



University of Alberta Students' Union
**FEE GOVERNANCE REVIEW
 COMMITTEE**

**1 December 2021
 6:00pm
 Google Meet**

We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students' Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students' Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT (Y/N)
Emily Kimani, Chair		N
Samar Barazesh		Y
Simran Dhillon		Y
Georgia Korfeh		Y
Samantha Gardner		Y
Andrew Batycki, (Acting Chair)		Y
Nathan Brandwein		Y
Marc Dumouchel		Y
Courtney Graham		N/A

MINUTES (FGRC 2021-04)

- 2021-04/1 INTRODUCTION**
- 2021-04/1a **Call to Order****
 BATYCKI: Called the meeting to order at 6:06 P.M.
- 2021-04/1b **Approval of Minutes****
 DHILLON/BARAZESH MOVE TO approve the minutes of the last meeting.
 CARRIED
- 2021-04/1c **Approval of Agenda****
- 2021-04/1d **Chair's Business****
- 2021-04/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2021-04/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2021-04/3a

Audit Fee Governance Report Presentation By Simran

DHILLON: Outlines the process of an audit and presents the proposed bylaw changes which would be required for the new, stream-lined audit process being proposed by Audit Committee. Also, argues for greater penalties should an audit not be completed. The proposed bylaw changes will make Audit Committee more functional and holistic.

Suggests that, to reflect these changes, Audit Committee should have a seat on CoFA. Having a seat on CoFA would be valuable to Audit Committee because most SRAs do not know how to create a FAMF proposal and current bylaws do not include a lot of necessary information to do so.

2021-04/3b

Fee Consultation

DHILLON: Fee consultation has been a consistent issue, particularly regarding last night's Students' Council FAMF proposals. Not enough students were polled regarding fee consultations and, often, consultation processes are not long enough for students to actively participate in.

GARDNER: Suggest creating a rubric to standardize the FAMF process as well as the adjudication completion timelines of FAMFs.

BRANDWEIN: Agrees and further suggests that councillors from specific faculty associations should liaison with their faculty association to ensure the success of FAMF proposals.

BATYCKI: Reiterates that there should be a consistent timeline instead of a single due date of December 15th.

DHILLON: Going further, questions in consultations should be standardized. Suggests, also, that at least 10% of a faculty should be consulted for a FAMF proposal to be considered successful. Notes that there should be ramifications if a FAMF proposal is not adequately presented when given as detailed of a rubric as the one that is being proposed.

KORFEH: Suggests having 20% as the baseline for student consultation.

DUMOUCHEL: Questions what constitutes the percentage of consultation.

DHILLON: Town hall attendance and survey participation would together count as the consultation percentage.

DUMOUCHEL: Wonders if reading an email would also count towards consultation.

BATYCKI: Defines consultation as an active process. Suggests that someone reading an email is not actively participating and, therefore, does not count

towards consultation percentages.

BRANDWEIN: Reasons that faculties could create incentives for participating in consultations.

BARAZESH: Disagrees with setting a standard percentage for student consultation. Suggests that having a baseline percentage will increase the struggle surrounding FAMF proposals and does not inherently serve the students

BATYCKI: Argues that having a percentage baseline is important. Suggests, as an alternative, having a clause which states that if all forms of consultation have been exhausted, and the baseline percentage of students has not been consulted, then the percentage limit doesn't need to be hit.

DUMOUCHEL: The percentage limit could change based on whether or not the FAMF proposal is new or recurring.

DHILLON: Every SRA knows when their FAMF needs to be renewed (typically 4 years) so it could become standard practice to start consultation the year before. Consulting 10% of the faculty is very feasible while enforcing the importance of consultation.

BRANDWEIN: A distinction needs to be made between those students who were consulted and those who simply didn't care to participate.

DUMOUCHEL: Agrees with Samar about not having the baseline percentage be so firm and suggests percentage baselines as targets rather than mandatory requirements. States that good consultation is evident regardless of percentage values.

Further states that a new vs old FAMF proposal is differentiated not by if it has been done previously but if the FAMF proposal has been done before and will continue to be done in a similar way or if the proposal is completely new.

DHILLON: Questions where FAMF money will go and what external funding has been collected for FAMFs.

Wonders what happens if it comes about that, retroactively, an SRA has not utilized their money properly?

BATYCKI: Suggests that it demonstrates that the SRA cannot handle money properly and, at the moment, they should not receive funding from the SU.

DHILLON: Agrees, but suggests that if Audit Committee doesn't properly do their job when conducting audits, SRAs can't reasonably be held accountable.

DUMOUCHEL: Concurr. Group executives change over the years. As such, new executives should not be held accountable for the actions of previous executives.

BATYCKI: Declares that this is where probation comes in. Probation doesn't

prevent the student group from operating, based on the actions of previous executives, it just means that the student group has to work more closely with the SU to ensure their success and proper management for the next year or two.

DHILLON: It's very easy for people to lie on audits as only 3 or 4 receipts are requested for audit approval. Bank statements should be utilized as well to help minimize the ability of SRAs to lie on their audits.

BARAZESH: Agrees that money shouldn't be taken away based on previous execs' actions. Agrees also with probation as a meaningful punishment.

DHILLON: A probationary period is important initially, but after multiple indiscretions, the money should eventually be taken away altogether.

BATYCKI: Money could be taken away for a year but, again, executives change every year, which makes financial punishments extremely difficult.

BRANDWEIN: SRAs should come up with different ways to garner money and not just rely on SU funding. External funding is important. Also, too many SRAs just garner money without utilizing it for their students.

BATYCKI: A lot of councillors struggle with the concept of an SRA asking for money when the SRA already has a surplus of funding.

DHILLON: It doesn't make sense for SRAs to automatically reserve funds for a savings account without using that money for students.

BATYCKI: ESA has to hold on to a certain amount of money in their account, as well as the ASA, based on outside restrictions. However, if there are no requirements from outside organizations, SRAs should not have large savings accounts.

BARAZESH: The surplus of SRA funding should be returned to the SU or otherwise utilized for students.

BATYCKI: Summarizes that the majority of the committee agrees with a percentage threshold for consultation, with an appropriate exception.

2021-03/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2021-03/5

ADJOURNMENT

BATYCKI: Adjourned the meeting at 7:01 P.M.