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>Attendance</th>
<th>Proxy or Written Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voting Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian Aisenstat (Chair)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon Atwood</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noor Abdelwahab</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Raitz</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Voting Members &amp; Guests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Dumouchel</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Manager (Non-Voting Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Manager, Governance Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseel Atia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance Support Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Thiessen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Almeida</td>
<td></td>
<td>UASU Vice President Academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES (Bylaw-2024-15)

2024-15/1 INTRODUCTION

2024-15/1a Call to Order

AISENSTAT calls the meeting to order at 2:06pm.

- Land Acknowledgement
- Attendance

2024-15/1b Approval of Agenda

COMMITTEE MOVED TO approve the agenda. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2024-15/1c Approval of Minutes

COMMITTEE MOVED TO approve BC-2023-13-M.docx and BC-2023-14-M CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

2024-15/1d Chair’s Business

- Jill will be absent on the 12th - need to have a replacement chair.

AISENSTAT: Will be absent on January 12th and asks COMMITTEE to choose a replacement chair.

RAITZ: Offers to be the replacement Chair for the Bylaw meeting on January 12th.

2024-15/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2024-15/2a FAMF proposals (refer to email Courtney sent on 12/19/23)

- OASIS
- IHCC
- HCA
- ISA
- ESS

AISENSTAT: FAMF proposals are to be due on January 18th as the COMMITTEE intends to submit the FAMF proposals onto the Order Papers for Students’ Council on January 23rd.

RAITZ: Suggests that FAMF proposals be finalized for the January 12th Bylaw Committee meeting.

2024-15/3 OLD BUSINESS

2024-15/3a

2024-15/3 NEW BUSINESS
2024-15/3a Fee Governance First Principles

FLAMAN: Reads over the Fee Governance Review presented by DUMOUCHEL on November 24th. The most pressing issues refer to a DIE Board ruling in which Students’ Council could not waive the petition requirement for certain groups if they were not SRA’s or SU operations or services, however The Gateway was unable to fall under this clause. After discussions with The Gateway, drafted changes to include recipients to ask Students’ Council to waive petition requirements.

THIESSEN: In reference to the given documents, notes that questions may arise including who will deem it as threat to the Students’ Union along with how this will be implemented.

DUMOUCHEL: States that this is vague in order to provide Students’ Council the ability to make their own interpretational assessment of this along with the DIE Board. Does not want to outline a specific criteria due to fluctuations.

Notes that there is also an option to remove the part that is causing DFU issues and work on them at a later date.

Highlights to the COMMITTEE that this would need to be addressed by the end of January or they will need to communicate this to The Gateway.

RAITZ: Is comfortable going forward with the First Principles at this point as they will get to the specifics in the Second Principles. Highlights that this is a denser First Principles that might pose more questions and may want to pare the First Principles back.

FLAMAN: Will draft a First Principles that is more straightforward.

RAITZ: Suggests highlighting proposed changes in the First Principles along with a brief history.

AISENSTAT: Suggests FLAMAN receive more time to draft a First Principle which will be approved through e-vote.

FLAMAN: Has spoken to ZUKOWSKI and believes this could be put onto the Late Additions due to time sensitivity.

DUMOUCHEL: Acknowledges that this is a bigger change and there could be another option if a fuller discussion is desired by the COMMITTEE. Notes that the COMMITTEE could revise Bylaw 6100 to remove the section which requires a petition and which pertains to The Gateway in order to reflect a more current DFU standard.

FLAMAN: Notes that striking out Section 9 and 10 of Bylaw 6100 would accommodate the time sensitivity of this issue.
DUMOUCHEL: Highlights that there are two alternatives: one includes a partial rewrite of Bylaw 6100 and the other is to amend clauses that are in contradiction with the intent expressed by the committee.

ATWOOD: Does not completely agree with amending a bylaw in order to meet the needs of an individual organization as it can set a negative precedent. However, notes that the committee does represent the students that run The Gateway. In their opinion, they cannot claim The Gateway is not complying with a non-existent bylaw.

DUMOUCHEL: Agrees with ATWOOD, but is unsure if the DIE Board would agree. Shares the same concern in regards to focusing on a single organization, however this is not the intent as The Gateway has only added a time sensitivity to the proposed changes.

RAITZ: Agrees with a more specific amendment and notes that this would be of future benefit. Can focus on the bigger picture in February and March.

AISENSTAT: Agrees with RAITZ.

FLAMAN to send over a specific revision of the First Principle and will conduct an e-vote approving it.

**2024-15/3b** Election Timeline

- [Regulation 320.02.pdf](#)
  - [Consultation form](#)

AISENSTAT: FLAMAN and ALMEIDA are looking to rewrite Regulation 320.02 in order to emphasize consistency and sensibility in regards to Election Timelines. Highlight that the provided documents have outlined outstanding questions for consultation.

FLAMAN: Essentially intends on reverting to timelines for the General Election, such as making relevant deadlines before or during reading week. Logistical challenges have arisen previously.

AISENSTAT: Would want to have consultation with CAC before passing the proposed regulations.

**COMMITTEE MOVES TO** extend the meeting until 3:30pm.

ALMEIDA: Disagrees with FLAMAN on a few points with the six outstanding questions in the document. Highlights the blue timeline that is suggested and a red timeline that is suggested, and a combined purple timeline. Does not think it should go to a vote in this meeting, but wants the consultation form to be filled out and wants consultation from CAC.

The main reason to have an early election call is to reduce severe anxiety felt by candidates.
FLAMAN: Moving the results further gives the election office time to verify as well as more incentive to clean up campaign materials. Moving to the Friday allows for the celebration to curtail.

ALMEIDA: Disagrees with FLAMAN. Has seen quite a bit of posters after elections last year. Note that there’s other options that they can explore while also prioritizing the anxiety of the candidates. In regards to celebration, note that individual agency and the SU’s planning of social events on Thursday is in order to move away from over-drinking so it may be considered contradictory.

2024-15/4 WRAP-UP
2024-15/4a Action Items / To-Do List
   ● FAMF proposal drafts.
2024-15/4b Next Scheduled Meeting
   ● Friday, January 12th, 2023

2024-15/5 Adjournment
   ● Closing Attendance

AISENSTAT adjourned the meeting at 3:27pm.