

Students Nova Scotia	Board of Directors	students 
	<i>Meeting Minutes</i>	

Meeting Name:	Board Meeting		
Meeting Date:	December 9-10, 2012		
Meeting Time:	1:00PM, AST		
Venue:	The Hub Halifax	City:	Halifax, NS
Attendees			
Primary and Secondary Delegates:	Kyle Power (Chair/ASU), Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU), Matthew Rios (ASU), Jamie Arron (DSU), Jared Perry (SMUSA), Michelle Lahey (Vice-Chair/CBUSU), Mike MacDonell (SMUSA), Jesse Smith (ASTSU), Robert Bossler (ASTSU)		
Other attendees:	Jonathan Williams (Executive Director), Alexis Zederayko (Volunteer Recorder)		
Absent:	Patrick Carruthers (Treasurer/SFXUSU) (regrets), Aaron Beale (regrets).		
Quorum (50% of Members represented?): Yes			

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Roll call
- 3) Approval of Agenda
 - Amendment proposed: addition of item 9.
 - Amended agenda **approved by general consent.**

- 4) Approval of October 10, 2012 and November 9, 2012 Minutes
Minutes had not been circulated in time for previous meeting and deferred until present meeting. Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.
- In camera.**
- Out of camera.**
- Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Matthew Rios (ASU) **seconded the motion** for omnibus approval of October 10, 2012 and November 9, 2012 Minutes.
- Minutes **approved by general consent.**

REPORTS

- 5) Reports of the members
- Kyle Power (Chair/ASU) requested details regarding student assemblies.
- a) ASTSU
- i) All is going well.
 - ii) No student assemblies to date, as there were timing conflicts with other events. Will hold the first one in January.
 - iii) AST Board started discussions with faculty and students about our vision for campus.
- b) ASU
- i) Held Student Life Summit. StudentsNS attended, and it provided an opportunity for lots of robust discussions, spanning a vast scope of issues. Details will be circulated.
 - ii) Matthew Rios had a meeting with Ray Ivany regarding the outlook for the coming year.
 - iii) ASU began discussing hosting the student mental health conference.
- c) CBUSU
- i) Held their first student summit. Turnout was great.
 - ii) Engaged in dialogue with the municipal community regarding student alcohol use.
 - iii) Met with student operations and registrar. Will be getting another part-time counselor and improving mental health services for students.
- JW (ED): Request clarification regarding the status of campus alcohol policy.
- ML (CBUSU): CBUSU met with Gordon MacInnis [Financial Affairs, CBU], and will meet with the director of residence. Will update Board when more information is available.
- d) DSU
- i) JA (DSU) met with JW (ED) to discuss issues faced by International Students.
 - ii) The Mental Health Peer-Support Program is going well.
 - iii) Brian Foster (Communications) met with the director of Dalhousie's Career Resources Centre.
 - iv) JW (ED) met with DSU Council to discuss the Accountability Paper.
 - v) DSU is presently on its executive retreat, and planning its January 13th Volunteer Engagement project.

e) SMUSA

- i) Student assembly went well, and there was good student participation.
- ii) There was not enough time for referendum to occur, but it will happen in February at the same time as the executive elections.

N H-P (SFXUSU): What is the sense of the vote [concerning SMUSA's full membership within StudentsNS]?

JP (SMUSA): Believes that the vote will be 'positive', but will be wording questions differently.

f) SFXUSU

- i) Student assembly was a success. It included a small focus group that addressed funding formula issues, and provided an opportunity to gather information specific to rural campuses. Resulted in increases in student understanding of issues, and in interest in StudentsNS and CASA.
- ii) Held a prioritization review; SU worked with faculty and staff to look at programs offered.
- iii) Students received their X-Rings, resulting in wide-spread jubilation.

KP (Chair): Requested clarification concerning the aforementioned "prioritization."

N H-P (SFXUSU): It is in its early stages, but SU is working through the process and engaging in discussion with Guelph University and Wilfred Laurier University, who have undertaken a similar effort. They say that the process will take 2 years. There is lots of support from students and faculty.

6) Reports of the Officers

a) Chair – Kyle Power (ASU)

- i) Attended a week-long CASA meeting in Ottawa.
- ii) Attended student assembly in Wolfville.
- iii) Has been busy preparing documents for this meeting.

b) Vice-Chair – Michelle Lahey (CBUSU)

- i) Engaged in discussions with JW (ED) regarding the role of women in student governance campaign. Is presently obtaining information relevant to low representation of women in this arena.

c) Treasurer - Absent

7) Reports of the staff

a) Executive Director: Jonathan Williams

- i) Meeting with PC (Treasurer) to discuss StudentNS's finances

KP (Chair): Due to the order of Agenda items, suggests deferring the remainder of the ED report to tomorrow morning. *(Agreed.)*

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

8) Reports and discussion regarding first round of student assemblies.

JW (ED): StudentsNS attended four student assemblies on 4 different campuses. ED is excited about the models that are emerging, and happy about how seriously these assemblies are taken. They seem to be a useful tool for SU's, and seem like they are off to a good start. He would really like to round-table the member's experiences, but we presently have a full agenda; ED does not anticipate that there will be time.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Found that many students lacked information that would have liked to have prior to the assembly. He wants to get briefs together to distribute so that students are better prepared for discussions.

JW (ED): These briefs are on the list of items to work on (together with responsibilities of the different levels of government N H-P requested in a previous meeting); further attention will be paid as to how to distribute or summarize documents that are 35+ pages long. Received valuable feedback from the board presentations at DSU and CBU.

KP (Chair): Board will take this issue up again next semester before the next round of student assemblies.

9) Funding and Accountability Position Paper.

JW (ED): Circulated the final version of this motion, and it has been approved by Board. The Paper itself is a reflection of the motion.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification: did the Paper change significantly after Board discussions? (*No.*)

JW (ED): Requested formal feedback. If student assemblies yield concerns or recommendations for change, members will need to notify StudentsNS a week in advance for the changes to be drafted. ED did not receive feedback in any formal form (only in brief conversation), and has no way to subjectively assess what is desired change and what is discussion. The only group so far to voice serious concerns is the DSU.

JA (DSU): ED came to a SU council meeting at the beginning of November. There were many significant questions raised, predominantly concerning the lack of clarity of certain items (these concerns were sent to ED). JA attempted to organize a council discussion, but members were unable to attend. Most of the questions addressed the quality of the Position Paper. JA would like to receive further input, and would prefer not to be put into a position of deciding whether or not to formally adopt items that the council does not fully understand. He advises keeping this Paper in draft form; while JA understands frustration that may result from the lag, he feels that the delay is important.

JW (ED): Here are the questions raised by the DSU:

- i) How do we ensure students aren't left to make up the shortfall in tuition dollars if funding is withdrawn in some programs?
- ii) Determining specific process by which incentive indicators will be determined.
- iii) As StudentsNS what types of indicators do we want to see (eg. rates of employment, student satisfaction ratings, outreach to low-income communities, research recognition, etc)? are there certain types of research/teaching we want to incentivize?
- iv) How do we ensure that this doesn't undermine the academic autonomy of the university? how do we ensure it actually achieves the goals that I think it is we are trying to achieve?
- v) How do we ensure that this doesn't result in constant shift of universities' priorities as governments come and go... resulting in waste/inefficiency/lack of vision?

JA (DSU): The DSU Council supports the steering principles of this Position Paper, but would like these questions explored prior to adopting a formal position.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification as to the topic of questions 4 and 5 (designated by “this”). (*Refers to funding formula.*) Is the Board able to answer these questions to the extent that it would affect the writing of the Position Paper?

JW (ED): Some of these questions are addressed by the Paper, and some are the work of further Papers and are outside of this one’s scope. For example, questions addressing tuition, total system funding and specific indicators require negotiation with government and universities. We don’t want to state our position on these matters so firmly that we’d have to backtrack after receiving more information. This Paper is designed to set a basic negotiation framework.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Regarding the second question: didn’t we talk about being hesitant to proscribe specific processes, thereby leaving us open to work with specific stakeholders? (*Yes – this Paper creates a structure by which we can intervene, negotiate, and work further.*)

JW (ED): We do not have the resources to address all of these questions right away. Home-Office’s opinion is that no Paper can address all of these details.

MR (ASU): Was there an email sent in reply to the DSU? Can we go through each question to identify points that can be addressed now?

JA (DSU): Is okay with that, but addressing these questions will not change anything [concerning the DSU Council’s concerns].

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification as to where in the future these questions will be addressed.

JS (ASTSU): Requested clarification regarding the question on university autonomy [question 3] – public funding requires accountability, which is in conflict with true autonomy.

JW (ED): Briefly addressed the concerns of each question:

Q1: Is outside of the scope of this Paper.

Q2: It is indicated in the Position Paper that these are determined by the MOU, and that students will be major players in formation of the MOU. MPHEC has lots of information, and will be key in determining our approach.

Q3: There are some examples in the Position Paper, but many recommendations will be drawn from MPHEC and articulated in the Quality Position Paper. We did not want to tackle this topic at this time, as it would require much more work, and the Quality Paper is not due to be released until September.

Q4: Regarding ‘autonomy’, it is often a conflation of academic freedom and institutional autonomy, which supposedly protects academic freedom. So how do we not undermine it? This Paper is specifically about reasonably curtailing it, and ensuring accountability for student funds.

MR (ASU): Didn’t the Board already have robust discussions about this? (*That is up to the Board’s judgment.*)

JW (ED): Given that, in the past, Nova Scotia has seen university independence and autonomy result in serious problems, we don’t want to protect non-accountability.

KP (Chair): We are discussing the use of public funds.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Our role as StudentsNS is to ensure accountability of public funds. Our existence would be hard to defend, otherwise.

JW (ED): Our Position Paper states that protecting academic freedom is important, but we are not in a position to proscribe resolutions for that.

Q5: The second recommendation in this Paper is that there should be a common vision, and that students should have a part in determining it. Changes that may result from the election of different governments is a concern, and we must keep this in mind during negotiations. There is legitimacy in different governments being elected for different priorities.

KP (Chair): Also, we are involved in this process.

JW (ED): Regarding concerns about tuition and indicators: there is a process for determining these things. StudentsNS has other Papers due to be released in 3 months, no decisions will be made in the meantime so there is no risk to leaving these open right now. MPHEC's studies are key, and are not yet completed. We aren't falling behind – we're waiting to see if the funding formula has changed to encompass these envelopes. We want to account for the timing of other decisions.

N H-P (SFXUSU): These discussions are being had now, and it is important for us to have released a Paper with our position on it.

JA (DSU): Agreed, but the tone of the Paper doesn't account for unknown variables. How do we fix the disparities? How do we engage partners to get the most input? DSU has concerns about reducing the enrollment grant; without being clear about the other elements, such as how students are involved, there are worries about the government setting criteria with which we don't agree. DSU is not willing to open up a whole can of worms, and worries about constraining universities to the point where they become diploma factories. Yes, let's give our staff the room to pull in this information, but let's keep this Paper as a draft and ratify it later on. JA is happy with the discussion here, but the message from the DSU Council is that there are too many unknown variables.

JW (ED): Understands JA's concerns, but the first recommendation of the Paper is that students are full partners in development of funding, etc. If the government ignores it, it is a basis for objection. The other concerns that were raised do not speak to the current Position Paper as described, such as performance indicators. Throughout the process, they can be developed. This Paper doesn't preclude us from objecting. It does open up a terrain on which we can fight with the government, but it is important to create space for struggle if we want change. The staff's position is that this Paper has a clear flexibility and vision to resolve the impasse.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification: what is the motion on the table?

JW (ED): The motion [provided below] is 3 pages long, and is essentially an outline of the Paper.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Called the question.

KP (Chair): Is there any opposition to a vote?

JA (DSU): It will be in conflict with the DSU Council if it passes.

MR (ASU): As a Board member of StudentsNS, did JA receive any feedback from the DSU Council regarding your attempts to satisfy their concerns? (*JA requests clarification of this question.*) Have any of their objections been mitigated?

JA (DSU): Noted limited time involved; DSU requires discussions beyond the scope of 45 minute discussion.

JW (ED): StudentsNS provides schools with a month to review the Papers before passing them.

JA (DSU): Discussions require more than one month. The document was provided at the beginning of November, and is still not resolved.

N H-P (SFXUSU): We are looking to pass the Position Paper so we can discover answers to questions raised. This Paper does not close doors, but opens them.

MR (ASU): Noted that JA's goals are good, as they open the breadth of the conversation. The Position Paper allows for those conversations to be had with the government.

KP (Chair): The Board's priorities were set at the outset, and no matter where we start, will not be complete, since we are starting from scratch. The conversation now is about approving the Paper and moving forward or delaying.

JA (DSU): Noted that he would be required to vote contrary to the motion.

MR (ASU): Suggested sending a letter from the ED and Chair addressing DSU's questions and outlining next steps.

JW (ED): This Position Paper leads into others; without strong position envelopes, we are unable to apply recommendations regarding International Students, Student Mental Health, etc. All work is held up in those areas if we can't approve these fundamental positions.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Reiterated previous call to question.

KP (Chair): Heard no objections. Called vote.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXSU) **moved** and Jared Perry (SMUSA) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia approve the proposed System Funding Paper and its corresponding Policy Statement:

Students Nova Scotia Policy Statement

WHEREAS Students Nova Scotia holds the following Principles:

Post-secondary institutions play vital economic, social, and cultural roles in Nova Scotia, most significantly by educating students.

Post-secondary institutions should be treated as parts within a system and encouraged to cooperate in pursuit of common objectives.

Public funding to Nova Scotia post-secondary institutions should be provided in ways that encourage accountability and incentivize improved performance.

Public funding to Nova Scotia post-secondary institutions should be responsive to changes in cost drivers.

All reasonable efforts should be made to ensure the revenues post-secondary institutions receive to educate a student are tied to the cost of serving that student.

Funding allocation must accommodate the diversity of Nova Scotia post-secondary institutions.

Public funding to universities should be reasonably predictable.

Public funding among universities should be distributed transparently and without unfairly favouring certain universities over others.

Institutional autonomy, academic freedom and accountability to students and the public must be and can be reconciled.

AND WHEREAS StudentsNS has identified the following Concerns:

Nova Scotia's university system lacks long-term system-level thinking, clear public policy goals and objectives, and accountability mechanisms.

Students are not included as full partners in the Memorandum of Understanding negotiations that set the direction of Nova Scotia's university system.

Nova Scotia's prime university age cohort is declining and recruitment of future out-of-province and international enrolment is unpredictable at best. For this reason, a heavily enrolment-based formula is the wrong mechanism to allocate university funding.

The funding formula's current emphasis on enrolment encourages unhealthy competition between universities, discourages cooperation and threatens institutional viability.

The current enrolment-based funding formula incentivizes enrolment growth over all other factors, including quality of educational programs and services.

The Weighted Enrolment Grant does not promote institutional accountability.

The heavily enrolment-driven formula does not accurately reflect the costs of operating Nova Scotia's universities.

Enrolment figures currently used to calculate the Weighted Enrolment Grant are out-of-date and therefore provide an inaccurate picture of institutional costs.

The current funding formula restricts government funding for international students at an arbitrary percentage of the total student population.

The current funding formula includes no accountability measures to ensure public funding for international students is spent in support of these students.

Through the Research Grant provision of the current funding formula, the Province provides adequate funding to cover typical research overhead costs. However, universities claim an additional percentage of all research awards ostensibly to cover the same overhead costs. This hinders empirical research and innovation in Nova Scotia by diverting funds from core research activities.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT StudentsNS makes the following recommendations:

StudentsNS, as the representative of greater than 85% of Nova Scotia university students, should be included as a full partner in future tripartite Memoranda of Understanding between the Province, Universities, and Students.

Nova Scotia should build a formal Post-Secondary Policy and Accountability Framework, in full partnership with students and the universities, in time for the next Memorandum of Understanding (2015-2018).

i. The Framework should set clear policy objectives for Nova Scotia's post-secondary system and establish accountability mechanisms to focus universities' efforts toward reaching those objectives.

ii. The Framework should include mandatory comprehensive annual reports from government and institutions, which are easy to access and fully transparent with respect to revenues, spending decisions and compliance with accountability measures.

Nova Scotia should continue to employ a funding formula approach, including a Weighted Enrolment Grant, and based upon the present bin-weights.

The government should significantly reduce the proportion of funding allocated through the Weighted Enrolment Grant. For purposes of discussion, we propose that approximately 50% of funding be distributed through this part of the funding formula.

The Weighted Enrolment Grant should be calculated using a rolling average of the three most recent years for which final enrolment data is available, thereby ensuring that universities are funded based on more current estimates of actual expected costs.

International students should be removed from the Weighted Enrolment Grant component of the funding formula.

Accountability in funding should be established by allocating significant funds between a Learning-Focused Envelope and a Provincial Initiatives Envelope. For discussion purposes, we propose the each envelope be allocated 20% of the total operating funding.

The Learning-Focused Envelope should be allocated using a combination of performance and non-competitive strategic funding.

The Provincial Initiatives Envelope should be allocated using a combination of competitive and non-competitive strategic funding mechanisms.

New Restricted International Student Grants should be introduced to cover some institutional costs of educating international students and included within the Provincial Initiatives and Learning-Focused Envelopes.

Any institution claiming a portion of competitive research awards for administrative purposes should be required to refund the full value of the Provincial Research Grant.

Vote:

CBUSU - Yes

SFXSU – Yes

DSU – No

ASU – Yes

ASTSU - Yes

Motion passed.

KP (Chair): Thank you to JA and ML for staying. Called for a 5 minute recess.

(Jamie Arron (DSU) and Michelle Labey (CBUSU) left the Board Meeting.)

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Nick Head-Petersen (SFXSU) **seconded the motion** for a 5 minute recess.

Recess

Out of recess.

10) Platform for provincial election.

JW (ED): Apologized for not circulating this in advance, but will go over it now with the Board. The Board identified 4 themes for developing this platform:

Nova Scotia's next provincial government should ...

(1) Support Nova Scotian students with the best student assistance program in Canada.

- (2) Include Stronger Student Voice in the Post-Secondary System.
- (3) Promote Quality and Affordability by Providing Adequate Funding and Ensuring Institutional Accountability.
- (4) Invest in Students' Life-long Wellbeing.

The wording is flexible. It was drafted by BP (Research) and BF (Communications). The document goes on to say that: "The next provincial government should eliminate interest on the provincial portion of student loans." As is done on PEI, the government will recoup less money through repayment of loans. Estimate cost is projection of current low interest rate, but interest will go up. Further benefits include: eliminating interest is hard to undo politically; it is not very expensive, but it looks good, so is very attractive to political parties; it is a step forward for accessibility; as it is a highly visible new element to the student assistance program – it may make the student loan program more attractive than would changes to the grant/loan ratio even if its concrete implications are smaller.

N H-P (SFXUSU): What is the budget of the provincial government? And what is the amount spent on the education envelope? (*\$328 Million, and 4.1%.*) So it is not a lot of money. (*Correct.*)

JW (ED): \$30 Million per year is the cost for the NS Bursary to reduce tuition by \$1283 for NS students, and \$521 for out-of-province students. These projections only go back to 2007, as prior to that time RBC provided student loans.

KP (Chair): Regarding up-front costs, we are not asking the government to fund a new program, but to eliminate a revenue stream in terms of loan interest.

JW (ED): The issue concerns the potential for a 1:1 grant/loan ratio to reduce debt for 10,300 students. This change would result in a substantial benefit for students who need help most. Asking the government to raise the limit on student loans is a hard "ask" to work through. The question is how to eliminate unmet need, especially within International programs, and to what extent should NS subsidize expensive out-of-province programs. \$3.49 million would be required to meet unmet need for NS students at NS universities. One problem is that some private colleges tie tuition to assistance. We need more data – the details are not fully fleshed out, but the Board can indicate direction. A lot of money in this category would go to Law and Medicine students if the grant/loan ratio changed. The cost of this ask also changes with time. There is the Ontario Graduate Scholarship in Ontario; we would be looking to create a mimic of the OGS. We have a lower ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students than Ontario, but the Ontario ratio has been assumed for the purpose of these cost projections.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requests clarification regarding the number of schools adding grad programs, as well as the changes in costs that can be expected.

JW (ED): It is not a huge ratio, as grad students comprise less than 20% of total students. The cost increases that are anticipated involve just a couple of thousand dollars. It is our position that the government should eliminate the Grad Retention Rebate. This would be accomplished to pay for the other recommendations, and graduates with higher debt would benefit more. Also, it is a better retention strategy as it raises the attractiveness of our graduate programs. Costs would increase as a result of StudentsNS' recommendations, but eliminating the rebate balances those increases almost exactly. In terms of tuition and education tax credits gets complicated, as most provinces have tax credits available to students; we would have to figure out how this change interacts with students coming and going from NS. One idea is that tax credits could be made refundable.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Leaving off on this topic allows CASA time to do research.

JW (ED): We could just put the additional funds into tuition reduction, but it would require lots of work to figure out the impacts.

JS (ASTSU): Noted that he has been in both the position of a student with and without a need for tax credits, and found them to be of direct benefit as a grad student and part of his strategic thinking.

KP (Chair): Older students may need them more.

JW (ED): Tax credits may unjustly benefit higher-income people. “The next provincial government should invest in improved academic, career and financial planning in secondary schools”: here we state a commitment to high-quality career counseling. Concerning income exemptions: this issue gets complicated very quickly. It isn’t clear how huge of a benefit it will be, or how it will impact part-time students.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Head Office may want to contact CASA, as they have some information on this.

JW (ED): We have 2 new envelopes for this platform. We’re skipping Position Papers with this document, but we have to get it to parties in a timely manner. This paper recommends a formal student approval process for all compulsory ancillary fees. StudentsNS suggests a referendum for this.

MR (ASU): Will the government mandate this process? (*Yes.*)

KP (Chair): There were long discussions concerning this topic during the MOU process. The government didn’t want it included in the MOU, but it should be something for universities to negotiate with students.

JW (ED): There would have to be formal approval, not just consultation. There was also suggestions of recommending an audit of university finances, but we can’t make the auditor general do something in a platform, so this is not included. Concerning theme #4 (*Focus on Mental Health and Housing*), it’s not clear that parties will want to take this up.

MR (ASU): Met with Mayor Savage, who encouraged StudentsNS to reach out.

JW (ED): This is on StudentsNS’s list of things to do. The intention was to approve this document today, but if not, then ideally before Christmas. We may want to explore the numbers for tuition and funding. This document presents university funding and tuition under various scenarios. It is linked to GDP or inflation, so that funding evolves with the government’s capacity to pay. We aren’t going to worry about “Real GDP” at this point, and if we tie it to CPI (2x), universities may argue that they have their own inflation based on human capital costs (3x or 4x). Universities have kept a steady proportion of government funding. Under this model, they will have a constant share.

KP (Chair): But it will be difficult for universities to plan.

JW (ED): Tuition increases would be tied to inflation in income. A viability test could be: how much money comes out of government grants. BP (Research) recommends that it be tied to CPI, but there may be problems, such as when tuition or funding doesn’t increase by at least 2xCPI: will this result in money out of the system? Some proposals include asking the government to provide grants at 3x the rate of inflation or funding provided via tuition or operating grant increases tied to the rates of GDP. Additional funds could be put into tuition offsets instead of the university.

KP (Chair): It seems to be a microcosm, and is not at the depth that will be approached during the election setting. The question is: how deep do we need to go, and if we’re going deep, focusing on tuition may be more attractive.

JW (ED): For the platform, we should recognize that tuition rates are dependent on these factors.

MR (ASU): Noted that fixed costs differ based on location.

JW (ED): If the Board wants, ED can approach parties with asks that don’t include this. We can approve everything else, but leave this out.

KP (Chair): We have, however, seen the ratio move in the wrong direction.

JW (ED): We could address it by asking for the ratio to stay the same, except for changes in funding for International Students.

KP (Chair): That may work as a broad principle, given that we are lacking specific data.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Robert Bossler (ASTSU) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.

In camera.

Out of camera.

JW (ED): ED will send this document out this evening for review.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion** to table this item until tomorrow morning. **Motion passed** by general consent.

11) Appointment of Board Reviewers for Funding and Tuition, Student Mental Health, Employment, and International Students Position Papers

KP (Chair): All relevant documents have been circulated. There is no discussion anticipated unless any Board members have questions. This won't be approved unless the Board wills it, but the intention is to appoint reviewers so that staff can move forward.

MR (ASU): Requested clarification regarding the Funding and Tuition Paper's "Key concepts" and the "total cost of education". Would like to know more concerning the costs of running each institution – both fixed and variable – Can StudentsNS work on this.

KP (ASU): Called for any other questions.

JW (ED): In the future, Board members may want to pay special attention to the "Principles" in these Papers.

N H-P (SFXUSU): ML may be particularly interested in the topic of International Students.

JP (SMUSA): Self-nominated as a reviewer for the International Student Position Paper.

MR (ASU): Requested clarification as to what criteria we are looking for in reviewers, and what type of work is required.

JW (ED): Criterion mainly involves interest in the subject area. The work involves careful reviewing and editing within 1 week of receipt. It will be the first draft, so early feedback is solicited on direction and structure. Home Office staff will take all feedback under advisement, and will take the StudentsNS mandate, etc. into account.

N H-P (SFXUSU): The Mental Health topic may interest someone who is working on the conference. Nominated Matthew Rios (ASU) as a reviewer for the Funding and Tuition Paper. Nominated Jamie Arron (DSU) as a reviewer for the Mental Health Paper.

JS (ASTSU): Self-nominated as a reviewer for the Employment Paper.

KP (Chair): JA (DSU) is absent, and can neither accept nor turn down his nomination. Suggests tabling this item until tomorrow morning.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Matthew Rios (ASU) **seconded the motion** to table this item until tomorrow morning. **Motion passed** by general consent.

12) Proposed study on how student unions can promote healthy attitudes and safe consumption with respect to alcohol.

JW (ED): Felt that there are too few people present for this discussion to take place. Recommended tabling this discussion until tomorrow, when the DSU and CBUSU will be represented. Since the cost of this study would fall to student unions, Board cannot pass a vote on this issue without representation from the DSU and CBUSU. These projected estimates assume that SMUSA will contribute as a full member. ED sent the document to the Board, and would like them to think it through.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **seconded the motion** to table this item until tomorrow morning. **Motion passed** by general consent.

13) Proposed amendment to the Governing Policies regarding member statements.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted frustration in regards to the other 6 agenda items and the absence of several members. Asked Chair to invoke powers to hold members accountable for attendance.

KP (Chair): Input received.

RB (ASTSU): Noted his absence during tomorrow's meeting. Requests clarification as to how he can proxy his vote.

KP (Chair): Absent Board members can write a paragraph imbuing their powers to vote and comment.

JW (ED): Also, ASTSU may not want to participate in study of alcohol use on campus. Will discuss this matter further after the Board meeting.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Mike MacDonell (ASU) **seconded the motion** to table this item until tomorrow morning.

KP (Chair): Recommended that we deal with this item during this meeting; there will be no more Board members present tomorrow than there is today.

14) Proposed Women in Student Politics Campaign.

JW (ED): This item is more of an update and small decision.

JW (ED): Requests clarification as to Student Council election timelines within member schools.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Jan 10, but non-elected positions still hold.

JW (ED): Is not sure how many of the Board members have seen the proposal, but noted its complexity. Requested direction regarding posters and funding. ED recommends that the Board spend out of the campaign budget, with the understanding that funding from the foundation "Democracy 250" is most likely secured.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Nick Head-Petersen (SFXSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia draw funds from the Campaign Budget line to fund this campaign.

MR (ASU): Noted that StudentsNS should pursue this campaign regardless of the security of D250 funding. The makeup of this Board is not representative of the diversity within the student body.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Agreed. Requested clarification regarding the expected amount of funding. (\$1350.) Also, would like [during the campaign] to create as many opportunities as possible for students, instead of paying for work from companies.

KP (Chair): We may not have time to investigate this.

JS (ASTSU): This document states that the ASTSU executive is 100% male, but it's 60% female. (*JW apologizes for mistake*).

MM (SMUSA): Requested clarification regarding the \$2500 line for food.

JW (ED): This is to allow for greater attendance of social events.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Called the question.

KP (Chair): Called the vote.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

ASU – Yes

AST - Yes

Motion passed unanimously.

JW (ED): Recommended a governing policy which would encourage universities to consider both genders when appointing members to the StudentsNS Board.

N H-P (SFXUSU): This may be out of our control, although it is a good intention.

JS (ASTSU): Instead of “both genders,” could the wording try to avoid dichotomizing gender? (*So amended.*)

KP (Chair): If approved, will be inserted into governing policies.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Robert Bossler (ASTSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia approve the adoption of the following clause into its governing policies:

Members are expected to consider gender representation when making appointments to the Board of Directors.

Motion passed by general consent.

15) Proposed Mental Health Conference.

JW (ED): MR, JA, and ED met last week to discuss this issue. ED met with Lisa Jacobs regarding the offer of \$10,000 from the government to hold a mental health conference. If we wanted, we could split these funds between the conference and the alcohol study. Ms. Jacobs has no problem with StudentsNS holding the conference, but does not want it to constitute a protest or confrontation. The goal is public education and policy formation. MR recommends holding the event at Acadia University; they are super-supportive in terms of providing a location, food, technology, etc. The conference may also benefit from Acadia’s profile.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted that mental health conferences in the past provided funding for travel. We may want to do similarly.

JW (ED): We are presently trying to figure out how to divide the money. Individuals coming from Cape Breton and Antigonish will have to stay the night, so we’re taking everything into consideration: the cost of organization, facilitations, speakers, etc. We’re looking at essential costs and then budgeting down from there. We’re also looking into potentially working with other student groups, although invitations for this would come from ASU, not from StudentsNS. In terms of the Agenda, invitations will be sent for representatives from each school to ask for feedback of what students are looking to see at the conference, and this feedback will determine content; it will be based on the participants.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Recommended having students speak about mental health, perhaps sharing their personal stories.

JW (ED): Noted agreement. There will be a focus on facilitation and conversation. The aforementioned representatives are not intended to be only SU executives; we are hoping to get input from international students, women’s centre representatives, etc.

N H-P (SFXUSU): The earlier the date is set, the better.

JW (ED): Agreed. Is a motion needed at this point? (*No.*)

MR (ASU): Ms. Jacobs is our contact for the Strang Review. She advises that the conference address both mental health and substance abuse (especially alcohol). The ASU is committed to the success of this conference, and has access to a “wellness fund.” MR advised leaving fixed costs of the conference to the ASU. Also noted a preference for not allowing our funding

restrictions to determine the content of the conference; he prefers to design an amazing conference, and then find ways to fund it.

JW (ED): Maybe Board should work out funding for transportation.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Maybe a letter should be sent to determine estimated costs.

MR (ASU): Noted benefit of dedicating funds to media and awareness.

KP (Chair): Felt that the Board should apply the \$10,000 to the conference first, and use what is left over for other stuff.

N H-P (SFXUSU): We will burn through that money pretty easily. Board may want to discuss what to do if it runs out.

JW (ED): Is in the process of forming a budget.

MR (ASU): Recommended that the Board put out informal calls for support. Also, JA had expressed concerns about StudentsNS putting on the conference; if it is being held by the ASU, then the ASU is coming to StudentsNS and asking for help planning.

OTHER BUSINESS

JW (ED): Regarding the next agenda item, as well as the conference, can Board members please send their timetables to ED by tomorrow?

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.

In camera.

Out of camera.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Matthew Rios (ASU) **seconded the motion** to recess until tomorrow morning. **Motion passed by general consent.**

Recess.

Out of recess.

Roll call.

Present: Matthew Rios (ASU), Kyle Power (Chair/ASU), Aaron Beale (DSU), Michael MacDonell (SMUSA), Jared Perry (SMUSA), Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU), Jonathan Williams (ED), Alexis Zederayko (VR).

Regrets: Patrick Carruthers (SFXUSU), Michelle Lahey (CBUSU), Robert Bossler (ASTSU), Jesse Smith (ASTSU).

10) Platform for provincial election (Continued)

JW (ED): Yesterday, we reviewed the mental health conference and the party platform document.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification: what does the ED need, in order for him to move forward with this item?

JW (ED): Would require information as to which parts of policies to include in platform. Board can choose not to endorse some, but we need to communicate something to parties.

KP (Chair): PC mentioned a need for something regarding funding/tuition ratio to ensure that it doesn't fall by the wayside. (*Agreed.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Do we have something concerning mental health outside of academia? (*Yes.*)
Requests clarification: do we have a template for these reports? (*Yes, we received one from Kula, but it might need more work.*)

MR (ASU): Does AB have any questions regarding the content of yesterday's discussion?

AB (DSU): Not at this time. Also, regrets absence yesterday.

MR (ASU): Would ED like to give highlights to AB? (*Yes, ED did so.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Regarding the retention rebate, do we have data about its ineffectiveness? (*Yes, and StudentsNS has been citing it all along.*)

JW (ED): Noted inclusion of StudentsNS in MOU as a full partner, and the introduction of accountability envelopes to the funding formula, and enhanced regulations concerning ancillary fees. Proposed audit not included in our platform asks.

AB (DSU): Requested clarification: this was sent yesterday? (*Yes.*)

MM (SMUSA): How is this presented during the election? (*It is presented pre-election.*) Are items negotiable? (*That depends on the will of the Board. The first step is to hash them out, then consider their negotiability.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted importance of capturing timing to see what parties will come up with. Requested input from Board members who know more about party politics.

MM (SMUSA): Some platforms are currently in development.

JW (ED): We can put in vague desires for no change – for example, with the percent of funding.

MR (ASU): We may want to include an item on the sustainable reconfiguration of the system.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification: is it our intention to have this document out by December 21st? (*Yes.*) Moved for the Board to accept the Platform for the Provincial Election document in principle and that Board gives consent to reviewed draft of the final Election Platform by December 17th, to be voted on no later than 12:00 on December 13th. (*Board may want earlier dates than this.*) December 12th, then?

KP (Chair): Does the ED need 1 week to finish drafting the document? (*ED can have it finished by the 12th.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Even if it is finished on the 14th, it will not take the Board a long time to look through it. (*Agreed. It doesn't require major changes, so vote can be expected by the 12th.*) Requested clarification: will the items on tuition and funding be included? (*ED will put in a paragraph to this effect.*)

KP (Chair): We also need to make it presentable.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted importance of not sending a [Microsoft Word format] document to parties. It may also be beneficial to share with parties for bi-lateral agreement and possibly presentation in early January.

KP (Chair): Disagreed. Parties don't want to run on old ideas, so it would not be beneficial to circulate the document.

N H-P (SFXUSU): There is currently a lot of discussion concerning this topic within universities.

JW (ED): But if those universities do not get this, they won't know if we took a position on tuition and funding.

AB (DSU): Requested clarification concerning StudentsNS' tuition stance.

KP (Chair): It is now a broader statement about downloading costs.

JW (ED): If we go heavy on the tuition stance, since universities need to recoup these costs through funding, it would be unclear how universities are to meet all their systems funding needs.

AB (DSU): When was this document created? (*Friday.*) And the Board discussed it yesterday? (*Yes.*)

MR (ASU): The Board wanted to make sure that everybody had an opportunity to read it before any vote.

AB (DSU): Noted that an election is likely in the fall.

KP (Chair): Yes, but come February, the province may decide on a spring election. Calls vote.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia approve the following policies for communication to the parties in advance of the coming election:

The next provincial government should raise the limit on maximum annual provincial student financial assistance (i.e. reduce unmet financial need).

The next provincial government should increase the grant-to-loan ratio of Nova Scotia Student Assistance to 50/50

The next provincial government should eliminate interest on the provincial portion of student loans

The next provincial government should create a Nova Scotia Graduate Scholarship to build advanced studies and research capacity in Nova Scotia and better compete with other provinces and international PSE leaders.

The next provincial government should include Students Nova Scotia, as the representative of 85% of Nova Scotia university students, as a full partner with the Province and the Universities in future Memoranda of Understanding.

The next provincial government should build a formal *Post-Secondary Policy and Accountability Framework*, in full partnership with students and institutions. This would:

The next provincial government should reverse the long-term trend of shifting university system costs onto students by committing to increase public funding to the universities at a faster rate than tuition and in such a way as reflects inflation in university operating costs.

The next provincial government should regulate tuition for all students, including professional and international students, to ensure predictability and university accountability in keeping the costs of programs under control, and with the goal of reversing the long-term trend in shifting university costs onto students.

The next provincial government should strengthen regulations on all compulsory ancillary fees, such that:

- all new ancillary fees must be approved through a formal student approval process agreed upon by each institution's student association and be subject to periodic review by students or term limits on project-specific fees;
- all existing compulsory student fees are easily distinguishable from tuition with respect to the goods and services they pay for;
- compulsory student fees, once in effect, may not grow faster than inflation;
- university annual financial reports clearly itemize fee revenues and their disbursement into discrete accounts by intended function; and,
- the total cost and justification for all student fees (tuition, compulsory, and non-compulsory) is easily accessible on university websites, including projected cost increases over each program's typical length.

The next provincial government should initiate a comprehensive review of health services on all post-secondary campuses in Nova Scotia, in view of generating a Post-Secondary Student Wellness Strategy.

The next provincial government should invest in improved academic, career and financial planning in secondary schools.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU – Yes

ASU – Yes

Motion passed unanimously.

11) Appointment of Board Reviewers for Funding and Tuition, Student Mental Health, Employment, and International Students Position Papers (Continued)

MR (ASU): Self-struck from nomination, and nominated Patrick Carruthers (SFXUSU). (*PC has already agreed to accept this nomination.*)

KP (Chair): Is waiting to hear from JA for final appointment. Proposed reviewers: Jared Perry (SMUSA) - International Students, Jamie Arron (DSU) - Mental Health, Patrick Carruthers (SFXUSU) - Funding and Tuition, Jesse Smith (ASTSU) - Employment

- 12) Proposed study on how student unions can promote healthy attitudes and safe consumption with respect to alcohol (Continued)

JW (ED): I spoke to 3 references, all excellent, and involved BP and BF from Home Office staff. I discussed this with the chosen consultant, and told her the details – that it is about safe consumption and healthy attitudes concerning alcohol. She works for Martell Consulting Services Ltd., and she has a website.

MM (SMUSA): Noted desire to avoid having a vague contract. Is there any way to ensure clarity and direction?

JW (ED): All references said that she is on time with all of her projects, even if they started late. We can also write strict terms into the contract.

MR (ASU): Noted concern about wasting money and making a project public if it is not up to par. Advised Board to ensure its own protection.

KP (Chair): What is the timeline for approval? Also, can we get this project completed in time for the conference?

JW (ED): Tried to figure out a timeline with her, but it is ultimately a Board decision. We may wish to use the conference as a way to gather feed-back and hold a focus group, or we can release prior. It may be valuable to release early in next Board's mandate, since members of this Board will be leaving in 1 month.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted that, throughout Board member transition, he hopes that current Board members convey the importance of this project to incoming members.

JW (ED): It may be beneficial to release it in April, then. In an email, the consultant outlined spending 2 days on each campus. She recommends that the Board appoint a steering committee to draft terms of reference. ED was clear that drinking is going to play a part in campus, so she knows the scope to guide her recommendations. She will be wholly independent, and the final decisions will be hers. The Board decides whether or not to release publically or to keep it internal.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.

In camera.

Out of camera.

JP (SMUSA): Requested clarification as to what happens if one school does not agree to the project? (*The other schools will re-allocate.*)

JW (ED): The total cost, excluding visits to campus, will be \$21,000, projected on a model of equal participation of the DSU, ASU, SFXUSU, CBUSU, and NSACSA. ED is not recommending ASTSU's participation, as cost may outweigh benefit in their case.

KP (Chair): We may not come up with terms of reference today. If we want to release on April 10th, what is the timeline? (*To be determined.*) So is it beneficial to form a steering committee now?

JW (ED): Advised working through the terms of reference with the consultant after confirming contract, but Board may want to draft them now.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Can then take the draft to our respective councils for approval. (*ED can draft terms of reference with steering committee and will circulate within Board.*)

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion** to create a steering committee of 3 people (in addition to Home Office staff) to draft the Terms of Reference by January 13th for the Study on how student unions can promote healthy attitudes and safe consumption with respect to alcohol.

JW (ED): Four people may be preferred, as the committee would still be efficient but more representative.

MR (ASU): Nominated JA (DSU) or AB (DSU) to the committee.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requests clarification: doesn't the motion have to pass in order for nominations to take place?

AB (DSU): Refused nomination, as he presently doesn't have capacity, but will ask JA if he will accept. Noted that JA accepted nomination as a reviewer.

KP (Chair): Nominated JW (ED).

N H-P (SFXUSU): Nominated MR (ASU). Nominated MM (SMUSA). (*Seconded by MR (ASU).*) Requested clarification: can we nominate a non-Board member? (*Not unless their acceptance has been confirmed.*) Does Dalhousie have an event coordinator? (*Yes.*)

JW (ED): Can the Board just nominate SU's, who can then appoint their own committee members? (*Yes.*)

KP (Chair): So far we've nominated JW (ED), Dalhousie, Acadia, and St. Mary's University SU's. They will be responsible for figuring out who is on the committee.

AB (DSU): Noted that JA refused the nomination as a committee member.

N H-P (SFXUSU): If the DSU can not find someone to serve on the committee, SFXUSU will take the seat.

KP (Chair): Requested clarification: will the DSU have someone available to serve? (*AB is texting other potential individuals now.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted importance of all schools choosing members who are relevant.

KP (Chair): Called the vote.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia form an Alcohol Policy terms of reference drafting committee including Jonathan Williams and delegates from the DSU, ASU, and SMUSA, whose names shall be forward to the ED no later than December 12th.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU – Yes

ASU – Yes

Motion passed unanimously.

AB (DSU): Requested clarification regarding access to the results of the study.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted importance of providing a budget to the SU's by January.

JW (ED): Is AB able to approach the King's SU concerning this issue? (*Yes.*)

MR (ASU): Offered to approach MSVUSU. Noted that this is a non-partisan, 3rd person study.

N H-P: Would including more schools result in a lower cost overall? (*Including more schools would require more campus visits and more time.*) Moves that a list of participant schools be sent to all participants along with the budget by January 11th. (*This date is too late for some members.*) Noted that going to councils with the full details would be helpful. (*The 4th may be a better date.*) Noted that

many members will not be working on the 4th and will not be back at classes until the 7th of January, and the list requires that other schools are contacted.

AB (DSU): Can these contacts be done by email?

JW (ED): Noted benefit of making personal contact, as there may be negotiation.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Amends the motion to read "January 4th" instead of "January 11th."

KP (Chair): Noted that there is no motion necessary.

JW (ED): Suggested amending it to read "December 20th." (*It was changed from "January 1st."*) Requests clarification regarding approaching SUNSCAD. (*AB will do it.*) Noted that these estimates include estimate of including other schools.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requests clarification: the list of participating schools and the terms of reference are to be completed by January 4th? (*Yes.*)

Chair: Calls vote.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Mike MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia circulate the terms of reference for the Alcohol Policy study and a final list of interested schools by December 20th.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU – Abstention

ASU – Yes

Motion passed.

16) Scheduling a meeting times twice-per-month for the Winter Semester.

KP (Chair): StudentsNS will try to book bi-weekly meetings next semester. Requested that Board members send him their schedules. Will attempt to schedule meetings on a weekday.

AB (DSU): Noted the efficiency of a Doodle poll. (*Agreed.*)

13) Proposed amendment to the Governing Policies regarding member statements.

JW (ED): Approached Veronica MacNeil for feedback on modification of policy statements. Given that she had substantial feedback, ED wanted to bring it to the Board.

Suggested New Clause related to StudentsNS statements and member statements

Decisions made by the Board of Directors are understood to represent the views of the membership. While board members may request that dissenting views be recorded in the minutes of meetings, they are answerable for the process by which those decisions were made and are expected to uphold those decisions publicly and in any formal meeting with representatives of government or political parties, unless expressly directed to adopt an alternative position by the overseeing body identified in the member's by-laws or constitution.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requests clarification as to the clause's content.

JW (ED): In plain terms: if the Board approves something (X), an individual Board member can only publically contradict it if their Council says so.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Could that person go to their Council and ask them to support their dissent?

JW (ED): Yes. They can also record dissent in the minutes. Externally, however, they would be expected to uphold the decision unless directed by their Council.

MR (ASU): How is this to be enforced? (*By the Board.*)

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU) **moved** and Matthew Rios (ASU) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.

In camera.

Out of camera.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted that he is not sure that this clause is needed, but is not opposed to its adoption.

Suggested New Clause related to StudentsNS statements and member statements

Decisions made by the Board of Directors are understood to represent the views of the membership. While board members may request that dissenting views be recorded in the minutes of meetings, they are answerable for the process by which those decisions were made and are expected to uphold those decisions publicly and in any formal meeting with representatives of government or political parties, unless expressly directed to adopt an alternative position by the overseeing body identified in the member's by-laws or constitution.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXSU) **moved** and Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia approve the suggested New Clause related to StudentsNS statements and member statements.

Motion passed by general consent.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Nick Head-Petersen (SFXSU) **seconded the motion** for a 10 minute recess.

Recess

Out of recess.

18) Preparation for government roundtable

JW (ED): First a quick update regarding student assemblies, and \$8000 of funding from D250. The deal is that we have to spend the money by March. ED recommends that for schools who have hosted their student assemblies already, that they send him their invoices for next semester, especially if they are more elaborate. D250 is funding the development of a student-assembly model. Regarding the roundtable: ED tried to limit the items on the agenda to stress depth. The key question concerns a vision for the university system, and how much money is provided to achieve it. Did not understand why universities were invited to the roundtable if it was supposed to be student-driven; the concern was that their presence would stifle student expression. The government is thinking it through, but he was already asked to this one, so couldn't be un-invited. ED did not have direction from the board on this topic, so didn't push this issue.

Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **moved** and Matthew Rios (ASU) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.

In camera.

Out of camera.

14) Proposed Women in Student Politics Campaign (Continued)

JW (ED): Is excited about the 2 volunteers, and there may be a third from Acadia University. ED likes the model where we develop jobs, then find volunteers for those jobs, as then they have real responsibilities.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted that it is a valuable way for students to get experience and get involved in our process.

OTHER BUSINESS

19) Reports of the staff (Continued): Report of the Executive Director

- i) Rebrand and website are clearly finished. ED hopes that everyone has seen it and that they approved. The campaign template is in its late stages, and it fits into the website with an external campaign element. Both feed into the website.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Would like to see more content from the schools. Feels that the photos that were used were 'stock', and that some are adversarial.

JW (ED): We have none built up internally, and would welcome contributions. Will put it on the to-do list.

MM (SMUSA): Requested clarification regarding the inclusion of bios.

JW (ED): Has asked all members to submit them. Also, multi-purpose banners will be distributed soon which include the StudentsNS and school logos. (*How big are the banners?*) 8 x 3 feet. Also, we have ordered a vertical banner, which I can show after the meeting.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Spoke with BF (Communications) concerning a campaign to increase website traffic. Noted that perhaps a banner may help to drum up traffic and inform students about StudentsNS activities.

- ii) CONSUP meeting: Some features of it were bizarre, and we should ensure that we co-organize next time. Advises not attending the meeting without the agenda having been circulated in advance.
- iii) Student assembly feedback was generally positive, with some difficult questions raised. No formal requests or amendments to Position Papers were received by the deadline.
- iv) All Board members have received outlines for the position papers. ED is reasonably confident that staff can get them all done on time.
- v) Nutrition study with the province is in its early stages. Funding and control of this project was transferred from CONSUP to the government. The idea is to have it done by the end of the year, but it probably won't be completed in time for the mental health conference.
- vi) BP (Research) and the Quality working group produced notes that were sent out to the Board. They include a lot of skepticism about process from VP academics. There is a focus on KPI, but it will ultimately derive from, MPHEC processes. There is evidence that some universities tried to get the development of KPIs for research blocked, which is unacceptable; a sub-group has been formed to address the issue.

KP (Chair): Are there other student organizations represented in the working group?

JW (ED): Yes, and we have had a constructive and positive relationship with them. Their representative is also affiliated with MPHEC, which has been helpful.

- vii) Implementing provincial health insurance for international students turns out to be as beneficial as we had anticipated, and also less costly than we thought. The government says that it is under consideration.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification concerning the timeframe for this.

JW (ED): Would not be surprised if it ends up on a platform – it is a 'good news' item. International students would still have to purchase repatriation insurance, but it would still be less than they are currently paying.

- viii) There is currently no news about the new Hubspace.

Nick Head-Petersen (SFXSU) **moved** and Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion to adjourn.**

Motion passed by general consent.

ADJOURNMENT