



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

**18 January 2022
 4:00pm
 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		Y
Samar Barazesh		Y
Simran Dhillon		Y
Georgia Korfeh		N
Samantha Gardner		Y
Andrew Batycki		Y
Nathan Brandwein		Y
Chris Beasley		N/A
Ethan Hunter		N/A
Courtney Graham		N/A

MINUTES (FGRC 2021-05-M)

- 2021-05/1 INTRODUCTION**
- 2021-05/1a **Call to Order****
 KIMANI: Called the meeting to order at 4:06 P.M.
- 2021-05/1b **Approval of Minutes****
- 2021-05/1c **Approval of Agenda****
- 2021-05/1d **Chair's Business****
- 2021-05/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2021-05/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2021-05/3a

BYLAW 6100 Series

KIMANI: Questions what is wrong with Bylaw 6100 and how it can be fixed. Further questions if a new bylaw should be introduced to replace Bylaw 6100.

BATYCKI: For DFUs, consultation processes and expectations need to be spelled out. Consultation processes have to be outlined, particularly because some DFUs do not have the capacity to conduct consultation to specific standards.

DHILLON: Questions the timeline for DFUs.

KIMANI: In the Bylaw 2000s series, which outlines SRA proposals, there is are much clearer instructions compared to the Bylaw 6000s series. The process should be more standardized, as the the two different bylaw series give conflicting information. Standardizing the process through creating a new bylaw, which combines the processes of both DFUs and SRA approvals and the information of both the Bylaw 2000s series and the Bylaw 6000s series could be a solution.

BATYCKI: Bylaws have timelines in them, but there is a lot of confusion each year regarding these timelines. If the bylaw is redone, each DFU needs to be very clear what the timelines are and more disciplinary actions need to be taken if DFUs do not follow the process, especially once that process is very clearly outlined.

KIMANI: There is no significance of choosing dates for DFU and SRA submissions: they are arbitrary and can be changed if the committee sees fit.

DHILLON: Agrees and suggests changing the dates for DFU and SRA submission, whilst clarifying timelines.

KIMANI: There are differences when creating a fee or maintaining a fee or updating a fee for DFUs and SRAs, which could provide more flexibility for fee deadlines.

BEASLEY: If a point is reached where the dates are successfully published, it is reasonable to not grant DFUs which do not reach deadlines.

KIMANI: If a DFU forgets to send in a question, as written in bylaws currently, it falls to the SU to create the question for their referendum.

BEASLEY: States that that feels like a privilege afforded to groups, not a necessity.

BARAZESH: Agrees that dates need to be more clearly outlined in the bylaws. As well, if a student group does not send in a question, there needs to be another way in which to demonstrate a student group's engagement with the fee.

BATYCKI: SRAs and DFUs need to disclose some sort of awareness and participation before a fee renewal. Wonders if DFUs should be required to present about their fee renewal to Students' Council.

DHILLON: Agrees.

KIMANI: Questions when a presentation would be required.

BATYCKI: States that an in-depth presentation would be required during a fee creation. A less robust presentation would be required for a free renewal.

KIMANI: States that one deadline for all proposals would be ideal. Currently, there are too many deadlines in the Bylaws, which makes it confusing to know when the actual deadline is.

BRANDWEIN: Suggests that having the same deadline for everything creates less confusion but also creates more work for the Fee Governance Review Committee. Inquires what workload is manageable for the committee and suggests that having multiple deadlines is more manageable for the committee.

BARAZESH: Agrees that varied deadlines is more manageable for the committee. Proposes that, instead of having a deadline of December 15, the deadline should be January 15.

KIMANI: Suggests that, due to elections in February, having the deadlines in November and December would be better,

BATYCKI: Suggests that November 15 should be the deadline for proposals and December 15 should be the deadline for renewals.

KIMANI: Agrees.

2021-05/3b

DHILLON'S PRESENTATION

DHILLON: Will present on the 8000s series of Bylaws. Would, specifically, like to retire Bylaw 8400.

Bylaw 8200 is most relevant to the current conversation. Questions if CPAs should be included in Bylaw 8200. Would like to make small changes to the wording of Bylaw 8400.

States that there is a current 5 year cap on FAMF proposals. Questions if the SU should reach out, in regards to FAMF proposals, to establish better communication. Argues that the SU needs to provide current information for student groups, especially during elections. Switching Audit from a trimesterly system to a bi-yearly system is something that needs to be included in the Bylaw 8000s series.

There is currently a lot of confusion on how SRA fees should be created. To decrease said confusion, the following items should be added to the Bylaw 8000s series: mandate of the organization, what fees will be given to students, what the fee will do for students and why that SRA needs that fee. External funding should be considered before asking for student funding. Further questions financial

controls regarding SU funding.

BRANDWEIN: ESA has to keep a certain amount of money within their bank account, as required by the Alberta Teaching Association (ATA). States that this is a situation where it is appropriate for SRAs to keep an excess of funds within their account.

DHILLON: It is not necessary to store funds, unless mandated by outside organizations such as the ATA.

BRANDWEIN: Agrees and states that it should definitely be based on the student group and should not be mandated.

BATYCKI: Points of alternative revenues should not be completely removed. Some departmental associations really do need to keep money in their accounts.

KIMANI: Notes that some points of the 8000s series of Bylaws are repetitive and could be consolidated, such as Section 7.

2021-03/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2021-03/5

ADJOURNMENT

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