



University of Alberta Students' Union

# Bylaw COMMITTEE

Thursday, June 2, 2016

6:00PM

SUB 6-06

## AGENDA (BC 2016-03)

2016-03/1            INTRODUCTION

2016-03/1a           **Call to Order**

2016-03/1b           **Approval of Agenda**

2016-03/1c           **Approval of Minutes**

2016-03/1d           **Chair's Business**

2016-03/1d           May 31, 2016 - Meeting summary with President Rahman and VP Banister

2016-03/2            QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-03/2a           Faculty Association political policy diversion discussion

2016-03/3            COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-03/3a           Bill #1 - *Vacancy Petitions*  
CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the first principles of Bill #1 and implement Vacancy Petitions as a mechanism to fill vacant Students' Council seats:

First Principles

1. Full representation of all Faculties on Students' Council is ideal to ensure all undergraduate students have

representation.

2. Current mechanisms to fill vacancies on Students' Council, including fall by-elections and councillors-in-waiting, are not always effective.
3. Smaller Faculties often have vacancies after the fall by-elections and therefore remain vacant, without representation, for the entirety of the elected term.
4. A new mechanism shall be created to fill vacancies after the period of the fall by-election.
5. Immediately following the by-election period, the office of Discover Governance shall create a petition form for all faculties with vacancies and disseminate the form broadly, including to the Faculty Association in which the vacancy is held.
6. Any student member in the faculty with a vacancy shall be eligible to complete the petition form which will require signatures from a prescribed number of students in that faculty based on past elections.
7. After the valid petition is submitted, it shall come into effect after 7 days unless another petition is received.
8. In the event that two or more students submit petitions, the student with the higher amount of signatures shall be the winner.
9. Bylaw 100 and other pertinent Bylaws shall be amended to implement this mechanism.
10. This mechanism shall be called a "Vacancy Petition."

**2016-03/4**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

**2016-03/5**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**2016-03/5a**

**Next Meeting:**

**BYLAW  
COMMITTEE**

Tuesday May 19, 2016

6.00 pm  
SUB 6-06

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

**ATTENDANCE**

**MINUTES (BC 2016-02)**

**2016-02/1      INTRODUCTION**

**2016-02/1a      Call to Order**  
Meeting called to order by CHRISTENSEN at 6.03 p.m.

**2016-02/1b      Approval of Agenda**  
CHRISTENSEN  
Said that the two things sent to him are items 2c and 2d  
  
PACHES / LARSEN moved to approve the agenda  
5/0/0 CARRIED

**2016-02/1c      Approval of Minutes**  
LARSEN / MCKINLAY moved to approve the minutes  
5/0/0 CARRIED

**2016-02/1d      Chairs Business**  
CHRISTENSEN  
Said that Donald will come in June, for which he will get a firm date

2016-02/2

QUESTION & DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-02/2a

**Discussion of current projects and next steps**

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned about the need to focus on: discussion of current projects and next steps; projects to be accomplished this year; and about slates  
Said that the committee will hold discussion about: autonomy and about vacancy appointments;  
Also indicated that Reed has issues about elections

LARSEN

Said that he has identified 9 items from elections, and will discuss with them with CRO  
Most of them have to do with advertisement, internet, and classroom discussion, and also said that there are concerns such as why can't they campaign in the SUB.

PACHES

Mentioned that with certain specific election bylaws, Mark can answer some questions, and it is good to feel free to use any resources, but old boys have rules that restrict it

LARSEN

Said that one can be creative without affecting elections rules, and if you want to do something creative you want to bring Google blog, as an example

PACHES

Mentioned that he didn't have a chance to review the applicable operating policy and bylaws

LARSEN

Said that about attendance policy, he can imagine that at the end of year somebody might bring it up, and that can be done by standing order

CHRISTENSEN

Said that arguments can be made but it is complicated but has a place for discussion, as they can talk about bylaw changes  
Mentioned that with standing orders you can't punish anyone

LARSEN

Said that the next time CAC meets they will change their room for attendance policy, and for them to change their standing orders they need to change their attendance policy

PACHES

Said that the goal is to expand what has been done

LARSEN

Mentioned that they take attendance, and if you miss the meetings and don't contact the chair, then without your knowledge you will be removed from the Bylaw Committee; that it is first step towards a larger attendance policy; and that CAC states that if you miss three meetings you are removed from the committee, and need to be elected again to be back in the committee

McKINLAY

Stated that 2 % of the candidates will get back in July

PROCHNAU

Indicated that it will be done by 23rd on Dean's meeting

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he is meeting on the 31st with Fahim and Marina, and that last year it was fixed but he would normally be flexible. Added that he will keep the committee posted

Said that with appointments, there are a few options they talked and will see what it best, and mentioned that they can go to COFA as well for the same

**2016-02/2b**

**Additional project brainstorming**

CHRISTENSEN

Said that they can do brainstorming for the same ideas  
Mentioned that last year it was included in first principles, that all FAs can appoint, but some FAs are more robust than others  
Asked about who is in favour of FA appointment after by-elections

LARSEN

Said that he will be in favour of secondary check

PACHES

Said that it is too autonomous and he is of the opinion to have representation, but would ask if somebody wants to consider running

McKINLAY

Said that councillors are democratically elected and if somebody doesn't want to run won't run

CHRISTENSEN

It's of benefit to have after by-election

PROCHNAU

Mentioned that it is not lack of drive to fight elections but it is that they are clever

McKINLAY

Said that FAs pick whoever they want

CHRISTENSEN

Said that if somebody chose not to run, it is less intimidating for people; for faculty of medicine (as an example) it is less intense, and people are nervous in running for public office; and therefore It is like a trade-off

McKINLAY

Mentioned that FAs only picks people that are already involved

PACHES

Said that they can put on a public quest for application and it will protect individuals that are open and that way they can have a superior application

LARSEN

(Jotted down a diagram in the white board and pointed out there and explained about how seats are filled, i.e. elected, appointed by CRO, FAs, nominated, or re-elected by petition)

PROCHNAU

Said that if he needs to get 25 % that is a thousand students, and he only know 20 people all year and doesn't know anyone outside

LARSEN

Said that a decent number is half of the faculty

PROCHNAU

Said that if you are nominated it is not that difficult

LARSEN

Said that you can go to classes and say hey I want to be your councillor

CHRISTENSEN

Agreed but said that there are issues, like people have to know that it exists

PROCHNAU

Said that he doesn't like SU doing it but FA to do it

LARSEN

Said that he doesn't believe in people who don't run, and most of time they are lazy, and that for getting a council of different people, they can also have people who are quite but also nevertheless engaged

Mentioned that he is in favor of petition and not the FAs conducting it

CHRISTENSEN

Said that FAs should conduct it

McKINLAY

Said that her faculty is unengaged and she has doesn't know how do get then involved

LARSEN

Mentioned that a strong FA will find the process and a way to do it

CHRISTENSEN

Proposed a hybrid approach

Said that CRO should develop a form for nomination package and post it in websites, and FAs should advertise it

PROCHNAU  
Expressed disliking about the petition idea

LARSEN  
Asked if a bylaw needs to be written

CHRISTENSEN  
Said that it is a big change

PACHES  
Said that DG officer or Rebecca can do that

McKINLAY  
Mentioned that like nominating, appointing happens after by-election

LARSEN  
(sketches in white board)  
Said that Petition or nomination can be done by DG or Rebecca, and in GP or FA, if you have more than necessary then it will be an election

CHRISTENSEN  
Asked if there is deadline, how do you get most people to do it

LARSEN  
Said that if it is more than necessary you will go all the way back, and the easiest fix is to do before by-election

PACHES  
Indicated that he is not in favour before by-election

CHRISTENSEN  
Asked how about two people for one seat?

LARSEN  
Said that they can go for more signatures obviously

PROCHNAU  
Questioned what if it gets tied

CHRISTENSEN  
Answered that then coin toss is the solution

LARSEN  
Said that there is no budget and there are no posters  
Questioned about the time frame

CHRISTENSEN  
Proposed a ten day period for time frame

LARSEN  
Said that it can be a rolling nomination and a 7 day period

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he needs to discuss what is the cut off and what the numbers will be and also wants this written down

PROCHNAU

Said that run by-election the turnout has to be 50 plus one, and if no body turns out then it has to be average of the university

Questioned as to how about taking 15 or 20 % and considering the higher number

LARSEN

For engineering proposed 25 %

McKINLAY

Proposed 13 % as in council

PROCHNAU

Said that if you have a really strong turnout then it is not bad

LARSEN

Said that he wants the number to be low because the purpose is fill the seat

CHRISTENSEN

Confirmed that at last 13 % of the people have to sign

CHRISTENSEN

Proposed the last turnout in their faculty's main election

PROCHNAU

Said that that if the only election was a by-election then use that

LARSEN

Said that in faculties you have many numbers , like 8 different numbers and proposed one number for all of them

Said that, otherwise, it will be complicated

PROCHAU

Said that it is complicated and proposed picking the higher number

LARSEN

Said that if it is higher it is 15 % flat rate, and if is lower, then it is 3.4 %, and mentioned that flat rate is not good

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it is either the council average or the faculty turnout at the last main election

Asked as to how it would affect bylaws?

Mentioned that things are spread all over

PROCHNAU

Asked about which one is more amicable or favourable

LARSEN

Said that if elections are coming, it will be DG



CHRISTENSEN

Said that Bylaw 100 has to be amended and they have to touch upon 2100 and 2400  
Mentioned that they have to add one number to bylaw 100  
Said that it is about people going out and talking to people and is a practical way

PROCHNAU

Said that it is hard to explain

LARSEN

Said that it is like a nomination package

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he wants to talk about the policy diversions, and mutually agreeable and beneficial processes

Mentioned that there are various reasons, and generally they are for creating a framework, but there are several steps.

Said that they talked about having a referendum about more funding for increased tuition, and mentioned about law students recommending that referendum be appraised by council

PACHES

Questioned if it is political policy or any other policy by giving an example of deferred maintenance.

Also questioned if it is specifically for FAs

Mentioned that it will be having to be clear about specifics of policies and said that in political policy, the word political has to be scratched out

CHRISTENSEN

Said that they need to outline what is relevant to FAs and if there is any academic material

LARSEN

Drew in white board - and asked if FAs have the right to deviate

Said that they are ejected on their own and they are accountable to their own constituencies

PROCHNAU

Said that SU doesn't have the right to tell them not to have an opinion

LARSEN

Said that it has to have accountability and some sort of election process, and they have to point out to contradictions in good faith

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it needs better explanation

(Read out three or four things that have to happen)

Mentioned that it needs to be centrally run and not like a Google poll by 15 people and that in the last years there was a bit of politics therefore he is not happy with FAs doing it

Mentioned that it is the debate but needs a framework

McKINLAY

Said that it needs to be through SU so that it is secure, done right and online

LARSEN

Agreed that it is not bad and said that you have to amend political policy, and they have the ability to change political policy

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned that there has to be evidence of referendum, which doesn't change anything but is a checkbox, and that two years ago it happened  
Added that if there is no one there and the only recourse is SU deregulate what FAs get  
Asked for thoughts

PACHES

Appreciated FAs, and said that if they want to advocate on the behalf of students it is fine, and then there will be power for lobbying, and unified voice is better than broken voice. Said that he has seen both sides of it but is yet to make his decision. Added that if COFA is powerful, it will solve the issues, and there will be faculties to convince other faculties

PROCHNAU

Disagreed and said that if one faculty says that it benefits and another says it doesn't there is no way it can be changed, and that students don't know that COFA exists

PACHES

If bylaw were stronger this will not be an issue, and it would be more effective for COFA to be an advisory body

McKINLAY

Said that FAs should have the power to deviate and not to do whatever they want, in order to avoid problems  
Said that last year FAs had some privileges but it is not like whatever they wanted

PACHES

Said that they are trying to create a message and it's like strength in a unified voice

CHRISTENSEN

Said that the voice is disproportionately representing the faculties and they want a general mould

PROCHNAU

Said that he is for auditing the final and doesn't know why people can't go with it  
Mentioned that in engineering they had market modifier but got nothing out of it, it did not be fit them  
Questioned about why people can't be given the option to state what they don't want.  
Said that his argument is for having FAs voice their opinion and by that he is talking about student and their rights and not FAs right  
Said that its like if your councillor is one councillor then he gets silenced, and it's like fixing one implies fixing all

PACHES

Said that he understands the logic and background, and stated that this type of problem will be there in future

Questioned if they are doing a disservice, and are they then a little guy and a bad guy? Also questioned if they can advocate the FAs to be a more powerful voice?

PROCHNAU

Argued with the example of US congress and centralization of power, and said that if they have FAs if they don't have power

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he is going to meet with VP furnace and asked if he should say that he is going to bring this up?

PACHES

Suggested that one key takeaways is to bridge the gap, in order to give way to give them, a voice that is more powerful

CHRISTENSEN

Asked about telling the SU that FAs need more money?

PACHES

If FAs need help the SU helps, and all political policies are created by student council

PROCHNAU

Said that there are outstanding issues and there is outrage

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned that two items that were started were not on agenda

Indicated that the next meeting on June 2

Said that there is a new administrative assistant, and that anything on agenda just be emailed to her by 4 pm on the Wednesday before the meeting on Thursday

Mentioned that in the next meeting he will have a hard copy of his conversation with Marina

2016-02/3

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2016-02/4

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-02/5

**ADJOURNEMENT**

CHRISTENSEN /PROCHNAU moved to adjourn the meeting

Carried 5/0/0

Meeting Adjourned at 7.38 pm

2016-02/5a

**NEXT MEETING**

6 pm on June 2, 2016

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

MOTION	VOTES
PACHES / LARSEN moved to approve the agenda	5/0/0 – CARRIED

LARSEN / MCKINLAY moved to approve the minutes	5/0/0 – CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN /PROCHNAU moved to adjourn the meeting at 7.38 pm	5/0/0 – CARRIED