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**AGENDA (BC-2018-07)**

**2018-07/1 INTRODUCTION**

**2018-07/1a Call to Order**

**2018-07/1b Approval of Agenda**

**2018-07/1c Approval of Minutes**

**2018-07/1d Chair’s Business**

**2018-07/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

**2018-07/2a Meeting time for Bylaw Committee**

**2018-07/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**2018-07/3a KIM MOVES to approve amended First principles of Bill #2: Bylaw 100.**


**2018-07/3b SUNDAY MOVES to approve First principles of Bill #4: Bylaw 100**

See BC-2018-07.05.

**2018-07/4 INFORMATION ITEMS**


See BC-2018-07.01.

**2018-07/4b BC-2018-05-M, August 1, 2018**

See BC-2018-07.02.
See BC-2018-07.03.

First principles of Bill #2: Bylaw 100


First Principles: Bill #4, Bylaw 100

See BC-2018-07.05.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Next Meeting: TBA.
We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students’ Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students’ Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kim (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahra Haddouche</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Ley</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Called-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Raitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Ripka</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Thibaudeau</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Larsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akanksha Bhatnagar</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES (BC-2018-04)

2018-04/1 INTRODUCTION

2018-04/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:06 PM.

2018-04/1b Approval of Agenda
SUNDAY/THIBAUDEAU MOVE to amend the agenda to include the late additions to the agenda.
5/0/0 CARRIED

2018-04/1c Approval of Minutes

THIBAUDEAU/RIPKA MOVE to approve the minutes.
4/0/1 CARRIED

2018-04/1d Chair’s Business

2018-04/1e Review of Bylaws

KIM: I made a folder for editorial changes. I know Bylaw 100 is coming up.

RIPKA: I only had the chance to review 8200. My big concern about it is about Special Interest Fees which don’t really exist right now. You can see the definition of the fee, pretty vague. (Reads the definition) I don’t know if you have any knowledge as to why this became a bylaw in the first place, seems obsolete now.

SUNDAY: I want to say charity, money that doesn’t go to the operating budget. Is money collected from all the students in the faculty for this fee?

RIPKA: 8200 Schedule - It just says no association currently has this fee.

KIM: They were talking about FA membership fees but special fee...

RIPKA: “Special initiatives or projects” but it may be charity but it also might be under operating if you choose to use your budget for that. I was going to wait until Rebecca comes back and will speak to her and maybe bring an amendment next meeting.

KIM: Did you find anything?

THIBAUDEAU: I don’t know what that is.

SUNDAY: Right now it’s obsolete anyway because there’s no procedure.

(Councillor Rowan would like to call in)

RIPKA: We can make that as an action item.

KIM: We can discuss next meeting so we can amend it, add clarification. Councillor Raitz had a few editorial changes he wanted to add but because
he’s not present, it’s better to table his section for next Chair’s item. Do you have anything?

THIBAUDEAU: I haven’t had the chance to look.

HADDOUCHE: I reviewed and couldn’t find anything.

KIM: If anyone finds anything, bring it up so we can amend it. That’s all I have for my chair’s business.

2018-04/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

KIM: Is there anything you want to discuss?

RIPKA: We were talking about bylaw mandated training for Council. Any thoughts?

KIM: We haven’t discussed this during BC.

RIPKA: All the committee chairs discussed strategic direction last meeting. We came to a consensus re severe lack of training for chairs but maybe all of council - it’s hard to know everything eg. Robert’s rules, what the committees do and it’s hard to force volunteers to do things. How can we ensure Councillors, Chairs etc have proper training for students’ council? Maybe if we put it into bylaw similar to attendance in bylaw to incentivize people to attend training.

KIM: We did something similar with CAC, we set-up a few expectations for Councillors eg. participating in WOW. I think it’s a little too specific for this training to be in bylaw.

THIBAUDEAU: I’m not sure that I like that idea bc we offer quite a bit of training already. The Councillor elect had the opportunity to have a mock meeting explaining Robert’s rules. Any more training for this would be redundant. Any other training, it’s difficult to force volunteers to do anything. We already offer this at GovCamp and it’s already difficult for councillors to come to GovCamp. I don’t think there’s any way we can punish a councillor who doesn’t go through this training. I don’t think it can work in bylaw. We can say “you’re expected to attend these training sessions” in standing orders but no real punishment for not attending.

SUNDAY: You can create a bylaw for chair training. I don’t think it would have a place in Council Standing Orders. It’s for committees.

THIBAUDEAU: I agree with this because it has to do with Chairs bc if a Chair does not go through training or transition then there could be a punishment for those who don’t go through training.
HADDOUCHE: I agree. More training for councillors so everyone is on the same page if you can't come to GovCamp.

LEY: The idea is that GovCamp would qualify as GovCamp or would there be an alternative to those who can't make it to GovCamp or would there be an alternative if they can't attend? It seems kind of doubling up.

KIM: There was no specific material on the GovCamp re bylaws specifically and we're not here to mandate anything but we're trying to present the idea that having some other training that councillors might find it useful. Having it under GovCamp is not under discussion for this point.

HADDOUCHE: I agree.

RIPKA: Bylaw needs to give a presentation to council to summarize what they do bc bylaw is the backbone of council and ppl's power and their role and if a councillor doesn't understand what their role is. How could they feel empowered to do their job properly? It can be very dry so maybe we should talk to CAC about it.

SUNDAY: We can put that in bylaw standing orders, it doesn't have to go to CAC. I think for chairs - there should be a bylaw. I don't mean a punishment for chairs but having a bylaw in place so DG can create some training.

Ripka: part of the chairs’ term is to transition future chairs.

Kim: so for this item, ew have the bylaw for chairs and bylaw so having an amendment to present to council every year. Anyone want to take a stab at bylaw for chairs.

Sunday: Sure.

KIM: Bylaw s.o. Amendment to have a presentation. Any one who would try to try the first principles or amendments? I think for new councillors, if there are certain discussion items, the chair will appoint council members to try the first principal staff then submit it next meeting then review it.

Ripka: you don’t need to do first principles just a motion on the table. To amend or add the standing order but it doesn’t need to go to council just debate.

KIM: I will take this item then. I’ll try to make the amendment for next meeting.

2018-04/3  COMMITTEE BUSINESS
KIM MOVES to approve the First Principles of Bill #2: Bylaw 100 attendance regulations.

1. In August of 2017, then-speaker of Students’ council Saadiq Sumar called for a DIE board interpretation of bylaw 100 surrounding section 7: start-up, and section 21: attendance regulations.

2. Sumar was asking for an interpretation of when the introductory council meeting could occur, and if it could occur prior to May 1st. In addition, Sumar was also seeking clarification as to if the start-up meeting should be considered for councillor attendance regulations.

3. DIE board found the following:

“The questions that were asked of this Panel, and our answers to them, are as follows:

1. Do both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7? What are the consequences if this does not happen? Can the first meeting occur before May 1?

Both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7. The first meeting can occur before May 1 in certain circumstances. If the first meeting is held after May 7 and if an application that is brought under section 29 of Bylaw 1500 postdates the first meeting, then there is no consequence to the Students’ Union or Students’ Council. However, DIE Board may be able to force the meeting to take place if the application that is brought under section 29 of Bylaw 1500 is submitted before the first meeting takes place.

2. Is the introductory meeting counted towards councillor attendance for the Spring/Summer term?

This meeting is unique to this term. The introductory meeting does not count towards councillor attendance for any trimester, as interpreted from the Bylaws. In the event that the first meeting (and indeed, any meeting) occurs before May 1, then that meeting will also not count towards councillor attendance for any trimester.”

4. The recommendation was made that Council Bylaws should be updated to include this interpretation. Section 7 of Bylaw 100 was amended to instate the start up meeting shall occur anytime in April, and that the first official meeting of council shall occur before May 15th. Section 21, attendance regulations were not amended so that the introductory meeting should not count towards

5. In accordance with the recommendations from DIE board, Bylaw 100, section 21 shall be updated so that the introductory meeting of council shall no longer be included in attendance regulations.

RE Bill #2
KIM: There was quite a bit of debate re Attendance regulation bc the first meeting is technically before they were appointed as councillor. Previously, it was no incorporated in attendance portion because they’re not necessarily a councillor but also an important meeting. It’s the very first meeting, also when committee members are being decided. There have been opposition to this motion bc a lot of ppl believe the first mtg is very important.

SUNDAY: Why can’t we combine meeting zero and the first into one meeting. No reason to have a meeting zero. There’s only an installation ceremony during the first meeting and it goes by quickly. Rather than having two, we just have the one meeting.

Kim: In our meeting one, we had the installation ceremony and blanket exercise.

SUNDAY: the blanket exercise should happen at govcamp not at meeting zero.

Ripka: good idea, bc FAs are included.

THIBAUDEAU: I agree with Sunday. That’s what we should pursue. We could get rid of the introductory mtg of councillor or we can switch the first mtg of council with the introductory meeting. We can review robert’s rules and then in may - that first mtg we can nominate for committees.

Ripka: so you wouldn’t be amending the principles bc we would say meeting zero is not necessary but still would be missing mtg. I don’t have a problem as long as it’s not the mtg where committee members are being appointed. The oath, robert’s rules training is symbolic but should be part of the attendance.

Sunday: re training - we should get rid of mtg zero. At first meeting have installation ceremony and have committee appointment, then second meeting - do training. No reason to have two meetings. Before any order of govt does any work, they will do an installation ceremony.

Kim: I’m also in favor of the idea of having an installation ceremony then committee voting.

Ripka: I agree. Meeting zero is redundant, does it have to be a council meeting to do an installation meeting?

Kim: yes

Sunday: mtg zero, we do the stuff for the committees then do installation ceremony.

THIBAUDEAU: the introductory mtg we elect the speaker for SC, we select committee composition and set mtg schedule they could all be done at beg of
may. At first SC mtg, all members shall be installed at the ceremony. Those are the only 2 bylaws that dictate first two mtg sof council so we can rearrange them.

Ripka: they try to do that earlier as to catch ppl who are going to be away during the summer.

Sunday: conversely, i know ppl had exams.

Thibaudeau: those who aren't going to be here over the summer aren't going to be as dedicated to committees. I'd rather have someone coming in who show that dedication and be here during the summer.

Ripka: even if they are away during the summer, they will call in to be appointed.

Haddouche: i agree with everything that's been said. I like the idea of doing the appointing to committees after the ceremony.

Ley: i have nothing to add. Sunday put it best.

Kim: we have to rewrite the first principles. We'll make a google doc and we’ll review rewritten first principles next meeting.
Bylaw 100 Students’ Council committee regulations.

6/0/0 CARRIED

1. Bylaw 100 is the premiere piece of legislation of Students’ Council, housing much of the administrative and operational regulation of the body.

2. In January 2018, Students’ Council approved amendments to Bylaw 100 that created four types of committees: legislative committees, oversight committees, ad hoc committees, and operational committees.
   a) Prior to these amendments, Bylaw 100 stipulated only one type of committee: Standing Committees.

1. As a result of these amendments, legislative committees were housed in Bylaw 100, while oversight, ad hoc, and operational committees were placed in Bylaw 100: Schedule B.

2. The differentiation between legislative committees and oversight committees received wide criticism from students; specifically, Aboriginal students.

3. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to replace legislative committees and oversight committees with Standing Committees.

4. In light of the criticism surrounding the current Students’ Council committee structure, as well as discussions surrounding committee structure at the Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation Committee, three categories of committees will be defined:
   a) “Standing” committees;
   b) “Ad Hoc” committees; and
   c) “Operational” committees.

SUNDAY: Council has received criticism over their decision to amend their bylaw to create 4 type of committees. Originally there was one standing committee. Getting rid of legislative and oversight committee.

Ripka: I support this. Could you please give a brief definition of the 3?

Sunday: standing committee: any committing of SC so all the committees. Ad-hoc: are committees in a year in length and deal with specific issues then dissolve. EG. Aboriginal relations and reconciliation. We worked for a yr to produce standing orders then they dissolved. Operational: deal with operational side of SU. EG Health and dental committee. This is coming leg and oversight and combining into one to call them standing committee.

Kim: why did they decide to split legislative
Sunday: there was debate last year about having SAL on committees. Before the amendments, nothing was said about SAL. Any committee could have SALs, however the blaw committee saw fit to differentiate comm with SAL and those without those comm w/o SAL members = legislative committee would have legislative authority given by SC. Oversight committee w/ SAL who also had legislative fx. The only diff is those with SAL membership and reg council member. This is really moot bc any SAL membership has to go through SC anyway. EG. the SAL membership for AARC we put motion fwd to recommend appt to SC so committees can’t unilaterally decide to have SALs it has to go through council first so no real point of having the two.

Ripka: how are SALs appointed? That’s just through council.

Sunday: council votes for it.

Ripka: should we put that through NomCom? If more recommendations are made, then it would ease the load on council.

Sunday: if this does pass and we rewrite 100 then we could look into that.

Thibaudeau: i’m not sure how i feel about this. I think one of the main thing we did last year was that it wasn’t any committee could have SAL on standing comm last year but no bylaw re SAL. there was a lot of concern; for eg. what if there was a huge outcry from students that they wanted SAL on finance comm or bylaw comm. So one of the reason why we decided to divvy up by legislative and oversight comm. We had leg for specific fx and we have oversight which deal with much more range of areas of SU and SC than it did with by law or other committee. They were able to oversee any other committee. In this case, it was ARRC, they were watching over the SU and made sure they were operating in spirit of reconciliation and wanted to have a very clear direction and procedure.

Kim: i don’t get how the process that cou sunday proposed, it seems straightforward to me. And you said having an oversight comm and legislative comm. By being in oversight comm, it’s easier to create those other committees?

Sunday: it’s easier to create and remove oversight comms. A lot of talk about reconciliation last year. ARRC was against this, all Aboriginal students were against it. All comms do the same thing - all have legislative functions through SC so need to differentiate the two, we made it to seem like the “other” which is the reason why it’s scheduled in bylaw but not in bylaw 100. The ARRC met and this was this recommended pathway.

RIPKA: To address This concerns. I get that but wonder if amending a bylaw through NomCom instead of dividing committees so categories need to be a
bit flexible. Some comms can have SALs and some will not. The long process to become a standing committee, I don’t think that’s a bad thing. If you want to be a permanent committee then you should do the work.

SUNDAY: I agree.

THIBAUDEAU: ARRC looks like it’s in schedule B because bylaw didn’t put comms that should be in an oversight committee in an oversight comm. I agree you should go through a process to make sure a committee has standing orders but we shouldn’t turn away groups that already face challenges and resistance on campus. I think you want to make sure that there’s an easy process and they can go through the procedures to refine their mandate and standing orders.

SUNDAY: If we’re talking about scaring off students, that’s already been done. Students who may have potentially wanted a committee are already going to be scared off.

LEY: If council is appointing people to comms who are SALS then we also have the ability to legislate to create SALs position by changing bylaw 100. Why is Councillor Thibaudeau’s view is worth having, those harms when the only benefit we don’t have SALs on essential comms eg. Finance. In the future, council can demand bylaw 100 if they want to put SALs on FC or other comms that they don’t find appropriate to find SALs on.

THIBAUDEAU: I want it to be known that I argued in favor of having SALs on sitting on comms. However, this was the acceptable solution brought to SC. Has ARRC been negatively affected by changes to bylaw 100 last year.

SUNDAY: Yes, we took a large his. Their faith in SC was shaken, they had brought their concerns to SC but they said we understand your concerns but we’re going ahead with this anyway. It’s mainly a symbolic thing. For Aboriginal students, symbolism is a big thing but differentiation is not needed. The membership of a committee is decided by a comm and reflected in bylaw.

RIPKA: I’d like to support Councillor Sunday that it’s typical of a privileged people to speak on behalf of marginalized communities. I think this recommendation from ARRC is symbolic but important to continue in the spirit of cooperation. I just want to clarify there’s nothing in bylaw that says standing comms cannot have SALs. I support these principles so long as we discuss the process through which SALs will be recommended for their comms.

HADDIUCHE: I support Councillor Sunday. I feel this is important for marginalized students.
SUNDAY: Previous bylaw 100 did not stipulate how you created standing comms. We’re saying it takes longer but when ARRC become Ad Hoc committee, it was DG’s opinion but there was no mandate.

LEY: A committee did vote to have its own standing orders but council can refuse to vote to ratify their nominees.

THIBAUDEAU: I’m not 100% convinced that this is the best move. I think it makes SC more efficient and addresses some concerns. However, the process of forming Bill 5 last year, where Aboriginal SALs were not giving the opportunity to speak was an improper decision and it was the fault of the SC last year. I will be voting in favor of it, it’s something council should look at.

SUNDAY provides brief summary to President Larsen.

LARSEN: Was the NomCom idea added to the bill?

SUNDAY: No, the first principle was talking about amending bylaw 100.

LARSEN: If it’s going to be talking about second principles then I suggest you have a process for nominating individuals to make sure the mandate is there and council is aware.

RIPKA: How should we write the seventh principle?

SUNDAY: A pathway for the nomination for SALS will be created in which the final say should be through the appointment of SC.

THIBAUDEAU: Can we add in two extra points to outline procedure to create a standing comm and also address membership.

RIPKA: For the seventh principle, bylaw should outline the process for SAL position... should we say appointed or ratified?

All: Ratified.

THIBAUDEAU: Isn’t committee membership decided by standing orders?

LARSEN: Depends, some are in bylaw and some aren’t.

2018-04/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2018-04/5 ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:12 PM.

2018-04/5a Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 @ 5:00PM in SUB 6-06.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MOTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>VOTES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUNDAY/THIBAUDEAU MOVE</strong> to amend the agenda to include the late additions to the agenda.</td>
<td>5/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIBAUDEAU/RIPKA MOVE</strong> to approve the minutes.</td>
<td>4/0/1 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUNDAY/RIPKA MOVES</strong> to amend and approve the First Principles of Bill #3: Bylaw 100 Students’ Council committee regulations.</td>
<td>6/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students’ Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students’ Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

**ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kim (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahra Haddouche</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Ley</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Raitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Ripka</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Thibaudeau</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MINUTES (BC-2018-05)**

2018-05/1 **INTRODUCTION**

2018-05/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 5:05 PM.

2018-05/1b **Approval of Agenda**
THIBAUDEAU/RIPKA MOVE to approve the agenda.
4/0/0 CARRIED

2018-05/1c Approval of Minutes

Will be approved next meeting.

2018-05/1d Chair’s Business

EDITORIAL CHANGES

Bylaw 600

Translation requirement.
Q: Why is the operating policy excluded?

RIPKA: It’s because if you think about the translation is, it’s for CSJ or maybe they’re not involved in the operating policy, so why would they need to read up on it. Also because it was mandated by Council are bylaw and political policies.

RAITZ: I’d like to see that change but editorial changes can be disregarded.

KIM: This bylaw will have to be edited anyway. I’m going to keep this comment on. What do you mean by where it is located?

RAITZ: I think I was just double speaking so it can be disregarded.

KIM: The English shall be enforceable...

RAITZ: Why is that a separate bullet point, I didn’t understand the logic behind it. Re 4.2a

THIB: It’s just describing the previous term.

RIPKA: Can you take out 2 and put 2 beside a?

KIM: That one stays on. The capitalization is not consistent with the other sub bullet points. The comment regarding the sustainable method, I think it’s necessary due to questions if translation is a one time thing. I think that can stay.

RAITZ: Sustainable can be defined when it’s brought to the operating policy. The sustainability is following through will appear when policy is more flushed out.

KIM: We’ll revisit this in the next couple meetings after the first draft is done.

RE Bylaw 2300
KIM: If you look at definition 1d. The wording as amended?

RAITZ: I don’t know what the protocol is, you can add the words “as amended” but that was just me.

KIM: That will be removed. (Will share the version she has) Section 1j - the word is repeated twice. We’ll be adding definition of quotation marks, Student’s Union. (Reviews noted errors and suggested changes)

KIM/RAITZ MOVE TO approve amended editorial changes to Bylaw 2300 as proposed by Councillor Raitz.
5/0/0 CARRIED

2018-05/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

RAITZ: I’ll be stepping down from this committee for time management reasons.

THIB: For Bill #3 passed last night in Council, Sunday, Belcourt and I will be working together to form second principles.

KIM: I have learned the BC's standing orders that whoever is doing admin stuff the deadline to share the agenda is the day prior before 4:30 PM but I personally think it’s not enough time.

2018-05/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2018-05/3a KIM MOVES to approve amended First principles of Bill #2: Bylaw 100 Attendance Regulations.

See BC-2018-05.02.

KIM: We didn’t see the need to having meeting 0 and we can just scrap that and reformat our meeting for better purposes. I changed it to the introductory meeting of Council (Mtg 1) so those are the mtgs happening after elected as a councillor. I’ll open up the floor.

THIBAudeau: I would amend it to strike in that term “shall no longer be included in attendance regulations” I feel that it’s implied when the meeting is removed.

KIM: changed to "shall be removed"

RIPKA: The first principles went to council a couple weeks ago. What happened?

KIM: When the first went to council, lots of questions whether or not intro mtg should be mandatory. That’s why lots of ppl were questioning it so lots of edits that had to be made so we discussed why are we having this discussion when we don’t do much in the following meeting anyway.
RAITZ: I don’t remember this happening in the discussion? I need help recalling that. I think we should have an intro mtg in April.

KIM: The decision was made within BC. I think either way, there will always be a consequence for doing it before or after. If we have our meeting in early May, that would be better.

RIPKA: So mtg 0 is Robert’s rules training and the Oath?

KIM: (Reads comments from Councillor Sunday)

RAITZ: We were on the same page earlier that a meeting in April was the best route but if we think on students on campus so it’s easier to get a proxy in April because everyone is on campus.

RIPKA: I feel it’s necessary for training before we start appointing people. If someone has no clue about Robert’s rules then it’s complicated for them so important to maintain mtg 0.

THIB: This is the perfect space to be arguing for this so I’m on the fence on whether or not we have the April mtg. We’re trying to increase the training for committee chairs but if we have our intro mtg in May then previous comm chair’s term will be done and there’s a good chance they won’t be around council.

KIM: We were planning to have chair training done by DG. We have transition reports and we wanted more formal chair training by DG.

RIPKA: You need committees before you have chairs so it makes sense to do it at the end of April, first council mtg, training oath will be a short mtg bc everyone has exams then first week of May, have the one you appoint everyone and do transition.

LEY: Do we think that making that mtg necessary will results in ppl going or sending a proxy? That might be an issue.

RAITZ: I don’t think it matters if the first meeting is mandatory. All council meetings are mandatory but most ppl don’t show up anyway. The most ppl show up to that first mtg. Right now, it’s mandatory but going forward it won’t be mandatory. The first one shouldn’t need to be mandatory bc ppl should be driven enough.

KIM: The first discussion is having the necessity of having mtg 0. If we’re still having mtg 0, should it be mandatory or not? There was push back from councillors as to why it’s not being mandatory because it’s an important mtg.

RIPKA: Should we talk about wanting meeting 0?
KIM: Hypothetically, we're selecting a speak at meeting 1.

RIPKA: Supporting mtg 0, selecting a speaker took a decent amount of time and there were only 3 applicants so that's in support of keeping mtg 0.

RAITZ: We're going to have trouble navigating it all.

**RIPKA/THIBAUDEAU MOVE** to retable item 05.3a to the next meeting.  
5/0/0 CARRIED.

**2018-05/3b SUNDAY MOVES** to approve First principles of Bill #4: Bylaw 100 Students’ Council Committee Chairs’ Training.

See BC-2018-05.03.

KIM: The creation of this motion was during the chairs meeting and transition was an issue.

LEY: What is chair shadowing referring to? I just think it's too vague, I don't know what it means.

RIPKA: Chair shadowing might have been an overlooking of the timeline. I would have gone and shadowed Robyn Paches from before but he was already done before I was elected. We can look at options of going to committees if you're thinking of running as chair.

KIM: Elections are done mid-March so you know if you're a councillor or not so there's still a potential for chair shadowing but different committees have different timelines.

RAITZ: I was thinking about that point too. I think to change the wording of 6 to say it “may include” but I rather start with grey level of understanding then develop the idea from there.

THIBAUDEAU: I disagree with Councillor Raitz. I don't like the wording but not limited but rather have a clear directive in first principles. I'm very concerned about item 6c, modifying Robert's rules. 6c is very vague to me.

RIPKA: Did we decide the meetings of the chairs? If it's going through DG, I do think it's necessary to consult with them. I can consult with them before going to Council. Not every chair uses Robert's rules to a T. Each chair has their own style.

RAITZ: I agree. Another route would be striking C and D and send it forward. "But not limited to" gives us space between first and second reading.

LEY: It seems like a pretty big thing to not specify it at all. If we're sending this to council with only two things in this section then they don't know what they're
voting on.

KIM: One reason that idea came up is because whatever DG does, it’s operational side and council does not have power.

RAITZ: I’d feel comfortable with having that before we come to the finalized version. I’d feel ok with that going forward.

RIPKA: I wouldn’t mind adding under 6, something about the planning process. For example, the purpose of each committee. That transition would be helpful in that planning process - identifying goals, tentative plan that the chair could take to the first meeting.

THIBAUDEAU: I like that idea. For 6C, is it support to relax Robert’s Rules at the committee level?

KIM: We’re going to use a modified version of the rules.

THIBAUDEAU: I’m not sure I like that so much because in standing orders, it’s up to the chair’s discussion is to use Robert’s rules as they see fit but we use it for action items but Chair should enforce it to its full potential.

RIPKA: It’s just to find the balance for the chair. Should I talk to DG about this? If so, what are some actual questions you want me to ask.

KIM: I think can add one potential for them to give us group chair training, how Robert’s Rules are used at the committee level, transition reports.

RAITZ: The idea of planning long-term, the idea of training ppl in the short-term, just preparing for each meeting, when you should be sending updates, something about short term preparation.

KIM: The wording we use, what is first, second principles, who moves, those specific wording to be included. What’s important for BC, is do they have capacity to do it?

RAITZ: How to handle really difficult situations? But there could be if we added it or being able to handle different kind of individuals.

RIPKA: How to mitigate circle talking.

KIM: Do we want to table it for next meeting?

RAITZ: Point 6 is where we need more info. Points 1 to 5 are what we’re comfortable with.

RIPKA: The reason I got this idea was because there was some discrepancy.
THIBAUDEAU: I don't think we have to do a ton more work re this bill. Under group chair training you included everything else.

RIPKA: I would amend C to be long and short term planning or goal setting.

KIM: This motion has been moved by Councillor Sunday.

THIB: We can table this for next meeting.

KIM: That's the best mechanism because that person is not there.

**KIM/LEY MOVE** to table this for next meeting after this discussion.

5/0/0 CARRIED

---

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 PM.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, August 15, 2018 @ 5:00PM in SUB 6-06.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIBAUDEAU/RIPKA MOVE</strong> to approve the agenda.</td>
<td>4/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIM/RAITZ MOVE TO</strong> approve amended editorial changes to Bylaw 2300 as proposed by Councillor Raitz.</td>
<td>5/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIPKA/THIBAUDEAU MOVE</strong> to retable item 05.3a to the next meeting.</td>
<td>5/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIM/LEY MOVE</strong> to table this for next meeting after this discussion.</td>
<td>5/0/0 CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students’ Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students’ Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

**ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kim (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahra Haddouche</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan Ley</td>
<td>YES (arrived late)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Ripka</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8400: Engineering is the only faculty that currently has a Faculty membership fee, and they want to dissolve it. All that needs to happen is the ESS needs to give approval, then it will be removed; I am working on it right now. Once tha happens, I’d suggest that bylaw looks at removing this bylaw all together because this type of fee is no longer necessary. Re: Jimmy. 8200: I suggested a couple content-heavy changes as well as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some editorial ones, you can choose to table this until I am back to explain?

6200 & 1500: I am going through currently.

Training of the chairs (questions to DG): Overall, what the executive committee & management has decided is that this type of thing does not belong in bylaw, because it will be provided by DG, which is an operation (thus, it would fall under operational policy). Moving forward, this topic will be brought to the meeting of the chairs, where we will provide guidance to DG as to how to improve training.

Bylaw 100 & attendance: My view on this is the first council meeting (0) should happen at the end of April, not included in the attendance as the training and speaker selection should be enough of an incentive to come. Then, at meeting 1 in May, committees shall be formed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Sunday</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Thibaudeau</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariyanna Callihoo (SAL)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Belcourt</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES (BC-2018-06)

2018-06/1  INTRODUCTION

2018-06/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:12 PM

2018-06/1b Approval of Agenda

SUNDAY/THIBAudeau MOVE to suspend standing orders to discuss item 3c first
5/0/0 CARRIED.

2018-06/1c Approval of Minutes

No previous minutes to approve.

2018-06/1d Chair’s Business

2018-06/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2018-06/2a Bylaw 100 (19), which states that:

The two (2) individuals nominated as ex-officio representatives of the Students’ Union to the University of Alberta General Faculties Council shall be

1. The Students’ Union Vice President (Academic), and
2. The Students’ Union Vice President (Student Life).

However, under the Post-Secondary Learning Act, section 24 (c)(i), GFC must have, "2 students nominated by the council of the students association". Due to the Bylaw, Students’ Council is unable to vote (or even ratify) the two positions.

Kim: Reads RIPKA’s submission.

Sunday: every faculty except for native studies has a membership fee.

Thibaudeau: this is referring to a diff type of fee that in the past, it was able to be used for renos, etc. The only one still o/s is the engineering fee is we’re not sure if it expires or not. The only reason is the bylaw still exists is as a reminder to not let that happen again in the future.

Sunday: is it still being collected?

Kim: yes. It’s called a faculty membership fee but faculties don’t use it. Councillor Rait? Has resigned from BC due to scheduling conflicts so we have to select another councillor.
RE RIPKA’s submission
Sunday: doesn’t make sense.

Kim: she spoke to exec and management re this so that’s all she provided. Is it okay if we move it to the next meeting bc we have one more at the end of August?

Sunday: I want to see if we can move it bc it doesn't have anything to do with DG, etc.

Kim: so we want to push it in a way for transition report standards to be responsible for it.

Sunday: There are standards in place but it’s outlined in bylaw. For eg. Setting goals - that’s something that can be modified at the end of the year. It’s up to the chair to decide how to use robert’s rules so that doesn’t involve DG either. It’s all at the Committee level. All this stuff is done at the Committee here, just no standards in place.

Kim: re chair shadowing - the timing of it basically because when the chairs are being elected.

Sunday: well if I was a councillor one year and if I know I’m coming back and I want to be chair then I can speak to the chair now nad have a better understanding for next year so there shouldn’t be such a steep. Learning curve.

Ley: what’s the diff by someone shadowing the chair and showing up at. A council mtg.

Kim: the chair would show the calling for votes and send the recording to this person.

Sunday: there's are broad here.

Kim: I’m personally in favor to table bill #2. So for bill#4, I’m ok with us bringing it to council then here.

Sunday: if first principles go through, then ..... but how it’s written now. Then I’ll move it.

SUNDAY/LEY second move for first principles.
3/0/1
BELCOURT abstains.
2018-06/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2018-06/3a KIM MOVES to approve amended First principles of Bill #2: Bylaw 100 Attendance Regulations.

KIM/LEY MOVE to have bill #2 tabled for next mtg
4/0/0 CARRIED

2018-06/3b SUNDAY MOVES to approve First principles of Bill #4: Bylaw 100 Students’ Council Committee Chairs’ Training.

Ley: VP Academic and student’s Life will be the most obvious to sit on GFC so I don’t personally have a problem with this in principal but if there’s some sort of contradiction in post secondary learning ac then we can have DIE Board voting on it.

Sunday: we should be given the choice to nominate not be forced to.

Thibaudeau: every other member of SC has opportunity to run in the election for GFC and if they win that nomination then they sit on the council. Or if they run and lost, then we’d be going behind the students’ vote to nominate them on GFC. As for the other exec, VP EXT makes no sense to sit on GFC, opsfi makes no sense to sit on as well, president could but portfolio of student life; it makes. A lot more sense for them to sit on GFC.

Sunday: I’m fine with having two of them as student reps but for ex we had to ratify the appt of Nadia. It’s just a symbolic gesture; for ex. They already had the position we just ratified that through council.

Kim: it’s very obvious for all of us that VP Academic and Student Life to sit on GFC. But while in bylaw being ex-officio members are stated is a bit contradictory. Is there another line so them to be ratified/

Sunday: so it could be the 2 individuals nominated and ratified.

Ley: so the’re both automatically nominated?

Sunday: yes, they'll automatically have the seat and it will be a symbolic gesture that council still has the authority.

Belcourt: so in postsec learning act, so there are already GFC reps.

Kim: from my understanding, post secondary learning act, there are
**2018-06/3c**  
**SUNDAY/KIM MOVES** to approve Second principles of Bill #3. For recommended amendments

5/0/0

See BC-2018-06.01.

SUNDAY: We had started on this last year and made finishing touches on the weekend. First principles so legislative and operational are gone and only standing committee, Ad-Hoc Committee. If this get approved...

KIM: 7b - there's a typo saying student council with large O.

SUNDAY: Katherine and I discussed the process. We didn’t want to go through a robust process eg. NomCom process not in bylaw so a heavy process for not picking SALs should not be in SO either. SAL are already in the NomCom bylaw.

KIM: It's good so committee

SUNDAY: stuff drafted for SAL and confidentiality agreements. There's one created for SALs.

THIBAudeau: For the first one, section 1i - why did you remove out of delegated legislative functions definitions?

SUNDAY: didn't think it was needed bc all committees have de

THIBAudeau: The original bylaw was to include the processes behind bylaws, policies and finances in bylaw so this was the main reason the original bylaw was written in the first place. I don’t know if it was redundant to include or not or necessary. The same type of wording in 1g.

SUNDAY: We can keep it in, doesn't matter to me. I would also like to add that to Ad-Hoc and Operational Committee definition.

THIBAudeau: for 1k under Ad-Hoc Committee you struck out b. Reason>?

SUNDAY: Section 5 says shall expire.. not exceeding one year so no need to have both.

THIBAudeau: RE section 1k & 1L. I agree with decision to leave close/open memberships for comm’s decision so probably eliminate section 4 and 2. That should be struck bc open memberships aren’t defined anywhere in the bylaw. There's no definition of open memberships.
KIM: It’s struck out but still mentioned again. What was the reason?

SUNDAY: I didn't think it was needed.

Kim: do you mind putting it back for clarification.

Sunday: we can get rid of open membership and it’ll be up to the Committee to decide.

THIBAUDEAU: I agree. I’d like it better to include definition of open membership and just keep that line within both so when comm are formed. SC are aware they can choose whoever they want

Sunday: then it has to be under standing comms too. It infers that stand comms can have SALs

DECISION: We will strike out open membership portion.

Thibaudeau: section 12, section 8 - you included all permanent memberships but is their membership still scouncil members and d

Sunday: it’s still open for SC, and certain number of aboriginal SALs.

Thibaudeau: You should include that close in here but under CAC, this section of bylaw isn’t used in quorum but in SOs

Sunday: Yes.

Thibaudeau: I like your SAL process, it made sense. In section 22, standing comm attendance regulation, section 4; should we change wording to a member of that Committee where a member meets the following criteria or defined as per Committee?

Sunday: I’d say the comm defines it. Or what does everyone think.

Kim: I think it’s up to the comm bc some have more power than others.

Sunday: for the aboriginal SAL on ARRC if an aboriginal wants to come to the meeting then they’d have to email me to vote. Numbers can com and go as they please.

Thibaudeau: the same thing goes for CAC. But I’m thinking more of the permanent membership so is it for the council review to dictate the SAL

Sunday: we’re leaving it up to the comms so if they want to have SALs they can.
Kim: I’m leaning more towards leaving it up to the comms

Belcourt: I think that’s a good point. If we have it as members for both then it’s for consistency.

Sunday: the reason we changed it to member, it’s good to leave stuff open but I don’t think comms should dictate if SALs can have proxies or not which is why we changed 223 so they can have proxies.

Thibaudeau: we should say SAL attendance regulation should be determined by that comm

Sunday: I agree. We’ll have a 5th one.

Ley: for section 1, subsection K2; why was it struck out?

Sunday: under 5, it says they will expire and shall not exceed 1 yr so it’s redundant.

Ley: I guess I saw it more as a guideline but that’s fine. For section 12.1 - why does it say CAC and not bylaw has the authority to bring forward first principles for a change to this bylaw?

Sunday: it was a suggestion from DG bc CAC is the admin comm and they deal with administrative side of council. Bylaw only has a set number for voting representation.

Belcourt: a comm isn’t being blindsided by another comm so it’s fair.

Ley: another minor typos I noticed but I can talk to you about that later.

Thibaudeau: section 12, subsection 12; has there been any thought of pointing out for it to be a permanent membership for going through that process. AARC has their own process for

Kim: can you say permanent SAL members?

Sunday: Yes. I think that’s fine

Thibaudeau: that should follow through each of the subsections, just to clarify.

Sun: sounds good

Ley: under 17, 7K - does that include standing comms of council bc I believe it would be done by NomCom right?

Kim: that’s true
Thibaudeau: I feel like that’s fine bc clause says comms would have main focus on aboriginal students

Ley: so how does that work?

Sunday: for ext, we did it through council.

Ley: does it include council comms?

Sunday: yes

Ley: but it does specifically say it’s chosen through nom com?

Kim: it’s only councillors going through SC...

Sunday: if non-councillor reps SC sign a confidentiality agreement? Out of my scope

Ley: if it was change do stay ARRC would provide recommendation to NomCom.

Sunday: could say recommend to SC and not NomCom.

Belcourt: if you do that then closing off ppl who hold diff position

Sunday: but in ARRC, you’re not a councillor.

Belcourt: 1.1.j - it sounds good the way it’s now. Would that be the same as being technically a SAL on ARRC but when I’m in AARC.

Kim: you’re not a rep of SC but you’re representing your group.

Ley: why ARRC is a higher quorum than other things?

Sunday: we have a larger permanent memberships - execs, SALs, councillors, the elder.

2018-06/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2018-06/5 ADJOURNMENT

@ 6:01; will decide on a mtg time next semester so bring your seed use.

2018-06/5a Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 @ 5:00PM in SUB 0-55.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SUNDAY/LEY second move for first principles. | 3/0/1 CARRIED
BELCOURT abstains. |
| KIM/LEY MOVE to have bill #2 tabled for next mtg | 4/0/0 CARRIED |
| SUNDAY/KIM MOVES to approve Second principles of Bill #3. For recommended amendments | 5/0/0 CARRIED |
First principles: Bylaw 100 attendance regulations.

1. In August of 2017, then-speaker of Students’ council Saadiq Sumar called for a DIE board interpretation of bylaw 100 concerning the start-up meeting of council.

2. The speaker Sumar seeking clarification as to if the start-up meeting should be considered for councillor attendance regulations.

3. DIE board found the following:
   “This meeting is unique to this term. The introductory meeting does not count towards councillor attendance for any trimester, as interpreted from the Bylaws. In the event that the first meeting (and indeed, any meeting) occurs before May 1, then that meeting will also not count towards councillor attendance for any trimester.”

4. The only item that is included in the introductory meeting is the installation ceremonies.

5. In accordance with the recommendations from DIE board, Bylaw 100, section 21 shall be updated to, the following:
   a. The introductory meeting of council, occurring prior to a council’s official term begins, shall no longer be included in attendance regulations and be removed;
   b. The installation ceremonies and nominations to the committees to occur on the first meeting of council after the beginning of council’s official terms.
First Principles of Bill # 4:
Bylaw 100 Students’ Council Committee Chairs’ Training

1. Bylaw 100 is the premiere piece of legislation of Students’ Council, housing much of the administrative and operational regulation of the body.
2. Bylaw 100, Section 13 and Bylaw 100 Schedule B, Section 6 discuss the appointment of committee chairs.
3. Each committee of Students’ Council has a chair, appointed from within its membership, to oversee the everyday functioning of the committee.
4. For those who have never acted as chair of a Students’ Council committee, there is a steep learning curve.
5. The learning curve is highly dependent on the previous chair’s transition report, in which quality standards are not in place.
   a. As a result, those new chairs who receive inadequate transition reports are at a disadvantage; resulting in committee startup delays.
6. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to create a structured approach to chair training, including, but not limited to, the following:
   a. Transition Report Standards;
   b. Group Chair Training;
   c. Long and short term goal setting
   d. Modifying Robert’s Rules of Order at the Committee Level; and
   e. Chair shadowing.
   f. Identify goals for the committee and present