Date: October 24\textsuperscript{th} 2014  
Time: 5.17 pm

In Attendance:

- STEPHANIE GRUHLKE (Chair)
- BRENDAN FEDOSKI
- NICHOLAS DIAZ (Proxy for VIVIAN KWAN)

Excused Absence:

- MARINA BANISTER
- KEVIN JACOBSON

Others in Attendance:

- CORY HODGSON
- SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

1. Call to Order:

   The meeting was called to order by GRUHLKE at 5.17 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda:

   FEDOSKI moved to approve the agenda for October 24, 2014 as tabled.
   The motion was seconded by DIAZ.
   Vote 3/0/0
   CARRIED

3. Approval of Minutes:

   FEDOSKI moved to approve the minutes for June 11, 2014 as tabled.
   The motion was seconded by GRUHLKE.
   Vote 2/0/1
   CARRIED

4. Announcements:

   GRUHLKE: ERC (Elections Review Committee) hasn’t met for a long time. Our last meeting was on June 11, 2014. Jessica Nguyen is our new CRO (Chief Returning Officer). Unfortunately, she couldn’t make it today. We are excited to have her.
Election of a Chair is on our agenda. But, let’s table that for today. I can remain as the interim chair.

5. NEW BUSINESS

Presentation by Vice-president Cory Hodgson

HODGSON: New ideas for different possible committee structures came out of a conversation with Craig Turner. The mandate of ERC is very unclear. It’s essentially a bylaw committee that focuses on a very specific section of bylaws. In 2009, there was a task force created to review the 2000 series bylaws, which are the election bylaws. They did a really good job, and people thought that it would be a good idea to do it every year. That’s how ERC was born. However, I think the mandate was a bit misguided. Major reviews of bylaws don’t need to be done every year. It takes multiple years of running those bylaws to see what their flaws are. So, there has been a split opinion on ERC’s usefulness.

From the conversations with Craig Turner, we came up with an alternate way to deal with ERC. There are specific areas of bylaw which needs more attention than just the Bylaw Committee. The three we have identified are elections, dedicated fee units (DFUs), and faculty associations (FAs). We thought about having sub-committees of bylaw. These are small committees of about 5 people chaired by a bylaw committee member. You have information people sitting on them such as the CRO, and someone from Discover Governance. The other members can be anyone from Council. The sub-committees would be a lot less formal than committees, and will only be required to meet once every trimester. They can meet more if needed.

The issue with ERC is that it’s expected to meet every two weeks. For a committee that is only reviewing, the only workload is stuff that you generate yourself.

GRUHLKE: Chloe Speakman who was last year’s chair was a very proactive.

HODGSON: Yes. It works sometimes. But, for a committee, there should be standing work to be done. These sub-committees meet super infrequently. However, when something happens, you have a standing group of knowledgeable people who are ready to meet.

GRUHLKE: So, under bylaw committee, there would be three sub-committees right?

HODGSON: There wouldn’t necessarily be the three. Bylaw 100 would say that the Bylaw Committee can make sub-committees. Which ones exist would be in the Bylaw Committee’s standing orders. Those are the three we have identified. There could be more or less though.

GRUHLKE: For the sub-committee for FAs, you would want the Vice-president Academic and Discover Governance on it. For the DFU one, you would want Vice-president Operations and Finance and the Audit Committee. For the sub-committee about elections, you would want the CRO and Discover Governance on it.
HODGSON: Yes.
GRUHLKE: Would the other sub-committee members be members from the Bylaw Committee?
HODGSON: They would be from the Council.
GRUHLKE: So, would the bylaw committee come to council to ask for a certain number of people to fill the sub-committee?
HODGSON: Yes. If I were to move this, a part of it would include disbanding ERC.
GRUHLKE: To get rid of a committee, do you want the Committee or the Council to vote on getting rid of it.
HODGSON: The Council.
GRUHLKE: How about a recommendation from all committee members to get rid of the committee.
HODGSON: It doesn’t carry any official weight.
GRUHLKE: Would you want one of us to motion to get rid of ERC?
HODGSON: I can move that. I have already drafted first principles of the sub-committee part.
GRUHLKE: I can second that if you want.
HODGSON: Any other comments? I would do this in the next month or two.
FEDOSKI: I think it would be way more efficient.
GRUHLKE: Yes. I’m ok with it.
HODGSON: I will move ahead then.

6. DISCUSSION

Future of ERC

GRUHLKE: We just discussed this, and vice-president Hodgson is going to deal with it.

Meeting Schedule

GRUHLKE: When will this motion come? Should we meet again before we dissolve because we don’t have the full committee here?
HODGSON: Probably on the Council meeting after the next meeting.
GRUHLKE: I will be in contact with vice-president Hodgson to determine whether we need to meet again.

7. REPORTS

None.

8. CLOSED SESSION

NIL

9. NEXT MEETING

Not decided.
10. ADJOURNMENT  

*FEDOSKI moved to adjourn the meeting.*  
The motion was seconded by DIAZ.  
Vote 3/0/0  
CARRIED  

The meeting was adjourned by GRUHLKE at 5:31 pm.