

**JUNE 24, 2020**

**6:07pm**

[Google Hangout](#)

**ATTENDANCE**

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Alana Krahn		Y
Lucas Marques		Y
Rahul Korde		Y(6:14PM)
Samar Barazesh		Y
Tyler Saretzky		Y
Kristofer Akkerman		Y
Marwan Burhani		Y
Katie Kidd		Y

**MINUTES (FC 2020-03)**

**2020-03/1**

**INTRODUCTION**

**2020-03/1a**

**Call to Order**

KRAHN: Called the meeting to order at 6:07pm.

**2020-03/1b**

**Approval of Agenda**

**KRAHN/MARQUES MOVED** to approve the agenda.

CARRIED

**2020-03/1c**

**Chair's Business**

KRAHN: Noted that the Committee meeting scheduled July 8 requires an alternate chair as she will be unavailable.

**2020-03/2**

**QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

**2020-03/2a**

AKKERMAN: Inquired into when the Committee will receive a presentation from the General Manager concerning COVID's impacts on the SU budget.

KRAHN: Determined to ask that the GM present to the Committee on July 8.

**2020-03/3**

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**2020-03/3a**

**Memoranda of Understanding for Dedicated Fee Units**

KRAHN: Established that the Students' Union is looking to create a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with each of its dedicated fee units (DFU). Clarified that the Committee would work to create these agreements. Suggested that the MOUs would improve DFU accountability by enabling students to better understand how their fees contribute to their University experience and make an informed decision when DFU's go to referendum. Noted that the content of the MOU would be informed by referendum questions and DFU mandates as per Bylaw 6100 Schedule. Suggested that MOU's would offer more DFU's more flexibility than Bylaw in terms of fulfilling their obligations to students. Noted that the Committee will have to decide how MOU's are ratified and updated.

BARAZESH: Inquired as to why DFU's go for referendum every five years.

KRAHN: Responded that this timeline is prescribed in Bylaw.

AKKERMAN: Suggested that MOUs be reviewed on the same schedule that DFU's go for referendum but that the Committee should check-in on them annually.

KIDD: Inquired into whether the DFU's are aware of the SU's intent to require them to join into MOU's.

KRAHN: Responded that they are not.

KIDD: Expressed concern that the MOU plan will be contentious given that DFU's believe they are accountable to students and not the SU in fulfilling their mandate.

KRAHN: Suggested that the MOU plan is uncontentious in principle as the SU controls the collection and disbursement of the DFU funds. Clarified that the intent of the plan is not to check every expense made by DFU's in order to ensure it complies with an MOU but rather to create an additional general layer of accountability. Suggested that DFU's who oppose the MOU plan are unconfident in their ability to fulfil the mandate the students expect them to deliver.

KIDD: Opposed the MOU plan on the basis that it is outside the scope of the Committee to judge whether DFU's fulfil their referendum promises. Suggested that DFU's are ultimately responsible to student voters and not with the Students' Union. Clarified that the scope of SU oversight is only to conduct financial audits to ensure no fraud occurs. Suggested, moving forward, that the SU should look to create MOU's only with new DFU's.

MARQUES: Suggested that MOU's are not legally binding and, therefore, would not undermine the primary responsibility DFU's have to voters.

KRAHN: Suggested that Bylaw 6100 empowers the Students' Union to control DFU's via MOU's pursuant to Section 3.7(a) and (b).

KIDD: Inquired into whether Council has the power to cancel a DFU within the middle of the term. Suggested that DFU's would cite Bylaw in rejecting the MOU plan.

AKKERMAN: Inquired as to the authority responsible for auditing DFU's.

KRAHN: Clarified that Finance Committee is the financial oversight body for DFU's.

AKKERMAN: Suggested that DFU's mandates are already sufficient at describing what value they must provide to their student voters.

KRAHN: Expressed concern that some DFU's do not have mandates, have outdated mandates, or have mandates that fail to offer satisfactory explanation or context. Proposed that the Committee do a review of mandates.

AKKERMAN: Inquired into whether the DFU mandates are updated whenever a DFU goes for reapproval at election.

KRAHN: Responded that they should be updated in principle but it is unclear whether that occurs in practice.

KORDE: Inquired into when a DFU goes for review.

KRAHN: Responded that DFU's go for review every five years from their last election.

AKKERMAN: Responded that Bylaw 6000 Schedule identifies when a DFU is set to go for review before students in an election.

KIDD: Expressed concern at the optics of cancelling a DFUs on the basis that it failed to deliver on its MOU when many DFUs, such as Aboriginal Student Council, were created to fill gaps left by the SU. Recommended reviewing DFUS' fulfillment of their mandates annually. Proposed that, if MOUs are implemented, Council and not just the Committee should be responsible for deciding to withhold their funds. Expressed concern that DFUs are not aware of the SU's plan to create MOUs.

AKKERMAN: Inquired into the nature of financial oversight the SU exercises over DFUs.

KIDD: Responded that the SU perform audits to ensure fraud does not occur and that DFUs act pursuant to their mandates. Suggested that MOUs are unduly difficult to apply to DFUs given that they have considerable grey area. Expressed concern, for example, that a DFU could be punished for failing to deliver on its MOU even if it spent all its funds appropriately and made a sincere effort to deliver on its mandate.

KRAHN: Considered the idea of creating a self-reporting system for DFUs to describe their mandate fulfillment. Suggested that, if the Committee is to act in the best interests of students, it is insufficient for the extent of its financial oversight to be limited to fraud prevention.

MARQUES: Suggested that the extent of the Committee's oversight is greater than fraud prevention as the Committee can withhold funds from DFUs that fail to perform their election promises or violate SU Bylaw as per Bylaw 6100 Section 6.1(a-b).

AKKERMAN: Proposed implementing a new reporting requirement as part of Bylaw 6100 6.1(a) which would have DFUs present to Council on how they fulfilled their election promises.

KRAHN: Supported Akkerman's suggestion. Agreed that the decision to withhold DFU funds should be considered at Council.

KIDD: Suggested that the Committee does not have sufficient expertise to determine if a DFU is failing to support the group it serves. Suggested that it should be left up to voters to decide if a DFU should continue. Considered that the SU would have to seek forming MOUs with Residence Associations and Faculty Associations if it creates them with DFUs. Expressed concern at reviewing DFUs for MOUs compliance given that the SU is overworked managing its existing financial oversight obligations. Suggested that it is unrealistic to have DFUs present at Council meetings as there is not enough time in Council's schedule. Proposed discussing the MOU issue at Council.

MARQUES: Concurred with Kidd regarding discussing the issue before Council. Suggested that the Committee does have the authority to review DFU's on whether they are delivering on their election promises.

KIDD: Suggested that the Committee can review DFUs for bylaw compliance but not for mandate fulfillment.

MARQUES: Opposed Kidd's suggestion on the basis that bylaw requires DFUs to fulfil their mandates and that, therefore, they are one in the same.

KRAHN: Determined to discuss MOUs at the next meeting when there is more time and after the Committee has taken time to consider the issue.

**2020-03/4**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

**2020-03/5**

**ADJOURNMENT**

KRAHN: Adjourned the meeting at 7:12pm.

**2020-03/5a**

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, June 3th 2020 6:00pm - 7:00pm