



STUDENTS' COUNCIL ENGAGEMENT TASK FORCE MINUTES

2013 – 2014

Date: January 27th 2014

Time: 5.12 pm

In Attendance:

NATALIA BINCZYK (Chair)

PETROS KUSMU

LOK TO

JESSICA NGUYEN

MARINA BANISTER (Left at 5.37 pm)

DAWSON ZENG

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:

SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

**1. CALL TO
ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by BINCZYK at 5.12 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF
AGENDA**

BANISTER moved to approve the agenda for *January 27, 2014* as tabled.

The motion was seconded by TO.

Vote 6/0/0

CARRIED

**3. APPROVAL OF
MINUTES**

KUSMU moved to approve the minutes for *January 13, 2014* as tabled.

The motion was seconded by ZENG.

Vote 6/0/0

CARRIED

4.

BINCZYK: This will be our last meeting. It has been a pleasure chairing this

ANNOUNCEMENTS
5. DISCUSSION

Task Force.

SCET Recommendations Document

BINCZYK: I'm looking for feedback on how the presentation to council went.

NGUYEN: It went pretty well.

BANISTER: It was good. I was surprised to hear about the feedback on the Faculty Associations (FAs).

BINCZYK: I want to revise a few things of the document. The main thing is about having FA members on council or vice versa. I contacted FAs and told them about the different options. I got feedback from 3 representatives. All were content with having a council representative on the FA. I contacted the Interdepartmental Science Students Society, the Agricultural Life and Environmental Sciences Faculty Student Association, and the Augustana Students' Association.

I will attend a CoFA (Council of Faculty Associations) meeting to get more feedback. Most people prefer this idea of having councilors in FAs. However, Vice-president Chelen has been advocating for the opposite.

BANISTER: I don't think FA members should be on the Council. They are inherently different things. The Council has a good size. We don't want it to be too big. You have to look at the numbers. Most FAs don't have the capacity to send a representative to council.

NGUYEN: What's Vice-president Chelen's argument?

KUSMU: He works the most closely with FAs. FAs work closely with students. He thinks that FAs are more in tune with the students of their faculty.

BANISTER: Ideally, councilors would be equally in tune with what is going on in their faculties, especially when the Students' Council Engagement Task Force (SCET) recommendations come into effect.

Having others to represent the respective faculties means that the councilors aren't doing a good enough job.

Also, the lack of response to Natalia's email by the FAs shows that they are content with how it is.

NGUYEN: Also, the 2 biggest FAs are in favor of having a council member in the FA.

KUSMU: Another thing that Vice-president Chelen wants from his idea is to have a closer connection and cohesion between the FAs and the Students' Union (SU).

BANISTER: According to his proposal, the proportion of seats for each faculty on council would change significantly. Also, small faculties can hardly find people to fill the current spots.

BINCZYK: I'll summarize these arguments and send them to council.

KUSMU: Our recommendation is not forceful. We don't want to push them to change their structure. It should only be a gentle recommendation.

BINCZYK: What do you think about the introduction and exit interviews? I

didn't get too much feedback on it.

NGUYEN: If you didn't get too much feedback, it probably means that people are ok with it.

BINCZYK: Would you also want to recommend that *Discover Governance* should present the results to council?

NGUYEN: Yes. I think the results will be good to know.

TO: Yes. Specially the exit interviews.

BINCZYK: Can we have the presentation about the introduction and exit interviews together? They will coincide for the new council and the outgoing council.

BANISTER: Yes. It will save time.

TO: Yes. The opinions will also be independent of each other.

BINCZYK: One person wants the council reports to be an informal internal process rather than through Bylaw 4000 because being a councilor is voluntary. I'm having mixed feeling about that.

KUSMU: One of the questions is about what will happen to a councilor if they miss their deadline. One of the concerns was about overworking councilors. They do not receive any pay. The other idea is to have council goals as opposed to individual goals. For example, each committee can come up with a goals document. If there are individual goals, they can be included as miscellaneous goals. Anyway, I see merit in council wide goals.

BANISTER: I don't think we can punish people for not meeting a deadline. But, we can reward people for meeting that deadline. I'm against giving monetary rewards though.

KUSMU: If you don't agree with pay, what incentives do you suggest?

BANISTER: It could be something like swag or small treats.

BINCZYK: Would we not be putting it in bylaw at all?

BANISTER: No.

BINCZYK: So how do we specify the dates then?

KUSMU: If they are council wide goals, they can be in the Standing Orders of the individual committees. Individual goals can be included as miscellaneous goals.

BINCZYK: Where do we specify the dates to those individual goals?

KUSMU: Everyone is giving it in at the same time.

BINCZYK: I like the idea of the swag, but I think it's hard to implement.

KUSMU: Maybe it's something that the CAC (Council Administration Committee) chair could do. It will become tradition after that.

BINCZYK: To summarize, we can recommend each committee to submit a goals document. They can change their own Standing Orders. CAC would establish the deadlines. The CAC chair can come up with an incentive scheme.

BINCZYK: There was a suggestion that *Discover Governance* should come up with a template to make the goals documents more coherent. We can have those templates for both individuals and committees.

NGUYEN: We can have themed templates.

KUSMU: Yes. The executive committee can take it to the Marketing Department for formatting.

BINCZYK: Okay. Finally, the documents will be organized on the website by *Discover Governance*.

BINCZYK: Another major point was about having a job description for councilors. Will you be in favour of having one?

NGUYEN: Yes.

ZENG: I don't know. A lot of people join council for different reasons. It will be restrictive if we provide a job description.

BINCZYK: I don't think it will constrain you. It will only communicate what you do to another student.

TO: Does the application have any description?

BINCZYK: According to my knowledge, no.

KUSMU: The debate about this point has been going on since around 2006. It has been a pretty intensive discussion.

BINCZYK: We can have *Discover Governance* checking out the minutes having that debate. We can have *Discover Governance* come up with a job description which has to be approved by council. If it's rejected by council, then the recommendation will just not be implemented. If the job description is broad enough, I don't see why it should be a problem.

TO: If it's too broad, it will defeat the purpose of having one.

BINCZYK: I think it will still be better than having nothing.

ZENG: I don't see too much advantage in having a job description. It could be misleading. Council activities are very broad.

BINCZYK: If we are going to reject this, we have to come up with strong arguments for our decision. As a con, it will be hard to come to a consensus at council on what the exact wording is. But, this is not strong enough.

NGUYEN: I'm in favour of having a job description. There are some things that every councilor does. We can have a clause saying that the duties of being a councilor are not limited to that stuff.

KUSMU: I'm indifferent.

ZENG: I see the point of having a description. However, I think it will be extremely hard to define. Different councilors play their roles differently.

BINCZYK: My argument to that would be; every councilor does the same general thing, but in different ways.

TO: I'm indifferent. A lot of students don't know what a councilor does.

NGUYEN: Wouldn't that be an argument for having one?

TO: An explanation is very different from a job description too. It will give just as much information to a student as a job description without holding a councilor responsible.

BINCZYK: I'll be in favor of that.

KUSMU: A lot of the past debates have risen from the point about responsibility.

BINCZYK: So, everyone agrees for a job explanation.

BINCZYK: There is another suggestion to have some incentives such as having 10% off from SU businesses. However, it may be hard to implement in a coherent way.

KUSMU: All the staff gets the discount at a certain time.

TO: All the SU service volunteers get it too.

BINCZYK: Essentially this would be to give out any discounts at the beginning of the year. We can tie this recommendation to the one regarding swag.

TO: What about the oath?

BINCZYK: I got the impression that council wasn't really in favor of it.

BINCZYK: There was a recommendation by the General Manager to have more professional development opportunities for councilors. The idea we settled on was to have speakers come before council, and have workshops/presentations.

TO: Is it open to the public?

BINCZYK: I don't see why it shouldn't. I don't think we will get a lot of extra students all of a sudden. If we get a few extra participants, I don't see it affecting the quality of instruction that councilors would get.

KUSMU: It will depend on your objective. If this is aimed at being an incentive, it should be exclusive.

We don't have to specify the exact thing. We can say that we recommend CAC and *Discover Governance* to find professional development opportunities for councilors in conjunction with the General Manager.

BINCZYK: Does everyone agree with that? Great.

TO: I find the discussion about the time commitment interesting.

NGUYEN: I don't think you should specify it.

KUSMU: I think the councilor pay is something that we should have a discussion about in the future.

BINCZYK: I will finish the document as soon as possible and send it for approval.

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 6. REPORTS | <i>None</i> |
| 7. CLOSED SESSION | <i>NIL</i> |
| 8. NEXT MEETING | <i>No future meetings.</i> |
| 9. ADJOURNMENT | The meeting was adjourned by BINCZYK at 6.06 pm. |