

**BYLAW
COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, May 23, 2017
6:30 PM
SUB 0-55**

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT	SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)
Brandon Christensen (Chair)		Y	N/A
Sandy Brophy		Y	N/A
Navneet Gidda	James Thibaudeau	Y	N/A
Delane Howie		Y	N/A
Nicole Jones		Y	N/A
Robyn Paches		N	N
Alannah Piasecki		Y	N/A

MINUTES (BC 2017-01)

2017-01/1 INTRODUCTION

2017-01/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 18:30 (6:30 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2017-01/1b Approval of Agenda

JONES/PIASECKI MOVE to approve the agenda.

6/0/0

CARRIED

2017-01/1c Approval of Minutes

HOWIE/PIASECKI MOVE to approve the minutes.

5/0/1 (Thibaudeau abstains)

CARRIED

2017-01/1d Chair's Business

2017-01/1d Attendance

Attendance was taken. Proxies in attendance were noted above.

2017-01/1d Welcome & introductions

The committee went around a circle and introduced themselves and their favorite thing about summer.

2017-01/1d How Bylaw committee works

CHRISTENSEN:

Bylaw committee generally meets once every 2 weeks during the summer and perhaps a bit less during the school year. Generally, based on the practice of the last 2 years almost all first readings have originated through bylaw committee and then been passed. Technically, any member can propose first reading directly to council and only second reading needs to come to the committee but recently everything has originated in Bylaw Committee for the sake of robustness.

THIBAudeau:

So technically, any member can propose something to Students' Council without it having to go through Bylaw Committee?

CHRISTENSEN:

Yes! Although, generally more advisable to go through Bylaw Committee.

HOWIE:

I would certainly advise a member to bring this to Bylaw Committee before going to Students' Council as there is more time for discussion and some of the ideas can be better hashed out.

BROPHY:

Like, it's not technically required but its best practice at this point.

2017-01/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2017-01/2a Specific goals for the year and timeline.

CHRISTENSEN:

So, at this point, let's go around the circle and discuss any projects that individuals wish to accomplish this year.

BROPHY:

I would really like to re-open elections bylaws again this summer. After listening to former CRO Donald Ademaj's suggestions there are some changes I would like to see made this summer and will prioritize it.

THIBAudeau:

I don't have any ideas at this point and didn't hear anything from Councillor Gidda.

JONES:

Elections bylaws were of particular interest to me. I would definitely like to work on them.

PIASECKI:

One of my goals would be to look at some of the student representative association bylaws.

HOWIE:

I would also like to look at student representative association bylaws and particularly help the International Students' Association (ISA) become a formalized association with representative powers. Further, I would also like to clarify elections bylaws regarding universal materials.

CHRISTENSEN:

A few of my goals for this year were DIE Board ruling review, which we're doing today. Another were some clarifications in Bylaw 100 regarding Policy Committee, implementation of the Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation (ARRC) Standing Committee, clarifying pre-campaigning in the elections bylaws, rewording some FAMF referendum bylaws to clarify if Bylaw Committee should be drafting these questions and then a small clarification in Bylaw 2400 regarding what happens when a joke candidate wins.

THIBAudeau:

I sit on ARRC and the committee has so far set some goals for the year. They are looking at how to accomplish outreach initiatives for these populations, campus and the community as a whole. They meet on-Council Wednesdays at 6:00PM.

At the ad hoc committee, they were setting some of the goals. They were

BROPHY:

I agree with Councillor Christensen that there needs to be some changes to the FAMF bylaw wording as I think Bylaw Committee should be giving these FAMF questions a read over, since they are analogous to DFUs.

THIBAudeau:

How do things work currently if a joke candidate is elected?

BROPHY:

Bylaw 2400 needs to be clarified as currently it is unclear what happens when a joke candidate wins. Technically, based on the way I read it, it should be vacant which is insane.

2017-01/2b DIE Board ruling 2016-01 review

CHRISTENSEN:

As part of Bylaw Committee's new mandate, the committee shall review all DIE Board rulings prior to August and make recommendations based on the Board's recommendations.

BROPHY:

I think something should be in place to fix the hole in the bylaws that allowed this to happen. in place to fix the hole in bylaws but there should also be a way for the CRO to shut down a question that is inappropriate. Thinks that the CRO should have the ability to shut down questions that are personal in nature.

THIBAudeau:

Believes there should be a clause "at the CRO's discretion".

PIASECKI:

Believes we should define heckling. She views heckling as someone in the audience saying or doing something inappropriate to the candidates.

HOWIE:

Believes the definition of heckling should be discussed. That said, we don't want the bylaws to be reactive, but rather proactive. We should be careful to consider, but not hinge on this. I worry that there could be some concerns with two people standing in line and someone saying, "well we should be kinder" is that considered heckling?

BROPHY:

In this particular situation, the individual in question had a track record of saying inappropriate things.

PIASECKI:

Was the person's previous aggressions documented?

BROPHY:

It was documented in the ruling as facts agreed to but there was no formal documentation for the same.

THIBAudeau:

Believes we should not try to "stop" inappropriate questions but rather reword them in a neutral way. Try to make things less black and white by just saying "no your question is inappropriate."

HOWIE:

Believed that there was no heckling going on based on her colloquial understanding of the term.

BROPHY:

Feels that this was not heckling in any way, shape or form. I believe it is more of a loud disruption. Whereas this situation was more of an interference.

2017-01/2c Dedicated Fee Units and Faculty Association Membership Fees up for renewal this year.

CHRISTENSEN:

DFUs are funds that each student pays which cover the cost of certain operational or granting organizations. CREF is the only DFU up for renewal this year.

HOWIE:

It is a granting dedicated fee unit. There are grants that can be taken away from it. Unlike an operational unit it is not used to fund the organization.

CHRISTENSEN:

AUFSJ and ESS are up for renewal for the FAMF side of things.

HOWIE:

It will be interesting as the AUFSJ question will need to be worded in

French. I will help the new executive word it.

2017-01/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2017-01/3a **Bill #1 - Elections Forums Amendment - *First Reading***

ORIGINAL VERSION:

First Principles

1. Formal regulation of elections forums under Bylaw 2200 is limited to only the Myer Horowitz Forum. There is no regulation of forums under Bylaw 2300.
2. In light of DIE Board ruling 2016-01, additional and clarifying regulations are required, in order for the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) most effectively perform their job.
3. Bylaw 2200 shall be amended to broaden the rules of forums to extend to all forums organized by the elections office, not just the Myer Horowitz Forum.
4. Bylaw 2300 shall be amended to include rules regarding the conduct of forums under that Bylaw, if applicable.
5. The aforementioned regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the following regulations, in addition to those already listed in Bylaw:
 - a. No candidate, or a volunteer representing their campaign, shall interfere, attempt to stop, limit, or otherwise dissuade a member from asking a question during an elections office organized forum.
 - b. The CRO shall prioritize audience questions from members who have not already submitted a question orally or electronically.
 - c. The CRO shall be permitted to set a time limit limiting the length of individual questions and answers during forums, at their discretion, so long as these details are provided to the candidates in advance and verbalized at the start of the forum.
6. The legislative structure for Bylaw 2300 will follow the same framework as Bylaw 2200, except not mandating the CRO host a forum

SUMMARY OF DISUCSSION:

Went through the Bill line by line with agreement at each stage or minor

modifications as per below.

HOWIE:

Would this apply to all forms or just those organized by the elections office?

CHRISTENSEN:

Just those organized by the elections office. In any given year, the CRO could organize as many or as few forums as they want according to the rules prescribed under bylaw 2200.

HOWIE:

So it will only include SUBStage, CSJ, Augustana, and Myer Horowitz.

BROPHY:

I think these standardized rules would be useful. Also, it is surprising there are no rules currently prescribed for council elections.

JONES:

I like the way things are worded.

HOWIE:

Thinks inter-candidate questions should be prioritized

THIBAudeau:

I also agree to an extent. I Liked the ISA forum. The opening speeches were short and the audience questions were more robust. Things were very productive.

BROPHY:

I find I quite like the inter-candidate questions more than that audience questions, which tend to be a bit generic.

HOWIE:

I think we should be catering to the electorate, not other candidates' agendas.

Moving on to defining heckling vs. accepting the new wording.

BROPHY:

I feel like we still need to define heckling as this was a glaring error last time.

PIASECKI:

I think it is fine to leave heckling in without a definition. I think the newest edition would help completely remove these problems with interference that were brought up in the DIE Board ruling.

JONES:

I also think we don't need to define heckling now that we have added this new clause.

HOWIE:

I like how it says "no objects shall be thrown".

BROPHY:

Did people ever throw objects like tomatoes?

PIASECKI:

I think in the 17th century that would have been more of a problem not today.

CHRISTENSEN:

Sometimes I wonder what the point of having these SUBstage forums for Council elections. Like, it is a lot of work for very little reach.

PIASECKI:

Most of the people were who were there were just studying rather than contributing or listening. The executives were the only ones who asked questions.

HOWIE:

I think there needs to be better publicizing of what is going on and who is speaking at each forum.

THIBAudeau:

I think at the Myer Horowitz Forum there should be opening speech

restrictions to only one minute. If you think about it, having 2 minutes for speeches and 20 candidates that blows almost the entire time for the forum.

PIASECKI:

I think the electorate questions are the most important part of these forums.

HOWIE:

I think the Myer Horowitz was the most important forum of them all and most people will only attend this one so I wonder if we should really be trying to change it. This might be there only interaction with the next SU President.

THIBAudeau:

I agree that it is fair.

FINAL VERSION:

Bill #1 - Elections Forums Amendment - *First Reading*

CHRISTENSEN MOVES to approve the first reading of Bill #1 - Elections Forums, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles:

First Principles

1. Formal regulation of elections forums under Bylaw 2200 is limited to only the Myer Horowitz Forum. There is no regulation of forums under Bylaw 2300.
2. In light of DIE Board ruling 2016-01, additional and clarifying regulations are required, in order for the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) most effectively perform their job.
3. Bylaw 2200 shall be amended to broaden the rules of forums to extend to all forums organized by the elections office, not just the Myer Horowitz Forum.
4. Bylaw 2300 shall be amended to include rules regarding the conduct of forums under that Bylaw, if applicable.
5. The new regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the following, in addition to those already listed in Bylaw:
 - a. No candidate or side, or a volunteer representing their campaign, shall interfere, attempt to stop, limit, or otherwise dissuade a member from asking a question

- during an elections office organized forum.
- b. The CRO shall prioritize audience questions from members who have not already submitted a question orally or electronically.
 - c. The CRO shall be permitted to set a time limit restricting the length of individual questions and answers during forums, at their discretion, so long as these details are provided to the candidates and sides in advance and verbalized at the start of the forum.
6. The legislative structure for Bylaw 2300 will follow the same framework as Bylaw 2200, except not mandating the CRO host a forum.

MOTION:

CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #1 - Elections Forums, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the above first principles.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2017-01/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2017-01/5 ADJOURNMENT

2017-01/5a Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 6, 2017 @ 6:30 PM in SUB 0-55.

2017-01/5b JONES/THIBAUDEAU MOVE to adjourn at 7:45 PM.

6/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 19:45 (7:45 PM).

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
JONES/PIASECKI MOVE to approve the agenda.	6/0/0 CARRIED
HOWIE/PIASECKI MOVE to approve the minutes.	5/0/1 CARRIED

	(Thibaudeau abstains)
<p>CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #1 - Elections Forums, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles:</p> <p>First Principles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formal regulation of elections forums under Bylaw 2200 is limited to only the Myer Horowitz Forum. There is no regulation of forums under Bylaw 2300. 2. In light of DIE Board ruling 2016-01, additional and clarifying regulations are required, in order for the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) most effectively perform their job. 3. Bylaw 2200 shall be amended to broaden the rules of forums to extend to all forums organized by the elections office, not just the Myer Horowitz Forum. 4. Bylaw 2300 shall be amended to include rules regarding the conduct of forums under that Bylaw, if applicable. 5. The new regulations shall include, but not be limited to, the following, in addition to those already listed in Bylaw: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. No candidate or side, or a volunteer representing their campaign, shall interfere, attempt to stop, limit, or otherwise dissuade a member from asking a question during an elections office organized forum. b. The CRO shall prioritize audience questions from members who have not already submitted a question orally or electronically. c. The CRO shall be permitted to set a time limit restricting the length of individual questions and answers during forums, at their discretion, so long as these details are provided to the candidates and sides in advance and verbalized at the start of the forum. 6. The legislative structure for Bylaw 2300 will follow the same framework as Bylaw 2200, except not mandating the CRO host a forum. 	<p>6/0/0 CARRIED</p>
<p>JONES/THIBAUDEAU MOVE to adjourn at 7:45 PM.</p>	<p>6/0/0 CARRIED</p>