

**STUDENT GROUP
COMMITTEE**

Friday, September 17, 2021

12:00 PM

Google Meet

We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students' Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students' Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT (Y/N)
Abner Monteiro, Chair		Y
Christopher Beasley		Y
Daniela Carbajal		Y
Talia Dixon		Y
Aadhavya Sivakumaran		Y
Bing Ge Yang		N
Jaqueline Yang		Y
Asyah Saif		N/A
Selen Erkut		N/A
Courtney Graham		N/A

MINUTES (SGC 2021-01)

- 2021-01/1 INTRODUCTION Abner Monteiro**
- 2021-01/1a Call to Order**
- MONTEIRO CALLED the meeting to order at 12:06 P.M.
- 2021-01/1b Approval of Minutes**
- 2021-01/1c Approval of Agenda**
- DIXON/SIVAKUMARAN MOVED to approve the agenda.
- 2021-01/1d Chair's Business**
- Welcome

**STUDENT GROUP
COMMITTEE**

2021-01/2 **QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2021-01/2a This is an opportunity to ask any questions you may have.

2021-01/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2021-01/3a Undergraduate Psychology Association Investigation

Selen Erkut

ERKUT: UPA is both a departmental group as well as a student group. They are accountable to both OASIS and ICE. A complaint was received about a student who believed they were wrongfully accused of fraud in the UPA election. They came to the SU to express their concerns and give a detailed overview of the events. A report has been drafted about this situation and a list of recommendations on what to do about this situation is included within the report.

There were no physical damages on the complainant but there were emotional damages.

The UPA conducted an investigation into this case and their investigation was not supported and was advised against by the SU, who conducted their own investigation.

The UPA investigation should not be considered as valid.

The complainant has no academic charges against them, but was removed from their executive position.

More clear guidelines on election conduct need to be created, which is where the SGC comes into play, as they have the power to do so.

The complainant and all witnesses will come to SGC at the next meeting, to give them a chance to speak about the case. As well, the report is attached to the agenda and it is expected that everyone reads it for the next meeting.

DIXON: Will the final decision be made in front of the complainant and witnesses, as they are attending the meeting?

MONTEIRO: The standing orders are unclear on this situation. Standing orders will be read through again to confirm this. If the standing orders remain unclear, the committee can decide

the best course of action.

DIXON: Suggests that there should be a closed session where the committee decides without the pirates present.

BEASLEY: Suggests following DIE Board precedent where the complainant talks, asks questions and then leave the meeting when the decisions is being made.

COMMITTEE: Agrees

BEASLEY: Was the President of OASIS last year but does not hold any information or direct contact with the situation. However, has a relationship with the UPA executives and may decide to sit out of the next meeting due to a potential conflict of interest.

MONTEIRO: Suggests that both Beasley and Erkut should be a part of the discussion and question period but should leave for the decision making process.

ERKUT: Agrees.

BEASLEY: Agrees.

2021-01/3b

LEY/ORVOLD MOVED to, on behalf of Council, request that the Student Group Committee assess the relationship between the International Students' Association and Students' Union, and provide recommendations to Council on how it may be improved.

Abner Monteiro
Selen Erkut

MONTEIRO: The objective of this item is to give objective advice and recommendations, without letting personal matters into the conversation.

The starting point will be investigating what happened with the ISA/SU relationship and then recommendations will be given.

Should Erkut draft a report, shaped by the recommendations of the SGC, or should Erkut start a report immediately and then give it to SGC to make recommendations about it?

Would you prefer Erkut to make a proposal or would you prefer Erkut to immediately start an investigation?

**STUDENT GROUP
COMMITTEE**

DIXON: Suggests that Erkut should draft a proposal and then bring it back to SGC.

COMMITTEE: Agrees.

MONTEIRO: What groups need to be interviewed so that Erkut can make a proper proposal?

As a group, we need to decide what groups need to be interviewed or what people need to be asked questions.

DIXON: Suggests moving to a CLOSED SESSION.

CARBAJAL: Questions what the consequences are if someone breaks the confidentiality of being in camera, as it has happened in the past.

DIXON: Moving in closed ensures the trust of information and because SGC is such a small group, it will be more obvious who leaked the information. Consequences are listed but that would be explored further if something should happen.

MONTEIRO MOTIONS TO GO IN CAMERA.

BEASLEY/SIVAKUMARAN MOVED TO GO IN CAMERA.

MONTEIRO MOTIONS TO MOVE OUT OF CAMERA

CARBAJAL/SIVAKUMARAN MOVED TO GO OUT OF CAMERA

2021-01/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2021-01/4a [Undergraduate Psychology Association Investigation Report](#)

2021-01/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

MONTEIRO ADJOURNED the meeting at 1:06 P.M.

2021-01/5a **Next Meeting:** October 1st @12:00 P.M.