

Minutes
UMES Council Meeting 07R-14
2007 February 7
5:30 p.m.

UMSU Council Chambers (176 Helen Glass)

Present: Elise Dyck, Chris Nichols, Eric Wickstrom, Rahulan Sethupathy, Nathan Jolly, Doug Readman, Amy Meacham, Dario Schor, Dennis Lu, Richard Dyrkacz, Daryl Godkin, Jessica McCombe, Victor Lam, Travis Friesen, Jordan Ilott, Tyler Shipman, James McKee, Steve Woodrow, Kathryn Hearson, Tracy Hunt, Phil Dompierre, James Blatz, Gwen Nedohin, Adam Coolidge, Katie Szilagyi, Megan Lusty

Absent with Regrets: Ariel Brawerman, Romain Coudiere, Scott Hammond, Garrett Keith, Matt Jones

Absent: Nhi Le, Marc Seewald, Rohan Lall, Kelli Goldstone, Jenelle Salanguit, Nemish Budhia, Dave White, Jane MacAngus, Janet Young, Daisy Yee

I. Call to Order – 5:38 p.m.

II. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve agenda

Moved by: Treasurer

Seconded by: VSE

Motion Passed Unanimously

III. Approval of Minutes from 2007 January 11 (07R-12) meeting

Motion to approve minutes

Moved by: PR

Seconded by: Spirit

Motion Passed Unanimously

IV. Approval of Minutes from 2007 January 22 (07R-13) meeting

Motion to approve minutes

Moved by: Senator

Seconded by: Spirit

Motion Passed Unanimously

V. Old Business

13.3 Assistance with Library Study Space (E3-360) – Senior Stick

- help more furniture around in the engineering library on Monday,
February 19th

- pizza and drinks for volunteers

- need 4 people for around an hour

- sign up sheet passed around

VI. New Business

14.0 New Council Members & Positions – Selection Committee

- approved Garrett Keith for sports

- Victor Lam has moved from yearbook to merchandise

14.2 Faculty Finances & Tuition Surcharge Referendum – UMES Executive

- Dr. Ruth got notice shortly before winter break that the faculty is no longer aloud to run a deficit; they are taking loans out of professor's research accounts and will pay it back over the next 1 or 2 years
- Dean is looking into tuition surcharge
- Proposal from the Dean passed out (what is going on, why they need the money, how much of a surcharge suggesting)
- University will be approaching provincial government; need \$3.5 million increase to run faculty properly
- General Questions:
 - *How is the money allocating from TA section and the \$100 000 laboratory equipment upgrades?* Everything is undergraduate funding, but may be used for graduate studies in the off season; lab equipment money will be for undergraduate labs
 - *Are we getting 100% back to faculty?* Students will not agree to this if we do not get back all the money we get in; administration is happy to see any faculty willing to do a surcharge
 - *Will university administration cut our baseline?* The baseline cannot change from what it is today, but our increase in future years may be limited because of this process; this is not to take faculty forward, but will just help
 - *Can government take away baseline if we increase?* It would be difficult for the government to take away a baseline amount if students increased their tuition, but they could do it
 - The is a document in the Dean's office of Dean's funding meeting: structural deficit (with only salaries we are already in deficit; other costs require money we don't have); administration did not increase budget because they did not want to commit to it, left buffer in budget; taxing profs research accounts; first time that university has impacted profs ability to do their job, profs looking at other universities that don't do this; Dean going to provincial government; there is the accreditation issue, but don't have report yet, visiting team acknowledged structural deficit as a major issue, we cannot cover all our programs (had to cancel classes); perception of degree for all students who attended there if university loses accreditation; Dean asking province for money
 - *Food for thought from Senior Stick: What about international students? Is this too rushed? Will the dollar value not be accepted? What happens if the province gives more money? (will adjustments to surcharge be made?)*
 - *If government does step up and gives us money, will we no longer have to pay?* If money does come in from province, faculty will try to reduce the surcharge. Dean does not want to have to ask the students for money; if government committed to pay this every year.

Motion: Tuition Surcharge Referendum (attached)

Moved by: UMES Executive

Secunder not required

- Questions about Tuition Surcharge Referendum:

- *What is “plan b”, what happens if the referendum is voted down?*

There would probably be another referendum. For this year, there is taxing of all the professors’ accounts (a lot of professors will look into different universities), but there is no “plan b”. If referendum does not pass, we will see what the CEAB report says (will come out in summer), which can hopefully be used for more money

- *Accountability; what about labs where students do not have access to?* Funds that are in motion represent equipment TAs will used for undergraduate labs; stipulate that funds will be used for undergrads

- *Allocation of money is pretty broad, how will it be allocated between departs/prioritized? Will deficits of lab equipment be fixed before more equipment is bought for other classes?* This is currently ongoing; departments are trying to find lab equipment overlaps

- *Would UMES have any say in where money is being spent?* We would be adding more money to the money we are already giving to the faculty, which they distribute in our best interest. We should we get a solid answer about how money will be allocated; Steve will get the equipment upgrade priority list for the next meeting

- *Without any commitment from the government, will it turn into keep asking for more money? What will happen without any funding from the provincial government?* Not about doing new things, need to get program back to standards; effort has to go forward with this to get government to put money into it as well; everyone agrees that tuition surcharge is not enough, faculty asking for a little bit more to fix big issues, hoping more money will follow; not raises for profs, etc. in this, no knew hiring

- *What can we do to get the province behind us? Can we get them to give us dollar for dollar? How is it possible to get them to do something to help this along?* Second question on referendum (put forward by UMES), good to get 100% with this; need to go to government with our own “day of action” and get a lot of students out. UMSU’s approach to lobbying is different from what we want to do; rally around the Red Lion and go down to legislature; UMSU does their lobbying because that is what works with our current government; council would need to decide what we would do (possibly build a large plywood lion, bring to legislature; need large number of faculty to support; have professionals support us)

- *Approach faculty for a day people don’t have to go to class?* Bring to faculty council; tell faculty exactly what you want to do, could probably get support, especially if we are willing to pay ourselves; hopefully faculty members will come as well.

-Faculty courses outside of faculty? Could try, but they are not governed by us.

-Writing letters will not accomplish anything, we need to do something a bit more radical. If accreditation report says bad things, we need to attract attention in the newspapers. MB is trying to say it is on the forefront of innovation. There is a problem with the perception that all students want lower tuition fees.

- Are there other faculties that are having troubles? Would it be easier if we are not “battling” UMSU alone? Science is on the brink; from student senate meetings, architecture students are opposed or neutral.

- UMSU is not representing students properly – we have an unique position in Canada, we are the only western province that only has 1 engineering school; if we loose accreditation we have to go somewhere else; a very large percentage of Manitoba practising engineers from the U of M

- We don't want to undermine UMSU; we agree that we need more provincial funding, but they are unclear with their reduce tuition fees slogan. Their campaign at legislature was not about more provincial funding, but just about keeping tuition freeze

- Industry support: corporations in MB want to keep students speech at APEGM dinner, how are we keeping students if we may not have an engineering school? Send out memo to professionals.

- We need to create a huge spectacle at legislature; premier invited U of M Symonized Engineering Marching Band to play, we should all go down.

- Compared to many other Universities, this is still nothing that we are paying for our education. Columns shown in referendum, we are still paying one of the lowest fees in western Canada.

- It is a good idea to get industry involved, but it is on us, we need to be accountable to ourselves. If we loose our accreditation their reputation is also on the line; we need to partner with APEGM very early on in the process, APEGM needs to distribute their support; we do have memorandum of understanding with APEGM for situations like this

- Management and law have had tried to do this before; winter of 2004 management wanted to have referendum to increase fees, UMSU got very upset and ran very aggressive ‘no’ campaign and it was defeated; law had to run second campaign to pass their increase; we need to get faculty on board to help with campaign. UMSU will likely run campaign against engineering, but there are no engineering students on UMSU; UMES as a council is not taking position because they are running the referendum/finding out what students want, but this does not prevent UMES members from taking a position.

-If we have to “fight” UMSU, where would we get materials for posters etc? Engineering tech socs would probably be able to help

- we could strike clause from motion: UMES should take a position and lead the referendum

- *Situation with international students?* Accounting based on no differential between students; Dean still waiting for a call, that is why we cannot approve question as it stands on ballot today.

- *How many international students are there?* We don't know, a lot come here because it is cheaper; the government is the one who put more fees on international students

- *Timeline?* Moving further back with be on top of UMES elections, which especially important if we need strong leadership for next year; need to go to government as a group know matter yes or no.

- *Can there be a commitment to go to government be worded in the question?* Will have decision by March 1st; will have 1 month to go to government.

- *Will we start on this before motion?* Need to have posters on the wall saying there is a referendum.

- *We are willing to pay more money if we cannot get more money from the government by the time the next term starts?* That holds false hope that government will come through; we should get government to match money; we show that we are really committed to issue by increasing tuition;

- *Why should the province require international students?* *Everyone needs the money and it would hurt everyone.* There could be a block 'no' from the international students and there are a lot of them; we need to answer their questions.

- We should do a rally right after referendum; advertise together. Voting on Thursday, Friday; we need to give notice about rallying; the next week is UMES election week (this is more important than UMES council elections); need to check for midterms; push back to Monday, Tuesday so that people are still excited and can be rallied right away

- *Dollar value?* Originally \$54; if we go lower it will not have the impact we want; if it is well detailed in proposal it will be easier to sell, clear where money is going; \$40 good

- *Advertising of referendum: we need to hit first and second years the hardest.* Younger students will be affected more, need it to be explained; probably deal with in motions on campaigning

- Discussion on Tuition Surcharge Referendum:

- Questions will be on separate ballots

- Senior Stick may have someone else be CRO (if UMES is behind referendum)

- Amend BIFRT voting will take place on March 5th and 6th, and campaigning should end on Friday March 2nd

- Dean wants to have open forum week after reading week: this would involve changing the length of campaigning

- Remove UMES neutrality clause: UMES needs to represent well being of engineering students (*Should we represent the students this way if we don't know what they want?* We need to represent the interest of

students, they elected us and the general public is somewhat uneducated on this issue. We dislike that UMSU says everyone wants he freeze, why would be say all engineering students feel the same as us? We are saying that we have an opinion, and we will take a stance; we need to influence/we need to have something behind it or you just have individual representation.) UMES represents students and we are taking referendum to see what students want, this way UMES can say we are putting this forward as a group; need to show facts and there is really nothing else that can be done. Students may not feel it is for their best interest, but without increasing payment we won't have a school. UMES Council is elected executive and selected members; UMES is all engineering students; we need to say UMES Council says this. We can go to students and say UMES Council feels this is in your best interest. The referendum needs to get out there with someone standing behind it.

Motion to amend by striking UMES neutrality clause

Moved by: VSE

Seconded by: Spirit

Friendly Amendment

- There is an issue with having a longer campaigning period

Motion to table Tuition Surcharge Referendum Motion

Moved by: Treasurer

Seconded by: Spirit

Motion Passed Unanimously

Motion to suspend Article X, Section 3, Paragraph 1 of the UMES Constitution for the length of campaigning periods of referenda

Moved by: Treasure

Seconded by: VSE

1 against

Motion Passed

Motion to take Tuition Surcharge Referendum Motion from the table

Moved by: VSA

Seconded by: Senator

Motion Passed Unanimously

Motion to amend by lengthening campaign period to be from 21 February 2007 to 2 March 2007.

Moved by: ?

Seconded by: ?

Motion Passed Unanimously

Vote: Amended Tuition Surcharge Referendum (attached)

15 for

No opposed
No abstentions
Motion Passed

Motion to table 14.3, 14.4, 14.1 and Section VII until next council meeting

Moved by: VSA

Seconded by: Treasurer

Motion Passed

14.5 Next Council Meeting – Senior Stick

- Executive has had meetings on how to improve UMES, restructuring, and serve students better
- Our new position on referendum/rally
- Wednesday after reading week

VIII. Adjournment – 7:26 p.m.

Motion to adjourn

Moved by: Senator

Seconded by: PR

Motion Passed Unanimously

MOTION — UMES COUNCIL MEETING 07R-14

Title: Tuition Surcharge Referendum
Mover: UMES Executive
Second: *(Not Required)*

WHEREAS the Faculty of Engineering is currently experiencing a funding shortfall that cannot be resolved directly by the means of the Faculty.

WHEREAS the Faculty of Engineering has requested that UMES determine if undergraduate engineering students support a proposal to add a per-credit-hour tuition fee surcharge.

WHEREAS the Faculty of Engineering has provided the UMES Executive with a draft copy of the tuition surcharge proposal, which will be displayed to UMES Council and UMES members at the February 7, 2007 UMES Council Meeting.

BIRT UMES Council carry out a referendum to determine the will of the members of UMES, the undergraduate students of the Faculty of Engineering, with respect to the following questions:

1. *(see draft proposal — put forward by the Faculty)*
2. *(put forward by UMES Executive)*

I feel that my engineering education has been negatively impacted by the current level of funding provided to the Faculty of Engineering.

With respect to question 1, this shall be taken as a tentative question that conveys the general meaning and intent of the question. The final question as it will appear on the ballot shall be approved at the next UMES Council meeting, scheduled for 21 February 2007.

BIFRT the CRO shall be the current Senior Stick or an appointed Society member of their choosing, per the UMES Constitution.

BIFRT that voting shall take place on Monday, 5 March 2007 and Tuesday, 6 March 2007 from 08:30-16:30 each day at a location to be announced. A week of campaigning shall take place before the first day of voting, beginning on Wednesday, 21 February 2007 and ending on Friday, 2 March 2007. A forum shall be held on Monday, 26 February 2007 in E2-229 EITC from 10:30-12:30.