Purpose

The Students’ Union (SU) exists to serve and represent University of Calgary undergraduates. This procedure provides students with the opportunity to voice their concerns and identify solutions to important issues. Policy proposals cannot become Union Policy; however, well-researched and comprehensive proposals can enable SU governing bodies to make informed and timely Union Policy decisions regarding issues that are of importance to students.

SLC, its Committees, the General Manager, and Chief Returning Officer have the authority to make Union Policy decisions as outlined in the Union Bylaw and the SU’s Policy Development and Review Policy. Proposal authors should consult these documents for additional information regarding the policy approval process.

Submission Procedures

1 (1) Any SU Elected Official, Active Member or staff member may submit proposals for the purpose of:

   (a) Creating new policy;
   (b) Amending existing policy; or
   (c) Repealing existing policy.

   (2) All policy proposals submitted to the SU for consideration must:

      (a) Include the submission of the policy proposal package, completed in its entirety;
      (b) Address all of the questions outlined in the policy proposal package; and
      (c) Address a post-secondary education issue that impacts the majority or a specific, measurable demographic of undergraduate students at the University of Calgary; and
      (d) Propose a policy change that is in accordance with the SU’s policy making authority.

2 (1) Policy proposals must be submitted to the SU Main Office. Once received, proposals will be forwarded to the appropriate SU governance authority for initial review. An SU Executive will contact the proposal’s author within five business days to acknowledge receipt of the proposal and provide an initial response regarding how the proposal will be considered.

3 (1) Upon receipt of a policy proposal, the appropriate SU governance authority may:

      (a) Reject the proposal; or
      (b) Refer the proposal to the appropriate SU governance body for consideration.

   (2) A proposal may be rejected if it:
(a) Does not meet the criteria outlined in section 1(2); or
(b) Does not fall under the authority of the SU, as defined in the SU's Policy Development and Review Policy, the Union Bylaw and the Constitution.

(3) SU Executives must provide proposal authors with a detailed explanation regarding why a policy proposal was rejected. This explanation must:

(a) Identify missing or incomplete portions of the proposal; and
(b) Specify how the proposal may be outside of the SU’s policy making authority.

4 (1) As outlined in the SU’s Policy Development and Review Policy, valid policy proposals shall be directed to the appropriate governance body for consideration. Committee Chairs shall address policy proposals within a reasonable timeframe given other Committee responsibilities. The Committee Chair shall notify the proposal author regarding the expected timeframe and process to be followed.

(2) At the discretion of the Committee Chair, proposal authors may be invited to attend relevant Committee meetings in regard to the policy proposal in question.

(3) Committees shall evaluate policy proposals according to the Policy Development and Review Principles outlined in sections 6 – 8 of the Policy Development and Review Policy. Proposal evaluations may result in a Committee decision to:

(a) Reject a proposal;
(b) Conduct additional research on the issue in question;
(c) Begin the policy development process;
(d) Consider amendments to an existing policy; or
(e) Consider the repeal of an existing policy.

(4) The Committee Chair shall notify the proposal author of the Committee’s decision regarding a policy proposal.

(a) In the event that a proposal is rejected, the Committee Chair shall provide the proposal author with a detailed explanation of the Policy Development and Review Principles relevant to the decision.
(b) Where a policy proposal leads to a Committee decision to develop new or review existing policy, the Committee Chair shall provide the proposal author with a detailed explanation of how the proposal will contribute to further work on the issue in question.