

# **BYLAW MINUTES**

2010 - 2011 # 11

Date:	October 18, 2	2011	Time:	5:08pm
In Attendance:				
WOODS (chair), SUMAR, ISKANDAR, KARUVELIL				
Excused Absence:				
Others in Attendance:				
1. Cali Order	_	The meeting was called to order by WOODS at 5:08pm.		
2. APPF	2. APPROVAL OF KARUVELIL amended agenda to include the placement of Impeachment			

**AGENDA** 

Reading to New Business.

KARUVELIL moved that the October 18, 2011 agenda be approved as

amended.

Seconded by ISKANDAR.

Vote on Motion 4/0/0

CARRIED.

3. APPROVAL OF **MINUTES** 

KARUVELIL amended minutes to include the change of the spelling "ERK" to *"ERC"*.

KARUVELIL moved that the September 7, 2011 minutes be approved as

The motion was seconded by ISKANDAR.

Vote on Motion 3/0/1 SUMAR abstains

CARRIED.

SUMAR amended minutes to include the change the spelling to "Robert's Rules of Order" and to change the wording to "WOODS took minutes at the meeting before".

SUMAR moved that the October 4, 2011 minutes be approved as amended. The motion was seconded by KARUVELIL.

Vote on Motion 3/0/1 ISKANDAR abstains

CARRIED.

#### 4.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

# 5. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

#### 6. OLD BUSINESS

#### 7. NEW BUSINESS

## ERC Bylaw 2000 Changes

WOODS all that ISKANDAR has done is eliminate section 27, and change the rest so that the numbers have order.

ISKANDAR moved that the above changes to Bylaw 2000 be approved. The motion was seconded by WOODS.

Vote on Motion 4/0/0

CARRIED.

# Impeachment Bylaw 2<sup>nd</sup> reading

ISKANDAR just say the short name of the bylaw, just to keep it consistent across the bylaws.

KARUVELIL it looks good but the wording is weird now.

ISKANDAR another thing to notice, section 2,3 and 4 start with the wording "a motion to impeach" you could divide it into subdivisions like a, b, c...I'm not sure if we should use "shall" or "must". These things matter.

SUMAR I think the rest of the executives would be hesitant to sign a petition for impeachment. There is a conflict of interest. I think it just puts executives in a precarious position.

ISKANDAR it's not a conflict of interest in my opinion.

KARUVELIL the executives have the same powers as we do.

ISKANDAR why's it ok for them to vote on it but not sign a petition?

SUMAR I'm on the fence right now, I'm just presenting the other side.

WOODS if we're going to say that an executive isn't allowed to sign a petition, they shouldn't be allowed to vote either.

SUMAR I'm sure if an exec was doing a bad job, execs would notice but the councilors would notice just as much.

KARUVELIL execs should have every right to start a motion.

SUMAR in my mind it's what an SU is structurally. Execs are like on the same field.

WOODS I think regardless we can't bring this out now. Bring it up in council.

ISKANDAR moved that the changes to Impeachment Bylaw 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading be approved.

The motion was seconded by *SUMAR*.

Vote on Motion 4/0/0

### CARRIED.

8. DISCUSSION AND **Information ITEMS** 

9. REPORTS

10. CLOSED **SESSION** 

**11. Next Meeting** *November* 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 @ 5pm

*KARUVELIL* moved that the meeting be *adjourned*. The motion was seconded by *SUMAR*. 12. ADJOURNMENT

Vote on Motion 4/0/0

CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 5:47pm.