suggested that the University does not believe students will pay for deferred maintenance.

RAITZ: Inquired into why Ripka selected $54 as the target fee amount for the Levy.

RIPKA: Responded that that amount was defined in using relevant financial projections and survey data are part of the Appendix C in the Report.

RAITZ: Inquired into whether the survey question asked respondents whether they are willing to pay a fee, the benefits of which they will not see within their degree.

RIPKA: Responded in the negative. Noted, however, that this fact is implied in the question.

HADDOCHE: Inquired into whether the question clearly outlined that students would be paying a $54 as opposed to $9.

RIPKA: Responded that the other question options were for 2019, 2020, and 2021 payments were: $8, $16, $24 or $10, $20, $30, or $12, $24, $36.Noted that the question preamble that used the word deferred maintenance was not selected as it performed poorly because students likely do not know what deferred maintenance means.

HADDOUCHE: Suggested that the reason the question's poor performance indicates that students know what deferred maintenance is and do not intend to pay for it.

TSE: Expressed concern that, in the informal consultations, parties were not informed the total amount would be $54.

RIPKA: Responded that during these consultations there was no set value proposition.

HUSSEIN: Inquired into what plan exists to engage students with the Levy.

RIPKA: Responded that all students have an equal opportunity to access the Levy. Noted that the Levy also gives special consideration of marginalised communities and prohibits the use of funds on the same building within two years.

TSE: Expressed concern that the sixty-eight page Report was released only twenty-four hours prior to the meeting.

RIPKA: Emphasised that Council has received many updates on the Levy since September 4th. Noted that Bylaw Committee raised no issues when the item was discussed on January 15.

HUSSEIN: Expressed concern that many students do not use SUB and do not wish to maintain it. Inquired into what process exists for the submission of proposals for SUB renovations.

RIPKA: Responded that Levy renovations of SUB occur via the standard process for proposals relating to any building.

SUNDAY: Inquired into whether a renovation in SUB would result in a two-year waiting period until another proposal could be accepted. Inquired into what the Report defines as substantial renovation.

RIPKA: Responded in the affirmative.

SUNDAY: Inquired into why the Levy granting committee includes the General Manager as a general member and the Vice-President Operations and Finance as an ex-officio member.

RIPKA: Responded that these persons have operational and institutional knowledge. Noted that the General Manager is well suited to vet SUB project proposals.

HADDOCHE: Expressed concern that, if the question is approved by Council and students, Council will not later have the ability to manage the specifics of the project.

SUNDAY: Inquired into whether there is an appeal process for proposals that are rejected.

RIPKA: Responded in the negative. Noted that the Committee will advise on how to improve the proposal.

BHATNAGAR: Considered that the specifics of the Levy will be overseen by Council as, if the question passes, Council must create the Levy committee,

standing orders, and update bylaw.

BELCOURT: Expressed concern that the question does not outline how proposals will be considered in a fair manner.

MOGALE: Inquired into how the Report defines marginalised persons to whom it will give special consideration.

RIPKA: Responded that Council will decide the definition.

MOGALE: Expressed concern that this approach leaves open the possibility for an ineffective and changing definition of marginalised persons.

LEY: Noted that the University does complete some student space overhauls. Cited the example of chemistry and bioscience. Inquired into whether the Levy will result in the University stopping student space renovations or doing fewer renovations with the expectation that if students want a space they will pay for it themselves.

RIPKA: Responded that the University will likely participate as a collaborator in any Levy generated renovations. Suggested that the University tries to improve the lives of students and would not cease to fund a limited set of renovations.

HADDOUCHE: Inquired into the extent of the consultation with faculty associations.

RIPKA: Responded that her team emailed all associations and offered to either consult just the president of a given association or as many members as available.

HUSSEIN: Expressed concern that the Business Students' Association felt it had insufficient time in its consultation.

RIPKA: Noted that there was a supplementary consultation with the BSA president.

FLAMAN/BROWN MOVED to return to committee of the difference.
CARRIED

BHATNAGAR/BILAK MOVED to enter the committee of the whole to discuss the proposed question.
CARRIED

AGARWAL: Expressed concern that the question uses the term 'term' as opposed to 'semester'.

STATT: Proposed that the question outline that the fee will exist in perpetuity

and that the Students' Union can end it at any point.

BILAK: Considered that the question could outline fees in a per year model to be clearer and more transparent.

FLAMAN: Expressed concern that the Class A fee designation does not subject the question to the standard set of restrictions of Bylaw 6100. Expressed concern that the question, therefore, is not clear that there is no opt-out option, whether it the fee applies in spring and summer, and its application in other campuses.

BOURGEOIS: Supported the Levy question.

BROWN: Supported the Levy question as it addresses a need that the University is not fulfilling.

BHATNAGAR: Supported the Levy question as it now defines academic and nonacademic spaces.

MOGALE: Expressed concern that councillors are being asked to go beyond their duty to edit the question. Suggested that any proposal of a similar nature, advanced by a non-Students' Union group, would not receive preferential treatment or special consideration.

HADDOUCHE: Proposed condensing the definition of student spaces included in the question.

TSE: Proposed that the question identify the fee as non-instructional.

SUNDAY: Inquired into whether the Levy fee would be included as part of the Students' Union membership fee.

RIPKA: Responded in the negative. Clarified that it would appear similar to the SUB renovation fee.

HADDOUCHE: Expressed concern that the Beartracks fee listing does not include the different fees as separate lines but as one sum cost.

BELCOURT: Expressed concern that the Levy results in student adopting the burden of deferred maintenance. Proposed that Augustana be included as part of the Levy.

SUNDAY: Expressed concern that the Levy question does not specifically reference SUB even when the fee amount of $54 reflects the expected cost to maintain SUB over the long-run according to the Report.

AHMAD: Proposed that the question outline that the Levy can be can be reviewed by referenda every five years.

LARSEN: Supported the Levy question.

BHATNAGAR/STATT MOVED to return to the committee of the difference.
Carried.

MOGALE/RIZVI MOVED to recess for fifteen minutes.
Carried.

HUSSEIN: Expressed concern that the Levy would not advantage all students.

SUNDAY: Expressed concern that the Levy proposal development was rushed and that student consultation has been insufficient or lacked follow-up. Considered that Council would have demanded better consultation if a student group proposed a similar fee.

RAITZ: Opposed the question. Expressed concern that the Levy relies upon the University's confirmed support, which it has not yet given formally. Noted that there is value in the proposal. Suggested that it be further developed in the next term.

AGARWAL: Established that, in a recent survey of forty-eight science students, around 60% opposed the fee.

MOGALE: Established that, in a recent survey of thirty-one arts students, only around 29% supported the fee. Expressed concern that the executives believe they know what is better for students than students themselves. Suggested that Larsen inappropriately attempted to shut down discussion. Suggested that the executive inappropriately attempted to influence councillors votes via private messages.

STATT: Confirmed that the Business Student Association supports the question.

BILAK: Confirmed that student spaces are especially bad in Arts buildings. Suggested that denying students the chance to vote on the Levy would deny them an opportunity to improve their spaces.

HADDOCHE: Opposed the motion. Considered that, without written agreement from the University, the Levy may result in only funds being used in SUB. Suggested that the Levy return next year with corrections.

LEY: Noted that the Levy proposal sets a foundation for another proposal in future. Noted that approving the problematic Levy question would set a bad precedent for future proposals and that passing the question would bring Council into disrepute.

BELCOURT: Considered that the Students' Union has not fully explored all

options for funding student space renovations and SUB maintenance. Suggested there has been an abuse of power with the process of proposing the Levy. Expressed concern that the General Manager provided advice prejudiced in favour of the Levy. Suggested that Council must consider what is best for students and not the Students' Union.

RIPKA: Confirmed that she accepted all the above proposals in an amended question, excepting the changes related to the use of the term 'semester' and an annual representation of the fee. Suggested it is, in fact, the job of councillors to improve and consider all proposed questions in detail. Suggested that consultation has been thorough and open and that a referendum is the best form of consultation. Suggested that Council convened a special meeting to consider Bill 5 and that, therefore, the Levy question is not receiving preferential treatment compared to an external proposal.

SUNDAY: Suggested that Bill 5 was not proposed by an external group and is, therefore, no means to assess whether there would is fair and equal treatment between internal and external proposals.

BROWN: Considered that passing the question now demonstrates to the University that Council is serious about the Levy. Suggested the written agreement can be received in future. Expressed concern that, if this proposal does not pass, there will be few dollars to pay to renovate the Horowitz Theatre and other building changes. Reaffirmed that the Provincial Government will not fund renovations to non-academic spaces.

AHMAD: Suggested that the process surrounding the proposal has been contrary to the rules of Council and good governance.

HUSSEIN: Suggested that deferring the issue until the next year would result in saddling an incoming Vice-President Operations and Finance with the responsibility for the issue.

BOSE: Expressed concern that students will not recognise that, without written confirmation, the Levy may succeed but result in all the funds being allocated to SUB. Suggested that Engineering students do not require many renovations and the fee is unreasonably high.

SUNDAY: Expressed concern that the Council oath of office affirms the need for members to vote on the basis of the facts which are absent or only now presented.

FLAMAN: Suggested that the Levy proposal and question has been an example of lazy and sloppy governance.

LARSEN: Suggested Council pass the question and allow students at large to consider the issue democratically.

TSE: Proposed the question describe the fee as both mandatory and as un-opt-outable.

DIPINTO: Suggested that Ripka should have sought the written confirmation of the University's participation as early as possible. Expressed concern that the question and process have not been fair, feasible, and well-thought-out. Expressed concern that the implementation of the Levy is unclear.

SUNDAY: Called for a division of the question.

FAILED - 9/17/0

2018-19/9 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2018-19/9f Students' Council - Attendance.

See SC-2018.19.01.

2018-19/9g Students' Council Motion Tracker.

See SC-2018.19.02.

2018-19/9h Executive Committee Motion Tracker

See SC-2018.19.03.

2018-19/9i Students' Council, Votes and Proceedings (SC-2018-18)

See SC-2018.19.04.

2018-19/9j Students' Spaces Levy Proposal

See SC-2018.19.05.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:26PM.