Thursday, June 16, 2016
6:00PM
SUB 6-06

AGENDA (BC 2016-04)

2016-04/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-04/1a Call to Order

2016-04/1b Approval of Agenda

2016-04/1c Approval of Minutes

2016-04/1d Chair’s Business
  2016-04/1d Attendance

  2016-04/1d Introduction of the Chief Returning Officer, Donald Ademaj.

2016-04/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD
  2016-04/2a Election Bylaw Discussion

2016-04/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS
  2016-04/3a Bill #2 – Faculty Association Political Policy Diversion - First Principles

  CHRISTENSEN MOVES to amend Bylaw 8100 to allow faculty associations additional autonomy as guided by these principles:

  First Principles
1. Faculty associations are often the best representatives of undergraduate students within the individual faculties of the University of Alberta.

2. With proper consultation, faculty associations shall be allowed to advocate and represent the interests of their constituents as best as possible.

3. Barriers to the effective advocacy of faculty associations shall be removed from Bylaw 8100 to facilitate proper representation of students at a grassroots level.

4. Bylaw 8100 shall be amended to allow faculty associations to advocate for issues deemed important to their constituents, even if these issues contradict Students’ Union political policies, so long as appropriate procedural steps are completed, including a plebiscite or referendum.

5. Upon completing the the proper consultative and procedural steps, faculty associations shall provide Students’ Council with a summary and presentation of these steps taken.

6. Students’ Council shall be allowed to discuss, debate, question, and approve/reject the advocacy effort based on presentation provided, procedural steps taken and any other metrics so deemed appropriate.

7.

2016-04/3b  Bill #1 - Vacancy Petitions - Second Reading

CHRISTENSEN/PROCHNAU MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #1, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, and implement Vacancy Petitions as a mechanism to fill vacant Students’ Council seats. (Specific wording to be reviewed on Google Drive)

2016-04/4  INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-04/5  ADJOURNMENT
Next Meeting:
ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Christensen (Chair)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bismillah Kiani</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Prochnau</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delane Howie</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eilish McKinlay</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Larsen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Paches</td>
<td>Fahim Rahman</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENDA/MINUTES (BC 2016-03)

2016-03/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-03/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 06:03 pm
2016-03/1b  Approval of Agenda

LARSEN/PROCHNAU move to approve the agenda.

5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-03/1c  Approval of Minutes

LARSEN/McKINLAY move to approve the minutes.

4/0/1
CARRIED

2016-03/1d  Chair's Business

CHRISTENSEN
Said that: he had a conversation with Fahim and the meeting was good; Fahim will share his thoughts about political policies and diversions, this years versus last year, and his position; Said that they will discuss about bills coming forward Asked for any questions (There were no questions)

2016-03/2  QUESTION/DISCUSION PERIOD

RAHMAN
Said that he and Brandon Christensen agreed about how FAs can deviate from policy; Explained that SU coordinates negotiations on political policy and diversions and accounts for impact on students and faculties, which includes the so called "other faculties" Expressed the question of how to fill the gap when FAs don't agree on political policy
CHRISTENSEN
Replied that there are concerns about whether council will be able to
approve the final step or not, and if not there will be impasse

McKINLAY
Mentioned the requirement for exact grounds

CHRISTENSEN
Said that the actual policy was laid out like the way it will be needed
Added that there will be referendum, which will be presented to student
council, and the council can reject it only on the basis of being poorly
done as it will then be detrimental to students
Mentioned that the odds of it passing are better

McKINLAY
Said that the council can do it on any ground but that has to be very
clear
Added that if it is not done within the jurisdiction, it does not
necessarily have to be FAs

RAHMAN
Said that it is tough to narrow down everything the policy entails

LARSEN
Said that it comes to councillors it has to be the vote of majority, which
has to be a clear majority

CHRISTENSEN
Replied that less than 2/3rd it is like approved

LARSEN
(Explained in the board that if one third is "yes" then it is a pass)

RAHMAN
Said they should not tell councillors how to think and that if the
legislation is passed, then it is something that the faculty agrees to and it
has to be in the interest of students.
Mentioned the example of post-secondary education being more
accessible
Said that he prefers to see it 50-50

McKINLAY
Wondered if council approves it then is it like two-third, and it passes
rather than not
Said that she doesn't want to foster a new competition

RAHMAN
Said that it might add to a bit of class mentality

**PROCHNAU**
Brandon
Said that it is like the two-third thing and he prefers the option of rejection, and said that one should think harder about the way to say no, because a no is harder to give than a yes is
Mentioned that he likes the idea of giving a rejection

**RAHMAN**
Said that it is how a motion should be, and added that it requires 50% of the council to approve or to say no

**CHRISTENSEN**
Said that he likes two-third to say no
Mentioned that by the next meeting, he will have the redacted version
Asked for questions and concerns

**RAHMAN**
Said that the council should be able to debate

**CHRISTENSEN**
Asked the committee to comment

**LARSEN**
Said that it is a free and open debate and you are not going tell people to give a reason to say no

**McKINLAY**
Asked if it is like already doing the whole process
Mentioned that rile of council is to review the process, and her thinking is that the council should say if it is proper and if this is what the students want

**LARSEN**
Said that when it comes to council, it has to say that the council creates it, and asked if they can amend messages that FAs has bring to us

**RAHMAN**
Said that the council’s role is to reflect the interest of students

**LARSEN**
Mentioned that it is the role of FAs, and that two or three persons from FAs can go to council and debate it and be able strike that

**RAHMAN**
Agreed and said that student council is the highest body
LARSEN
Mentioned that the whole process of FA crafting that process is through the council

RAHMAN
Said that if there is comma, then it would be an editorial amendment

PROCHNAU
Mentioned that he doesn't like that idea and that if it would be amended it would look bad

RAHMAN
Said that motion to approve SU fees for health and dental plan can be an example

CHRISTENSEN
Said that people are giving presentations but it may or may not get approved, because it is about both approving and disapproving

McKINLAY
Expressed her disliking about it

PROCHNAU
Also expressed disagreement and that he doesn't like it but mentioned that it is like a democratic process

2016-03/3
COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-03/3a
Bill #1 Vacancy petition

CHRISTENSEN
Said that wording is usually what people want to change
Read out the points loud and asked if all are fine with the wording

LARSEN
Asked if they should say that "some faculties" rather than "smaller faculties"? - #3
(All agree with "some faculties")

CHRISTENSEN
Said that he will be turning those into changes in the second principles
McKINLAY
Mentioned that they are not guaranteeing it

CHRISTENSEN
Read out #4, 5, 6 and 7
(All agreed with the wording)

McKINLAY
Mentioned that "valid" should be added before “petitions” in #8
(All agreed)

LARSEN
Said that if you want to do an introduction, you don’t want council to ratify
Added that they are checking signatures but they should check ccid, and asked if duplicates are allowed

PROCHNAU
Replied that it is preferential

RAHMAN
Said that there is potential for contest, and that is a concern with #8

CHRISTENSEN
Replied that in a perfect world it will be easy to do it; and in engineering and business you can run elections but in all faculties the same is not possible

LARSEN
Mentioned that it is like having more signatures

Summary of the discussion:
Apart from small changes, the committee agreed with the wording of the first principles of Bill #1

**Motion:**

LARSEN/PROCHNAU move to approve the first principles of Bill #1 and implement Vacancy Petitions as a mechanism to fill vacant Students’ Council seats:
5/0/0
CARRIED

**2016-03/4**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**
2016-03/4a  
CHRISTENSEN  
Said that he talked to Donald  
Mentioned that he can send emails out and discuss anything; in the June 16 meeting they will do the number 2; and that the next meeting after that is on June 30

2016-03/5  
ADJOURNMENT

2016-03/5a  
Next Meeting: June 16, 2016, 6 pm, SUB 6-06

2016-03/5b  
RAHMAN/LARSEN move to adjourn.  

5/0/0  
CARRIED  

Meeting adjourned at 6.45 pm

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARSEN/PROCHNAU move to approve the agenda</td>
<td>5/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSEN/McKINLAY move to approve the minutes</td>
<td>4/1/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSEN/PROCHNAU move to approve the first principles of Bill #1 and implement Vacancy Petitions as a mechanism to fill vacant Students’ Council seats:</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAHMAN/LARSEN move to adjourn the meeting at 6.45 pm</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>