



**FINANCE
COMMITTEE**

**December 6th, 2022
4:00 pm MST
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, Dènesųłiné (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
Julia Villosio, chair	Abner Monteiro	Y
Simran Dhillon, interim chair		Y
Joannie Fogue		Y
Haruun Ali		Y
Lionel Liu	Leo Huang	Y
David Lee		Y
Levi Flaman		Y
Fateh Arslan		Y
Milan Regmi		N
Courtney Graham		N/A
Tanisha Sahu		N/A

MINUTES (FC-2022-14)

2022-14/1

INTRODUCTION

2022-14/1a

Call to Order

DHILLON: CALLED the meeting to order at 4:10 PM

2022-14/1b

Approval of Agenda

FOGUE/ARSLAN MOVE TO approve the agenda for the meeting.

CARRIED

2022-14/1c

Approval of Minutes

TABLED

2022-14/1d

Chair's Business

DHILLON: Informs that she will be the interim chair for today's meeting.

2022-14/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2022-14/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-14/3a

Discussion of SC 2022-14/8h motion:

“**ALI/SINGH MOVE TO** direct the Finance Committee in collaboration with the Executive Committee to complete a financial management assessment of the UASU and to complete a comparative analysis of other Students' Union financial management along with student consultation by February 7th”

FOGUE: Thinks that this motion should go back to Council so that all members can vote on it. Suggests that everyone needs clarity on this item as the Speaker's list ended early during the last Council meeting.

However, also believes that this item fits better in Audit Committee's mandate.

DUMOUCHEL: Adds that there is no problem in doing an assessment as the motion needs additional clarity. However, both Audit and Finance have upcoming deadlines for other projects, which should be kept in mind.

DHILLON: Informs that from the last Council meeting, councillors noted that deadlines would most likely be delayed from the ones presented in the motion. Thinks that when the motion goes back to Council, a change to deadlines won't be an issue.

MONTEIRO: Agrees with FOGUE as many councillors do not have clarity on this motion. Supports sending the motion back to council.

ARSLAN/FOGUE MOVE TO put this item on the council agenda to discuss and get clarity on this motion.

CARRIED

LIU: Asks if there are any updates on the idea proposed by ALI and REGMI to strike an ad-hoc committee or creating a new committee to deal with this issue.

ARSLAN: States that if its going back to council, striking a new committee would be better if that comes from council rather than a committee making the decision.

FLAMAN: Believes that a brand new committee is not needed. As some committees struggle with quorum and with a new committee on the list, it will become an added pressure to the councillors involved.

FOGUE: Seconds FLAMAN. Adds that we dont want to duplicate the work that's already being done. But this is something important towards transparency and financial management. We want to follow right procedures and practices so its better to go back to council to vote on how exactly to proceed.

Abner: Points that we have already committees that can handle this item.

2022-14/3b

[APIRG DFU Report](#)

DHILLON: hope to approve the SLS and APIRG reports. Gives everyone some time to go through the documents.

FLAMAN: Questions on why there is such a large income statement variance between the 2022 Budget and the 2022 Actual value. Adds that variances of about \$25,000 or about 15% from the previous year should be considered significant.

Questions if we can send this back to APIRG and hear what they have to say on this.

DHILLON: Reminds that in regards to deadlines for the committee to approve it, we don't want it to delay because only after our approval they receive their funds.

DUMOUCHEL: Clarifies that the question lies in if its worth asking them, but it is upto to the committee to assess if this approval is fine with a little delay.

FOGUE: Adds that if the response from APIRG will change our decision of them getting the funds.

FLAMAN: States that it goes back to the oath taken. If they have a budgeted amount, as an oversight organization we are supposed to look into it. Adds that he would want to know the response before making a vote on this.

MONTEIRO: Questions if these reports are being addressed for the first time

in the committee or if there was a member assigned to ask these questions.

DHILLON: Answers that this is the first time these reports are coming to Finance Committee. Adds that there are certain members assigned to DFUs, but we've never asked such questions.

Adds that this is a concern and hence this question will be sent to APIRG and hopefully they answer back before our next meeting in order to approve funding for them.

2022-14/3c

[SLS DFU Report](#)

FLAMAN: Raises concern as according to the Bylaw 6200, they are not fulfilling the part that they should post the minutes online publicly but are not on their website.

DHILLON: States that she will contact SLS for breach of the Bylaw 6200 Section 4.5 and hopefully we hear back to approve them on the next meeting.

Flaman: Checks for the same for APIRG and they have the minutes going back until 2002.

2022-14/3d

Fee Governance Discussion

- Budget Creation
- Creation Process

DHILLON: One suggestion from REGMI was to introduce a 1 month mandatory period of consultation with SRAs and the general student body in the process of budget principles creation (e.g: assigning Finance Committee members to SRAs, release surveys, etc.).

FLAMAN: Questions what exactly defines consultation and what should be talked about. Given the low engagement in elections, does not think too many people beyond the already invested people would reply back for the consultation. Adds that councillors and execs are expected to consultation in some way or the other, and need not be told to do consultation as its one of their prime duties. This would essentially mean creating a problem to solve an existing one.

DHILLON: Sees merit in doing the consultation process. It would be better to have it like an informal expectation enforced among the members.

DUMOUCHEL: Points that these are being address as Finance Committee should only consult on things that matter. Budget will be non controversial

in the upcoming years and extensive consultation wouldn't be required. We need not burden the upcoming councillors with these problems we have in the past. But these could be put in the standing orders.

DHILLON: Suggest to somehow place in standing order but in a way that allows flexibility (for the future Finance Committee) while ensuring that it happens. Giving a leeway to the future Finance Committees to decide what consultation would look like in their time.

FLAMAN: States that this would mean that we make recommendations but then have it flexible enough for the upcoming committee to modify.

- Timeline

DHILLON; Same as last possible change proposed as discussed earlier
Have it the same as discussed earlier to make it flexible for the upcoming FC.

DUMOUCHEL: Thinks its better to set an general consultation rather than we stick a schedule because things might differ each year.

FLAMAN: Points that in the past 4 years there has never been a discussion of this sort but a series of mis steps led to this discussion and thinks that its not a lot of heavy handed measures that are needed to correct this.

DHILLON: Agrees as its an expectation of Council, but in an informal manner.

FLAMAN: One suggestion would be to starting the processes soon or tightening the timeline a little order to meet the deadlines.

DUMOUCHEL: Clarifies that we can't just add 30 days in the middle as it will mess up the yearly schedule and processes. Usually no work happens due to Elections and the campaigns which then has to be speedrun to complete the pending items.

MONTEIRO: Thinks that the focus should be on budget principles. There are different requirements and getting a sense of student's feelings on this and then bring that back to finance committee.

- Format

DHILLON: One proposed change is to expand how the budget is displayed with specific breakdowns of departments.

DUMOUCHEL: Clarifies that one of the concerns is breakdown by department. But we don't talk about the specific details of where the money is being spent within the department. States that this is being worked on and some changes would be proposed in early January.

One such change would be specifying how much is being spent on programs or productions, staff and recruitment and, space costs. This is something important to track over time as we're a big organization. The problem is the way these departments are structured and we're trying to consolidate them. For example, at times the costs are spread between some departments and that changes from year to year. So there's a lot of coordination to be done as we want to make it simpler but also protect the privacy.

Thinks that one change can also be questioning a trend data, for example if there's an a deviation in the budget from the previous year by a huge number then it's something questionable.

DHILLON: Thinks that it could be explained in detail. As the budget would only indicate saying \$50000 was spent on academic affairs. But the actual question is what were these academic affairs.

FLAMAN: Points that it's also about how useful the information is and goes back to BTR. Only one event that caused the chaos but it was never a problem prior to it. Getting into too much minute detail might be unnecessary and adding more work on our plates.

DUMOUCHEL: It also highly depends on what information Council really wants. Like for example it could be the big budget changes to be reported.

ALI: More interested in how there's a lack of information. More information is crucial with respect to the size of the organization and its impact towards the students. Seeing the budget, is very confusing on how the organization deals with money. This is not where to do with BTR, but something very important for an organization to have financial transparent.

ARLSAN: Expects everyone to have a basic understanding of a financial statement and then coming up with a conclusion. And hence thinks that what we have now is also pretty detailed.

DHILLON: One of the changes is including more comprehension statistics and thinks that outlining some of the KPIs in regards to if the budget principles are actually progress or being met. One of indicators last year was more expenditure into EDI.

DUMOUCHEL: Clarifies that EDI ends up getting integrating with a lot of things we do. The salaries have come down to range of numbers. One such aspect was on how to cost out the volunteer and staff appreciation. We could also look into supporting the student services and how to save money from their expenditure.

ALI: States that it has been a topic of major discussion on Reddit where students question us on why we didn't have information to the BTR expense prior to the event.

States that last year there was very little discussion while passing the budget and it should have been discussed extensively.

We should have transparency to see who has authorization on spending.

DUMOUCHEL: Agrees that the budget is supposed to be discussed in detail before passing it.

DHILLON: Thinks its mainly about having certain touchpoints on how some budget principles are met or still need to be polished.

FLAMAN: Agrees.

MONTEIRO: Providing information with the trends would definitely help councillors to understand the statements better.

- **Responsible Parties: Finance Committee**

COMMITTEE: No possible changes made to this section.

- **Type B Fees**

- **Definition**

No changes were discussed.

- **Creation**

DHILLON: Comments in regard to the minimum criterias to include in the proposal, if it would be beneficial to have a 4th category that requires them to demonstrate the fee allocation of where the money is spent.

FLAMAN: States that this might potentially intrude a hurdle. An alternative revenue source should be explored but it shouldnt preclude the fees if they can present a case of sufficient need and demonstrate its importance.

DHILLON: Answers that this becomes important for SRA fee creating but for renewals they built their budget off it.

FLAMAN: Suggests that it can be reworded as it sounds like if they dont have an alternative source explored, they can't submit the proposal.

- Review + Oversight
- Reporting
- Termination

2022-14/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2022-14/4a

[Prep Document #5: Budget Process + Type A Fees](#)

2022-14/5

ADJOURNMENT

DHILLON: ADJOURNED the meeting at 6:53 PM.