University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Thursday, August 11, 2016
6:00PM
SUB 6-06

AGENDA (BC 2016-09)

2016-09/1	**INTRODUCTION**
2016-09/1a	**Call to Order**
2016-09/1b	**Approval of Agenda**
2016-09/1c	**Approval of Minutes**
2016-09/1d	**Chair's Business**
2016-09/1d	Attendance
2016-09/1d	Fall meeting schedule - *See information item below*
2016-09/2	**QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**
2016-09/2a	Election enrollment errors - 2014/2015 through 2016/2017
2016-09/2b	General Bylaw review allocation - Reminder
2016-09/3	**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**
2016-09/3a	**Bill #4 - Two member Candidates and Councillor-Designates - *Second Reading***

HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #4, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300 to abolish two member candidates and implement Councillor-Designates according to these first principles (See specific changes on Google Drive).

2016-09/3b **Bill #5 - Department Association Regulations - *Second Reading***

CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the second reading of Bill #5, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, according to these first principles (See specific changes on Google Drive).

2016-09/3c **Bill #6 - CRO Responsibilities - *Second Reading***

LARSEN/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #6, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, to clarify and outline C.R.O. Responsibilities according to the these first principles (See specific changes on Google Drive).

2016-09/3d **Bill #7 - Students' Council Seat Distribution - *Second Reading***

CHRISTENSEN/PROCHNAU MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #7, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, and amend Bylaw 100 and Bylaw 100 Schedule based on the following first principles (See specific changes on Google Drive).

2016-09/3e **Bill #8 - Students' Council Attendance Regulations - *Second Reading***

CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the first reading of Bill #8, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300 based on the following first principles (See specific changes on Google Drive).

2016-09/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-09/4a **Fall Meeting Schedule**

Members will review their Fall schedules before the August 25 Bylaw Committee meeting and provide the Chair with availability. Tentatively, the committee will meet once each month in the Fall according to the following schedule:

Tuesday, September 27 @ 6:00 PM
Tuesday, October 25 @ 6:00 PM
Tuesday, November 29 @ 6:00 PM

2016-09/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2016-09/5a **Next meeting**: Thursday, August 25, 2016 @ 6:00PM in SUB 6-06

University of Alberta Students' Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Thursday, August 4, 2016
6:00 PM
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

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

MINUTES (BC 2016-08)

2016-08/1 **INTRODUCTION**

2016-08/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 18:04 (6:04 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2016-08/1b **Approval of Agenda**

HOWIE/RAHMAN MOVE to approve the agenda.
6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-08/1c **Approval of Minutes**

BROPHY/HOWIE MOVE to approve the minutes from July 28.
3/0/3 (BANISTER, RAHMAN and PROCHNAU abstained)
CARRIED

2016-08/1d **Chair's Business**

2016-08/1d Attendance
Attendance was taken. Proxies in attendance were noted above.

2016-08/2 **<u>QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD</u>**

2016-08/2a **General Bylaw Review Allocation**
CHRISTENSEN
Said that review of Bylaws is to be performed every year as per the Bylaw Committee mandate; therefore Bylaws are allocated for correction of any spelling mistakes to eliminate typos; The past VP Operations and Finance indicated there were typos identified by the team that converted the Bylaws from PDF to Wiki System;

Said that LARSEN has been working on elections Bylaws, 2100 to 2500.

Since full committee attendance has not occurred in recent weeks the committee will proceed with assignment of:

Sandy Brophy – Bylaw 1500
Delaine Howie – Bylaws 100, 8100, 8200 and 8400
Brandon Prochnau – Bylaws 5600 and 4000 bylaw
Reed Larsen – Bylaws 2100 through 2500
Fahim Rahman – Bylaws 3000 and 6100
Robyn Paches – Bylaws 6200 and 6300
Brandon Christensen – Bylaws 500 and 1100

2016-08/2b **Bilingual Translation Committee – Bylaw List**
HOWIE
Introduced the Translation Committee and their progress thus far. Asked if there were any questions and asked Bylaw Committee to come up with the priority Bylaws.

BANISTER
Asked what is the current priority is.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that Bylaws 2200 and 2300 are the first priority since they are

the only one's members actually read.

HOWIE
Indicated they have been doing trials for translators with Policies right now, as they are shorter.

BANISTER
Said that she would like to see 8100, given that it applies to AUFSJ.

CHRSITENSEN
Suggested adding Bylaw 100 as it is the main governing Bylaw.

BROPHY
Said that Bylaw 2500 would also be important as it deals with referenda.

2016-08/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

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

First Principles (Original)

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.

Summary of Discussion
CHRISTENSEN
Introduced the discussion on Students' Council seat distribution, and mentioned the current algorithm in-place and his desire to reduce the seats from 32 to 27, since currently the allotment of seats is arbitrary.

Mentioned he was open to feedback and other methods of allotment.

Asked for discussion

Said that there is a systematic way to allocate seat, whereby one faculty gets at least one seat (lower limit).

BANISTER
Asked if this won't be implemented until the next round of election

CHRISTENSEN
Confirmed BANISTER and assuaged her concerns. Said that when there were 32 seats, there were 2 more committees than there are now.

BANISTER
Said that algorithm, charts and numbers are very political. Mentioned she does not like political things and believes there should be a complete overhaul to reduce how political this organization is.

Suggested that the seats should be proportional to the size of the faculty. Mentioned she is in favor of looking at the numbers, for example. Providing one seat for every 1,000 students enrolled in that faculty. Mentioned the current arbitrary situation doesn't make sense.

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that according to the out-of-date Bylaw 100 Schedule the Students/Seat is 875 and this change recommends 1096.

PROCHNAU
Questioned how the seats would be allocated according to this system.

BANISTER
Said that RAHMAN and herself were discussing with Lisa (Registrar), and every year the data for enrolment is different. Enrolment numbers will be changing by 100s of students in certain faculties this year.

CHRISTENSEN
Agreed that it is supposed to change every year and that, if the CRO actually does the work, it should change every year. The Bylaw 100 Schedule has not be updated in 3 years which is in violation of SU Bylaw 100 Section 2(10).

RAHMAN
Said that it is too late to be changed this year, and that they can plan for changes next year in January, and cited an example of Faculty of Science, mentioning that if Science goes up by 1000 the number of seats go up by 1.

BANISTER
Agreed that it be reflected every year but she would like the process to be evaluated every 3 years; and the Bylaws should then say that the number seats should depend on number of students enrolled and not on a fixed number like 5.

PROCHNAU
Said that the algorithm is the algorithm and that the number of seats doesn't matter. Completely arbitrary. The proportional nature of the algorithm makes sure that each faculty is properly allocated seats, regardless of the total number of seats. Said that they don't need the algorithm, but can put the actual enrolment numbers in a bracket system.

CHRISTENSEN
Agreed with PROCHNAU.

BANISTER
Some faculty get less or more, and that's not relevant; it is about the math and should be fair and proportional; and at least be representative for the faculties and their total number depending on pure math; Mentioned that this way it will not be political;

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that he is more in favor of an equitable system, rather than a purely equally proportional system.

BANISTER
Said that it will be good if people are campaigning, and it will be user friendly as well

CHRISTENSEN
Read on the points. Read on Bylaw 100, Section 2. Read through the principles

RAHMAN
Compared with federal seat structures with north-west territories

(Everyone agreed with points 1 to 3)

HOWIE
Asked when will review happen

BANISTER
Suggested, writing, after SU's assessment of the most recent student registration date, that it will be reviewed in 2016, 2020 and 2024

RAHMAN
Said that every January you can ask the CRO to look into enrollment data

CHRISTENSEN
Rewrote point 5

BANISTER
Said that they will need to decide

CHRISTENSEN
Said that it will be completely generated, and should be based on total enrollment, and mentioned that the figures 29 or 30 in that corresponds to the 30499 corresponds to 30 seats

RAHMAN
Question how CHRISTENSEN's math works

BANISTER
Suggested that if they did not have the algorithm they can have only 1000 per faculty

PROCHNAU
Said that if it is below 1500 they round it down to 1, and if more than 1500 then they round up to 2.

BROPHY
Mentioned his disliking for a complicated algorithm and preference for a bracket system.

Marina
Said that they should not frighten the small faculties.

PROCHNAU

Said that the number that makes sense.

BANISTER
Said that the threshold below is the lower number and above is the above number

BROPHY
Proposed rounding it up to the closest 1000.

Everyone agreed with rounding it up to nearest 1000

CHRISTENSEN
Asked if 6 and 7 need to be different

BANISTER
If every faculty get one and then there should not be any issue.

HOWIE
Mentioned that the wording currently could lead to misinterpretation of the Bylaw, such that there would be an additional seat distributed at 1000, which is not the intent.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested having "notwithstanding" in point 7, and mentioning that every faculty shall have one seat.

RAHMAN
Said that he wants to propose that if any faculty has more than 1500 then the faculty will get an seat.

PROCHNAU
Suggested implementing a chart.

CHRISTENSEN
Said can't have charts in first principles. That said, suggested implementing this in the Bylaw 100 Schedule.

RAHMAN
Suggested that it is totally possible to do by words.

BANISTER
Suggested, for faculties having more students, one more seat for 1,000 more students.

CHRISTENSEN
Read on with the principles.

PROCHNAU
Asked if the Schedule can be changed to chart.

CHRISTENSEN
Confirmed that the Bylaw 100 Schedule could be changed into a chart.

PROCHNAU
Said that he can help with the chart.

RAHMAN
Indicated that with the current wording of Point 7, and mentioned that if there will 1001 students then there will 2 seats, which is not the intention of this Bill.

BANISTER
Said that points 7 and 8 may help.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that the enrolment number will be based on 1000 students and then they can get into the specifics of how the rounding will be

(*Members thought quietly*)

RAHMAN
Said that point 8 specifies the rounding factor.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested explicitly listing the bracket system in the first principles to eliminate the need to create complicated rounding wording. (Typed into Google Doc)

All agreed and approved of the new wording.

BANISTER
Read on. Said that based on these principles the new numbers will be generally the same, and that the CRO will get the data and adjust the Bylaw 100 Schedule.

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that it is explicitly says in Bylaw 100, Section 2(10) that the CRO is supposed to get the enrolment numbers each year and

update the Bylaw 100 Schedule to list the distribution of seats. Indicated that it is black and white and failing to do so is a violation of Bylaw 100.

BANISTER
Questioned if it says that CRO will do this

HOWIE
Confirmed and read out Bylaw 100, Section 2(10) where it mentions the CRO shall calculated the enrollment criteria by February 15. Mentioned she wants the seat allocation remains constant until the next following election cycle

HOWIE and BANISTER
Suggested using "seat allocation shall use the previous year's numbers"

MOTION:
CHRISTENSEN/PROCHNAU MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #7 and amend Bylaw 100 and Bylaw 100 Schedule based on the following first principles:

First Principles (Finalized)

1. The evaluation of Students' Council seat allocation review currently occurs irregularly and often on an *ad hoc* basis.
2. The current seat structure and number has been constant since 2004/2005, when it was last reduced from forty-two (42) to thirty-two (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 adjust the number of seats according to the most recent enrolment data.
6. Every Faculty shall have a minimum of one (1) seat.
7. Where the allocation of seats shall be based on student enrolment below:
    a. 1-1499 shall receive one (1) seat; and
    b. 1500-2499 shall receive two (2) seats; and
    c. 2500-3499 shall receive three (3) seats; and
    d. 3500-4499 shall receive four (4) seats; and
    e. 4500-5499 shall receive five (5) seats; and
    f. 5500-6499 shall receive six (6) seats; and
    g. 6500-7499 shall receive seven (7) seats; and

h. 7500-8499 shall receive eight (8) seats; and
i. 8500-9499 shall receive nine (9) seats;
j. And so on…

1. Bylaw 100 schedule shall be amended to include a chart with the information provided in (7).

2. Seat allocation shall remain constant until the next general election cycle.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-08/3b **Bill #8 - Students' Council Attendance Regulations - *First Principles***

First Principles (Original)

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.

2. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to implement this process.
3. The Speaker shall present these regulations at the start of each trimester.

4. This process shall not take effect until the 2017/2018 term of Students' Council.

Summary of discussion

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that every Bylaw Committee since 2011 has discussed this issue and nothing has ever been done. Said it is very frustrating to see the lack of a decision on this matter.

Mentioned that under the proposal above, at the end of each trimester CAC will evaluate the numbers. Those below 50% will receive communication, through the speaker, indicating a pending motion of removal. There would be two readings of the motion for removal, each to be approved by a majority vote. If the councillor is removed, they would be able to appeal the decision to DIE Board.

BANISTER
Said that she loves the system and that this is coming to Bylaw Committee finally. That said, she believes the motions at Students' Council are too political and that the Councillors should be automatically removed at the end of each trimester where they've had less than 50% attendance. Added that if they feel the decision is unfair they can go to DIE Board.

PROCHNAU
Said the he doesn't agree with Council removing councillors. He believes only constituents should be allowed to do this and believes Council should implement Recall Legislation.

CHRISTENSEN
Said he really likes the idea of Recall Legislation, although questionable logistic viability. Suggested PROCHNAU create principles for Recall Legislation and the committee could discuss it at the August 11th meeting.

BROPHY
Said that he would like having a DIE Board appeal as a last ditch, and maintain the Council vote. Doesn't want people to be "guilty" until proven "innocent."

BANISTER
Emphasized that appeal should only be allowed in cases where accommodation, like family problem, are a consideration.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that it should not be automatic and that based on past situations when it was automatic a councillor was removed for a bogus reason. That said, believes a DIE Board process should at least be maintained so there is some recourse.

BANISTER
Said that her belief is that in an ideal world this would go to referendum. Said this could not be done because PACHES says there is too many referenda this year.

However, if you are a competent councillor you should do at least 50% of the job, otherwise you are fired. She wants to fire these incompetent councillors who don't show up. Said that she wants to wants to second the motion and PROCHNAU agrees give up his second.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested reading line by line. Read on.
All agreed on points 1 and 2. On point 3, suggested attendance be calculated every trimester at the end.

BANISTER
Insisted the committee remove the council motion/readings portion and make it automatic. Change was made. Mentioned this will only apply to Councillors and not Executives or non-voting members (e.g. General Manager). Suggested using "if you miss more than three meetings in a trimester, then the speaker will notify you about the danger your being removed"

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested that, while in principle it would be good to warn these people, it is challenging because almost no one in the SU actually follows the rules and Bylaws as they are written currently, so further

adding instructions would probably not actually change anything and would make the contravening councillor's appeal more successful if this wasn't completed.

BANISTER
Mentioned that these rules should be included in the Nomination Package for each election so that those getting involved know what they're signing up for. Agreed that they should be allowed to appeal to DIE Board.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested a straw poll to gauge support amongst committee members.

Only 4 out of 6 are in favor at this point. Concerns vary from outright opposition to concerns about "guilty" until proven "innocent."

BANISTER
Said that people should not be babied to attend more than 50% of meetings. Said this whole Bill is common sense and doesn't understand why members are opposed.

RAHMAN
Indicated his personal opposition to holding members to account in this way. That said, will support as he is attending for PACHES. Mentioned that those members who don't come to Council are probably hard to reach anyway so suggested that mandatory communication to these councillors doesn't really make sense.

CHRISTENSEN
Moved to strike Point 4, 5a through 5e.

BANISTER
Affirmed the automatic removal system.

RAHMAN
Said that he likes voting process with two readings as proposed in original Bill.

BANISTER
Disagreed and argued against RAHMAN saying that voting is political and that those councillor Council doesn't like would be more likely to be removed.

CHRISTENSEN
Tried to calm the heated emotions and suggested that Bylaw Committee set the conditions in Bylaw for DIE Board to overrule the decision.

HOWIE
Suggested including "contravening councillor shall be able to appeal the decision"

BROPHY
Suggested DIE Board be allowed some judgment in the process as to give the human touch that this system is currently lacking.

Brought up a hypothetical example where a councillor didn't show up at the start of the trimester because they didn't take it seriously, and then mid-way through they turn things around and show up and then for the last meeting they end up ill, family emergency, *etc*. and as such meet the criteria for removal. Using this example, wants to ensure there is discretion.

CHRISTENSEN
Asked if it is reasonable to say "other circumstances deemed reasonable"

BANISTER
Said that "half the meetings in the trimester" should also be mentioned.

All disagree with BANISTER.

HOWIE
Asked if her councillor designate does not attend, and she comes back and presents her case, then can that be deemed reasonable

BANISTER
It should be on a case by case basis, and it is the responsibility of the councillor to ensure their proxies and designates are showing up.

HOWIE
Said that because proxies are not showing up will be the *main* issue and reason this Bylaw is contravened, they can say that proxy or council designate reliability will not be your fault.

BANISTER
Disagreed vehemently with HOWIE and said councillors should be checking in on their proxies and councillor designates. People should take some responsibility and we should not be building Bylaw around incompetent councillors who don't take the position seriously.

RAHMAN
Disagreed with BANISTER. Asked if they can leave Bylaw silent on the subject.

HOWIE
Agreed with RAHMAN.

BANISTER
Moved to add unreliable proxies and councillor designate as an invalid reason, unless DIE Board deems unforeseeable circumstances.

Moving on

BANISTER
Brought up leaves of absence and asked for the committee's thoughts.

CHRISTENSEN
Believed that leave of absences are currently not included in overall percentages. However, was fine in explicitly including this.

BANISTER
Agreed with leave of absences as CHRISTENSEN mention.

CHRISTENSEN
Said he is okay with elections, and asked if all are okay with 6a, 6b and 6c

PROCHNAU
Argued that this is not a paid position but rather volunteer and therefore suggested that removal shouldn't really be used. Also affirmed his stance that councillors should not be paid and that this is a waste of money.

BANISTER
Argued against PROCHNAU and said that these people are representatives and they owe the people who elected them at least some responsibility. This is like the minimum job requirement. To show up to work 50% of the time. It is common sense.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that the Bylaw Committee needs to put a timeline for the appeal process. DIE Board needs certain criteria to ensure there is a process for the appeal since the committee is creating something new. Suggested 48 hours as a starting point.

HOWIE
Suggested appeals process within 7 days by writing to the DIE Board.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that he thinks that it should be 3 business days.

BANISTER
Asked if people can people appeal the DIE Board's decision

CHRISTENSEN
Said yes. Since this isn't an appeal of the CRO's ruling but rather a panel of first instance it is possible to appeal according to Bylaw 1500. Suggested the committee discuss who should go to provide evidence to DIE Board.

BANISTER
Said that the Speaker must be present to provide the facts.

CHRISTENSEN
Agreed with BANISTER.

BANISTER
Asked if it should it be like the councillor vs. council

HOWIE
Brought up serious concerns with BANISTER's overhaul of this bill and suggested abstaining to the motion of this Bill. Said that she is also concerned about DIE Board and the timeline;

RAHMAN
Said that it is non-specific and that he is personally unhappy with this legislation.

(*Everybody talked loudly at the same time*)

HOWIE
Said that all appeals to DIE Board must be in writing, according to

Bylaw 1500.

CHRISTENSEN
Brings the committee back on topic. Suggested adding “the Speaker shall attend the appeals process” (Discussed about "panels first instance")
Read from the top. Suggested making 5 to make it 4a.

BANISTER
Argued against RAHMAN again suggesting that VP PACHES wanted automatic removal and that RAHMAN should respect that as proxy. Said she is fine and trusts DIE Board.

CHRISTENSEN
Confirmed the current wording with an example. Said that out of four meetings, the fourth one can be overturned due to extenuating circumstance.

RAHMAN
Confirmed CHRISTENSEN’s example. Said that it better to have more than 50% for removal.

BANISTER
Asked if everyone is comfortable with 5b?

CHRISTENSEN
Identified concerns of the committee, took a pause and asked how every committee member was feeling about this Bill.

HOWIE
Said she is not feeling good about it. Currently leaning “no”

PROCHNAU
Overall opposed to this legislation and believes it is inappropriate to remove councillors. Will vote abstain at committee.

BROPHY
Said he is not saying yes or no. Leaning to abstain.

BANISTER
Said that she is in favor because she wants the councillors to meet expectations and to be responsible. Questions why people don’t understand.

RAHMAN
Said that he is not a fan if this but VP PACHES is so he will vote “yes.”

CHRISTENSEN
Asked how members felt about the initial process he created with the two readings.

HOWIE
Said that she can look into the how extenuating circumstance work; Re-affirms that she believes people should be responsible or resign. Wonders if they should be kicked off, though. A lot of times, people run unopposed and don’t realize how much time commitment this whole process is. Questions if it is worth kicking someone out. Thinks pensively.

BANSITER
Asks CHRISTENSEN to provide his opinion on the Bill.

CHRISTENSEN
Said that he just wants something to be put in place. Something people are generally agreeable to address this concern so that people will stop talking about it.

HOWIE
Asked if the Bylaw Committee was to implement a Bylaw to deal with this

RAHMAN
Said that the problem is Bylaw 1500

BANISTER
Said that everything single year this is brought up and nothing happens. Gave an impassioned speech saying that if any Bylaw Committee was going to get this done it would be this one because of how hard working and committed to excellence this committee is. Argues that this is such an important issue and that it is time for change.

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned his desire to come up with something agreeable. Said that the committee has already wasted an hour on this, just like every other Bylaw Committee before it. Suggested the committee proceed and see what happens.

RAHMAN
Said that he is afraid to open Bylaw 1500 and believes there should not be any change to DIE Board.

PROCHNAU
Brought up his concerns again. Said that technically Bylaw Committee can do anything, but this is a volunteer position and people who voted the councillors have no say at all; therefore, he does not see the point in attending all meetings; and in this system if a councillor gets removed for not attending, but what difference does it make if one attends and does not participate and does not get removed.

BANISTER
Emphasized that other volunteer positions also have attendance policy.

BROPHY
Said that people should show up, but if they do not then he not for punishing but for giving it a more human touch. Again mentions the current process is “guilty until proven innocent.”

HOWIE
Said that they have given DIE Board a mandate to have some leeway.

BANISTER
Said that if you volunteer there is an expectation, and she doesn’t think that one can be a good councillor by not attending. Again mentioned that if you don’t up to 50% of your job without explanation you will be fired.

PROCHNAU
Argued against BANISTER. Disagreed and said that if you can't quantify something with a value then you can’t compare it as a job.

RAHMAN
Said that if a councillors have midterms and they come to meetings and do not participate and do not contribute, then how their attendance is justified

BANISTER
On her attendance campaign last year, she always mentioned that attendance is only one metric to evaluate councillor effectiveness. She does not believe that it is the be all and end all. Believes that there should be a minimum standard for the position set up front, and that

should be attendance. Believes 50% is a very reasonable number given the ability to Skype, call, send a proxy or designate. Askes the committee if they believe Students' Council should have standards.

HOWIE and CHRISTENSEN
Agreed

PROCHNAU
Agreed with that but conditionally, again mentioning Recall Legislation.

HOWIE
After reviewing Bylaw 1500, said there is no need for any changes. Thus assuaging RAHMAN's earlier concerns and suggesting the removal of Bylaw 1500 from the Bill since it is not needed.

BROPHY
Said that he continues to have an ethical concern with the Bill in its current form.

CHRISTENSEN
Suggested an alternative where it was an automatic suspension following a mandatory DIE Board hearing to decide the contravening councillor's fate. Would the committee be more in favor that way.

Those in favor remained in favor, those opposed remained opposed.

BANISTER
Suggested reading the Bill over and then voting on the motion. Read on.

HOWIE
Expressed concern about "and minimum" and said that it is redundant because "at least 50%" is there; and said that "each election" replaced by "council elections"

All agree.

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that he made those changes changed. Asked for any last questions (*There were none*).

MOTION:
CHRISTENSEN/BANISTER MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill

#8 and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300 based on the following first principles:

First Principles (Finalized)

1. Councillors are expected to attend, send a proxy or Councillor-Designate, to meetings of Students' Council.
2. 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. Formal attendance shall be calculated at the end of every trimester by the Speaker.
4. Where a Councillor has less than 50% attendance at the end of the trimester, they shall be automatically removed as a member of Students' Council.
    a. Leaves of absence for elections shall not be accounted into the attendance percentage.
5. The contravening Councillor shall be able to appeal their removal to D.I.E. Board, based on extenuating circumstances including but not limited to those listed below, within three (3) business days of their removal:
    a. Medical, emotional, mental, or family emergencies; and
    b. Other circumstances deemed reasonable, at the discretion of D.I.E. Board.
6. Unreliable proxies or Councillor-Designates shall not be considered a reasonable excuse for appeal, unless D.I.E. Board deems there were extenuating circumstances.
7. The Speaker shall attend the D.I.E. Board hearing to provide the official attendance record and field any questions of the Board.
8. Should the D.I.E. Board approve an appeal to the contravening Councillor, that Councillor shall be re-appointed immediately.
9. The Speaker shall present at Council and email these regulations to all Councillors at the start of each trimester.
10. These regulations shall also be included in the Nomination Package of each Council election.
11. Bylaw 100 and 2300 shall be amended to implement this process.
12. This process shall not take effect until the 2017/2018 term of Students' Council.

4/0/2 (PROCHNAU and BROPHY abstained)
CARRIED

CHRISTENSEN

Mentioned his concerns that this Bill will likely not pass Council. If this isn't implemented this year he believes it should not be talked about for at least 5 years.

BANISTER
Said if this does not pass she will pursue a referendum as she is very passionate about this topic.

2016-08/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2016-08/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

2016-08/5a **Next Meeting:** Thursday, August 11, 2016 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06

2016-08/5b **BROPHY/HOWIE MOVE** to adjourn at 8:35 PM.

6/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 20:35 (8:35 PM).

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	**VOTES**
HOWIE/RAHMAN MOVE to approve the agenda	6/0/0 – CARRIED
BROPHY/HOWIE MOVE to approve the minutes from July 28.	3/0/3 – CARRIED BANISTER, RAHMAN and PROCHNAU abstained
CHRISTENSEN/PROCHNAU MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #7 and amend Bylaw 100 and Bylaw 100 Schedule based on the following first principles: First Principles (Finalized) 1. The evaluation of Students' Council seat allocation review currently occurs irregularly and often on an *ad hoc* basis. 2. The current seat structure and number has been constant since 2004/2005, when it was last reduced from forty-two (42) to thirty-two (32) seats. 3. Seats are currently distributed according to the "representation by population" rule.	6/0/0 – CARRIED

4. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to implement a regular timeline for Students' Council seat review. 5. Bylaw 100 shall be further amended to adjust the number of seats according to the most recent enrolment data. 6. Every Faculty shall have a minimum of one (1) seat. 7. Where the allocation of seats shall be based on student enrolment below: a. 1-1499 shall receive one (1) seat; and b. 1500-2499 shall receive two (2) seats; and c. 2500-3499 shall receive three (3) seats; and d. 3500-4499 shall receive four (4) seats; and e. 4500-5499 shall receive five (5) seats; and f. 5500-6499 shall receive six (6) seats; and g. 6500-7499 shall receive seven (7) seats; and h. 7500-8499 shall receive eight (8) seats; and i. 8500-9499 shall receive nine (9) seats; j. And so on… 3. Bylaw 100 schedule shall be amended to include a chart with the information provided in (7). 4. Seat allocation shall remain constant until the next general election cycle.	
CHRISTENSEN/BANISTER MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #8 and amend Bylaw 100 and 2300 based on the following first principles: First Principles (Finalized) 1. Councillors are expected to attend, send a proxy or Councillor-Designate, to meetings of Students' Council. 2. 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. Formal attendance shall be calculated at the end of every trimester by the Speaker. 4. Where a Councillor has less than 50% attendance at the end of the trimester, they shall be automatically removed as a member of Students' Council. a. Leaves of absence for elections shall not be accounted into the attendance percentage. 5. The contravening Councillor shall be able to appeal their removal to D.I.E. Board, based on extenuating	4/0/2 – CARRIED PROCHNAU and BROPHY abstained

circumstances including but not limited to those listed below, within three (3) business days of their removal: a. Medical, emotional, mental, or family emergencies; and b. Other circumstances deemed reasonable, at the discretion of D.I.E. Board. 6. Unreliable proxies or Councillor-Designates shall not be considered a reasonable excuse for appeal, unless D.I.E. Board deems there were extenuating circumstances. 7. The Speaker shall attend the D.I.E. Board hearing to provide the official attendance record and field any questions of the Board. 8. Should the D.I.E. Board approve an appeal to the contravening Councillor, that Councillor shall be re-appointed immediately. 9. The Speaker shall present at Council and email these regulations to all Councillors at the start of each trimester. 10. These regulations shall also be included in the Nomination Package of each Council election. 11. Bylaw 100 and 2300 shall be amended to implement this process. 12. This process shall not take effect until the 2017/2018 term of Students' Council.	
BROPHY/HOWIE MOVE to adjourn at 8:35 PM	6/0/0 – CARRIED