



BYLAW MINUTES

2010 - 2011 #11

Date: October 4, 2011

Time: 5:05pm

In Attendance:

WOODS (chair), ESLINGER, GOULD, SUMAR, KARUVELIL, CHEEMA (proxy for ISKANDAR)

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:

**1. CALL TO
ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by **WOODS** at 5:05 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF
AGENDA**

WOODS amended agenda to include *second reading impeachment in discussion period and to take out impeachment petition from New Business.*

SUMAR moved that the *October 4, 2011* agenda be approved as *amended.*
Seconded by **GOULD.**

Vote on Motion 4/0/0
CARRIED.

**3. APPROVAL OF
MINUTES**

GOULDS "*took meetings at the minutes before*".

KARUVELIL moved to approve the *September 7, 2011* minutes as *tabled.*

Seconded by **GOULD.**

Vote on Motion 3/0/2 **CHEEMA** and **SUMAR** *abstain*
CARRIED.

**4.
ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Meeting schedule is going to be every off-council Tuesdays @ 5:00pm.

**5. REVIEW OF
ACTION ITEMS**

6. OLD BUSINESS

7. NEW BUSINESS

8. DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION ITEMS

Second Reading Impeachment

WOODS Robert's Rule of Order didn't really add anything to 8.

CHEEMA has everyone had a chance to read through the text?

WOODS let's read and I'll scroll.

CHEEMA so were essentially determining if it captures the same ideas as the first reading only differently formatted?

WOODS yes so we won't motion on this today. #10 should be changed to "responded".

Grammatical errors are corrected. Formatting is changed for consistency.

CHEEMA "passage" means died, I have a dictionary.

Replenishment Bylaw

WOODS now currently in Bylaw 100 the only mention of BoG is here (reads section). This is fresh so we need to start from the beginning. So the first thing that comes to my mind, would we be able to hold a by-election fast enough if impeachment of a president, vice-president or BoG rep happens?

CHEEMA in recent memory, what happened was the CRO prepared a report on the feasibility of doing an election. Then it was left off to the council. Just a bit of historical knowledge.

WOODS what did the CRO have to say?

CHEEMA there's a cost component which weighed against it and the time it takes to make an election, so you get a situation where you get election saturation and voter confusion. There was a committee struck, I don't remember but what they did was provide a short list to council.

SUMAR I think the first thing we should do would be to ask the CRO of what he/she would do.

GOULD and go with what the committee recommends.

WOODS so should I seek out the CRO?

CHEEMA it would probably be a good idea because a CRO is the expertise in elections.

WOODS so obviously this is going to be a two part process.

KARUVELIL What I see happening is a VP taking over, if a VP has to get replaced it won't be a two-step process right?

WOODS right. I agree we have to look at it from an unbiased perspective. I guess the big concern is the domino effect starting from by-elections.

CHEEMA I think I would like to see all possible scenarios, without constraining council. There are three types of positions that are susceptible.

ESLINGER the worst chain is vacant positions.

WOODS how about a VP can't replace a VP?

*KARUVELIL what if we say you can't unless council approves of it?
WOODS how can you have an election if there are 2 or 3 persons are to be replaced? With a possible chance that they won't be? Obviously we want to be democratic. I will email the CRO to see if he will come to the next meeting.*

9. REPORTS

10. CLOSED SESSION *NIL*

11. NEXT MEETING *October 18, 2011 @ 5:00pm*

12. ADJOURNMENT *KARUVELIL moved that the meeting be adjourned.
The motion was seconded by SUMAR.
Vote on Motion 4/0/1 CHEEMA abstains
CARRIED.
Meeting adjourned at 5:49 pm.*