Tuesday, October 25, 2016
6:00PM
SUB 6-06

AGENDA (BC 2016-12)

2016-12/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-12/1a Call to Order

2016-12/1b Approval of Agenda

2016-12/1c Approval of Minutes

2016-12/1d Chair’s Business

2016-12/1d Attendance

2016-12/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-12/2a SU Council Referenda and Plebiscites - Discussion

2016-12/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-12/3a Editorial #14 - Bylaw 8200

McKINLAY MOVES to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8200 as listed on Google Drive.

2016-12/3b DFU Plebiscite Question #1 - APIRG

The Alberta Public Interest Research Group (APIRG) seeks to foster positive social change and empower students with the tools to become active, engaged citizens. Annually, APIRG distributes $30,000 in direct granting to student and community-led social initiatives.

Do you support a fee of $3.50 per term per full-time student and $1.75 per part-time student to fund APIRG?
The conditions of the funds will be such as:

1. Students shall have the option to opt out via the SU website at
the beginning of each term and receive a full refund of their fee;

2. The fee will be assessed only in the Fall and Winter Terms

3. APIRG continues to function as a student-run non-profit organization in accordance with its mandate of “research, education, advocacy, and action in the public interest” as per Schedule 6000 of the Students’ Union Bylaws.

2016-12/3c DFU Plebiscite Question #2 - WUSC

The Student Refugee Program has been helping bring refugee students to the University of Alberta for over 25 years. It has aided these peoples fleeing from fear of their countries to have access to this life changing program Through the power of education, we are able to change the world. A levy of 0.48 cents per student per year supports the Student Refugee Program to sponsor one student every year at the University of Alberta. Do you support the Student Refugee Program 0.48 cent per student per year levy in the Students’ Union Fees for the purpose of sponsoring one refugee student per year through the World University Services of Canada (WUSC)?

2016-12/3d DFU Referenda Question #3 - Campus Food Bank

Do you support a $1.00 fee per student per semester to fund The Campus Food Bank (CFB)? The CFB is a charity dedicated to eliminating hunger on campus. It is open to all undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, recent alumni and their families/dependents.

If the referendum passes, the fee will replace the current funding provided by the Students’ Union to the CFB. The CFB believes that university is a place where one should hunger for knowledge, not food; providing food hamper packages based on the Canada Food Guide to over 2000 individuals on an annual basis.

The fee will be collected from full-time and part-time undergraduate students in the Fall and Winter semester; Augustana students will be exempt. Students will have the option to opt out online from the fee.

Funding areas:
- Operating costs (staff wages and supplies)
- Programming, events, outreach and awareness
- Fundraising events and food drives
- Volunteer program

Funding areas are determined and prioritized by the CFB’s staff and board. The board will consist of 7 to 12 members from the following categories:

- One Students’ Union Executive member or delegate appointed from Students’ Union Council
- One Graduate Students’ Association representative
- One volunteer representative (selected by the volunteer membership)
- 4 - 9 community members

2016-12/3e Editorial #15 - Bylaw 6100

PACHES MOVES to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 6100 as listed on Google Drive.

2016-12/3f Editorial #16 - Bylaw 6200

PACHES MOVES to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 6200 as listed on Google Drive.

2016-12/3h Editorial #17 - Bylaw 8100

HOWIE MOVES to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8100 as listed on Google Drive.

2016-12/3i Editorial #18 - Bylaw 2100

LARSEN MOVES to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2100 as listed on Google Drive.

2016-12/3j Editorial #19 - Bylaw 1500

KIANI MOVES to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 1500 as listed on Google Drive.

2016-12/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-12/4a The committee will begin the process for the UPASS Referenda question at the November 29, 2016 meeting.
2016-12/4b  Proposed Winter Semester meeting schedule:
Tuesday, January 17, 2017 @ 6:00 PM
Tuesday, January 31, 2017 @ 6:00 PM
Monday, February 13, 2017 @ 6:00 PM
Tuesday, March 21, 2017 @ 6:00 PM

2016-12/5  ADJOURNMENT

2016-12/5a  Next meeting: Tuesday, November 29, 2016 @ 6:00PM in SUB 6-06.
University of Alberta Students’ Union

BYLAW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 27, 2016
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>Bismillah Kiani</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Prochnau</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></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 2016-11)

2016-11/1 INTRODUCTION

2016-11/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 18:05 (6:05 PM) by CHRISTENSEN.

2016-11/1b Approval of Agenda

KIANI/LARSEN MOVE to approve the agenda.
5/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/1c Approval of Minutes

LARSEN/PACHES MOVE to approve the minutes.
3/0/2
CARRIED
2016-11/1d  Chair’s Business

Attendance was taken. Chief Returning Officer (C.R.O.) Donald Ademaj and President Fahim Rahman are also in attendance.

2016-11/2  QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2016-11/2a  Fall Timeline Discussion

CHRISTENSEN:
We chatted about this during the last meeting as well. Does anyone else have other projects?

LARSEN:
Councilor Brophy definitely has a project.

PACHES:
He wants to bring an amendment to the attendance, and the removal process.

CHRISTENSEN:
I don’t think we should make a change this year. We ought to give it some time, and change it next year if there are issues.

RAHMAN:
I think he wanted to make a strict but fair process.

LARSEN:
Next, there was a talk about universalizing the definitions. That’s one thing that we should get into. I don’t really have any other specific plans at the moment.

CHRISTENSEN:
Look at all we’ve accomplished this year!

LARSEN:
We will collect the Residence Association fees this year. However, they haven’t run a plebiscite for the last few years, and it’s something we should look into.
2016-11/2b Dedicated Fee Unit (DFU) Plebiscites

CHRISTENSEN:
I sent Vice-president Paches an email a month ago about this and he said he would contact the various DFUs.

PACHES:
I forwarded it to all the Dedicated Fee Units (D.F.U.s) that are up for renewal. They're all aware. Up for renewal this year are WUSC and APIRG. We will have a referendum this year for the Upass. FACRA is up for next year.

CHRISTENSEN:
According to Bylaw, If they send us the question before November 1, we can edit it. If they don’t, we can do it ourselves. Hopefully they send it by then. I’m hoping they would send it by October 20 so that we can start the process on October 25.

2016-11/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2016-11/3a Bill #6 - C.R.O. Responsibilities - Second Reading

CHRISTENSEN:
This is regarding the things we passed as omnibus about a month ago. There were some concerns. It had already passed second reading at Bylaw, but was referred back.

RAHMAN:
I think it’s micromanaging to dictate how many Deputy Returning Officers (D.R.O.s) should be there in the elections office. This is one of the main reasons it was referred back.

CHRISTENSEN:
The rationale was that it was permissible according to the first principles. It would be a good idea as the elections have been growing and because there have been issues in the past.

KIANI:
Is there going to be a budget difference?
CHRISTENSEN:
That was one of the concerns.

ADEMAJ:
I plan on hiring 2 D.R.O.s this year. Their salary is around $4250. They're hired from the middle of November till April 31. The budget for salaries is split among the 2 D.R.O.s. My concern is that I’m not sure whether future Chief Returning Officers (C.R.O.s) will want to hire 2 D.R.O.s. There have been occasions where past C.R.O.s have had 2 D.R.O.s. But, there have been other occasions including last year when there was only one. So, I don’t want to restrict the next C.R.O.

RAHMAN:
That’s my point as well.

PACHES:
I completely agree. What's the turnover?

ADEMAJ:
I’m responsible for transitioning the future C.R.O. along with Discover Governance. Also, if the budget for the salaries is less, I wouldn’t want to hire two D.R.O.s.

CHRISTENSEN:
There have been chronic issues happening every year because there are so few people working in the elections office. This would hopefully cause an increase in the next year’s budget as well. But, if you guys think it’s a bad idea, I’m OK with removing it.

HOWIE:
Is there anything preventing the C.R.O. from hiring 2 D.R.O.s right now?

ADEMAJ:
Nothing except budgetary constraints. I can hire 3 or 4 if I want to. The elections office has also had volunteers. Maybe that could be included in the definition.
PACHES:
The bylaws should ideally provide a square for you to work in, and you should be free to do whatever is best within that square.

LARSEN:
By legislating like this, we can expect 2 D.R.O.s every year. If you had budgeted money for two, I don’t see why we don’t have 2 as the base line.

PACHES:
We didn’t budget money for two. We budgeted money for staff.

LARSEN:
The C.R.O.is hiring 2 this year anyway.

PACHES:
He’s splitting the budget.

LARSEN:
We can continue splitting it in the future and raise whatever they’re making.

RAHMAN:
The number of staff and their compensation seem like decisions for the Finance Committee.

CHRISTENSEN:
We have chosen this arbitrary number of one. Why isn’t it five?

PACHES:
It’s adaptable. We can have as many as required depending on the workload. There aren’t as many candidates during certain years.

LARSEN:
You don’t know what it’s going to be like before you hire your D.R.O.s.
I don’t think it should be up to the Bylaw Committee to micromanage how many people are in a department. Leave it up to the C.R.O.

RAHMAN:
If we say one or more, we’re giving them a tool. By restricting it to two or more, we are cutting off a bit of that tool. Even now, the C.R.O. can take 2 D.R.O.s if needed. We would be limiting his/her right to pick.

KINANI:
Sometimes it may not be helpful to have two due to miscommunications.

HOWIE:
You can strongly recommend two D.R.O.s in your transition report.

ADEMAJ:
I talked with the previous C.R.O. and she believed that there weren’t enough jobs for two. In addition, some people will say that it’s hard to handle more than one person. In my opinion, I want two D.R.O.s. However, a future C.R.O. may think differently.

CHRISTENSEN:
Let’s go back to one then.
Another concern was about how the D.R.O. can perform the duties of the C.R.O. as allocated. What if the C.R.O. makes one decision and the D.R.O. makes another? We should have it such that the C.R.O. supersedes the D.R.O.

ADEMAJ:
It’s fine with me but seems redundant.

RAHMAN:
I’d like to see something like “delegating duties as needed to the D.R.O.”. In that case, it’s clear that the C.R.O. has responsibility, and they can un-delegate if there’s something they disagree.

CHRISTENSEN:
Sounds good.
Another concern was about what happens if the C.R.O. is incompetent or unable to perform duties.

PACHES:
I agree with the logic. However, the wording is very open, and it makes me uncomfortable. If the C.R.O. is a couple of days late in submitting a report, somebody at the Council Administration Committee (C.A.C.) may pull up this clause.

HOWIE:
That’s a very valid concern.

PROCHNAU:
It should be incapacitated.

HOWIE:
Yes, that’s what we were looking for. We were meaning somebody who was physically incapacitated.

CHRISTENSEN:
What if somebody was literally incompetent?

PACHES: Who should judge that?

CHRISTENSEN:
That’s the thing. There were some serious concerns three years ago.

PACHES:
C.A.C. can always bring the C.R.O. in and inform him/her that they will bring an issue to council if he/she doesn’t fix it soon.

CHRISTENSEN:
C.A.C. really has no authority other than a supervisory role. You can fire a D.R.O. with a vote in C. A. C. However, you need 2 votes in Council at least a week apart to fire a C.R.O.

LARSEN:
We need to make it clear that we aren’t removing the C.R.O. We’re just
assigning duties to another member.

HOWIE:
I think that's controlling.

MCKINLAY:
I don't think something like incompetent should be written in the bylaws. Who decides what incompetent is?

CHRISTENSEN:
I agree. But, the elections period is only 9 days long. By the time Council fires the C.R.O. the elections may be over.

RAHMAN: If you have an incompetent C.R.O. you may have to go to a revote. I'm not saying that that has to happen. But, it'd give you enough time to remove the C.R.O. and find a more suitable candidate.

CHRISTENSEN:
That's reasonable.

PACHES:
I'm concerned that we may be pushing on to Operating Policies here.

CHRISTENSEN:
It's only in the interim. There will be no firing through this. There were other concerns that demanding reports was inappropriate.

RAHMAN:
My concern was the 24-hour notice. I don't believe that the time is enough. I prefer it to be 2-3 business days.

HOWIE:
The time frame for submitting reports is all over the place.

LARSEN:
72 hours makes sense. Even if you get the email before a weekend, you can still get it done by the end of Monday.
PACHES:
What’s the expectation on elections staff to work during the weekends?

KIANI:
Is this responsibility outlined in your job description Donald?

ADEMAJ:
There’s a brief expectation of hours. It’s not like I’m monitored or anything. It’s up to my discretion. I’d be working more often during the by-election. After that, it will be a bit less. When we come to the Executive and Council elections, it will be really busy.

LARSEN:
We could do 24 business hours too.

RAHMAN:
If we do that it’ll be another standard we have to navigate.

CHRISTENSEN:
We’ll do 48 hours then.
The next issue was regarding the Gateway. It used to say “student newspaper” before.

LARSEN:
Let’s change it to student publication.

ADEMAJ:
They’re a magazine now. How often do they publish?

MCKINLAY:
It’s once a month. They do online content.

ADEMAJ:
Does this refer to online content as well?

CHRISTENSEN:
It’d have to.
LARSEN:
The other option would be to remove it entirely, and have it up to your office to find places to advertise.

ADEMAJ:
I don’t mind either way. My concern is that if they publish once a month, it may not be suitable to the Elections Office’s needs. I’m fine with advertising online.

MCKINLAY:
Also, what’s online isn’t necessarily in the print edition.

PROCHNAU:
Publication doesn’t necessarily mean print.

PACHES:
We should have it as “student supported publication”.

ADEMAJ:
If there are two such publications, I will have to advertise in both.

CHRISTENSEN:
Right now, it says student newspaper. That’s why we changed it. I’m wondering if we should have it as the “Students’ Union recognized publication”. Should we get rid of the Gateway then?

HOWIE:
It will always be an option. It doesn’t have to be in bylaw to be an option.

PROCHNAU:
We ought to loosen up the wording.

CHRISTENSEN:
We are also in favor of making things less controlling. We’ll say “advertise in a student publication”.
MCKINLAY:
You don’t have to be a student to be a member of the Gateway staff.

Moving on to classroom talk.

KIANI:
The point about the 10 minute interval between classes doesn't sound right.

MCKINLAY:
"10 minute period" is better.

HOWIE:
We aren’t seeking permission any more. This point eliminates the need for the candidate to go and ask/email each staff member about speaking during that 10 minute period.

LARSEN:
We also wanted to make it very clear that everybody is responsible for what they say/do during that period.

MCKINLAY:
Point 11-2 can be more concise about the list of staff.

MOTION:
LARSEN/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to approve the second reading of Bill #6, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, to clarify and outline C.R.O. Responsibilities according to the approved first principles (See Google Drive for specific word changes).

7/0/0  
CARRIED

2016-11/3b  Editorial #1 - Bylaw 500

CHRISTENSEN:
There are only a few commas and the addition of councilor designates.

MOTION:
CHRISTENSEN/KIANI MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 500 as listed on Google Drive.
2016-11/3c  Editorial #2 - Bylaw 1100

CHRISTENSEN:
There is an issue in 6-B regarding the Social and Environmental Responsibility Committee (S.E.R.C.). It currently refers to the strategic plan of 2011-2014.

LARSEN:
Is S.E.R.C. still in the strategic plan?

PACHES: It’s still editorial right now.

CHRISTENSEN:
Social and economic sustainability as aspired by the strategic plan should be in there.

LARSEN:
If it turns out to be wrong, somebody in the future would remove it.

RAHMAN:
The strategic plan has a life of no less than 4 years.

CHRISTENSEN:
The new one should then be 2015-2018.

HOWIE:
Can we take the years out? That would be the best thing.

Committee agrees

**MOTION:**
CHRISTENSEN/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 1100 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3d  Editorial #3 - Bylaw 100

CHRISTENSEN:
This bylaw is the essence of the Students’ Council. The changes are very small.

MCKINLAY:
The list in 15-1 is wrong.

**MOTION:**
**HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE** to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 100 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

**2016-11/3e Editorial #4 - Bylaw 3000**

RAHMAN:
This will allow us to accept donations. However, we don’t have a place to accept donations right now.

PACHES:
This would just reflect the mandates of the Student Involvement Endowment Fund (S.I.E.F.).

LARSEN: It’s cool to change it; we’re doing it anyway. But, it’s pertinent to inform Council about it.

PACHES:
The moment any money is flowing out of S.I.E.F. multiple people have to approve it in addition to the executives.

HOWIE:
My concern is that we’re opening it us too much.

LARSEN:
This is dangerous. We’re no longer discussing editorial changes. I get why we’re talking about this, but it’s a large change to the bylaw. We should inform the Council in enough wording that this is the current status of S.I.E.F., and that this change is purely editorial.

CHRISTENSEN:
The Discipline Interpretation and Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board may say that it’s not editorial.

LARSEN:
I feel it will be a long debate in Council which would end in us doing it anyway.

PACHES:
S.I.E.F. is an external charity whose board is comprised of the SU executives. It has its own bylaws and terms of reference.

HOWIE:
So, if they have their own bylaws, is this the only clause preventing the use of S.I.E.F. money in such a way?

PACHES:
Technically yes.

CHRISTENSEN:
Do our bylaws supersede S.I.E.F.’s bylaws?

PACHES:
I’m not sure.

LARSEN:
It doesn’t limit what S.I.E.F. does with their money. However, it limits how the SU uses S.I.E.F. money.

PACHES:
It should be worded as “Donations from S.I.E.F. shall be used for the support of the awards provided by the awards committee, and similar activities to support student life on campus”. But, that would make this more than an editorial change.

LARSEN: This has to be brought to Council.

CHRISTENSEN:
Is this time sensitive?

RAHMAN:
No.

PACHES:
We aren’t spending anything from S.I.E.F. right now. We’re only collecting.

CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE strike 3.7 from the proposed edits to Bylaw 3000.
6/0/0  
CARRIED  

**MOTION:**  
PACHES/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the amended editorial changes to Bylaw 3000 as listed below:  
7.3: "In addition to the base Students' Union membership fee, the Chair of Finance Committee shall maintain a schedule of dedicated fees to be collected."  
7.9 add a period after Augustana  
7.10 capitalize Act in Post-Secondary Learning act  

6/0/0  
CARRIED  

2016-11/3f Editorial #5 - Bylaw 6100  

RAHMAN:  
I don’t think that 14 days are enough.  

CHRISTENSEN:  
A lot of the stuff for D. F. U. s are due in November. What if we use 30 days instead?  

LARSEN: If we put a hard date, we may be getting out of the realm of editorial changes.  

**CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE** to amend the edit 3.5 as below:  
3.5 The Bylaw Committee shall approve within fourteen (14) (replace with thirty (30)) days from receiving the proposal, a petition question that reflects the original intent of the proposal and outlines the following:  
2.4, 2.5, 4.2, 5.3.f: add a period at the end  
4.5: A representative from the board of the Dedicated Fee Unit, or designate, as outlined...  

5/0/0  
CARRIED  

**MOTION:**  
PACHES/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 6100 as listed below:
3.5 The Bylaw Committee shall approve within fourteen (14) (replace with thirty (30)) days from receiving the proposal, a petition question that reflects the original intent of the proposal and outlines the following:

2.4, 2.5, 4.2, 5.3.f: add a period at the end
4.5: A representative from the board of the Dedicated Fee Unit, or designate, as outlined...

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3g Editorial #6 - Bylaw 4000

PROCHNAU:
Most of the changes were small ones regarding punctuation regarding commas and semicolons.

MOTION:
PROCHNAU/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 4000 as listed on Google Drive.

7/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3h Editorial #7 - Bylaw 5600

PROCHNAU:
I reformatted it. Also, there were some things that use the SU acronym and some which didn’t. I changed everything to have the acronym.

HOWIE:
Shouldn’t there be periods between acronyms?

CHRISTENSEN:
There should periods between acronyms, except for “SU”.

MOTION:
PROCHNAU/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 5600 as listed on Google Drive.

7/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3i Editorial #8 - Bylaw 2100
LARSEN:
I didn’t do 2100 yet because we were going to add changes from the last bill.

**MOTION:**
**LARSEN/KIANI MOVE** to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2100 as listed on Google Drive.

0/6/0
DEFEATED

2016-11/3j  Editorial #9 - Bylaw 2200

LARSEN:
Regarding 8-2, there are only two official sides. In 9, “side” is redundant. In 10, I removed “or”. 11-2-b should not be there. I moved it without changing the wording.

MCKINLAY:
Why are you supposed to put $50 as a deposit?

LARSEN:
You will be responsible for a budget. So it’s kind of collateral.

RAHMAN:
It’s a partial deterrence to having a huge number of candidates who have no serious interest in running.

LARSEN:
12-2 could be either an “and” or an “or”.

MCKINLAY:
I believe “or” should be there.

RAHMAN:
In the end, the joke candidate cannot win. They don’t count as real people.

HOWIE:
It should be a period as the next one is its own sentence. Also, isn’t 12-3 redundant?

CHRISTENSEN:
In bylaw, it’s important to say what happens when the rule is broken. Otherwise, it would be up to the C.R.O. Also, under 18-4, it should be Section 47.

LARSEN:
In 20, I changed “Campus” to “North Campus”. What do you guys think of SUBprint in 38-1? Shall we change it?

CHRISTENSEN:
I think we should leave it as is.

LARSEN:
Should we add “and/or” to 44-4?

CHRISTENSEN:
It’s just a list.

LARSEN:
Under 47, I was confused why you would black out the number instead of both the name and the number. There is no expectation of an anonymous complaint.

CHRISTENSEN:
We should leave it as it is.

MCKINLAY:
47-1-b is wrong.

HOWIE:
I think that statement is correct.

CHRISTENSEN:
It implies that the volunteer was with that campaign.

RAHMAN:
I don’t know if we can punish volunteers or not, but we can punish candidates because they have signed and agreed to our bylaws.

CHRISTENSEN:
The campaign manager should oversee the volunteer. I think the wording is good enough.

**MOTION:**
LARSEN/KIANI MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2200 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3k Editorial #10 - Bylaw 2300

LARSEN:
All of point 7-3 is made redundant by 7-3-b. We should change it. The wording within 21 is odd.

HOWIE:
Is there any regulation on volunteer sharing?

LARSEN:
No. You can help any contestant as long as you don’t use one candidate’s resources for another.

CHRISTENSEN:
Wasn’t this a clause in 2200 as well? Did we address it?

LARSEN:
That was updated with the universal resources bill. This one wasn’t.

MOTION:
LARSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2300 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3l Editorial #11 - Bylaw 2400

HOWIE:
Shouldn’t there be an “and” between precise and accurate in 6-1?

CHRISTENSEN:
Both are correct.

MOTION:
LARSEN/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2400 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3m Editorial #12 - Bylaw 2500

LARSEN:
There's only a small change in this one.

**MOTION:**
**LARSEN/PACHES MOVE** to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2500 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/3n Editorial #13 - Bylaw 8400

KIANI:
I changed the wording of 9-6.

**MOTION:**
**KIANI/LARSEN MOVE** to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8400 as listed on Google Drive.

6/0/0
CARRIED

2016-11/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2016-11/4a Members who have not completed their General Bylaw Review shall submit it before the October 25, 2016 meeting.

2016-11/5 ADJOURNMENT

2016-11/5a Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 25, 2016 @ 6:00 PM in SUB 6-06

2016-11/5b **KIANI/CHRISTENSEN MOVE** to adjourn at 8:20 PM.
6/0/0
CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 20:20 (8:20 PM).

**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIANI/LARSEN MOVE</strong> to approve the agenda.</td>
<td>5/0/0 - CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSEN/PACHES MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARSEN/CHRISTENSEN MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the second reading of Bill #6, on the recommendation of Bylaw Committee, to clarify and outline C.R.O. Responsibilities according to the approved first principles (See Google Drive for specific word changes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/KIANI MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 500 as listed on Google Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/MCKINLAY MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 1100 as listed on Google Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWIE/CHRISTENSEN MOVE</td>
<td>to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 100 as listed on Google Drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN/HOWIE MOVE</td>
<td>strike 3.7 from the proposed edits to Bylaw 3000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PACHES/MCKINLAY MOVE | to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 3000 as listed below:  
7.3: "In addition to the base Students’ Union membership fee, the Chair of Finance Committee shall maintain a schedule of dedicated fees to be collected."
7.9 add a period after Augustana
7.10 capitalize Act in Post-Secondary Learning act | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
| CHRISTENSEN/LARSEN MOVE | to amend the edit 3.5 as below:  
3.5 The Bylaw Committee shall approve within fourteen (14) (replace with thirty (30)) days from receiving the proposal, a petition question that reflects the original intent of the proposal and outlines the following:  
2.4, 2.5, 4.2, 5.3.f: add a period at the end  
4.5: A representative from the board of the Dedicated Fee Unit, or designate, as outlined… | 5/0/0 - CARRIED |
| PACHES/MCKINLAY MOVE | to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 6100 as listed below:  
3.5 The Bylaw Committee shall approve within fourteen (14) (replace with thirty (30)) days from receiving the proposal, a petition question that… | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
reflects the original intent of the proposal and outlines the following:
2.4, 2.5, 4.2, 5.3.f: add a period at the end
4.5: A representative from the board of the Dedicated Fee Unit, or designate, as outlined...

| PROCHNAU/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 4000 as listed on Google Drive. | 7/0/0 - CARRIED |
| PROCHNAU/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 5600 as listed on Google Drive. | 7/0/0 - CARRIED |
| LARSEN/KIANI MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2100 as listed on Google Drive. | 0/6/0 - DEFEATED |
| LARSEN/KIANI MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2200 as listed on Google Drive. | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
| LARSEN/HOWIE MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2300 as listed on Google Drive. | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
| LARSEN/MCKINLAY MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2400 as listed on Google Drive. | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
| LARSEN/PACHES MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 2500 as listed on Google Drive. | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
| KIANI/LARSEN MOVE to approve the editorial changes to Bylaw 8400 as listed on Google Drive. | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |
| KIANI/CHRISTENSEN MOVE to adjourn at 8:20 PM. | 6/0/0 - CARRIED |