



Council on Student Services
Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, January 18 2017
5:00 p.m. – 7:00 pm in room SL232

Members: Desmond P., Laura B., Jen Tigno., Liza A., Jessica K., Thomas W., Nafisa M., Sitharsana Srithas., Annie S., Caitlin C., Andrew L., Raymond D., Kubra Z., Indira R., Nikita R., Conor A., Joyce H., Trina J., Yasmin R., Michelle V., Nadia R., Erika L.

Non-Members: Ruxandra P., Manjot B., Jen D., Shehna J., Marg L., Kavita S., Ron C., Tony C., Kevin T., Delmar M., Kendel C., Nisbeth A., Chris B., Tasneem L., Megan L. (Secretary)

Before beginning, Jessica K noted the dialogue started at the January 9 meeting around the importance of the budget package being sent prior to the pre-budget meeting. Jessica stated there would be space between item #3 and #4 for discussion.

1. Approval of Agenda

Move: Thomas W.

Second: Sana S.

Agenda approved

2. Approval of Minutes

Move: Nikita R.

Second: Raymond D.

Minutes approved

3. Student Enhancement Fund-Round 2

Liza thanked the committee members and noted due to the size of this round they had to meet twice. She said many were approved, while many proposals were moved to SCSU Funding, Partnership Fund, or put on hold pending further information. This round \$48,659.58 was requested and they are asking approval for \$10,197.58. Liza then mentioned the 3rd round is usually the largest, and asked the group to read the proposals and then invited questions.

Thomas W. asked about the nature of the pending proposals.

Liza noted \$500 was for Shutterbugs and \$300 was for BioSA Let's Talk.

Liza asked to vote omnibus.

Motion to vote omnibus

Move: Liza A.

Second: Andrew L.

Motion approved to vote omnibus

Motion to approve the round 2 Enhancement Fund proposals

Move: Sana S.

Second: Annie S.

Motion approved

4. Budget Vote

Desmond noted the good quorum and recognized the Student Affairs staff and directors present. He stated that Joyce H. was present for financial questions before continuing. Desmond described some of the Student Affairs departmental accomplishments, such as: restructuring, leveraging tri-campus roles, collaboration across Student Affairs departments for shared Orientation and 6 Week programming, in addition to individual departmental achievements.

Kubra Z. asked about CCR validation process for student group members and how is it addressed when executives don't pass information to group.

Nadia R. said currently only campus group executive roles are included on the CCR. Focus groups said they only wanted to include leadership positions on the CCR.

Thomas W. added he had heard some groups say some executives didn't report CCR positions for other executives.

Desmond P. said that up until now everything has been done without any funding, which is why 0.5FTE is being requested for CCR

Kubra Z. asked about the possibility of all students being emailed about the CCR

Nadia R. said this was good takeaway information and noted to possibility of holding more focus groups to prepare for Fall. She also mentioned the DSL only has access to contact information for two signing officers.

Manjot B. added that the 0.5FTE position that has been requested will be dedicated to strategically examining the CCR.

Erika L. said that any students from CSS who sit on the DSL/ISC Advisory Committee are invited to raise this at the next meeting.

Desmond outlined the proposed investments:

- 0.6FTE for mental health nurse

- 0.5FTE for sessional counsellor (specialty in trauma)

- 0.5FTE for coordinator for DSL programming, leadership, and CCR

- 1.0FTE for equity and ambassador role in athletics

- \$15,000 for Get Started

- \$20,000 for Student Affairs equity, intercultural dialogue, and leadership development

Thomas W. asked Desmond why he thought it was a mistake to use the word "equity" to describe the requested Athletics role.

Desmond replied that equity covers a lot of things and means a lot of different things to different people. By attaching the word to the outreach role, it has created a bit of confusion.

Laura B. disagreed with Desmond, adding that equity is how Athletics envisions the role, noting a gap that needs to be filled and recognizing that there is a need to connect with groups using an equity framework in an outreach capacity.

Liza added that when "equity" is attached to a role, it is coming from the Principal's Office, which must be filtered in all programs. Whether it's actually named or not, all jobs moving forward will have an equity framework.

Trina J. said this discussion is an example of not being ready to move forward with this proposed role until a discussion is had about exactly what the details are.

Sana S. said there is confusion about what the role entails and added that it would be helpful to get feedback from the Advisory Committee.

Laura replied that it isn't possible to discuss the job, however, they have discussed issues and how to create solutions to address the issues. This is as concrete as she is able to get at this point.

Trina wanted to ensure a variety of intersects are recognized through this role

Desmond said this is what he was referring to when using the word “equity” as it opens up huge conversations. He said it isn’t unreasonable to have discussions during the development of the role. He reminded everyone the role is intended to get the best for all students as far as the use and involvement in TPASC and that student feedback is important in a position like this.

Annie S. added that at the January 9 meeting they said they might need more information to move forward. If the group votes no now, there won’t be the opportunity to try. She said that Athletics can’t move forward without resources and expect a description to be created now for consultation.

Desmond continued with some budget vote reminders, such as: all voting members can vote, however, only the student vote determines the outcome; a simple majority is required to pass the vote; the Chair doesn’t vote.

Desmond then presented the Student Services Fee (SSF) Schedule on the screen.

Raymond D. asked why there was a discrepancy between the numbers in the DSL/ISC minutes and the SSF.

Liza said they may have been draft numbers, but whatever number is presented in the Finance Advisory Committee and on the SSF is correct.

Raymond inquired about Line A for Student Affairs.

Joyce H. replied it is the Operating Fund for certain staff that was identified as critical expenses.

Desmond added that a major expense was additional funding for positions, but it was university money, for a high-risk position.

Thomas asked for clarification on the SSF regarding the use of brackets.

Joyce replied it notes contributions coming in.

Thomas further clarified by saying that \$75,000 is received from fee, and another \$25,000 is from the Principal’s Office.

Liza said that is correct, and compared it to the ISC line, noting that they receive funding from the university as well.

Thomas inquired as to the point of the brackets.

Joyce replied it is to show movement of funds meant to reduce the overall costs. They are only there to show the math.

Thomas asked that this be advised next year, because he read it as an expense which he found confusing.

Liza asked whether it would be easier for students to see just the net costs for students.

Joyce replied that it’s easier to include the net cost to students if it’s really the most relevant number, but wanted to show everything for transparency.

Desmond noted this discussion has come up before and students have asked for other contributions to be shown, especially university contributions, so the SSF is meant to capture that.

Raymond asked about the Student Centre Reserve

Desmond reminded the group that that line is collected regularly and was supporting the repayment of a loan and now, after discovering its intended purpose, is covering the maintenance of the exterior grounds and cladding.

Thomas said all this discussion reinforces the point that it important to have the SSF at the pre-budget meeting, because now so much voting time is being used to discuss the issues.

Desmond said that the pre-budget meeting is where these discussions take place and the materials were made available to voting members this year exceeding the timelines required by the by-laws. The CSS meeting is bookended by Governance cycles which ramps up after exams and the break. He said he would be happy to see the change addressed in the By-laws Advisory Committee but reminded timelines are limited.

Thomas said there still won’t be enough time even if exceeding the time requirements. Students should be able to see the SSF before the pre-budget meeting. If they are able to have the SSF at the meeting then he questioned why it couldn’t be distributed. If it isn’t distributed until five days before budget vote, then committee members will bring the discussion to the vote meeting, instead of the pre-budget meeting.

Desmond said there had been more meetings scheduled, however, he was told to have fewer, so the number of meetings was reduced.

Liza said they can strike an ad-hoc By-laws meeting where this can be addressed. In past CSS meetings, there were reports from the advisory committees that was part of the meeting agenda, which kept people up to date.

Desmond continued by drawing attention to the overall increase for all departments:

2.64% increase for FT 2.64% increase for PT

He mentioned the overall UTI/CPI increase is 3.9%, the lower of UTI/CPI is permanent, while the higher of the two is temporary for 3 years.

Connor, for clarity, asked the year over year increase will be the sum of the two, at which point after 3 years, the highest falls off and only the lowest is included.

Desmond said yes.

Jessica read the motions to the group.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

CSS approve a permanent year over year increase of 3% in the Health & Wellness fee, from \$65.35 to \$67.31 per full-time student per session (\$13.07 to \$13.46 for part-time)

Ballots distributed, members voted, ballots collected.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

CSS approve a permanent year over year increase of 2.5% in the Athletics & Recreation fee, from \$134.21 to \$137.57 per full-time student per session (\$26.84 to \$27.51 for part-time)

Ballots distributed, members voted, ballots collected.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

CSS approve a permanent year over year increase of 2.61% increase in the Student Services Fee, from \$173.08 to \$177.60 per full-time student per session (\$34.62 to \$35.52 for part-time)

Ballots distributed, members voted, ballots collected.

Jessica asked for a volunteer to act as scrutineer. Nikita R. volunteered.

Jessica K. counted the votes, Tasneem L. recorded the votes, and Nikita R. witnessed the votes.

Health & Wellness

Staff: 5 yes

Students: 9 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain

Health & Wellness budget passes.

Athletics

Staff: 5 yes

Students: 7 yes, 2 no, 2 abstain

Athletics budget passes

Student Services Fee

Staff: 5 yes

Students: 8 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain

SSF budget passes.

Jessica K. made a motion to destroy the ballots.

Move: Thomas W.

Second: Conor A.
Motion approved to destroy ballot

Jessica noted there were still questions surrounding the continuing conversation about the Athletics position, and the bylaws committee meeting around the pre-budget meeting, which can be addressed at the next meeting.

5. Adjournment

Move: Sana S.
Second: Kubra Z.
Meeting adjourned