University of Alberta Students’ Union
BYLAW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, November 29, 2016
6:00 PM
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

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

MINUTES (BC 2016-14)

2016-14/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-14/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 18:05 (6:12 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2016-14/1b Approval of Agenda

Christensen moved item 3a “Bill #9 - Student Involvement Endowment Fund (SIEF) Reform - First Principles” to the Question/Discussion Period as 2c.

MCKINLAY/BROPHY MOVE to approve the agenda.

4/0/0
CARRIED
2016-14/1c  Approval of Minutes

LARSEN/BROPHY MOVE to approve the minutes.

4/0/0
CARRIED

2016-14/1d  Chair’s Business

Attendance was taken. Proxies in attendance were noted above.

2016-14/2  QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-14/2a  Bylaw Committee attendance policy - Feedback for the Committee of Chairs (COC)

LARSEN:
The motivation here is to have the attendance policy of each committee to reflect the Council’s, where there’s automatic removal. It seems fair to me, as there’s nobody to blame. If the removal was up to the committee members, then they may be blamed. Some people also say that the conditions for removal are not stringent enough.

BROPHY:
It’s so easy to get back on to a committee. You can set the number of meetings before you are removed.

MCKINLAY:
I didn’t come during the summer because I had to do a job. I would have been removed if this policy was in effect. There are valid reasons for non-attendance especially if you are a nursing or co-op student. You never really know your schedule beforehand. I’m against this on principle. However, I understand why this policy may be desirable.

BROPHY:
It should be good enough even if you show that you try to find a proxy.

MCKINLAY:
With automatic removal, you are only able to defend yourself retroactively.

LARSEN:
There should at least be a written notice by the councilor in question regarding their inability to attend.
CHRISTENSEN: 
I personally don't care too much either way. This will be discussed at the Committee of Chairs meeting tomorrow. The chair of that meeting will be pushing to get this implemented.

BROPHY: 
I wasn't sure how the Committee of Chairs worked.

CHRISTENSEN: 
Maybe we should officially have a Committee of Chairs!

HOWIE: 
Does this individual want the attendance policy on committees to go through?

CHRISTENSEN: 
Yes, there will be a big push. The intention is to make the committee attendance policies similar to Council attendance policy.

HOWIE: 
Having the number of meetings you miss as the main criteria for removal doesn't make too much sense for committees. While some committees meet often, others meet very infrequently. It's not like Council where the meetings are regular, and you meet every 2 weeks.

MCKINLAY: 
For committees meeting infrequently, you would have missed a fair chunk of the meetings even if you miss a couple of meeting.

CHRISTENSEN: 
Yes, I don't know whether it should reflect the Council attendance policy because Council meetings are regular.

HOWIE: 
Also, it's hard to find people to be proxies for committees. It's not like for Council where you pretty much have your whole faculty. It can be really difficult when it comes to committee meetings!

BROPHY: 
For committees, if you try to find a proxy, that should be enough irrespective of whether you succeed or not.

HOWIE:
It also depends on how effective this member is. There should be some allowance to active members who miss some meetings. There may be some committee members who rarely participate in the activities even if they are present all the time!

CHRISTENSEN:
The committees can decide as they see fit.

HOWIE:
The argument is that the person may be wasting a seat by not participating in committee meetings.

CHRISTENSEN:
There are 2 separate grounds for these: non-attendance, and non-participation. It’s a bigger conversation than this.

HOWIE:
I agree with putting a little bit of pressure as needed to ensure that committee members attend meetings. However, it shouldn’t be too severe.

BROPHY:
Dates for committee meetings are based on the availability of members anyway.

CHRISTENSEN:
There should be a minimum number of meetings for this to come to effect. Members of committees not fulfilling this minimum requirement should not be subject to removal.

HOWIE:
This should also be only for pre-scheduled meetings. Meetings that prop up at the last moment shouldn’t count.

MCKINLAY:
I’m still against this on principle. Have committees in the past had really bad attendance?

CHRISTENSEN:
There have been some years. Usually, some committees just disintegrate and die during this time of the year due to the increased workload of school.

BROPHY:
The other committees that I’m currently on seem to be going fine. They aren't going down so to speak.

MCKINLAY:
Can we see how it works out with Council before bringing the legislation to committees?

HOWIE:
Can’t it be committee specific? The policy of each committee could be read before members join.

CHRISTENSEN:
These are all very good ideas. I’ll convey these tomorrow. However, tomorrow’s discussion may not be as cordial because some members will be pushing to bring this policy through.

LARSEN:
The decision at the Council Administration Committee was to put an item in the Council Order Papers so that standing committees adopt Students’ Council attendance policy regulations found in Bylaw 100 Section 21. The idea was that it’s good to adopt the Students’ Council’s policies without talking about it in every committee.

BROPHY:
The Audit Committee hasn’t met since this came out.

LARSEN:
In the Policy Committee, everyone was OK with whatever decision came after the Committee of Chairs meeting. There hasn’t been any problem with attendance.

CHRISTENSEN:
Currently, committees cannot remove members, only Council can.

HOWIE:
Does the Executive Committee have regular meetings?

CHRISTENSEN:
They do, but it’s hard to find out when exactly their meetings are held in advance. Furthermore, their minutes are merely general concepts more or less.

BROPHY:
Detailed minutes are not taken for the Executive Committee.
LARSEN: When was the Social and Environmental Responsibility Committee (S.E.R.C.) removed? Apparently it’s not a thing anymore.

CHRISTENSEN: The people who initiated it from the establishment aren’t here now.

HOWIE: I’ll probably be against the attendance policy as it was controversial in Council.

LARSEN: For me, this is not a hill that I’m going to die on. So, I’m amenable.

CHRISTENSEN: There will be a vote tomorrow at the Committee of Chairs meeting on how to proceed.

BROPHY: Councillor Hammond asked me to represent the Audit Committee at tomorrow’s meeting as she’s busy during this period. Because there hasn’t been any discussion within the Audit Committee about this, I’ll contact the members to get their views.

MCKINLAY: Councillor Christensen, what are your personal thoughts on this?

CHRISTENSEN: I don’t really have a strong opinion either way. I was favoring the attendance policy at the start. However, your comments have swayed me into thinking otherwise.

2016-14/2b Committee written reports discussion - Abolishing Bylaw 100, Section 16

CHRISTENSEN: Councillor Flaman brought this up. There’s a mandatory requirement to present written reports to Council about all committee business. This hasn’t been done for almost 3 years now! Do you want to remove this?

MCKINLAY: Let’s get rid of this legislation.
BROPHY:  
Yes, let’s end it.

CHRISTENSEN:  
It’s organizationally dangerous to have this piece of legislation as all the actions are illegitimated if the written reports are not submitted. However, with written reports themselves, I do agree that it’s a good idea to have them. What I don’t agree with is the legality of committee decisions being dependent upon the submission of written reports.

HOWIE:  
The minutes of committees are public aren’t they? So, why do we need to have separate written reports?

BROPHY:  
Everything being contingent on written reports is not good.

HOWIE:  
Written reports are not really necessary as we already have oral reports.

BROPHY:  
I think they’re useful when you want to have a quick look at what happened.

LARSEN:  
If we do abolish written reports, I’m going to push for turnover documents.

CHRISTENSEN:  
That’s a good idea. Also, having a report about the summary of things done within a semester is good.

HOWIE:  
That’s a great idea to have semester reports.

BROPHY:  
A lot of the time during oral reports, they will say “nothing to report”. I think that’s a waste of time.

CHRISTENSEN:  
Great. We will draft the first principles of this during our January 17, 2017 meeting.
Bill #9 - Student Involvement Endowment Fund (SIEF) Reform - Discussion

1. The Student Involvement Endowment Fund has been used to support specific initiatives for the Students' Union.
2. The Student Involvement Endowment Fund has grown in scope since it was conceived in Bylaw.
3. These changes have been described in the current objectives of the society.
4. Bylaw 3000 shall be amended to reflect these changes.

CHRISTENSEN: This isn’t going anywhere currently. We were technically told to do it by Students’ Council. I got a message last night saying that this should be deferred. That’s why I moved it from Committee Business to the Question/Discussion Period.

HOWIE: I wasn’t present when the discussion happened. Can you recap?

LARSEN: The only check & balance the Student Involvement Endowment Fund (S.I.E.F.) had was one line in Bylaw where it mentioned that the money can only be spent on scholarships. The request was to open it up for the Executives to spend on other projects. However, with the new proposal, there is no baseline. This would have fundamentally removed the barrier for S.I.E.F. money being spent on other stuff. Only that single bylaw stopped the S.I.E.F. money being spent by the Students’ Union on anything else.

CHRISTENSEN: With the proposed reform, an approval from the Finance Committee is needed instead of an approval from Council on the Students’ Union side.

LARSEN: The argument was that Council can act as the check. However, the Council is political. It must be written in Bylaw. At minimum, there should be an overview from Council with 75% or 67% of the vote.

MCKINLAY: We shouldn’t be opening up scholarship funds for other stuff. It’s not a good idea.
BROPHY:
I like the flexibility. However, for something with such a specific intent, at least a 75% of the vote before being used for something else is good. I'm also against money just sitting there in a pot. If the money is just sitting there without going for scholarships for whatever reason, I'm open for it going towards other projects as necessary.

HOWIE:
Can we get the Standing Orders of S.I.E.F.?

LARSEN:
I'm not sure whether it's available or not.

CHRISTENSEN:
Also, the mandate on the S.I.E.F. side reflects what the executives want to see.

HOWIE:
I'm not completely against the money being used to improve the quality of life for students. But, is this project something like that? The money is proposed to go towards the Myer Horowitz Theatre renovation. Many students and student groups use it. Therefore, I do think that this project improves the lives of students.

MCKINLAY:
We already had a huge renovation. Do we want another one so soon? Does it make sense?

BROPHY:
The Myer Horowitz Theatre renovation proposal has already passed.

CHRISTENSEN:
I don't think so. The actual, final approval hasn't happened yet.

LARSEN:
I don't think that the money will get mismanaged per se. However, I didn't agree with this change happening in Bylaw as an editorial change. It was attempted before. If the barriers are removed, we simply have no control, and we will not be able to get that control back either.

BROPHY:
As long as Council has final authority, I'm OK with opening it up.
HOWIE:
I trust Students' Council to make the best decisions. We need to make the necessary renovations ASAP to benefit the most number of future students.

MCKINLAY:
I'm against the way this has been done. You can’t change whatever you want so that the money can be used for other things.

LARSEN:
A lot of the money has been given by donors for specific purposes, namely for scholarships. There were no public documents on S.I.E.F. It’s basically a giant pot of money. Even though we can skim money off from the top, the money will never be regenerated!

CHRISTENSEN:
In June 2014, there was a change to the objectives. I want to know what the old objectives were.

MCKINLAY:
This was apparently something that was going to happen from a long time ago.

LARSEN:
This change was pushed on us as an editorial change, and that’s not right.

HOWIE:
I think everyone acts in the best interests of students. I can see why the proposed change makes sense. In the end, it serves students.

BROPHY:
As long as the Students’ Union can say how the money should be used, I’m OK with it. If it’s already part of the mandate of S.I.E.F., I think the proposed change makes sense. In the Bylaw, it should say that Students’ Council has to sign off on it.

HOWIE:
I’d rather have a 2/3 vote at Students’ Council.

LARSEN:
Let’s wait for the first principles.

CHRISTENSEN:
COMMITTEE BUSINESS

UPASS Referendum Question

PROPOSED QUESTION:
Edmonton Transit Services (ETS) provides a U-Pass to all students at a lower price than a monthly pass, in order to encourage the use of city transportation among undergraduate students. All undergraduate students pay this U-Pass, and as a result the cost of the U-Pass is lowered for University of Alberta undergraduates.

The current U-Pass deal expires in August 2017, and a referendum is being held to renew the U-Pass. The deal proposed by ETS will see the cost of the U-Pass rise by no more than $5 per year until 2020 - 2021.

The University of Alberta provides a subsidy to further reduce costs to students and has committed to continuing this subsidy. The current cost of the U-Pass to other institutions is $170 while University of Alberta undergraduates pay $141.67.

The U-Pass will cost University of Alberta undergraduates, after subsidy, $145.00 in 2017-18, $148.00 in 2018-19, $153.00 in 2019-20 and $158.00 in 2020-21.

The conditions of this fee shall include:
1. Students can not opt-out of this fee.
2. This fee will not be assessed to Augustana and off-campus students, as defined by the University Calendar.

Do you support a fee of $145.00 in 2017 - 2018, $148.00 in 2018 - 2019, and $153.00 in 2019 - 2020 and $158.00 in 2020-2021 per term for full time and part time undergraduates to fund a Universal Transit Pass (U-Pass)?

CHRISTENSEN:
This was something sent to me. From the Bylaw Committee, it will be sent to the Students’ Council, and thereafter to the Elections Office. The University is cutting the subsidy, and this has been shrinking every year. They’re facing budgetary restrictions.

MCKINLAY:
I don’t like the fact that you can’t opt-out of it. However, there are exceptions. When I was doing an internship outside the ETS range, I was able to get the fee back.

HOWIE:
I think the question is good.

CHRISTENSEN:
According to Bylaw 2200, there are no requirements. We pretty much just get to edit. However, the rules are a bit unclear.

MCKINLAY:
The question has been crafted well.

CHRISTENSEN:
I made the last statement bold.

HOWIE:
If this doesn’t pass, will the U-pass be abolished?

CHRISTENSEN:
Yes.

HOWIE:
An average student may vote against it because they are not in favor of increasing the fee without knowing that the U-pass will be abolished.

BROPHY:
Yes, that’s a valid concern.

LARSEN:
The question has to be unbiased.

CHRISTENSEN:
A good campaign may have to be carried out for the “Yes” side.

HOWIE:
It doesn’t say what will happen if you vote “No”. All the necessary information should be there.

MCKINLAY:
It’s not our job. The question should be unbiased.
LARSEN: Maybe that is a piece of necessary information.

CHRISTENSEN: Maybe we can amend it to say “maintain the U-pass”.

MCKINLAY: A better word is “continue”.

BROPHY: If people vote “No” because they don’t want the U-pass, that’s fine. However, people may vote “No” because they don’t like the price hike without knowing the other consequences.

**FINALIZED QUESTION:**
Edmonton Transit Services (ETS) provides a U-Pass to all students at a lower price than a monthly pass, in order to encourage the use of city transportation among undergraduate students. All undergraduate students pay this U-Pass, and as a result the cost of the U-Pass is lowered for University of Alberta undergraduates.

The current U-Pass deal expires in August 2017, and a referendum is being held to renew the U-Pass. The deal proposed by ETS will see the cost of the U-Pass rise by no more than $5 per year until 2020 - 2021.

The University of Alberta provides a subsidy to further reduce costs to students and has committed to continuing this subsidy. The current cost of the U-Pass to other institutions is $170 while University of Alberta undergraduates pay $141.67.

The U-Pass will cost University of Alberta undergraduates, after subsidy, $145.00 in 2017-18, $148.00 in 2018-19, $153.00 in 2019-20 and $158.00 in 2020-21.

The conditions of this fee shall include:
1. Students can not opt-out of this fee.
2. This fee will not be assessed to Augustana and off-campus students, as defined by the University Calendar.

Do you support a fee of $145.00 in 2017 - 2018, $148.00 in 2018 - 2019, and $153.00 in 2019 - 2020 and $158.00 in 2020-2021 per term for full time and part time undergraduates to continue the Universal Transit Pass (U-Pass) at the University of Alberta?
MOTION:
CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the finalized UPASS Referendum question as listed above.

5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-14/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-14/4a Winter Semester meeting schedule:
Tuesday, January 17, 2017 @ 6:00 PM
Tuesday, January 31, 2017 @ 6:00 PM
Thursday, February 16, 2017 @ 6:00 PM
Tuesday, March 21, 2017 @ 6:00 PM

CHRISTENSEN:
I may have to change the date of the March 21, 2017 meeting.

2016-14/5 ADJOURNMENT

2016-14/5a Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 17, 2016 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06.

2016-14/5b CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to adjourn at 7:20 PM.

5/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 19:20 (7:20 PM).

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCKINLAY/BROPHY MOVE to approve the agenda.</td>
<td>4/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSEN/BROPHY MOVE to approve the minutes.</td>
<td>4/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the finalized UPASS Referendum question as listed above.</td>
<td>5/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to adjourn at 7:20 PM.</td>
<td>5/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>