ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justis Allard (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Bondarchuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Duan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Thondson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Patrick</td>
<td>Azhar Khan</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Zhang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpreet Grewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES (BC 2015-09)

2015-09/1 INTRODUCTION

2015-09/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order by ZHANG at 4.46 p.m.

2015-09/1b Approval of Agenda

ZHANG / CHRISTENSEN motioned to approve the agenda
7/0/0 CARRIED

2015-09/1c Approval of Minutes

CHRISTENSEN
ANGUS was not present, and therefore amendment must be made to the minutes to replace ANGUS by THRONDSON
ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned to approve the minutes as amended
6/0/1 (ZHANG abstains)
CARRIED

2015-09/1d Chair’s Business
None

2015-09/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

(Discussion about Bylaw amendment procedure)

THRONDSON
Said that Bylaw had let them into difficulty numerous times
New bylaws, should talk about policy goals, and state what they are trying to amend
Otherwise it will be frustrating for a few members
Bylaws should be honest
Said that he will have his thoughts on paper and wants them to be recorded
A proposal is there for new amendment process, and an amendment will come -
Ideally first principle rejection will imply policy change
Second reading rejection will symbolize wording

ALLARD
Said that, from the way they do, it is pretty certain that it is around
Policy Committee and the Bylaw Committee kind of adapted that

THRONDSON
Said that he feels that in their organization the process is not conducive as it takes longer for what they want to say, and that in government there is a chain of command but they don’t

ALLARD
Said that you don't want it have non-specific language and the only reason is because of convention

ZHANG
Asked if the proposed model is for specific type of amendment?
Cites the example of bringing about gender neutrality of washrooms.
THRONDSON
Asked if the meeting attendees are talking about new bylaws.
Said that he agrees that for new bylaws it is good to make policy debates, and that this is not in reaction to last council meeting, though it is tipping point, and also that it will easier and a transparent system

BONDARCHUK
Said that it looked like most standing order papers of the first readings of the bylaws, and the bylaw committee takes it

ZHANG
There are going to be multiple levels and procedures that will make it complicated.
Asked, if it must go to council and not BC, going forward.
Bringing changes to bylaw is no more BC’s responsibility but council’s responsibility

ALLARD
That will be a fundamental shift but may be it is worth putting on a presentation.
A potential work will be included in bylaw, so is an information item about proposed second principles.
It will solve the problem that were there the last time.
The debate has changed somewhat from how it has worked previously.

THRONDSON
Said he likes that idea and that he liked presenting to the council about changes to bylaw

DUAN
Questioned if they still have any voting talk about that.
Said that given that Bylaw Committee is most knowledgeable about bylaws, it may not be good to about debate bylaws in council

ALLARD
Said, he thinks that they should make it clear to other councillors that they can bring it.
You can just bring it directly to council or bring it to the Bylaw Committee

ZHANG
Said that there should a balance between freedom and making councillor know what you are doing. If it is not specific then it comes
with second principle where debate is on technicalities and not on intentions

BONDARCHUK
Said, he thinks that you can put that in first principle and second one will have literal editing

THRONDSON
Said that then it will double the work, and that he doesn't want things twice but written only once; Also said that he would like to suggest for the clause and the policy to be in the first reading, and the intent of the policy in the first stage with specific wordings. Councillors have to be aware that they are debating the intent of the wording. Said that, he was envisioning the changes in form of legation and also in the rationale

ALLARD
Said that they will change the information rationale
For standing orders: first is intent and second is wording, CAC can be approach

BONDARCHUK
Said that they can talk to Donald (CAC chair)

ALLARD
Said, if you are interested in making a presentation, then he should be sent a message

2015-09/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

KHAN
Said that his concern is that they we are giving too much power to CROs It is procedurally unfair Persons accused should be given the certainty of time CROs should have longer time and not 12 hours Said that they should talk to DIE Board’s chair and get more time Issue is that if they don’t go then DIE Board will respond on time There are also paperwork and notices to be given for getting extensions

ALLARD
Asked if the paperwork will be public or private
Said that the concern is if it is public then it will affect the vote because people are going to see that

CHRISTENSEN
Said that they can also cc it to the affected person and so they can see that are taking care

KHAN
For every single decision, procedural fairness should be in-place. First thing is about the amount of time, because 12 hours is not long enough

ALLARD
Said that it is actually 12 working hours

(responses came, for 24, 48 hours )

KHAN
Asked how about striking “working hours”, and stating “hours” only?

KHAN
Said that he can imagine issues if it rolls over to the weekend

ALLARD
Said that in weekend the problem is when they apply for extension

(Majority of attendees agreed to 48 hours)

ALLARD
Said that they can we draft it
(Attendees agreed to draft it)

CHRISTENSEN
(Read about intent)
Brought about the issue of complaints that are brought in the first 12 hours
Said that he doesn’t want to have time limits for complaints to be filed

BONDARCHUK
Said he thinks it should be by the end of the academic year or first year because it can affect elections

CHRISTENSEN
Asked if they should say “within 48 hours”
(All agreed, and CHRISTENSEN read out)

ALLARD
Raised the question about who should be reported and if it is the chair of CAC

(All agreed that it is)

BONDARCHUK
Asked if alleged offender should be included in the notice.

(Attendees said no)

ALLARD
Said, he thinks that the chief tribunal of DIE Board does it, as it is the ultimate authority
(Everybody agree that it is the Chief tribunal of DIE board, or Rebecca)

BONDARCHUK
The CRO can say that they are going to extend
If they are to extend they can say that

ALLARD
It is only a notice and not an appeal

ZHANG
Said that he is for giving the power to DIE Board and not to the chair

THRONDSON
Said that this has to be on record if they are going to have a decision

ALLARD
Said that the reason they are providing notice is because the chief tribunal requires it

KHAN
Asked about how about stopping to do any more investigations?

ALLARD
Asked if they should legislate that or if they should trust the CRO
Khan
Said that it is the checks and balances

Christensen
Asked how about rules broken by them, with no notification

Bondarchuk
Questioned about requesting an extension for 72 hours, which will make it 5 days, prior to the deadline
Said that anything that takes them longer they will have to take Die Board’s approval, and that’s where the current situation stands
Said that, otherwise, the offender could appeal the actual ruling because the vote will be on voting day, and the outcomes and rulings can be pushed back.
Asked, again how about additional 72 hours after the 48 hours?

Christensen
(Reads out loud the changes he made)

Bondarchuk
Proposed the wordings "CRO shall include a copy of the application for the extension"
Said that CROs can also control the length of the elections if they want

Allard
Said that then that would abuse 2300

MOTION:
Christensen / Duang motioned to amend BC 15-09/3a as follows:
   1. The C.R.O. shall prepare and provide a complaint form which shall require complaints to indicate
      a. their names and student identification numbers;
      b. the specific bylaw and section, rule, or regulation that has allegedly been contravened;
      c. the specific individual or group that is alleged to be in contravention;
      d. the specific facts which constitute the alleged contravention; and
      e. the evidence for these facts.
   2. Where a complaint is received within twelve (12) working
hours of the alleged contravention, and where the original complaint form is provided to the C.R.O., the C.R.O. shall rule on that complaint.

3. The C.R.O. shall provide a copy of the complaint form, with the complainant’s student identification number blacked out, to each respondent.

4. Where a complaint is received and is found to be complete as set out in Section 47(1), the C.R.O. shall rule on the complaint within forty-eight (48) hours of receiving the complaint.
   a. If the C.R.O. requires more time to investigate the complaint they shall, prior to the deadline:
      1. Notify the Chief Tribune of D.I.E. Board, via e-mail, with:
         1. The reason for extension of the investigation period; and
         2. The anticipated date and time the ruling will be released, not to exceed 72 hours after the deadline.
      2. Provide a carbon copy to the complainant and the Manager of Discover Governance.
   b. The C.R.O. shall include this notification as an appendix to the final ruling.
   c. 7/0/0 CARRIED

**MOTION TO ADJOURN:**
ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned to adjourn the meeting
7/0/0 CARRIED

**INFORMATION ITEMS**
2015-09/5  **ADJOURNMENT**

2015-09/5a  **Next Meeting:** Wednesday, after the next in SUB 6-06
ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned to adjourn the meeting, at 6.00 pm
7/0/0 CARRIED

2015-09/5b  Meeting was adjourned at 6.00 p.m.

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZHANG / CHRISTENSEN motioned to approve the agenda</td>
<td>7/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned approve the minutes as amended</td>
<td>6/0/1 – CARRIED (ZHANG abstains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN / DUAN motioned to amend 2015-09/3a</td>
<td>7/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned to adjourn the meeting</td>
<td>7/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>