

Date: Wednesday, September 15th, 2023.

Time: 2:00pm

Online: [Zoom](#)

The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwaciswaskahikan (Beaver Hills House), on Treaty 6 territory. From time immemorial, the banks along the river valley have been known as the Pehonan, a meeting place for the nêhiyawak (Cree), the Niitsitapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesųliné (Dene), Ojibway/Saulteaux/Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and others. The University, the Students' Union and much of the city are located on the unlawfully stolen land of the forcibly removed Papaschase Cree.

We acknowledge that sharing this land gives each of us the responsibility to research the historic contexts of Treaty 6, to reflect on our personal relationships to the land, the Nations we've named, and to our roles in upholding justice on this territory. Since they began, the Students' Union and the University have benefited from historic and ongoing dispossession of land and resources from Indigenous Peoples. As a result, it is our responsibility to seek the restitution of this land and its resources. Finally, we seek to do better by working to make our learning, research, and governance align with the histories, languages, teachings, and cultures of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples in the land presently occupied by the Canadian state.

We encourage critical reflection by asking the following question. In relation to the territory on which you are situated, what role do you play in strengthening the resistance and resurgence of Indigenous students within your communities?

Attendance

Name	Attendance	Proxy or Written Submission
Voting Members		
Jillian Aisenstat (Chair)	Y	
Damon Atwood	Y	
Levi Flaman	Y	
Precious Majekodunmi	N	
Stephen Raitz	Y	
Non-Voting Members & Guests		
Name	Position or Affiliation	
Marc Dumouchel	N/A	
Courtney Graham	N/A	
Aseel Atia	N/A	

MINUTES (Bylaw-2023-08-M)

2023-08/1 INTRODUCTION

2023-08/1a Call to Order

AISENSTAT called the meeting to order at 2:04pm.

- Land Acknowledgement
- Attendance

2023-08/1b Approval of Agenda

COMMITTEE MOVES TO approve the agenda.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2023-08/1c Approval of Minutes

COMMITTEE MOVES TO approve last week's minutes

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2023-08/1d Chair's Business

AISENSTAT: Notes that there may be a need to reassess a new meeting schedule in order to accommodate changes in MAJEKODUNMI's schedule.

2023-08/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2023-08/2a Reviewing Second Principles:

- Jill: Bylaw 600
 - [Proposed Draft Amendments: Bylaw 600: Students' Union Bilingualism](#)
 -

AISENSTAT: Highlights that voting on the draft amendments of Bylaw 600 will be pushed off because DUMOUCHEL's input is wanted. Notes that Translation Amendments were kept the same due to the high probability they can be published in English and French in the future. The Bylaw and Political Policy portion was also kept the same. The process portion is to be gutted due to there no longer being a Translation Committee.

Asks the COMMITTEE's opinions on the appropriateness of the Second Principles of Translation. Notes that referring to a DFU was a suggestion by DUMOUCHEL, meaning that The Campus Food Bank or The Landing or other SUB Services would be expected to implement bilingualism into their programs through reasonable efforts. Lists that there are already organizations that do this but that this would be formally legislated for all DFU associations to do.

RAITZ: States that once translation is completed, the task is done. This is more about access, as it used to be about translation which did not move forward. Notes that French Language Access would be a more suitable terminology.

AISENSTAT: Agrees and mentions that the Principles of Translation terminology has been changed to French Language Access.

Asks the committee if adding a section about DFUs into Bylaw 600 is necessary. Personally thinks that it is necessary and useful, and has already seen examples of this.

RAITZ: Agrees. Along with the change to French Language Access, the liability of the fee unit can be lesser due to the shift away from expecting direct translation and more so having those who speak French as a first language be able to access services.

AISENSTAT: Provides an example of reasonable efforts as: working alongside VP Student Life to figure out who works and volunteers at The Landing that has basic knowledge of French and relay that information to those at CSJ.

FLAMAN: Notes concern over French fluency and if they will be able to have sufficient mutual understanding or, if in the case of DFU's not having anyone that speaks French, asks what decides a reasonable effort and what accounts for a contravention of bylaw. Mentions that DFU's should be encouraged on what to do instead of being told what to do.

AISENSTAT: Echoes this concern. Does not want to penalize DFU's if they do not have French Language Access readily accessible. Asks if the DIE board is responsible for this sort of interpretation.

FLAMAN: Suggests expanding French Language access to SRAs.

Highlights that they do not want to make it harder for DFU's, SRA's and any FAMF recipients, but can adjust the DFU and FAMF regulation to have a provision for reasonable efforts made for French language services to be offered to DFU's and SRA's.

RAITZ: Responds in noting that bylaws are intended as directions and rules. Highlights that they should move away from encouraging things in bylaw and instead focus on writing what reasonable efforts are

AISENSTAT: Agrees that bylaws should not be encouraging behaviour and should instead be directing behaviour. Asks RAITZ if DFU's will be taken to the DIE Board if they do not make reasonable efforts

RAITZ: Reasonable efforts are context sensitive.

FLAMAN: Asks if it is feasible to make sections of this into regulation rather than bylaw. Asks if DFU's or SRA's would be able to go to Council for a pass if unable to find translators instead of going directly to DIE Board.

AISENSTAT: It could be possible, but would have to explore how to frame it properly. States that the term "reasonable efforts" is open to interpretation.

RAITZ: Wants to add that the bylaw is the bare minimum standard that associations need to follow and putting it into regulations would make it easier for DFU's to evade the bare minimum. Students' Council can still amend the bylaw in the future. Is not sure if the bylaw and regulation distinction is applicable in this case.

AISENSTAT: Thinks that this can be TABLED for now. Notes that making DFU's less susceptible to scrutiny from the DIE Board is a priority. The responsibility for determining reasonable efforts can be outlined in Bylaw as falling under the jurisdiction of the UASU.

2023-08/2b Bylaw 200 (Precious)

TABLED

AISENSTAT: MAJEKODUNMI is not available to discuss Bylaw 200 but will hopefully be getting more information for the committee to look over sometime soon.

2023-08/2c Potential Changes to Article 1 concerning quorum (Damon)

- [Link to Bylaw 120](#)
- [Link to Bylaw 130](#)

ATWOOD: The issue on the table is that there is no defined quorum for Executive Sub-Committees within bylaw. The issue arose at a Sustainability Committee meeting and there was debate on whether quorum was reached.

Was thinking to tighten up the language in order for the Executive Sub-Committees to have precise quorum definitions. Would also like to change the general quorum rules to be indicative of half the seats plus one that are currently filled on the committee rather than half of the total seats on a committee plus one (which may mean that empty seats are being counted towards quorum).

AISENSTAT: Agrees and is likely in favour of changing quorum rules to a majority plus one of existing seats filled.

Highlights again that there is no quorum stated for Executive Sub-Committees in Bylaw 130 and believes that establishing a standard quorum for all committees would be favorable.

FLAMAN: Notes that leaving quorum at four for the Executive Committee would be the only instance where more would be better than less because large changes made by three out of five Executives is not ideal. Highlights that quorum should be kept as ratios or percentages instead of fixed integers.

AISENSTAT: Believes the initial solution is to add an exact quorum amount to the Executive Sub-Committees.

2023-08/2d Minor Changes to Bylaws 110/120/130/140 (Stephen)

RAITZ: ALMEIDA and FOTANG raised concerns over changes to the right to attend committee/Executive meetings, particularly if an individual, who is not on the committee, is given permission to be in an in-camera session. Their concern is that an in-camera session can be about a person and that the committee would allow that person to come into that in-camera session.

The larger concern was getting access to the meeting materials about the person or yourself after the fact. Notes that this is not something that they are going to discuss due to this being a request of information issue.

Other valid concerns raised were the voting threshold for committees. As it is now, committees are able to go in-camera and the Chair is able to remove that person from the meeting. ALMEIDA and FOTANG wondered if there should be a voting threshold, especially because committees are smaller and more informal. Does not believe that they need that level of specificity due to committees being different from Executive meetings and because they have governance support during the meeting.

GRAHAM: Does not think a voting threshold may be the best course of action but it may be a good idea to have a definition for a valid reason to go in-camera.

AISENSTAT: Asks RAITZ to clarify if the voting threshold is to go in-camera or expelling an individual from a meeting.

RAITZ: Responds by stating that both ideas were discussed, therefore is unsure if they are strictly referring to one or the other. Highlights that committee meetings are roughly guided by Robert's Rules of Order, which gives a framework to make decisions within. States that GRAHAM's idea of establishing a standard definition for going in-camera is an ideal direction to move.

FLAMAN: Asks if the threshold to go in-camera is a simple majority through Robert's Rules of Order.

RAITZ: Responds that it is, but that the concerns raised warrant a heightened voting threshold out of concern of this being abused.

ATWOOD: Thinks that the Committee should be wary of getting too detailed in procedure. If an issue of abuse of in-camera use arises, that is something Council as a whole can deal with. Notes that some of these issues can be addressed through Standing Orders facilitated by CAC intervention. Reiterates that if there are issues of abuse, there are already mechanisms in place to deal with them.

RAITZ: Agrees.

FLAMAN: States that if there is usually a reason to go in-camera, there is most likely a good reason for it and usually not an issue to get a simple majority for it. Notes that Council values transparency and should use the in-camera mechanism sparingly. It makes sense to have a higher threshold in a more public forum, such as Council or the Executive Committee, but it is fine where it is at the committee level.

RAITZ: Another concern that was raised was about the Executive Committee. The Executives suggested that there be a requirement that one needs to reach out in advance if they want to attend an Executive Committee meeting. . They recommended that this is something that can also be implemented for committees and the DIE Board. Raises that the committee can bring forth minor amendments to Bylaw 120/130/140 alongside Bylaw 500 amendments to add that one must give notice before attending. Does not believe this is required for Council, however.

FLAMAN: States that implementing a written notice requirement rule may go against seeking to make it easier for people to attend meetings.

AISENSTAT: Echoes FLAMAN.

GRAHAM: Notes, for context, that there have been people reaching out to watch the Health and Dental Committee Meetings and Google Calendar invites have been sent with all the required information to attend these meetings.

FLAMAN: Touches on the security aspect of the issue. Considers that there have been valid concerns over instances of stalking and security issues, but notes that there are provisions mentioning that the chair is able to eject people from meetings. Takes issue that there is a possibility of making it harder for most individuals to attend meetings by the actions of one bad actor.

ATWOOD: States that the committee cannot prepare for all eventualities. Does not believe having advanced notice is the best course of action moving forward.

RAITZ: Agrees and has taken the committee's perspective into consideration. Will not go further with this or add additional conditions.

2023-08/2c Discussing our plans for Fall semester (Jill)

AISENSTAT: Notes that some changes to bylaw that the committee wanted to accomplish have been completed, such as striking Bylaw 9000, rearranging portions of Bylaw 500 and working on Bylaw 600. Further work on Bylaw 600 will continue once DUMOUCHEL is back. Further revisions to Bylaw 200 will occur when MAJEKODUNMI brings them.

While getting plebiscite questions drafted, seeks to be able to organize operational bylaws which were read over at the beginning of the committee's term. Notes that there will not be any functional changes to Bylaw 4000 as the STRAT plan is to be renewed at the end of year. Mentions that they are also not going to address Bylaw 5100: Student Conduct due to alleged changes that Student Group Services is working on.

2023-08/3 **OLD BUSINESS**

- 2023-08/3a**
- None

2023-08/3 **NEW BUSINESS**

-

2023-08/4 **WRAP-UP**

2023-08/4a **Action Items / To-Do List**

-

2023-08/4b **Next Scheduled Meeting**

- Friday September 29th, 2-3pm.

2023-08/5 Adjournment

- Closing Attendance
- AISENSTAT adjourned the meeting at 3:01pm.