A G E N D A

ERC

Date Wednesday Nov 16, 2011
Time 5:00pm
Location 306 SUB

1. Approval of the Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes

3. Announcements

4. Old Business
    1. Iskandar moves to recommend to Students' Council to split Bylaw 2000 into the four following documents:
        i. Bylaw 2100: A Bylaw Respecting the Chief Returning Officer and Elections\ Staff of the Student;
        ii. Bylaw 2200: A Bylaw Respecting Executive Committee and Board of Governors Representative Elections, Plebiscites and Referenda of the Students' Union;
        iii. Bylaw 2300: A Bylaw Respecting the Councillor Elections to Students' Council and General Faculties' Council;
        iv. Bylaw 2400: A Bylaw Respecting Balloting and Counting of Students' Union Elections

5. New Business

6. Discussion Period
    1. ERC Final Report

7. Confirmation of Next Meeting Date
    Wednesday November 30th 2011, 5 pm

8. Adjournment

Date: **October 19, 2011**	*Time: 4:16 PM*

In Attendance:

Eric Bellinger, Kim Ferguson, Farid Iskander, Scott Nicol

Excused Absence:

Brit Luimes

Others in Attendance:

Madeleine Reddon

---

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by *ISKANDER* at *4:16 pm*.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

NICOL moved that the *October 19, 2011* agenda be approved as *amended*. Seconded by *BELLINGER*.

Vote on Motion *4/0/0 CARRIED*.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ISKANDER amended minutes to include *a change to a typographical error on page 2, changing "IRC to IRV."*

ISKANDER amended minutes to include *a change to a typographical error on page 2, changing "UFC to U of C."*

FERGUSON amended minutes to include *a change to a typographical error on page 3, changing "no body to nobody."*

BELLINGER moved that the *October 5, 2011* minutes be approved as *amended*.

The motion was seconded by *ISKANDER*.

Vote on Motion *3/0/1*
CARRIED.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

ISKANDER: Britt has a permanent meeting in this time slot and Zack has a lab. So we may have to find a new time slot. I'll send out a doodle poll to everyone in order to find a time for our next meeting.

FERGUSON: Update for CAC. The council Administration committee is

reviewing Die Board committee number 4 for further implementation.

5. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

6. OLD BUSINESS

1. Nota in STV

ISKANDER: I think Eric should make a recommendation…It's okay if we can't come to an agreement on this issue. If we can't move forward, then I will make a motion in council to move forward. Personally, I am in favor of moving back to IRV but overall but I would like to hear some discussion and debate on this. In my opinion, IRV would be more easily explained to students and candidates. I understand that there is a general bias against the "none of the above" option in IRV and some bias against IRV's ability to enable candidates who, for one reason or another, should not be running. But overall, I think having a more complicated system than IRV might not be good. To make the vote more straightforward, can we get rid of some options such as removing NOTA from the ballot?

FERGUSON: No.

NICOL: As long as we are using IRV then I think nota should stay.

ISKANDER: How about Ron 1?

BELLINGER: I like Ron 1. I think it's okay.

FERGUSON: I think Ron 2 is the only option I would support if we used STV.

ISKANDER: Eric, why do you support Ron 1?

BELLINGER: I think that Ron 1, even though there is some groundwork to be done there, is the method that would be the easiest change for the electorate because it is the simplest method within STV to explain to the people.

NICOL: My issue with Ron 1 is that it still allows people who are ranked below candidates with more votes to get elected.

FERGUSON: If we have STV Ron 2 is the only option that makes sense because you are not limiting a candidate because you are not limiting the number of seats. Mathematically this makes sense, but as to voter education I can see the barrier.

ISKANDER: Do you want to speak for general favor of keeping STV?

FERGUSON: If I had to rank my options Ron 2 and STV make the most sense to me for an electorate system. I would prefer not to remove NOTA from STV. But we should keep or go back to IRV if that means that it would be better in terms of the electorate's education.

ISKANDER: We still don't know the cost of STV but it will be at least $5000. I am the chair so it is hard not to be unbiased but I will say that I think whatever decision we make will be kept for a long time and, that we should keep this in mind. I don't see any investigation for changing this voting system again, so this may not change for 5-10 years unless we make the wrong decision, a disastrous decision.

FERGUSON: I initially came into this problem last year on council and the debate we had was very fruitful. But I have no ties to the past council now and so I'm losing solidarity so what we decided at last year's council.

ISKANDER: This is bad to say but I see more value in candidates understanding the ballot system than the electorate. What gets me most wary about Ron 2 is that it will be the hardest option for the candidates to understand and, because it is so complex, it will be harder for future councils to tweak. I think a simpler system we can modify is better than a complicated system that we cannot.

NICOL: As to my history, I came into U of A when IRV was relatively new. It seemed to make sense to me because your vote doesn't lose weight simply because it's already elected someone. I think that IRV it is the most logically intuitive because my individual vote still counts after we elect A, B, and then go to C. I still don't really understand STV so we may have to reprogram it. It does seem that there is an arbitrary distinction as the system assigns value to a vote other than that one vote. That seems arbitrary because why should a vote ever have a value other than one vote? I'm still not convinced that is a good way to proceed. I am okay with IRV. But I don't want to just promote the status quo. How do we sit with a first past the post? Systems like that are how corporate directors etc, are elected. Generally, I think IRV with nota has adequately perplexed people about how the ranking works…. Anyway, that's my two cents.

ISKANDER: Maybe candidates would be more willing to sit through a longer session to understand how NOTA works but I think logistically for electorates, the algorithm will be too complex to understand.

FERGUSON: And it will be a lot of money too.

ISKANDER: Our reports showed increases in people voting for none of the above. With the new system, we will be able to see more seats being filled, with more representatives.

NICOL: In terms of student council, do we really want to risk a system where 6 out of 8 seats will remain empty? It could possibly disenfranchise people who want to run. Uninformed voting for "none of the above" will make candidates think that running wasn't worth their effort and so they won't run again.

ISKANDER: As well, people running through this bylaw won't understand it 5 years form now. It is brutal trying to understand the math, so… Is there anything else that can be added or should we vote? How does the committee feel? It is a real possibility that this will be a draw, but we need to make a motion, so it can pass at council. It's okay to change your mind at council because this is just a recommendation.

BELLINGER moved to *recommend to student council to revert back to the instant runoff voting system for student council, GFC, and executive election.*
Seconded by *NICOL*.

Vote on Motion *4/0/0*
CARRIED.

2. Campaigning on Election Days

ISKANDER: I tried to contact U of C and failed. Multiple times. So do we want to wait on this issue? Or are we satisfied with no campaigning activities or materials appearing within 20 feet of voting station such as no posters, handbills, etc.

BELLINGER; I would like to say yes to that but would like to add that candidates can continue campaigning through the election so that the excitement and enthusiasm for the election can be kept up. This will make sure people keep voting throughout the day.

FERGUSON: Should we have penalties if posters haven't been taken down, etc?

ISKANDER: I think Zack made it very clear that he will take the initiative to take down the posters during campaigning but it is hard for me to speak for him. Any thoughts?

NICOL: I think penalties are problematic. There is always the theory that someone might take down a poster of another candidate and put it up at a

voting station during election days. It is important that candidates who are playing by the rules are not penalized accidentally. Also I think the benefits of people campaigning on elections days are multifold.

ISKANDER: We have also been thinking about having people walk around with Ipads on election days in order to get people to vote. It would cost some money but it could be very effective. I think this issue needs to be finished by November but I don't see a big rush. Let's action item me to come up with some principles that will be more concrete. Generally we agree that campaigning on elections days is a good thing.

FERGUSON: Candidates have to take down their posters… So when voting closes, do all the posters come down?

BELLINGER: After polls closed all posters must come down.

ISKANDER: There is a fine if you don't pull down your own posters an hour after the results as tabulated. I think that this discussion suggests that we need to wait a bit.

NICOL: I think we have discussed it enough.

ISKANDER: Do you have a set of principles?

NICOL: There should be certain radius around voting stations that cannot be breached by campaigning materials or by campaigners. Candidates should tell people where voting stations are…

ISKANDER: We can't really put that in bylaw and the CRO will inform the candidates about this issue in the bylaw. I think that if the bylaw says, "On election days there is to be no campaigning allowed within 20 feet," is that enough for Zack to be able to pull posters down without being challenged or do we need to emphasize that?

Discussion follows in which *ISKANDER* defines what constitutes campaign activity from the Bylaw draft.

ISKANDER: We can also say that no campaign materials or activity can happen within 20 feet of the voting station. We can have both. For me, I think Zack could either say "I will personally take down posters so we can fulfill this bylaw' or he can say that the candidates have to take them down within range of the polling stations.
Eric; I feel more comfortable with you coming up with an action list. Specific set of principles.

Scott: I feel that we could have a general motion, general consensus that we

should allow campaigning on those days. Do you think we should make Bylaw come up with the principles?

NICOL: No the principles should be ours but implementation should be theirs. Then changes on the principles can follow from there if implementation suggests it.

ISKANDER: Would you be comfortable making a motion today on this based on the principles?

NICOL: I would be comfortable making a motion to recommend changing the bylaw.

Short discussion follows on metric and imperial measurements in the Bylaw draft.

NICOL moved to *recommend to student council to allow campaigning on voting days for the executive and council, GFC elections, as well as for referendums and plebiscites in first reading based on the following principles: 1) No campaign activity shall take place within 6 meters of polling stations. 2) No campaign materials shall be permitted within 6 meters of a polling station.*
Seconded by *BELLINGER*.
4/0/0 *CARRIED*.

FERGUSON moved to *directed bylaw committee to remove all reference to the word "slate" in Bylaw 2000.*
Seconded by *ISKANDER*.
4/0/0 *CARRIED*.

9. NEW BUSINESS

10. DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Section 21

ISKANDER: Section 21 states that after August 15 deadline that an empty seat will not be filled by election. A student has sent a letter expressing dissatisfaction with this motion and I think we should have discussion on this matter. Section 21 states that when one-person runs for a seat that has multiple seats open their candidacy satisfies the deadline. So if one person runs for multiple seats that satisfies multiple seats, do we want to change this?

FERGUSON: I think so. If science has 7 seats then only having one

candidate means that we could end up with a lot of empty seats. Extending the deadline for 24 hours would give us the option to fill more seats.

ISKANDER: I know that Scott thinks that extending the deadline is unfair to people who have submitted their application on time and expect to be in an uncontested race, only to find our that it will be a contested race.

NICOL: I'm not actually that concerned about that. If we have to make a principle then the principle should be based on helping populate our student body as much as possible. I am more inclined to keep it open if there are any seats that might possibly remain vacant.

ISKANDER: So you're saying to extend the deadline if there are not 4 candidates for 4 seats or let's say 3 candidates for 4 seats?

BELLINGER Won't that create some sort of loophole?

ISKANDER: No because it would only extend one time only. The process wouldn't go on indefinitely. Personally, I'm not sure what I think about this yet but if the committee is comfortable then we could make a motion.

BELLINGER: How does the extension get decided?

ISKANDER: I think there is merit in keeping this discussion open for another meeting for when Zack appears. But as I said, we can make a motion if we like.

FERGUSON moved that *when the number of valid nomination packages received for a race in a faculty is less than the number of open seats available in that race the CRO shall extend the deadline for up to 2 days.* Seconded by *NICOL*.
4/0/0 *CARRIED*.

2. Bylaw 2000 Division

ISKANDER: Honestly, I am tired of drafting this. I think it all makes sense now but I am not ready to make a motion about this. I would appreciate the committee taking some time to look at the work. There are some sections repeated. We'll have changes to Bylaw 2000 and it will be interesting for me to go back into those drafts to see if it is actually harder to change after Bylaw 2000. Let's take some time in the next two weeks to go through them. So let me know do the titles make sense? Does the flow of the bylaw make sense? Please consider topics similar to these when you are reviewing.

NICOL: I did a cursory look, and it looks pretty good. There are some

10. DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Section 21

ISKANDER: Section 21 states that after August 15 deadline that an empty seat will not be filled by election. A student has sent a letter expressing dissatisfaction with this motion and I think we should have discussion on this matter. Section 21 states that when one-person runs for a seat that has multiple seats open their candidacy satisfies the deadline. So if one person runs for multiple seats that satisfies multiple seats, do we want to change this?

FERGUSON: I think so. If science has 7 seats then only having one candidate means that we could end up with a lot of empty seats. Extending the deadline for 24 hours would give us the option to fill more seats.

ISKANDER: I know that Scott thinks that extending the deadline is unfair to people who have submitted their application on time and expect to be in an uncontested race, only to find our that it will be a contested race.

NICOL: I'm not actually that concerned about that. If we have to make a principle then the principle should be based on helping populate our student body as much as possible. I am more inclined to keep it open if there are any seats that might possibly remain vacant.

ISKANDER: So you're saying to extend the deadline if there are not 4 candidates for 4 seats or let's say 3 candidates for 4 seats?

Date: November 2, 2011	*Time: 5:07 PM*

In Attendance:

Eric Bellinger, Kim, Ferguson, Zach Fentiman, Farid Iskandar, Scott Nicol

Excused Absence:

Brit Luimes

Others in Attendance:

Madeleine Reddon

---

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by *ISKANDAR* at 5:07 *pm*.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA *ISKANDAR* moved that the *November 2, 2011* agenda be approved as *amended*.
Seconded by *BELLINGER*.
Vote on Motion *4/0/0 CARRIED*.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES *NICOL* amended minutes to include *capitalizations of all instances of NOTA*.

ISKANDER amended minutes to include *changes all instances of ISKANDER to ISKANDAR*.

BERGUSON amended minutes to include *changes to all instances of Zack to Zach*.

BELLINGER amended minutes to include *capitalizations of all instances of RON 1 and 2*.

ISKANDER: We will wait to amend the minutes until next meeting.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS *ISKANDAR*: Bylaw didn't do a second reading for IRV so our committee will do a second reading for IRV, hopefully on November 22nd.

5. REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS

6. OLD BUSINESS

9. NEW BUSINESS

ISKANDAR: "Campaigning on election day" has been sent back to the Election Committee for Review. I have summarized the council's arguments in the last two pages of your minutes. How should this be formatted? Perhaps a paragraph for feedback and subsequently a paragraph for response. Then maybe additionally a final response concerning the final results. Does this work?

NICOL: I like your format.

BELLINGER: The format is fantastic. Should we do a presentation on this for council?

ISKANDAR: A presentation could be good. Overall, I don't know if we will be ready for November 8th so it is more realistic to shoot towards the 22nd. Let's delve into the feedback. 1) Results of the election will be skewed due to uninformed votes. My argument towards this is that any increase in votes should be considered a good thing. We can't create Bylaws to make sure that votes will be informed. But even uninformed, we want all of the votes we can get.

BELLINGER: As far as I'm concerned all votes are good votes.

NICOL: I have a tangential question related to Farid's questions. How do we deal with capital expenses during the election? I'm thinking specifically of laptops and video cameras.

FENTIMAN: We haven't really had to deal with questions related to that kind of expense yet. Videos are fine because you are not using the camera itself as part of your campaign; it only facilitates the making of the video. And then the camera would be considered part of "general expertise." If you doing all of your poster campaigning using a computer or a tablet then you should be expensing that campaigning. Based on past precedent, say when you buy a domain name, we will just pro-rate that.

NICOL: Any websites should not be pro-rated because they won't be used outside of the campaign.

FENTIMAN: I was thinking of looking this up and having the knowledge in advance but I was considering looking into whether or not you can rent domain names, how much that would cost, etc. Then overall just pro-rating a rental rate for how many devices someone will want.

NICOL: The reason why I asked is related to the issue of uninformed voters. Six years ago, there was a campaign between two individuals where

technology played a big part of swaying the vote. The race was between Faridge, a soft-spoken man who did not use much technology based advertising, and Letner, a charismatic man who used a lot of said advertising. I'm pretty sure Letner's advertising, in its scope and intensity, couldn't have been done under $500… So should computers be considered a universal resource under the budget?

FENTIMAN: The "things" that the elections office considers universal resources are objects that the office would like to be able to provide to all candidates, even though candidates may choose to buy them out of their own pockets. Thing like: elastic bands, paint, tape, etc. The candidates can buy those things themselves or they can be partially supplied by the SU. The argument that might be brought up is, "If you supply paint why don't you supply computers?"

NICOL: I think it would be great to see candidates making videos and putting them up.

FENTIMAN: That would be fine because it would then go under social media, unless it has an expense. I think costs come into video making when they, for example, want to put it on SUB TV. They would have to pay a charge. Or if they wanted to put the video streaming live on a computer from a table, then there should perhaps be some charge. Is that part of your thinking? The displaying of some campaign material whether it be on paper or on a computer? Overall, I don't think that the student's union should be assuming that all people have computers. It just comes down to how you want to account for the tech, whether through categories like "social media" or "universal resources." If the candidates are accounting for capital equipment then there should be some sort of rate sheet. If you have a laptop (doesn't matter what kind) and you are using that for messaging, actual campaigning activity, then it should be charged per day or per campaign, etc.

NICOL: I just mentioned Letner's campaign because it was a close race, which came down to Letner's technological innovation. One of the things we were impressed with beyond all the flashiness of the campaign was that in the end the student body did care about who they elected. In the end, they simply did not vote for the vibrant exuberant candidate. And he campaign was huge and intense. I think he had close to 200 volunteers.

FERGUSON: The main issue I had with this feedback was that (since we have no exit holes) we have no idea if the votes are uninformed or not. I don't think the argument for having more "uninformed votes" is a valid criticism. I don't think it undermines candidates because the end is their crunch time and that is really the best time to campaign.

BELLINGER: And no other authoritative body qualifies the candidate so it doesn't really matter what a candidate's qualifications for the position are. That's what the student body decides.

FENTIMAN: All votes are weighted the same. Your vote does not matter more if it is uninformed or informed; that is erroneous.

ISKANDAR: Then I will write a response to it. Okay let's move on to governance. In my opinion, if council sees a problem with candidates getting more votes, then they should vote against it.

BELLINGER: It might be helpful to make council make it their mandate to inform votes, rather than to criticize something like this.

FENTIMAN: If there is an increase in voters, doesn't that also mean an increase in informed votes as well? I think this cuts both ways.

BELLINGER: Also, you might have those last minute folks who inform themselves at the last minute.

NICOL: And some people legitimately do do that in the last minutes of the election. They familiarize themselves with campaign material, even thirty minutes to the end of the election.

FENTIMAN: That's true but it's also unlikely because most of that stuff would be down. All online campaigning, facebook, websites, all your volunteers etc would be dismantled. The only thing that would be allowed is what the elections office whips out and who know if that even works.

ISKANDAR: Governance wise then, we don't think there is anything we can do to amend this motion…. And 6 meters is apparently not enough.

FERGUSON: If we had just kept it feet, we wouldn't have this problem.

ISKANDAR: Whatever the number is that we come up with it must be something the poll clerks can identify. And I think 20 meters is ridiculous.

FENTIMAN: I agree. There are some locations where the poll clerks will be forced outside to decide that. The clerks should be able to measure the length with their eyes, or with an SU endorsed rope. Even with 6 meters, we will have problems concerning walls.

BELLINGER: Maybe 7 meters?

ISKANDAR: We all agree that it should be a reasonable distance so that the poll clerks can easily identify the perimeter.

BELLINGER: 25 feet.

NICOL: Personally, I think that the longer the distance is, the sillier the possibilities for crazy circumstances for the clerks when measuring for the booth because it's supposed to be a spherical measure. So let's say someone, candidate or otherwise, leaves a poster directly above a polling station on another floor… could a candidate be punished for that? The open possibility creates room for abuse.

ISKANDAR: What are the merits of 7.5?

BELLINGER: I think that feasible. We can give clerks 7 and a half steps, or 7 feet ropes.

NICOL: Steps aren't really accurate enough, are they?

FENTIMAN: I could (and would) include ropes in the poll kit.

ISKANDAR: The reason we came up with 20 feet for the Bylaw was so that candidates could not be within 20 feet and that's my argument for keeping 6 meters.

FENTIMAN: This is also only because of our decision to use metric.

ISKANDAR: I prefer to say to the council that we chose 20 meters for the following reasons and then quote the bylaw. Governance would say that you can remove six but that we will need reasons for that change.

FERGUSON: I like 6.

FENTIMAN: The larger the number the harder it will be to implement and that harder it is to control. Their concern is not really with the number but with the perimeter. The extra length is just an additional aid just in case candidates are lurking around polling stations. But no matter what value you set, you will always have some candidates around the perimeter. It just can't be helped. But again, the larger the perimeter the less effect the candidate will have on the polling booth but the length could make spaces like quad problematic for campaigning purposes. And that's really an important space.

ISKANDAR: Personally, I think standing within reach of a polling booth and giving out stuff is not worth a candidate's time anyway. They should always be talking to people. That is much more effective.
NICOL: Can we give also give Zach a general authority or power that disallows candidates or volunteers interfering with the elected

administration of the election?

FENTIMAN: The concern for the SU is that we do not want our polling stations to appear as biased and this concern has no bearing on candidates influencing voting on the way to the polling station. The SU doesn't want candidates standing outside the polling station so that the SU isn't thought to be endorsing one or any candidate. The rule comes down to a perceived bias and any perceived bias compromises the integrity of the election. Solutions could be to shut down certain polling stations and that is something the SU has done in the past. It has given clerks the power to shut down their stations whenever there is any suspicion of interference, etc.

NICOL: And how many people actually vote at the stations?

FENTIMAN: It's less than 20% and I will put that in my report. What I'm looking to do in my report is to minimize the amount of voting stations overall. I'm also investigating the possibility of having rolling polling stations. Last year we had five booths and it cost us $5000. The rolling polling stations would consist of a clerk with a tablet who would walk around on specified routes. This would be advantageous because they could go from building to building. Overall, I don't think stationary polling stations are effective or cost effective. We need a new system.

BELLINGER: At open house, there were some Ipads being used and I thought they were quite effective.

FENTIMAN: And perhaps if we have rolling polling stations then we might post schedules and maps in order to reduce bias. With rolling polling stations we can get more people to vote and cover more places than we could with stationary voting booths.

ISKANDAR: Let's move on to whether or not we think a computer's should be considered part of a candidate's budget.

NICOL: I think that the less regulations the fewer problems we will have. We have so many rules that candidate could break accidentally. Why create more rules that give people a greater opportunity for innocent errors?

ISKANDAR: Well what about candidates and volunteers showing up with random computers and asking people to vote?

BELLINGER: Isn't that a form of voting under duress?

FERGUSON: I think if we leave the details up to CRO then we don't to micromanage these rules.

FENTIMAN: Well, I'll address the questions concerning "voting under duress." We can leave that up to the voter. We can put a message on the bottom of the ballot that says, "Don't vote under duress" with contact information. And then it is easy for me to reset a ballot if a voter emails me and says that they voted under duress. It would be better to put the onus on the voters rather than the candidates because it would make the system more accountable.

ISKANDAR: I think that the CRO has the ability to say that this year candidates cannot set up polling stations and then that way we won't have concerns of voter's duress.

FENTIMAN: I would like some feedback on whether council likes the idea of putting a disclaimer about duress on the bottom of the ballot. Feedback is always a big help. Also, we might want people to change their ballot through campaigning days because they may become more informed and want to vote for someone else. The only thing is that I don't want to publicize this too much because I will end up getting a thousand emails from voters and I won't be able to handle the load.

NICOL: Well, why don't we have an option so that if you are voting online you can "save" your vote? Then voters have the option to change their vote before the end of the campaign. Then you can put "feel free to change your ballot at any time" at the bottom. This would solve issues concerning voting under duress.

FENTIMAN: We could also have a "confirm" and a "save" option. If you confirm your ballot then that would be an unchangeable vote. But if you choose "save" then you have the option of changing your vote up until the end of voting. If you hit save but did not change your ballot then the last ballot saved would be confirmed as a vote.

BELLINGER: Moving towards the radical side, what would happen then if all campaign days turn into voting days?

ISKANDAR: Interesting idea, Eric. That definitely merits more discussion… Back to the candidates… I see council being very militant about candidates not approaching people and making them vote.

FENTIMAN: If we changed the online process so that there is a save option, then the duress issue could be addressed sufficiently.

ISKANDAR: Then will the candidates' laptops be counted in their budget or our budget?
FERGUSON: In U of C's campaign policies they say that presenting laptops to voters compromising voting and cites it as willful violation.

ISKANDAR: The only thing about that is that these violations already happen with volunteers. Volunteers tell people to go vote and to vote for their candidates.

FERGUSON: I'm fine with it as it is then. I think council should include it.

ISKANDAR: Moving on then, another criticism is that it increases chances of candidates breaking rules to win election.

FENTIMAN: If they break rules then they get a fine.

BELLINGER: That's how it always works.

FENTIMAN: They might also get disqualified. But the opposite effect could be true, they don't want to screw up on the last day because they don't want to take risks on those last days so they decide to talk to as many people as possible because they do want to win.

Discussion follows concerning time limits for submitting budgets.

ISKANDAR: For governance, I don't see anything other than shooting the bill if you don't think this is good. Because I can't see us making bylaws for breaking other bylaws. That's paradoxical. But let's move on to the criticism that moving the dates will make the "campaign period will be too long." I think this is mostly about the executive election and not council election. Executive elections are totally stressful for candidates. You miss midterms, class, etc for two weeks. The argument is that campaigning screws people academically and making it 2 days longer will put a bigger burden on them. The only option then is to move campaigning days to Tuesday and Wednesday.

FENTIMAN: That's easy for me. The dates can be changed easily.

ISKANDAR: So we are extending the number of days but giving them one less day to campaign. Personally, I don't see the difference from going from 9 to 10.

NICOL: Exactly. You are basically giving up two weeks of yours life no matter what.

FERGUSON: No fewer than seven then till you have the option of more.

ISKANDAR: I don't feel strongly about 10-11 days but I don't want to change the Meyer Horowitz days especially because it would be the weekend then polling days. That doesn't make sense to me.

FENTIMAN: And we can't make the change for this year anyway.

ISKANDAR: We'll show them the research and this will put us more to the general of the pack and then we will tell them to change this Tuesday and Wednesday. Next criticism: Candidates are disadvantaged from being sick on voting days.

FENTIMAN: We always tell people at the candidate meeting to make sure you eat, sleep and take care of yourselves. We tell them to take care of themselves so they don't get sick but we can't prevent people from getting sick. We can't really do anything about that.

ISKANDAR: Governance wise… We can't do anything to that. Here's the last one: this is not a solution for voter apathy.

NICOL: But that's always an issue.

ISKANDAR: Do we want to do this November 8th?

BELLINGER: Can we do a standing presentation?

ISKANDAR: Then the vote changes to the 22nd?

FERGUSON: So are these recommendations time-sensitive?

FENTIMAN: Yes.

ISKANDAR: Then I will put in the abstract for a presentation.

10. DISCUSSION AND INFORMATION ITEMS

11. REPORTS

ISKANDAR: I will make a Google doc with everything we've done. Is there anything new that we want to do? It's a strange year for ERC so the report will just be "this is what we've done."

FERGUSON: Will there be future recommendations for the next ERC?

ISKANDAR: Maybe. There are future things for ERC such as executive pay on leave but there isn't enough for the report. One recommendation is that maybe ERC be discontinued next year. Having ERC stand next year and the year after and changing voting every year could screw up our system. The

11. REPORTS

ISKANDAR: I will make a Google doc with everything we've done. Is there anything new that we want to do? It's a strange year for ERC so the report will just be "this is what we've done."

FERGUSON: Will there be future recommendations for the next ERC?

ISKANDAR: Maybe. There are future things for ERC such as executive pay on leave but there isn't enough for the report. One recommendation is that maybe ERC be discontinued next year. Having ERC stand next year and the year after and changing voting every year could screw up our system. The report should say the recommendations for now and that those recommendations include future recommendations. By November 22 it should be ready…. As well Bylaw 2000 division: do we want to do this? You've seen the bylaw. I can make it ready for next ERC. But in general, is there any opposition?

FERGUSON: No.

NICOL: I don't think so.

ISKANDAR: I could do the work for Thursday. But to make the motion pass you will have to present a draft. And Zach that means if it passes then it will pass twice. Alright- CRO update.

FENTIMAN: I have a couple things. I need to finish my report on the By Election. All critical stats I have submitted twice but it was just more of a detailed breakdown of the charts. I just need to put in the time. I received a handful of submissions for applications and I'm granting all of them interviews. That should be good and we'll have them for the end of November, etc. Mainly I was planning on having the report done by the end