
Wednesday, March 12, 2025
FGPS Boardroom, 1-16 Triffo Hall
10:00 AM - 12:00 PM

The GSA and the University of Alberta reside on Treaty 6 territory and the homeland of the Métis. This territory is a traditional gathering place for diverse Indigenous peoples including the Cree, Blackfoot, Métis, Nakota Sioux, Anishinaabe, Dene, Ojibway, Saulteaux, Inuit, and many others whose histories, languages, and cultures continue to influence our vibrant community. In acknowledging this traditional territory and its significance for the Indigenous peoples who lived and continue to live upon it, we recognize its longer history that reaches beyond colonization and the establishment of European colonies and recognize the GSA's ongoing collective responsibility in working with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit (FNMI) peoples and what that means for the work of the GSA as it aims to practice the principles of being Good Relations with FNMI peoples, Nations, communities, and lands.

QUORUM FOR GSAB IS THREE OF THE FIVE DIRECTLY-ELECTED OFFICERS
(Excluding the Associate Vice-President Labour)

ORDER OF SUCCESSION FOR GSA BOARD CHAIR:
Vice-President Student Life, Vice-President Student Services, Vice-President Academic

CLOSED SESSION:
Discussion of matters pertaining to the business interests of the GSA will occur in Closed Session

Regrets/Anticipated Absences of Directly-Elected Officers and Non-Voting Members
February 1-28, 2025

IN ATTENDANCE:
GSAB Voting Members:
GSA President: Haseeb Arshad (HA); VP External: Parman Mojir Shaibani (PS) [online]; VP Academic: Rija Kamran (RK) [online]; VP Student Services: Saad Iqbal (SI) [online]

GSAB Non-Voting Members:
Executive Director Lewie Moodley (LM); Associate Director Cindy Roose (CR); AVP Labour Muneeb Raja (MR) [online]; GSA Finance Manager Dorota Dziekan-Kryjak (DK); GSA Accountant Seidy Louangxay (SL); GSA Speaker: Zain Patel (ZP) [online]; GSA Deputy Speaker: Amirah Nazir (AN) [online]; Councillor-At-Large: Arseniy Belosokhov (AB) [online];

Regrets:
Councillor-At-Large: Cheryl Pan (CP); Councillor-At-Large Ibrahim Khodabocus (IK) [online];

Guests:
None at this time

| Time | Item # | Title | Presenter(s) |
|--------|--------------|---|-------------------------|
| 10:08 | 1 | Land Acknowledgement & Approval of the Agenda PS moved. SI seconded. Motion PASSED. | H. Arshad, President |
| 1 min | 2.0-2.5 | Approval of the GSA Board Minutes of March 5, 2025 PS moved. SI seconded. Motion PASSED. | H. Arshad |
| 15 min | 3 3.0-3.8 | <u>DISCUSSION ITEMS:</u> A. DEO Priorities Survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CR stated that we are thinking of sending out a survey for initial information for the SWP going into next year, asking students what should be prioritized with each position, to help build a basis for each DEO's SWP portfolio. We're hoping to send it out this month and compile all the information to work on it in April/May with the new board. b. AB agreed with this survey and how it explains what each VP does, and asks what challenges are important in each area of influence. He stated it's well-worded. It was clarified it will be in Google Form format. c. SI and CR discussed splitting services into separate questions to avoid getting too specific or too vague long answers. CR agreed. d. It will be sent out sometime in March, depending on Brandy's timeline. | H. Arshad |
| 1 hr | 4 | <u>ACTION ITEMS:</u> A. MOTION 1: That the GSA Board RECOMMEND TO GSA COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL , having also been unanimously and separately recommended by the GSA Budget and Finance Committee, the Operating and Capital Budget (2025-2026) (found in the attached material in the "2025-2026 Budget for Approval" column bordered in red on each page), the Labour Union Dues Budget (2025-2026) (found in the attached material in the "2025-2026 Budget for Approval" column bordered in red on each page), and the Restricted and Other Funding Budget (2025-2026) (found in the attached material in the "2025-2026 Budget for Approval" column bordered in red). B. MOTION 2: That the GSA Board RECOMMEND TO GSA COUNCIL TO RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION , having also been reviewed and advised upon by the GSA Budget and Finance Committee, the Operating and Capital Three-Year Budget/Business Plan (2025-2028), the Labour Union Dues Three-Year Budget/Business Plan (2025-2028), and the Restricted | H. Arshad |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>and Other Funding Three-Year Budget/Business Plan (2025-2028) (in the attached material).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Outline of Issue 3-Year Plan and 2025-2026 Budget b. Cover Letter to GSA Council 2025-2026 GSA Operating Budget c. 2025-2026 GSA Operating Budget (Including Capital Budget) (HD Estimated) d. GSA 2025-2026 Operating Budget (including Capital Budget) Narrative e. GSA 2025-2028 Restricted and Other Funding Budget f. GSA 2025-2028 Restricted and Other Funding Budget Narrative g. GSA 2025-2028 Labour Union Restricted Fund Budget h. GSA 2025-2026 Labour Union Restricted Fund Budget Narrative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MR recommended keeping the AVPL stipend the same level as the other VPs as per his previous recommendation and rationale. MR raised this as discussion was not completed at the BFC for him to provide full context. MR raised the point that if the stipend is being reduced due to the scope of the position, which was reduced with the creation of the VPSL portfolio, the portfolios of the VP External and VPSS also delegated portions of their portfolios to VPSL. He posited that these two positions had duty reductions equal to or larger than the AVPL. HA compared the salary to that of the GLU, which MR stated is a significantly smaller union with half the size in numbers and budget, which does not make a fair comparison. He suggested further comparison with other GSAs and to discuss this further at a better time, to align with election advertising for the position, so candidates are informed before running. MR explained that he was in bargaining sessions, so was not able to be available for the entirety of the BFC meeting to give his full recommendations and rationale. He stated that the compensation for loss of pay only covers whatever their university contract pays, which will not always be the same each year with each candidate who holds the position. He stated that AVPL work will increase next year as the GSA and university are going into monetary bargaining. If bargaining does not go well, then mobilization will occur. He recommended postponing this discussion until next year after bargaining is finalized and more research and discussion is done. • AB stated that this is a very divisive issue. We can send the budget back to BFC without the AVPL stipend for this year, and discuss with Council. He suggested making these two separate issues that require further discussion, so the rest of the budget can be finalized. He agreed with MR that the BFC should not have made the decision without his full rationale and perspective. Expectations and responsibilities will be affected by a reduced stipend, which would make GSA services suffer. He questioned whether this is a practical decision for the budget. • RK recommended against separating the stipend issue from the budget. The BFC vote was a recommendation, not finalization. She would be | <p>3.0-3.1 3.2-3.5 3.6-3.21 3.22-3.32 3.33-3.36 3.37-3.39 3.40 3.41-3.42</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>comfortable with this discussion coming up with budget approval at Council rather than reversing the BFC vote and returning it to the committee for discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AB stated that the BFC recommends the budget, so we should just treat it as a recommendation, so there is no decision we need to uphold its decisions currently. HA agreed and stated that the board can make its own recommendation to Council to debate and decide on. ● HA raised that this issue has been discussed at BFC since December 2024, and with management since July 2024. ● HA clarified his rationale was to match the stipend to the scope of the work, rather than duties, and the student number represented (3,500 out of 8,100) compared to the VPs. He stated that as the population represented is 40% of the graduate student population, but the stipend isn't being reduced by 60% and so is not fully tied to the scope of the position. ● HA stated that our GSA is the best paid in Alberta. In response to MR's statement that the UCGSA pays their executive team \$40,000, HA posited that the AVPL is receiving more than that with the additional funding provided by PSAC. He suggested, like the UCGSA, the AVPL should delegate to the newly created, paid positions of Chief Steward and Outreach Coordinator. With the AVPL stipend at its current rate and the \$5,000 honorariums paid to the CS and OC, the funding collectively is over \$50,000. MR stated that their time commitments are around 4 hours per week, so this is not realistic. HA responded that he was unaware of the hours of the Chief Steward and Outreach Coordinator being reduced by the LRC from the first proposal that came to Board (initially 10-15 hours/week). ● HA stated that the previous AVPL of UCGSA recommended her stipend be reduced to \$10,000, not due to their smaller budget, but due to their reduced duties and availability of delegation. He suggested increasing the CS and OC weekly hours, raising their honorarium to \$20,000 collectively to have half the hours of the AVPL. ● HA asked how NL can be AVPL if he is in a course-based Masters and is not a TA. LM and AB clarified that the bylaw states that the AVPL must be an AEGS student at the time of the election or have been within the preceding academic year (D.POL.11.3.C). ● HA presented training sessions put on by PSAC over this year, stating that they are paid attendance sessions. He asked why we have not been advertising these sessions, as graduate students would benefit from attending. He stated that the UCGSA AVPL stated that on an average year an AVPL can make an additional \$7,000 for attending PSAC sessions and conferences, which supplies additional funding to the AVPL stipend. ● MR responded that NL has a GTA contract, so he was eligible to run. Most of the trainings and conferences are on the weekends, particularly the longer sessions, so they don't receive loss of pay funding and are optional attendance. Unless something drastically changes, he doesn't expect NL would earn more than \$500 for trainings over the course of | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>this year, particularly for the reduced pay he would get from his university contract. He is uncertain regarding after-hours payment, but is certain regarding the weekend loss of pay. He doesn't know how the UCGSA got \$7000 on average annually, as he attended every large union conference and had five travel visits, and he received \$50/hour. He believes that the stipend should reflect the complexity of the work and the value added, rather than the number of students represented. MR also stated that the UCGSA AVPL offered to reduce their stipend due to a change in staffing structure, as they separated from their GSA. He posited that they have returned to a GSA staffing structure now and have been increasing their stipends each year and are back to \$40,000 for their executive stipends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AB recommended leaving the AVPL stipend out of it, otherwise the Council may decline the entirety of the budget, and recommended pushing it back to BFC to remove the AVPL issue. ● HA clarified that if there is loss of pay funding, then that funding should keep the stipend at the same rate. However, he posited that the stipend should not be decided on individual cases. ● MR responded that that won't be the case because the numbers used for this decision are based on his contract, so other AVPL candidates would not receive enough loss of pay funding to be equal to the other VPs. He also noted that many of the larger conferences won't be held for another couple of years, so can't be relied on for maintaining the current funding. He stated that with all the bargaining sessions and conferences he attended, he only made an additional \$3500. ● HA stated that if we made the position a full VP again with full scope, then this discussion would be moot. ● RK raised the increase to the GSA membership fee: this would be several times where CPI increases have been applied. In the presence of some additional surplus, she is hesitant to increase the fees considering the financial pressures students are already facing with tuition increases and rental concerns. RK also asked for clarification regarding the HR budget line: CPI and staff changes for the summer student. Is the summer student grant money built into the budget? SL confirmed it's built in. RK was expecting a reduction in the HR line due to the recent restructuring and asked what the increase consisted of. LM explained that as per the union agreement, the unionized staff get an increase each year for standard CPI and tax increases. The increase also takes into account the Health and Dental plan, and other benefits. LM explained that the budget change is also due to the switch in hours from SL to DK: SL's salary is higher, but her hours are going to be reduced this year, while DK's hours are increasing. SL explained that the Finance Manager role is limited to 3 day workweek, despite being a two-role position of Finance Manager and HR Manager. Additionally, LM stated that he did not ask for nor take a salary increase under the ED portfolio. ● HA asked for clarification if the Board approves merit increases for the ED. LM clarified it was for Board approval, which was not put forward. | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HA suggested having a Code of Conduct Officer for the DEOs, rather than a staff HR Manager that reports to the ED. LM stated that it is standard practice for HR to report to the CEO; the university works this way. The staff also have the union to work as HR representatives. LM stated that having a full-time HR officer is significantly cheaper than hiring a third-party HR company, which is around \$100-200/hour. LM stated that the DEOs have both options to approach: a full-time staff member and a third-party HR company. LM encouraged HA to review the SU's HR structure and policy. • It was clarified that the President is the 'CEO,' but the GSA does not have the structure of the university, as the HR Manager falls under staff and reports to the ED, not the President. The only officer that reports to the Board is the Executive Director. • AB stated that currently we are governed by board policy, which currently has no policy regarding interactions between staff and board. DEO complaints go to ACB, but the staff members have no recourse internally other than a third-party company. HA agreed. SL stated that DK has a code of conduct of confidentiality and neutrality for all HR issues. DK stated that it is standard practice for her to report to a CEO or CFO and it was her responsibility to deal with issues with full confidence and neutrality. SL and LM stated that DK should be a third-party, apart from the bylaw and board policy. • LM raised that last year, the GSA committed to supporting the IGSA and part of the restructuring shifted finances from one portfolio to hiring an extra staff for one day a week to support referenda. We have not been updated on how the IGSA is using this funding. Dorte, the previous Finance Manager, was meant to work an extra day to support the IGSA, but refused. • SL stated that DK is making a part-time to full-time transition, so the increase is not substantial. LM stated that GA is also doing two positions of administrative and elections work. LM clarified that he is not doing HR work and HR is not reflected in his contract. • AB raised that as of current board policy, ED is not the HR manager and the AD may hire additional staff. CR clarified that the ED is the only one who reports to the board; it would be highly inappropriate for the board to be involved in managerial and staffing decisions. They agreed that there should be no approval necessary to the managerial hiring process, only a notice of change. • To respond to RK, HA clarified that we have not done the CPI increases over the last few years. We could divert surpluses to reduce the membership fees. SL raised that we will likely not be making the same amount of revenue as expected previously; it's come to her attention that we have a reduction of fees, the latest reconciliation from PAW is that we're only making \$2200/month from the PAW contract, which is going to reduce. The surplus is likely only a quarter of what was originally predicted. Reducing membership fees will limit any surplus we could | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>potentially have. HA clarified that our surplus would reduce from \$50,000 to \$20,000 if we reduced the fees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AB noted that from the Council mailing from November 18th, we discussed that we should start saving and not spend the surplus. HA clarified that this is next year's surplus projection. SL explained that we are projecting surpluses due to interest gained from our bank account, which would reduce with increased spending. We didn't receive bills from the health and dental plan for an extended period of time, which led to larger surpluses from the interest this last year. • HA raised funding from DoS and FGPS: they are signing a contract, committing to giving \$8000 and \$6000 respectively. SL asked if we should revise commercial revenues, which was approved. • PS asked after 'other HR expenses' increases. LM clarified that it is for standard compensation for mileage for picking up supplies, paying for parking, insurance and wear and tear on vehicles, particularly for Social Hour preparations. BE drove to meet two vendors for the Spring Social, which BE usually pays for. Re the team building line, CR explained that in the past they haven't dedicated any funding for staff team building or recognition, as the board does. CR asked for it to be added, to create a healthy and appreciated work environment and to be able to do activities throughout the year, rather than being limited to one event. Office recognition is for birthday cakes, meals, social hours, retirements, weddings, etc. HA asked re NASA loss of pay; that is not an option. HA agreed that it is important for driving expenses and it should be included in the staff contracts. He suggested adding it under the office recognition budget line and increasing it by \$3000 rather than \$5000. CR agreed. • For the PD allowance, HA asked if this includes taking courses and attending conferences. He approved of a restricted allowance for staff to attend CASA conferences to travel with DEOs. SL noted that it is part of the managerial requirements for professional development training. • SI suggested providing more context regarding the usage options for each budget line. AB agreed. • AB recommended that Council should get summary graphics to fully understand the numbers. LM agreed and stated that this system was inherited and we will move to a more user-friendly format. This will be seen in the next budget. SI approved. <p>Motion 1: RK moved. PS seconded. MR raised moving the AVPL motion to a separate motion going to Council, risking the budget not being approved in its entirety. RK suggested discussing with ZP re separating different line items for Council to approve, and make that amendment at the Council.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">HA, SI, PS and RK for. Motion PASSED unanimously.</p> <p>Motion 2: RK moved. SI seconded. HA, RK, PS and SI for. Motion PASSED unanimously.</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--------|---|---|--|
| | 5 | PRESENTATION ITEMS: None at this time | |
| 45 min | 6 | <p>UPDATES - To Be Reported At Next Board</p> <p>A. President</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. University Association Meeting (Feb 26) b. Meeting with T. Raivio (Feb 26) c. BFC Budget Finalizing Meeting (Feb 27) d. Minister Sawhney Budget Meeting (Feb 27) e. Meeting with President Flanagan (Feb 28) f. EDIC (Mar 3) g. EDI Reading Group (Mar 5) h. Meeting with M. Padfield (Mar 5) i. MOU Meeting with S. Wolgemuth (Mar 5) j. HESA AI-cademy Conference (Mar 6-7) k. Recovery Pledge Follow-Up Meeting (Mar 6) l. Hackathon Event Discussion (Mar 6) m. Online GFC Budget Update (Mar 10) n. CAUU Toddler Centre Funding (Mar 11) o. DoS Meeting (Mar 11) <p>B. Vice-President Academic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. CASA Year In Review Consultation (Feb 26 & 27) b. Meeting with T. Raivio (Feb 26) c. ABT Community of Practice (Feb 28) d. GFC Executive Subcommittee on Procedural Oversight (Mar 3) e. Standing Committee on Convocation (Mar 10) f. Online GFC Budget Update (Mar 10) g. LMS of the Future Advisory Committee (Mar 11) h. DoS Meeting (Mar 11) <p>C. Vice-President Student Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. AllFactory Visit re Hydroponics Farm (Feb 26) b. DAAC Meeting (Feb 26) c. BFC Budget Finalizing Meeting (Feb 27) d. HCA 2025 Regional Gathering (Feb 27) e. Coalition for Action on High Risk Drinking (Feb 28) f. Student Group Mental Health Network Meeting (Mar 3) g. WDSJ Review Meeting (Mar 3) h. Meeting with T. Ira (Mar 4) i. Policy Committee Meeting (Mar 6) j. Campus Wellness Network (Mar 7) k. Students Who Parent Working Group (Mar 10) l. SEAP Support Team Meeting (Mar 10) m. CFB Board (Mar 10) n. Meeting with K. Friese (Mar 11) o. DoS Meeting (Mar 11) <p>D. Vice-President External</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Steering Committee: Engage with Purpose (Feb 26) | |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----------------------|
| 6.0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. ab-GPAC Discussion (Mar 6) c. Alumni Council Retreat (Mar 8) d. DoS Meeting (Mar 11) e. Post-Secondary Education Task Force (Mar 12) E. Associate Vice-President Labour <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. BFC Budget Finalizing Meeting (Feb 27) b. Welcome to the Union Training Session (Mar 1) c. GSA Ambassador Program Working Group (Mar 3) d. People Strategy Steering Committee (Mar 11) e. DoS Meeting (Mar 11) F. Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Election Debrief (Feb 26) b. NASA Negotiations (Feb 26) c. BFC Budget Finalizing Meeting (Feb 27) d. Meeting with Ellement & FGPS (Mar 5) e. Meeting with M. Pugsley, IST (Mar 6) f. ab-GPAC Discussion (Mar 6) | L. Moodley, GSA ED |
| 7 | <p>Information Pieces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. LM thanked the board for the opportunity of working here and appreciated the work the GSA is doing. He wished everyone all the best. B. LM clarified with AB that he provided one-month notice of resignation. C. SL asked why this decision has been moved up ahead of the one-month notice in a financial period of importance. HA stated this will be addressed in the Closed Session. SL noted that we are moving into the audit period, which is a significant concern. D. AB asked who will be taking on ED responsibilities, particularly if he is not completing the one month as per the one-month notice. He is uncomfortable working without a standing ED. HA will address this in the Closed Session. AB will be permitted to attend the Closed Session. | |
| 8 | <p>Additional Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. During the budgetary discussion, LM clarified that he informed NL of the potential, not confirmed, reduction in his salary. LM explained that NL had signed an NDA. LM encouraged NL to meet with HA and MR for further discussion and clarification. He maintained that no specific figures were disclosed and emphasized that he did not encourage NL's later behavior at the council meeting. LM stated that his intent was to ensure NL was aware of the potential change before assuming the role, considering that financial planning might have been made based on the original stipend. Questions arose regarding whether LM had committee approval to share this information, with concerns raised about potential breaches of confidentiality. LM defended his actions, stating that he acted within the scope of the NDA, while others argued that confidentiality rules required committee consent for disclosure. Additionally, concerns were expressed over NL's subsequent disclosure | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>of the information during a council meeting and in communications to constituents, which some felt constituted a breach of confidentiality. MR clarified that he had briefly discussed the salary change with NL but did not share specific figures or endorse any claims of misconduct. The discussion also addressed NL's public claims about a "shady" e-vote process regarding the salary reduction, which both LM and MR refuted as inaccurate. The board reiterated the importance of upholding committee decisions and governance protocols, emphasizing that confidential information should not be shared without explicit committee approval, and that any future concerns should be discussed directly with the individuals involved to prevent miscommunication and reputational risks.</p> <p>B. Closed Session Item</p> <p>a. RK moved. PS seconded. Moved into Closed Session at 12:14PM.</p> | |
| | | <p>Adjournment 12:35 PM</p> | |