

September 29, 2022

17:00 MDT

In Person: SUB 6-06

Online: [Zoom](#)

The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacišwâskahikan (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

Name	Proxy or Written Submission	Present
Voting Members		
Levi Flaman (Chair)		Y
Jayden Brooks		Y
Daniela Carbajal Velez		Y
Simran Dhillon		Y
David Lee		Y
Abner Monteiro		Y
Adrian Wattamaniuk		N
Non-Voting Members & Guests		
Tanisha Sahu	N/A	
Courtney Graham	N/A	

MINUTES (Bylaw-2022-08-M)

2022-08/1 INTRODUCTION

2022-08/1a Call to Order

FLAMAN: CALLED the meeting to order at 5:14 PM

2022-08/1b Approval of Agenda

CARBAJAL VELEZ ▾ / LEE ▾ move to approve the agenda

CARRIED

2022-08/1c Approval of Minutes

MOVER ▾ / SECONDER ▾ move to approve the BC-2022-04 minutes

TABLED

DHILLON ▾ / CARBAJAL VELEZ ▾ move to approve the [BC-2022-06](#) minutes

CARRIED

MONTEIRO ▾ / DHILLON ▾ move to approve the [BC-2022-07](#) minutes

CARRIED

2022-08/1d Chair's Business

- Undying gratitude to Governance staff for somehow scraping together minutes from BC-2022-06
- Does Thursday evenings still work for everyone? Was the 15th an anomaly or do we need to revisit Fall term availability and reschedule?

DHILLON: Agrees with Thursdays.

MONTEIRO: Works.

LEE: States that his schedule changes from week to week.

FLAMAN: Suggests that if there's a need, members can find a proxy until 3 pm on the day of the meeting.

LEE: Asks if the proxy has to be another councilor.

FLAMAN: Yes.

BROOKS: Most Thursdays work.

- For Speaker's report back to D.I.E. Board:
 - How will Bylaw (both [100](#) and [2300](#)) be amended to resolve the issues identified by the Board? (Does this approach follow one recommended by the Board in [2022-05-R](#) or is Bylaw Committee recommending a different solution?)

- Bylaw 100 is fine
 - Bylaw 2300.6.3.b will be clarified by adding that the “signed letter from the proposed nominee’s faculty confirming that they are in good academic standing under University regulations” is their faculty at the time of nomination, not a faculty you may be part of in the fall
 - Bylaw 2300.6.3.d will be clarified to read “papers soliciting the names, faculties, years, signatures, and student identification numbers of at least ten (10) members registered in the same faculty as the nominee as nominators” at the time of nomination.
- What will be the process and timeline for carrying out this amendment?
- FLAMAN: States that November 22, 2022, is the committee’s deadline for the first principles and then it goes to the Council for its second reading. This way it gives the action office about a whole month to go over the election package.
- MONTEIRO: Asks if the Election Bylaws have gone to the council.
- FLAMAN: No
- Timeframe to carry the amendment discussed will be no longer than 13 December, 2022.

2022-08/2 **QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2022-08/2a

- Bylaw/Regulation Review & Amendments
 - Will follow same format as [2022/23 Standing Order Reviews](#)
 - Bylaws/Regulations will be copy/pasted into docs in which Council has commenter access; interested parties may comment/suggest changes to be made
 - Leave docs open until about a month before deadline to give Bylaw Committee time to go through and debate/discuss suggestions
 - Similar to the restructuring, will work backwards in a way; bulk of the work done before First Principles so Second Reading should come easily
 - Section III: Elections should be complete (ready to pass First Principles in committee) no later than **November 22, 2022**
 - Section I: Governance should be complete before Christmas break
 - Section IV: Finances should be complete January or February
 - Section II: Operations should be complete February or March

2022-08/2b

- DFU Renewal Plebiscites in 2023
 - Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund

FLAMAN: Suggests to contact and remind them saying that they are up for renewal.

- SUB Renovation Fund

2022-08/2c

- DFU Renewal Referendum

- Make sure APIRG understands if they fail this, they're done
- Explore feedback from APIRG presentation
 - DFU's too crowded and can sometimes have 2-3 on the same ballot
 - Rearrange the renewals to spread them out a bit more?
 - Also frustrated with how much work is involved to go to plebiscite every 5 years (Have heard this from CJSR and Gateway in the past as well)
 - Increase the 5-year renewal period by a year or two?
 - Rescind 5-year automatic renewal period but allow for any member (of the SU) to challenge an existing DFU with an immunity period if they're successful (5-6 years?)

FLAMAN: Suggests that there is still an ability to pull it through without having it go through the DFU every year.

2022-08/2d

- FAMF's
 - Is [Bylaw 8200](#) out of date?
 - Business Students' Association expired August 31, 2022?
 - Education Students' Association expired August 31, 2021?
 - Engineering Students' Society expired August 31, 2022?
MONTEIRO: Comments that the Engineering Students' Society's FAMF has been renewed.
 - AUFSJ expired June 31, 2022?
 - Augustana Students' Association expired August 31, 2022?
MONTEIRO: Comments that the Augustana Students' Association's FAMF has been renewed.
DHILLON: Confirms.
 - Lister Hall Students' Association expired August 31, 2022?
 - HUB Community Association expiring August 31, 2023
 - ARFSJ expiring August 31, 2023

FLAMAN: Confirms if these associations will be receiving funds this year as their FAMF's are expired.

DHILLON: Agrees.

FLAMAN: Asks if there is an obligation from the committee's end to remind them about their renewals.

DHILLON: Points out that the system isn't extremely clear and most of these associations do not

know if their FAMF's are expired. Most of them were informed about this through the presentation given by her at CoFA. Also states that some of the associations forgot to send their reports of time to get their FAMF renewal process done.

2022-08/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2022-08/3a • **Discussion on CRO training and transition**

FLAMAN: Asks MONTEIRO if he had a word with VILLOSO and DUMOUCHEL.

MONTEIRO: Yes.

FLAMAN: States that this is mostly to do with poor training.

MONTEIRO: Agrees. Suggests that the timeline could be changed such that the days are structured to have a certain period to have the transition between the newly appointed CRO and the previous one. Points out that one major challenge will be to keep them at the university as they graduate and would leave off. And hence suggests to hire the newly appointed CRO about 2 weeks in advance to have an overlapping time in order to get a head start with the training.

LEE: Questions if the CRO has to be a student.

DHILLON: Yes.

MONTEIRO: Asks if the speaker is supposed to be a student.

DHILLON: No.

FLAMAN: States that it also comes down to if we want to give students that opportunity or have someone from the Governance staff train the new CRO.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: Thinks that it's not with the CRO position being permanent but more of giving the CRO proper training from the start. Suggests that there could be a person appointed to train the new CRO and hence this way there will be consistency. This could be someone from the governance team.

MONTEIRO: It will get difficult to have one person appointed as this might be an issue with the CRO to have a bond with them.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: Questions about the number of hours the CRO works.

FLAMAN: States that it's about 40 hours in the election season (February-March) and 20 hours during the rest of the year.

Suggests that the person to be appointed for the training doesn't have to work a full time, but could be a contract twice a year.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: States that this would be difficult as we will have to train them first so it will be good to have students on board.

MONTEIRO: States that in that case there will be certain limitations as it's supposed to be a professional work environment and orient it towards the students. And hence this trade-off would be challenging.

Also points out that having a student on board would be good since the CRO is autonomous. Having it as a permanent spot is often perceived as it's being controlled by the Student Union. And hence would make it seem that they are not entirely autonomous.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: Suggests taking a survey from students for their opinion for analyzing a broad perspective.

MONTEIRO: States that it would be beneficial to have a conversation with DUMOUCHEL for a starting point and also look at other schools to see their implementation, of having a student or a staff member. There could be a possibility for DUMOUCHEL to attend one Bylaw Committee meeting to potentially have a discussion on this.

2022-08/3b

- **Duration of the Committee meetings**

FLAMAN: States that one hour is less for the committee to get through all the agenda items given how much discussion takes place for each item.

Suggests that the committee should work on shared documents to streamline the process quicker and this way an hour of meeting time would be sufficient.

LEE: Asks if the members are assigned to certain sections or if all of them are on everything.

FLAMAN: Answers that all the members should be working on everything, if not that at least taking a look at it to see its progress. Also states that in the past years, the committee had assigned members to the bylaws, but as things weren't addressed properly, there wasn't a streamlined flow of the entire committee.

Suggests having reviews to bylaws in a certain period of time, just like how the Finance Committee does it every three years.

2022-08/4 ADJOURNMENT

FLAMAN: ADJOURNED the meeting at 6:04 pm