



Bylaw Committee

June 7, 2022
17:00 MDT
SUB 6-06

The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacîswâskahikan (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 Niitsítapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesųłíné (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	PROXY	PRESENT
Voting Members		
Levi Flaman (Chair)		Y
Daniela Carbajal Velez		Y
Simran Dhillon		N
Jaida Han		N
David Lee		Y
Abner Monteiro		N
Adrian Wattamaniuk		Y
Non-Voting Members & Guests		
Courtney Graham		
Munira Bushra		

MINUTES (Bylaw-2022-01)

2022-01/1

INTRODUCTION

2022-01/1a

Call to Order (2 min)

FLAMAN called the meeting to order at 5:05 pm

2022-01/1b

Approval of Agenda (1 min)

CARBAJAL VELEZ/LEE MOVED to approve the agenda
CARRIED

2022-01/1c

Approval of Minutes (1 min)

CARBAJAL VELEZ/WATTAMANIUK MOVED to approve the minutes
CARRIED

2022-01/1d

Chair's Business (9 min)

- Committee Member Re-Introductions
 - What brought you to Bylaw Committee?
 - Goals or aspirations for the year?

CARBAJAL VELEZ: In previous years, there have not been consultations or discussions with CSJ and Augustana. Bylaws were written most if not all by North Campus Students. I have started conversations regarding making changes to this and they have agreed with it. SGS is also amenable to changes. This is what I want to do this year.

WATTAMANIUK: Broad range of stuff to work on like Governance restructuring improvements, Election Policy. Bylaws are a really important part of an equitable campus environment.

LEE: Says he didn't have much conflict regarding Bylaw although many things have to be changed. Going overtime in SU council meetings which would like to change to use the time more effectively.

FLAMAN: Says GRTF is going to be huge. Engagement task force, DIE board decisions haven't been touched. Governance review, election policy and fees that were implemented are also the big ones.

2022-01/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD (45 min)

2022-01/2a

[Bylaw Committee Standing Orders Revisions](#)

FLAMAN: Says Abner mentioned Bylaws are very restrictive.

- Section 1: Says changes can't be made to it and has to be ignored as changing this mandate means Bylaw has to be changed.
- Section 2: Explains quorum used to be fixed to 4 voting members and I was going to change that to a majority of current voting membership like SU council. Committee especially Bylaw committee right now 4 out of 7 member is a majority at 57% and if someone leaves it's 4 out of 6 is 66% which is super majority. And if we want only a majority of 50% it has to be 3 out of 6. If we happen to have 2 vacancies then 4 out of 5 is 80%. I think having fixed numbers quorum is going to be poor so, just can be changed to a simple majority which is consistent with voting, quorum and many different

bodies.

- Struck out section 4 as it was redundant. 2.9 already says that
- Point 5: first meeting set the annual meeting for the following months. It's vague as it should just be for trimester.
- Line 7 just replacing start up with introductory
- 7, 1 and 2 where it says first meeting after the election of the chair we'll approve the annual meeting schedule which we don't we usually approve just the spring/summer then we do another at the beginning of September then another one at the beginning of January to accommodate any changes to academic schedules
- Line 11: I added in but that's just consolidating from section 19 further down.
- Section 3: Explains it consists of 7 members and specific to Bylaw 100
- There's another section 7 further down for non-voting members just scraping that and moving it up to membership. I don't feel the need for having a whole section when one is already there. We differentiate between voting and non voting membership and then where it wasn't previously specified like other bodies board and gfc do explicitly stating that support staff are non voting members and will remain in the meeting even if it goes in camera.
- Line 4: In the past we put in wording somewhere that any motion from any committee that goes in front of council is supposed to list the current membership of Bylaw committee and the meeting dates sometime for remainder of current terms as they'll always ask who are in the committee so they don't nominate somebody already sitting on it and when the meeting times occur. Having these items included with motion will prevent that from happening.
- Section 5 line 6: This is something I have seen in other boards as well that in my absence rather than designating a temporary alternate chair when need arises it's better to have a vice chair and that person can do outside duties too but I'm open to suggestions.

WATTAMANIUK: Agrees and adds in case you can't attend it's a good idea to allocate it to someone. Do you want to elect it by the committee or appointed by the chair?

FLAMAN: I'd say the same way the chair was elected.

WATTAMANIUK: Agrees

- FLAMAN: Section 6: Only scrapped line 4 and line 5 as I felt it was redundant with what's above. We've had issues in the past where we have given the same task to two similar but different entities creating more problems
- Section 7: Scrap that as that was moved in its entirety to membership
- Section 10: Need to find policy that requires two week wait time to publish minutes
- Section 12: Struck out line 1 and 2 as it conflicts with a previous section that says even non voting members could submit to orders

of the day

- line 4: I like how there's an order of precedence there. I feel there's some which should have more precedence like things which are further up when we have a committee which goes for a certain length of time. Second readings should come before first readings as process are about to come
- Section 15: Added draft people. I figured teams of two might be able to proofread each other and catch things a single person might have missed before bringing things back to the committee for discussion and debate. Might cut down on meeting time.
- Section 18: Is redundant as we're already bound by it and should be known already.
- Section 19: Scrapped as added further up

FLAMAN: Says it's an editable, suggestable document any changes or comments are welcome.

D.I.E. Board Decisions Review

2022-01/2b

- FLAMAN: Standing orders or Bylaw somewhere it says that Bylaw committees are tasked with reviewing the D.I.E. Board reviews and any suggestions made in last year by end of August. From March 4 of last year all of these have just copy-pasted the issue of what they were looking to address on the rulings, how they ruled on the ruling and my commentary on the issue of this position. There was no proposed action or discussion as they were straight forward from August 21. There were two councillors who were kicked out they both appealed the D.I.E. Board and the appeal was rejected. Back in January this year Singh vs SU where current councillor Chanpreet Singh made a motion because they didn't feel the preferential ballot was used but D.I.E. Board rejected the application and they also filed last year Councillors not being able to endorse each other. The elections office said no councillors could endorse each other. He disagreed and filed a ruling and D.I.E. Board said yeah you absolutely can. This could be something we could look into to prevent this.

2022-01/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-01/4

ADJOURNMENT (2 min)

CARBAJAL VELEZ/LEE MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 5:46 pm

CARRIED