Tuesday, January 17, 2017
6:00 PM
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Christensen (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander (Sandy) Brophy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Prochnau</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delane Howie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eilish McKinlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Larsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Paches</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES (BC 2016-15)

2016-15/1  INTRODUCTION

2016-15/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 18:02 (6:02 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2016-15/1b Approval of Agenda

BANISTER requested the committee move item 3c to 3a. CHRISTENSEN agreed.

CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to approve the agenda.

6/0/0 CARRIED

2016-15/1c Approval of Minutes
HOWIE/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the minutes.

5/0/1
CARRIED

2016-15/1d Chair’s Business

2016-15/1d Attendance
Attendance was taken. President Rahman was in attendance, while Vice-president Banister participated for the first business item.

2016-15/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-15/2a Re: International Students’ Association

CHRISTENSEN:
The International Students’ Association (ISA) had some questions regarding their representative authority. At this time, they have none. The SU President had already talked to the executives of the ISA. I sent an email to President Rahman and Vice-president Banister telling them that this discussion happened. I also talked with Rebecca Taylor of Discover Governance. She indicated that a student group representing a special class of individuals can be created.

HOWIE:
Are Residence Associations in this category?

RAHMAN:
Residence Associations have already been recognized.

HOWIE:
So is it only the ISA that’s in this weird limbo?

RAHMAN:
As of right now, there’s nobody. Students’ Council recognizes nobody apart from Faculty Associations, Department Associations, and Residence Associations.

BROPHY:
I would be in favor of a recognition equivalent of a Residence Association.

CHRISTENSEN:
It’s a unique situation.
RAHMAN:
Council will decide on a case-by-case basis.

CHRISTENSEN:
There’s a creation process. It should be something for the next Council.

**2016-15/2b SIEF Discussion**

RAHMAN:
Thanks for passing this along. I talked with vice-president Paches about it too. We’re trying to figure out what the right threshold would be to allow the funds to be used. That will take some time. I have one nitpicky point. Councillor Larsen said something like this was pushed on as an editorial change. I wasn’t forceful with the changes as editorials. I brought forward changes that I’d like to see in the bylaw, and it was brought as a comprehensive package. It didn’t pass. That was fine.

CHRISTENSEN:
What is your timeline? Will you keep on discussing with relevant people?

HOWIE:
What will the next step be?

PACHES:
We don’t have a foreseeable timeline. It’s not really possible to say what the next step would be at this point. We’re working on it.

LARSEN:
At what point was your nitpicky point mentioned?

RAHMAN:
It was the last meeting. It’s on page 10 of the minutes.

BROPHY:
It didn’t seem like it was an editorial change as it changed how it worked. That’s what Councillor Larsen meant on that day as far as I remember.

PACHES:
The core point of what President Rahman brought up is that that wasn’t the intention. It was perceived as an editorial, and we were incorrect.

LARSEN:
Do you want me to motion to change the minutes to reflect that?

RAHMAN:
No, that’s fine. I just wanted Bylaw Committee to know.

LARSEN:
Apologies for the language.

2016-15/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-15/3a Bill #10 - Standing Committee Attendance Regulations - First Reading

First Principles
1. Councillors are expected to attend, or send a Councillor-Designate, to meetings of standing committees of which they are members.
2. Attendance shall be taken at the start and end of every standing committee meeting.
3. Councillor attendance shall be defined as attending for at least one (1) roll call of that committee.
4. Where a Councillor meets the following criteria for three (3) regularly scheduled meetings, they shall be automatically removed from that standing committee:
   a. Fails to attend; and
   b. Fails to provide a formal document to the committee’s chair, prior to the start of the meeting, including their written thoughts on all agenda items listed.
2. Any councillor who has been removed from a committee shall be allowed to be re-nominated and re-appointed.
3. The Speaker shall inform all members of Students’ Council of the standing committee attendance regulation at the start of each Students’ Council year and at the time of appointment of vacant seats.
4. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to implement these principles, including the automatic removal of councillors from committees.
5. This process shall not take effect until the 2017/2018 term of Students’ Council.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

CHRISTENSEN:
We had a discussion here last time which was discussed with the other
chairs. These were the take-away points for standing committee attendance.

HOWIE:
We very rarely do a roll call of actual attendance. Do we take for granted that it’s happening even though we’re not doing it?

CHRISTENSEN:
Speaking for myself, I take attendance even though I don’t call everyone’s name per se.

BANISTER:
Is 0.5 being considered a 0.5, or is it considered 1? I think it should be considered 0.5.

BROPHY:
If somebody is late for 6 meetings, he/she runs the risk of being kicked off.

BANISTER:
I’m not saying it should count as 0. It should be counted as 0.5. If you have 6 0.5s in a row, you’ll be at 3.

BROPHY:
What if somebody was only 5 minutes late?

BANISTER:
Honestly, the chair can use discretion. Some councilors are only present for 45 minutes when the meeting is 3.5 hours. That should not be encouraged.

HOWIE:
I’m for that at Council because it’s a defined time. However, the schedule is unpredictable, and you don’t always get a say. For example, the Policy Committee meets at a time when I’m physically incapable of being on time for the start. I’ll always be 10 minutes late. As long as there’s a loop hole, it should be OK. If not, I don’t agree with it.

BANISTER:
It’s at the chair’s discretion. He/she can decide when to take attendance.

CHRISTENSEN:
According to the standing orders of this committee, that would be at the start and the end.
BROPHY:
It’s fine to mark somebody as present when they were actually there for the main part of the meeting. However, the logistics to enable that are too complicated.

BANISTER:
Being late and leaving early is disruptive to the committee. You hope you can find a time that people don’t need to be late or leave early. We’re thinking about the exception, and not the norm. Most of the time, people aren’t late for justifiable reasons. In addition, if you just attend the last 15 minutes of an hour long meeting, I’m opposed to that being considered as a full attendance.

LARSEN:
If you put the 0.5 there, it’s more of a measure of quality. I’m OK with it. I’ll actually leave it to the chair.

MCKINLAY:
I like rules and order. Therefore, I believe 0.5 should be 0.5.

HOWIE:
I’m not fine with it when you don’t have a control over the situation.

BROPHY:
If you are a few minutes late but attend the substantive part of the meeting, you can be marked as not being on time. On the other hand, if you give formal documentation to the chair with your opinions and comments on the agenda, you’re OK even if you don’t attend. So, a sort of emergency exit exists if people are hard done. As such, why are we going down harshly on people are only a few minutes late?

HOWIE:
I’m fine with 0.5 if there’s a clause saying that it’s at the discretion of the chair. Realistically, if you are late, you’re only missing the agenda and the minutes. Do I have to provide documentation about my comments on the agenda and the minutes because I’m 5 minutes late?

BANISTER:
Even if someone is late for a legitimate reason, they’re still late. It’s frustrating for people who do show up on time and stay till the end. I know this is harsh. If someone has a class which makes them 15 minutes late, they should not be on the committee. That’s my honest opinion. It happened to me too. I had to withdraw from committees when I was a
councilor because there were conflicts with classes. I don’t think that having 0.5 is going to be over the top where people are going to be removed.

CHRISTENSEN:
I enjoyed this discussion. We have to keep in mind that we’re implementing this for the very first time. I’m supportive of finding how something works first, before moving forward. I like the way it is right now because it matches the Council one. Since that one has already passed, it’s important to keep the consistency across the 2. My opinion would be to try this one for one year, see how it goes, and then change it accordingly.

BANISTER:
We can change Council’s one to 0.5 too.

HOWIE:
I’m fine with it being listed, but I don’t agree to this being a reason for kicking someone off the committee. That’s too harsh.

BROPHY:
Because it’s only the attendance at the beginning and the end, the effects of the 0.5s will get substantive for anybody missing those two attendance takings continuously. If we can functionally measure if somebody is literally there for none of the meeting, I’m fine with kicking them out. But, because that cannot be effectively measured, I’m reluctant to punish somebody in the margins.

RAHMAN:
Councillor Christensen, when somebody is late, what’s the time period he/she is late?

CHRISTENSEN:
It’s usually like 5 minutes unless they tell me that they’re at an event or something.

BANISTER:
In my experience, the same people will be late most of the time. In addition, they’re more than 5 minutes late. A person being 5 minutes late is the anomaly, not the rule. If somebody informs the chair that they’ll be a few minutes late, the chair can count that person as being in attendance as long as it’s reasonable.

CHRISTENSEN:
Technically, this is entrenched in bylaw. If we do this, we have to follow it to the letter. Otherwise, it can be appealed. Therefore, being reasonable should not count; the rules are rules.

BANISTER:
We can put a clause saying “at the chair's discretion”.

CHRISTENSEN:
That will complicate things as it'll be subjective. What if the chair doesn’t like a councillor, and makes sure he/she is always late. That would still be at the chair's discretion.

BANISTER:
Protecting people who are late should not be the primary concern. Being respectful of everyone else should be the concern. If the committee members think that 0.5 should count as 1, I respect that, but I think otherwise. I strongly believe that council’s attendance policy should also reflect a 0.5 as 0.5. Some people come in to Council, and leave for their night classes after half an hour. There are other people who’d like that councillor spot, and who would like to be on committees.

LARSEN:
As far as the first principles go, there’s nothing stopping you from making this case for the second reading. There’s nothing in here that would stop you. If you put the time people arrive on the minutes, you can see the amount of time a person is actually late. If there was a conflict regarding discretion, you could objectively see the times during which the councillor was present.

BROPHY:
This is not about being on the records. It will still show on the records as 0.5. This is about kicking someone off the committee. I’d like to keep track of the actual amount of time somebody is there. But, logistically we can only keep track of the start and end. I’ll always err on not punishing people who did nothing wrong even if it means that some people who should be punished go unpunished.

HOWIE:
This is frustrating because it affects me personally for the Policy Committee meeting. I could potentially lose my seat due to this. I respect everyone else’s time. We should consider whether someone is a contributing member to a committee who gets stuff done. I know we can’t track that, and that we should not track that. However, such a person can still get kicked off if they’re 5 minutes late at the start! That’s
not fair.

BROPHY:
We wrote that safety valve where you can send in documentation to show you’re interested. However, if you aren’t missing the substantive portions of the meeting, there is no reason to send in those documents. As such, you can still get kicked off. It’s a mismatch.

BANISTER:
As I said before, we’re protecting the anomaly. For Councillor Howie’s case, the solution should be to start the committee 10 minutes later. I don’t think it’ll cause a big issue. If the councillor is a contributing member who really wants to be on the committee, and if it’s only a 5-10 minute delay, the chair can delay the start of the meeting. If somebody is 45 minutes late for every meeting, I don’t think that person should be on the committee! It’s their responsibility to move around the class schedule.

MCKINLAY:
I agree.

PACHES:
I agree with that too. Even though I showed up a bit late myself, I’d accept the 0.5 if I was late. I’m big on starting on time.

CHRISTENSEN:
Because there’s a split, it should be good to do a straw poll.

LARSEN:
Let me point out again that this doesn’t prohibit adding a 0.5 during the second reading.

RAHMAN:
Because we have had such an extensive debate, it’s better not to open it up again when we are close to getting it done.

In the straw poll, the majority of committee members decided to keep the existing wording.

MOTION:
CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #10, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, according to the above first principles.
PROPOSED QUESTION:
This plebiscite question is for the renewal of the Sci5 Faculty Association Membership Fee (FAMF) that the Interdepartmental Science Students’ Society (ISSS) collects to support science student groups, science specific initiatives, and advocacy efforts within the Faculty of Science.

The conditions of the fee shall include:
1. It shall be distributed according to the framework approved by the University of Alberta Students' Union, Students' Council and is subject to the oversight of the Audit Committee.
2. The same fee will be applied to full time and part time students.
3. This fee will not be charged to off-campus students, as defined by the University Calendar.
4. Students may opt out of this fee on the ISSS website with a refund provided by cheque for each semester opted out of.

Do you support the Sci5, a $5.00 fee per student, per semester in the fall and winter semester?

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:
CHRISTENSEN:
This is not the exact thing they gave me. I added some clauses to be consistent with other similar questions.

PACHES:
We can’t change the content. But, they wasted a whole sentence at the start into which they could have added some context. However, it’s their problem.

MCKINLAY:
Even though it’s a very long sentence, it does make sense. I do understand what the question is asking.

PACHES:
It’s going to be really long when somebody is scrolling through this while voting. There must be a better way to do this.

MCKINLAY:
We discussed about the hyperlink before. The consensus was that people will click on the hyperlink and not come back.

CHRISTENSEN:
I put that stuff there to keep it consistent.

LARSEN:
I’m totally fine with that. It’s good the way it is.

HOWIE:
This makes sense, and I believe people would vote on this in an appropriate way.

RAHMAN:
Is this even a plebiscite?

PACHES:
It’s a referendum. Faculty Association Membership Fees (F. A. M. F. s) expire, and must be recreated.

BROPHY:
I thought it was a referendum only if you were increasing the fee. I could be wrong.

CHRISTENSEN:
It is a referendum. So, the question should refer that accordingly.

PACHES:
When it’s a creation, it’s a referendum. Since F. A. M. F. s cannot be renewed, they have to be recreated, and it’s always a referendum. Everything’s a referendum other than Dedicated Fee Unit (D. F. U.) renewals that don’t change.

BROPHY:
Have we done a bunch of referendums as plebiscites in previous meetings?

CHRISTENSEN:
No. We did it properly.

**HOWIE/BROPHY MOVE** to amend the ISSS FAMF referendum question as listed in Google Drive and presented below.

6/0/0
CARRIED

FINALIZED QUESTION:
This referendum question is for the renewal of the Sci5 Faculty Association Membership Fee (FAMF). The Interdepartmental Science Students’ Society (ISSS) collects this fee to support science student groups, science specific initiatives, and advocacy efforts within the Faculty of Science.

The conditions of the fee shall include:
1. It shall be distributed according to the framework approved by the University of Alberta Students' Union, Students' Council and is subject to the oversight of the Audit Committee.
2. The same fee will be applied to full time and part time students.
3. This fee will not be charged to off-campus students, as defined by the University Calendar.
4. Students may opt out of this fee on the ISSS website with a refund provided by cheque for each semester opted out of.

Do you support the Sci5, a $5.00 fee per student, per semester in the fall and winter semester?

MOTION:
HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the ISSS FAMF referendum question as listed above.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-15/3c Augustana Students' Association - FAMF Referendum Question

PROPOSED QUESTION:
The Augustana Students' Association (ASA) is the student representative association for Augustana Campus. As a student at Augustana you are currently charged a faculty association membership fee of $65.00 in each of the fall and winter semesters. You are voting in this plebiscite because the fee must be renewed every 5 years.

The condition of the fee shall include:
1. It shall be distributed according to the framework approved by the University of Alberta Students' Union, Students' Council and
is subject to the oversight of the Audit Committee.
2. The same fee will be applied to full time and part time students.
3. Students may opt out of this fee by contacting the ASA.

Do you support the renewal of the Faculty Association Membership Fee for the Augustana Students' Association to be assessed a rate of $65.00 per full-time or part-time student per Fall or Winter term, with this fee expiring August 31st, 2022?

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:
CHRISTENSEN:
This will also be amended to read “referendum question.” There’s one mistake that needs to be changed. In the final question, they had used Fall or Winter terms when it should be “and”.

MCKINLAY:
The question is not very clear.

CHRISTENSEN:
I literally received just the question. I created the top part.

BROPHY:
We don’t want people to vote “no” for stupid reasons.

CHRISTENSEN:
What are your thoughts on having the question as “…for each of the Fall and Winter terms”?

HOWIE:
There’s a sentence that has the word “semester” twice. It doesn’t look good.

BROPHY:
It’s awkward, but clear.

HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to amend the ASA FAMF referendum question as listed in Google Drive and presented below.

6/0/0
CARRIED

FINALIZED QUESTION:
The Augustana Students' Association (ASA) is the student representative association for Augustana Campus. As a student at
Augustana, you are currently charged a faculty association membership fee of $65.00 in each of the fall and winter semesters. You are voting in this referendum because the fee must be renewed every 5 years.

The conditions of the fee shall include:
1. It shall be distributed according to the framework approved by the University of Alberta Students’ Union, Students’ Council and is subject to the oversight of the Audit Committee.
2. The same fee will be applied to full time and part time students.
3. Students may opt out of this fee by contacting the ASA.

Do you support the renewal of the Faculty Association Membership Fee for the Augustana Students' Association to be assessed a rate of $65.00 per term for each of the Fall and Winter semesters, with this fee expiring August 31, 2022?

MOTION:
HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the ASA FAMF referendum question as listed above.

6/0/0 CARRIED

2016-15/3d Bill #11 - Standing Committee Reports to Students’ Council Reform – First Reading

ORIGINAL VERSION:
First Principles:
1. Bylaw 100, Section 16 shall be abolished and replaced with a new framework for standing committee reports.
2. Standing committee chairs will complete a written report at the end of each trimester, with the final report forming a transition document for the subsequent term.
3. The report shall be tabled on the order paper for the final meeting of each trimester.
4. Each report shall include, at a minimum:
   a. Activities of that committee during the previous trimester; and
   b. A general summary of decisions, recommendations, and motions; and
   c. The presumptive schedule for the coming semester, if applicable.
5. The transition report shall include, at a minimum:
   a. An outline of the committee structure and function; and
b. The responsibilities of the Chair; and

c. Future tasks or objectives that should be considered by the incoming committee.

6. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to reflect these principles.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

MCKINLAY:
It’s amazing that transition reports weren’t a thing before.

RAHMAN:
The last meeting of council is during the first week of April. Are we OK with giving people time till after the final exam period to write this report?

CHRISTENSEN:
While the majority have exam season during this time, we should always consider that there are unique programs that have final exams scattered throughout the year.

RAHMAN:
Do we want to include this in the last order paper of a committee meeting?

HOWIE:
Is point 3 regarding the final meeting of each committee or council?

BROPHY:
This is to replace the reports that are submitted every meeting to council. It makes more sense to submit reports every trimester.

HOWIE:
So, can we add the word “council”?

CHRISTENSEN:
I didn’t put that because only the agendas for council are called “order papers.” But for clarity let’s go ahead!

HOWIE:
You’re right.

CHRISTENSEN:
That’s fine. I like more specificity where possible.

HOWIE:
Would the attendance policy go into this report as well, as sub-point d) of point 4? For example, should the report include a summary of the attendance for that committee?

CHRISTENSEN:
Bill #10 doesn’t come into effect until May 1, 2017 while this Bill #11 would come into effect upon passage.

MCKINLAY:
If the attendance was very important, the chair would put that into the report anyway.

CHRISTENSEN:
These are the minimum requirements for the written reports, chairs may use their discretion and add more information as they see fit.

HOWIE:
It should have advice for the future chair, which is the most basic requirement of any transition report.

Committee agrees, point 5d added.

FINAL VERSION:
First Principles:
1. Bylaw 100, Section 16 shall be abolished and replaced with a new framework for standing committee reports.
2. Standing committee chairs will complete a written report at the end of each trimester, with the final report forming a transition document for the subsequent term.
3. The report shall be tabled on the order paper for the final Students’ Council meeting of each trimester.
4. Each report shall include, at a minimum:
   a. Activities of that committee during the previous trimester; and
   b. A general summary of decisions, recommendations, and motions; and
   c. The presumptive schedule for the coming semester, if applicable.
5. The transition report shall include, at a minimum:
   a. An outline of the committee structure and function; and
   b. The responsibilities of the Chair; and
   c. Future tasks or objectives that should be considered by the incoming committee; and
   d. Advice and recommended changes for the future
committee.

6. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to reflect these principles.

**MOTION:**
**CHRISTENSEN/MCKINLAY MOVE** to approve the first reading for Bill #11, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on these first principles.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-15/3e  **Bill #12 - D.I.E. Board Ruling Review Amendment - First Reading**

**First Principles:**

1. The mandated responsibility of reviewing D.I.E. Board Rulings shall be moved from the Council Administration Committee to Bylaw Committee.

2. The timeline for reviewing D.I.E. Board rulings shall be changed from two (2) meetings following the release of ruling to the end of the first August following the ruling’s release.

3. Bylaw 100 shall be amended to implement this change.

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

**CHRISTENSEN:**
These are very simple changes suggested by President Rahman. Technically, the Council Administration Committee (CAC) should review all D.I.E. (Discipline, Interpretation, and Enforcement) board rulings within 2 meetings of their release. It’s not very feasible given that CAC is usually unable to fulfill its tasks. So, first, the responsibility will move from CAC to Bylaw. Second, instead of after 2 meetings following the release of the ruling, the timeline will move to the end of the first August following the ruling.

**HOWIE:**
Shouldn’t it be written in the new way, saying that it’s the responsibility of the Bylaw Committee? Like, should we just dispense with mentioning CAC in the new principles?

**CHRISTENSEN:**
This will make it clearer for people because we’re changing the responsibility from one committee to another, not creating new responsibility. We don’t want Students’ Council to think this is a power grab or something. Just a minor change.
MCKINLAY:
When will this take effect?

CHRISTENSEN:
Immediately.

RAHMAN:
We haven’t had any D. I. E. board rulings this year yet.

CHRISTENSEN:
Anything that happens between now and the end of August will be the responsibility of the next Bylaw Committee.

**MOTION:**
CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #12, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles:

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-15/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-15/5 ADJOURNMENT

2016-15/5a Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06

2016-15/5b HOWIE/LARSEN MOVE to adjourn at 7:15 PM.

6/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 19:15 (7:15 PM).

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to approve the agenda.</td>
<td>6/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the minutes.</td>
<td>5/0/1 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE to approve the first reading of Bill #10, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, according to the above first principles:</td>
<td>4/2/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/BROPHY MOVE TO</td>
<td>amend the ISSS FAMF referendum question as listed in Google Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE TO</td>
<td>approve the ISSS FAMF referendum question as listed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE</td>
<td>to amend the ASA FAMF referendum question as listed in Google Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the ASA FAMF referendum question as listed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/MCKINLAY MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the first reading for Bill #11, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on these first principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the first reading of Bill #12, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, based on the following first principles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACHES/BROPHY MOVE</td>
<td>to amend the UPASS Referenda question as listed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/LARSEN MOVE</td>
<td>to adjourn at 7:15 PM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>