

Date: Wednesday, September 29th, 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		
Marc Dumouchel	N/A	
Aseel Atia	N/A	

MINUTES (Bylaw-2023-09-M)

2023-09/1 INTRODUCTION

2023-09/1a Call to Order

- Land Acknowledgement
- Attendance

AISENSTAT calls the meeting to order at 2:03pm.

2023-09/1b Approval of Agenda

COMMITTEE MOVES TO approve the agenda.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2023-09/1c Approval of Minutes

COMMITTEE MOVES TO approve [BC-2023-07-M](#)
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2023-09/1d Chair's Business

- Agenda numbers - need to fix them to match minutes.

2023-09/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2023-09/2a Reviewing Second Principles:

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

AISENSTAT: Highlights that the term “reasonable efforts” is deemed sufficient due to the work that has been previously done by other DFU’s.

COMMITTEE: Agrees.

2023-09/2b Bylaw 200 (Precious)

TABLED

2023-09/2c In-camera [bylaw review](#) (Stephen)

RAITZ: Introduces the possible need for improved direction on how to use in-camera portions due to concerns raised by *The Gateway* and based on discussed amendments at the previous Council Meeting. Notes that it could be beneficial to list the rationale for going in-camera as there is currently only the topic title available. Does not have any proposed first principles but is open to discussion.

DUMOUCHEL: Highlights the importance of being able to go in-camera in order to have honest discussions about administration as well as factors regarding sensitive materials and negotiations.

RAITZ: Understands the current model of going in-camera, procedurally, but notes that there can be a way for Council to know the subject along with the reasoning they are proposing to go in-camera. Emphasizes that it is more difficult to disseminate confidential information prior, but it is important in order for those involved in the conversation to be aware of what is to be discussed prior to going in-camera.

DUMOUCHEL: Will follow up on this. Notes that previous executives and council have discussed going in-camera as a standing item as a way to reassure others they are not intending on being unforthcoming. Another concern raised in the past was others convoluting the process prior to the item being discussed at council.

2023-09/2d [DFU petition requirements](#) (Levi/Marc)

- *The Gateway* wants to run a DFU referendum this year
- Thinks 15% of members is an insurmountable barrier to getting a question on the ballot; wanted Council to step in on their behalf (similar to ASC in 2019)

FLAMAN: *The Gateway* is planning on running a DFU referendum this year, however they are concerned on achieving the 15% constituent threshold required to put a question on the ballot, which would be around 5,000 students. *The Gateway* is asking the Council to intervene. Asks if it would be plausible for Students' Council to waive the referendum or plebiscite referrals for certain parties and what that would look like.

ATWOOD: Suggests opening the conversation more broadly instead.

RAITZ: Notes that 15% seems like a high number used from a different context to fit more broadly and could be considered a barrier for the question to be asked to students on campus. Recognizes the argument for Council to create exceptions and adjust quantities.

DUMOUCHEL: Asks the committee to consider that the higher petition limit carves out more time for a thorough campaign period that is without a counternarrative and notes that it is not DUMOUCHEL's purview to recognize whether this is positive or negative.

Respects the reasoning of the DIE Board decisions, however does not believe that they reflect the intent of bylaw or the Students' Council's application over the years. Notes that the intention of a petition is for the will of the students to supersede Students' Council. However, in general, Students' Council should have the ability to implement referendums as they see fit.

Notes that there are flaws in the bylaws that do not make this process clear and which require intervention before consulting the DIE Board.

AISENSTAT: Notes that 15% is a large number when taken into consideration the percentage of those who vote in the general election (~20%). Emphasizes that this does increase the campaign duration which can be a positive. Highlights that this is critical to take to council in order to refrain from making large decisions without their input

FLAMAN: Believes that the current process is sufficient due to comments made by the DIE Board. Additionally believes that referendums regarding finances should still go through the same process.

AISENSTAT: Notes that FLAMAN and DUMOUCHEL are to work on a drafted proposal and to bring it to the committee for more discussion.

2023-09/2e Minor changes to Bylaws 120 and 130 concerning quorum (Damon)

ATWOOD: The main issue was surrounding a lack of a quorum requirement for Executive Sub-Committee's. Notes that the issue regarding quorum has been resolved, due to the implementation of Bylaw 130, which states a quorum number for all Executive Sub-Committees.

Notes a concern regarding 1b of Bylaw 130 point i. as it ends with “or” despite the following terms ending with “and.” This creates an understanding that one is to adhere to either subparagraph i. or to subparagraph ii to vi.

FLAMAN: Is not opposed to rearranging the bylaw. Proposes moving point vi. to section 8.

2023-09/3 **OLD BUSINESS**

- 2023-09/3a** • None

2023-09/3 **NEW BUSINESS**

2023-09/4 **WRAP-UP**

2023-09/4a **Action Items / To-Do List**

- **COMMITTEE MOVES TO** extend the meeting by 5 minutes.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
- **AISENSTAT/ATWOOD MOVE TO** approve the Second Principles of Bylaw 600:
Student Union Bilingualism.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2023-09/4b **Next Scheduled Meeting**

- Friday, October 13th, 2-3pm.

2023-09/5 **Adjournment**

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