



University of Alberta Students' Union

**COUNCIL
ADMINISTRATION
COMMITTEE**

August 9th, 2022

5:00 P.M.

SUB Juniper Room/Zoom

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 Niitsitapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesųłiné (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
Adrian Wattamaniuk (Chair)		Y
Haruun Ali		Y
Rebeca Avila		Y
Milan Regmi		Y
Polina Reisbig		Y
Gurleen Kaur		Y
Julia Viloso		Y
Levi Flaman		Y
Jaida Han		Y
Jaydeen Brooks		Y
David Lee		Y

Abner Monteiro		Y
Joannie Fogue		Y
Chanpreet Singh		Y
Ibukun Ojo		Y
Simran Dhillon		Y
Courtney Graham		NA
Christian Zukowski		NA
Jetro Dano		NA
Tanisha Sahu		NA

MINUTES (CAC-2022-06-M)

2022-06/1

INTRODUCTION

2022-06/1a

Call to Order

Wattamaniuk called the meeting to order at 5:13.

2022-06/1b

Approval of Agenda

AVILA/ALI MOVE TO approve the agenda

CARRIED with ammendments (Unanimous decision)

2022-06/1c

Approval of Minutes

TABLED

2022-06/1d

Chair's Business

2022-06/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2022-06/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-06/3a

ALI/REGMI moves that CAC recommend to Council that a reputable third party conduct an investigation into the allegations of bullying and toxicity on Council and report back within a month.

ALI: Recommends for CAC to strike a subcommittee as approved by council.

Cites concern about inclusivity on council as well. An investigation done by a reputable third party will help determine the source of the issue and to help make a comfortable environment for everyone.

REGMI: Agrees with the motion and will vote in favour - cites several previous concerns that happened in the past.

WATTAMANIUK: Specific information is needed in order to conduct a third party investigation. Suggests that the motion be a signalling of intent for a 3rd party review.

ALI: Suggests moving forward quickly and a good opportunity is now.

Feels it is inappropriate for Marc to suggest that the cost of the investigation is more important than the intent of the investigation itself.

VILLOSO: Clarifies that Marc's information items are not terms of reference.

Asks if Ali's goal is to have his proposed motion approved at CAC or brought for consultation, review and approval at Students' Council.

ALI: The problem has been identified, and that a toxic culture is existent.

WATTAMANIUK: Personally thinks this motion does not fall under CAC's mandate, falls under Article B instead where CAC can make recommendations to Students' Council on the structure of Students' Council and its standing committees. However, the motion itself is not under the purview of CAC to approve.

VILLOSO: The only CAC can control is the budget CAC has, you have to go to Council anything over \$5,000.00.

ALI: Recommends to make a motion to recommend to Council.

FLAMAN: Hesitant to vote in favour of the presented motion because there is no upper budget limit. The report that Marc has given us originally was \$5,000 - \$25,000 and has gone up between \$25,000 - \$30,000. Thinks to use the budget first, and if the committee can't find what it's looking for, then can consider looking outside for other budget resources.

Have floated the idea to Simran to ask KPMG when it does its annual financial statement audit how much it costs to do a risk and compliance audit at the same time

MONTEIRO: If we don't find what we are looking for, we can look at other options. Toxicity, harassment & discrimination is defined in the Code of Conduct and is part of the Code of Conduct is supposed to be used for.

Utilize the Code of Conduct first before going into investing money to doing another process that's outside of the one that's already been created.

WATTAMANIUK: \$20,000 is a lot of money. Students are putting in a ballpark of \$100 a term for the Student's Union and that's is something that needs to be looked at seriously.

REGMI: Warns that councillors need to be very careful when they are only focusing on the cost of 20 000 dollars. While cost does matter, what ultimately needs to be considered is what is coming out of that cost. Something that needs to be considered more than cost is the fact that, at the start of the year, a councillor resigned due to the toxic nature of Council. Councillors in the past have accused the Executives of not doing enough to make Council a safe space. Councillor ALLI, specifically, experienced many racist comments while running for the Students' Council. Suggests that, if the student body is polled, the student body would agree with putting more money into Students' Council in order to make Council a safer space. This would also increase Council applications. Council accountable to undergraduate students and the University. Students know how toxic Council is and are talking about it on Reddit and other channels. The Gateway has also reported on this issue.

ALLI: Having a third party investigation is not a horrible idea. It is costly as it is 20 000 dollars, but the cost is worth it to make students feel safe. The Code of Student Conduct has not helped Students' Council so a third party is the only option.

WATTAMANIUK: KPMG will look at the organization, determine the issues relevant to whatever questions the committee is asking to have answered and potentially provide some recommendations. It is still going to be on council to implement those recommendations and make them happen.

It is worth a shot to be able to analyze the problem internally first because everyone is very aware of the problem that exists.

LEVI: First, agrees with Abner's previous point.

Second, the budget has not been finalized, among other things, it shows that this motion is rash and not properly thought out. The value of this investigation, as presented in the motion, is not tangible and, therefore, the worth of the motion is incapable of being determined.

2022-06/3b

Mentorship/WOW

REGMI: In the mentorship program members of the council will be paired with a student who is aspiring to be a councilor and wants to learn on what its like to be a councilor. Students will have to sign up for this program.

Will be sending out forms tomorrow to look for mentors with the exception of the Executives. Will introduce the program during the week of welcome. Will get in touch with the Social Media committee for advertisement and promotion.

2022-06/3c

[Standing Order Adherence](#)

TABLED.

2022-06/3d

[Councillor Visibility](#)

TABLED.

2022-06/3e

In-Person Attendance at Council

TABLED.

2022-06/3f

Framework for Standing Order Review

TABLED.

2022-06/3g

Size of Council

TABLED.

2022-06/4

ADJOURNMENT

WATTAMANIUK adjourned the meeting at 5:54 P.M.

2022-06/4a

Next Meeting: August 23rd, 2022, 5:00 PM