University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 28, 2016
6:00PM
SUB 6-06

AGENDA (BC 2016-07)

2016-07/1	**INTRODUCTION**
2016-07/1a	**Call to Order**
2016-07/1b	**Approval of Agenda**
2016-07/1c	**Approval of Minutes**
2016-07/1d	**Chair's Business**
2016-07/1d	Attendance
2016-07/1d	Summer meeting schedule: August 4, 11, & 25
2016-07/2	**QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**
2016-07/2a	Council seat distribution review - Discussion
2016-07/2b	Council attendance regulations - Discussion
2016-07/2c	Council and committee remuneration - Discussion
2016-07/3	**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**
2016-07/3a	**Bill #4 - Two-person candidates & Councillor Designates - *First principles***

HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #4, and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300, to abolish two-person candidates and implement councillor-designates according to these principles.

First Principles

1. The process for two-person candidates shall be abolished from SU Bylaws, given the questionable viability and usability in 1-year terms.
2. The definition of short-term and long-term proxies shall be amended into two new categories: "Proxy" (short term) and "Councillor-designate" (long term).
3. The process for Councillor-designate appointment shall be amended to:
    a. Simplify appointment requirements; and
    b. Set term limits on the appointment.
4. The process for Proxy appointment shall remain constant.
5. Bylaws 100 and 2300 shall be amended to implement these changes.

2016-07/3b **Bill #5 - Department association Amendment - *First principles***

2016-07/3c **Bill #6 - CRO Responsibilities Amendment - *First principles***

LARSEN/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #6 and amend Bylaw to clarify and outline C.R.O. Responsibilities based on the following first principles.

First Principles

1. Responsibilities of the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) are in need of updating to reflect the growing scale of elections and value of office. As such the following amendments shall be made to bylaw to ensure a stronger role throughout the academic year and during elections of the CROs office.
2. 'Advertisement' shall be amended to ensure CRO has larger and long term capabilities to properly advertise elections.
3. Timelines for reporting activity of office, both during elections and throughout academic year, shall be amended or introduced.
4. Timelines for nomination packages shall be amended to

ensure proper release.

5. The CROs responsibility in electronic device and social media management shall be amended to ensure candidates can have full access to technology without overbearing CRO office.
6. CROs responsibility in ensuring proper procedures are taken during classroom talks shall be solidified.
7. CRO punitive responsibilities shall be amended to ensure timely release of rulings as well as fair and due process for candidates during elections.
8. CRO responsibilities in reviewing elections materials shall be amended to focus on ensuring candidates budgetary constraints to ensure fair elections.
9. Elections bylaw, specifically but not limited to 2100(8) Duties of Elections Staff, shall be amended to fully include responsibilities of elections staff to ensure clear understanding of office.

2016-07/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-07/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2016-07/5a **Next meeting**: Thursday, August 4, 2016 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06.

University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 14, 2016
6:00 PM
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Brandon Christensen (Chair)		Y
Bismillah Kiani	Sandy Brophy	Y
Brandon Prochnau		N
Delane Howie		Y
Eilish McKinlay		N
Reed Larsen		Y
Robyn Paches	Fahim Rahman	Y

MINUTES (BC 2016-06)

2016-06/1 **INTRODUCTION**

2016-06/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 18:07 (6:07 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2016-06/1b **Approval of Agenda**

LARSEN/RAHMAN MOVE to approve the agenda.
5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-06/1c **Approval of Minutes**

HOWIE/RAHMAN MOVE to approve the minutes from June 30.
5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-06/1d **Chair's Business**

2016-06/1d **Attendance**

Attendance was taken and 5 councillors were present.

2016-06/1d **Committee schedule update**

CHRISTENSEN
Changing the meeting time, as McKINLAY suggested, was not possible given the short timeline and the fact that only half the members completed the Doodle Poll.

BROPHY
Offered to proxy for anyone not showing up, moving forward.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested finishing most big projects by August 2016. Mentioned that there would be at least one additional meeting in August. This meeting will likely be on August 4, 2016.

Current August meetings scheduled for August 11 and August 25.

Said that last year the Bylaw Committee did 5 bylaws in one meeting; the preference is for having meetings once a month during the school year; Last year many meetings had to be cancelled so having monthly meetings will be more simple. There will be some more business in January when referenda questions need to be drafted.

2016-06/2 **<u>QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD</u>**

2016-06/2a **Bylaw 600 (Bilingualism) – Progress Report**

RAHMAN
Introduced the bilingual translation committee, and that Delane, Thomas and he will go and help set up the translation committee in the coming weeks.

BROPHY
Mentioned that he knows a foreign student doing translation anyway who is known to do a good job; and asked whether she will be good enough?
Also mentioned that he has another friend who is going to be an active undergrad in Fall, and can do the job.

RAHMAN
Responded by saying that qualifications are posted, including

student status.

2016-06/2b **Two-person candidates – Discussion and planning**

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that McKINLAY took on the two-person candidates issue and that HOWIE has also been helping.

HOWIE
Said that she doesn't have any comments, but all can comment about their feelings on the issue, which will be good.

LARSEN
Indicated that he sees the need for professional faculties to have long term proxy. Said that the two-person candidate idea appears odd to him

BROPHY
Said that two person candidates complicate the matter, and therefore he doesn't see a principle behind one person for half a year and the other person running for the other half of the year;
Mentioned that there can be so many other ways to do it, and therefore long term proxies are an option.

HOWIE
Said that the more she looks the more she does not like two-person candidate idea; and dealing with the long term proxy will be better. It will also allow the candidate to decide who their proxy is and will be more flexible.

RAHMAN
Mentioned that it was with this idea last year, and agreed with BROPHY.
Said that he is okay with not having the two-person candidate option, and working with long term proxy.

CHRISTENSEN
Agreed with RAHMAN, and suggested that the Bylaw Committee should abolish two-person candidate because the idea is unsuitable and overbearing. Said the Bylaw Committee should redefine long term proxy by a new name, such as Councillor Designate.

LARSEN
Said that he loves the idea of having a title. (Referring to Bylaw 100)

said that a long term proxy is someone who attended at least two consecutive council meetings; whereas short term proxy is a one-time thing and can't sit in council for the second time or on the committee.
Suggested changing the wording in Bylaw 100(9).

CHRISTENSEN
Said that, in order to sit in the committee, one must meet certain criteria, and suggested not to change the Bylaw 100(9) now, as it will be more than an editorial change; Mentioned that the council may appreciate talking about it in the near future.

RAHMAN
Said that it is not editorial but a structural change.

CHRISTENSEN
HOWIE is trying to get hold of McKINLAY for her opinion, and Bylaw Committee should start that process in the next meeting; Said that the two-person candidate shall be removed from Bylaw 2300, and the Bylaw Committee can implement the Councillor Designate approach.

HOWIE
Agreed to find out what McKINLAY thinks.

2016-06/2c **General Bylaw review allocation**

CHRISTENSEN
Said that the Bylaw Committee is required to go through all bylaws and change any typos or any glaring errors. Last year the committee did not do this; Mentioned the committee is supposed to do it, and he was thinking that they can allocate certain sections to certain people to work.

BROPHY
Suggested that the allocation will be better when there are more actual Bylaw Committee permanent members present.

CHRISTENSEN
Agreed with BROPHY

LARSEN
Suggested emailing the committee members that in the next meeting all will be allocated certain sections, even if they are absent.

2016-06/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2016-06/3a **Bill #2 – Faculty Association Political Policy Diversion – *Second Reading***

Summary of Discussion

CHRISTENSEN
Asked, who will second the motion, as PROCHNAU is not present.

BROPHY
Agreed to second it for PROCHNAU.

CHRISTENSEN
Started paying attention to Google Doc file on Bill # 2, and confirmed that all the attendees are able access and edit the Google Doc.

(Everybody logged into the Google Doc)

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested going line by line
First focussed on section 4
(Read on)

LARSEN
Asked why is the SU utilizing the process?

CHRISTENSEN
Replied that it is because they have to get approval

(Attendees discuss among themselves and make changes to the Google Doc as they decided to be appropriate)

CHRISTENSEN
Said that he included "formal" meeting with VP Academic because he wanted to ensure that it wasn't an "on the fly" meeting.
(Committee debated about the word "formal")
Said that second reading of Bill #2 is slightly different than first principles but he added it to discuss specific political policies
(Read on)

HOWIE
Plebiscite is a form of consultation, and suggested taking out vague wording.

RAHMAN
Disagreed and wanted to keep vague wording as it makes sense.

CHRISTENSEN
Provided context and said that they added it as part of the first principles and won't taking it out.

(All are good with that)

RAHMAN
Said that we did not specify the timeline for Council approval in the first principles. Believed that during the first round of approval there should be a two-week waiting period between the presentation and voting for approval.

HOWIE
Said that for the first round this is too long turn around and is unnecessary to delay things before they even get started and before formal consultation has occurred in the form of the plebiscite.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that he likes it the way it is recorded currently where it says that Council will approve the plebiscite at the meeting it is presented. Suggested it made sense given the fact that Council can delay it for 2 week by requesting more information (this is included currently).

BROPHY
Said RAHMAN's suggestion would be unnecessarily delaying and unfair to keep the FA in limbo.

RAHMAN
Mentioned that he is favor of taking that clause out given the discussion because it will be a difficult process.

BROPHY
Mentioned that they should make sure that something is immediate and standing orders require a two thirds majority vote to actually consider the motion at the meeting the presentation occurs.

HOWIE
Agreed that two weeks is too long and believed that with Council's option to request more information that it makes sense.

(Moving onto drafting Plebiscite Questions)

BROPHY
Mentioned that if the plebiscite is approved by Council then it is like having a full month to get the question drafted and then put to the people and suggested that this was a bit excessive.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that chose a maximum of 30 days for Bylaw Committee to approve the plebiscite question because it is reasonable given, the current schedule of Bylaw. Overall the process could take anywhere from a minimum of a month and half to a maximum of six months.

HOWIE
Said that they can always suspend standing orders to expedite the process at council.

(Moving back to the two Council approval steps)

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that he will be more in favour of switching it so that the second Council approval is allowed to wait for 2 weeks, as is usually done after presentations.

LARSEN
Agreed with the point above.

(Moving back to plebiscite drafting process)

CHRISTENSEN
Asked to remember what is stuck out
(Read on)
(All agree that 30 day is reasonable)
Mentioned that he is amenable to changing F, expediting the process. For U Pass, the MSA did a referendum in Fall, so it is totally possible;
(Read on)
Said the only concern about allocation of costs.

HOWIE
Said that if something is urgent they have to pay for it but if it is not urgent then that means they don't have to.

BROPHY
Said their budget can afford $1000 easily

(Attendees discuss about wordings and grammar line by line)

CHRISTENSEN
(Read on)
(Attendees spoke with each other and debated about wording)
Said that they are ok with that.
(Read on)
Mentioned that there is one thing only that is not here, and it is "rigour of the process" and that he likes it that way as it is more of a narrative.
(Discussing the second Council approval step)

LARSEN
Said that this is a lot of extra language and which may be required to be broken up, and mentioned that many things are not necessary.

HOWIE
Said that it seems good though this the first time she saw it
Asked for presentations and plebiscite results to be explicitly included. She favors this approach. Said that plebiscite is the bulk of the presentation; it is in the presentation but they are considering it; and that political policy should represent everybody's view so she wants to include the word "consider."

LARSEN
Said that thought it should be presentation only, not plebiscite as well in the wording of the specific point since it is redundant.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested including presentation and plebiscite results, and approving or rejecting deviation from political policy. Said it was important to him.

HOWIE
Said that it is redundant

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that they have to respect opinion of everyone and will not move on until a consensus is reached.

LARSEN
Reluctantly agrees given the importance to certain members.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that this provides a guideline that it is binding in a very narrative way and he thinks that it is perfect.

(Read on)
(Talking about the format of Political Policies to provide context to diversion)

HOWIE
Said that the way political policy is written is that there are so many things in one policies and therefore the FA may contradict all they choose.

LARSEN
Said that facts are mostly facts in political policy. Said that it can be a nightmare if they are contradicting the facts of these policies.
(Read on to illustrate point)
Realized that some of the "facts" are actually leftist opinions and could be argued as such thus weakening his previous argument.
(Moved on)

CHRISTENSEN
(Read on)
Mentioned that the wording of the deviation procedure shouldn't be too specific as it could be limiting. The committee cannot predict every eventuality.

LARSEN
Indicated that FAs would be allowed to advocate against every resolution.

HOWIE
Said that they are not required to advocate against every single resolution, but they could be, within the policy of interest.

CHRISTENSEN
Provided an example related to Market Modifiers: the amount of money matters in the market modifier discussion and if we require extremely specific "asks" when the FA is drafting their proposal things might change, especially given the fact that, with market modifiers FAs negotiate the fee they are willing to sign on for.

RAHMAN
Said that while going to council, the Dean should be going as well.

BROPHY
Suggested that negotiation still has to occur and the final number might not be agreed until after this process is already initiated. Also questioned if talking to the Dean is not already advocacy?

CHRISTENSEN
Expressed concern about over legislating.

HOWIE
Said that there are so many different political policies that specifics may change down the road.

RAHMAN
Asked if they should specify that motion is expiring at the end of the academic year.

BROPHY
Responded by saying that an expiration date is reasonable but an academic year is not.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested a "calendar year"
(All agreed)

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested adding another letter and finishing with K
(Read on and edited the Google Doc)
Agreed to change the format.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that one year is good, and also suggested adding the option for council to extend for one additional calendar year.
(All agreed)

HOWIE
Mentioned that it also reflects the will of majority of that faculty at that point since after 2 years half of the people in that program at the time the process started will be gone.

BROPHY
Said that it can be up to one additional year, and one can actually use this process if one is there three years in a faculty

(Everybody work on the laptops)

CHRISTENSEN
(Went to I and L)
(Read on)
(All are fine)

(Went to M)
(Read on)

(All fine)

<u>MOTION</u>:
CHRISTENSEN/BROPHY MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #2 and amend Bylaw 8100, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, to allow faculty associations to deviate from political policy within the following guidelines (Specific wording to be reviewed on Google Drive).

5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-06/3b **Bill #3 - Universal Resources and Labors – *Second Reading***

<u>Summary of discussion</u>

LARSEN
Said that he copied most of the existing Bylaws, are these will fit in 2200 or 2300, and mentioned that certain sections will be eliminated
Asked how to proceed.

RAHMAN
Suggested proceeding line by line

(All agreed)

LARSEN
Mentioned that General Labour is a long one
Mentioned that Fair Market Value and Assessments need also to be looked at, and agreed to go through Bylaws 2200 and 2300; Went to #1, i.e. volunteer labour

RAHMAN
Asked if students are necessary

BROPHY and LARSEN
Said yes

CHRISTENSEN
Asked if they needed to be UAlberta?

LARSEN
Suggested taking ‘students” out and mentioned “volunteer labour”

BROPHY
Said that there is difference between real and student professionals

HOWIE
Said that she doesn't know how to make that distinction, and that students can doing phenomenal work and still can be full-fledged professionals, and these students and can be coming to school because they are volunteering their time

LARSEN
Said that “volunteering” has a very specific purpose because they only donate their time, and is therefore very specific

BROPHY
Said that having university life and donating skills and not having university life and donating skills has a difference

HOWIE
Said that Something seems different

CHRISTENSEN
Said that he likes it being “students"

BROPHY
Said that taking away the labour part of it, makes it a complex issue, and there is huge difference between student and non-students; Added that only one thing most of them agree is that someone outside the University having professional skills is a professional

LARSEN
Said that in his mind, if they take the line out, nothing will have changed but the wording will be a problem, and will be a large problem that they can deal at a different time;

HOWIE
Said that she doesn't see how deal with that. Added that you can have, for example Steven Spielberg, do a movie and still it does not become professional resource.

BROPHY
Suggested leaving it there and discussing about it later

LARSEN
Said that for logic sake, people will read it as film crew, and labor of people might be zero but the fruit of the labour has a market value

HOWIE
Said that she is for having all at zero

LARSEN
Mentioned that he is an advocate of zero, or as an universal resource designation

BROPHY
Said that CRO finally confirms universal or not, and now they understand RAHMAN's objection

LARSEN
Went back to number 1
(Read on)

CHIRSTENSEN
Suggested maintaining distinction between campaign budget and main budget, and gave examples of poster, etc.

LARSEN
(Read on, #2)
Said that this line distinguished universal from campaign budget

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that he is confused with the presentation provided.

HOWIE
Said it is "to which student had access"

LARSEN
(Read again)
Mentioned that it is "Specific purpose of campaigning" and said that any resource for campaigning cannot be an universal resources

BROPHY
Said that raw materials can't be posters, and poster can't be raw materials but banner paper can be.

LARSEN
(Read on)
Said that if we get rid of this because it is poorly worded, then

somebody using, for example, a common printer, can be using an universal resource

HOWIE
Went to Point D
Said that they say that an universal resource does not include product, resource or material that had been created for candidates to campaign in the current election period

LARSEN
Said that something that is inherently used for campaign is not an universal resource

CHRISTENSEN
Expressed confusion with products, materials, etc.

BROPHY
Clarified that any resource that does not have any candidates' names, slogans or other supporting information is an universal resource

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested making it as simple as possible, as otherwise, it will be hard to word things, and suggested using general terms

HOWIE
Said that it can be materials, products and resources deemed by CRO

LARSEN
Agreed with "are raw materials, products and resources" that CHRISTENSEN suggested

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested "unadulterated" as the right word

LARSEN
Said that people can read it but will not like to continue reading it, that way

Said that they don't need C

HOWIE
Said she doesn't like elections cycles

CHRISTENSEN
Asked about using same banner year over year is a good idea or not?

(All say no)

LARSEN
Said that there is a section of Bylaw that covers that

BROPHY
Said that they can talk about it later

LARSEN
Not much has changed but is confusing

(Everybody focussed on reading quietly)

CHRISTENSEN
Expressed concern about a new thing like creating an universal resource that was not there before

RAHMAN
Mentioned about banners, and said that as you buy unadulterated materials and make it adulterated

LARSEN
Mentioned that they don't have to say unadulterated
(Read out)

BROPHY
Suggested leaving unadulterated and use the phrase "combining other materials"

LARSEN
Suggested leaving it for now
(Read on)
Said 3 is not needed
Suggested leaving out, 4

HOWIE
Said that, for 5, it doesn't make sense

LARSEN
Suggested to keep going
Mentioned that universal budgets don't have reimbursements, and you can buy something, for example, from Home Depot but won't be reimbursed.

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned that he did not expect this from the discussion, but wanted to define what universal resources are in sections like: a, b, and c, etc.

LARSEN
Said you can buy anything and donate (at the end) and supply that to everyone in your race, then the resource will be universal

HOWIE
Said that if you buy something and keep it for everyone to use and not get reimbursed then it is still an universal resource
Added that, If she decides and don't give to everyone then she gets reimbursed and the resource is not universal

LARSEN
Said that the CRO has to determine what is universal finally

CHRISTENSEN
Expressed that it is still very confusing and extremely detailed.

RAHMAN
Mentioned that in current system you don't have that

CHRISTENSEN
Questioned as why can't everything that people use can't just be included on one budget?

LARSEN
Responded by saying that they call universal because people can buy and give it SU at the end to make it universal

CHRISTENSEN
Agreed that the stock should be replenished and said that it is good that way. Questioned saying it makes more sense to abolish universal resource, so that everybody pay according to their own budget

LARSEN
Disagreed and gave example of banner papers costing $1000.

CHRISTENSEN
Argued in favour of abolishing universal resource

RAHMAN
Said that everything has to fair market value

BROPHY
Argued against fair market value that it would disrupt everybody's campaign

CHRISTENSEN
Repeated that it is still very confusing and needs to be presented appropriately when it comes to Council.

LARSEN
Said he can't support something, which doesn't have the accountability he's looking for.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that you can account for and have everything you have in your budget.

BROPHY
It doesn't give exception for donated items

(LARSEN and BROPHY argued for universal resource)
(RAHMAN argued against universal resource)
BROPHY
Said that without the concept of universal resource (for items such as like paint brush) people can't bring in anything exciting and that's a problem

HOWIE
Said that If she building her signs beautiful at her dad's expense it should not go on to my budget

LARSEN
Agreed

CHRISTENSEN
Argued to abolish universal resources for the sake of simplicity

HOWIE
Said that she doesn't like universal resources for sustainability, and said that for cases like running out of money, universal resurface is good
Asked what is the problem with universal resource

LARSEN
Asked if they should leave it at CRO's discretion to decide in the

election period

(RAHMAN and HOWIE agreed with LARSEN)

LARSEN
Said in the campaign budget, if the CRO's office gets it, then it can be checked; Added that on a principle basis it can be paid back, and you don't have to share the things that you purchase but you can go to CRO office and deposit it there

(RAHMAN and HOWIE agreed with LARSEN)

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested using a Google or Excel spreadsheet to record all of the approved universal resources.

LARSEN
Said that they will word it with respect to ability to procure it
(Everybody agreed)

LARSEN
Suggested reading through

(All attendees read on and made changes as appropriate in Google Doc, made wording, spelling and grammar changes)

RAHMAN
Asked about time limit to file complaint

LARSEN
Said that it is 12 hours after approval as universal resource

CHRISTENSEN
Told LARSEN that changes will need to be made to 2300 and 2200 and said that if there is any problem another meeting will need to happen before it can go to Council.

HOWIE
Suggested ensuring that the numbers are fixed.

MOTION

LARSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #3, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, and amend Bylaw 2200

and 2300 to implement Universal Resources and Labors (Specific wording to be reviewed on Google Drive).

5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-06/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-06/4a **Department Association Legislation**

CHRISTENSEN
Vice President Banister will be bringing the first principles for this change to Bylaw Committee's next meeting. This will be Bill #5.

2016-06/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2016-06/5a **Next Meeting:** Thursday, July 28, 2016 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06

2016-06/5b CHRISTENSEN/BROPHY MOVE to adjourn at 9:30 PM.

5/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 21:30 (9:30 PM).

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
LARSEN/RAHMAN MOVE to approve the agenda	5/0/0 – CARRIED
HOWIE/RAHMAN MOVE to approve the minutes from June 30	5/0/0 – CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/BROPHY MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #2 and amend Bylaw 8100, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, to allow faculty associations to deviate from political policy within the following guidelines (Specific wording to be reviewed on Google Drive).	5/0/0 – CARRIED
LARSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #3, on the	5/0/0 – CARRIED

recommendation of Bylaw Committee, and amend Bylaw 2200 and 2300 to implement Universal Resources and Labors (Specific wording to be reviewed on Google Drive).	
CHRISTENSEN/BROPHY MOVE to adjourn at 9:30 PM	5/0/0 – CARRIED