



University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, October 10, 2017
6:00 PM
SUB 6-06**

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, Sauteaux, 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.

AGENDA (BC 2017-07)

2017-07/1 INTRODUCTION

2017-07/1a Call to Order

2017-07/1b Approval of Agenda

2017-07/1c Approval of Minutes

2017-07/1d Chair's Business

2017-07/1e Attendance

2017-07/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2017-07/2a DFU Updates - CREF

2017-07/2b Restrictions on Campaign Activities - Expanding to non-University owned Fraternities/Sororities?

2017-07/2c DIE Board Ruling 2017-01 Review

See BC 2017-07.01

2017-07/2d DIE Board Ruling 2017-02 Review

See BC 2017-07.02

2017-07/2e Students' Council Seat distribution

See BC 2017-07.03

2017-07/2f General Bylaw Review - Reminder (Bylaws: 100, 600, 6100, 3000, 4000, 8200, 2200, 2300).

2017-07/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2017-07/3a **Bill #4 - Removing Student Group Operating Policy Requirements - *Second reading***

PACHES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #4 - Removing Student Group Operating Policy Requirements, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles.

1. Bylaw 5600 currently requires that SU operating policy have “the following categories for student groups: registration requirements, privileges and services, administrative framework, constitutional reviews of student groups, grounds for suspension and termination, and granting.”
2. There is no current rationale for why this requirement exists under Bylaw 5600.
3. Operating policy is generally considered an internal Students’ Union document for the organization itself, specifically employee training, rather than to be applied to external student groups.
4. Bylaw 5600 shall be amended to remove operating policy requirements.

(See Google Drive for specific second reading changes).

2017-07/3b **Bill #5 - Bylaw 100 Amendments - *Drafting Process***

2017-07/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2017-07/4a BC-2017-06 Meeting Minutes

See BC 2017-07.04

2017-07/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2017-07/5a **Next meeting:** Tuesday, October 24, 2017 @ 6:00PM in SUB 6-06.

**DISCIPLINE, INTERPRETATION, AND ENFORCEMENT (DIE) BOARD
RULING # 2017-01**

Sunday v Students' Union (SU) Council

Hearing Date: August 18th, 2017

DIE Board Panel Members: Alin Florea, Chief Tribune
Landon Haynes, Tribune
Karamveer Lalh, Tribune

Appearing for the Applicant: Nathan Sunday

Appearing for the Respondent: Delane Howie (on behalf of Brandon Christensen)

The DIE Board is unanimous in the following decision.

[1] After reviewing the submitted materials and hearing the oral arguments, the Panel has unanimously concluded that the application is outside the jurisdiction of DIE Board. Therefore, the Panel cannot currently comment on the content and substance of the Students' Union motion, nor any hypothetical scenarios arising from it.

[2] Bylaw 1500 *Judiciary of the Students' Union Bylaw* states at section 2 "Mandate" that the "Board is the organ of the Students' Union responsible for the interpretation and enforcement of Students' Union legislation." Section 3 "Scope of Cases", further clarifies that "[t]he scope of the Board shall be limited to actions and appeals brought before it that: (a) initiate a complaint about a contravention of Students' Union legislation; (b) request an interpretation of Students' Union legislation or; (c) appeal rulings made by the Chief Returning Officer during the Students' Union's general elections."

[3] The current application before the Board involves Students' Council motion SC-2017-06/8a. "Legislation" is defined in Bylaw 100 at section 1(e) as including only "(i) Students' Union bylaws, (ii) Student's Union political policies, (iii) Students' Council standing orders, and (iv) general orders of Students' Council." It is this Board's opinion that a Students' Council motion is not a bylaw, political policy, standing order, or general order. Since DIE Board is currently limited to actions and appeals that directly involve Students' Union legislation or rulings made by the Chief Returning Officer, and since Students' Union Council motions are not considered to be legislation, commenting on the motion falls outside the current jurisdiction of DIE Board.

[4] If Students' Union Council intends for DIE Board to be able to provide opinions on the hypothetical results of motions which are not yet legislation, then Bylaw 1500 would have to be amended and such specific functions be explicitly added to section 2

“Mandate” and section 3 “Scope of Cases”. Considering the plain meaning of the phrase “the scope of the Board shall be limited to” in section 3 “Scope of Cases”, and without any other explicit statutory authorization, DIE Board at this time can only provide interpretations, rulings, and decisions on the specific types of items explicitly listed under sections 2 and 3 of Bylaw 1500.

[5] At this stage, it may be useful to explain the Canadian federal and provincial approach to issues of this kind. In Canadian law, a “reference question” (also called “abstract review”) is a submission by either the Federal or a provincial government to the Supreme Court of Canada or appellate court, asking for an advisory opinion on a major legal issue, usually involving the constitutionality (legality) of legislation, *including proposed legislation*. An example of a specific statutory authorization section that allows a court to answer such a question is section 53 “Special Jurisdiction -- References by Governor in Council -- Referring certain questions for opinion” of the *Supreme Court Act*.¹ The relevant excerpt of section 53 of the *Supreme Court Act* is attached at the end of this decision in Appendix I, in order to exemplify in explicit detail how such an enabling provision might be worded in order to allow a future special jurisdiction to exist in terms of referring certain questions for opinion. An example when a reference question was put to the Supreme Court of Canada was *Reference Re Same-Sex Marriage*² where the Supreme Court of Canada was asked to consider the constitutional validity of the Federal Government’s **proposal** for an Act “respecting certain aspects of legal capacity for marriage for civil purpose.” Even though the proposed Act had not yet received Royal Assent, the Supreme Court of Canada still had the authority to discuss and comment on the constitutional validity of the proposed Act.

[6] Allowing a court, administrative tribunal, or a students’ union judiciary to comment on proposed legislation has many advantages. Most importantly, reference questions can save significant time and effort in the legislative process. If a decision-making board can comment on a legislation-creating organization’s proposed legislation, then that board can help ensure that the organization does not waste time and effort trying to pass what will eventually be considered unlawful legislation. In effect, a reference question can save perhaps months or years of work if it is determined that a legislation-creating organization is trying to pass illegal legislation – and such proposed legislation could then be amended or discarded before continuing through the legislative process. Thus, the legislation-creating organization can be given fair and early warning of the opinion of the decision-making board if the legislation came to pass – months, if not years – before that legislation actually comes to pass.

Application dismissed.

¹ *Supreme Court Act*, RSC 1985, c S-26, s 53.

² *Reference re Same-Sex Marriage*, 2004 SCC 79, [2004] 3 SCR 698.

Appendix I -- *Supreme Court Act* -- Section 53 Excerpt

Special Jurisdiction

References by Governor in Council

Referring certain questions for opinion

53 (1) The Governor in Council may refer to the Court for hearing and consideration important questions of law or fact concerning

- (a) the interpretation of the *Constitution Acts*;
- (b) the constitutionality or interpretation of any federal or provincial legislation;
- (c) the appellate jurisdiction respecting educational matters, by the *Constitution Act, 1867*, or by any other Act or law vested in the Governor in Council; or
- (d) the powers of the Parliament of Canada, or of the legislatures of the provinces, or of the respective governments thereof, whether or not the particular power in question has been or is proposed to be exercised.

Other questions

(2) The Governor in Council may refer to the Court for hearing and consideration important questions of law or fact concerning any matter, whether or not in the opinion of the Court *ejusdem generis* with the enumerations contained in subsection (1), with reference to which the Governor in Council sees fit to submit any such question.

Questions deemed important

(3) Any question concerning any of the matters mentioned in subsections (1) and (2), and referred to the Court by the Governor in Council, shall be conclusively deemed to be an important question.

Opinion of Court

(4) Where a reference is made to the Court under subsection (1) or (2), it is the duty of the Court to hear and consider it and to answer each question so referred, and the Court shall certify to the Governor in Council, for his information, its opinion on each question, with the reasons for each answer, and the opinion shall be pronounced in like manner as in the case of a judgment on an appeal to the Court, and any judges who differ from the opinion of the majority shall in like manner certify their opinions and their reasons.

**DISCIPLINE, INTERPRETATION, AND ENFORCEMENT (DIE) BOARD
RULING # 2017-02**

Reference Re Section 7 and Section 21 of Bylaw 100

Hearing Date: August 24, 2017

DIE Board Panel Members: Alin Florea, Chief Tribune
Landon Haynes, Tribune
Karamveer Lalh, Tribune

Appearing for the Applicant: Saadiq Sumar

The DIE Board is unanimous in the following interpretation.

BACKGROUND

[1] The Students' Union, on behalf of Speaker Saadiq Sumar, made an application on August 21, 2017 requesting an interpretation of section 7 and section 21 of Bylaw 100 of the Students' Union Bylaws (the "Bylaws"). The relevant portions of the two sections of Bylaw 100 are reproduced below:

7 Start-Up

...

3. The Speaker shall convene and Chair the introductory meeting as soon as practical after all elections have been completed except any portion of the meeting in which the outgoing Speaker is running for re-election.
4. At the introductory meeting, the Students' Council-elect shall
 - a. select the ensuing year's Speaker of Students' Council; and
 - b. select the compositions of the ensuing year's standing committees; and
 - c. set the meeting schedule for the ensuing year's Students' Council, with the first meeting to occur not before the last scheduled meeting of the current Students' Council and not later than May 7, and the last meeting to occur not later than May 7 of the succeeding year.

5. At the first meeting of any year's Students' Council, all members of that Students' Council except the General Manager of the Students' Union shall be installed in a ceremony to be presided over by:

- a. the previous year's Students' Union President, if available; or
- b. the previous year's Speaker of Students' Council, if the previous year's President is unavailable; or
- c. the incoming Speaker of Students' Council, if neither the previous year's President nor the previous year's Speaker of Students' Council is available.

6. Upon the execution of (5), power is transferred from one year's Students' Council to the next.

21 Attendance Regulations

1. Attendance is defined as attending for at least one (1) roll call of attendance.
2. Councillors are expected to attend, send a Proxy or Councillor-Designate, to meetings of Students' Council as minimum expectation of holding office.
3. A Councillor shall have an attendance record of at least 50% of meetings each trimester.
4. Formal attendance percentages shall be calculated for each Councillor at the end of every trimester by the Speaker, and be provided as an information item to Students' Council.
 - a. A leave of absence for elections shall not be accounted into the attendance percentage.
5. Where a Councillor has less than 50% attendance at the end of the trimester, they shall be declared in contravention to this Bylaw and be automatically removed as a member of Students' Council.
 - a. This regulation shall only apply at the end of the Spring/Summer and Fall trimesters.

[2] “Introductory meeting” is defined in Section 1(d) as “the annual meeting of those persons elected to serve on Students’ Council for the coming year”.

[3] The questions posed to DIE Board in this application are as follows:

1. Do both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7? What are the consequences if this does not happen? Can the first meeting occur before May 1?

2. Is the introductory meeting counted towards councilor attendance for the Spring/Summer term? This meeting is unique to this term.

ANALYSIS

1. Do both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7? What are the consequences if this does not happen? Can the first meeting occur before May 1?

[4] Section 7(4)(c) of the Bylaws make it clear that the first meeting shall not be scheduled later than May 7. Since the first meeting is set at the introductory meeting, it follows that the introductory meeting cannot occur later than May 7. Hence, the answer to the question: “Do both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7?” should be answered in the affirmative.

[5] Turning to the last part of the first question (“Can the first meeting occur before May 1?”), section 7(4)(c) makes it clear that the first meeting is to occur not before the last scheduled meeting of the current Students’ Council. On a plain reading of this provision, it would seem that it is possible for the first meeting to occur before May 1 if the last scheduled meeting of the current Students’ Council is also scheduled before May 1. Subject to any Bylaws that have not been brought to our attention that add additional conditions to these dates, it is our interpretation that the first meeting can occur before May 1, under the right conditions (i.e., the last scheduled meeting of the current Students’ Council is held in April, and the introductory meeting is held in April).

[6] Turning now to the second part of the first question (“What are the consequences if [both the introductory meeting and the first meeting do not occur before May 7]?”) -- the Bylaws are not as clear.

[7] Discipline and penalties due to breaches of the Bylaws are comprehensively dealt with in other sections of the Bylaws (see for example section 47 of Bylaw 2200). However, these provisions deal with specific circumstances and do not apply to all breaches. In this case, it appears that Bylaw 100 is silent about what remedy would be available if either the introductory meeting or the first meeting do not occur before May 7.

[8] Perhaps the only relevant section of Bylaw 100, with regards to the current issue, is section 5(2):

5 Impeachment of President, a Vice President, or Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative

...

2. A motion to impeach the President, a Vice President, or the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative must be made in good faith and only for one or more of the following reasons:

- a A significant breach or multiple breaches of Students' Union Bylaw, or Political Policy. It is required that that such contraventions be supported by D.I.E. Board Rulings.

Hence, if either the President, a Vice President, or the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative had the authority to "set the meeting schedule for the ensuing year's Students' Council," then if the first meeting was set after May 7 under this authority, this may constitute a breach for the purpose of section 5 of Bylaw 100. However, section 7 of Bylaw 100 makes it clear that it is the "Students' Council-elect" that shall "set the meeting schedule for the ensuing year's Students' Council." This implies a group decision-making process, probably in a democratic setting, rather than the responsibility of a single individual. Even if the date-setting rested with the authority of the President, a Vice President, or the Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative, it would be an open question whether or not scheduling the first meeting after May 7 would be a "significant" breach within the meaning of section 5(2).

[9] In light of the observations listed in the previous paragraph, it is our interpretation that the Bylaws lack an appropriate provision to deal with the consequences if the first meeting of Students' Council occurs after May 7. While section 29 of Bylaw 1500 gives the DIE Board a general power of enforcement ("If the Board finds that an application for action or application for appeal requires action, the Board may make any order proscribing or prescribing any remedy it considers appropriate and just in the circumstances") it is our opinion that this provision would not be much help when, for example, the first meeting was held on May 8, rather than May 7. If

an application is brought after May 8, there can be no “application for action” since the “action” (i.e., the first meeting) has already taken place. If the application is brought before the May 8 first meeting, then the DIE Board may be able to issue a ruling mandating that the meeting be held on May 7 (or before), but this cannot be done if the meeting has already taken place, albeit later than the Bylaws demand.

2. Is the introductory meeting counted towards councilor attendance for the Spring/Summer term? This meeting is unique to this term.

[10] Section 21 of Bylaw 100 speaks exclusively about the attendance of “Councillors” rather than “Councillors-elect” who are the individuals in attendance at the introductory meeting as the term “Students’ Council-elect” is used in section 7(4) of Bylaw 100 in discussing the introductory meeting. For this reason alone, it is this Panel’s opinion that the introductory meeting does not count for attendance for any trimester. Since it is at the “first meeting of any year’s Students’ Council [when] all members of that Students’ Council ... shall be installed in a ceremony,” since the first meeting occurs after the introductory meeting, section 21 of Bylaw 100 does not apply to the introductory meeting. If the Students’ Union wishes to make section 21 of Bylaw 100 apply to the introductory meeting, then the Bylaws would have to be amended to specify that.

[11] However, there are added complications with the fact that we have interpreted that the introductory meeting and the first meeting may occur before May 1 under the right circumstances (see paragraph 5 above). For the first meeting (and the introductory meeting if the Bylaws are amended), which trimester would attendance count towards if that meeting was held before May 1? The only place in Bylaw 100 where the date ranges of the trimesters are laid out is section 15(1):

15 Functioning of Standing Committees

1. Standing committees shall establish meeting schedules on a trimesterly basis, in advance, with the trimesters being
 - a. May to August; and
 - b. September to December; and
 - c. January to April.

This section deals with the functioning of standing committees specifically, rather than the Students’ Union generally. However, without notice of a provision to the contrary, it is our interpretation that when the term “trimester” is used in the Bylaws those three “trimesters” represent the dates from May to August, September to December, and January to April. Section 21 refers to “Spring/Summer and Fall trimesters,” and this Panel thinks it is safe to assume that

the Spring/Summer trimester are the dates from May to August, with the Fall trimester being the dates from September to December. By process of elimination, this leaves a “Winter” trimester being the dates from January to April.

[12] The issue then becomes if the first meeting (and the introductory meeting if the Bylaws are amended) is held before May 1, does attendance count towards the “Spring/Summer trimester,” the “Winter trimester,” or no trimester at all? While adopting the time frames discussed would seem to suggest that attendance would count towards the Winter trimester, this would seem to contradict section 21 of Bylaw 100. Specifically, if we include the attendance in the Winter trimester, this would instead create a *quadrimester* regime, rather than a *trimester* regime. That is, there would be (presumably) one meeting in the first quadrimester (the first meeting to be held sometime in April), with meetings throughout the Spring/Summer and Fall quadrimesters, *but also meetings held in the Winter quadrimester of the following year*. Since section 21 of Bylaw 100 speaks exclusively of attendance during the “trimesters,” this quadrimester regime simply cannot be what the Students’ Union intended in passing this section.

[13] Furthermore, if we were to adopt the quadrimester regime, this would effectively make the first meeting an absolutely mandatory meeting for Councillors; missing the first meeting would result in being removed as a member of Students’ Council since the Councillor would have attended for exactly 0% of the meetings for the first Winter quadrimester (so long as the first meeting is the only meeting in April), and the Bylaws offer no discretion in the “automatic” removal of the Councillor. While our interpretation does not rely on this outcome (indeed, it is important for Councillors to attend *all* meetings, and making one meeting mandatory save automatic removal is not necessarily a bad thing in our opinion) we are cautious to interpret this kind of regime when this was probably not the Students’ Union plan, as expressed by Speaker Sumar.

[14] In light of all these observations, it is our interpretation that if the first meeting occurs before May 1, then any attendance taken at this meeting will not count for attendance for the Spring/Summer trimester and missing this meeting will technically not invoke any of the provisions in section 21. This is further supported by the fact that the automatic removal provision in section 21(5) is qualified by paragraph 21(5)(a) in that the provision “shall only apply at the end of the Spring/Summer and Fall trimesters.” If the first meeting were to occur before May 1, then it occurs during a period of time not contemplated by the language of the Bylaws (i.e., not in the Spring/Summer or Fall trimesters), and so attendance at this meeting attracts no consequence from section 21(5).

CONCLUSION

[15] The questions that were asked of this Panel, and our answers to them, are as follows:

1. Do both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7? What are the consequences if this does not happen? Can the first meeting occur before May 1?

Both the introductory meeting and the first meeting of Council need to occur before May 7. The first meeting can occur before May 1 in certain circumstances. If the first meeting is held after May 7 and if an application that is brought under section 29 of Bylaw 1500 postdates the first meeting, then there is no consequence to the Students' Union or Students' Council. However, DIE Board may be able to force the meeting to take place if the application that is brought under section 29 of Bylaw 1500 is submitted before the first meeting takes place.

2. Is the introductory meeting counted towards councilor attendance for the Spring/Summer term? This meeting is unique to this term.

The introductory meeting does not count towards councillor attendance for any trimester, as interpreted from the Bylaws. In the event that the first meeting (and indeed, any meeting) occurs before May 1, then that meeting will also not count towards councillor attendance for any trimester.

[16] **In conclusion, there are several gaps that we have identified in the Bylaws being discussed. It is our hope that Students' Council will address these issues by updating and amending their respective Bylaws.**

Students' Council Seat Distribution – 2017/18

Enrollment numbers current as of February 15, 2017

Faculty Code	Faculty Name	Enrollment	Total Seats
AH	Agricultural, Life & Environmental Sciences	1552	2
AR	Arts	5689	6
AU	Augustana	1008	1
BC	Business	2017	2
ED	Education	2885	3
EN	Engineering	4236	4
LA	Law	563	1
MH	Medicine & Dentistry	1036	1
NS	Native Studies	178	1
NU	Nursing	1342	1
OS	Open Studies	1120	1
PE	Physical Education & Recreation	979	1
PH	Pharmacy	543	1
SA	Faculté St. Jean	575	1
SC	Science	6097	6

Total Undergraduate Students: 29,820
 Students' Council Seats Available: 32



BYLAW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 12, 2017
6:00 PM
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT	SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)
Brandon Christensen (Chair)		Y	N/A
Sandy Brophy		Y	N/A
Delane Howie		Y	N/A
Nicole Jones		Y	N/A
Robyn Paches		0.5	N/A
Alannah Piasecki		Y	N/A
<i>Vacancy due to resignation.</i>			

AGENDA (BC 2017-06)

2017-06/1 INTRODUCTION

2017-06/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order at 18:00 (6:00PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2017-06/1b **Approval of Agenda**

JONES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the agenda.

5/0/0

CARRIED

2017-06/1c **Approval of Minutes**

CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the minutes.

5/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/1d Chair's Business

2017-06/1e Attendance

Attendance was taken as noted above. Councillor Thibaudeau was also in attendance.

2017-06/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2017-06/2a Fall semester goals and check in.

CHRISTENSEN:

In the spring we had goals we set for and so far we have accomplished everything we wanted to; we should go around and see if there is anything we want to change or anything else.

Each member present was given an opportunity to speak, in turn.

PIASECKI:

We have or about to accomplish all the goals we needed to, and interested to see what's ahead with the time we have.

HOWIE:

One significant goal is to update Bylaw 100 because there are several loose ends and to fix the problems and figuring out best ways to go about that.

JONES:

Satisfied with everything so far as we've accomplished most of our goals; excited to see how the elections this year and have a good feeling for elections' turnout this year

THIBAudeau:

To amend Bylaw 100 and talking about the different committees we have and to avoid controversy in the Students' Council.

BROPHY:

In terms of Bylaw 100, about how you change something in the second half of a policy and you have to go through the whole two-stage process needs to be changed such that you should only do that when the policy is

being changed in a significant manner

CHRISTENSEN:

If the facts are not being changed in the policy; then it should not be passed in two parts

HOWIE:

Although this is to be discussed on the October 10th meeting but all of section 11 of bylaw 100 needs to be brought up because there are several things in CAC like standing orders that are decided by CAC which is not a bad system but it changes so quickly that it is worrisome that things might not be followed.

CHRISTENSEN:

Agreed; we should set that as a goal and do that on October 10; Delane if you can create a document and put it in the shared folder so we can all review it.

Goals-wise we have accomplished more or less everything; there are a few things we still have to do such as Faculty association fees and DFUs.

2017-06/2b Regulating standing committee, ad hoc, and task forces.

CHRISTENSEN:

We did not make a decision regarding this last time so I thought we should re-introduce it. There was a mention that there should be a Bylaw defining how standing committees, ad hoc, and task forces are separated

HOWIE:

I think that we could include this in Bylaw 100 and make it a new section; section 12 after section 11 and then bump and the other sections down because currently it is section 11 which is legislation and section 12 which is standing committee membership therefore it seems like a good place to insert it.

CHRISTENSEN:

Personally I don't want to have ad hoc or task force added to Bylaw 100 because they're more temporary but just add it to standing orders instead.

HOWIE:

Should we add just the definition of ad hoc/task force to standing orders to what they exactly are?

CHRISTENSEN:

I think we should add everything about the ad hoc/task force like how it

was created and its process but definitely not just the definition of the two.

HOWIE:

These committees are a case by case basis and one definition for all would not be suitable so we should put them in standing orders.

CHRISTENSEN:

Therefore we should suggest CAC implement it into standing orders.

PIASECKI:

Is there an outline on why task forces are created or what they're supposed to accomplish?

CHRISTENSEN:

We could come up with a definition on task force.

HOWIE:

We should mention what an ad hoc is and its functions and why it was created; as well as what the membership will be for these committees.

2017-06/2c Future standing committees and structures.

CHRISTENSEN:

In light of what was going on in Students' Council last time: general thought was that standing committee should have people who get elected for it although I do have reservations for it I could be okay with if we could find methods to compromise. One idea would be to divide standing committees into two where one is administrative and non-administrative (advisory) standing committees (all elected people). Then in Bylaw 100 we can mention the distinction between the two.

BROPHY:

There should however be a clear distinction between the two. Currently all that exist are administrative committees.

HOWIE:

SERC used to be advisory committee which had unelected people on it.

PIASECKI:

Alternatively we could make it clear about how many spots will be councilors, executives and students at large.

JONES:

That is a good idea even other universities have reserved spots for certain

student groups who have an advisory seat.

CHRISTENSEN:

ARRC is proposing 50 voting spots for students at large

HOWIE:

It has been changed to 34

CHRISTENSEN:

That is still excessive in my opinion.

BROPHY:

It is important for membership to be set and there should be an application; not immediate entrance into the committee; this should not be done with Bylaw but can be done with ARRC; each committee should have a set membership; but CAC makes sense because it is so internal and has a floating membership.

CHRISTENSEN:

There should be a new structure created such as committees should not managing fund; elected people should be handling that; they can provide advice to that committee and make recommendations for handing funds but should not be able to budget.

HOWIE:

Right now all the money for Students' Union is through one consolidated committees and all the bylaws are from one committee and so this committee has all the knowledge in one place and can just pass it down to the next members. Any committee for example bylaw can propose a budget then give it to Council and then Council sends it to finance to approve the budget.

CHRISTENSEN:

I am okay with it if there are some safeguards to it; no committees should set its membership by itself but by the rules defined in Bylaw 100.

HOWIE:

It would be similar to CAC; legislation should not be created from one specific thing but should be made keeping with respect to things in the future.

CHRISTENSEN:

They committees should be able to give advisory opinions. Any discussions?

HOWIE:

They should make the committees legitimate; from my recollection of the ARRC committee; whatever committee it may be (advisory or administrative) it needs to be clear that it is a standing committee

CHRISTENSEN:

The rules need to be set clear so in the future there is no confusion.

CHRISTENSEN:

Updating Councilor PACHES to create the way standing committees are and dividing them into advisory/non-administrative and administrative committees

PACHES:

We need to formalize the type of committees that are under the Students' Unions and Council.

CHRISTENSEN:

If we didn't move forward with the two stream approach should we do the electing positions?

PACHES:

We should definitely put a definition to it.

2017-06/2d Dedicated Fee Units (DFUs) Renewal.

For renewal: Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund

Bylaw 6100(3)(2):

Entities that wish to establish a Dedicated Fee Unit shall submit a proposal to the main office of the Students' Union by November 15th, of the year before the fee is to be implemented.

CHRISTENSEN:

We should contact them and do that as soon as possible.

PIASECKI:

They should because otherwise we would not have any funds.

PACHES:

They submitted it but did not submit a campaign with it.

CHRISTENSEN:

Councilor PACHES is on that and will send us a email about that.

2017-06/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2017-06/3a **Bill #4 - Removing Student Group Operating Policy Requirements -
*First Reading***

ORIGINAL VERSION:

CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the first reading of Bill #4 - Abolishing Student Group Operating Policy Requirements, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles.

1. Bylaw 5600 currently requires that SU operating policy have “the following categories for student groups: registration requirements, privileges and services, administrative framework, constitutional reviews of student groups, grounds for suspension and termination, and granting.”
2. There is no current rationale for why this requirement exists under Bylaw 5600.
3. Operating policy is generally considered an internal Students’ Union document for the organization itself rather than to be applied to external student groups.
4. Bylaw 5600 shall be amended to abolish operating policy requirements.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

PACHES:

Personally I’m opposed to the title “Student’s Union abolishing student groups” and would be misleading.

PIASECKI:

We should move around the words so it doesn’t sound as bad.

PACHES:

Reviewing the operating policy so that it is concise and contained.

HOWIE:

Are you removing section 9 from the operating policy? (student groups-registrations policies, etc)

CHRISTENSEN:

We cannot amend these policies as a bylaw committee

PACHES:

We should remove 2 and 3 from the above Bill #4

PIASECKI:

We can remove anything related to operating policy.

PACHES:

I can introduce it to council.

CHRISTENSEN:

I will submit it with you as the mover.

FINALIZED VERSION:

CHRISTENSEN/PACHES MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #4 - Removing Student Group Operating Policy Requirements, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles.

1. Bylaw 5600 currently requires that SU operating policy have “the following categories for student groups: registration requirements, privileges and services, administrative framework, constitutional reviews of student groups, grounds for suspension and termination, and granting.”
2. There is no current rationale for why this requirement exists under Bylaw 5600.
3. Operating policy is generally considered an internal Students’ Union document for the organization itself, specifically employee training, rather than to be applied to external student groups.
4. Bylaw 5600 shall be amended to remove operating policy requirements.

6/0/0

CARRIED

2017-06/3b Editorial #1 - Bylaw 1100

JONES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 100 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/3c Editorial #2 - Bylaw 1500

BROPHY/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 1500 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/3d Editorial #3 - Bylaw 2100

CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2100 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/3e Editorial #4 - Bylaw 2400

CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2400 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/3f Editorial #5 - Bylaw 500

BROPHY/JONES MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 500 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/3g Editorial #6 - Bylaw 6300

JONES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 6300 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-06/3h Editorial #7 - Bylaw 8100

PIASECKI/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8100 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0

CARRIED

2017-06/3i Editorial #8 - Bylaw 8400

PIASECKI/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8400 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0

CARRIED

2017-06/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2017-06/4a Fall semester meeting schedule:

- Tuesday, September 12, 2017 @ 6:00PM
- Tuesday, October 10, 2017 @ 6:00PM
- Tuesday, October 24, 2017 @ 6:00PM
- Tuesday, November 28, 2017 @ 6:00PM

2017-06/5 ADJOURNMENT

BROPHY/PIASECKI MOVE to adjourn at 19:50 (7:50PM).

6/0/0

CARRIED

Meeting was adjourned at 7:50pm

2017-06/5a Next meeting: Tuesday, October 10, 2017 @ 6:00PM in SUB 6-06.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
JONES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the agenda.	5/0/0 CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE to approve minutes.	5/0/0 CARRIED
PACHES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve Bill #4 on the recommendation of bylaw committee, based on the following first principles.	6/0/0 CARRIED
JONES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 100 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
BROPHY/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 1500 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2100 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2400 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
BROPHY/JONES MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 500 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
JONES/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 6300 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
PIASECKI/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8100 as listed on Google Drive.	6/0/0 CARRIED
PIASECKI/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8400 as listed on Google Drive	6/0/0 CARRIED
BROPHY/PIASECKI MOVE to adjourn at 7:40PM.	6/0/0 CARRIED