

Thursday, August 4, 2016

6:00PM

SUB 6-06

AGENDA (BC 2016-08)

2016-08/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-08/1a Call to Order

2016-08/1b Approval of Agenda

2016-08/1c Approval of Minutes

2016-08/1d Chair's Business

2016-08/1d Attendance

2016-08/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-08/2a General Bylaw Review Allocation

2016-08/2b Bilingual Translation Committee - Bylaw List

2016-08/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-08/3a **Bill #7 - Students' Council Seat Distribution - *First Principles***

CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the first reading of Bill #7 and amend Bylaw 100 based on the following first principles:

First Principles

1. The evaluation of Students' Council seat distribution review currently occurs irregularly and often on an *ad hoc* basis.
2. The current seat structure and number has been constant

since the 2004/2005, where it was last reduced from 42 to 32 seats.

3. Seats are currently distributed according to the “representation by population” rule.
4. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to implement a regular timeline for Students’ Council seat review.
5. Bylaw 100 shall be further amended to reduce the number of seats on Students’ Council from 32 to 27, starting in the 2017/2018 term.
6. Students’ Council shall continue to follow the “representation by population” rule.

2016-08/3b

Bill #8 - Students’ Council Attendance Regulations - *First Principles*

CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the first reading of Bill #8 and amend Bylaw 100 based on the following first principles:

First Principles

1. Councillors are expected to attend, send a proxy or Councillor-Designate, to meetings of Students’ Council.
2. At a minimum, a Councillor shall have an attendance record of at least 50% of meetings each trimester, where attendance is defined as attending for at least one (1) roll call of attendance.
3. Where a Councillor contravenes these regulations, they shall be removed from Students’ Council according to the following process:
 - a. A formal motion from the Council Administration Committee (CAC), through the Speaker, to the contravening Councillor notifying them of their pending removal; and
 - b. At least two (2) readings, not occurring at the same

- meeting, discussing the removal of the contravening Councillor, requiring a majority vote of Students' Council to pass; and
- c. Where the first reading shall include a presentation where the respondents shall be given the opportunity to defend themselves, and the appellant shall be given the opportunity to present their case for removal; and
 - d. Where the proceedings shall take place *in camera*; and
 - e. Where the second reading is successfully passed, the contravening Councillor shall be immediately removed; and
 - f. Where the contravening Councillor believes fair and due process was not followed or where extenuating circumstances were not adequately considered, they shall be able to appeal the decision to D.I.E. Board for final consideration.
4. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to implement this process.
 5. The Speaker shall present these regulations at the start of each trimester.
 6. This process shall not take effect until the 2017/2018 term of Students' Council.

2016-08/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-08/5

ADJOURNMENT

2016-08/5a

Next meeting: Thursday, August 11, 2016 @ 6:00PM in SUB 6-06

**BYLAW
COMMITTEE**

Thursday, July 28, 2016

6:00 PM

SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Brandon Christensen (Chair)		Y
Bismillah Kiani	Sandy Brophy	Y
Brandon Prochnau		N
Delane Howie		Y
Eilish McKinlay	Marina Banister	0.5
Reed Larsen		Y
Robyn Paches		Y

MINUTES (BC 2016-07)

2016-07/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-07/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 18:01 (6:01PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2016-07/1b Approval of Agenda

BANISTER/HOWIE MOVE to approve the agenda.

6/0/0

CARRIED

2016-07/1c Approval of Minutes

HOWIE/LARSEN MOVE to approve the minutes from July 14.

5/0/1 (BANISTER abstained)

CARRIED

2016-07/1d **Chair's Business**

2016-07/1d Attendance

Attendance was taken. Councillor FLAMAN and ANGUS (over Skype) were additionally present. The meeting began with item 3b at BANISTER's request.

2016-07/1d Summer meeting schedule: August 4, 11, & 25

2016-07/2 **QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2016-07/2a **Council seat distribution review – Discussion**

CHRISTENSEN

Said that currently the number of council seats is 32, and there has been cut down in recent years; and it is suggested that 5 seats will be cut again, making it 27 seats.

Asked for any thoughts

ANGUS

Asked how CHRISTENSEN arrive at the number.

CHRISTENSEN

Said that there is a formula. Multiple options are on the table. Easiest would be just cutting the maximum number although another idea is to introduce capping so that equitable seat distribution is ensured, where a maximum of 5 seat per is allocated to a faculty

ANGUS

Said that arts and science students have lots of representation, and questioned how often changes is made to the formula

CHRISTENSEN

Replied that change of not made to the formula, but the numbers inputted into the formula change.

LARSEN

Said that you take number of committee seats that you have, and you take 5 committees and 5 people in them, and then it becomes 25, and so is fairly reasonable

ANGUS

Replied that it seems radical, and is not very realistic, but it is good

HOWIE

Said that it makes no sense for tiny faculties to have 2 seats when others are not filled; and that some seats are cut and they are from science and engineering

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it was based on the formula from 2009 and 2011

Read on the numbers of different faculties, and also read out how much each faculty dropped;

Said that it is how the algorithm works, and seats are never cut from the faculty with one seat only; reads out how many seats each faculty will have if they cut to 27;

HOWIE

Agreed

Said that the number of people who actually participate are not all, because all are on committee but not contributing; and there may not be opportunity also for all people to speak out as well, therefore 32 people is a lot

LARSEN

Said that What it does is it pushes councillors to be on roles for all the time, and they can't do that as they are council members; and he prefers bringing it down to a controllable number so that have some sort of engagement is assured for all

ANGUS

Asked that to present to Council how do they justify, and what is the justification for doing it; and said that he doesn't think the formula is a fair justification

PACHES

Said that there are people who are not more engaged than others but others contribute in different ways, and therefore dropping is not a good solution; Said that even if people don't talk they may contribute in other ways

Agree with ANGUS that dropping numbers may facilitate more efficient discussion and will be easier for people to grasp, but he is hesitant to drop numbers because proportional representation of faculties is what he wants; if they drop number then they must ensure that proportion is assured as that is the model for governance
Asked that they are 32 now and can they have a discussion ?

LARSEN

Said that if they were three councillors only they will have much stronger connection with their faculties, but not in larger numbers; and that it should be people who already are engaged and not people sitting at back;

PACHES

Responded to LARSEN by saying that with large faculties it will be tough to say that

BROPHY

Said that at the same time it can be an argument for not lowering the number

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he thinks that it is a procedural step for making Students' Council function more efficiently

LARSEN

Said that he is a fan of that, and people should put more hours per week

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he will see what happened last time from the motions in the minutes, and based on that they can make a general review process which is good to have once in three years, for example; and that the algorithm is based on the number of total students and the seats available at the minimum

LARSEN

Said that they have seen the actual quorum, and new enrolment schedule to change seats

CHRISTENSEN

Threshold is 31000 students that directly translates to 32 seats and that's how this algorithm works
Asked if they should pursue this or not.

(General agreement to look into it from the committee, PACHES will get numbers)

BROPHY

Suggested that it should go to the CAC before the Bylaw Committee discusses it.

2016-07/2b

Council attendance regulations – Discussion

CHRISTENSEN

Said that they need to decide on Council attendance regulations and whether the committee will pursue it as a referendum or as a Bill in Council.

PACHES

Mentioned that he had a conversation with ANGUS about referendum form; and that four to five referendums are happening this year; there is going to be message overload on students; this should change for it to be a success, and the question is whether the Students' Council has the authority or not; and the question also is will students truly be voicing opinions.

ANGUS

Said that it is possible to change Bylaw with Council alone but that he wanted to seek constituent opinion because of how controversial this has been.

CHRISTENSEN

Questioned if the Bylaw Committee supports this or not

(LARSEN, BROPHY and PACHES express their support)

HOWIE

Said that she generally would say yes but with a big question mark

CHRISTENSEN

Said that there is a layout with the actual process, and some important things are:

- Every trimester there will be an evaluation
- Upon missing many meetings, the councillor in advance that proceedings for their removal will be occurring over the course of 2 meetings.
- Ability to appeal that decision, then D.I.E. board will be involved to finalize the decision.

Said that it is how he saw it, and mentioned that August 26 is the last meeting of this trimester

HOWIE

Said that she prefers 50%

PACHES

Said that he supports three consecutive absences, and clarified that if in a month it is over if three times/meetings are missed in a row; and it is relatively easy for one to appointment a proxy because of knowledge of the faculty

BROPHY

Said that it is not the formula but what the actual person thinks matters

PACHES

Suggested that he wants to keep it simple, and therefore one page is good for attendance policy, instead of 6.

HOWIE

Suggested more thoughts and discussions

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested having these as discussion items and adding them to CAC agenda

2016-07/2c

Council and committee remuneration – Discussion

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned about the “pay as you go” remuneration scheme
Said that it is about payment of a fee to councillors for every meeting they attend; For example, \$10 for committee meetings and \$20 for council meetings. Mentioned that this is not his opinion to include a payment structure but rather one of some members who have asked for Bylaw to explore this.

LARSEN

Said that he think of this like a small town where one get paid by the number of meetings one attends and the number of hours one puts into it; and that he agree that it is worth it, because if people are interested in money they will come and add to discussions in meetings

CHRISTENSEN

Explained that all these three discussion items today are interconnected

HOWIE

Questioned how does it work for proxies

CHRISTENSEN

Replied that there would only be payment if the actual elected official attended. A proxy would count for attendance purposes but not for remuneration purposes.

PACHES

Explained that it will cost \$40,000 to run council that way; and will cost \$840 per council meeting;

Questioned that If you work for an not-for-profit organization that advocates for students, then how can you ask money that exorbitant.

Mentioned that he is a business student, and well understands value for money for time spent, but if you go to average students, and say that you have to pay more SU fees then they will not like that;

Said that therefore he has trouble with financial remuneration, but they can go to council and CAC.

HOWIE

Said that this does not make sense to regular students, as they often assume Students' Council is very easy and low commitment. For example, she was told that Council duties will take only in a couple of hours and is not a major time commitment. This ended up not being true, evidenced by many 2.5+ hour Bylaw meetings; therefore, it would be a hard sell to students and is not sure it is worth it.

PACHES

Mentioned that 80-90% of the students will not support this and that he is worried about a tarnishing scandal.

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he is not a huge fan of spending people's money and is hard to implement.

PACHES

Said that he doesn't want to financially remunerate councillors, only executives.

LARSEN

Said that financial award for attending meetings will drive people, be it any amount; if it is stipend it works for him too, and creative solutions are fine too, although he is not in need of money; and what he needs is value of a position and that every student should understand that there is value;

PACHES

Replied that he doesn't agree because councillors are elected, and money would add relevancy of meeting but won't add value

ANGUS

Mentioned that a lot of Students' Unions pay their councillors, and gave the example of University of Calgary. Although mentioned that there has been no objective increase in quality according to his discussions with UCalgary.

HOWIE

Said that she doesn't like doing things based on what others do; it is hard to put something on a less involved councillor; people who will come to contribute are the people who do; and she doesn't think pouring money into those people who are otherwise not involved will not solve the problem;

BROPHY

Agreed with PACHES

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned that it a good discussion but he doesn't see real chances of this change actually happening. People can have a follow up discussion afterwards.

(ANGUS departed the meeting)

2016-07/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-07/3a

Bill #4 - Two member candidates & Councillor-Designates - *First principles*

First Principles (Original)

1. The process for two-person candidates shall be abolished from SU Bylaws, given the questionable viability and usability in 1-year terms.
2. The definition of short-term and long-term proxies shall be amended into two new categories: "Proxy" (short term) and "Councillor-designate" (long term).
3. The process for Councillor-designate appointment shall be amended to:
 - a. Simplify appointment requirements; and
 - b. Set term limits on the appointment.
2. The process for Proxy appointment shall remain constant.

3. Bylaws 100 and 2300 shall be amended to implement these changes.

Summary of Discussion

CHRISTENSEN

Said that HOWIE and he worked on it and tried merging their ideas. Councillor HOWIE will be introducing this as her Bill.

HOWIE

Suggested completely abolishing two-person candidates. The original idea was to allow more representation but believes it was implemented hastily. Newly suggested having an official designation for long-term proxies. Said that changes will be made to Bylaw 100 and 2300.

Long term proxy will be renamed as Councillor-Designate.

PACHES

Said that he likes the current way because it will give legitimacy to both people. However, logistically the solution method provided here will be much simpler with the new Councillor-Designate system.

HOWIE

Asked for opinions if it needs to be made public, or just conveyed to the person to be a Councillor-Designate

CHRISTENSEN

Agreed that it is a problem and suggested that the best public way to post it will be on the Order Paper for the first meeting the Councillor-Designate will be appointed.

BROPHY

Said that communication in advance is ideal but there is no fair way to ensure this and also doesn't take into consideration extenuating circumstances that may come up in life.

LARSEN

Said he doesn't believe people should have to announce anything.

PACHES

Suggested focussing on the wording

Said that he can get appointed, for three terms; two-person candidate can be appointed as the elected member knows whether or not

he/she going for co-op, and so can appoint this person to take over;
Said that the main concern in Councillor-Designate is that the person in the seat is not elected, and about the reasoning behind why the two term was brought up.

HOWIE

Said that as a proxy you are taking more flexibility than an elected councillor.

PACHES

Said that if you are taking the effort to run in the election you must be prepared.

LARSEN

Said that "Abolish" is a great word but "removed" is a better word

CHRISTENSEN

Said he liked abolish because it is literally the perfect word for legislation.

HOWIE

Asked whether in point 4, if it can be mentioned that proxies don't change

LARSEN

Said that by having original point 4 it limits the legislation if the committee wanted to change anything in second reading. Suggested removal of point 4.

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested modification, and a minimum of two meetings minimum for being called a long-term proxy, and a maximum of two trimesters for the same, but not three trimesters as maximum; Said that he doesn't want to be too restrictive. Removed point 4 as well.

HOWIE

Said that she doesn't want councillors to be gone for long term.

CHRISTENSEN

Said that he is talking about maximum amount of time. Currently, a long term proxy could be appointed for the whole year.

PACHES

Asked if not for more than one trimester, but how about two-thirds of

a term.

CHRISTENSEN

Said that it will have too many limitations and make things more challenging.

(More than one people talked to discuss, and debated whether "abolish" is an appropriate word, or "correct" is).

An informal motion passed 3-2 for the word "abolish."

MOTION:

HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #4, and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300, to abolish two member candidates and implement Councillor-Designates according to these principles.

First Principles (Finalized)

1. The process for two member candidates shall be removed from SU Bylaws, given the questionable viability and usability in 1-year terms.
2. The definition of short-term and long-term proxies shall be amended into two new categories: "Proxy" (short term) and "Councillor-Designate" (long term).
3. The process for Councillor-Designate appointment shall be amended to:
 - a. Simplify appointment requirements; and
 - b. Set regulations and guidelines on the appointment process.
1. Bylaws 100 and 2300 shall be amended to implement these changes.

5/0/0

CARRIED

2016-07/3b

Bill #5 - Department Association Regulations - *First principles*

1. Department Associations shall be delegated authority by the Students' Union through their Faculty Associations to be official representatives for students in their departments, as well as provide advocacy and community building roles.
2. Departmental Associations already exist in the Students' Union hierarchy.

3. Bylaw 8100 shall be amended to provide clearer definitions for Departmental Associations. This will clarify their roles, give them legitimacy under the Students' Union, and allow the Students' Union and Faculty Associations to better connect with and support them.
4. Bylaw 8100 shall describe the minimum requirements for being a recognized Departmental Association.
5. Bylaw 8100 Schedule shall contain a list of all currently recognized Departmental Associations.

Summary of discussion

CHRISTENSEN

First principles are available to Bylaw Committee in the working folder on Google Drive;

BANISTER

This is not specially riveting, as currently in Bylaw DAs exist but it is not really formally defined in our structure. Said that DAs are students representative organizations, which have community building and advocacy roles but the description needs new, strong wording; she is hoping to get this passed by Bylaw Committee, and that will empower DAs; DAs exist and can empower students; and FAs are close to students but DAs are even closer, and can understand what students think and communicate the same to Council and abroad;

Said that the easiest way to compare is by looking at the federal, provincial and municipal governments; and that she is in favor of more general opinions and wants to take it in a stronger direction. At this point, she will keep things quite vague and not overly specific as the structure of each DA differs. Therefore, she does not want to over-legislate the particulars.

BROPHY

Agreed with BANISTER

CHRISTENSEN

Asked about what changes would be specifically in the second reading so the committee has a sense of what she's trying to accomplish.

BANISTER

Said that the second reading is similar to the first, and that it will be a little vague at this time; departments across campus look different;

and there are departments in business but not technically - they will be considered departments for all purposes (e.g. civil engineering, nursing, *etc.*) and they can just not be any groups;

FLAMAN

East Asian studies is a specialization in BA and Business, both, and how about that?

PACHES

Asked if DAs can be majors or academic departments only?

BANISTER

Said that the reason this general is because it different in different faculties; and in business, accounting cannot be a FA but in terms of advocacy they can be.

ANGUS

Passionately asked for further context.

BANISTER

Said that right now DAs are mixed up, and once they are given credibility they can be defined better; some are currently defined as clubs; This will also open the door to more resources. Currently, FAs financially support department and don't want to leave DAs hanging in cases where the FA goes under; Her goal is to have another Bylaw so that we distribute money better if FAs die and DAs don't die; the SU wants reach all organizations to become part of governance family.

BROPHY

Asked about room for fields of studies, giving examples of family law and criminal law

BANISTER

Said that she thinks that not all faculties have DAs; if, for instance, criminal law student association recognizes them then they can

There are two things:

- 1) Number one is increase roles and responsibilities
- 2) Second is, for instance if they have accounting club and don't want to become then they don't have to

LARSEN

Asked how independent funding model is to be constructed to make it sustainable.

BANISTER

Said that she doesn't want to bring it until later in the year, and that there will be schemes like emergency funding; and it has to be a different way because if FAs collapses then department should not suffer

Said that there is an email list for DA executives, and so they know the people who can be there

Called for the perspectives about where exactly to put in Bylaw.

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested Bylaw 8100, and said it would fit perfectly in there as a the Student Representative Association Bylaw.

BANISTER

Asked if the members want to go through it line by line

(HOWIE and LARSEN made some suggestions about wordings)

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested to pay attention to wordings line by line as that's what they do normally as part of due diligence.

BANISTER

Read on and asks for comments

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested having "shall be" in point 1

BANISTER

Read point 2 (all are fine with it)

Read point 3

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested adding "Bylaw 8100 shall be amended"

BANISTER

Read on

Suggested changing "to membership in that DAs..."

Asked if everyone is comfortable and for comments

BROPHY

Asked for standard metrics for analysis

BANISTER

Replied that there is no definition. Said that she will send to DG and COFA

MOTION:

BANISTER/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #5, and amend Bylaw 8100, to define department associations based on the following first principles.

6/0/0

CARRIED

(FLAMAN and BANISTER left the meeting)

2016-07/3c

Bill #6 - CRO Responsibilities Amendment - *First principles*

First Principles (Original)

1. Responsibilities of the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) are in need of updating to reflect the growing scale of elections and value of office. As such the following amendments shall be made to bylaw to ensure a stronger role throughout the academic year and during elections of the CROs office.
2. 'Advertisement' shall be amended to ensure CRO has larger and long term capabilities to properly advertise elections.
3. Timelines for reporting activity of office, both during elections and throughout academic year, shall be amended or introduced.
4. Timelines for nomination packages shall be amended to ensure proper release.
5. The CROs responsibility in electronic device and social media management shall be amended to ensure candidates can have full access to technology without overbearing CRO office.
6. CROs responsibility in ensuring proper procedures are taken during classroom talks shall be solidified.
7. CRO punitive responsibilities shall be amended to ensure timely release of rulings as well as fair and due process for candidates during elections.

8. CRO responsibilities in reviewing elections materials shall be amended to focus on ensuring candidates budgetary constraints to ensure fair elections.
9. Elections bylaw, specifically but not limited to 2100(8) Duties of Elections Staff, shall be amended to fully include responsibilities of elections staff to ensure clear understanding of office.

Summary of discussion

LARSEN

Said that he reviewed CROs responsibility amendment with Donald to make sure what they must do, and agreed that timeline is important; and it scattered into Bylaws 2100 and 2200 and needs to be out in one section

Read sections aloud.

HOWIE

Suggested wording changes

CHRISTENSEN

Suggested using "shall be updated"

LARSEN

Continued reading

Said that Donald was interested in making all out presentation to Council, and that way the CRO can have a definitive mandate

CHRISTENSEN

On point 4, suggested "timely release"

LARSEN

Said that they will see what to do

Reads out point 5

Clarified CRO's role in mandate the use of electronic devices, and said that it does not mandate use of electronic devices outside

PACHES

Mentioned the issue of social media

HOWIE

Said that use of social media must be different from voting

LARSEN

Said that social media management checks on videos and social media, and they want to move CRO office away from content; and questioned about how to structure the sentence;

Suggested taking out social media management, as CRO's office is responsible for managing the use of electronic devices during campaigning, and therefore "overbearing" is the right word;

Said that it is not only iPad but all devices

Added that the scope is not much about fair market value, as it for content delivery; and you can go to the candidate and tell here it is what you have and type it in;

BROPHY

Expressed agreement with the statement but said that in principle he is not with it

LARSEN

Said that "overbearing" is the right word because it should be in CRO's capability

BROPHY

Said that it can be a ridiculous overbearing rule to ban electronic devices

LARSEN

Said that you are supposed to use your phone to show someone or your Facebook page for the same, and to avoid these, everything has to be in the old way, that is a piece of paper;

(Discussions about wording continued)

LARSEN

Read on point 7

Read on 8 and mentioned that better wording is necessary

Said that it is not responsibility of the CRO's office but of the candidate; elections Bylaws prohibits malicious campaign, and the CRO will automatically be able to punish if that is practiced;

Said that instead of policing elections they actually stamp things if they are okay;

HOWIE

Indicated inconsistencies from point to point and suggested changes

PACHES

Suggested "stay within budget" in point 8

LARSEN

Read on point 9

Said that it is specific to CRO's and DRO's job description

LARSEN

Went back to point 5 and said that it is like point 8

Said that it is there so that people know exactly what it is talking about

(Discussion about wording continued)

MOTION:

LARSEN/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #6 and amend Bylaw to clarify and outline C.R.O. Responsibilities based on the following first principles.

First Principles (Finalized)

1. The Chief Returning Officer (C.R.O.) responsibilities shall be updated to reflect the growing scale of elections and value of office. As such the following amendments shall be made to bylaw to ensure a stronger role throughout the academic year and during SU elections.
2. Advertisement responsibilities of the C.R.O. shall be amended to ensure the position has larger and long term responsibilities to properly advertise elections.
3. Timelines for reporting the activities of the C.R.O.'s office, both during elections and throughout academic year, shall be amended or introduced.
4. Timelines for nomination packages shall be amended to ensure timely release.
5. The C.R.O.'s responsibilities regarding proper classroom talk procedure shall be outlined.
6. The C.R.O.'s office shall ensure timely release of rulings as well as fair and due process for candidates during elections.
7. The C.R.O.'s responsibilities regarding the review of campaign materials content shall be amended to focus on ensuring campaigns do not go over budget.
8. The elections bylaws, specifically but not limited to 2100(8) Duties of Elections Staff, shall be amended to fully include

responsibilities of the elections staff to ensure clear understanding of office.

5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-07/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-07/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2016-07/5a **Next Meeting:** Thursday, August 4, 2016 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06

2016-07/5b **BROPHY/PACHES MOVE** to adjourn at 8:15 PM.

5/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 20:15 (8:15 PM).

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
BANISTER/HOWIE MOVE to approve the agenda	6/0/0 – CARRIED
HOWIE/LARSEN MOVE to approve the minutes from July 14	5/0/1 – CARRIED (BANISTER abstained)
HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #4, and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300, to abolish two member candidates and implement Councillor-Designates according to these principles.	5/0/0 – CARRIED
BANISTER/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #5, and amend Bylaw 8100, to define department associations based on the following first principles.	6/0/0 – CARRIED

LARSEN/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #6 and amend Bylaw to clarify and outline C.R.O. Responsibilities based on the following first principles.	5/0/0 – CARRIED
BROPHY/PACHES MOVE to adjourn at 8:15 PM.	5/0/0 – CARRIED