

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

November 18, 2003
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-17)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/ Absent @ 9pm	Vote #1
President	Mat Brechtel	√	√
VP Academic	Janet Lo	√	√
VP External	Chris Samuel	√	X
VP Finance	Tyler Botten	X	Absent
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah	√	√
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych	√	√
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Tawana Wardlaw	√	Absent
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie	X	Absent
Arts	Alex Abboud	√	√
Arts	Chris Bolivar	√	√
Arts	Vivek Sharma	√	√
Arts	Erin Kelly	√	Absent
Arts	James Knull	√	Absent

Arts	Chris Laver	√	√
Arts	Terra Melnyk	√	X
Arts	Heather Wallace	√	X
Arts	Paul Welke	X	absent
Business	Adam Cook	√	X
Business	Steve Smith	√	X
Education			
Education	Allison Ekdahl	√	√
Education			
Education	Christine Wudarck	√	X
Education			
Engineering	Josh Bazin	√	√
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)	√	
Engineering	James Crossman	√	X
Engineering	David Wepler	√	√
Law	Dean Hutchison	√	√
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice	√	√
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk	√	√
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong (Alyson Jubber)	√	√
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat	√	Abstain
Nursing	Jean Abbott	X	Absent
Nursing			

Open Studies			
Open Studies			
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac	√	√
Physical Education	Holly Higgins	√	
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	√	√
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube	√	√
Science	Matthew Eaton	√	√
Science	Tereza Elyas	X	Abstain
Science	Justin Kehoe	√	X
Science	Aisha Khatib	√	√
Science	Shawna Pandya	√	Abstain
Science	Elaine Poon	√	√
Science	Steven Schendel	X	Absent
Science	Duncan Taylor	√	X
Science	LeeAnn Lim	X	Absent
President Athletics			
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	√	
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo	√	

Guests of Council: Marc Matras, Jordan Blatz, Hailey Pinto, Stephen Congly, Chelli Kelly, Sara Katz, Stephen Kirkham, Adrienne de Montarnal, Nicholas Tam, Mike Heugen, Katt Hryciw, Jacob Fortio, Andrew Sullivan

MINUTES (SC 2003-17)

2003-17/01

CALL TO ORDER

Speaker calls meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2003-17/02

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA CHEER SONG “Ring Out a Cheer”

WEPLER leads Students’ Council in the singing of the cheer song.

2003-17/03

SPEAKER’S BUSINESS

Speaker – Quorum call. 25 members. We’re good. Under the authority granted to me under section 10, the Residence Hall presentation will be a special order. Limit to no more than 15 minutes for the presentation and the questions can be dealt with under question period.

2003-17/5

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

2003-17/5a

RICE – SU council has been discussing the resident hall seat.

HRYCIW–We are here to present why the seat is extremely important. We are a unique kind of student. The students who don’t live on campus are affected by the discussion here. For example, dealing with the rent increase, which was initially presented at the Board of Governors presentation. Faculty councilors are not the most appropriate councilors to represent, if they were, they would need an in-depth knowledge what it is like to be a residence of all of the residences. We elect the resident to speak for all the residences. Additionally, the President to RHA must be in the 3rd year of resident and have served on council for 1 year. In order to illustrate the knowledge needed, we have provided a quiz. There are no trick questions, it is a quiz to see what questions you can and cannot answer.

DUBE – Question about number 20, is it prior to 2 weeks ago?

HRYCIW – The quiz is just a tip of the ice berg. Question 18, one of the problems they are facing right now. They also don’t have a community area. Currently the RHA is working with all the residences to get that going. In brief we have a group of individuals that are selected to represent.

RICE – We have a petition of residents that are concerned with this issue. Although as councilors, you may see that you represent the residents adequately, but you are sending a message to the residence that they are not important. Residences make up 10% of SU's constitution. Key strategic 1.1 threw residences into turmoil. If you are interested, you can see council's minutes from that year. 1.4. New residence being built is restricted to 60 international students and the application process is intensive to get in, including submitting an essay. The residence's life is in the Dean's life of portfolio. Although the RHA does run some programs, for example attending conferences, there are few groups on campus that are directly affected by the decisions of admin as residences are. Residences don't leave campus, maybe they aren't adequately represented as they only have 1 residence councilor. Council is set up on the way it is because it intends to represent students. You probably know who your dean is and have ties with student associations. Faculty reps are the best people and most effective people to represent their faculty and selecting someone from the RHA would best represent RHA. Please consider the impact of withdrawing the vote.

Speaker – The next thing that I will make a special order is the approval of the agenda.

2003-17-04

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

TAYLOR/BAZIN MOVED THAT the agenda be approved.

BRECHTEL/LO MOVED TO remove the presentation by Carl Amrhein and add item 10d, the motion for the tuition political policy.

BRECHTEL – There is a presentation today on the multi-year tuition, what we have today is a presentation of a product of those negotiations and approving or disapproving them is necessary, because by Dec 2, it will be too late. In negotiations, we were unable to change 1 thing, the multi-year acceptance of max tuition. We still need to debate that. To make that debate not out of order, we need to change this political policy. So instead of having a motion regarding on what we do on multi-year tuition, we'll make that statement via presentation, have that presentation in a committee as a whole. So to have that discussion, this is the only way to figure out how to do it. We have a tuition campaign, it has posters made up for it, we have been developing 2 different alternatives, we have to decide what we need to do in the next year. If the multi-year goes through, we need to decide how to use resources at a university level. With the exception of calling an extra meeting, we need to discuss this now.

Speaker – I am going to say that this is acceptable and will move to debate on the amendment.

DUBE – I don't understand what Mat is saying, but that is okay. I say we hear him out.

SMITH – How many minutes before the meeting did this made the late additions package. Is there also a motion to add a motion to multi-year on the agenda?

Speaker – There is no separate motion on the agenda tonight with adopting multi-year. My understanding is that that presentation will be made in an informal consideration when we get to that point and it will be made a special order.

BRECHTEL – About 50 minutes before.

Amendment is carried.

Speaker – That will fall under legislation under 10d. We will be expecting Dr. Amrhein, so this will be a special order.

2003-17/10d

BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students Council approve the Tuition Political policy as amended.

BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT Students' Council move to informal consideration

SMITH – I don't see how it is beneficial to move from a structured debate to meandering endlessly, so I will be opposing this.

BRECHTEL – The purpose is not to allow the debate, but to allow the presentation to go on.

The motion to move to informal consideration is carried.

BRECHTEL – A couple meetings ago, council came up with several suggestions about multi-year tuition and whatever happens, that proposal will come back to council. We have had 3-4 budget meetings, the last of which occurred today, the product of which Dr. Amrhein has on the projector. You will be able to see what we came to. It is up to council to decide what to do.

AMRHEIN –We have the proposal that can be put up on the overhead. The details of the proposal are pretty short and are well known. It is a 2 year proposal where we increase tuition to the maximum. So, maximum tuition for 2 years and a revenue sharing formula agreed upon in the document we can look at. There are a whole series of things. An answer question put forward in Gateway, what's in it for the students? I can see that the tuition debate is very important, beyond the definition of just tuition. It is for students to voice agreements and disagreements. I hear a great deal of concern of tuition levels becoming a barrier to the post secondary institution. I hear that people tell me that you don't trust our motives or agree with the admin. But at the same time, you are willing to look at a different way of working with the admin. So, the proposal I think addresses most of your concerns and creates an opportunity to voice your agreements. It is an opportunity to hold senior admin accountable. We can talk about our current views of the budget situation and the magnitude of the requests. We can talk about the learning enhancements that you ask for under the revenue allocation arrangement.

But Mat and I have been upfront from the first day, going far back into my first contact with them. We expect to be taking the max tuition permitted for the foreseeable future. There will be a 2 year delay in and there will be many opportunities to us jointly to lobby the government with student leaders, Board of Governors and leaders of groups on campus. I think the success of the package is hard to predict. We can look back through 23 years of not being too successful. We can look back to what universities got out of elections for the previous government. Maybe we should try something different. We have heard the minister say things that sound supportive of post secondary learning. There are quotes from the minutes that he sees the need. We get a sense though that the message is getting through. So that is what we see is in it for you. For the admin, in the absence of an intense debate on tuition, we will be able to jointly much more aggressively and consistently push the government to reinvest in our core budget. In 1983, we get \$10 for every dollar of tuition, now we get \$2.33 for every dollar of tuition. I think there have been a lot of questions put forth as why this is a good thing to do and I hope that good things for the students as well. So, those are the opening comments.

BRECHTEL – I would like to ask the first question. You made it clear to me why you see coupling us agreeing to maximum tuition increase as necessary to agree to have a year off to agreeing to rest of the parts of the deal, I think this needs to be a central point that is addressed.

AMRHEIN – It is a package. I'm not sure I would ask a newly elected student organization to agree to maximum tuition increase. The point here is to get your agreement to a package. A package to join us in pushing the government. No question whether we get this or not, the admin will continue lobbying the government. The lobbying part to government is going very well and will be even more effective if it was one single voice. Students, staff, faculty administration, Board of Governors coming to the legislation with a single voice. The 2 years increase is necessary because the university budget is not in good shape. We have not had any announcement from the Governor or confirm the 2.5% we got last summer, if we don't get that, our deficit will go up. We can work jointly and collaboratively to help students. This is what we have to offer. How do we get from A to B, we have been told that the students would like to be assured. But it is a package. If we break the package apart, I don't need someone to pass a motion at the Board of Governors to lobby the government. I've been doing that since the day I arrived.

KOTOVYCH – What are the details of the revenue sharing? When the proposal was brought forward, the President was to sit as a non-voting member of EPC, has that changed? We are in the 4th year of the cycle and differential proposal can only be implemented at the start of cycle so I'm not sure if this works.

AMRHEIN – It doesn't mean it could only be brought forward of the cycle. The EPC offer is still on the table, we haven't sent out the invitations yet, but we will do that. And details of revenue sharing, the 2.1% assumes the 2.7% from last year is confirmed. 20% to reduce tuition fee increase, 30% to support learning enhancements and 50% will go to the operating budget. The budget we are talking about does not include the trust accounts. The budget last time was about 60% government support and 26% tuition. If we get really successful and it goes above 5%, there is a different ratio of sharing - 10% for tuition, 15% to learning enhancements and 75% to the operating budget.

KOTOVYCH – Would the EPC remain a non-voting seat?

AMRHEIN- Yes.

SAMUEL – First of all, in reference to something you said earlier. The only pro the university would be getting from the multi-year deal is not having to deal with the annual tuition?

AMRHEIN - No. I'm not afraid of the annual tuition debate. I said we will have the opportunity to have more time to organize a better lobbying effort with a much complete coalition to lobby against government.

SAMUEL – When we do our lobbying, we use our annual tuition decision as our lobbying point and that serves us quite well. It is very useful for us and draws a lot of attention because of its perpetuity. What do you see as the alternative of the rallying in terms of an actual date and event?

AMRHEIN – We had 5 days, including a front page headline and it had nothing to do with the tuition debate. That was a lot of media attention. We had comments from fairly high ranking officials about the Edmonton Journal. The purpose of introducing me to these people, the twin message of reinvesting, that was the president and the meeting the editor of the Edmonton journal editorial board. We routinely talk to deputy messengers and can broaden the range of people. I guess the question back to you, if you feel looking back 23 years that we do it recently has been successful, then you don't need this package.

SAMUEL – Other question is about the specifics of the revenue sharing. 1st question, would it be possible, if I recall, the university receives revenue from 4 resources. Would it be possible to incorporate more streams of revenue into revenue sharing, such as investments and that would be an excellent revenue sharing model. And looking at the breakdown right there, if we are going 20% and then shifting 10% once we hit that 5.1, it is better for students to receive a 5% increase in funding rather than a 9%, maybe we should have a more elaborate formula.

AMRHEIN - My understanding that of that 2.1-5, this kicks, above the 5, these numbers kick in, so you are not better off. The additional revenue streams, we don't spend investments, they become a part of the endowment and is predetermined by the donor. Much of that money is flowing to students through bursaries and scholarships. In that sense, the income from the investments already flow into the pockets of the students. Our budget is less off than last we were here is because the university will have to reduce the amount from that endowment because the performance from the stock market has not recovered. The other forms of income that we didn't mention are the trust accounts. There is a much more dramatic impact on graduate students, so these are the 2 items, government money and tuition, the other ones you mentioned, legal agreements. So we can come back and give you a financing 101.

WUDARCK – I am wondering if there was any significance to the 5% and why that was chosen and wondering if you can justify why you are only allocating 20% to tuition when you are asking for maximum tuition?

AMRHEIN – The request for maximum tuition is based on the university budget. Even if we meet all of those guidelines, there is a long list of deferred maintenance and it stands about 600 million dollars. There are issues related to the pension because the same stock market behavior which has reduced our investments has also reduced this. So we are saying that if we get revenue we don't already budgeted, then there are 3 requirements, the magic of the 5% is how it came out in the discussion. There is improving the quality of the undergraduate experience and a long list of financial worries the university has to deal with. If you add up the pieces, there is a direct benefit to current enrolled students and the other benefits will pay in the long run. They were worked out at the budget meeting, just a free wheeling conversation.

DUBE – Sincere apologies, although I understand, I fail to understand the answer of how this will affect the students. Bullet point what the students are getting.

AMRHEIN– What's on the table is not maximum tuition. We will take that forward no matter what we do. The budget model needs that in meeting the multi-year requirement. Benefits to students – the revenue sharing. We been told students want to see how EPC gets their numbers so you will have a seat at that discussion. We forget that when these discussions started, Bill 43 was in question. We are committed to bound by the existing tuition cap in the university's act. The other piece is that we have the opportunity with a single message to lobby the government and that is a conversation that is more than just students.

BRECHTEL – One of the things council talked about entertaining a discussion at the Board of Governor level and discussed that and is a valuable benefit to students.

AMRHEIN – I cannot commit the Board of Governors or EPC, but I can commit myself as the top priority of the student union and do everything I can to add that to the conversation with the body.

DUBE – I am confused at the revenue sharing. Looking at this, admin is saying tuition is too high for students. I am unconvinced that admin couldn't do that anyways. So I don't understand why that is a benefit to us, I see it us their job.

AMRHEIN – My job is to provide the best quality of education for all students. What you get here is a commitment on our part. Me agreeing to this is because your student rep said that this is your top priority. Maybe the board's top priority is different - to restore some of the professors that have been lost. What you get with this, is agreement in advance that your priority will be funded at this rate. So I take your point is my job is to do the best job, but it doesn't mean that I agree what the top priority is. The Board of Governors may like to do something else. So this is what you get, outside all of the government processes and is up to you to decide how valuable that is.

COOK – Has the board agreed to this?

AMRHEIN – The board won't see this till January. This is the motion that will go to the board. I don't have any authority to approve this. However, you've all been in the university longer than I have, you tell me what the probability the Board of Governors overturning the recommendation from student group and admin.

COOK- Please elaborate on lobbying campaigning, will accessibility be a part of the campaign?

CLARK – The lobbying campaign is not flushed out yet. Parts of the campaign will be different for students from administration. So we agree on that, we are looking at public forums, meetings with MLAs, the Minister, the Premier, where we talk about that issue. We also agree on the capacity issue that we need more funding for students. There could be times that you may feel more strongly about an issue than us. So we have tossed around a lot of ideas, things like asking former SU presidents and your parents and family to come out and speak to the government. There are lots of things we can do. It is our annual time and it is an easy trick to pull off. But is there a way to use that energy and get an actual result at the end of the day. I think by getting rid of the fighting and truing the energy where it belongs, we will be further down.

SMITH – You were here 6 weeks ago, a brief summary of what has changed from 6 weeks ago. The only think that has changed that I understand is the revenue sharing. Also, if the SU does not agree to this, will you support the admin to decide tuition for this year and next year?

AMRHEIN - What has changed? We didn't have anything on paper. Now we have detail and several conversations with key members with the Board of Governors. We have a sense by talking to people in the ministry and they have reacted to that. So, basically details and much greater confidence. If you vote this down, the package deal is off the table. There will be a conversation with GSA with their concerns. What will we take to the Board of Governors? The details aren't there yet. I suspect what I will take to the Board of Governors is the history of conversations that we will recommend that this year we do max-tuition and will give the board notice if we do maximum tuition the next year as well. The budget model assumes max tuition for 2 years. So the difference of approving that now or year by year is a decision by EPC. We are still assuming we have a 2 year deal.

ABBOUD – To gain some of the things we are looking for, we have to make some sacrifices as well. What are the other shareholder groups asked to sacrifice in part of the multi-year proposal. Such as GCA?

AMRHEIN – GCA is in the same situation as you. The percentages look like this, but they reserve the right to use the money different. Since I bear the front on the tuition debate, management will speak with a single voice, but it doesn't mean that management agree on every detail.

ABBOUD – Question for Ms. Clark, how much of that has gone towards tuition relief for undergraduates in recent years?

CLARK – The first thing that happened was that the budget assumption was we get a 2% increase. If we meet that, we have some flexibility. At the EPC table, we talked about what we want to support with the extra money. But the bottom line has been a huge call in terms of extra money. In the budget package, there is 14 million dollars in extra revenue we have to find, so making the budget work is to find the 14 million dollars.

DUBE – Dr. Amrhein , my understanding is that it is government policy. My understanding is that the U of A should provide the students with a 3-year forecast.

AMRHEIN– We have multi-year forecasts, but that is not a substitute for the annual approval cycle. We have been in touch with ministry officials what this will look like. Yes, we give multi-year forecasts, but not a multi-year approval. It is up to the Board of Governors to approve these things.

RICE – How much of the increase revenue we get from this goes towards the debt and the \$600 million pension plan?

CLARK – We have a budget plan that forecasts a 1 million deficit. So the first thing we have to do is drive towards that. The government does have to approve deficits. If we don't meet our budget targets, they won't approve an unbalanced budget. Let's assume that we get what we are forecasting and meet the extra revenue target, in our budget process we know that we have a hole of 8 million dollars that we have to fill. We also have to have the discussion at EPC about the deferred pension plan.

AMRHEIN – Increased utility costs, pension plan, if we don't get it, it becomes part of the budget deficit.

CLARK – That pension number, the total is 6 million.

AMRHEIN – If the stock market goes up like a rocket, these things will change, but we haven't seen that. It takes a long time for the cost to go down, if the market goes up.

WUDARCK – About revenue sharing, if there were to be a 5% increase in funding, how much of that percentage will be offset? Also, I am wondering if you have an actual percentage for maximum tuition.

AMRHEIN – 1% of tuition is about a million dollars. So, we expect that a maximum tuition increase will be more than 5% or 5.5%. So five and half million dollars.

SAMUEL – On the Auditor's General report, from what we read from that report, there were questions about the U of A's budget calculation processes with sponsor research costs. What we gathered from the report, it wasn't deducting all the costs, we discovered that we are a lot closer to that 30% cap than we thought we were. If it turns out that we are at the cap, does that still hold? Also, about the maximum tuition, if we get under this model, a 10% increase in base funding, if it still doesn't translate to a freezing.

AMRHEIN – We don't have to agree with his report. The issue here has to do with treatment of individual cost recovery and we disagree with the General Auditor comment. That means the accountants have sorted it out at a staff level. At the 30% cap at a 2 year agreement, if it says we are bound by that, then we are bound by that. A deal is a deal.

BRECHTEL – If what he is suggesting is that we hit the cap already and you are suggesting that we have maximum tuition, then those two statements would be in agreement.

AMRHEIN – Then the increase would be zero. But no deal though. Maybe I should put a much finer point on that. Management may be giving up a lot of tuition. In the future, that is why we are staying with the current legislation.

HUTCHISON – I understand the value of this deal benefits the students and admin. My concern is about the message that goes to the public when students agree to a tuition increase. The government may think that the students don't have it that bad and give money to something else like health care. So what do you think the message sends to the public?

AMRHEIN – What the government thinks is a good question. I think we are not asking students to vote. We are asking you to support the package. Your representatives have many opportunities to speak to the complexity of the package. Despite our deep opposition to management's max tuition proposal, we hope you support the package. Because the administration will go to maximum tuition anyways.

CROSSMAN – About the unified voice - health care is more successful than university in lobbying, their internal disagreements are mutually exclusive and yet, they were still able to present this unified voice. In our example, the unified voice is there already, we both think we aren't getting enough funding from the government.

AMRHEIN – Nobody is asking you to lay down the tuition issue internally. This discussion is not in camera and will be recorded. There is not an internal coherence on a wide range of topics. The point is, publicly we agree with a vote from the Board of Governors to have a common front in our approach to the legislature. But once there is a package and support it, that we then agree that this is the approach we take to the government.

CROSSMAN – But what do we have to go through this package, this whole process when we already agree on the same issue?

AMRHEIN – Because there are people that still push for zero tuition, not zero increase, but zero tuition. That is the variation of the message the public has received and allows the government to say they are not clear what they should do. So why don't you bring a single message that says, "we want investment". This isn't just something that we dreamt out to finesse on you on the tuition issue. We do not have a single consistent message to the government, except that, "we want more".

PEWARCHUK – About maximum tuition increase, hypothetically if the deal is rejected by council and if Bill 43 allows a larger tuition increase, will the 2nd year increase be higher like 15%?

AMRHEIN – Can't say. I don't believe that Bill 43 will hold out that possibility. We think maximum for tuition for 2 years is what we need to bring the budget home. Everything I have said tonight, we have gone through the EPC discussion, gone through the discussion with the key folks.

DUBE – I can see how there are benefits. I can see how there are major drawbacks. I think this is a hard hit for us. At the Board of Governors meeting, a student group will raise that ruckus anyways. More over, I am questioning how you said you will be acknowledge that is an issue and you turn around when I ask you how you acknowledge it. We need in this deal tuition to be seen as a priority, not only for students, but for the admin. I don't think we will have a unified voice until admin says that tuition is an issue, because we don't have the same interest.

AMRHEIN– What you asked, if we don't have a deal, will I still agree to this? I can't bind administration and there are many pressures on the administration. So, personally, I committed to Mat that accessibility is the issue. There are a lot of costs to go into attending the university. If you are someone from rural Alberta and has to travel here, the issue is not just tuition, it is room and board. Maybe we should worry more about rural Alberta students. Accessibility is an issue, how much it all costs you to attend, relative to your ability to attend. They are related for sure, overlapped, but not identical. I can not bind administration unilaterally.

Speaker – This is a decision of some monument. So if you still have questions, ask them now.

HUTCHISON – You mentioned not being able to bind the future, are we not binding next years?

AMRHEIN– I said I cannot bind administration without going through the conversations that have proceeded this evening. I have had the discussion with the admin and is speaking with confidence on behalf of admin, but not for the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors has authority to make this decision. I'm happy to take back to admin any questions or additions you want to add to it. I am simply trying to be straight forwarded.

WUDARCK – About rural Albertans, how their tuition is not their greatest concern. How can you argue that when the student loan program has \$721 for room and board expenses, and \$57 a year and tuition will continue to increase? So how can you justify room and board is most important?

AMRHEIN – Room and board is a lot more than tuition. It is simply the arithmetic of it. If you have to live at the university, accessibility is greater than tuition. So my pushback on the tuition agreement, it is all in. Accessibility is defined by how much you to pay to attend the university. And 5 years from now, tuition will probably be higher and room and board will surely be higher.

SAMUEL - Dr. Amrhein, I thank you for coming. With regards to Bill 43, I know that one of the things the Minister of Learning has been talking about and coming forward in the new legislature is more legislated consultants - have we have considered that a multi-year is illegal?

AMRHEIN– Our understanding is that the U of A is the model of consultation. And when they talk about consultation, we have had no indication from the ministry that our consultative processes have found to be anything by the model. There are 2 decisions in which the year is up for discussions. In a year that tuition is predetermined, the budget still goes through. We can create opportunities, just like the Edmonton Journal editorial board created opportunities for us. Next year there will still be a budget and the consultation is here now with admin as delegated with the board.

SAMUEL – Would then the university budget be open for us to criticize and debate on campus in a way that it will be open to all students? Part of the thing will be all of our efforts will not really be dealing with the conflict with the admin, but conflicts with the Governor. From what you have said, the budget is still open.

AMRHEIN– The budget process, your access to me will be undiminished. You can summon me as you wish and I will be here. You can criticize the budget now and in the future. Absented tuition - there is still the point of the budget.

SMITH/KOTOVYCH MOVED THAT Students' Council move out of informal consideration.

Carried with unanimous consent.

AMRHEIN – The deal is off the table if you want it off the table. It is your choice.

BRECHTEL/ PANDYA MOVED THAT Students' Council go for a 10-minute recess.

Carried.

Speaker – We are still on item 10d, which is a special order. I am not going to limit debate, but keep things front and center.

BRECHTEL/WALLACE MOVED THAT Students' Council move in camera

SMITH/BAZIN MOVE THAT Students' Council move ex camera.

Defeated.

DUBE/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council move ex camera.

Carried.

DUBE – I don't know if I have ever felt so torn. I am going to speak in favor of going into the negotiations. First of all, I have learned a lot in the Bill 43 campaign. We were able to pull off a media campaign even though the media wasn't aware, the students weren't aware, but today we proved that today we can accomplish whatever. I believe that if we strategize, we can make anything work. I want to get away this idea that we can get media only if we have the tuition campaign.

ABBOUD - You can't extrapolate the campaign in a single event?

DUBE - You can look at it that way, or you can look at it in the way that you get what you are willing to put in, you get what you fight for. 2nd point, why are we here as councilors? My constituents don't always know what the best action is, if they did, they would be at the legislature, voicing MLAs. I believe that is the number 1 mandate above all else. If we can say that we brought down tuition, screw how we did it, because we got something done. I moved out of camera because I don't care what people think I say. Constituents know what they want, but not how to achieve it. Don't turn it down, because Carl came down as the antagonistic. I want to say that we got tuition down. No more thoughts, it is time of action.

RICE – The reason why the residences approved the rent increases this year because we told them why it was increased. When Carl was in here, I lost a lot of faith I had last time. But at the same time, it is easier to convince students that taking the max this year that next year it is a 30% increase instead of a 7% increase.

HUTCHISON - The university is running at a deficit. What will they do? They will raise revenues any way they can, by raising tuition. So tuition is getting raised to the max, so why not get something from it. I do have a concern about publicly supporting a tuition increase, but this time we are getting something from this proposal. So it seems like a no-brainer, in my opinion.

WEPLER – My experience, every year council tries to do everything in their power. They think that every year is going to be year that is not going to go up. But we look at the economics. There will be no comparison. We get screwed either way. There is still going to be a lot of internal agreement here because now we can see how EPC looks like. We can argue about where these expenditures are. About media, the best way to get funding is to work with admin.

TAYLOR - Like Councilor Wudarck, last time this came through, I initially supported the concept of sending Mat into negotiations. And then we got the presentation here and I saw no difference. This is not a victory at all. The only we are getting from the admin is a last cigarette and it is not a gift. If we agree to this, I am seriously concerned that the one thing students care about – high tuition. If we take this, basically I see it as giving up. I don't see us choices as simply biting the bullet and taking this, or sending it back. I see it as putting the chicken suits and getting out there and saying that we are getting insulting offers from admin.

BOLIVAR – This type of debate, in terms of a victory or a loss, is disconcerting to me. There is no victory to be won. The university isn't coming to you saying that they want our input, they are saying that this is what they are doing. This mentality that people at the university coming in, a bunch of corporate people who are out to screw students. In our policy arena that students are even seen as an interest group. We have a substantial number of marketing dollars to put on campaign. We should consider that pragmatically. Lastly, on chicken suits. We have look at what has worked and what has not worked in the past. As nice as an effort they put in, it didn't work.

SAMUEL – In terms of success and failure, how are you measuring that?

BOLIVAR- The criteria you outline for yourself. You have university people who are coming into this room with budgetary concerns saying that this is not happening. You set your own criteria for success and our criteria wasn't achieved.

LO – Maximum tuition suck. But taxes suck too. Anyone that lives in this country would love no taxes. It is great to have ideology and everybody should have some. But the truth of the matter was to make decisions based on the reality that we have to deal with. What the provost came in was reality. We can tell him that we don't like this deal, but we don't have a choice. We can go elsewhere and say that post secondary suck and we need more money. Not simply, that we want a freeze in tuition, but our education is going to suffer if we say no tuition. We need to start looking at our quality

When we sat at 17 hours of gripe tables. It's not just tuition that is pissing people off, people are saying that they went to another institution that taught better. So it the tuition that they are paying a lot of tuition, or the quality of education. Having an open communication with the government, communication with EPC will help. Nothing will fix the problem, but it will help. I heard this news at 3:30 like Mat and it is not nice. We need to do what is best and I don't think this is giving up. What this is doing is opening more doors and telling the government that we are accepting something that we don't want to accept. This isn't about victory and losses. I think students want a better education and maybe this is a step that will help us get there.

PANDYA – What we have heard is that multi year is going to go through no matter what. I mean max-tuition is going to go through no matter what. Do we not run with it, or run with it and play the game, and say “throw us a bone here and give us what we want”. If we do go with this, what are our critics going to say? They are going to crucify us to agreeing. Carl in his own words the success of this plan is anyone's guess. That we went through, we said in the beginning and said that we are not going to agree to max tuition, we went back and changed our policy. I think we need to look at other methods. My main concern is that it is too risky to go through with the plan by which the Provost's own words aren't even close to clear.

ABBOUD – Seems to be a little confusion on what we are debating and voting on. Is it the policy in front of us?

Speaker – Voting on this change to the existing tuition policy because the proposal violates the current policy. In terms of threshold, requires a 2/3rds majority.

SAMUEL – Have we not exceeded our maximum time?

Speaker – Yes, limited to 20 minutes.

KOTOVYCH/PEWARCHUK MOVED TO suspend standing order 28

Motion is carried.

MELNYK – I am wondering if someone can answer how this policy be affected by Bill 43.

SHARMA – 2 ways to do things. There is the Mike Hudema grassroots way to do things, there is the Mat Bretchel behind-the-doors way to do things. Within the past 2 years, we may have achieved something to deal with this long term. I see this as an opportunity to gain something. Previously last year and the year before, the most productive thing we did do was engage in an ambition PR campaign. The political strategy, I see this as a crystallized gain, to ensure that in the future, the long term solution, which will be the only solution in the future and individuals will stand up and demand that funding when tuition is 8 or 9 or 10 thousand dollars. This is an opportunity to ensure that when it happens to mitigate a very weak and poor position.

COOK – I am opposed to this change to the political policy. About not being successful in the last 20 years, there is no such thing as success, there are short term gains. 2 separate messages are not necessary a bad thing. It can come out better to the public. Not only is it a funding issue, also an accessibility issue. Admin never said that accessibility was an issue. It says to me they are trying to dodge this whole accessibility thing. Admin is going to be the ones that make sure that quality is going to be obtained, but they are not fighting for accessibility. We as students are they only ones that will fight for accessibility. Public message needs to include that accessibility to post secondary is a huge issue.

KOTOVYCH – The political policy change is a good one. There is a positive way to look at it, the problem with the status quo is that we target the public to get them to put pressure on the government. Where you do that to get them to give us money, there is no guarantee that the university will put that towards tuition. So we either push them to give money to the university, as where here we have a guarantee that it will go towards tuition. Rod Fraser is lobbying for 400 million, signed off with the 4 presidents of the university, but here we have an investment formula. Well there is no guarantee that anything we do here is going to have here. This is not about re-election. The Gateway has said that maybe this is going to pursue.

PEWARCHUK – Said by a number of people that this multi-year thing that students want the lowest possible tuition. The only way we can fulfill that desire is to sign on to multi-year. Without it, we will have maximum tuition. With multi-year, we can have less than maximum and fulfill what students want. Now, on the topic of the political policy itself, the quality of this change in that funded tuition freezes. It has very dilatory effects on education policy. In BC, then tuition freeze decline in quality for education. The lowest possible tuition increases, fixing it to inflation – that is a good thing. Just this political policy is good itself.

SHARMA/RICE MOVED the previous question

Motion to move the previous question is defeated.

CROSSMAN – Quick number crunching. What Carl said about the numbers what he was using, 1% = 1 million dollars. So we agree to this framework and things stay relatively the same for the next 2 years. If the government says 10%, this translates to \$114. If they increase funding to 1%, that is \$13 per student. So is it worth \$13/student to compromise? My math may be wrong. But I don't if students care about \$13 as much as their students care about their views represented. I'm seeing a \$13 decrease, I don't think that matters.

SAMUEL – An increase of 0-2%, we get nothing. In that scenario, what Crossman has reflected is more of a 3%. The 2% is going to be there. We haven't seen a 3% increase in the last 5 years. If we think we are getting tones of revenue, we are likely to get nothing. Any money that the government puts in the university will be in the form that the priorities the government has laid out. Other point, when we go to the table, we are taking a look at the University and is this university spending our money in the right way that students value. We use that ability to say to the University that, "No", that is not why we are spending the money.

BRECHTEL – The most shocking thing that happened to me today. The Dean of Students was sitting around the table and vehemently opposed differential tuition and tuition in general. To my mind, he is the best advocate of student philosophies. He said to me, "What you are getting good, but what you are getting is better than nothing". Chris made the point that he doesn't believe that we give up our right, we are giving up our right. We will have a say in EPC, Carl also said that it is a time to comment on how the university spends the money. I don't intend to stop doing things like protesting on the steps of the legislation. I intend to keep the public dialogue. What it comes down to, what is the best way to find the smallest tuition increase for the students. As much as I want to save face, this is the best way to find the least and smallest tuition for the students.

WUDARCK – I wanted to address a couple things. 1 is that this deal is better than the status quo. Well there is no guarantee there will be money from the government. I honestly don't believe that the money we get from the government, through the funding formula would overshadow the money we get. The money that we do get, a portion of that doesn't even go to tuition. It goes straight to base funding. I don't think that having a seat on EPC and only after 5% - that formula sucks. People have been saying that a guarantee of max increase, but the Board of Governors decides that. And lastly, what do students want, think about students that you are representing, what they are doing when you vote.

EATON/PEWARCHUK MOVED the previous question.

Carried. (19/0/0)

Main Motion is carried (21/10/3).

WALLACE/HUTCHISON MOVED to Adjourn

SAMUEL – Did we just approve multi-year?

Speaker – What council has effectively done, is gutted the existing tuition policy. So within that guideline, council can basically pursue the multi-year proposal as it stands. We don't need another motion.

BRECHTEL – Can I make the motion now?

WALLACE withdraws motion to adjourn.

Speaker – No objections. Motion is withdrawn. So now, we have a member of DIE Board who was originally going to speak to us about the DIE Board ruling that was postponed from last meeting to this meeting. Would you rather proceed directly to the new policy or to the DIE Board ruling?

RICE – Will there be Question Period tonight?

Speaker- I suspect not. So, going back to the approval of the agenda.

SMITH/EATON MOVED TO add 10b and 10c to the agenda.

SMITH – They should be on there already, but it was an administration error.

Amendment is carried.

BRECHTEL/KOTOVYCH MOVED TO add the motion 10e -
“BRECHTEL/EATON MOVED THAT Students' Council endorse and approve the multi-year package as proposed by the Provost and VPA.”

Amendment is carried.

The agenda is carried.

Speaker – I will make that a special order.

2003-17/10e

BRECHTEL/EATON MOVED THAT Students' Council endorse and approve the multi-year package as proposed by the Provost and VPA.”

SMITH/BAZIN MOVED TO postpone item 10e to the next meeting.

SMITH - It is incredibly irresponsible of passing it, with no written material, none of us has seen the package, if we need another council, then I would rather have an extra council meeting than just passing this. I suspect that when we see a package, we will still vote in favor. I can't believe that council is prepared to sign this without even seeing this.

DUBE – I think this is a bad idea. I think we are in a position to deal with this. We know what we are voting on. I am sick of using the process in order of making decision. Vote on this tonight.

Motion is defeated. (Smith, Eaton, Bazin and Samuel abstained)

SMITH – This was 20 minutes ago, the SU giving up the major plank, giving up the \$13 change a year. The only councilor that has done any analyze in this is Crossman. Council should defeat this.

Speaker – About the ruling last time -if something is broad and general, it constitutes a political policy. Something that is specific and detailed will follow marching orders. So this is not a political policy.

SMITH - I would ask to not consider this motion this evening.

Speaker – In effect there is a request to read papers. When any paper is read once and be read again if members were to vote on it. This is a rule that cannot be overruled. He does have the right to see the entire motion before being forced to vote on this. The President is currently running off to photocopy the document.

WEPLER – I would like to amend the motion and grant the President permission to enter into negotiations.

Speaker – I am going to rule that out of order. The factor of us not voting on that tonight, the President already has that grant authority. So it the motion is unnecessary. In effect, it is revising the agenda. There is nothing to stop the president of doing this.

DUBE – Is it possible to ask for a 5 minute recess?

EKDAHL – We have to leave this room in 10 minutes. So can we move now.

DUBE/POON MOVED THAT council take a 5 minute recess.

Defeated.

HUTCHISON – Call for quorum

Speaker – 27 members. Yes we have quorum.

COOK – Can we see the overhead that the Provost had as well as the percentages?

BRECHTEL – It is fairly simple, it is the exact same piece of paper. I can read it to you.

Speaker – The tuition recommendation for academic year 2004-05 and 2005-06. Quality – The U of A’s vision, in teaching, research and community service, is to be indisputably recognized nationally and internationally as one of Canada’s finest universities and amongst a handful of the world’s best. Core commitments: the University’s mission is to serve its community by the discovery, dissemination and application of new knowledge through teaching and research. Access: the University and the Government of Alberta are committed to ensuring that talented and dedicated students who are prepared to succeed in high quality educational programs will not be denied access to a university education. Accountability: the University must recover from the deficit position that has evolved from resource restrictions of the past tow decades. If increase in base funding allocation ranges from 2.1-5%, 20% is allocated to reduce tuition fee increases, unless the Provost, on advice from the GSA allocates the receipts from the Graduate Student Tuition in a different manner. 30% to support learning enhancements and 50% to the operating budget. If an increase in base funding allocation ranges from 5.1-10%, 10% will go towards reducing the tuition fee, unless the Provost, on advice from GSA allocates the receipts from the Graduate Student Tuition in a different manner. 15% to support learning enhancements and 75% to the operating budget.

SMITH – What is being asked of us is to approve a document which we have not seen until 10 minutes ago. The separation of power has been deferred several times. Where is the source that we are prepared to pass this tonight without having to digest this? Most of us didn’t know this was coming forward, it wasn’t on the agenda, not on late additions, are we really prepared for this?

DUBE – I suck because I am a flip flopper. I agree with Steve.

PEWARCHUK – We have debated this policy for 4 hours.

BAZIN – Some of us didn’t know the exact details of this agreement. Would you concede that many students would like the details of this before they vote on this?

PEWARCHUK – Entirely possible. But the fact of the matter remains that we have done due process as far as council goes. It will just be the exact same thing next week.

DUBE – I hope that councilor Pewarchuk concedes that redundancy sucks but we have a job to do. We have been debating hypotheticals up to now. So, all of the discussions in the last 3 weeks have been hypothetical. At the very least, I would like the chance to talk to Faculte one more time. I would rather make the right decision, rather than make the decision in haste.

BRECHTEL – Making the decision in haste, I am willing to put a good deal of money that talking to your constituents about the hypothetical and what we have today is not that different. There are details here, but not the sort of thing you are going to put to the average student.

PEWARCHUK - We have considered this in almost the exact state that it sits in front of us today for almost 24 hours. It would be wise to make a decision.

LO – We are discussing the idea do we postpone till next week? Are we debating a motion to postpone or debating multiyear tuition?

Speaker – Debating the 3 pages that was passed out.

LO/HUTCHISON MOVED to move the previous question.

Motion is defeated.

TAYLOR/DUBE MOVED TO postpone until next meeting.

LO – Is there a way to put a condition that if we postpone we will call a meeting next week?

BRECHTEL – I can promise that.

Motion to postpone is carried. (Hutchison, Rice and Pewarchuk voted opposed)

2003-17/16

EKDAHL/WALLACE MOVED TO adjourn at 10:07 pm

Carried