The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students’ Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacîswâskahikan (Beaver Hills House), on Treaty 6 territory. From time immemorial, the banks along the river valley have been known as the Pehonan, a meeting place for the nêhiyawak (Cree), the Niitsitapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesųłiné (Dene), Ojibway/Saulteaux/Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and others. The University, the Students’ Union and much of the city are located on the unlawfully stolen land of the forcibly removed Papaschase Cree.

We acknowledge that sharing this land gives each of us the responsibility to research the historic contexts of Treaty 6, to reflect on our personal relationships to the land, the Nations we’ve named, and to our roles in upholding justice on this territory. Since they began, the Students’ Union and the University have benefited from historic and ongoing dispossession of land and resources from Indigenous Peoples. As a result, it is our responsibility to seek the restitution of this land and its resources. Finally, we seek to do better by working to make our learning, research, and governance align with the histories, languages, teachings, and cultures of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples in the land presently occupied by the Canadian state.

We encourage critical reflection by asking the following question. In relation to the territory on which you are situated, what role do you play in strengthening the resistance and resurgence of Indigenous students within your communities?

**ATTENDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Carbajal Velez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simran Dhillon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaida Han</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abner Monteiro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Wattamaniuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Voting Members &amp; Guests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Smudge performed by CARBAJAL-VELEZ

Call to Order

FLAMAN called the meeting to order at 5:05 P.M.

Approval of Agenda

WATTAMANIUK/CARBAJAL VELEZ MOVE TO approve the agenda with amendments
CARRIED

Approval of Minutes

WATTAMANIUK/CARBAJAL VELEZ MOVE TO approve the BC-2022-01 minutes
CARRIED

WATTAMANIUK/CARBAJAL VELEZ MOVE TO approve the BC-2022-02 minutes
CARRIED

Chair’s Business

CARBAJAL-VELEZ: Set up meeting with Selen to discuss Student Group Bylaw.

FLAMAN: Foregoes Chair Business.

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

UASU Elections Legislation - CRO Matin Koohkan

○ Bylaw 100.3: Conflict of Interest

○ Joke Candidates

TABLED

Composition of Students’ Council

WATTAMANIUK: Has discussed with the Speaker about Council seat numbers. There is a discrepancy between Bylaw and attendance in regards to the number of Council seats for Arts, ALES and Science (all have one more

1 Proposed SU bill would stop joke candidates from winning the most first-place votes
seat in attendance records than outlined in Bylaw)

FLAMAN: Suggests that, if attendance numbers have been updated and nomination packages have been updated, than there has been a breakdown of communication/implementation in regards to Bylaw.

WATTAMANIUK: Thinks that the Bylaw needs to be updated to reflect the change in Council seat numbers for Arts, ALES and Science faculties.

MONTEIRO: Confirms that Bylaw needs to be updated in regards to attendance numbers.

FLAMAN: GRTF (Governance Restructuring Task Force) will also change Students’ Council composition, so these changes will be dealt with during the year at Bylaw Committee.

WATTAMANIUK: Notes that there is not an easy way to confirm faculty enrollment and/or faculty seat numbers.

MONTEIRO: Questions if Bylaw states faculty seat numbers or enrollment.

WATTAMANIUK: Bylaw says both as it correlates the number of students per faculty into seat numbers.

MONTEIRO: States that, however Bylaw is updated in regards to Council seat numbers, there needs to be a way to minimise the number of changes needed in Bylaw year after year. Suggests that the CRO could verify Council seat numbers, based on faculty enrollment, and that this could be included in the Bylaw.

WATTAMANIUK: Bylaw needs to ask: Should there be a process for students’ to switch faculties during their students’ council term? Or should they have to resign and then run again?

Current interpretation says that you need to be currently in the faculty that you are running to represent.

CARBAJAL VELEZ - Was told that they were not able to run for Students’ Council when they were in the process of transferring from Augustana to the Faculty of Science. This has not been consistent though and who can run, during faculty transitions, is often determined differently from year to year.

WATTAMANIUK: States the need for consistently in bylaw procedure for this.

MONTEIRO: Language could be introduced that students’ must be in the faculty that they will be running to represent by the beginning of the Fall semester for the academic year that they would be a councillor.

WATTAMANIUK: Agrees to this.

FLAMAN: States that, if someone who doesn't get in to the faculty that they ran for by Fall semester, would have to resign their position as councillor.
MONTEIRO: Notes that it is hard to cover every-case-scenario. Verification of what faculty a potential councillor is in should be required. Questions what the process is that the CRO goes through to verify faculties for students. Changing that language does help students’ who know that they will be going to a new faculty, but it does create a new problem for a smaller group of students.

WATTAMANIUK: Right now it is a problem for everyone, so the larger problem needs to be considered.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: States that conditional acceptance is almost guaranteed acceptance, so students who have conditional acceptance in March for the Fall semester, would almost always get into the faculty they are hoping to represent.

MONTEIRO: Questions again what the CRO needs to verify faculty representation. Suggests that this is also an issue for students’ who run for GFC.

WATTAMANIUK: The biggest issue for councillor faculty membership is the summer, which is currently a grey area. If membership is determined for the Fall, there is less of a case by case basis which the CRO needs to deal with.

**Bylaw 100 Renewal**

- [Bylaw 100: Governance](#) First Draft
- [Regulation 110: Students' Council](#) First Draft
- [Regulation 111: Students' Council Standing Orders](#) First Draft
- [Regulation 120: Committees of Students' Council](#) First Draft

FLAMAN: Reformatted Bylaw 100 and broke it into different sections, but suggests that it is still very much a work in progress. Would like Bylaw 100 done and finalised by the next Bylaw meeting (July 19th) or by the following one (August 2nd). The process utilised for reformatting Bylaw 100 could then be used as a creation template/mould to format the rest of the bylaws reviewed throughout the year.

MONTEIRO: States that the way that FLAMAN wrote and divided Bylaw 100 looks great. However, notes that, when revisioning bylaw, bylaw is composed of the process and principles are composed of the regulations. Replenishment, the whole process, is outlined in bylaw but principles should not be removed from the bylaw and should remain within the initial bylaw.

WATTAMANIUK: Agrees that the principles should be included in the bylaw. Also thinks that the way the bylaw is outlined right now is really good. However, wonders if the proposed structure implies sub-regulations.

MONTEIRO: Clarifies that the Standing Orders are all outlined as sub-regulations. Questions if the structure should be as follows: articles and then bylaws and then regulations (standing orders and processes). This
might be easier to understand than sub-regulations.

FLAMAN: In bylaw, wanted to have a main level, sub level and then a sub-sub level. Clarifies that he hasn’t changed anything majorly in the bylaw, just reorganised it.

MONTEIRO: States again that the way the bylaw is structured, as presented, should be kept. However, principles should stay in the bylaw and processes should be hyper-linked to the bylaw.

FLAMAN: States that the way the bylaw is now makes it quite wordy. Suggests that the bylaw can be shortened for brevity.

MONTEIRO: That’s an exercise that the committee needs to do: determine what things need to describe the processes and what things have to remain in bylaw.

FLAMAN: Wants this bylaw to be done and ready for approval by August 2nd. After that, will assign bylaws to committee members to work on throughout the year.

MONTEIRO: Suggests that the committee needs a template to outline regulations and draft bylaws so that all documents are similar and every committee member is working on them in the same way.

WATTAMANIUK: Suggests that there are certain sections of Bylaw 100 that should be a separate bylaw, because it does not relate to Students’ Council.

MONTEIRO: Suggests that the Bylaw Committee should be diligent to ensure that it is incredibly hard for bylaw to be changed once it has been set. It should be easier to change principles than it is to change bylaw.

WATTAMANIUK: Questions if the committee should then change the process for changing Bylaw.

MONTEIRO: Suggests that the threshold for changing/adapting should be lowered for regulations but increased for bylaw. D.I.E Board has very little to interpret because bylaws are so clear. But, broadening the principle itself gives D.I.E Board more to interpret.

FLAMAN: As the next steps for the committee, FLAMAN wants everyone to look over Bylaw 100, tear it apart and give feedback and comments for the next committee meeting.

MONTEIRO: Questions what the new hybrid structure for bylaw would look like.

WATTAMANIUK: Suggests that the committee take what Flaman has for the current Bylaw 100: Governance and turn it into a new bylaw and then put regulations and processes into a separate document.

MONTEIRO: Notes that committee mandates outlines all the responsibility for each committee and is included in Bylaw 100. Questions if Bylaw Committee has talked to all currently operating committees to what they
think are the responsibilities for each of their committees.

WATTAMANIUK: As CAC Chair, will talk to each committee chair and define their core responsibilities with them over the course of the summer. Will also send them their bylaw mandate and then discuss what actually gets done in a year for each committee.

FLAMAN: Currently all the mandates from the committee standing orders are outlined in bylaw. Thinks that standing orders are what pertains from the time that the meeting is called to the time that the meeting is closed. Standing orders and bylaw can contradict each other, which can lead to confusion.

MONTEIRO: In that case, should the mandates of committees be included in bylaw.

WATTAMANIUK: Doesn’t think that mandates need to be included in bylaw at all.

FLAMAN: Putting a new threshold to change bylaw could be put into regulations. The committee also needs to talk about the delegation of authority as well as committee fatigue. A lot of work should be done in the committees but, oftentimes, it isn’t.

WATTAMANIUK: Committees should all run in the exact same way, so there could just be one regulation which pertains to the process of all committees.

MONTEIRO: Notes that that also creates consistency amongst committee chairs.

WATTAMANIUK: Suggests that that would also make the CAC chair’s job much easier. The only major difference between committees is membership and quorum, which would have to be outlined.

LEE: Likes the new bylaw structure which has been outlined by FLAMAN. Wishes, however, that there was a function on Google Docs to show changes between the original bylaw and the newly presented bylaw.

FLAMAN: Directs Lee to look at the Bylaw Committee Folder and view both the old and current version of each updated bylaw.

MONTEIRO: States that each committee member should define bylaw, regulation and process in Bylaw 100 and bring their ideas for restructuring bylaw to the next Bylaw Committee meeting.

2022-03/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-03/4

ADJOURNMENT

FLAMAN adjourned the meeting at 6:06 P.M.