

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

Meeting Name:	Board Meeting		
Meeting Date:	April 19-20, 2013		
Meeting Time:	9:00AM, AST		
Venue:	AST	City:	Halifax, NS
Attendees			
Primary and Secondary Delegates:	Nick Head-Petersen (SFXUSU), Jesse Smith (ASTSU), Jared Perry (SMUSA), Mike MacDonell (SMUSA), Aaron Beale (DSU), Robert Bossler (ASTSU), Kyle Power (Chair/ASU), Matthew Rios (ASU)		
Other attendees:	Jonathan Williams (Executive Director), Brian Foster (Communications), Bob Parker (Research), Jonathan LeBlanc (ASTSU)		
Absent:	Patrick Carruthers (Treasurer/SFXUSU) (regrets), Alana Lawrence (CBUSU) (regrets), Michelle Lahey (Vice-Chair/CBUSU) (regrets), Jamie Arron (DSU).		
Quorum (50% of Members represented?): Yes			

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Roll call
- 3) Approval of Agenda  
Amended agenda **approved by general consent.**

- 4) Approval of March 15, 2013 Minutes  
Minutes **approved by general consent.**

#### DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

- 5) Member's Meeting

Nick Head-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Robert Bossler (AST) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Alliance of Nova Scotia Student Associations be renamed Students Nova Scotia Association.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

ASU - Yes

**Motion passed unanimously.**

- 6) International Students Position Paper

JW (ED): Circulated latest draft on Monday evening. Only changes left are copy edit ones, although some were done in preparation for today. Got feedback from several people on the released report: government, universities, a community organization, and one student. Not as much final feedback as we would like, probably because of timing. Spoke to many students, though during drafting. The motion is at the end of the report. There were no major changes from the first draft to the second, minor changes involved toning down the recommendations for the entrance requirement. Clarified that we are not recommending cessation of using test scores, just asking that those exams be considered as part of the full application package. In the governing policies, there is a requirement to report on any student assemblies before moving on any position papers.

KP (Chair): Did any happen? (*No. So reported.*)

RB (AST): We discussed this one here at AST. (*Clarification: we discussed the Student Funding paper.*)

JW (ED): We did an international students presentation at Dal, and presented the other report at the SFXU Council. The remainder of the student assemblies would have been prior to the release of this. We had two events at Dal where we talked about this. SMU had two where we talked about International student issues, and Acadia had one. At CBU there was one student assembly in the Fall.

AB (DSU): I'm not sure where we go with this, to a vote or whatever, but for the record, I feel like this is a really hard time to have student assemblies, and that's no fault of staff. At Dal there were only two international students present at the one assembly, and I don't think that they understood it. I emailed it to the nine executives and did some outreach to DISA [Dalhousie International Students Association], and eventually sat down with the whole executive for three hours, but it was right after this paper was released.

KP (Chair): Noted the importance of this point: it was a hard time of year, and should be taken into consideration for scheduling next year.

JW (ED): Point is well taken, and timing of paper releases next year reflect it, which should work better on both ends.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Not specific to this paper, one of the struggles at StFX was the base knowledge of students. This is not accessible to students. We present it to students, but their understanding and ability to join in that conversation, it's too high-level. We're talking about things that are intertwined with government and social circles. If these are meant to be accessible to students who want to read a document, I think that we need to do something different. Students are not going to read a 71 page document. It is fine for use in government, but for students we need to find a way to create something else or we're not doing due diligence to our members.

JW (AST): In the fall there was discussion of creating a two-page document of talking points for each paper. It sounds to me that that is the kind of thing that we're hoping for, that contains the salient points. Is that something to include with the abstract maybe?

N H-P (SFXUSU): Partly agreed, but felt that the organization needs to create some form of baseline government relations overview or something. For the student assembly that we held in the fall, we spent 80% of the time telling people how things worked, so their questions were not about the paper, which was about why we want to split the funding into four different sections. Their questions were about "how is it done now?", and "where to people get their money from now?", "how much does the government give to individual universities?" There's not a high enough baseline for students to start talking about this. It took me the summer to get up to speed on provincial politics, so briefs are good, but we still need something on the website to outline policies at it pertains to PSE.

JW (ED): We have thought about this a bit; we have fact sheets on website. We've also discussed creating more around the time of release, about funding, benefits of higher education, and those would be about a page and a half. Do you think that it would help to have the recommendations on a separate page? We can do that pretty easily, and we could create the fact sheets earlier, such as when it comes out in draft form.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Things we can do multi-media-wise which is interactive, particularly with the provincial election coming up, creative ways of engaging students is of paramount importance. We can host something at each school in the fall explaining what each selection means from a PSE perspective, and we can create a quick video so that students understand what is at stake.

JW (ED): We can go through the recommendations again or have a free-flowing conversation. Here is the full resolution with all of our principles (important beliefs), concerns (challenges), and then the recommendations. The recommendations are to cap the tuition for international students (IS) at the funding that the institution receives for domestic students for that program; regulate tuition so that IS have an understanding of their costs when they enroll. It's basically a back-up so that if the government doesn't cap tuition, it will still be predictable. NS universities should undergo third-party reviews on the funding for international students; IS should be removed from the weighted enrolment grant. The province should provide additional funds to support IS's, which would be paid for by public funding. There is now around \$30 million spent on this. Province should mandate the elimination of international fees for 5% of students over 5 years, introduced incrementally. Province should guarantee that all graduates of our programs graduate with sufficient education to pass the immigration test. The language education grant will support ESL. PHEC framework will be used to evaluate services. We also recommend that scoring be considered as part of an application package, and not used as a cut-off. If students get slightly lower than admission score but student is likely to succeed, they should be admitted.

KP (Chair): The philosophy is that these scores should mean less.

JW (ED): There is also a strategy to connect IS with domestic students by 2015/16. We toned this recommendation down from a guarantee to an investigation of strategies. We recommend that residences be available for students looking for off-campus housing. Immediate MSI coverage, councillors with multicultural interests, access to employment and immigration

counselling, equal eligibility for co-op programs and equal fees for them, an active campaign to spread awareness to NS employers about ease of hiring IS's and international graduates. ED suggests a slight amendment to this. We meant to say: a broad program to promote immigration as being important for NS, to counteract some of the discrimination that we see towards IS. Accurate information on websites is important, and continuing to allow graduates to be eligible for government employment programs.

KP (Chair): Called for questions.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Going back to the minimum scores, I think that faculties at universities may be more receptive if we worded it differently. (*How so?*) Not requiring minimum score in a language exam when you're studying at a rural NS university with minimum language supports, I'm not sure you're setting student up to succeed.

JW (ED): But they would be receiving money for supports, and would be required to build those supports. If you're getting really poor scores in English, still, don't accept them. We're not suggesting that they don't consider language scores, only for the hard cases of students who have a 6.0, and who are brilliant.

MM (SMUSA): Maybe lead with "we suggest that language scores be considered as one component of a student's application." I don't know what a softer way to say that would be.

BF (Comms.): The other thing we could do is preface it with "In concert with the development of our recommendations... a de-emphasis of language scores."

JW (ED): We'll want to be clear. One element of this is that it ties in with the language supports that we suggest, so if we start adding those clauses, we have to have every recommendations supporting each other, which is difficult to do here.

N H-P (SFXUSU): If minimum scores are not required, yet the government does not add language supports, we are not setting students up for success. I don't know how one can come without the other.

KP (Chair): So, universities shall de-emphasis language exam scores as a component of student success, recognizing that they are flawed...

JW (ED): This is intended for those students who are close to those scores, but who are likely to succeed due to other elements.

N H-P (SFXUSU): If you get a 6.0 versus a 6.5, your score should not be considered; I don't think that that is something that we can put in a recommendation. So we need to find a way to deemphasize language scores or eliminate them only if there are adequate supports in place to ensure that those students are succeeding.

RB (ASTSU): What about: "Not rely solely on minimum language scores."

KP (Chair): How about "Minimum scores as a measure of proficiency."

JW (ED): Or even "Admissibility", because basically, if you don't meet the minimum score, that part of your application is thrown out. Is that fair?

JS (AST): They're not in this room, but what we're saying is that we're advocating for all NS students, and this document only refers to English proficiency. For University St. Anne, we would be referring to French proficiency, and immigration standards for Canada allow immigration based on proficiency in either language. Our recommendations don't specify "English", but the paper only talks about "English".

JW (ED): I edited it out. The latest version has next to no references to English. The paper has almost no references to English left, and only then when we're talking about specific institutions.

RB (AST): That's something that can be highlighted in our broader perspective on schools for a possible rapprochement.

JW (ED): It will be interesting to see the implications for this. IS's might get some money for supports, which would be nice.

KP (Chair): Noted that the Board has been in discussion for quite some time, and suggests finishing this item and taking a 5 minute recess.

AB (DSU): Requested clarification: would the scholarship wipe out the differential fee?

JW (ED): Numbers in this paper are estimations, and may be arbitrary. Initially thought that 1 or 2 percent was realistic, but 5 seemed more so if they introduce it incrementally, and it seemed like a realistic target, given that it wouldn't reduce their funding. I estimate \$1.5 million in lost revenues to universities, so that is the amount that goes back to IS's through this change. It is a combined need/merit basis.

AB (DSU): Are there logistical problems with administration?

JW (ED): It would have to be enforced by the province.

AB (DSU): For example, how would family income be tracked? (*It is unclear.*) Do IS's pay income tax? (*No.*)

KP (Chair): The regulations just changed, and now they can work off-campus. They still do not pay income tax.

JW (ED): We talk about that in the report.

RB (ASTSU): It depends on how much money they make. If they are making the bulk of their money here, they have to file taxes here.

JW (ED): They pay sales taxes, property taxes, and income taxes on their income if they earn enough. In terms of its implications on tuition recommendations, the amount that they would be paying wouldn't come close to the cost of educating them.

MM (SMUSA): How many domestic students qualify for needs-based assistance?

JW (ED): I think that the Nova Scotia Assistance Program has over 10,000 recipients, so about 20%.

MM (SMUSA): Regarding the 1.5 million, at SMU we have 2,600 IS's. With the differential fee at 109% right now, so about \$6,000 per student. At 20%, that's around 500 students, so it's twice as much as you're asking for our school alone. Even at a conservative estimate of 20%, we're looking at around \$3 million to fund IS's in this way across Nova Scotia.

JW (ED): Part of the recommendation is that scholarships be allocated based on student population, so 5% of SMU students would receive the award, 5% of Dal students, etc. Whether or not SMU students have more financial need than Dal students would not be taken into account, just to mitigate this problem.

MM (SMUSA): So would smaller universities benefit from this?

JW (ED): No, it would be an equal proportion of IS's from all universities.

N H-P (SFXUSU): But if a university has fewer IS's, wouldn't a greater proportion of their students get it? (*No, because it is based on a proportion of those students.*)

JP (SMUSA): How would it be assessed?

JW (ED): Unclear. It would have to be assessed on an institution-by-institution basis, and that would be challenging.

AB (DSU): So the purpose of administering it on a university-by-university basis is so that universities don't lose out?

JW (ED): Yes, because it involves taking away revenues as opposed to giving them money for it. The government isn't giving them money to make up for those revenues. The institutions are just not collecting those revenues. The challenge for the way that universities work now, is

enforceability. We continue to push the province to be tougher, so in this case, we would want them to do similar to what we've proposed with ancillary fees. If you break the rule, whatever you gain by breaking the rule is removed from your operating grant. There will be no incentive to break the rule, because you're just not going to get the money anyway.

KP (Chair): I know that it won't always be the reality, but isn't the academic financial rule not to pay for bursaries out of your operating grant? So wouldn't we have to get these endowed?

JW (ED): BP (Research) and I discussed this, and had initially said that you can't take endowment money for this, because we were worried that they would pull out scholarships for domestic students to fulfill this requirement. After thinking about it more, we decided to leave it open and just say that you can't replace domestic student scholarships with this. In practice, you would be forced to do this, so you would either find the money through endowment to replace this cost. Or, you just don't receive those revenues. Because international enrolment is going up every year, you would never receive less money, it would just be less of an increase. Some of the schools' endowments are exceedingly high, and it's questionable about why they don't use more of the money they have in their endowments. Dal is a particular case.

BP (Research): That is a fair representation of endowment. We didn't touch it, because it is a whole big can of worms that is difficult to get into, but my high-level take is that some of the schools are pretty conservative about the amount of money that they take out of their endowments. They could do more. Dalhousie in particular, could manage them less conservatively and still have them grow. It is a question of whether or not it is a priority.

BF (Comms): If you compare it to private American universities that function purely off of their endowments, they manage to be physically viable with that, even when a huge proportion of that is going into student scholarships and supports. You look at a place like Harvard, and a huge amount of money is going into bringing in international and out-of-state students, and they're fully funded. They get multi-billion dollar endowments, but nonetheless, the question is of proportion. Our feeling is that our universities are leaning on the government to pay the students' portion, so when the government claws back, they can go after the students for the money, and they leave their endowments for capital spending.

BP (Research): Anecdotally, the endowment figure that the AAU often uses to say "this is what we do to support students" is \$38 million, and it's been \$38 million for five years. They do support students to a certain extent, but I'm really questioning whether they do as much as they could.

KP (Chair): Having a good student on campus will only last for four years, while having a new building will last for ten, before you want to remodel it. (*Exactly.*) Called for questions.

AB (DSU): In my talks with IS's, they were all really excited to see so many recommendations. I think that most IS's don't feel appreciated, and they were really excited about it. Most of the questions I got were about the scholarship, and the most concerns were about the cap. In the end, there was a difference in opinion: some IS's agreed that, since they don't pay taxes, they shouldn't be paid for by the government, but some students disagreed with that. Also, there was concern that, if tuition went down drastically, that it wouldn't go down for IS's, so they felt left out of the student movement. My concern is then about the cap, and not asking for it to be drastically reduced, and accepting a lot of the premises that the government gives us.

KP (Chair): If any of us are waiting for a drastic reduction in the student movement, we would not be a part of the movement. There was a similar situation at SMU.

JW (ED): At SMU, a chunk of the IS population accepts the premise that they pay the full amount because they're not citizens, and a chunk of them feel that that is unfair. Ultimately, it's your assessment. In this report, consistent with StudentsNS, we asked for a tuition reduction, but we asked for it for the people who need it the most. The scholarship would represent a 5% reduction in tuition, but instead of giving it equally to everyone, it's going to the students who really need it the most, through this mechanism.

KP (Chair): I take your point that it isn't the most idealistic or activist-y type of paper, but at the same time it's about where you land on that shade of grey and how pragmatic you want to be to make that system more progressive. This is the first time anyone would get a wedge in the door for supports for international students.

JW (ED): With this scenario, if it were implemented, we'd have the fourth lowest IS tuition in the country. From what I read, in Nova Scotia, it's about two times the domestic student tuition, while the national average is three to four times higher, so we'd be keeping it at a level that is well below national averages. Other provinces would be fighting to reduce tuition to get to where we would have it here.

KP (Chair): The jurisdiction of Nova Scotia is really competitive, even globally, for IS's in terms of price, and especially compared to the 'States.

AB (DSU): These are concerns that the IS's have expressed to me, while my personal concerns are more about tactics. I worry that we're making the government's arguments for them sometimes. Maybe it isn't the time to hit back against those arguments, but to make them for them seems unnecessary. (*In terms of whether or not there should be a differential at all?*) Just saying that, since IS's don't pay taxes, that they shouldn't be funded by the government.

JS (ASTSU): You mean that it legitimates that rationale?

AB (DSU): Yes. And accepting it and then asking for a cap that is higher than some differential fees in Nova Scotia, and then equal to other ones.

JW (ED): In practice, we don't know what the cap would be at this stage, hence the independent review. It's a suspicion that we're near to it, but we don't know in practice what it would amount to.

AB (DSU): When I calculated just the percentage of government grant and tuition, at Dal it would have been \$200 more than it is. That's not considering the services and services paid for by the government. That's a pretty rough estimate, but...

KP (Chair): So Dal, right now, is charging too low, by this rationale. (*Yes.*)

JW (ED): Going through the math, we came out with the differential fee being too low right now, and the element that complicated that is that the high-cost programs don't include IS's, such as medical students who cost hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money in some cases, not many of them are IS's. Our hunch was that, in the end, is that we're very close, but all you can generate with the information that we have is guesstimates.

AB (DSU): Agreed. I did my calculations based on science students.

KP (Chair): I was concerned that the province already pays for close to or more than half of the IS population already, so I'm wondering: should it be the cost of education, less the amount the government's already giving to educate these students?

JW (ED): That cost of education amount isn't actually the cost of educating IS's. They have additional costs: international recruitment costs more, IS centre, language education, etc. (*Yes, but not \$7000 more.*) Not to the extent of the \$30 million that universities get, but there would be a legitimate argument from a lot of Nova Scotians that our position is wrong; that IS's should be covering all those costs, too, instead of the taxpayer. I think that that's where our thinking of moving the \$30 million to cover that comes from. In this sense, this support of IS's is generous, given that we're bringing their costs down below the real cost to educate them, through use of public money. The other element is that \$30 million that is allocated through the university funding distribution formula for IS's is kind of a fiction anyway, because they never allowed it to increase with enrolment, and it was introduced at a time when the differential was substantially lower.

KP (Chair): Only because they abused it out of relevancy.

BP (Research): The fiction is really the 10% and 30%. They accounted for those numbers at the time, and effectively haven't changed them since. The \$30 million is an accounting abstraction,

essentially, and the key thing is to figure out whether or not they're actually spending that money on IS's. That's what the perfect policy is for this, and we're not even there yet.

JW (ED): The other issue is that, even if the \$30 million is immediately put into reducing IS tuition in some way, you'd be effectively cutting \$30 million out of university budgets, and I don't think that anyone can ask for that to be taken out of their budgets. On the other hand, even if we go with the recommendations that we have now, with \$30 million at the max, I don't think that the IS services that we're asking for would cost \$30 million. But say that all of that money were shifted in to services for IS, whatever difference there would be between the cost of IS services now, and what we're asking for, would have to be cut out of other things. Universities have built their cost structures based on the way that funding is allocated now. So there is some pain there, and who knows how that might affect students in the province.

KP (Chair): I would be very unsympathetic to the universities if they push back against this, because they already have \$30 million to do this.

JW (ED): And they have all of the differential fees in the meantime.

KP (Chair): Noted that he takes a personal interest in this issue. Called for further discussion or questions of the IS paper.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Are we moving for its release today? (*No, but we'd like to vote on approval today.*)

AB (DSU): Would like to reiterate that IS expressed support for many of these items, but concern about others, so they asked AB to vote against it.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted that the release of the paper will start important discussions.

Nick Head-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Robert Bossler (AST) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Board approve the International Students Position Paper for release.

Vote:

ASU - Yes

DSU - No

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

Motion passed.

## 7) Student Fees and System Funding Position Paper

JW (ED): The recommendations have changed from the first draft, condensed into single recommendations – particularly the one related to the NS student bursary and the one related to the cap on tuition. The first recommendation is to regulate tuition for all university students, so tuition would be regulated for international students for example, as well as professional students. The second is related to a sliding annual rate of tuition fee change. It is a complex formula based on a suggestion from Dal, using a 0% base rate of growth. It is a nominal tuition freeze, a real tuition reduction, recognizing that some students' incomes don't grow with inflation. Tuition rate should be set to income inflation rate of average NS graduates ages 20-24, unless the post-graduate labour conditions are especially strong. A Key employment rate differential of 8.5% as the difference between working populations of ages 25 and over and 20-24, so if that difference was 8.5 or less, you would get an inflationary increase in tuition annually. With an annual inflation rate of 2.2%, tuition growth would reach 0% when the current rate exceeds 12.5%.

BP (Research): This indicator is at 16% right now, and it's been above 12.5% since the recession hit. The 8.5 number was selected because it was still the number that existed before the last recession, so conceived as a good starting place.

KP (Chair): What if, hypothetically, youth unemployment and general unemployment aren't the same, but they're both staggeringly high?

JW (ED): This would be affected. You would have inflationary growth tuition.

BP (Research): It would still be the differential between the two that will matter for this policy. It is not exactly the unemployment rate that we're looking at here, but the employment rate, which factors in all people of an age who are looking for work. The differential would apply, but wouldn't change much. If the overall rate goes up, you'd expect the student rate to go up even more.

JW (ED): If the student rate is 20%, you'd have inflationary increase in tuition, but in practice, it is just never going to happen.

KP (Chair): Noted that this is a clever strategy, particularly over recessions. If this differential is very high, and it is at its highest during recessions, then everyone is suffering, including the government, so who will pay for it? I am worried that it will get thrown out the window at the first sign of trouble, when it is most needed.

JW (ED): Like right now.

BP (Research): Here is where you'd be relying on governments to make those cyclical arguments to keep things rolling.

JW (ED): Should I keep going, and we can come back to it if we need to? (*Yes.*) The next one is that the province should make the NS bursary program permanent, and index its value to growth and tuition fees. Our initial thinking was to eliminate the NS student bursary and ask universities to reduce tuition by its value, which would have the same impact as what we say here. Practically, government has no mechanisms to reduce tuition, per say. They would have to police it all, and it would be quite complicated through operating grants. Bursaries are the simplest, most feasible way to reduce it, since it comes out to the same thing. One thing we could change regarding indexing it to growth and tuition fees, there are a few options: we could index it to tuition fees or to operating grant growth. Ultimately, if the scenario we outlined here took place, the value of the bursary would grow. We prefer to stick it to tuition; it makes sense.

KP (Chair): Operating grants could become a thumb on the scale, too, couldn't they, if they are reduced while tuition goes up? It would be a ton of more money for students to pay. (*Yes.*)

JW (ED): The other thing was, do we index it to growth and tuition fees immediately, or do we index it retroactively to when the full value of the bursary was introduced? We wanted to leave it to the Board. There would be a cost associated with that (10-12% increase in value of bursary done retroactively – expense of \$3-4 million). If we are giving the government a choice between putting \$3-4 million into student bursaries or financial assistance, we want financial assistance.

KP (Chair): It would be a large infusion of cash up front.

BP (Research): It would be 12.61% since 2011 as opposed to since last year and the start of the MOU. You would get 4-5 years of compound growth at 3%.

JW (ED): The next recommendation is that, to help control the cost of education for university students, the province should strengthen existing limitations with respect to existing auxiliary and ancillary fees. All compulsory student fees should be distinguished from tuition by defining what tuition pays for. All new ancillary fees should be tied to market prices for similar services, so they should go up with inflation. With respect to fee categories 2 and 3, all fee increases must be approved through a clearly defined student approval process as agreed upon by the students and institution. All new fees/increases should be subjected to periodic reviews. They have to expire at some point, or students have to be asked again if they want to keep paying. The total cost of education for all programs should be communicated well in advance to all students at the beginning of each academic year. They should be provided with an estimated total cost of their program over four years. The value of ancillary fees in violation of the rules should be removed from the value of universities' operating grants. The operating grant should increase annually at

the higher of the following two rates: real GDP growth and provincial inflation. So the floor on funding is inflation, and the max is the growth of GDP. One of the strong messages out of this paper is that, with the tying of tuition to employment outcomes and the tying of funding to GDP, we're asking the government to respect students' capacity to pay to go to school, and we're respecting the government's capacity to pay for universities. There is a mutual respect there. Lastly, the province should establish clear standards and requirements for university annual financial reporting. While universities shall remain free to employ whatever accounting practices they see fit for their own purposes, they must be required to submit financial data to government and students in a mutually agreeable format. University annual financial reports should clearly and separately itemize the collection of tuition and all student fees and also indicate how these funds are disbursed to various functional units of the university. The province should clearly indicate which aspects of revenue it sees as part of normal operating revenue, and hold each university to that standard in its financial reporting. Those are the recommendations.

AB (DSU): Requested clarifications as to why it is hard for universities to reduce tuition. (*It isn't hard. It is hard for the government to make them do it.*) Does it have to be an amendment to the MOU? (*No, but it will.*)

BP (Research): If you talk to the bureaucrats right now, they would tell you that they do not want to enforce the MOU as it is written (to be soft on institutions). If they continue to take this same approach, universities could play with that. This is a failsafe for that possible eventuality.

JW (ED): It is the enforceability of policing 11 institutions with however many students each that they reduce the fees by the right amount. It is way more complicated than just giving money to students directly through the bursary, which is why we prefer the bursary.

BP (Research): If we inflated from 2010/11 to 2015/16, which would be the start of the next MOU, at 3%, it would be \$1464 for the NS Student bursary. If we started next year at 3%, then it would be two years later, so \$1339. It's more than \$100 difference to students, if that at all sways your thinking.

KP (Chair): Requested clarification as to why the KERD was chosen as an indicator.

BP (Research): When we presented the paper the first time, there was a sense that we're not sensitive enough to checks against tuition inflation. It was really trying to think through the best way to create a failsafe to that. It is appropriate for tuition to inflate year after year and have that weight fall on students, especially when they're having a hard time getting a job and making money? The logic roughly works in that way; what is the best mechanism to approximate students' ability to pay relative to the economy.

JW (ED): Why did we go 'relative' to the rest of the population?

BP (Research): Because it is important to keep some sense of what is going on in the rest of the economy. Are youth worse off in being able to make money than the average person in the workforce, and the answer is usually yes. It might be a recessionary mechanism, and it might bring students up at the times when it is hardest for them.

KP (Chair): Have we done any research in terms of what was the differential in the 2000's, vs. the 90's or 80's?

BP (Research): I haven't done a ton of research, but what I did do was concerned with where to set the limit. It was about running scenarios for picking different numbers: if I pick 8.5, what does that do to me? Not only did I go forward, but I went backwards. The differentials were higher in the late 90's, so the answer is yes, I didn't check extensively, but I did do a search around the number.

JW (ED): What the relative figure does, too, is that it reflects students' capacity to pay, and also to incentivize universities to support student employment outcomes. It makes it more fair to universities in terms of their responsibility to student employment, especially if employment is down across the whole population.

KP (Chair): Noted the other side of the argument, that if unemployment is very low, why shouldn't students pay more? Will this take a 'give' from students? (*Yes, and we have to be willing to fight those arguments as they arise.*)

BF (Comm.): It's a similar situation as with the IS differential; are they going to torque our own argument back against us? We need to keep in mind that they stand for three years, and we don't have to worry, with current projections, of the economy miraculously turning around in three years. In three years, it will be back up for assessment, and we can reassess based on changing landscape.

KP (Chair): Noted that changing our stance when it is no longer convenient for us to make this argument is kind of shady, as well.

JW (ED): This scenario has to be put into a larger picture. This scenario requires universities to be substantially more thrifty with their money. If we go with 0%, in particular, considering that they feel that their inflation rate is higher than elsewhere, they will have less money every year than costs. Every year, it means less. It might seem like 0% is asking for status quo, but it means less money for universities.

N H-P (SFXUSU): How is that going to affect what universities are able to provide?

JW (ED): Considering demographic and enrolment trends, their financial woes are going to be mitigated by the fact that they are consistently replacing domestic students with international students, and every time they do that, they get a boost in revenues.

BP (Research): So the broader part of the policy is creating incentives for change. This is a clear incentive that, if universities are spending money in the wrong places, that they are going to have to stop doing that, and also, it asks how we can work together to get the Ship Nova Scotia sailing a bit stronger in the wind, how to make us a stronger province using the university system here and our potential. The timing of these papers is key. If we don't attract the ISs we hope to, the system will look very different in future years, and may involve closed universities. We're dealing with how to keep them vital, and how to keep the investment in NS.

KP (Chair): It would be easy to frame as a commitment to youth, which is always popular.

JW (ED): The other angle as well for keeping enrolment up, is that if we don't have high enrolment, we can't keep the services up.

N H-P (SFXUSU): So we're proposing that until post-grad labour market conditions are sufficiently strong, that tuition does not increase, while recognizing the fact the universities' operating expenditures annually increase?

JW (ED): Yes. But the way that they spend their funds now is perhaps questionable.

N H-P (SFXUSU): But what this recommendation is saying is that unless the government introduces a large amount of money into the PSE, there will be less money in the operating budgets of universities in real terms.

JW (ED): Yes, and we're not recommending that governments put dramatically more money into the system.

N H-P (SFXUSU): How is that setting up universities for high quality education?

JW (ED): It is partly mitigated by ISs replacing domestic students, so that will mean that revenues will not fall.

N H-P (SFXUSU): So a school with 2% ISs, looking to grow at 1-2% a year, is going to be 5 years, at best, before they are at that 10%.

JW (ED): The 10% is irrelevant because they are not tying funding to enrolment right now. Each one percent increment is worth double or more of the domestic student right now. That is where extra money comes from.

N H-P (SFXUSU): This recommendation is based on increasing our IS population?

JW (ED): Yes. If we keep it the same, total enrolment drops 14% in the next 20 years. It is the only way to stay viable.

BP (Research): NS spends a lot on its university system, and it is a matter of resource allocation. (*Where does this conclusion come from?*) From other students, Board members. NS spends more than any other province on PSE, and Canada does spend more than any other country in the world as a proportion of its total revenue.

N H-P (SFXUSU): And yet we still have some of the highest tuition in the country.

JW (ED): Which means that our universities have more money than anywhere else in the world.

AB (DSU): There are more complexities than that.

BP (Research): Yes, including the fact that our province has chosen to have eleven universities, so the money is spread out more.

AB (DSU): Can we compare it to the taxpayer? It doesn't mean that it will be a smaller amount per taxpayer. Norway spends lots of money on different things...

JW (ED): If you look at total expenditure on PSE, Canada is third in the world, and that is proportional to GDP. In terms of share of public spending going to PSE, we are also third in the world. If you looked at the total amount per student, you are not reflecting on the fact that NS is poorer than Alberta. We have to recognize that we don't have the revenues to compete.

MM (SMUSA): Is there any way to do a comparison excluding non-negotiable HR salaries? Dal's HR is what, 70% of their budget? (*Yes, around that.*) I understand that universities aren't exactly in the best position for funding; is there a way that we can do a comparison excluding that? Their hands are tied in those situations.

JW (ED): Are they? If they negotiated bad labour contracts, how long do your students have to pay because you signed bad deals with your unions?

N H-P (SFXUSU): Having been through this the past year, I don't know if it was bad faith negotiations on the part of either side.

KP (Chair): Part of the problem is that we have a publically-funded system, with a New England style model which breeds some inefficiencies. I wouldn't think that the HR salaries are particularly higher in NS than anywhere else.

BF (Comms.): Actually they're lower. Definitely. The other thing to keep in mind is that there is a discussion to be had about deficiencies within the faculty structure, but the debate that needs to happen is around the use of temporary faculty to do the vast amount of teaching, with stratified union structures. It's not about discussing the fixed costs, instead we can strike at undermining the quality of education by stratifying the faculty system. Tenured people are being paid \$145K a year while teaching one course, while non tenure-track faculty are teaching 8 half-courses and making \$35K. We also have the lowest paid non-tenure-track faculty. It is creating divisions within the union movement itself. This is a real problem, and if we wanted to insert ourselves into faculty issues is not in a way that gives administration an inch at the negotiating table to undermine existing structures.

KP (Chair): Bringing us back, we were talking about costs of universities and quality of education.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Notes a sentiment that we don't need to put any more money into the system, we just need to go find more ISs so that they can pay a higher differential fee, except that we just said that we don't want as high of a differential fee. I'm trying to understand what will come out of all these papers and all these recommendations. What is our direction?

BP (Research): There are two key things in this paper that I'd point out: 1) the concern about whether or not universities are spending all of their money really well, and 2) should students continue to pay a greater share of the total cost or not. Universities are, in our opinion, getting plenty of money to do their jobs well, and they are not spending the money ideally. Secondly,

students for 20-ish years have been paying a greater and greater proportion of the cost, and this trend will continue if not stopped, to a more and more privately funded system.

KP (Chair): So would this all be in the recommendation that “university operating grants be increased at the following rates”? Should it be “at minimum?” (*Yes.*)

BP (Research): One of JA’s (DSU) concerns was exactly that. The other piece that is in the paper in rhetoric but without a specific recommendation is that it would be a really good idea for the province to spend more money to fund services that the universities are providing outside of their mandate: Health centres, career centres. Why have those been passed on to universities? It doesn’t all have to come from Labour and Advanced Education, but from other departments as well. We aren’t asking for a cap on funding per se, we see ways for universities to have some fiscal responsibility taken away from them so that they can focus on education.

JW (ED): We left it open so that the Health recommendation can come out of the Health paper. There are still places to do those things. This is the base evolution for simple operating funds.

N H-P (SFXUSU): My hesitation is that we are a provincial lobbying organization, yet we are asking for accountability from individual institutions, rather than getting more money into the system. I do not understand why we would take the approach of having check-marked the government as having mostly succeeded, and making it the universities’ fault. Our solution is more ISs, when most institutions don’t have the infrastructure to support any increased ISs, and I don’t know if that is the system that we want to be putting forward. It changes the system, the supports required, and it seems premature, and it removes the government from responsibility.

JW (ED): We are saying that the government has responsibility to give an equal share of their total revenue as they are giving now. They increase funding to the system with growth of the economy. If we don’t recruit ISs, our university system shrinks, and we have to convince the government, year after year, to give more money to educate fewer students. It’s a losing proposition. Our system is the third best funded, which also makes it the third most expensive. Is the way to address that by giving it more public money, and by constantly having that as our point? If student organizations across Canada continue to argue that universities should be getting as much money as they want but it should be coming from the public and not from students, we are going to lose. Universities will never deal with their cost structures. The best thing we can do to keep costs down for students is to keep costs down, at this time, especially with economic trends right now in NS.

KP (Chair): Look at the last three years. We have a system that is this bloated, but when governments change, who will be left holding the bag when priorities change? When universities need money and governments no longer choose to pay for it, it will be the other side who pays.

N H-P (SFXUSU): We just said that 70% of operating grants is on HR, but we don’t want part-time professors... (*That isn’t part of our recommendations.*) Then how are we recommending that universities cut costs and still provide all the services that we desire? (*It is strongly felt within the Board that they should cease and desist with building activities.*)

BF (Comms.): It isn’t about stopping growth, but about making growth more sustainable. The fact that universities came off of year-after-year 10% increases means that they are acting like addicts. It should be an indication that the issue is twofold: a) we should ask government for more money, but in a way that puts universities on a shorter leash, that is predictable and sustainable. It ties the hands of new governments, and keeps them from flooding the system with money and building a ton of new buildings in a way that isn’t sustainable.

BP (Research): If this policy were in place, there wouldn’t have been three years of cuts to universities. They would have gotten three years of inflationary increases. Basic growth. It’s almost a tactical consideration for us: when JW and I spoke to the officers of the schools about sustainability and funding, they were talking about 10% a year increases, but our idea of stability is ‘not getting cut again unless things change drastically.’ It’s something you can plan for, and they don’t like that we’re not taking their exact position, but we’re probably doing them a favour that they will never recognize.

BF (Comms.): And that is usually what the student movement does across the country: when university presidents say they want more money, student organizations latch on to it, complaining that it is coming out of their pockets. But no, if they are going out and building, they are going to come to [the students] for the deferred maintenance on that building down the line when the government pulls that funding out. The trick is keeping the size of the system in check.

JS (ASTSU): With regards to some of the basic presuppositions in this arguments, one being that the NS native population is either stagnant or reversing in trends so we have to rely on ISs, and yet we're wondering about money, it may be out of the scope of the paper, but it would seem that the next set of people who we ask for money in terms of funding allocations, is that we look through the department of tourism. It would bring people here and enrich local economies, and we should be asking who is responsible for bringing people here and enriching this economy, and it shouldn't be student recruitment centres. It should be the department of tourism.

JW (ED): We did say this; that government should help fund recruitment.

BP (Research): That's what Manitoba has done. Ten years ago, it had the same number of immigrants per year as NS, and now they have ten times as many because they have taken a whole government focus on it. There has to be a more fully realized immigration strategy tied to it, if they are going to be smart about it.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Having been through three weeks of Building rhetoric this year, I think that spending of university finances is much bigger than building buildings, and that is not how we are going to control costs. We have to be careful not to checkmark the government box saying that they're less responsible than universities. I think that it needs to be an equally shared burden on multiple stakeholders, including students to some extent. We have to be responsible for the money we're putting in, like any other group. I think that by saying that by decreasing the money available to universities and their operating budget, I don't know how that is servicing students.

JW (ED): Again, this scenario would not decrease the money available in the operating budget. Bob has the available information here of how much this would lead to. It's just decreasing it relative to what they've gotten in the past. This would be the growth that you would see in the university system under our scenario. It would be almost doubling in 20 years, as opposed to the 200% growth we saw in those ten years we were talking about before. This would be 100%.

BP (Research): The assumptions in this are that: the ISs will replace any students that leave, so we have a system of the same size; all the other stuff that universities do grow at about 5% per year (O'Neil's assumption). It indicates that incremental cuts to get there are not even that large.

JW (ED): This is assuming an inflationary increase in students' tuition, so if 0% happened, then stayed, it would be less than what is projected here. We'll add some other projections, to make it clearer. That's the worst case scenario for public funding, if the economy doesn't grow faster than inflation.

BP (Research): Having looked back over the past 25 years, it will fluctuate a lot. We can do something like a cyclical model, but the bottom line is that it will grow.

KP (Chair): Called for questions or further comments.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I just don't want to send the message that we're satisfied with what the government is producing, when I don't think it's adequate. Whether or not those come in dedicated money transfers to provide for healthcare or career services or IS or all of it, it just seems that, by this, we are implying that system funding is good. I don't know that that's our mandate as an organization or what we want to be saying, going into government meetings, especially in an election year.

KP (Chair): This disagrees with their decisions for the past three years, and it will disagree with their decisions for the upcoming years.

JW (ED): This scenario is completely different from anything that government has ever done.

JS (ASTSU): Would a recommendation speaking directly to investments that aren't within the institutional mandate help to allay any of your concerns?

N H-P (SFXUSU): I think it needs something. I think that we're too soft on this one. We need to recognize what has been provided, but also the burden on students, and that it is probably due to the misallocation of services that are being provided by universities and student unions, rather than the province.

KP (Chair): One of the problems is to define what tuition pays for. Is the problem that we're not doing that? We're just assuming that this is what they should be doing and they should be getting this much money for it. Should we instead be providing the stance that: this is what universities should be doing, and I don't know why they're doing any of this?

N H-P (SFXUSU): Yes. Universities should be paying for academics. I completely agree that they have enough in the system to pay for academics, but there are also right now healthcare centres, academic centres, career centres, IS providers, and they don't have enough money for that.

JW (ED): Don't they, though? Are you confident that they don't have enough money for those things? IS centres, for example, they have to provide those because it is critical to student success. Health centres, I agree, but employment centres: is it not the job of the university to help with employment incomes? It's complicated, and I'm looking forward to looking at it in the employment paper, but I'm not convinced that the university's position is responsible, when I think that most students go to university to have a meaningful career. (*But where does that responsibility come from?*) Universities get \$300 million of public money a year.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I think that if you re-ran these numbers including all the things that they provide right now, it would be drastically higher. (*What would?*) The end result of the cost of the university system.

BP (Research): But this includes every penny spent. It is expenditure based, not revenue based. I don't disagree with you in the sense that, in this paper, we don't know what these things cost. Thematically, in a scenario where students and governments get serious about what are the financial facts here and stop having it be about rhetoric of upping contributions or lowering tuition, there is room for the government to do more. Personally, there is a right way to say that there should be a review of what universities should and shouldn't pay for. There is a way to address that.

JW (ED): We could easily add a recommendation in there that could be open to additional funding envelopes for ancillary services. We could say: this is our scenario for operating grants, and government can provide funding to achieve certain objective in excess of this amount, but it needs to come with clear objectives, like a health service.

RB (ASTSU): If there was a recommendation that acknowledges what N H-P was saying about areas that universities are currently funding that should be funded by possibly by other areas of government. You didn't necessarily want to put those in this paper, but in the Health paper, but even if there is something in this paper that says that those recommendations are forthcoming, it would still hold the government to account for additional funding beyond what is in the scope of this paper.

JW (ED): We could easily throw that in here. Is it okay if we just put it as an outline?

BP (Research): I would propose a recommendation for a student, government, and institutional review of institutional mandates and finances. You can put it in our transparency piece.

JW (ED): Maybe we can set the elements of that here. I'd like to have this passed today, because we'd like to move on it. Can we put the elements here and finalize the phrasing later?

KP (Chair): Let's write it out so that we can all see it over lunch. We're going to come back after lunch, and if possible we can make a decision as to what we will do with this paper.

## **LUNCH BREAK**

JW (ED): So the recommendation that we crafted off of what was said is as follows: The Province, universities and students should undertake a full and transparent public review to determine which student services may not be covered under university operating grants and establish provincial, institutional or student responsibility for funding these services (THIS IS THE FINAL APPROVED TEXT).

KP (Chair): I would be comfortable leaving it with this language, but should we also add in: universities, governments, and students, since students are paying for all of these things too? (Yes.)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Does it anywhere in the paper recognize that universities are probably paying for things that they shouldn't be?

BP (Research): It's alluded to at this point, but going along, I would beef that section up a bit and make some changes to the messaging on that. We could definitely flesh it out and change the focus.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I think that I'm more comfortable with the general tone of our paper having recognized that universities are paying for things they shouldn't.

JW (ED): I don't know if we would want to say it that explicitly, again, because until we have this review done, because those might have been things where there were clear expectation that they fund them. Universities are paying for these things, but they're paying for it with our money.

N H-P (SFXUSU): But they're not considering that it's from a different pocket of money. If it is all coming out of the social transfer...

BP (Research): The social transfer alone is not nearly big enough to cover it all. But I think that we can get around the sticky point by having a nuanced discussion of institutional mandate and having that the basis of this review. It doesn't seem to me like a story stopper.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Do we need a motion to add this recommendation in? (Yes.)

Nick Head-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Jesse Smith (ASTSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the aforementioned recommendation be added to this position paper, and any changes that the authors envision.

ASU - Yes

DSU - Abstained

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

**Motion passed.**

KP (Chair): Is there any other discussion or debate for the overarching policy paper?

AB (DSU): After N H-P's comments, I think that some of them are about tactics, and beating a dead horse, as far as some as them that have come up, when talking to the government, and I'm not sure why we would talk about how university governance is so un-transparent and it is their problem, since that is what the government is already saying. I don't know why we would make their arguments for them.

RB (ASTSU): It's not just about our interactions with government, though, but about our interactions with universities. If we agree with the government that universities are not being transparent, I don't see why we can't make that argument, too.

AB (DSU): Sure, but I would like to advocate for as much funding for students as possible, from both the universities and from the province. I feel like talking about the university system and the problems in that as well as the university mispending are already the lines that the government uses.

JW (ED): The way, in part, of having an affordable university system for students is having an affordable system, period. Right now, we have a government that is more than usually inclined to increasing public revenue: taxes, public expenditures, etc., and they are not willing to move these things any more. They've even started to reduce, which is a whole other problem. Realistically, it is difficult to imagine a government that will systematically behave differently. If we don't take on the task of making the system more affordable, we are leaving students open to paying for an unaffordable system. The government will protect the public, and we have to protect students.

RB (ASTSU): If the government is reluctant to increase funding because of a lack of transparency, and if we agree that transparency from the university system is something that we would want to see, I don't see why it would be a bad tactic to advocate for it. Students can see how money is spent, and it gives government one less reason not to give funding.

AB (DSU): I feel like this conversation could go on, and my intention is not to sway opinions necessarily. I have direction from my council to vote against it, so I will do that, but I'm just expressing that: if these are meant to be discussion starters, in my opinion the discussions we should be trying to start are problematizing the concerns in the university system, and bringing up even bigger concerns, such as questions of private bailouts. Why is the government doing these things when they could be investing in students? Those are the discussions I would like to be starting.

JW (ED): On the accountability piece, part of that is that we're seizing an opportunity that is happening right now, regarding being clear as to how the money is being spent. If we are clear, we will be better positioned in three years to come back and say yes, there should be more public money going into the system, and increase in the proportion of revenues going into the system in NS, because we have a clear understanding that that funding increase is going to go to improving quality for students. Also, right now, with the way the system is governed, it is difficult for us to say that funding increases are going to lead to an improvement in the system.

Nick Head-Peterson (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-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Robert Bossler (ASTSU) **seconded the motion**: Be it resolved that the Board accept this paper in principle, with a final draft to be presented to the Board on April 24<sup>th</sup> for final approval by electronic vote on April 26<sup>th</sup>.

ASU - Yes

DSU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

**Motion passed.**

8) Abuse policy

JW (ED): The reason to introduce an abuse policy is that we are required to by our insurer. I have crafted this policy, and what it outlines, is that if there is any case of verbal, physical, psychological, sexual harassment, abuse, or neglect what we need to do. The essence of the policy is that if, in a case of abuse, the officers or mediators (or if it's a staff member) initially goes to the executive director, and then to the officers if it is an issue with the executive director. And we have to refer any case that could be criminal or a violation of the human rights code to the appropriate body. Also, we do mediation with the person to claims to have been abused and the alleged abuser together, or we can meet them separately if the claimant prefers that.

N H-P (SFXUSU): It's in accordance with all legal proceedings.

JW (ED): Yes. They sent us suggestions through the whole thing, and suggested that we hire a lawyer to do this, but it seems like a lot of money for something that regulates the interactions of fifteen people. It should work. We were probably going to be fine before this, but it is good to have it.

KP (Chair): Called for questions and further discussion/debate. Heard none.

Nick Head-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Jesse Smith (ASTSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** Students Nova Scotia approve the proposed Abuse Policy.

ASU - Yes

DSU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

**Motion passed unanimously.**

9) Dalhousie Agriculture Students Association (DASA) application for full membership

JW (ED): We received a communication requesting full membership from the Dalhousie Agriculture Students' Association. This was discussed at the Board meeting at Acadia, and there was consensus around the table that it would be approved, that they were sufficiently independent of the DSU that it was appropriate. Basically, my understanding is that this has already been agreed to, it is just a question of doing the formal approval because they had submitted a formal request for membership.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Do we know what their numbers are? (*It is already incorporated into DSU's portion of the budget right now.*)

JW (ED): We get our enrolment recorded by the MPHEC, and they recorded total Dalhousie enrolment, including at the Agricultural College. So I think that it is somewhat retroactive, but if you will, their contribution is somewhat in the neighbourhood of \$5,000 a year (not a lot of money).

N H-P (SFXUSU): Previous discussions were had about their timing? (*Yes.*)

KP (Chair): They have their own elections, they have their own executive, and they do their own student fees, I think.

AB (DSU): JA (DSU) knows more than I do about it.

JW (ED): We've already talked this through, too. It was an informal conversation. One of the key things is that they don't elect the DSU executive, they only elect their own. It's largely logistical.

KP (Chair): Called for further discussion/debate. Heard none.

Aaron Beale (DSU) **moved** and Nick Head-Peterson (SFXSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Dalhousie Agriculture Students Association's application for full membership be accepted by the Board.

ASU - Yes

DSU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

**Motion passed unanimously.**

10) Invitation to Presidents: The Challenges and Opportunities of PSE in Nova Scotia

JW (ED): I don't know how many of you got the invitation from the government for the Challenges and Opportunities event. Rachel Henderson gave me a call at the office yesterday or two days ago and wanted to know if there was general interest; they hadn't had any RSVPs. I thought it was a public event, but it turns out it was by invitation only. There can be one representative per union, so I wanted to get a sense of who could make it.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Not me. I can put it to Ben, though.

MR (ASU): Nope.

JW (ED): It's next Thursday night. Anybody else?

MR (ASU): If I can give you feedback, we discuss it at a later time. I was sharing my frustration with Ray that, obviously, there will be the speakers, and then the next day they're going to be breaking into strategic bidding with government, and I just find it ironic that we get an invitation to hear the speakers and get all inspired, then we're locked out of the negotiations. We're obviously very lucky to have the opportunities we do with government right now, but I'd really urge government to really decide what they want out of this. I think students can be an ally for them in these discussions with universities, and take a lot of pressure off of them.

JW (ED): We did make a request to government to include us, and they said no. But they did say that they'd give us a summary of what was said afterwards. So, no SFXUSU. Confirmed, I have: Aaron, Mike. (*Can we send two?*) You can email and ask. AST? Will you send someone? (*JS may be available.*)

KP (Chair): Does StudentsNS get a seat?

JW (ED): Yes, it gets one, but I've asked for four. I've just now confirmed that the event is by invitation only, and limited to student union presidents.

11) Alcohol inspection results

JW (ED): Board members had requested a few days to think these through. I don't know if there is anything to say about this, but I thought that we should put it as an agenda item since this is the last meeting of the year.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I mentioned it to our Board, presented as information that they might want to consider, and I think that they were surprised at some of the numbers, mostly how low they were, and how infrequently campus bars were visited. Other than that, it was just a passing along of information.

KP (ASU): The other thing that I was thinking was that the numbers on this spreadsheet were significantly different. When we went back and asked for violations, citations, and warnings, they reduced the number of total inspections significantly, which they told us was due to 'clerical error.'

BP (Research): It was apparently a mix-up in the way that they record the data, and because they didn't send the formula in, and just sent the raw numbers, I had no way of checking it, so the numbers still showed that student bars were inspected more often, so it wasn't like they were completely fudging it, but less so than before.

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

**In camera.**

**Out of camera.**

KP (Chair): Called for further discussion/debate. Heard none. Thanks to BP (Research) for FOIPOP'ing this information and sending it out to the Board.

12) Brainstorms of Summer 2013 Position Papers on Student Financial Assistance and Wellness and Students with Disabilities, Housing – NOT ON RECORD.

13) Decision on Board Officer terms

N H-P (SFXUSU): My broad reservation is that we need to figure out a way to address the fact that we're no longer elected representatives of our organization and also, in many cases, no longer students. After we have that discussion, it would be nice if Jonathan could explain how he got to these numbers for honoraria, and then if we do move forward with the Be it Resolved clauses, we could have another discussion about how much the honorariums are.

MR (ASU): Just in response to the first concerns: I also had serious concerns surrounding the democratic legitimacy of having officers fulfill terms outside of their elected mandate. We've had discussions about that. I offered the amendment that, at the first Board meeting of the new elected year, that our successor in the next Board would have to ratify those officers to continue their terms. To me it is a sort of a check and balance clause that helps to ensure that if there were serious issue with the direction in which this organization went in a previous year and for some reason various student unions ran against what we had just done as a Board, then that newly-elected Board would have the opportunity to say "thank you, but your service is no longer needed." I think that it validates the role of these individuals as interim officers when you have newly elected individuals ratify them. As much as it would be pro forma, their actions would be an articulation of why we're doing this every year, and a rationalization of what they can offer the new Board for the three months. So for me, that satisfied that concern for me.

AB (DSU): Why is the AGM in August?

JW (ED): It had to be in June or July, because we have to get our auditor review done, and it takes some time. April 30<sup>th</sup>, I don't have all of the expenditures for the year finished yet. (*I thought this says 'August.'*) We had it in August this year because this year was irregularly scheduled. It should have been, and will be June or July. The other element to the AGM this year was that we wanted to make by-law changes, and we wanted to re-name, and we had to do that at the member meeting so we delayed the member meeting so that there would be sufficient notice. Bringing it back to the topic at hand, one of the key elements to this is making sure that Board members know each other when they elect a chair, treasurer, or vice-chair. I don't think that happens when you do it at the first meetings when you first meet each other. Secondary and tertiary benefits are around accountability and the audit.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I agree. Electing a chair that people have gotten to know is important. My concern is around the practicality of it. I don't know that when we're creating policy if this is sustainable. We've talked a lot about how this works because we have some members who are staying in HRM, but, for instance, who will chair meetings between May and the AGM? (*We could appoint an interim person.*) It seems like we're creating something that may work some years, but isn't necessarily sustainable. Yes, there is a learning curve to being the chair, treasurer, or vice-chair of this organization, and yes I think that there needs to be some form of transition, but I don't know that this is the best way to do that.

MR (ASU): I do not disagree with N H-P. It is not a perfect solution. However, it is the best solution that we have right now. It is not going to work every time, and that is part of my reservations, but having a lack of alternative in place is also unsustainable. We're not going to have a returning individual from the previous Board every year who wants to step into the Chair position: 1) it would give an advantage to that type of person, and 2) there will be years where there will be a complete turnover and we will be just as screwed if not more. This at least gives us a safeguard for, say, 70% or even 50% of the time. I'd rather have this option 50% of the time than not, as it gives us more flexibility as an organization to be able to have some continuity.

Worst case scenario, like this year, our chair is not available, it goes to the vice-chair. If they are not available, it goes to the Treasurer. If none of them are available, we would have to ratify new Board members anyway. The democratic deficit was the one area where I could see a huge minus, and once I got myself over that hurdle, everything else was just logistical.

N H-P (SFXUSU): For me, if you presented me with the option of having an experienced individual carry on for two months at the first board meeting, I probably would have nodded my head and said yes, now look where I am. I'm looking at it from a completely different angle. So I don't know that by saying we're going to present new Board members with this option, that they will be the ones that actually ratify the officers, will be getting us over that hurdle. Because they're new, and the whole process and dynamic is new at that first meeting. I think that we defined ourselves as a group much earlier on, and part of that came from the fact that we elected people right away. That was our team. That was what we were moving forward with.

KP (Chair): I think that it is better to have the results of an uninformed decision last two months, rather than last twelve months.

JW (ED): I think that the same concerns apply if you're appointing the chair for the full year, but in this case you're appointing them for two months, and then you have a shot at re-electing them.

KP (Chair): In that case, it probably isn't a big problem, but if it is, if the person did a terrible job, there will be people at the table screaming at the Chair how bad they were, you will have to mentally engage with that conversation at that point, and you won't be just smiling and nodding. I didn't burn the place down last year, so there wasn't much opposition this year to keeping me on, but if I had, you probably would have heard about it.

MR (ASU): One thing that I would like to have formalized within our bylaws is the transition plan for incoming executives. I would have loved to see JA's (DSU) successor sitting here with us. Obviously Darcy couldn't make it, but both JP (SMUSA) and I were given an opportunity as incoming executives to sit in on policy planning before we started our terms. If we could formalize in our bylaws that there is an inherent expectation that we will bring incoming individuals into these meetings so that they understand: 1) how this organization is run, and 2) if there are issues from the previous year of which they need to be aware. I feel that this should be formalized, whether it is two meetings prior to transition, I think that it is important that they are present.

JW (ED): If you like, I can draft a policy along those lines for tomorrow to be approved tomorrow.

MM (ASU): Do you see it as something that is valuable? I think it is tied to this indirectly.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I think that if we have a good succession plan, we have less of a need for this policy, because people have seen the operations of a meeting and they are better informed moving forward. Not that by attendance of a meeting or two they will know exactly what the Chair or officers do, but there is less of a need for it.

MR (ASU): That may be the case, but we won't know that until further down the road. We'll have to apply it for a couple of years to see if it works, and if it doesn't, we can withdraw it.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I may be beating a dead horse, but I want to present a scenario where the chair, vice-chair, and treasurer are all not available, we elect someone for the interim, and then in July, based on two months, has this person done a good enough job, or were they incompetent, and now we have a fractured Board because we have a new Chair in July who has to go through...

KP (Chair): It is still better than electing someone on two months' experience than zero months' experience.

JW (ED): The other thing is that, in standard practice, the interim person is not supposed to be able to run for the permanent position. (*That would be best, and we should make that clear.*) We can put that in the governing policy if we wanted.

N H-P (SFXUSU): This, to me, just does not seem completely thought out and ready to pass, but I am okay with moving on with it.

MR (ASU): I share your issue. We're so used to finding policies that we see as perfect. Our governance model of Students NS, coupled with our own governance models of our respective Student Unions are not perfectly congruent, and I think that what we're trying to do is papier-mâché a process that tries to make it as straight-forward as possible. It is not perfect, but it offers as much flexibility for our organization and provides us with options, rather than constricts, it opens us up to more flexibility.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I just don't think that those options are fully thought out, and that we've thought of all these strange scenarios that we're going to get into, and then suddenly we're creating policy on the spot because we haven't thought of it. I'm happy to talk about honorarium levels now.

KP (Chair): Let's focus on honorarium levels for now.

JW (ED): These levels are a bit arbitrary, but generally the Chair is the most important by a wide margin, of the officers. The Vice-Chair and Treasurer, this year and observing how things worked last year, there was a wide range of their degree of involvement. I am happy to speak in camera on these in detail.

Nick Head-Peterson (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: Be it resolved** that the Board approve the following amendment: "The Board *may approve* an honorarium..."

ASU - Yes

DSU - Abstained

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

**Motion passed.**

KP (Chair): Would N H-P like to propose another amendment?

N H-P (SFXUSU): Yes. I would like to ensure that there is more flexibility for certain circumstances, because I don't think that we've fleshed out all the possible circumstances, and that we increase the Chair's possible honorarium to \$700, and the possible honorariums for the Vice-Chair and Treasurer to \$350.

JS (ASTSU): Requested clarification as to why N H-P proposed the increase in honoraria.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Because we haven't fleshed out all the possible circumstances, we don't really know how much is going to be involved with these positions. Allowing the Board a little more discretion to find that balance between volunteerism and hourly rate, I think it would be respectable for us to provide a little bit more as a possible honorarium.

JW (ED): If you increase it, it might require that we allocate \$400 out of the budget. I think that we generally have to assume that the money is going to be spent. My other concern is that, potentially, if you increase it, those will become the benchmarks, as opposed to these

benchmarks. The expectations would be that we would spend a thousand dollars, and we would basically be increasing the expectation that we would spend \$1400.

AB (DSU): Would like the question to be called.

KP (Chair): Called for any further discussion. Hearing none, called the question.

Nick Head-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Matthew Rios (ASU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Board approve the following amendment: that the Board increase the Chair's possible honorarium to \$700, and the possible honorariums for the Vice-Chair and Treasurer to \$350.

ASU - Yes

DSU - No

ASTSU – Yes

SFXSU – Yes

**Motion passed.**

N H-P (SFXUSU): Going back to the original point, one thing that would ease my qualms about this would be the addition of a 'whereas' clause to the effect of: "no individual is required to do this," just so that it is stated in our policies. It seems to me that there are almost expectations for individuals to stay on, even though they have to be elected, the expectation is that they do not stay and that we are asking them to stay for them to decide on.

AB (DSU): Do you think that happens in policy, though, or just by an expectation that is made?

N H-P (SFXUSU): My question would be who would be asking the officers to stay on.

JW (ED): With this clause, that would be the expectation, when they run, but this year we're adding the expectation to officer terms that they stay an additional two months. In the future, the expectation when they choose to run will be that they will be available to serve until the next AGM. I think that the Board would be understanding if life circumstances happened, and we generally don't have whereas clauses within policies. We could just communicate it to people when they're elected, but people would know this expectation already in the future when they ran.

MR (ASU): Requests clarification regarding the honoraria that were just passed: are they allocated for the three months in which officers are not elected? (*They are from AGM to AGM.*) I would like to move to reconsider the previous amendments, because I think that we should be adding some language around honoraria for these roles of Chair, and I voted under the assumption that we were allocating these honoraria just for the three months that we're no longer elected by the student unions. I move to reconsider, make the appropriate edits, and pass that.

KP (Chair): What specifically are we looking to reconsider? The period for which the money is for, or the amount? (*The period.*) That would be a motion to amend. (*Okay.*)

AB (DSU): It says that they have to complete their full term. Does that not include...

MR (ASU): I would just look for some clarifying language on the implicit recognition of them going above and beyond their elected terms as student union officials. Not for their terms of services as officers of the Board.

JW (ED): And that is what is written in there. It's if they complete the full term of their officer term, not student union term.

KP (Chair): That assumption, that a full term is AGM to AGM contradicts what you are talking about in terms of inviting some of them to return, so that may be in conflict. We also may want to clarify that they are to complete a twelve-month term, or a year-long term, as opposed to 'full'. Why don't we put a timeline there instead of arguing what a full term is.

RB (ASTSU): Is a full term not defined as AGM to AGM?

KP (Chair): It is a matter of defining whether it is inviting them back, or what the expectations are.

BF (Comms.): Could the Board not clarify it by putting, in brackets, after “full term,” “one annual cycle?”

MR (ASU): I’m not a governance individual, but I see this as contradicting our own constitutions. I would look for clarifying language to clarify the ambiguities. I think that Kyle’s amendment is friendly.

JW (ED): In several places, it does say “AGM to AGM.” It wouldn’t be hard to add that bracket to the other ones. I should add that you haven’t passed this, to my knowledge. You’ve just passed amendments to the proposal. (*So it wouldn’t be a motion to reconsider?*) It would be a friendly amendment to add “AGM to AGM” at the end of the other ones.

MR (ASU): Does that actually address the issue?

KP (Chair): So if they don’t serve from AGM to AGM, say if they serve from AGM to October, or May 1<sup>st</sup>, they would not be serving a full term, and would not be open to any of the honorarium. Amendment on the table: to insert “AGM to AGM” in the appropriate places for clarification of Board officer terms.

**Amendment carried** by general consent.

N H-P (SFXUSU): So the new Board would have to have a discussion at the AGM about whether or not those individuals get some portion of that money? (*Yes.*) Based on the three months. (*Yes.*) I don’t know if that’s clear in what we’ve just written. What if the Board feels that the exiting officer had a stellar term but left in May, under the previous assumption, that is not what I voted that money to be for. It is in recognition for work done outside of the original commitment.

RB (ASTSU): They are only eligible for that honorarium if they serve until the next AGM.

KP (Chair): Ultimately, the Board can decide to give money to really whomever they want. They can decide to give money to someone on the street walking by, if they want to. We’ve set out specific terms here as to who qualifies for this money. Could future Boards overturn this? Yes, but I feel that this, for the time being, clearly defines who is eligible.

N H-P (SFXUSU): So in your capacity as Chair of this current Board, what we have written is clear to you that it is for individuals only who have served AGM to AGM terms, and most specifically those three months after their terms are done with their respective Student Union.

KP (Chair): Yes. It is my opinion as Chair, which doesn’t hold more weight than anyone else’s, but is my personal opinion, that I understand that clause to indicate a full term, and that is AGM to AGM, which requires work in the summer.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I still come back to the fact that I think there will be issues with this, but I think that, passing it, we will be able to deal with those issues. I think that one problem that we will find is in dealing with individuals who are concerned about the expectations that they are required to be there until June, and may have other plans subsequent to that, and may have a reluctance to run, or just have no idea what they’re doing twelve months from that time and Board members will be doing some form of this every year.

KP (Chair): I think that practice will make precedent and that practice will be ingrained. (*Do we pass these both together?*) Roberts Rules would say that we pass these clauses both together, unless someone would like to separate them, and we could absolutely consider that motion. I don’t see one forthcoming. The question has been called. Is there anyone else who would like to be added to the Speaker’s list? (*No.*)

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Jared Perry (SMUSA) **seconded the motion:**

**Be it resolved that:**

- a) Students Nova Scotia appoint Board Officers at the organization's Annual General Meeting to serve until the subsequent Annual General Meeting;
- a) Board Officers who are no longer elected representatives of member associations as of May 1 of their Officer term will cease to exercise a vote on the Board of Directors;
- b) Board Officers who are no longer elected representatives of member associations as of May 1 of their Officer term will have the cost of their travel to board events covered by Students Nova Scotia;
- c) At the first board meeting of each financial year, the board will ratify officers' continued service to the AGM.
- d) Board officers will retain signing authority until their replacements are appointed.

**Be it further resolved that:**

- a) The Board may approve an honorarium of up to \$700 for the Chair after they complete their full term (AGM to AGM) and preparing the organization's Annual Report for presentation at the AGM.
- b) The Board may approve an honorarium of up to \$350 for the Treasurer after they complete their full term (AGM to AGM) and overseeing the review or audit of the organization's books for presentation at the AGM.
- c) The Board may approve an honorarium of up to \$350 for the Vice-Chair after they complete their full term (AGM to AGM).

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU - Abstained

ASU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

**Motion passed.**

14) Executive Director Evaluation

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-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Jesse Smith (ASTSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Board accept the Executive Director's performance appraisal as prepared by the Chair and circulated.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU - Abstained

ASU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

**Motion passed.**

15) Proposed 2013-14 Budget

JW (ED): Budget was distributed, although minor modifications have been made since: minor modifications to salary, for example. Previous example set for salary growth unclear. It was understood to be inflation plus \$2,000 per year, but that works out to be a lot of money, so it has been downgraded to just the \$2,000 increase for every year staff stays on. This change freed up a lot of money in the budget for the communications and campaigns line. Before Mark Coffin was ED, we only retained EDs for a single year, year after year. Board made the decision to have incentive package for staff which included a portion of salary being contingent on finishing their contract and a significant pay increase for each subsequent year. The budget as circulated is for about \$200,000 in revenue. We now have exact amount based on MPHEC's enrolment numbers for last 2011/2012 numbers.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification regarding these numbers: do they reflect the addition of the Agricultural College? *(Yes.)*

JW (ED): The MPHEC numbers include the Agricultural College with Dalhousie's. Our representation is about 37,000 students: 31,000 full-time, 5,600 part-time. I have here four budget options for your consideration. The first option is continuing current practices but adding a Fall co-op student, half of whose salary will be paid by the government (\$7,000). The co-op student would be for 35 hours a week, for 16 weeks in the fall. The second option is the same as option one, except that we replace Bluenose with an office manager to complete accounting, which ups the cost of HR. We would pull the money out of communications and campaigns to fund it, which I will speak to in a moment. Option three is the same as option 2, except that we do a review instead of an audit. Our auditor has recommended that we do reviews instead of audits, moving forward, and Patrick Carruthers (Treasurer) has seconded that, because it saves us \$400 a year, and we're a pretty small shop to have audits done. Option four is for a \$1000 budget for Board officers. I suggest that we keep it at \$1000 budgeted, regardless of whether we pay that much or less. If it is less, we can redirect the funds elsewhere. In terms of the office manager piece: We're proposing an office manager for a four-hours a week position, 52 weeks a year. We won't discuss the salary while in camera, but it has been circulated. It is not a huge engagement, but it is consistent with other organizations of our size who also have an office manager come in once a week for half a day to do their books, such as the Nova Scotia Environmental Network, and Heartwood. Now, when we have expenses, I record them in our office in a big binder that I have. I handle writing all the cheques, then we send those expenses, along with the cheque tags, to accounting, and then they turn that into our ledgers. The problems that we have with this are: A) it is absorbing a lot of my time that I could be spending on other things, and we're paying this cost anyway because I am working extra hours to get this done while still doing every other part of my job. B) We don't have up-to-date ledgers, since we only send the documents to the accountants every so often, maybe three or four times a year. There is also a lot of duplication. I'd suggest that would be a more efficient way. We'd have to do a background check on whoever we hired, and figure out if the timing is appropriate, but the cost would not be the full amount stated, since we would be lowering our costs in the other ways mentioned by this change. The cost to us would end up being around \$2,400, which is not a huge amount of money.

KP (Chair): As the budget builds, and since the ED is giving several options, we will want to discuss items as they come up. Let's discuss the Manager position.

MM (SMUSA): Requested clarification regarding HUB location.

JW (ED): There is no news regarding the previously-proposed move. We will be in this space for the near future. We have included inflation in to the numbers on rent.

MR (ASU): Is PC (Treasurer) in favour of this?

JW (ED): During our conversation, PC was generally in favour of giving it a try this year. He had concerns about us absorbing too much time in supervision and hiring, and that we do a criminal record check.

JS (ASTSU): Would we hire someone from a firm? I think that it would be a good option.

KP (Chair): We could also make it into student employment, if possible.

JW (ED): It could be a student. To be honest, I was thinking about hiring a retiree, or hiring the same person who does this for the Nova Scotia Environmental Network or Heartwood, as they may be interested in doing it for us, as well.

MM (SMUSA): Would it not be cheaper to combine the summer volunteer with the Office Manager position, than to hire a full-year person with half of their salary paid by the government?

KP (Chair): The internship that we're looking at is getting someone from Public Relations at Mount Saint Vincent University. I would be hesitant about their level of competency with financial records, because we're not looking for a financial analyst. Maybe we'll luck out and get someone with really great business sense and who is great at PR, but I don't think that that was the intent of the co-op student that we're looking for.

MM (SMUSA): Is the budget balanced, or how much over/under is it? (*It is balanced.*) So we're not putting money aside?

JW (ED): There is a contingency of \$500, which is what PC recommended, but overall it is balanced. Another advantage of doing this in-house, with an office manager, is that we will better be able, throughout the year, to track where we're at with the budget than we were this year. (*Requested clarification regarding utilities.*) I've dropped the conference calls piece to \$0, and our landline is not included in the rent. This includes cellphones of the Executive Director and Communications Officer. (*Will we need the landline in 2013?*) Well, yes, especially since our office is expanding. We already have a third person whose cellphone we do not subsidize, we'll have an intern in the summer, and then the Office Manager, all of whom would be using the landline.

KP (Chair): It also ensures that phone lines are not tied up. I sometimes talk to the ED for hours, while the office line can stay open.

JS (ASTSU): Are those fixed costs? Do we have a more realistic idea of what the actual numbers are, without rounding? Do these have contingencies built-in?

JW (ED): Yes. All of these are approximate, although I can pull up the amounts. For example, the landline will cost around \$75 a month, and the cell phone costs about a hundred.

MR (ASU): A month? (*Yes.*) What carrier are you with? (*Bell.*) I recommend that you switch carriers. I don't recommend that the Board starts micromanaging what cell phone plan you use, but many of us have cell phone plans at our universities which are far less.

KP (Chair): Our plans are usually about \$130.

JW (ED): It varies, though, sometimes my bills are around \$90, and sometimes they're \$120.

MM (SMUSA): My cell phone plan is around \$100 a month.

JW (ED): We also have two lines on the landline, so it is a bit more expensive.

MR (ASU): We need a "Fave 8" Plan, with all of us.

JW (ED): I have that, with ten people, but the cost of the cell phone is shared, so only some of those are work contacts.

KP (Chair): Is there further discussion regarding the Office Manager position?

N H-P (SFXUSU): I'm in favour of it.

JW (ED): Option two, regarding the review in place of an audit. (*What is the difference?*) PC would be able to speak to this better than I, but in an audit, they do through each item, line by line. A review has less detail; they just check to see if there is anything unreasonable.

KP (Chair): We had one a while ago at the SU.

JS (ASTSU): If we accept this budget, the danger is then that we lose an audit as an option, moving forward. I think it makes more sense to say that every fourth year, or every fifth year, we do an audit.

KP (Chair): With MC as ED, we were going to try to get into a cycle of review and auditing, every second year. This year we're doing an audit because it is the ED's first year, two years ago we did an audit because it was MC's first year, and last year we did an audit because it was MC's last year. If we don't start sometime, it will always be someone's first or last year, so we want to get into the habit of doing it.

JW (ED): This budget would be paying for this year's review or audit. If the decision is to have an audit this year, this budget should reflect that.

JP (SMUSA): Requested clarification: as a not-for-profit organization, are we required to have an audit? (*We can do either.*)

JW (ED): The other thing that PC had drawn to my attention is that it doesn't make sense to flip between a review and an audit, apparently, because the audit can't compare the current year with the previous year if the previous year was just a review. The cost savings is \$400, and this is what our auditor and PC recommended, which was to do a review instead of an audit.

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

**In camera.**

**Out of camera.**

KP (Chair): So we'll have a straw-poll. It seems that the majority is in favour of a review.

N H-P (SFXUSU): For me, it isn't about the \$400, but whether or not our finance people are comfortable with it.

MR (ASU): It is about transparency.

JW (ED): We definitely need to do an audit or a review every year.

MR (ASU): I agree, but I do not think that \$400 is an overwhelming rationalization for one or the other. If both PC and our external accountant are in favour, it seems like a good idea.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I am more surprised by the fact that that is all the savings that we're going to see. What has our audit been costing us? (*\$2800-\$2900 this year.*)

AB (DSU): So the review would be around \$2400?

JW (ED): Yes. The one thing that I would say is that, while it is not a lot of money, if we did a breakdown of where we have discretionary spending in our budget, there isn't a whole lot of discretionary spending. It is a \$200,000 budget, but \$160,000 of that is in HR. Another \$6,000 is in rent. It quickly goes down in terms of how much we actually have control over, so \$400 might be a substantial proportion of that.

MR (ASU): Let's try a review, and see what difference it creates. We'll have a better feel for what it looks like once it's done. I'm comfortable, but I would make a note to re-examine it next year.

JW (ED): The last decision was made yesterday regarding Board Office terms, and people were comfortable with leaving with \$1000 instead of kicking it up to \$1400, although I don't think that we need to budget for that, since I'm not convinced that we're going to spend that much. In terms of these options, that's everything.

MR (ASU): I'm familiar with budgeting for the highest-end scenario. I'd rather overstate, then we don't run into a deficit. (*We do in some areas.*) I would overstate when it comes to honoraria. While I'm not a financial individual, I would be more comfortable stating the maximum.

JW (ED): Okay, so \$1400. The line in here that makes things make sense is generally the communications and campaigns budget. That's where we take things out of, and where we put

money back when we find money elsewhere. The other element that is not included, but is worth discussing, is that I haven't put in here the honorarium for the person who takes minutes. I suggest that we go in camera for this, since it's HR related.

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

**In camera.**

**Out of camera.**

KP (Chair): We will be adding an honorarium/salary line in the budget for the minute preparation.

AB (DSU): That will be a wage too, right? (*Yes.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Requested clarification regarding what is expected of the communications and campaigns line? Noting that next year is an election year, is BF (Comms.) comfortable with that level of support, with the potential increase in campaign need?

JW (ED): BF would ideally like more funds for this line. (*What was spend this year?*) To be honest, I am not sure at this stage, mostly since I do not have access to the ledgers for the past three months. Part of what affects the campaign and communications line is how much we saved this year. I'm almost positive that we turned a surplus this year that was significant, and we intend to channel that surplus into additional funds for the election campaign.

MR (ASU): As it is right now, we have a roll-over budget, right? (*Yes.*)

N H-P (SFXUSU): Noted the value of student assemblies, although not necessarily in their old form. That this will be the second year where we do not have a budgeted line for student assemblies is disappointing. It would be nice to continue to explore ways to address that.

JW (ED): This is the budget just from our student fees. It doesn't include potential funding from D250 or from the provincial government through student/youth employment programs. This year, we had \$8,000 for student assemblies from D250, and we're preparing an application for the same money next year. We'll approach next year's board very early in terms of what they envision for that money.

MR (ASU): Thinks that N H-P is not speaking of student assemblies on each campus, but the original congregation on a provincial level.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I only had the opportunity to go to one, but I found it to be immensely valuable. I went up to CBU and did what we do now, but on a larger scale. I think that, with the number of topics we are discussing at the Board level, there could be provincial issues in the coming years. Having a budgeted line so that more students would be able to attend those and have those discussions would be helpful. Maybe it will come from D250, but student assemblies should not just be on our own campuses, and oriented around the papers and release of things, but they should be also similar in form to a provincial gathering of students on a large scale. I'm sure that there are grants and funding available for that.

JW (ED): I think that we are looking for funding for the Leader Lab, which is similar to that in a number of ways. It's would be really interesting to hold them around the election. That would be a really interesting thing to do then, and we could look for D250 money. We were thinking of how to mobilize those resources for use in the provincial election.

JP (SMUSA): Looking down the road, is the D250 money something we can count on year after year, or is it something that should be reflected in the budget. I don't know anything about it. (*Not sure.*)

MR (ASU): Are we the only people utilizing this funding?

JW (ED): We're one of the key ones. When Mark Coffin moved into his Springtide project, they were using D250 money. I know that at one point, they were having trouble getting money out the door, so we were helpful in that area. Our thinking, which partially informs people who are

here next year, is that we want to get our applications for funding done ASAP, since we want to budget that at the start of the year. We can't now, since we don't have it secured, but we would be looking for renewed funding for Mend the Gap, Leader Lab, and Student Assemblies. We may take different approaches to spending it from last year. One very reasonable fourth project to undertake is the type of provincial assembly that N H-P is proposing. It's something to think of holding around the election. One caution: the organization of student assemblies took up an enormous amount of time and resources. There is a sense that I got from MC that it is not a priority, for that reason.

N H-P (SFXUSU): When I became involved in them, they were on a downturn, but people spoke of a time when they were really vibrant and a big part of what we did as an organization. There are ways to look at provincial gatherings of students that we need to start facilitating. It isn't limited to our Board or our member schools even. We can go big with the idea of a student assembly.

JW (ED): I should add, regarding the \$0 on the student assembly line, that I'd like to rework the ledgers and how we do our budgeting. That line is money in and out, so when you compensate us for the down payment that we made today, that goes into our student assembly line. Or the money that came from D250 or the provincial government for the mental health conference, and then all of the expenses that came out of that, that was in and out of this line as well.

N H-P (SFXUSU): My one other comment is regarding the travel and meetings budget line. It is huge, in my opinion, and I think that we should find as many ways as possible to minimize it and put that money to other areas of our budget.

JW (ED): I suspect that we went way under budget this year. At the same time, I don't think that we were at CBU, or SFX this year as frequently as I would have liked.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Agreed. And finding the balance between making sure that we are at all of our members schools and the cost-savings measures is important.

KP (Chair): Something else that I didn't know until last night, was that there are members paying to go to these conferences out of their pocket, like AST. In addition, I'd like this line to be used not just for staff meetings, but also for officers who do not have student unions covering their costs of budget lines at their homes schools.

JW (ED): Suggests that the Board go into camera.

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

**In camera.**

**Out of camera.**

MR (ASU): Do we still need a motion to accept the budget? (*Unless there is anything else to be discussed.*)

RB (ASTSU): Requested clarification: you are taking the extra money that we've budgeted now for the honoraria out of Communications?

JW (ED): Yes, and the Campaigns line. If we save on the travel budget, the margins that we make there will go into Communications and Campaigns. The estimate here is lower than the resources that are available this year.

KP (Chair): Called for further discussion.

N H-P (STFUSU): Where student fees do provide a lot of our budget, I feel that, as much as our organization is capable of finding alternative sources of revenue through other funding avenues will increase our capacity. I think that it is something that we have done very well this year from home-office in terms of D250 and others, but continuing that practice to increase our capacity as an organization would, obviously, be commendable.

JW (ED): To clarify that, I meant to say that we did not spend it all, and will be giving some funding back, but we mobilized just under \$50,000 in additional funding through other funding sources for various projects. If we got the same funding this year, plus our planned co-op student, plus an additional possible co-op student through the mend-the-gap campaign, we'd be looking at over \$50K this year.

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Jesse Smith (ASTSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Board accept "option 4" in their approval of the 2013/2014 Budget.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU - Yes

ASU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

**Motion unanimously passed.**

JW (ED): There remain 30 minutes before lunch. The ED recommends that we address another agenda item, and leave the Strategic Plan until after lunch. Perhaps we would prefer to deal with the Bank Account item.

KP (Chair): Heard no opposition to this suggestion. It passed as a friendly amendment to the agenda.

#### 16) Students Nova Scotia bank account

JW (ED): I brought along Credit Union Atlantic's flyer on their services for not-for-profit organizations, if anyone is interested. Basically, with the degree of transactions that we do, we would get free banking through the Credit Union. We're not talking enormous savings here, only \$150 or \$160 that we're paying not to RBC, but part of our thinking is that it would be a good time to do this because we are going to have a turnover, relatively soon, of Board officers, so we'll have to go through the process of getting new signatures for signing authority. We're also going through the name change, so we'd have to do that with the bank account already. There are all these changes that we're making already, so we can just move the account at the same time. The added element, and the element that is probably more interesting is the briefing note that BF (Comms.) did. We did not circulate this in advance (and apologies).

MM (SMUSA): Motion to move in camera.

KP (Chair): Suggests that the ED explain the brief, then that the discussion takes place in camera. (*Board agrees.*)

JW (ED): The other element is that RBC has been in the news in the past few weeks over the temporary foreign workers issue. Basically, it is a clear case where they were replacing Canadian workers with temporary foreign workers. I think that even the Harper government was going to investigate the foreign worker program because of this abuse. We recommend to the Board that we use the fact that we are moving our account to make a statement about the importance of hiring our graduates and our constituents

Mike 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.**

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Aaron Beale (DSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that Students Nova Scotia move its bank account to Credit Union Atlantic.

Vote:

SFXUSU – Yes

DSU - Yes

ASU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

**Motion unanimously passed.**

17) Thrive Study

JW (ED): We are still trying to get on the steering committee provincially for this study. I brought a draft letter to CONSUP, which I circulated, and I request that Board members sign this. If anyone is not comfortable with it, then I will proceed to adjust the letter. Basically, we're just trying to get onto the steering committee to continue to work on this. I have two copies of this, and if everyone could make sure that they sign both copies today before they leave, that would be great.

18) Nominations to International Students Working Group

KP (Chair): We've secured representation on the group. The ED had a couple of ideas as to how to use it.

N H-P (SFXUSU): How many people do we get?

JW (ED): There are two representatives on the Working Group. The way that it usually works is that StudentsNS appoints one representative, and the CFS appoints one representative. In this case, the government has said that different parties can appoint representatives, but they're planning to have two, and they basically want to judge the representatives as applications to holding the positions. They can be elected student leaders, regular students, whatever. AB (DSU), you were looking at potentially nominating someone. (*What do they do?*) It would be like the other working groups. We have some terms of reference, and I can pull them up if you want. (*No, sorry, WHEN are they due?*) Tuesday. We have to decide today. (*What is the location?*) HRM.

MM (SMUSA): Should we not wait until our first meeting in May with our new Board members?

N H-P (SFXUSU): That would be on Tuesday.

JW (ED): The working group is starting now. I don't think that we want to delay and have the group to more work without representatives on it.

KP (Chair): What are the options?

JW (ED): I would be willing and interested in doing this. I contacted the groups that I spoke to when preparing the IS paper, and we had a nomination by the president of Mount Saint Vincent University SU. If we want to talk about this (or any other) candidate specifically, I would rather do it in camera, as it is an HR-type discussion. AB (DSU) may be interested in identifying someone.

AB (DSU): I don't know very much about what they would be doing. I just mentioned it at the IS AGM, and that people should contact me.

KP (Chair): So what is our role, as an organization?

JW (ED): That is up for discussion here.

Jared Perry (SMUSA) **moved** and Aaron Beale (DSU) **seconded the motion** for session to go in camera. **Motion passed** by general consent.

**In camera.**

**Out of camera.**

Matthew Rios (ASU) **moved** and Aaron Beale (DSU) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Board appoint Jonathan Williams as primary delegate and Kay Balite as secondary delegate (MSVU) to the International Students Working Group of the Partnership.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU - Yes

ASU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

**Motion passed unanimously.**

19) Preliminary 2012-13 Annual Report

The Board had an informal discussion of activities and results in the past year.

Robert Bossler (ASTSU) **moved** and Aaron Beale (DSU) **seconded the motion** for session to go in recess. **Motion passed** by general consent.

**In recess.**

**Out of recess.**

20) Proposed 2013-16 Strategic Plan

JW (ED): There is some awkwardness in this paper, in that the system fee/student funding paper was intended to be done before this one. Some elements of this paper reflect that. In terms of the methodology of this, Veronica [McNeil] has gone over it, and has said that it is a pretty good looking strategic plan. It is about two pages, and what you see generally is a broad goal in the first column, and the strategy for achieving what that goal is, and then the measures of success are indicators of whether or not we've met that goal, so that we can evaluate as we move along. I think that this is a good framework for annual framework in the future: clear goals, clear strategies, and clear indicators. Parts of this will be quicker, and some will require discussion. We'll go through the fast things first, then come back. The first goal is advocacy. Improve representation was a broad thing that was raised. For those of you who weren't here, at Acadia, Veronica facilitated a discussion on this. We went back with Board and drafted an item, going through to shape it further. The second major goal is to improve major representation, done through hosting student assemblies. They are held at least twice a year on every campus. Board and staff members discuss student assembly positions in their work and receive documented feedback on position papers through these assemblies. These are three different ways for us to measure success. Next is to promote Students NS among students. There are materials in orientation packs, and the brand is visible on banners, etc. Students are familiar with our name, purpose, and positions, generally speaking. Mend the Gap in NS student politics campaigns are running on all campuses, gender representation on Board and student politics is of concern. Continue to work to unite student voice, continue to represent students at the provincial level, and meet requests for support. Does that sound right? (Yes.) I propose that we flag things if they look bad, otherwise they will just carry. Strengthen policy and research. Complete a comprehensive position paper library. Please note that this is a three-year plan, not an annual plan. Position papers are based on Board priorities, and serve as references on key Nova Scotia issues. Communicate research and policy outside position papers. Other reports communicate NS policy priorities. The same fact sheets are available on our website. Our research library is available on our website, directing visitors to our key information resources. StudentsNS provides regular, evidence-based commentary on policy issues relevant to students. Build research network: StudentsNS has detailed records of research contacts (this is something that

we're doing already, and StudentsNS has contact with potential volunteer networks (this is something that we have not yet done). We may integrate into the Public Administration program at Dal, and maybe channel their students into doing some work for us if they want to. It could be a project for school, where they get published on our website. Conduct impactful campaigns of communications. Impact NS elections. The discourse on student priorities is framed by the position of Students NS and its members. Build a strong media presence: StudentsNS maintains elevated reach in formal media, as measured by a qualitative comparison of past and present performance. That's the best we can do; compare ourselves against the past, if we start documenting our reach this year. Some media say: "If you get into media 'x', you've hit 10,000 people," but it seems that those measures are not entirely sound. StudentsNS is the primary media contact for student perspectives at the provincial level. StudentsNS is generating news, not just responding. So we're not just reacting to things, but we're creating stories, which is something that we've gotten a bit better at, with position papers coming out, for instance. Build a strong on-line presence. StudentsNS' reach on social media is consistently expanding as evidenced by increasing twitter followers, Facebook views and likes. StudentsNS.ca has a top Google ranking; when you Google these things, StudentsNS comes high on the list. Produce interactive digital content. We've maintained the Students Speak Out campaign with new interviews this year. I think that there are other things that we can do to expand on that, but that is a base one that we can use this year.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Can we word that differently? Maybe reverse it: StudentsNS maintains and expands campaigns, including Students Speak Out. I think we've had discussions about the Students Speak Out campaign and how it has been effective, but I wouldn't want our three-year plan to limit that in any way. Maybe another line, such as "look for creative opportunities..."

JW (ED): Host an annual Student Wellness conference. Conferences are attended by representatives from 80% of institutions. It's just a goal, although somewhat arbitrary. Conference attendees come from a range of backgrounds. Basically, we'll evaluate whether or not we're getting a diverse representation of students at those events. Students initiatives initiated after the conferences. 2/3 of attendees say that the conferences were well done. Expand partnerships: identify and approach partners. Partners are willing to be identified on our website, I think, is a measure of how much they value us as a partner, how well we're performing, etc. Partners have reported that StudentsNS is a helpful collaborator. Collaborate with faculty associations on issues of common concern and viewpoints, when we have common concerns. I should add that we isolate the faculty associations here, because in the advocacy lines we talk about being partners with government and universities on different issues, and faculty is the other major party. Maintain strong governance and operations. The Board drives StudentsNS. Board members feel ownership over StudentsNS is a measure of that. We do exit interviews every year, and we follow the advice that you give to the extent that we can while respecting the next Board's authority. Maintain connection with alumni. We have an alumni database, and alumni are contacted to help with various projects, such as the Mend the Gap campaign. They were exceedingly helpful. Build strong governance. That governing policies are respected is basically a measure of whether or not they're good. Responsibly manage finances. We get clean audits or reviews every year. Maintain positive unrestricted net assets: at the end of each fiscal year, we're not in the red. StudentsNS still has some money. At the end of last year, we ran a deficit of \$4000, which is not particularly concerning. What is concerning is that we had -\$1000 as our net assets, so we don't want to do that again. Guarantee transparency. The most recent minutes, audits, statements, governance, whatever, they're all available on our site. An honest, up-to-date record of our setbacks is also available on our site. Retain staff. Staff members are fulfilling the full terms of their contracts. And secure additional funding, which ties in with what you were saying earlier; a minimum of 10% of revenues each year are generated through funding sources other than member fees. In practice, we're well above that. The first piece (effective advocacy): collaborate with province and universities, we participate in negotiations for the 2015/16 MOU, some clauses reflect student priorities. We participate in student government round tables, we host annual lobby conferences, we've met with 2/3 of MLA's at least once per

year, which is obviously a major expansion on what we do now. And collaborate with civil servants; they report that StudentsNS is a constructive and impactful stakeholder.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I think it would be interesting to add in another one that StudentsNS looks for opportunities to participate with CONSUP and university round tables. That is one place that we've been shut out, time and time again.

JW (ED): We could add a particular university-bent one? (*Yes.*)

KP (Chair): I think that a great weakness of our organization is that we don't do a lot of on-campus lobbying. We don't talk to administrations enough about our StudentsNS thing, but we talk to our administrations about the other parts of our jobs. I think that we should do a significantly better job with lobbying CONSUP, lobbying administrators, talking with them, and talking about our issues, at least so we know where they're going to oppose us and why. We can be ready for that. Even if that's the only thing we get out of it, that alone is valuable.

JW (ED): So that would be a new objective. "Board members have constant dialogue with their own university administration on StudentsNS-related issues."

KP (Chair): Just saying that Board members should go back and chat more doesn't necessarily reflect their particular political advocacy strategy and how they go about it and what sort of things they do. I think it should be centralized in that sort of way: more strategic than that.

JW (ED): Does this amendment look right? (*Yes.*) So the remaining item here is advanced priority policies. I think we have to evaluate whether or not we achieve results contained in the strategic plan. Obviously, we set a lot of different goals in position papers, and there are a lot of policies that we want. What I identified here are two things, both big policies, and both achievable in the next three years. The first one: Nova Scotia continues to invest in improvements to the student assistance program. The second one: tuition is regulated for all students at rates of change that protect and enhance post-secondary affordability. We have tied this to the position paper, and the Board will have to evaluate, after three years, whether or not that was achieved, but the position paper would dictate exactly how that was done. Same thing with the student assistance program piece. The university funding distribution formula is designed in such a way as to promote accountability and sustainability. Nova Scotia increases university operating grants at the rate of economic growth; this is what we outlined in the position paper. Students control approval of new or increased ancillary fees: I think that is achievable in the next three years. The minimum wage continues to be tied to the low-income cut-off, and continues to go up with inflation. International students receive MSI coverage immediately upon arrival. So those are broad, key priorities that I can see for us in the next three years, and where I could identify clear, achievable outcomes.

KP (Chair): And which policy papers dictate.

JW (ED): And the policy papers would remain our policy, primarily. This is just mostly for evaluating our performance. We can always add more measures of success

KP (Chair): Called for questions and debate.

N H-P (SFXUSU): Can we just add somewhere that StudentsNS continues to remain relevant recognizing the changing priorities of the next three years. Yes, these are the things that now we want to do, but with a possible change in government, current events, and the passage of three years, we just don't know. Maybe something about them reflecting Board priorities for the year.

KP (Chair): For example, mental health was not previously a priority for this Board at all, then there were some external things that happened that couldn't be expected politically. Then we rightly changed course to focus on them.

JW (ED): We can add it as a preamble.

N H-P (SFXUSU): It's probably good to have a preamble to the strategic plan anyways outlining how it was developed and how what it is.

JW (ED): We can add that. I tried to get it so that you can have one sheet, two-sided, that has the full strategic plan on it. We can set it up so that you see that on the website, but then there is that document so that you can hand it out and get it out to people on one sheet.

KP (Chair): This document was trying to be reflective of Board discussions that we've had around policies, although not everybody could be there for those discussions. It's still open to any improvements or changes. Called for further comments or input.

AB (DSU): As this is reflective of our discussions, it's also reflective of some of my concerns over the papers. Obviously, I would prefer to see, rather than have tuition next to inflation, I'd rather start real discussions about government priorities. I just wanted that voiced.

KP (Chair): Requested clarification about the section on hiring and retaining high-quality staff.

JW (ED): The only item on staff was that they fulfill the terms of their contracts.

KP (Chair): Retaining high-quality staff is not a strategic initiative unique to StudentsNS.

JW (ED): To address slightly AB's (DSU) concerns, this says that 'tuition is regulated at rates of change that protect and enhance affordability.' That could mean a reduction. It doesn't commit to an inflationary increase. It's left to the Board, in this case, to assess.

KP (Chair): It also reflects a policy that expires after a certain window, and can be revised at will.

JW (ED): We can also add to the preamble that evaluating success will vary with change in priorities. (*What else would it be tied to?*) For example, advance priority policies, if we identify a different priority later, we would still evaluate ourselves positively if we achieved whatever the other thing was that we wanted to achieve. We just can't know now what might come up. One of the things that Veronica asks is whether or not this is something that we want to review and update annually, or whether or not we just want to have a three-year plan and craft a new one then.

N H-P (SFXUSU): I think that it makes sense to have three-year strategic plans and yearly annual plans. I don't think that that should be changed. (*The Board agrees.*)

AB (DSU): Requested clarification regarding the second point: the ED mentioned that it could be interpreted differently, depending on what our policy is.

JW (ED): Yes, but we can't legitimately not evaluate ourselves based on what changes in tuition.

KP (Chair): I think that what you may be disagreeing with is the policy. The statement itself is a better way of saying advocate our policy on tuition and funding. If that policy changes, then that statement would say the same.

JW (ED): The only policy-specific thing in that statement is that it should be regulated for all students, which is at the heart of the matter.

Nick Head-Peterson (SFXUSU) **moved** and Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion: Be it resolved** that the Board approve the (amended) Proposed 2013-16 Strategic Plan.

Vote:

SFXSU – Yes

DSU - Yes

ASU - Yes

ASTSU – Yes

**Motion passed unanimously.**

## REPORTS

21) Reports of the Officers

- a) Chair – Kyle Power (ASU)
  - i) Has been busy preparing documents for this meeting: in particular, the ED’s performance appraisal.
- b) Vice-Chair – absent
- c) Treasurer – absent

22) Reports of the staff

- a) Executive Director – Jonathan Williams
  - i) NSCCSA: We speak with their full Board on May 4<sup>th</sup>. Staff will put lots of energy into doing that well.
  - ii) BF (Comms.) has been in touch with Board, and has asked for contact info for incoming Board members. It would be helpful if that could be communicated to us.
  - iii) Board Education Retreat will be between May 14<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>. It will not be the full three days, probably half days on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>. It will be in Halifax.
  - iv) Staff is going through process of reporting on D250 projects. We’ll be giving a substantial amount of money back to D250 for those projects, but at the same time, we’re preparing proposals for next year. When we give the reports on how we did this year, we will attach the funding proposals next year to communicate exactly what we’re learning from this year to try to do things more effectively next year. Some of the proposals we’ve been looking at are for Mend the Gap and student assemblies. With Mend the Gap, we’re looking at having a co-op student for the full Fall term to coordinate the program. We would also be looking at offering \$500 honoraria to coordinators on each campus. It would be a substantially different-looking project than what we had projected this year, but we think that it will be much more effective. Similarly, with student assemblies, our thinking at this point is to have \$1000 honoraria for six people on each member campus except AST to coordinate one student assembly per semester, basically helping out your student unions in making sure that those things happen. I’m interested to hear your thoughts on those, but we will also go over them with future Board members before we submit those proposals, but that’s the direction that we’ve gone in trying to think about how to make those activities work better.
  - v) Staff are trying to finalize the position papers. Of course, things are exceedingly busy, but it’s because lots of good stuff is culminating.
  - vi) Since this is the last opportunity with KP (Chair) in front of everybody, I think we all owe him a big ‘thank you’ for two years of doing this job. This organization would not be where it is without him. He has been an inspiration to small children, and a comfort to the sickly. His tears have washed away our sorrows, and his endurance has put us all to shame. No matter where we go, as the evening breeze plays with our hair, it will gently whisper his name. We wish we knew how to quit you, Kyle.

23) Reports of the members

- a) ASTSU
  - i) AST will have co-presidents serving on the next Board. Both incoming presidents are women!
  - ii) JS and RB have both enjoyed being here.
- b) ASU

- i) Would like to recognise KP for his hard work both at ASU and at StudentsNS. Kyle does a great job of exceeding expectations and fulfilling his duties.
  - ii) ASU met on campus for a round-table discussion. Discussed the work that they had been doing in K-12 around mental health and student supports, and how it would be possible to transfer a lot of those structures to a university setting.
  - iii) MR gave a presentation on Alcohol in the university setting in Toronto
  - iv) Fully into transition mode.
- c) DSU
- i) The DSU's VP Finance retired
  - ii) Hosted a meeting, 22 students showed up
  - iii) Has been meeting with the DFA and other unions, and discussed how to move towards the Fall in terms of campaigns. (*How has the DFA report gone down on campus?*) We've asked repeatedly from the administration for an official response to it, or even individual responses, and they generally just deny things. There has been a change in rhetoric. In the past, they denied on camera that any money from the operating budget was going towards capital projects. Now they admit it, but they say 'oh, that's normal, everyone does that.' In Senate and Board of Governors meetings, they generally don't address it. (*Does the Board not care?*) We asked the Board how many people had actually read the report, and two people raised their hands. I think it hasn't really sunk in, and in general, few Board members make the decisions, and the rest are left in the dark. I think that there will be a lot more uncovered.
- d) SFXUSU
- i) In the midst of transitioning
  - ii) Ben is the incoming president, along with the secondary delegate Amy (VP Union Services). They will continue the work as diligently as we have done.
  - iii) N H-P has had a great time on the Board, as did PC, and they would like to thank the Board for that.
  - iv) Best of luck to those continuing on. It is a great organization.
- e) SMUSA
- i) Winding down with exams
  - ii) MM and JP both had a great time on the Board this year
  - iii) 12 days away from a vote

#### OTHER BUSINESS

KP (Chair): Would like to thank everyone for their hard work that they've put into this organization. It's been a lot of fun being the Chair (most days). I've met some great people, and made some great friends. Thank you.

Jared Perry (SMUSA) **moved** and Michael MacDonell (SMUSA) **seconded the motion** to adjourn.

**Motion passed by general consent.**

#### ADJOURNMENT

Vote on Position Paper on Student Fees and System Funding, Friday April 26, by email:

ASTSU: In Favor.

ASU: In Favor.

CBUSU: In Favor.

DSU: Opposed.

SFXUSU: In Favor.

Motion passes.