

**BYLAW  
COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, August 1, 2018  
5:00 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, 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	SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)
Michelle Kim ( Chair)		YES	
Tahra Haddouche		NO	
Rowan Ley		YES	
Stephen Raitz		YES	
Emma Ripka		YES	
Nathan Sunday		NO	
Jimmy Thibaudeau		YES	

**MINUTES (BC-2018-05)**

**2018-05/1    INTRODUCTION**

**2018-05/1a    Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 5:05 PM.

**2018-05/1b    Approval of Agenda**

**THIBAudeau/RIPKA MOVE** to approve the agenda.  
4/0/0 CARRIED

**2018-05/1c Approval of Minutes**

Will be approved next meeting.

**2018-05/1d Chair's Business**

**EDITORIAL CHANGES**

**Bylaw 600**

Translation requirement.

Q: Why is the operating policy excluded?

RIPKA: It's because if you think about the translation is, it's for CSJ or maybe they're not involved in the operating policy, so why would they need to read up on it. Also because it was mandated by Council are bylaw and political policies.

RAITZ: I'd like to see that change but editorial changes can be disregarded.

KIM: This bylaw will have to be edited anyway. I'm going to keep this comment on. What do you mean by where it is located?

RAITZ: I think I was just double speaking so it can be disregarded.

KIM: The English shall be enforceable...

RAITZ: Why is that a separate bullet point, I didn't understand the logic behind it.  
Re 4.2a

THIB: It's just describing the previous term.

RIPKA: Can you take out 2 and put 2 beside a?

KIM: That one stays on. The capitalization is not consistent with the other sub bullet points. The comment regarding the sustainable method, i think it's necessary due to questions if translation is a one time thing. I think that can stay.

RAITZ: Sustainable can be defined when it's brought to the operating policy. The sustainability is following through will appear when policy is more flushed out.

KIM: We'll revisit this in the next couple meetings after the first draft is done.

**RE Bylaw 2300**

KIM: If you look at definition 1d. The wording as amended?

RAITZ: I don't know what the protocol is, you can add the words "as amended" but that was just me.

KIM: That will be removed. (Will share the version she has) Section 1j - the word is repeated twice. We'll be adding definition of quotation marks, Student's Union. (Reviews noted errors and suggested changes)

**KIM/RAITZ MOVE TO** approve amended editorial changes to Bylaw 2300 as proposed by Councillor Raitz.

5/0/0 CARRIED

**2018-05/2**      **QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

RAITZ: I'll be stepping down from this committee for time management reasons.

THIB: For Bill #3 passed last night in Council, Sunday, Belcourt and I will be working together to form second principles.

KIM: I have learned the BC's standing orders that whoever is doing admin stuff the deadline to share the agenda is the day prior before 4:30 PM but I personally think it's not enough time.

**2018-05/3**      **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**2018-05/3a**      **KIM MOVES** to approve amended First principles of Bill #2: Bylaw 100 Attendance Regulations.

See BC-2018-05.02.

KIM: We didn't see the need to having meeting 0 and we can just scrap that and reformat our meeting for better purposes. I changed it to the introductory meeting of Council (Mtg 1) so those are the mtgs happening after elected as a councillor. I'll open up the floor.

THIBAudeau: I would amend it to strike in that term "shall no longer be included in attendance regulations" I feel that it's implied when the meeting is removed.

KIM: changed to "shall be removed"

RIPKA: The first principles went to council a couple weeks ago. What happened?

KIM: When the first went to council, lots of questions whether or not intro mtg should be mandatory. That's why lots of ppl were questioning it so lots of edits that had to be made so we discussed why are we having this discussion when we don't do much in the following meeting anyway.

RAITZ: I don't remember this happening in the discussion? I need help recalling that. I think we should have an intro mtg in April.

KIM: The decision was made within BC. I think either way, there will always be a consequence for doing it before or after. If we have our meeting in early May, that would be better.

RIPKA: So mtg 0 is Robert's rules training and the Oath?

KIM: (Reads comments from Councillor Sunday)

RAITZ: We were on the same page earlier that a meeting in April was the best route but if we think on students on campus so it's easier to get a proxy in April because everyone is on campus.

RIPKA: I feel it's necessary for training before we start appointing people. If someone has no clue about Robert's rules then it's complicated for them so important to maintain mtg 0.

THIB: This is the perfect space to be arguing for this so I'm on the fence on whether or not we have the April mtg. We're trying to increase the training for committee chairs but if we have our intro mtg in May then previous comm chair's term will be done and there's a good chance they won't be around council.

KIM: We were planning to have chair training done by DG. We have transition reports and we wanted more formal chair training by DG.

RIPKA: You need committees before you have chairs so it makes sense to do it at the end of April, first council mtg, training oath will be a short mtg bc everyone has exams then first week of May, have the one you appoint everyone and do transition.

LEY: Do we think that making that mtg necessary will results in ppl going or sending a proxy? That might be an issue.

RAITZ: I don't think it matters if the first meeting is mandatory. All council meetings are mandatory but most ppl don't show up anyway. The most ppl show up to that first mtg. Right now, it's mandatory but going forward it won't be mandatory. The first one shouldn't need to be mandatory bc ppl should be driven enough.

KIM: The first discussion is having the necessity of having mtg 0. If we're still having mtg 0, should it be mandatory or not? There was push back from councillors as to why it's not being mandatory because it's an important mtg.

RIPKA: Should we talk about wanting meeting 0?

KIM: Hypothetically, we're selecting a speaker at meeting 1.

RIPKA: Supporting mtg 0, selecting a speaker took a decent amount of time and there were only 3 applicants so that's in support of keeping mtg 0.

RAITZ: We're going to have trouble navigating it all.

**RIPKA/THIBAudeau MOVE** to retable item 05.3a to the next meeting.  
5/0/0 CARRIED.

**2018-05/3b SUNDAY MOVES** to approve First principles of Bill #4: Bylaw 100 Students' Council Committee Chairs' Training.

See BC-2018-05.03.

KIM: The creation of this motion was during the chairs meeting and transition was an issue.

LEY: What is chair shadowing referring to? I just think it's too vague, I don't know what it means.

RIPKA: Chair shadowing might have been an overlooking of the timeline. I would have gone and shadowed Robyn Paches from before but he was already done before I was elected. We can look at options of going to committees if you're thinking of running as chair.

KIM: Elections are done mid-March so you know if you're a councillor or not so there's still a potential for chair shadowing but different committees have different timelines.

RAITZ: I was thinking about that point too. I think to change the wording of 6 to say it "may include" but I rather start with grey level of understanding then develop the idea from there.

THIBAudeau: I disagree with Councillor Raitz. I don't like the wording but not limited but rather have a clear directive in first principles. I'm very concerned about item 6c, modifying Robert's rules. 6C is very vague to me.

RIPKA: Did we decide the meetings of the chairs? If it's going through DG, I do think it's necessary to consult with them. I can consult with them before going to Council. Not every chair uses Robert's rules to a T. Each chair has their own style.

RAITZ: I agree. Another route would be striking C and D and send it forward. "But not limited to" gives us space between first and second reading.

LEY: It seems like a pretty big thing to not specify it at all. If we're sending this to council with only two things in this section then they don't know what they're

voting on.

KIM: One reason that idea came up is because whatever DG does, it's operational side and council does not have power.

RAITZ: I'd feel comfortable with having that before we come to the finalized version. I'd feel ok with that going forward.

RIPKA: I wouldn't mind adding under 6, something about the planning process. For ex, the purpose of each committee. That transition would be helpful in that planning process - identifying goals, tentative plan that the chair could take to the first meeting.

THIBAudeau: I like that idea. For 6C, is it support to relax Robert's Rules at the committee level?

KIM: We're going to use a modified version of the rules.

THIBAudeau: I'm not sure I like that so much because in standing orders, it's up to the chair's discussion is to use Robert's rules as they see fit but we use it for action items but Chair should enforce it to its full potential.

RIPKA: It's just to find the balance for the chair. Should I talk to DG about this? If so, what are some actual questions you want me to ask.

KIM: I think can add one potential for them to give us group chair training, how Robert's Rules are used at the committee level, transition reports.

RAITZ: The idea of planning long-term, the idea of training ppl in the short-term, just preparing for each meeting, when you should be sending updates, something about short term preparation.

KIM: The wording we use, what is first, second principles, who moves, those specific wording to be included. What's important for BC, is do they have capacity to do it?

RAITZ: How to handle really difficult situations? But there could be if we added it or being able to handle different kind of individuals.

RIPKA: How to mitigate circle talking.

KIM: Do we want to table it for next meeting?

RAITZ: Point 6 is where we need more info. Points 1 to 5 are what we're comfortable with.

RIPKA: The reason I got this idea was because there was some discrepancy.

THIBAUDEAU: I don't think we have to do a ton more work re this bill. Under group chair training you included everything else.

RIPKA: I would amend C to be long and short term planning or goal setting.

KIM: This motion has been moved by Councillor Sunday.

THIB: We can table this for next meeting.

KIM: That's the best mechanism because that person is not there.

**KIM/LEY MOVE** to table this for next meeting after this discussion.  
5/0/0 CARRIED

**2018-05/4**     **INFORMATION ITEMS**

**2018-05/5**     **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 PM.

**2018-05/5a**     **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, August 15, 2018 @ 5:00PM in SUB 6-06.

<b>MOTION</b>	<b>VOTES</b>
<b>THIBAUDEAU/RIPKA MOVE</b> to approve the agenda.	4/0/0 CARRIED
<b>KIM/RAITZ MOVE TO</b> approve amended editorial changes to Bylaw 2300 as proposed by Councillor Raitz.	5/0/0 CARRIED
<b>RIPKA/THIBAUDEAU MOVE</b> to retable item 05.3a to the next meeting.	5/0/0 CARRIED
<b>KIM/LEY MOVE</b> to table this for next meeting after this discussion.	5/0/0 CARRIED