



# ERC MINUTES

2011 - 2012 # meeting number

Date: October 5, 2011

Time: 4:03 PM

In Attendance:

*Eric Bellinger, Farid Iskander, Scott Nicol*

Excused Absence:

*Kim Ferguson, Brit Luimes*

Others in Attendance:

*Madeleine Reddon*

**1. CALL TO  
ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order by *ISKANDER* at 4:03 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF  
AGENDA**

*ISKANDER* moved that the *October 5, 2011* agenda be approved as *amended*.  
Seconded by *NICOL*.  
Vote on Motion 3/0/0 *CARRIED*.

**3. APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES**

*NICOL* amended minutes to include *the accurate date for the next meeting night, October 19, 2011*.  
*NICOL* moved that the *October 5, 2011* minutes be approved as *amended*.  
The motion was seconded by *ISKANDER*.  
Vote on Motion 2/0/1 *CARRIED*.

**4.  
ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*ISKANDER*: I challenged the decision and asked for clarification for CRO and was told that in the event that one person runs for a category where there are many seats, then that position is satisfied. We should keep the status quo on this position until it is worth discussing.  
*NICOL*: I don't think this is particularly an issue because there are policy reasons for these decisions.  
*ISKANDER*: I know the bylaw committee is interested in this discussion.

Action Item: *ISKANDER* will add Section 21 of Bylaw 2000 as a discussion for the next meeting.

**5. REVIEW OF  
ACTION ITEMS**

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

**9. NEW BUSINESS**     NOTA IN STV

*ISKANDER:* Now that council is informed about the opposition NOTA in STV it will make a decision whether it is ours or not.

*NICOL:* We should retain the choice of the lowest possibility of NOTA being elected. NOTA is a great choice but the problem with it is that we will have a yes or no nomination. This system would work great if we were doing a non-preferential ballot for those who are running for a single seat. But we will always have a segment of voters who think they will be advantaging a candidate as their friend, voting one for their friend, and voting two for NOTA. Multiple candidates will multiple seats might tip the scales.

*ISKANDER:* So you are suggesting keeping the status quo?

*NICOL:* IRV does not discount the value of their vote.

*ISKANDER:* The reason why we want to move from IRV to STV is because of the advantage that it gives slates. The person who votes for the top candidate gets that their vote gets passed on a lot. The top three candidates were passed from a slate, and because of the IRV system, it gave an advantage to the bottom three, and all the independents that had the advantage in the middle, lost.

*ISKANDER:* Personally, I'm in favor of going back to IRV.

*NICOL:* STV gets to be needlessly complicated.

*BELLINGER:* Yes.

*ISKANDER:* I've read some academic papers on the difference between the two, and STV is praised in comparison to IRV if there are parties rather than people. If there are parties then STV is better at allocating votes in comparison to IRV.

*NICOL:* We should still make decisions on these things, even if Kim and Brit aren't here.

*ISKANDER:* Should we make a decision next meeting, or make a decision now? If we vote on it today, then we vote on it at council on Tuesday.

*BELLINGER:* Having the deadline of our next meeting is probably good.

*NICOL:* If we keep NOTA then we can process some results in STV. But if we have a system that ends up with 7 out of 8 seats empty, then that is going to be disastrous.

Discussion follows concerning the issues of Ron 1 and Ron 2.

*NICOL:* With NOTA, if you have a candidate running in the general the student body really wouldn't want (an extremist of bad character) then some voters might intentionally vote none of the above.

*ISKANDER:* NOTA is extremely important in regards to the executive election, not to council election.

*NICOL:* Maybe we should leave NOTA in the case that there is an objectionable candidate running and there are no other candidates in the running.

*ISKANDER:* I think NOTA should exist even if five people run for executive.

*NICOL:* I would be okay with getting rid of NOTA for council elections.

Short discussion involving retaining or discarding NOTA for council elections.

#### BYLAW 2000

*ISKANDER:* I will be reading next meeting for Bylaw 2000. We will vote on whether or not we will make this recommendation next meeting. Do we also want to make a decision for key reporting at the next meeting?

*BELLINGER:* I say we should bring it to vote next meeting.

Discussion continues on to campaigning rules.

*ISKANDER:* U of C bylaws state that all campaigning should be done 20 meters from laptop/computer voting stations. Those figures seem excessive.

*BELLINGER:* I like 20 feet. That seems more reasonable.

*NICOL:* In general, nobody should be disruptive to voting. People shouldn't be able to approach the voting booth, etc.

*ISKANDER:* What about the handbill bylaw?

*BELLINGER:* It would make sense to me to have no material being put up on voting day including handbills, but having the candidates hand out voting

handbills for the elections office would be good. ‘Here I am so and so, here’s where voting stations are...’

*NICOL:* I think the more restrictions we put in the more complicated it gets.

*ISKANDER:* So do we want more time to decide? Or are we good for 6 meters, and no restrictions except that all posters within 6 meters will be put down. I will write down the exact principles and put them together for our next meeting for voting. Six meters, all campaign activities including handbills, posters, etc...

*NICOL:* What can we dispense of today?

*ISKANDER:* Our issues have been nota and STV and I think we have exhausted it now. We will just have a simple vote. It is perfectly fine if we end up with 3 vs. 2, we do not have to vote unanimously.

*NICOL:* Can we have an email ratification of three motions?

*ISKANDER:* I doubt it... It’s a big deal to be done in an email. Voting on election days can be done on email, but since we are meeting for NOTA and STV we can do it then and there.

Discussion follows concerning the bylaw committee, for the amendments for elections and whether there should be one motion or multiple motions concerning elections.

*ISKANDER:* No for omnibus then?

*BELLINGER:* I would not want to omnibus that.

*NICOL:* Could we just have it so that we have one motion that we can just amend?

*ISKANDER:* Debate will be a lot easier without an omnibus. Omnibus is something you do with a majority.

## **10. DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION ITEMS**

## **11. REPORTS**

**12. CLOSED  
SESSION**

**13. NEXT MEETING** *October 19, 2011 at 4:00 PM.*

**14. ADJOURNMENT** *ISKANDER* moved that the meeting be adjourned.  
The motion was seconded by *NICOL*.  
Vote on Motion *3/0/0 CARRIED*.  
Meeting adjourned at *4:43 PM*.