The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students’ Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwaciwâskahikan (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>Pedro Almeida</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Barnes (SAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selen Erkut (SGS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Griffiths (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Kennedy (SAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kim (SGS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Majekodunmi</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton Meronyk (SAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muneeba Qadir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaryan Shetty (SAL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanisha Sahu</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES (SGC-2023-02-M)

2023-02/1 INTRODUCTION

2023-02/1a Call to Order
GRIFFITHS: Called the meeting to order at 1 PM.

2023-02/1b Approval of Agenda
SHETTY/ALMEIDA MOVE TO approve the meeting's agenda.
CARRIED

2023-02/1c Approval of Minutes
ALMEIDA/KENNEDY MOVE TO approve the previous meeting minutes.
CARRIED

2023-02/1d Chair’s Business
- Reminder: confidentiality, boundaries, reputation

2023-02/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

SHETTY: States that there's a conflict of interest with all the cases and one of
the cases is directly related to them as they're the complainant. Thinks it is
unfair to be involved in their case. Shares that they would like to be involved
in the discussion of other cases but with a neutral and unbiased opinion.
Adds that they had applied to be a volunteer with ISA and had signed an NDA
but there has been no direct involvement in terms of work.

2023-02/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2023-02/3a Discussion on conflict of interest (COI) and committee participation

GRIFFITHS: Thinks that it is not fair to have SHETTY adjudicate their case,
being a complainant. However, it is up to the committee to decide the
outcome and if SHETTY can participate in the other cases

COMMITTEE: Decides to not have SHETTY adjudicate the cases.

2023-02/3b Case Discussion
- #1
GRIFFITHS: States that there are two major elements of the case -
confidentiality and miscommunication within the organization.

KENNDY: Questions if the job position was open while the complainant was
being interviewed.

GRIFFITHS: Answers that there are no precise details but moving forward the
committee could recommend ISA on how they could communicate about the open positions.

BARNES: Questions why the email response while offering the position had the term “benefit of the doubt”.

GRIFFITHS: States that the hiring director’s perception of the complainant being rude is different from the majority of elements in the case. It could be possible that the hiring director’s decision was purely based on what happened in the interview if it was only them who made the decision.

KENNEDY: Points that it looks like the hiring director reported the behavior to the VP Internals. So it could be the VPs involved in the hiring process too.

GRIFFITHS: States that there’s no information available as of now regarding that. Also states that it was a failure of the organization’s process about the closed session details coming out in public.

Recommends taking extra time to deliver a resolution. So far the Committee has identified breaking of NDA as an issue and can flag the involvement of any execs during the hiring process. Moving forward the committee can make recommendations to the organization which will be discussed at the next meeting.

- #3

KENNEDY: Questions if there was a need to have two forms to be filled by the candidates. Thinks that the process could be simplified by having only one form for the social media submissions.

GRIFFITHS: States that this could be something that the committee could consider as a suggestion while making the final decision.

QADIR: Adds that there could be someone to cross-check the information and reach out to the candidates if there’s no submission made. there could be someone to reach out to candidates or have reminders saying there’s no information.

GRIFFITHS: Shares that the ISA constitution indicates that the CRO has the final say on the election issues. Hence it could be beneficial to know how the CRO was involved in this case.

ALMEIDA: Points out that it is a common complaint across the board that the elections are not accessible due to certain barriers.

GRIFFITHS: States that the next steps could be to get more information as needed by the committee. For this particular case, the committee could
recommend making changes to the election process or come up with a statement justifying if their actions were fair or not.

2023-02/3c  **Scope of committee mandate and exploring resolution options**
GRIFFITHS: Shares that they will share a document with the possible options with which the committee can go forward regarding these cases.

2023-02/3d  **GRIFFITHS/ALMEIDA move to extend decision deadline by 2 weeks**
CARRIED

2023-02/4  **INFORMATION ITEMS**
-  [Bylaw 5100](#)
-  [ISA Constitution](#)
-  Next Meeting: Friday, December 1st
  -  Important to attend!

2023-02/5  **ADJOURNMENT**
GRIFFITHS: Adjourned the meeting at 2 PM.