



University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Friday, February 6, 2016

1.00pm

SUB 6-06

AGENDA (BC 2015-13)

- 2015-13/1 INTRODUCTION**
- 2015-13/1a Call to Order**
- 2015-13/1b Approval of Agenda**
- 2015-13/1c Approval of Minutes**
- 2015-13/1d Chair's Business**
- 2015-13/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**
- 2015-13/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS**
- 2015-13/3a Bylaw 2300 Amendment: Slate Second Principles.**
- 2015-13/3b ESS FAMF Plebiscite Question**
- 2015-13/4 INFORMATION ITEMS**
- 2015-13/5 ADJOURNMENT**
- 2015-13/5a **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, February 16, 2015 @ 1.00pm in SUB 0-48.**

**BYLAW
COMMITTEE**

Tuesday Jan 26, 2016

1.00 pm

SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Justis Allard (Chair)		Y
Cody Bondarchuk		Y
Annie Duan		Y
Ben Thronson		Y
Brandon Christensen		Y
Thomas Patrick		Y
Bo Zhang		N
Navneet Khinda		Y
Levi Flaman		N
Fahim Rahman		Y

MINUTES (BC 2016-02)

2016-02/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-02/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order by ALLARD at 1.04 p.m.

2016-02/1b Approval of Agenda

CHRISTENSEN / DUAN moved to approve the agenda

8/0/0 CARRIED

2016-02/1c

Approval of Minutes

CHRISTENSEN / BONDARCHUK moved to approved the minutes
6/0/2 CARRIED (two abstentions)

2016-02/1d

Chair's Business

None

2016-02/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2015-10/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2015-10/3a

Bill #14 - Faculty Association Advocacy Amendment first principles.

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned about fixing the document by looking at the first principles in the meeting today, and to discuss things like appeals and interpreting bylaw. Suggested the next step to draft it using a step-wise approach

ALLARD

Said that his understanding is that FAs can approach die board in cases where the council had rejected their application based on things other than the process
Said that he is not sure where it will fall depending on the interpretation of bylaw, and that he is also not sure where it will be redundant

BONDARCHUK

Said that he doesn't know where it will be redundant and that the DIE Board bylaw have to be changed for appeals

KHINDA

DIE board can appeal but the student council is the final decider

ALLARD

It does not even relate to the decision of council

BONDARCHUK

Anytime council does something the members don't like they go to DIE Board

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he is for scrapping that section and suggested to discuss the actual merits of first principle

RAHMAN

Said that the university can almost decide when it comes to speaking to student

council, and it is not the process only but also policy that matters. Added that the decision that FAs make affect other students and that's why policy and appropriate procedural steps must be taken and that first principle is alright but second reading must be clear

CHRISTENSEN

Said he understands that there can be dramatic things, such as race, gender, etc. but that he is concerned with steps taken to allow for the SU to have a debate and have a serious wordings to strike it down, based on ideology

KHINDA

Questioned, what is the role of SU then when it passes on responsibility down?

CHRISTENSEN

Said that 99% of policies would stand, though he could see that there are some amendments

KHINDA

Said that policies are already applicable to some students, and tuition is applicable to all students

CHRISTENSEN

Said that tuition is important to everyone but if one FA wants to change it he doesn't see why it should be increased for all.

ALLARD

Said that it is difficult because the only policy that is being affected is tuition, and questioned if there is an issue where FA has no policy

KHINDA

Said that it is like making sure that the council is taking care

ALLARD

Said that tuition can be faculty specific and the tuition issue is not the primary function of SU, the incentive is different and it is advocating for the university or the government against charging us more

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he sees it the same way but he thinks that people should have the choice. Questioned, when FAs need more then how do they advocate? Said that in future you don't know things are going to be

KHINDA

Said that on the surface level it is a reactionary change, but there is no change on the fundamental structure of the organization. Added that individual FAs don't bring about changes and she hopes that the bylaw committee understands how

big a change this can be.

ALLARD

Said that he is less in favor of this change and that he agrees with Fahim to base it on policy rather than procedure

RAHMAN

Said that he is still in favor of making the change but wants to make sure that FAs don't deviate from policies

KHINDA

Said that last year everything was in a rush, law students did what they wanted to and it was really political. Added that, if one of the FAs came with enough evidence they did what they wanted and it was fine, and stated that perhaps they need stronger rules

DUAN

Questioned if there are any consequences

KHINDA

Answered that trust can be lost

BONDARCHUK

Said that by that logic anyone can break bylaw and if they did then they will also loose funding and representation in meetings and effectively get derecognized, and added that if a councillor breaks rules there should still be something in place

KHINDA

Explained that when it concerns recognition, the same students will be there Said that they are the SU , and are the only communicators to the board of governors, and that because SU is the only one that the government recognizes, FAs get recognition only if they stay with SU and thereby get certain privileges. Mentioned that, therefore there is a definite purpose in recognizing these groups and maintaining the power relationships

THRONDSO

Said that between FAs and SU, he will trust his FA to advocate him but won't be comfortable with FA going to a higher level like the SU

PATRICK

Said that FAs don't realize where the bar is but they need to set a high bar, and questioned: suppose they did a consultative process, do u think it is good to be specific?

KHINDA

Said that every faculty has the capacity to carry responsibility and that's fine but

there should be certain benchmark, and answered Ben's question, by saying that it will be good to take feedback to decide in council. Said that impacts will be far reaching to multiple faculties, and that tuition and fees impact all students. So it's not limited a group of students.

CHRISTENSEN

Expressed hope that plebiscites can be solution

KHIND

Questioned as to who then will decide on plebiscites?

ALLARD

Said that LSA had one last year, and the decision can be on a case by case basis

KHINDA

Emphasized that if they broke a political policy they will get trouble from council. Said that power relationship existed between dean and FAs and that in 2009, there was no dean and there was different relationship

Added that last year there was a power relationship and a conflict of interest and these are the things they need to consider for considering advocacy

Said that there is the issue of transition between FAs, right now FAs don't have cross institutional rights, and they are the only one in Alberta that delegated power down

BONDARCHUK

Said that one point is that FAs also rely of SU for office space and for permanent changes in policy

KHINDA

Said that they need to talk about impact governance

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it's like they want to facilitate advocacy and It will harder to make impacts if they want market modifiers

ALLARD

Questioned as to who can advocate against political policy, and if is COFA?

RAHMAN

Said that he is not for it

ALLARD

Said that people talk about ability and capacity of FAs and realistically FAs have no political policy, and that SU don't have social mandate but FAs do. Added that SU is a political organization because it does bylaws, etc.

KHINDA

Said that ideally they can do their jobs better by talking to FAs more because they talk to the government and to the board

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it is the dean that they talk to and they give him all he needs and that's not like advocating against policy

KHINDA

Said that each FA has agreement with dean and right now there is actual problem with that because there is no one hold the deal accountable. Added that LSA might be asking SU about day-to-day outcomes of advocacy and that's important

RAHMAN

Said that FAs should give feedback about what best for students

CHRISTENSEN

Agreed and said that should not be considered advocacy

RAHMAN

Said that you can help them create a better proposal but not let them contradict the political policy

BONDARCHUK

Said that it is confusing at board level because students get conflicting messages

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he can go to some students and ask to sign something and that can happen, adding to the confusion

BONDARCHUK

Said that random students can say something and create a lot of mess at the top level and therefore they should allowed them to take the positions so that communication will be easy

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it is why they say it should not go to the student council at all and that's how they will not have any conflict

KHINDA

Said that they don't have the legitimacy to advocate

RAHMAN

Said that the SU was responsible to planning

KHINDA

Said that it is a circular argument but tuition is a very departmental thing

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he will forward it to FA and SU can say what it wants

PATRICK

Asked, in what capacity FAs cannot take upper approval and still talk to the students?

RAHMAN

Said that FAs can speak to the dean and discuss with board of governor

ALLARD

Said that If FAs advocate what we are against, and if we weaken that, it worsens our argument when it comes to the board, and that that Fahim will bring it COFA

(BONDARCHUK and DUAN left the meeting)

2015-10/3b

Language Accessibility Bylaw

KHINDA

Mentioned about the bylaws in French

ALLARD

Said that the argument is an internal argument and, like standing orders bylaws, are external but can be translated to French

PATRICK

Said that for the general direction, he will take it to COFA senior board and they will have insightful inputs

2015-10/3c

Slate First Principles:

KHINDA

Questioned as to what will happen when there is no runner up, and if there is a vacancy

Also questioned about who will replace a person if he/she ran as an individual

CHRISTENSEN

Said that if the winter term person dies or resigns, the next fall person does it

RAHMAN

Said that it depends when the resignation is

(All agree to figure it out later)

PATRICK

Questioned, what it is in the middle of a term?

ALLARD

Said that everybody will fill the position they are assigned to and after that they next person will do it

PATRICK

Said that he was trying to word it in a way that they won't automatically extend it to future and then future council has to redo it, so that there won't be any conflict of interest and therefore it will be an non-issue

KHINDA

Said that the only problem is when people see slates for multiple positions, and there are things like coops

PATRICK

Said that in fourth principle, in actual bylaw for terms starting in between semester, it is stated that person will be allowed to hold that term, and that's a reasonably high standard

ALLARD

Said that to ensure a slate, one has to get to the CRO, and questioned if there is anything with CRO about holding authority over?

Added that the documentation that one submits when one runs, determines it and can't be changed.

PATRICK

Said that in council election the turnover is low key and how big a campaign is depends on the number of people in the ballot.

ALLARD

Said that you are splitting a small pool of votes and it is a bit of concern

PATRICK

Suggested that in future they must specify the margin to win, in terms of the process, and asked if doing so gives bylaws approval carry weight?

KHINDA

Answered that it does

ALLARD

Said that for certain faculties it might be problematic, and in engineering all

students can be coop but other program it is not true. Questioned that if slates don't have impact on government why restrict it?
Then said that it does not need to be restricted, and that the CRO can decide

PATRICK

Said that you have to go through the learning curve If you run a different year and it has to go through bylaw

THRONDSO

Said that council can have a full term proxy, which can be favourable to all faculties

PATRICK / CHRISTENSEN move to approve all the points outlined in Slate First Principles, which are as follows:

- Some programs have requirements that take students off campus for entire semesters at a time, and this can prove to be a substantial barrier to participation in student governance.
- When students are overly impeded from participating in governance because of their program, a lack of representation from that program is created.
- In order to best represent students, opportunities on Students Council must be available to as many students as possible.
- Elections could be structured to allow two individuals to run for a single position where they would hold the official title of the position one at a time, and switch the holder on a date defined before the election.
- Two individuals running or holding a position in such a manner will be referred to as a slate for the purpose of these principles, though a different term will be the official term used in bylaw.
- Slates will be tested in the coming year for students' council elections (not including executive elections), and may be subject to particular additional rules around elections and campaigning.
- The programs that allow their students to run in slates will be chosen based on how accessible being part of students council currently is for the students, and how effective slates would be in making it more accessible.

PATRICK

Questioned if they should go to council first and then COFA?

RAHMAN

Answered that they should go to the council first

2015-10/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2015-10/5

ADJOURNMENT

2015-10/5a **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, February 9, 2016 in SUB 6-06, at 1 pm

CHRISTENSEN / PATRICK moved to adjourn the meeting, at 2.26 pm
6/0/0 CARRIED

2015-10/5b

Meeting was adjourned at 2.26 p.m.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
CHRISTENSEN / DUAN moved to approve the agenda	8/0/0 – CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN / BONDARCHUK moved approve the minutes	6/0/2 – CARRIED (two abstentions)
PATRICK / CHRISTENSEN move to approve all the points outlined in Slate First Principles, which are as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some programs have requirements that take students off campus for entire semesters at a time, and this can prove to be a substantial barrier to participation in student governance.• When students are overly impeded from participating in governance because of their program, a lack of representation from that program is created.• In order to best represent students, opportunities on Students Council must be available to as many students as possible.• Elections could be structured to allow two individuals to run for a single position where they would hold the official title of the position one at a time, and switch the holder on a date defined before the election.• Two individuals running or holding a position in such a manner will be referred to as a slate for the purpose of these principles, though a different term will be the official term used in bylaw.• Slates will be tested in the coming year for students' council elections (not including executive elections), and may be subject to particular additional rules around elections and campaigning.• The programs that allow their students to run in slates will be chosen based on how accessible being part of students council currently is for the students, and how effective slates would be in making it more accessible.	6/0/0 – CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN / PATRICK motioned to adjourn the meeting	6/0/0 – CARRIED