



# BYLAW COMMITTEE MINUTES

2014 – 2015

Date: July 31<sup>st</sup> 2014

Time: 6.05 pm

In Attendance:

- BO ZHANG (Chair)
- JAMES HWANG
- CORY HODGSON
- JUSTIS ALLARD
- JAMIE HUDSON
- VIVIAN KWAN

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:

- SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by ZHANG at 6.05 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*ZHANG moved to amend the agenda such that item 11 a) came before item 6 a).*

*The motion was seconded by HODGSON.*

*Vote 6/0/0*

**CARRIED**

*HODGSON moved to amend the agenda such that item 8 b) came before item 8 a).*

*The motion was seconded by ZHANG.*

*Vote 6/0/0*

**CARRIED**

*HWANG moved to approve the agenda for July 31, 2014 as amended.*

*The motion was seconded by KWAN.*

*Vote 6/0/0*

**CARRIED**

**3. APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES**

*HWANG moved to approve the minutes for July 17, 2014 as tabled.  
The motion was seconded by HUDSON.  
Vote 5/0/1 (Abstention by ALLARD)  
CARRIED*

**4. GENERAL  
ORDERS**

(a) Editorial changes to Bylaws 100, 3000, and 6000

HODGSON: I got an email from Craig Turner saying that around 80% of the bylaws were transferred to the wiki format. I need a signoff from the Bylaw Committee that they are correct. These are all formatting changes. Craig has double checked them himself, but there may be errors he has missed. We would need to approve these three bylaws before approving the second reading of BFC (Budget and Finance Committee) and GAC (Grant Allocation Committee) amalgamation bill. SO, it's good to get them done as soon as possible.

ZHANG: I'm good with approving them.

We also assigned bylaws to individual members for editorial changes. We can potentially assign them again.

HODGSON: I was looking at the possibility of looking at bylaw 100 as a committee.

ZHANG: Let's approve the changes Craig has made now, and go through them later. We can always revise them later whenever we want.

*ZHANG moved to approve all editorial changes made by Craig Turner as outlined, for the purpose of transferring bylaws to the wiki format.  
The motion was seconded by HODGSON.  
Vote 6/0/0  
CARRIED*

**5. DRAFTING  
BYLAWS FOR  
SECOND READING**

(a) BFC & GAC Amalgamation Bill

*Hodgson read out the changes made to bylaws 100, 4000, and 6000.*

HODGSON: The principles were: amalgamate. Increase membership, rename GAC to Finance, and dissolve BFC. So, I renamed instances of *GAC* to *Finance Committee*. I renamed instances of *BFC* to *Finance Committee* too because those jobs would now be done by them. Items which were talking about BFC as a committee got removed. In bylaw 100, all duties of BFC were moved to the duties of the Finance Committee.

ZHANG: How do I show this? I don't think Council would be happy with the format of the bill.

HODGSON: In the old system, you had to show the entire relevant bylaw. Anyway, it'll take some time to adjust to the new wiki system. Also, each bylaw is an individual page.

***HODGSON moved to approve the second reading of the Budget and Finance Committee and the Grant Allocation Committee Amalgamation Bill.***

***The motion was seconded by ZHANG.***

***Vote 6/0/0***

***CARRIED***

**6. DRAFTING BILLS  
FOR FIRST  
READING**

**(a) Access Fund Bill**

HODGSON: I don't have a bill yet. It's something I wanted to talk about. We have a fund called the Access Fund. Students pay into it, and can apply to receive bursaries whenever they are in dire financial need. It's supposed to be a funding pool as a last resort. It has been around since 1995. We also used to have a department called SFAIC (Student Financial Aid and Information Center). The University recently acquired that department from us because they were consolidating all financial aid. There's now a new financial aid department at the University called *Student Financial Services*. We are also trying to transfer the administration of the Access Fund over to them. The University wants to have one application process for all bursaries on campus. Last week, GAC signed off on the terms of reference over how the fund will be handles, and the funding agreement. We are only delegating the administration of the Access Fund over to them. It is still our money, and we collect it.

Bylaw 100 Section 18 (7) stipulates the first duties of GAC with regards to the Access Fund. GAC will still be able to set policies for the Access Fund to a lesser extent. The policies will be reviewed once a year. But, we don't have the same flexibility as before. We are losing some control. But, it's a trade-off. There would be increased exposure, and increased ease of access.

We have a clause saying that the Access Fund must be appealable. The University is not fond of having an appeal process.

Also, points like (c), (d), and (e) under Section 18, (7) would not happen because we are not administering it anymore. So, definitely some of the clauses need to be changed.

I'm also worried about what would happen in the future regarding how future GACs treat the issue. I would like to remove parts that are obsolete. I also want to make it a bit stronger, and tone up the rhetoric. We want to emphasize how it should work, and that we set the policies. They don't have to follow our bylaws. But, I would be more comfortable if we had a few stronger statements here. Although we are delegating administration, we must

constantly review that administration!

ZHANG: You said GAC can review policies each year. So, during the middle of the year, does that administrative body have the authority to change policies?

HODGSON: Due to the funding agreement, they have to fund according to that. However, some small changes may happen unilaterally.

ZHANG: If we approve a set of policies to be reviewed annually, can we do anything to prevent unilateral decisions that we don't agree with?

HODGSON: We reimburse them. If something like that happens, we can just not give them the money.

ZHANG: You said we allocate a certain amount of money for the administration process. Does that money come from the fund?

HODGSON: Yes. With SFAIC moving over to the University, we saved a decent amount of money. Right now, the Access Fund doesn't have any administration cost.

ALLARD: As a student, will the new process differentiate where the money comes from?

HODGSON: They'll know it's from the Access Fund. They have to promote us as part of the funding agreement.

ALLARD: If the students don't get money, how would they initiate the appeal process?

HODGSON: I don't know how they'll advertise it. Before, we ran our own appeals process. It was a really broad process. Now, they are going to catch all extenuating circumstances at the front. Now, only the most extreme circumstances will be appealed. They are trying to minimize the appeals. Some people didn't like advertising the appeals process upfront.

ZHANG: Right now, all of the Access Fund is used to fund students right?

HODGSON: Yes. The physical money itself isn't separated. Money has no identity. In our accounting system, it's clearly dedicated.

ZHANG: What is your plan regarding this?

HODGSON: I wanted to get everyone's thoughts on this. I'm not sure how strong to word it. It may be better to have another meeting next week, and wait till the system settles. The biggest concerns we had were answered.

ZHANG: You can bring it forward whenever you think fit.

#### (a) Conflict of Interest Bill

ZHANG: We were going to bring the first principles to last council meeting. We got pushback from some council members regarding the contents. Board of Governors (BoG) representative Hansra drafted his own version of principles. He said he touched on what he thought was missing in our Bill. In light of that, we pulled the bill. BoG representative Hansra sent us his version. It's really well written. But, we aren't going to use what he wrote. It's his interpretation of what should be in the first principles. Instead, we can pull

relevant stuff from his version. We should have a longer discussion about this. Also, committee members can draft up what they think should be first principles.

HODGSON: BoG representative Hansra did an outline of issues relating to conflict of interest. There's a lot of work to take what he has written to the stage of first principles. Another concern of mine is that it's very technical. Our bylaws should be designed such that any student or councillor could understand it.

I talked with BoG representative Hansra, and his main concern was the flowchart we had. He said that the flowchart had to be communicated to words. My argument is that first principles are about expressing the intent. It has nothing to do with what it will appear as a bylaw later. So, I think it is fine to have a flowchart in the first principles. We will translate that to actual words for the second reading. He also wanted to have more teeth there.

I think the best way to go forward is to read articles about conflict of interest including the research done last year. We can have a meeting specific for this bill.

ZHANG: I'll write my version of the first principles. All members should have an idea of what they believe first principles should look like. If we can find points we all agree on, we wouldn't have to talk much about those.

HODGSON: It's nice to have a work plan. We talked about reviewing bylaws and the Access Fund bill. We should plan meetings accordingly.

***ALLARD moved to table the Conflict of Interest Bill till next meeting.  
The motion was seconded by KWAN.***

***Vote 6/0/0***

***CARRIED***

**7. CLOSED SESSION** *NIL*

**8. NEXT MEETING** *August 14, 2014 at 6.00 pm.*

**9. ADJOURNMENT** ***HWANG moved to adjourn the meeting.  
The motion was seconded by HUDSON.***

***Vote 6/0/0***

***CARRIED***

The meeting was adjourned by ZHANG at 7.01 pm.