**Engineering Society Council Minutes**

Engineering Society of Queen’s University

Thursday, January 7th 2016

Dunning Hall, Room 12

Speaker: Tyler Snook

  Secretary: Lianne Zelsman

*Council begins: 6:01 pm*

## I. Attendance

Tyler Snook: Good evening everyone. Since Ryan Cattrysse is sick I will be the speaker for tonight. It is exciting to be back. We are going to take attendance. Please click 1 if you are here and 2 if you are a proxy.

*Attendance taken: 6:02 pm*

## II. Adoption of the Agenda

### Motion 1

Whereas: It’s 2016!

& Whereas: Let’s make this year a good one;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of Thursday, January 7th 2016, as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Julianna Jeans

Seconded by: Ryan Cattrysse

Opening (Julianna Jeans): Please note that there was a miscommunication. There is an extra motion. Motion 10 can be seen on one of the sheets of paper you should have picked up.

**Motion Passes: 6:04 pm (31, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

## III. Adoption of the Minutes

### Motion 2

Whereas: Our last meeting was a while ago;

& Whereas: We need to remember what happened;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of Thursday, November 27th 2015 as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Lianne Zelsman

Seconded by: Julianna Jeans

Opening (Lianne Zelsman): If there are any problems with the minutes let me know.

**Motion Passes: 6:05 pm (31, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

## IV. Speaker’s Business

Tyler Snook: Hi everyone. I have another joke for you today. Why do we wear glass when we do math? Because it helps with di-vision. If you plan to use acronyms, please define them first. Let us have a good council.

*Council breaks: 6:05 pm*

*Council resumes: 6:09 pm*

## V. Presentations

No presentations occurred.

## VI. New Business: Motions 3-9

### Motion 3

Whereas: The portfolios of certain directorships have developed significantly in the past few years;

& Whereas: Some directorships are better suited under the guidance of a different executive member;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the second reading of the changes to By-Law 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in APPENDIX “DO THE SHUFFLE”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Alex Wood): I will try to summarize things for people who were not here last council. We are doing a fairly large chunk of restructuring to the current government structure. We plan to shift different Director positions to under different Executive. It should not change the individual portfolios much. The Director of Information Technology (IT) will be moved under the Vice President of Operations (VPOps). The Director of Human Resources (HR) will be moved under the President. The Director of Conferences will be moved under the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA). We had the initial reading last council. This council we will have the second reading of the By-Law. The changes to Policy will be discussed in the next motion.

Andrew Crawford: Is it possible to pass the changes to Policy and By-Law in the same motion?

Avery Cole: If declared friendly, you can amend the agenda so that both motions can be voted on together. That is how the Alma Mater Society (AMS) does it.

Sam Anderson: Given that there are multiple motions that discuss the Policy and By-Law counter parts tonight, we could also open the agenda and make the changes all at once.

Tyler Snook: We need to finish this motion first, then we can open the agenda.

**Motion Passes: 6:12 pm (31, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion to Open Agenda:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Evan Dressel

**Motion Passes: 6:13 pm**

*The agenda is now open.*

Alex Wood: I would like to motion to omnibus. This would mean that Motions 5 and 6, and Motions 7 and 8 would be combined.

Julianna Jeans: Friendly

Stephen Martin: Can you explain what an omnibus is?

Avery Cole: It means that we are combing several motions so that they can be discussed together, as they are about similar topics.

### Motion to Close Agenda:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Galvin Niu

**Motion Passes: 6:16 pm**

*Agenda is now closed.*

Tyler Snook: Just to clarify, Motions 5 and 6 are now just Motion 5. Motions 7 and 8 are now just Motion 6.

### Motion 4

Whereas: The portfolios of certain directorships have developed significantly in the past few years;

& Whereas: Some directorships are better suited under the guidance of a different executive member;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to Policy Section β: Society Leadership, as seen in APPENDIX “PORTFOLIO SHUFFLE”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Alex Wood): This is just the Policy that accompanies the By-Law that was just passed.

**Motion Passes: 6:18 pm (31, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

Tyler Snook: Laptops can be open for the next motion.

*Matt Whittle and Chloë Harkness leave and proxy their votes to Avery Cole and Alexander Amos respectively.*

Tyler Snook: Please note that there was another appendix to go with this next motion, but it was not printed.

### Motion 5

Whereas: Outreach, regardless of the scope of it, is an important aspect of a student society;

& Whereas: We currently do not have a streamlined or strong outreach portfolio;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the second reading of the changes to By-Law 2: Rules of Order and By-Law 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in APPENDIX “REEEEEACH” and council approves the changes to Policy Section β: Society Leadership as seen in APPENDIX “OUTREACH”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Alex Wood): This is probably the most substantial restructuring change as it is to introduce a new Director position. This new position, the Director of Outreach, is to be our liaison with the community. We think that we can make more of a difference in the community if we streamline our community outreach initiatives through one position. The engineers sometimes garner a poor reputation with Kingston residents, so a position like this will help us gain back a positive reputation by giving back. I assembled a three year plan document. If anyone here is interested in the document and did not receive it, let me know and I can email it to you.

Mike Blair: Just note that there are a few clerical errors that need to be fixed within the documents.

Alex Wood: Friendly.

Avery Cole: Know that I do read through the changes and check them before they are uploaded, so it is not necessary to point out all of the clerical errors, unless a substantive change needs to be made.

Sam Anderson: Great job Alex Wood for putting together the long term plan. I just have a question about the position’s responsibilities. It talks about how the Director will keep the Engineering Society (EngSoc) updated on issues facing members of the community. In terms of informing students about municipal issues, that is already the job of the Commissioner of Municipal Affairs in the AMS. Why do we need this as part of the portfolio if there is already someone else designated to do the job? Would it perhaps be a distraction from the other core responsibilities of the position?

Alex Wood: The idea is that it would be more of an unofficial part of the position. It is true that the AMS is the primary advocacy to the city, but as an engineering student I find that I rarely have an idea of what is going on. The idea is that the Director could extend a hand to the AMS commissioner so that they can communicate between them and the engineering faculty to ensure that we are all aware of what is happening. In terms of adding more strain, I do not think it will. The interfaculty caucuses normally have monthly or bi-weekly meetings. The Director will treat those meetings as opportunities to get information from the Municipal Affairs Commissioner that they can relay back to the engineering students. The position will help to define and formalize our connections.

Eleanor McAuley: In Policy it says that the Director of Outreach will require approval from the EngSoc President on any matters affecting the reputation of the society within the community. What is this line pertaining too? We normally deal with our reputation in an “after the fact” sort of way. How is this different? Why do we need it?

Alex Wood: It is similar to how the Director of Conferences needs to act a specific way at conferences as they tend to act as the EngSoc representative. If the outreach person is running community events they can often say something that may be taken as the opinion of the society. Anything that can strongly affect the society’s reputation, such as if they want to make a substantive change or run a substantive event, needs approval first. It is important to have the presidential oversight so that the Director does not make any major decisions regarding our activities alone. While they are the right person to make such decisions, it is important to still have some oversight.

Alexander Cavaliere: Is there a risk with the oversight from the President becoming a form of micromanagement over the position? This could lead to the President doing both the role they currently have and taking on responsibilities of the Director. The presidential position would then not be operating with the best value to students. I am worried that the President will just end up doing what they are already doing in terms of outreach, which eliminates the value of the Director position.

Alex Wood: It is more of a managerial thing. While it does say that the President has to be consulted, it does not mean that they have to be the one to do things. It just means that before the Director does anything drastic, they just need approval. I do not see it adding strain onto the President.

Eric McElroy: I move to change the wording in Policy and By-Law to say “Director of Community Outreach”.

Alex Wood: Unfriendly for the sake of discussion.

Eric McElroy: I motion to change the name as it is entirely a community outreach position. I think this change will benefit the person who ends up in this role, as it will help to very clearly indicate that their actions will be for the community.

Alexander Cavaliere: I am in favour of this amendment as it will help to make the role clearer, especially for members outside the society. By adding in the extra word it helps people know that this person is meant for serving the community.

*Council votes on the amendment.*

**Motion Passes: 6:32 pm**

Meara Hampton: It is not a secret that our reputation is not always outstanding within the community. I think this position will help be proactive to change that. It should not be a reactionary thing such as “we did something wrong, let us fix it”. Rather it should be used as a proactive role.

Eric McElroy: In the Policy B.13.1, it looks like there is a word missing from the first sentence. What is it?

Eleanor McAuley: In B.13.3 the second sentence should read “Director will require approval “from”” not “of”.

Alex Wood: Both changes are friendly. The missing word is “community”.

Mike Blair: For B.13.1 I would like to amend it to remove the phrase “community around us”.

Alex Wood: I am going to say unfriendly so that I can talk about it. I think that the phrase gives the Director more room to expand their outreach to the Greater Kingston Area. The idea is that we focus on Kingston, but we do not want to limit the portfolio to only work within Kingston. If we ever wanted to do an event outside of Kingston, it will allow the portfolio more space.

Mike Blair: I retract my amendment.

Alex Wood: I appreciate the debate. I am really glad you encouraged me to do the three year plan. I think it would be a great idea to do for all positions. I look forward to seeing the results.

**Motion Passes: 6:38 pm (31, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 6

Whereas: One Director of Design cannot and should not be expected to handle all the design teams and clubs;

& Whereas: Some clubs fit better under different directorships due to varied mandates;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the second reading of the changes to By-Law 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in APPENDIX “I HATE CLUBBING” and council approves the changes to Policy Section β: Society Leadership as seen in APPENDIX “CLUBSHUFFLE”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Alex Wood): The Director of Design position is currently a direct descendant from the Vice President of Student Development. Many of that VP’s responsibilities got put under the Director of Design portfolio. At the time there were only around twelve design teams. We now have over fifteen. There are even more clubs now. We currently have one person who is doing all of the oversight for almost thirty different groups, and they are expected to be an expert on all of them. We are going to take clubs and put them under the Directors in the society who share a similar mandate with the club. We want to move them under the guidance of a Director who can give them the best support.

Siobhan Powell: In appendix “CLUB SHUFFLE” C.3 and C.11 it seems that both list Women in Science and Engineering (WISE). Who will be their primary contact?

Alex Wood: This came from a discussion I had with WISE. I asked which Director would work best with them. They said that it was a 50/50 split between both Community Outreach and Professional Development. We are going to allow them to contact either Director depending on the type of question they wish to ask. The idea is to have two different people to facilitate their club’s two complimentary branches.

*Rigers Rukaj and Eleanor McAuley leave and proxy their votes to Taylor Sawadsky and Tyler Bennett respectively.*

Kevin Corey: It appears that there are some clerical errors throughout the document. Some of the groups and Directors are listed incorrectly. For example, Queen’s Economic Commodities Association should be listed under Professional Development.

Alex Wood: I will fix all of the errors. I would like to take a straw poll. Can I table this so that I can bring it back later without any errors?

*Straw poll conducted. Most people in favour.*

Alexander Cavaliere: Can a tabled motion be brought back at the same council?

Alex Wood: Never mind, I have the correct version on my computer. I think I just sent the wrong one. I can send you the correct one so that people can get it and vote on it.

*Correct version put on projector.*

Alex Wood: These are the correct changes.

Meara Hampton: Is Engineers Without Borders (EWB) ratified as a club in EngSoc?

Alex Wood: We have had mixed reports on this recently. EWB says that they are not ratified, but every document we have says that they are. We are just going to assume that they are already ratified instead of having them come to council to be re-ratified.

Taylor Sweet: I do not think that I saw Robogals under Policy. Is it there?

Alex Wood: I will add it in. Sorry for all of the problems. Thank you for your patience.

*Matt Whittle returns and reclaims his vote.*

**Motion Passes: 6:55 pm (31, 0, 0)**

### Motion 7

Whereas: Policy requires a proposal for a summer IT position to be brought by the executive;

& Whereas: There are multiple benefits associated with the position;

& Whereas: The cost of the position outweighs the benefits;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

There shall not be a summer IT position for the summer of 2016.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Andrew Crawford): We talked about this last council and asked for more time to look into it. In the process of doing that we realized that our priorities for this year were not to get the IT position in place. I apologize if this is not the depth of a proposal you are looking for. I do not think we can justify spending $9,000 for the summer. If you have any questions please ask.

Sam Grant: I yield my speaking rights to Nick Sheahan.

Nick Sheahan: What are the costs of using the ITS server?

Eric McElroy: As former Director of IT, I worked on a project where we built an application that would be secured under Queen’s Single Sign-On (SSO) system. The costs consisted entirely of the labour costs as the hosting space was free.

Sam Grant: I yield my speaking rights to Nick Sheahan.

Nick Sheahan: Why can you not just do it all yourself?

Andrew Crawford: When we hire for our Director of IT the focus of the position is on maintaining the servers and keeping things running, not on developing new apps. The position requires a very unique set of skills. The way we go about dealing with our programs is by having the Director of IT acting to translate what Queen’s Information Technology Services (ITS) needs to know, rather than them doing everything themselves. We need to have Queen’s ITS build it for us. If they build it for us, it needs to be consistent with their practices. If we have a Director of IT that does not know what a specific piece of software is, we can consult ITS to learn more about it.

Richard Hum: Another reason that we do not develop many things is that if we want to collect things like confidential student data, we would be charged to audit it on the servers. It just saves us time to get them to develop it.

Eric McElroy: Another issue is time. Most people do not have the skills to do this until after their third year. It should not be expected of anyone in the society to be able to build something of this complexity. It also should not be expected of a volunteer. It makes sense that rather than giving the task to students, we give it to people on campus who have the qualifications to do it properly.

Sam Grant: I yield my speaking rights to Nick Sheahan.

Nick Sheahan: That makes sense. The reason I am really here today was that it was my intention to apply for that position. You guys need to build a new eCommerce platform and redesign the Engineering Society website. I have specific knowledge of the infrastructure. I think I would have done a fantastic job.

Nick Rupar: We also have an IT Team this year which has taken on these types of programs. We hope to have something for commerce, so it is not absolutely necessary for the summer IT position to look at that specific program.

Alexander Rey: Unless specifically identified as such, our positions are open to all faculties.

Eric McElroy: Andrew Crawford you mentioned that the proposal felt a bit light. I was wondering how you feel about how some of the summer Exec plans are structured, as they sometimes feel just as light.

Alex Wood: I will not try to say that the summer plans should not be more flushed out, as I do agree that they can be improved on. I think the changes we made to the timeline will help us to improve how the plans are laid out. Right now when people are elected, they begin their position very close to summer. At that point they still do not know much about their position and they are busy with exams and hiring. This does not allow them adequate time to write up a proper summer budget and plan. That is why our process is incredibly flawed. I personally felt rushed. With the new changes that will be implemented next year, I think it will allow the Exec to put more time and energy into the summer plans.

Meara Hampton: In budget council we were talking about how we do not spend that much money. These things seem very relevant and are important to get done. I am in favour of having an IT position, as the student would get to work in a relevant field and help to get these projects done. As we have discussed before, we do have extra money.

Alex Wood: I would love to have an IT person to do this. The problem is that I did not think that we can fill an entire summer with just these plans, and we did not want to present something depthless to council. We will definitely recommend that this be looked into next year, but I do not think this is the right time to put money and time into the position.

Sam Anderson: It seems to me that Policy is being a bit restrictive about how we can go about solving this problem. There has been no discussion about why the restricting elements in Policy could not be amended. Is there not a better solution?

Andrew Crawford: Yes, that was a discussion that happened. We had an intent to come and change that Policy next council as it is restricting us. If we identify the need for a Director of IT we should not have to come back every single year to discuss the position.

Sam Grant: I yield my speaking rights to Nick Sheahan.

Nick Sheahan: You said that you are already started on some of the projects with the IT team. Is that correct?

Nick Rupar: We are working on it, but we had a bit of a slow start this year. I cannot say how fast it will go, but we are having a meeting Saturday to get things started. At that point we will have more information on our plan. From what I understand, I would not bet on it being done by the end of the semester. I understand that these projects will not get done as quickly as if they were done as a summer position, but I agree that there might not be enough work for a summer position at this time.

Nick Sheahan: The proposal states that the purpose of this position would be to work on these projects. So is that incorrect? You need to realize that the construction of software is very difficult and the complexity is unknown at the beginning of a project. Software takes a long time to develop and its timeframe cannot be accurately estimated. In the light of not potentially having enough work available for the summer, you need to remember that software projects take longer than you think.

Nick Rupar: We are aware of that. We will have more information available after our meeting as I previously said.

Alex Wood: Many times an IT team will start a project and it will be continued in the next year. I realize that these projects can take a very long time. They are more meant as an extracurricular and have not been seen as a huge priority in the past. We never expect them to get software done in one year as it is a long-term process. We understand that there is a large amount of work to get done. We are not saying that there is no value in this position. We want to change Policy so that we may have a team working on the proposal for a long period of time. We do not want something to pass without lots of detail put into it.

Nick Rupar: Are you thinking to bring this motion back later this year? Or just passing over the position completely for the year?

Alex Wood: We will completely bypass the position this year.

Callen Hageman: Would the Exec be willing to think of contract or project based work? Do you think that people might be interested in having project based jobs instead? Would the society be willing pay people for that type of work?

Andrew Crawford: That is very similar to how IT has functioned this year and in the past. It is a possibility to convert some things into project based contracts, but it is not what we are currently discussing.

Mike Blair: With respect to various projects, I see that many of these look like capital type investments and projects that will affect things over the years. What does the Advisory Board think about these projects? It also appears that many of these projects are fairly pressing. If we do not have a dedicated person to get these things done, when and how will they be accomplished?

Andrew Crawford: The Advisory Board does not oversee the society general. This stuff is not being discussed at Board yet. In terms of the projects seeming fairly urgent, it is important to note that they were not just created for this proposal. The need for these projects has been around for a long time. They were just included into this proposal to demonstrate ideas of what could be done with the position. Though they would be valuable projects, I would not say that there is an urgent need for any of them.

Alexander Rey: Can we call EngSoc Apply a little bit urgent?

Richard Hum: I do believe the AMS is working on a new application system, so we are holding off on the EngSoc Apply until we see where they progress.

Sam Anderson: I think this is great example of blending two sides of the spectrum. Many things we do are in the attempt to benefit student experience and provide a broader set of services. The IT structure is a good example of that. It is important to make sure that things like our website and EngSoc Apply are of high quality. Those are probably our number one interface with students. Most other students do not come to council meetings or hang out in the lounge. This makes those kinds of tools very important for how we interact with the society. I would like to hear from the Exec on how we will move forward by solving these issues, rather than focusing on following Policy. I really resonate with the concerns raised about these issues, as they have been a problem for many years. They have yet to be addressed. I understand it might not be within the mandate of the Exec to accomplish these tasks before they finish their term, but they are in the position now to set up the plan for how to get them done. I worry that if we do not do anything this spring, nothing will get done for another year.

Andrew Crawford: We plan on adjusting Policy to allow for future flexibility. That way we can make sure that we hire the right person for the job. In terms of action being taken over the summer that is something that can be reviewed and advised. That is what we are focusing on. Maybe it is not in regard to this issue itself, but we only have so much time to focus on the issues that we have decided are the most relevant. We have seen the addition of a whole new Director position and the shuffle of many other positions in the government. The changes going on this year have been very important, but just not pertaining to this.

*Taylor Sweet leaves and proxies vote to Nick Rupar.*

Tyler Bennett: I understand that the Director of IT is currently pretty swamped with server issues. I know many websites under the EngSoc umbrella are down.

Richard Hum: It is back up.

Eric McElroy: One thing I found when doing IT things is that you have to have a very limited amount of time to accomplish a large amount of work. This is something that continues to be a problem. Progress on IT projects is very slow, and you really only have eight months to do anything. When you arrive in September people need emails and many other things need to get done. This causes other larger projects to move very slowly. At some point there really needs to be a summer IT position to get things done. For example the ListServ solution has been one of the only real changes in the past few years. Nothing else substantial has really happened. The only way to get something substantial done is to have that summer IT position. The Policy document is really inconveniencing us right now. At the end of the day I would like to see the Exec with a big plan for fixing these problems. EngSoc apply is a nightmare. There are many issues in our infrastructure. We need someone who has the time and ability to fix these things. The summer would be a great time to do it.

*Galvin Niu leaves and proxies vote to Austin Greisman.*

Nick Rupar: What happens if this is voted down? Would there be required to be a summer position?

Julianna Jeans: It would mean that at next council the Exec would be forced to bring a new proposal regarding the position.

Alexander Rey: It would signal that in the will of council there would be an expectation for a summer IT position. By voting for it, council would not feel the position to be appropriate at this time.

Nick Rupar: So this motion can be voted down now, with a new proposal being brought to next council that could go either way, independent of what happens today?

Alexander Rey: From my understanding the reason it is in Policy is to make sure that a discussion is had every year about IT. The motion has been brought by the Exec to make sure this discussion happens.

Stephen Martin: I like what everyone has been saying. I want to back up the Executive. They admitted this is something they were not ready for. Right now we are trying to force fit a position in a way that it is described and it is not really working. We are addressing that there are issues, but we have not really looked at any solutions. There is money available to be spent. This is not necessarily the most urgent need, but it would be very beneficial. Right now would not be the most ideal time for them to talk about it and plan something else. I would encourage the Exec to take the feedback and talk with the correct people in order to actually prepare something useful. We need to allow them time to take what we have said and do something valid with it.

Eric McElroy: There is no requirement for the proposal in the summer IT approval process. Having reviewed this Policy specifically last year, I can assure you that there was nothing about a requirement for a proposal at this stage. It was not mandatory, but our Exec did it for us anyway.

Alex Wood: The largest issue for us right now is this piece of Policy. We realized we have not done enough work on this as we would have liked. We are not saying there is no value for the position, but given the timeline forced on us, we were not prepared to propose a high enough quality proposal that council would accept. I am glad we are having this discussion. I would love to make some changes to this Policy so that we can make it fit with what council would like to see. If the council really wants the summer IT position, I would be happy to tackle this more thoroughly in the winter. I think we have every intent to pass down a strong transition document so that the team next year can look into this with more detail.

Eric McElroy: The summer IT officer would be responsible for developing their own summer plan in conjunction with the new Exec. There is no onus on the current Exec to do anything other than decide whether they think they should have one.

*Rigers Rukaj and Eleanor McAuley return and reclaim their votes.*

Sam Grant: I yield my speaking rights to Nick Sheahan.

Nick Sheahan: I am glad to hear this discussion. Computer science students are a group of kids who would love to get a job at a place like Microsoft or IBM. Their whole purpose is to build software that can change the world. You find that focus on IT culture in many organizations. There are many institutions that I do not feel have seen the light yet. Having world class IT infrastructure changes the face of your institution at every level. I am incredibly glad to hear that it sounds like there will be a future discussion on the matter.

Nick Rupar: I would like to encourage some of the Computer Science students to apply to the IT team in future years.

Sam Anderson: I would like to speak to Alex Wood’s point about priorities for the winter term. We have seen everything the Exec has accomplished this year and their judgment on where their time should be prioritized. This issue is something that we have identified as being important, but that Exec might not have time for. So what are some solutions? What is another group that could look into this? If we vote yes to this today, all we do is say that the position cannot exist. We would only succeed in checking off a box in Policy. There have been many great ideas suggested today, such as Callen Hageman’s proposal to have more project based contracts. I think we are really stuck on the Policy. We should not decide now that we will not have a summer IT position. I would like to see council take out the policy that stops us from doing the things we want to do. I do not think that if we put this off, we will be in a better position next year. We should be deciding how we will tackle this issue. This might be something IT team can take on or that the Advisory Board can look over. Whether or not we talk about solutions today, I think the focus should be on that, and not just checking off the box in Policy that says we will not do anything about this problem.

Nick Rupar: In light of what Sam Anderson and Eric McElroy have said, I want to see a straw poll. If this motion is turned down, would the council like a more rigorous motion to be brought to next council about the summer IT position?

Sam Anderson: I would like to clarify that it is equally important to bring up how we will actually do something about IT. Would council like to see a proposal for the action that needs to be taken? Whether it is to hire a position or strike a committee, we need to have a plan. That plan cannot just be to shut this down and leave it where it is.

*The straw poll is conducted. It appears that most people are in favour.*

Mike Blair: I strongly recommend that the members here vote against this motion, as it is against the will of what council has stated. Please note that if you do not pass this motion, it does not necessarily mean that there will or will not be this position.

Alex Wood: I would like to amend the motion to read: “as referenced in Policy” as that is what this is about right now. By the sounds of it council does not love how that Policy reads.

Eric McElroy: There has not been a discussion about the Policy.

Alex Wood: I would like to vote directly as referenced in the Policy, so that if we do vote this down we can still make decisions regarding it later.

Kevin Corey: Would tabling the motion not allow it to come back later?

Mike Blair: Can you make changes to a tabled motion?

Julianna Jeans: Alex Wood has amended his motion to read “as referenced in Policy Section: Information Technology”. We would have to bring it back, then change it again. We cannot change the spirit of the motion.

Andrew Crawford: If you vote no, nothing happens. There is no mandate that this position needs to exist. It says that the IT officer only exists if it is approved.

Alex Shieck: Could we not table the motion, then bring up a separate motion and never deal with the tabled motion again? Then the new motion could reflect the will of the council.

Alexander Rey: You technically can, but you are not really supposed to.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Matt Lawson

Second by: Brandon Tseung

**Motion Passes:** **7:56 pm**

*The question is called. The council will now vote on the motion.*

**Motion Fails: 7:57 pm (6, 20, 3)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri, Andrew Crawford and Alex Wood abstained.

*Andrew Crawford leaves and proxies his vote to Jane Ferguson.*

### Motion 8

Whereas: You kindly passed my motion last time;

& Whereas: Some good points were brought up during discussion;

& Whereas: Let’s turn those discussion points into reality.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approves the changes to Policy Section β as seen in APPENDIX “FOR THE PEOPLE”.

Moved by: Stewart Jensen

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Stewart Jensen): Last council we decided that if changes are made to positions, there should be some information given to people at council. I am happy to answer any questions.

Eleanor McAuley: You used the word “permanent” to describe the positions. I think that a different wording should be used, as the society does not normally refer to positions as “permanent”. We talked about needing to submit a motion for new position, however it was not discussed whether this would be required if we were to take one away.

Stewart Jensen: I view that document as sort of like a living memory, so that we can see that we used to have “x” and “y” managers. That is why I did not want to take them away. In terms of taking away the word “permanent” I am open to changing it to “service manager”.

Alexander Cavaliere: I believe what Eleanor meant to ask was what would happen if a position is intended to no longer be hired, as in something that will not be required to be hired in Policy?

Stewart Jensen: I will make that change.

Eric McElroy: Was the point of what we did last council not to ensure that a specific number of management positions for each one were not needed? It was worded so that they existed, but did not necessarily need to be hired.

Stewart Jensen: That was kind of the point. For example, “here are the seven managers that may include but are not limited to… etc”.

**Motion Passes: 8:02 pm** **(30, 0, 1)**

Sam Anderson: I would like to add a motion relating to the IT proposal.

Motion to Open Agenda:

Moved by: Sam Anderson

Seconded by: Kevin Corey

**Motion Passes: 8:03 pm**

*The agenda is now open.*

Sam Anderson: I would like to propose to add a motion. It will say that the Executive must bring a proposal to council on January 21st, 2016 detailing what action will be taken to identify and address EngSoc’s current IT infrastructure requirements.

### Motion to Close Agenda:

Moved by: Sam Anderson

Seconded by: Kevin Corey

**Motion Passes: 8:04 pm**

*The agenda is closed.*

Motion 9

Whereas: IT infrastructure is important to the Engineering Society;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The executive bring a proposal to Council on January 21st 2016 detailing what action will be taken to identify and address EngSoc’s current IT infrastructure requirements.

Moved by: Sam Anderson

Seconded by: Nick Rupar

Opening (Sam Anderson): I wanted to add something just so that we had an action item on the table and so that the Exec can figure out what works for them. There should be some sort of position taken to actually determine who can address the issue, as every year the Exec keep the responsibility on themselves. I think we need to plan how we are going to address the infrastructure.

Jacqueline Craig: I think this is a great idea, but should have been talked about earlier on to ensure the initiative was not being forced onto the Exec. They had the whole winter break to look at the availability of a summer position, so I do not think there is a value of forcing them to submit a proposal.

Nick Rupar: They would not be submitting a proposal for an IT position specifically, but more on how to approach the situation.

Eric McElroy: I do not think the Exec are the correct people to be asked this question. I think the correct people would be the people who deal with this regularly, such as people within the IT portfolio. The people inside the Exec bubble are very minimally involved within the IT structure. I believe there are people who are more appropriate to look into the IT infrastructure needs of the society. Giving those people more than just two weeks would be ideal, rather than putting this burden on the Exec.

Alexander Cavaliere: Eric McElroy, I think that as far reaching as the IT infrastructure is, I still think the Exec are the right group to explore this type of proposal as this would affect all members of society. However it is their duty to make sure that they are in contact with all of the correct groups to make sure the perspectives of others within the IT infrastructure are brought to the table. I also feel that two weeks for this type of proposal seems very quick. Especially given that two members of Exec are not currently in attendance, is two weeks reasonable for something like this to be brought forward with enough detail to do justice to what our society and students require?

Nick Rupar: The proposal is not to bring up what the position will actually do, but rather to decide who will make the decisions on the subject. It is a simple matter of the Exec deciding that perhaps some other Directors or society members should be the decision making body on the issue. For example they could propose to have a consultation committee that will have more say on the topic.

Alexander Cavaliere: While I respect your comment, I am still uncertain as to whether there is enough time for this to be done effectively in two weeks.

Richard Hum: Given what Eric McElroy said before, the Exec are not mandated to bring forward a proposal. I think the best person to bring forward this proposal is the summer IT person themselves, much like the Exec do for their summer plans. IT is very technical, which makes it extremely difficult for someone else to understand how it works from an outside perspective. I do not think the Exec are the best people to bring forward the plan.

Mike Blair: Keep in mind what this motion is actually stating. It is not asking for a full, detailed analysis. The Exec should and ought to seek out input from various parties, given that anything this group passes takes effect in EngSoc Policy. We can legislate to the officers and members what we think ought to happen. I think it is reasonable to ask them of this with the two week time frame. It is not asking for a full report. It is just acknowledging the fact that we understand the seriousness of the IT related issues we discussed earlier.

Stewart Jensen: If we cannot delegate IT questions to our IT team, why do we even have those positions? We have in-house experts that can deal with this. We should be conscious of our timelines. We only have a few more councils until the Annual General Meeting (AGM).

Sam Anderson: I do not think that anything anyone has said is contrary to what I have brought forward in this motion. If it will take us over a year to put together a proposal, the Exec can say so. This motion is just for the Exec to say what they will do. I think we will do our constituents a disservice if we do not do anything. We will not be making any critical decisions now. It is okay if it takes two weeks or a year, but I would like to see us start the decision process now.

Richard Hum: When do the applications for Director of IT go out?

Alex Wood: Typically Wednesday or Thursday during campaign week. We could wait until just after to put out the application. Thanks to everyone for the feedback. I agree with what has been said so far. I think we should bring our thoughts to the next council. Andrew Crawford was already saying he wanted to strike a task force with people qualified to discuss this. I think this motion is reasonable in terms of us just choosing our course of action.

Eleanor McAuley: I think that we are looking at a summer IT position and a summer IT position proposal as a lump thing. However I think it would make sense logically to separate them.

Nick Rupar: Basically what we decided was that we are not really sure what the problems are. This motion is to determine them.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Matt Lawson

Seconded by: Kevin Corey

**Motion Passes: 8:18 pm**

*The question is called. The council will now vote on the motion.*

**Motion Passes: 8:18 pm (30, 0, 1)**

Let it be noted that Alex Wood and Stephan Dobri abstained.

## VII. Break

*Council breaks: 8:18 pm*

*Council resumes: 8:26 pm*

## VIII. Executive Reports

### i) President

Julie Tseng: Not present. Read report for more information.

### ii) VP (Student Affairs)

Alex Wood: I explained in my report what my plans are for the remainder of the year. The sword case has been installed in the lounge. It is for the Order of the Purple Knight, which is the highest award in the society.

### iii) VP (Operations)

Andrew Crawford: Not present. Read report for more information.

## IX. Director Reports

### i) Academics

Jacqueline Craig: Welcome back everyone. It is great to start this semester. I have two things to add to my report. Since it is the beginning of the school year, if you have questions regarding anything academic related feel free to shoot me an email. There was an email that went out about the Fall Reading Break. I presented a version to council in the fall. A large amount of feedback was given to the Senate committee. They came out with another iteration based on what they thought the break should look like. The idea is to take two days out of Orientation Week and give students two days of break. We are sitting down with the chair of the Senate committee to talk about it. We are working with the AMS and other stakeholders to make sure the engineering voice is heard.

### ii) Communications

Laura Penstone: Everything is mostly in my report. We are still looking to collect information from all of the discipline clubs. If you do not know what I am talking about, let me know. The Orientation Week video is finally finished being edited.

### iii) Conferences

Loralyn Blondin: Not present. Read report for more information.

### iv) Design

Stephan Dobri: Good evening. It is all in my report.

### v) Events

Jerry Haron: Hi, it is me Jerry. EngWeek is coming up next week. We are selling tickets now and all weekend. It is definitely going to be a great time. I encourage you to come to the all-ages event. There is a new winter Fix n’ Clean event. If you are 21 or over and have a G license contact Emma about driving. It is on the 23rd and 24th. EngVents is holding the first ever Thunderballz tournament. It is frosh groups playing dodgeball. You will get an all new “Thunderballz” jacket bar.

### vi) Finance

Jane Ferguson: It is all in my report. Just a reminder that if you need a cash box for something, make sure you give me a week’s notice.

### vii) First Year

Evan Dressel: The First Year Conference (FYC) is this weekend. I am very excited about it. I will be firing out messages to all of the discipline reps. There are some changes to do with what we want to do with discipline club nights. There are talks about doing speed dating with disciplines.

### viii) Human Resources

Alexander Rey: We are about 2/3 through Staff Chats. That is exciting. There is a brand new forum, so for the next two weeks it will be the preferred way to put stuff on EngSoc apply. Go to engsoc.com.comm. It goes straight to me. It makes the whole process a lot smoother.

### ix) Information Technology

Richard Hum: It is all in my report.

### x) Internal Affairs

Julianna Jeans: Please write down the second set of dates into your calendars from my report.

### xi) Professional Development

James Gibbard-McCall: It should all be in my report. I want to emphasize that the Eng and Tech Career Fair is coming up. Put some time into your resume and cover letter.

### xii) Services

Stewart Jensen: It is all in my report.

## X. Question Period

Siobhan Powell: You mentioned speed dating. Is that at discipline club nights?

Evan Dressel: It is a secondary event after the discipline club nights. So there will be all of the nights, then sometime after there will be a time where you can meet up with disciplines for the speed dating. It is a good way to be introduced to all of them without having to sit through all of the presentations.

Mike Blair: Alexander Rey, you said that you are nearly through your compliance regulation check for HR. Have you found anything interesting?

Alexander Rey: Not yet.

Stephanie Carswell: Just to clarify, speed dating will not replace discipline nights?

Evan Dressel: Correct.

Sam Grant: Is Thunderballz only restricted to frosh groups of 2015?

Jerry Haron: There are 32 spots and only 26 current frosh groups. Interpret that as you will.

## XI. Faculty Board Report

Matt Whittle: We passed the Dean’s motion to change the degree name from BSc to BaSc, which is good. The faculty went through a budgeting process. It went well. In terms of the new expansion, they collected about ten million dollars before the Faculty Board meeting. Hopefully this will be happening sometime in the future. In terms of Fall Reading Week (FRW), the original plan was that the FRW for engineers would be that we got Monday-Wednesday off after Thanksgiving. Many of us were not happy with that. As a result they changed their proposal to something drastically different. What the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures (SCAP) is proposing to Senate is to push the starting date of classes a week earlier and to have classes during Orientation Week. That way we would get a full week off after Thanksgiving. My understanding is that the Senate had an open email response, which was inconveniently right before exams and closed two days ago. Hopefully we can still get our voices heard. It is important to remember that this is the Senate committee’s proposal to the Senate, which will then get passed down. The pre-exam study break would only be two days, rather than four. If you have any questions feel free to message me. Hopefully we will get more information from the AMS and faculty soon. There has been a large amount of misinformation in the past.

Meara Hampton: If you Google the Queen’s University Senate proposal, it is one of the first things that will come up.

## XII. Alma Mater Society Report

Callen Hageman: Matt Whittle’s information was more up to date than mine. The email that everyone got from the AMS was just to gather student opinions on that proposal. It was not in any way an official vote. Do not worry about that being passed. We recently filled some committee positions. We also changed some campaigning rules. You can now make posters of any size and of any amount, in hopes of encouraging campaigning and further voter turnout. Candidates are now allowed to campaign on the voting days. The AMS applications got changed up. There is now a series of questions you have to answer in order to make positions easier to apply for. We passed a motion brought by Alex Wood. If only one party runs for an AMS position they must be approved by the Assembly before they get the position. There will also be an option for “none of the above” on the ballot. We discussed bursaries. We also talked about taking away fall hiring for AMS services.

Matt Lawson: They are only taking away fall hiring for things like the Common Ground (CoGro) and AMS Pub Services (TAPS), not other things like Walkhome.

## XIII. Senate Report

Brandon Tseung: There have been many modifications to programs. Nothing too interesting. An update on the Non Academic Misconduct (NAM) system: students have won over the debate for restorative justice. The new system will have restorative justice. There was a new discussion on whether academics might be involved in the system. For example, the Dean wanted to be made aware of issues that fall under NAM. This can cause issues with privacy and confidentiality.

## XIV. Engineering Review Board Report

Alex Doig: We hired the Engineering Review Board (ERB) member positions.

## XV. Advisory Board Report

Bailey Piggot: We have not met yet. We will be meeting in a few weeks to discuss long term planning. We are still hiring a secretary.

Alexander Rey: Although not specifically defined in Policy, I would assume that you need to be in engineering to apply for confidentiality purposes.

*Alexander Rey and Bailey Piggot leave. Bailey Piggot proxies her vote to Stephan Dobri.*

## XVI. Club Reports (Happy Group)

### i) Eng Phys

Nick Rupar: There are new T-Shirts. They say “the struggle is real”.

### ii) ECE

Sarah Taylor: We are planning another Clark night and foosball tournament. We are still selling our merchandise.

### iii) Mechanical

No mechanical representative present.

### iv) Mining

Sam Grant: Our merchandise has finally arrived. We have some guest speakers coming up. Fourth years have been invited to go on a trip to Chile, which is exciting. There will be more information in the next couple of weeks.

## XVII. Year Reports

### v) Sci’16

Stephan Martin: Before the break we finished off material for the Thank You gift information video. Thank you to Matt Whittle and the Communications Team for their hard work. That should be dropping in the next week or so. The thought of getting iron rings is getting close. We will hopefully be banging our fingers soon. Sizing for the rings will be in upcoming weeks. We are currently planning an after party, it should be a great time. We are working on getting our Yearbook pictures in. Please send them to us.

### vi) Sci’17

Eleanor McAuley: In terms of the NAM, Rigers Rukaj has written a letter on behalf of our entire year, which we have all signed. We were happy to send the letter on behalf of our year since the previous feedback given was not as extensive as we had wanted. Super Semi is happening. The tentative date is the Sunday of week ten. We are working on Valentine’s Day candy grams for our entire year that we will hand out Mean Girls style. We are currently buying more merchandise.

### vii) Sci’18

Chloë Harkness: Before exams our event coordinates ran a great Smash Bros tournament. We are planning another Clark Hall takeover. We will have a Coffee House after that. We are getting feedback on merchandise.

### viii) Sci’19

Benji Christie: FYC is this weekend. We have been working with Alexander Cavaliere and Evan Dressel to get the Semi Formal going. We will get an update on ticket sales after this.

## XVIII. Statements and Questions by Members

Alex Shieck: Speaking to what Matt Whittle said about FRW, this whole new break idea is harming Orientation Week and taking out two days of our study time. It is a serious issue. Whenever they plan things where they want feedback during a break, they do it with the intention to steam roll over us. If EngSoc were to put forward an official statement in opposition to their proposal, it could be very effective. Our Orientation Week is at risk. The incoming students will be missing out on many days. Having class in the middle would ruin the amazing feeling that we loved about the week.

Alexander Cavaliere: The Super Semi date is set for week ten. Is that the Sunday at the beginning of week ten or after week ten? The Sunday after week ten is iron ring day.

Eleanor McAuley: It is on iron ring day. Typically fourth years do not go. We thought of it as a way for us to celebrate in our own way while you guys go to your iron ring after party. We thought week eleven was too late. It is also during Easter. But we can look at other options if this is a serious problem.

Sam Grant: I know many people are worried about the large email that was sent to engineers from representatives from the University of Toronto. Any word on this?

Alex Wood: They did not break in through our ListServe, they are untouched. We are unsure how they currently got our emails, as that is a much bigger issue. If you want more information Engsoc has provided some states to The Journal.

Matt Whittle: In a response to what Alex Shieck said about FRW, our next meeting is next Wednesday and I would be more than happy to work with others to development a statement. I think that it is very important. The fact that engineers would have those Thursday and Friday classes during the break from the original proposal was seen as a huge issue. This would be a very large problem, especially if there are labs on those days. Trying to force students to be here for two days could be a problem as many people may not show up. There were concerns raised for courses that are shared between engineers and arts and science students. The original idea was just to give engineering specific content on those days. But that contradicts the idea to not add any new content. I would like to clarify that professors will not be adding any new content whatsoever. That is one of the reasons the faculty did not like the original proposal. That is why they created this new schedule. In terms of the pre-exam study break, the faculty could technically decide to not give us any study days at all. It is not a minimum of four days, but a maximum of four days. If the faculty were to decide to only give us a two day study break, that would mean that every engineer would be writing exams in the first three days of the exam period. We would be the only available demographic to write exams in the beginning. It just makes more sense to have us start the same time as other faculties. I would be willing to work to prepare a statement on behalf of engineers for Faculty Board.

Jacqueline Craig: Something unrelated that I have been thinking about is that as you grow up, school turns from a play place to more of a professional setting. As you graduate from different years, different levels of professionalism is expected. While I did not know how to act in first year, I have seen a higher level of professionalism in my fourth year classes. Professionalism also relates to dress code. This week on campus I have seen a few people wearing what I would not consider professional attire. I think that it is important to note that our dress code affects the professional environment of our school.

Nick Rupar: With the changes to Orientation Week, would we still get five days or would it be reduced to four?

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Benji Christie

Seconded by: Richard Hum

**Motion Passes: 9:00 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Matt Whittle: We would be losing a day. The whole schedule would be completely changed with three days of class right in the middle of everything.

Alex Shieck: I would like to do a straw poll to see if you agree with a potential statement I have written. The statement is along the lines of this opinion: We the council believe the new schedule put forward is detrimental to all engineers, both current and future. We believe it would decrease school spirit and hinder academic performance. Please let me know if you would agree with this statement.

Alex Wood: One of the reasons we have not officially made a statement is that we have not polled the engineers as whole. I do not feel comfortable with council making this decision themselves. There was an idea to use the ballots during elections to gauge the opinions of engineers on the subject.

Alex Shieck: I do believe that this is the general opinion of the council. We do not have to ever push forward our statement, and can still decide to poll everyone if we wish to do so. But generally whenever the university polls everyone during a break or exam period, they do it to prevent student backlash. Every time it has happened, we have generally lost. Even if we vote, sign and pass this statement, it can remain with us, in a folder. We do not need to release it if we do not want to, but it is good to have just in case. They could decide to pass something two days from now, and we need to be prepared.

Nick Rupar: Is there anything in documentation that allows us to call an emergency council if something like that were to happen?

Alexander Rey: We can, but it never really works.

Jacqueline Craig: I believe the EngSoc can make a statement without the council. I think it is premature for us to vote on this right now.

Sam Anderson: The AMS conducted a student wide survey for opinions on their proposal. On that survey you could indicate your faculty. So we do actually have a slice of data regarding the general engineering opinion on the subject.

Mike Blair: In terms of making a collective statement in quick time, I think that it could be a good idea as the discussion and process on the topic are continuously moving. However to say that this group is not properly representative of the views of the society is untrue. Everything you vote on is to represent your people. To say that for some things you need to consult every member of the society, but for others you do not seems to be a double standard. We are all here because our job is to represent our constituents. This collective group represents the opinions of the society.

Alex Shieck: It never hurts to be prepared. It would be better to have the letter but never use it, than to not have it when we need it.

Nick Rupar: Are you going to make it non-binding for us to send it?

Alex Shieck: Yes.

### Motion to Open Agenda:

Moved by: Alex Shieck

Seconded by: Troy Su

**Motion Passes: 9:13 pm**

*Agenda now open.*

Alex Shieck: I would like to put forward a motion to create a letter that contains our statement on the FRW and the change of the academic schedule. I think we should all vote on it to decide whether we agree and only send it if we feel that it is right.

Stephen Martin: I fully understand that I am to vote on behalf of my constituents, however I normally have a chance to talk to people first. Right now I do not have the opportunity to do that. This is not a slight to Alex Shieck, but this is coming up as him being the proxy for the Sci’16 representative. Generally if you vote as a proxy, you would do it in consultation with the person who holds that vote.

Alex Shieck: If it would make people feel more comfortable, I would like to ask people who are a proxy to abstain from voting on this motion.

Alexnder Cavaliere: It has been brought up a few times that we might not have consultation with the students, but we have known about this for a long time. The information is readily available. There have been many opportunities to gauge the opinions of our constituents. It is our duty to consult people. I know when I spoke to my constituents about the core issues regarding Orientation and pre-exam week, it was easy to gauge their general opinion. I do not think that there is any excuse for us to not be aware of what our constituents think.

Jacqueline Crag: I can assure you that we have been working alongside several people to make sure that the best solution comes about. I think it would be irresponsible for us to make a statement right now. We have had lots of consultation, but I am not prepared to put out a statement from EngSoc council. I have been working on this issue since October and I honestly think that this letter right now would ruin many of our relationships. I recommend that people do not vote for something that will ruin our relationships. This issue is a priority and is an important project happening right now. However, it should not be accelerated right here, right now.

Mike Blair: In terms of relationships you have made some vague references to people and things. Who are those people and things you mentioned?

Jacqueline Craig: Mainly the faculty. I think it is important to have a standing relationship with the faculty and to be wary about our words. The AMS represents all students. We represent the engineers. The relationship between AMS and EngSoc needs to continue in a positive direction. There have been many opportunities for people to voice their opinion on different versions of the fall break proposal. It would be irresponsible to make a statement without consulting everyone.

Alexander Cavaliere: I do not disagree with maintaining positive relationships. The reason I worded the motion so that we would sign “a letter” and not “the letter” was so that we have the opportunity to change it. We have a responsibility to make sure that what we do is in the best interest of everyone. Whether this letter remains the same or if we decide to make modifications, it is our duty to prepare the best statement possible. It does not need to remain exactly as written. We need to make sure it is a good representation of what we want to say. There will be no obligation to release it publically. But if we find that we need it, we will have it at our disposal. At least we will have summarized what we mean to say on the issue.

Chloë Harkness: One issue I notice is that in this letter, we are lumping together the topic of taking days out of Orientation Week and taking days out of the pre-exam period. I think that they are two different topics that are not linked. I think they should be discussed separately.

Alex Shieck: This is to act as one rebuttal to their overall plan, saying that we do not like the current plan that they are trying to push as a whole. If they try to push it all together in the near future, we will at least have this at our disposal. Then we can have time later to discuss and respond to a new proposal.

Andrew Crawford: My understanding is that all of these motions are procedure, so they should not have a debate. If all of this debate is on the motion, it should be within the actual debate itself. Right now the agenda is still open.

Mike Blair: So right now the agenda is open and the addition of the motion has been declared unfriendly. It requires 2/3 of a vote to put on the agenda.

Alex Shieck: I would like to have two minutes to close, as people have said things against my motion and I should be allowed to respond to those.

Tyler Snook: In order to follow policy I am going to close discussion.

Alex Shieck: I would like to challenge the speaker. I should be allowed to close in a time where I otherwise would normally have been able to.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Jacqueline Craig

Seconded by: Kevin Corey

**Motion Passes: 9:29 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

### Motion to Oppose Speaker:

Moved by: Alex Shieck

**Motion Passes: 9:30 pm**

*Alex Shieck is allowed two minutes to close.*

Alex Shieck: In terms of maintaining our positive relationships with the faculty and others, I not believe that we should go along with everything the faculty is saying as our goals are not aligned. They want something that will hurt us. You should think of this motion not as a move to step forward, but rather as a move to prepare. How would our constituents react if we had something that we could have used as a defense, but did not? Exams are difficult and you need four days to study for them. Orientation Week is an essential part of our faculty’s spirit and identity. When you talk to others about Queen’s, what do you tell them about? Orientation Week. If our Orientation Week is broken and fractured, it will not be the same.

*Note the following motion requires 2/3 of the vote to pass.*

### Motion to Add Motion to Agenda:

Moved by: Alex Shieck

Seconded by: Alexander Cavaliere

**Motion Passes: 9:33 pm**

*The motion has been added to agenda.*

### Motion to Close Agenda:

Moved by: Alexander Cavaliere

Seconded by: Alex Shieck

**Motion Passes: 9:34 pm**

*The agenda is closed.*

## XIX. New Business Continued: Motion 10

### Motion 10

Whereas: Fall Reading Week is an important issue;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Engineering Society and its members discourage the adaption of any changes to the academic schedule that would reduce the potential number of pre-exam days and/or change the current Orientation Week schedule.

Moved by: Alex Shieck

Seconded by: Alexander Cavaliere

Opening (Alex Shieck): I think this is really important for our students.

James Gibbard-McCall: I was going to call a straw poll. I was under the opinion that we are voting here to represent our constituents. I think it is a very powerful tool for Jacqueline Craig, who has been working on this for a long time, to say that it is not in the opinion of our constituents. I think we should have a straw poll to determine what we can take away from the council. That way we can refer to the results of the straw poll as an indicator of our position on the issue. We sort of already know what EngSoc thinks about this problem.

Alex Shieck: My motion is effectively doing the same thing as the straw poll, but in a more professional way. It cannot be ignored as easily. If it comes to the point where it feels like it is time to put the letter out it will not damage our relationships.

Jacqueline Craig: I would like to say that I agree with James Gibbard-McCall. The straw poll would be sufficient. I disagree that we should have a letter ready and signed. If we vote on it here and now, it is saying that that is our view on the FRW. The President is not even here and she is our main liaison for Orientation Week. By everyone voting here to say that you would like to sign this letter, but then later decide that we want to change it, we would all need to get together again. I think this is an unnecessary step to take.

Julianna Jeans: I would encourage Alex Shieck at this time to give his vote to another fourth year in the room

*Alex Shieck proxies his vote to Jane Ferguson.*

Stephanie Carswell: I very much disagree with this new FRW proposal. In all of the conversations I have had with my constituents regarding the removal of Orientation Week days and pre-exam days, no one has been in favour of the new proposal. Nobody wants to lose exam study days or days of Orientation Week. I do think that we need something in place to say that we will be creating a strong statement of our opinion before any voting happens on this. In terms of losing two pre-exam study days, I do not believe that any engineering student would be happy to hear that other faculties may receive more days than us.

Matt Whittle: I would like to clarify that at no point was the faculty proposing to give engineers fewer pre-exam days than other faculties. I just wanted to explain why we had four days.

Stephanie Carswell: If a proposal were to come across that would give us less study days than other faculties, I would say that most people would be even more against it. That is a possibility that we should let our constituents know about.

Quinlan Hickey: At the beginning there were talks about how we have to take our peer’s thoughts about the issue into consideration. I posted in the Chem Eng group asking about what people would want to do. So far, everyone has been very much for the letter. They want it put forward. Many people are extremely against losing days of Orientation Week.

Julianna Jeans: I wanted to point out that if council was thinking of doing something like a referendum vote, we would not get the results back until the end of January. It would not be for another month before we could discuss this again.

Evan Dressel: Could we not just use Survey Gizmo and get a poll out tomorrow?

Jacqueline Craig: But then an arts or science student could log in and answer as an engineer.

Nick Rupar: I know there were ways of getting around having one vote per person on the last poll the AMS sent around.

Andrew Crawford: Has there been a Senate agenda put out yet for the next meeting? Do we have an indication of a timeline from Senate so that we know whether we actually have time for a vote? Can we get some solid timelines?

Alex Wood: At the last Faculty Board meeting Professor Morelli laid out the timeline currently being followed by SCAP. They stopped accepting feedback a few days ago. By the end of January they plan to come up with a final proposal and then go to Senate for a vote in March.

Stephanie Carswell: Are they bound to that timeline or can they amend it without letting others know? Can they push it forward without us knowing??

Alexander Cavaliere: In my experience they have done that multiple times in the past.

Eleanor McAuley: The last Faculty Board meeting happened on December 16th. Before that I was not aware that Orientation Week would be cut. I think getting valuable data on what the current proposal is and having it on a referendum ballot would be beneficial regardless of what we decide tonight. This is a way to ensure we get the best representative opinion on the current model of the proposal.

Peter Liberty: Orientation Week having reduced days was on the AMS poll.

Nick Rupar: Given the fact that it is getting rather late, emotions are running high, and the fact that I do not think it will change the spirit, I would like to propose an amendment to state that we are in the process of consulting our peers. That way we can still consult others, but we can express our opinion should we need to do anything.

Alex Shieck: Unfriendly. I do not think that it will be a good idea. It would be like saying “we do not like your proposal…probably”. It will not be effective. I think it will vastly change the spirit.

Tyler Snook: I believe that your amendment does change the spirit of the motion, so it cannot be done.

Evan Dressel: I would not be representing the first years properly without mentioning all of the emails I have received regarding the fall break. Many students have emailed me indicating that they are strongly against the removal of days from Orientation Week. I helped to direct their opinions in the correct direction in the hope that all of their voices were heard. By speaking to people in second year I have learned that many Sci’18s are also in agreement. One of the greatest support systems first years have is with their FRECs. With the separation caused by classes during Orientation Week, they will be unable to build the same strong relationship. Right now they have five solid days to spend with their FRECs before classes begin. This would not be true with the changes. In engineering we strive to provide the best ways to keep people happy. These relationships last all throughout your undergrad. I am in support of having this letter, as it is an important tool to have at our disposal. I want something physical that the representatives can bring to Senate, a way to show that we are not in agreement with their current proposal. It is very powerful for our society to say “we do not want our Orientation Week harmed or the pre-exam study days to be taken away”. I believe that it would be more effective than just having our Senators arriving empty handed.

Siobhan Powell: I think having something connotative for this would add weight to our position. Even an online poll would really help to solidify our position. Developing this with some sense of urgency would be really beneficial. I am sure that we could come up with a way to collect this information quickly before the next Senate meeting.

Alex Shieck: I think you are right. I think that by having something quantitative to show that the student body supports our decision would add power to our position.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Hazik Ahmad

**Motion Passes: 9:58 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Alexander Cavaliere: I would like to invite anyone in the room to make amendments to this letter. Whether it is in the spirit of the motion or friendly is up to the speaker and mover respectively, but I think it would be a great idea to get the opinion of the council. The motion here is to determine that these are the sentiments of the society. I think we should pursue some form of quantitative measure no matter the outcome of this motion. We have many options. We do not need to use the letter if we find that the society wide quantitative data is against it.

Kevin Corey: Can we get a copy of the motion at hand put up in the screen?

Stephan Dobri: We could also write it on blackboard.

Tyler Snook: Please keep any posts on social media general until further decisions are made.

Stephan Dobri: I think it is a really good idea to have something. This is not saying that we will hand the letter out. It is just saying that we have something that indicates that we do not like the idea in general. Something that says “look, there are many engineers that do not like this”. I have yet to meet anyone who was for losing days of Orientation Week. Speaking as a past Orientation Chair, 2/3 of everyone who goes through Orientation Week try to be a FREC. Even more try to be plants and on OTIS. This shows that many people really enjoy the week. I would like to have something in writing just in case they try to move this forward quickly.

Alex Shieck: I would like to apologize, I am very passionate. One thing I would caution, you are correct on the Senate timeline. However when a final proposal comes, it is basically already done. Everyone then just votes it through. Thank you again for being here. We are here to do what is best for the engineering students, and I think that is what having this letter does.

Mike Blair: I would like to caution the position of a letter. I would like to propose an amendment. Instead of writing a letter we could just collectively determine the society’s opinion in a statement. This amendment would entirely replace Alex Shieck’s original motion. It would say something along the lines of: “the Engineering Society and its members discourage the adaption of any changes to the academic schedule that would reduce the potential number of pre-exam days and/or change the current Orientation Week schedule”.

Alexander Cavaliere: If we are going to consider an amendment, could you write it out?

Alex Shieck: Unfriendly for the sake of discussion.

Nick Rupar: Would this allow an Exec to issue a letter of their own?

Alex Shieck: I do not think that this would hurt us. I would like this amendment to be added to my motion.

*Council begins discussion on the amendment.*

Callen Hageman: I think we can all agree that we love Orientation Week and that we need to pass our exams. I think that it is a good idea that we do not tie ourselves down to a single letter that cannot be changed in the future. I got a large amount of feedback from others and everyone seems to be on the same page as us. We all agree. If we come to a point where we need to make a statement, I think that this will allow us to do so quickly and to get a survey done if we so desire.

Alex Shieck: I would like to make an amendment to replace my motion with Mike Blair’s.

Troy Su: I was under the impression that this new amendment would have something to do with the exam prep days?

Mike Blair: It does, I just forgot to write it out, my mistake.

Alex Wood: I do not disagree with what has been said. However I do feel that there has been a large amount of fear mongering, which is not the correct way to do this. The whole point of this is for the benefit of the students, not the university. I do not think it is quite as urgent as it has been portrayed, as Professor Morelli did give us a timeline. Our minutes are public. We just made a statement to the Journal yesterday saying that we did not have a specific opinion on the FRW as we did not have enough consultation. I think it speaks volumes that Jacqueline Craig does not approve of this as she has been working on this since she first started her position. I do not disagree with the points that have been said, but I disagree with the way we are approaching it. There have already been rumours going around that engineers will start a “no” campaign to the reading week proposal. I think we need hard numbers before I can feel comfortable making such a decision, as I do not think we can necessarily represent everyone right now. While it is easy to say we have talked to our peers, I would not consider that a representation of everyone.

Alex Shieck: I think this is a form of consultation. The only time we do it perfectly is with a referendum. This is the purpose of this room. To do what you guys think is best for the students. If you think this is what is best for the students, then we should do it. This in itself is a form of consultation.

Matt Whittle: I believe Professor Morelli’s timeline and think that we do have time to think this over. I do believe that there is time to survey our constituents and come up with a better response that we can all get behind. I do not think that we need to rush to make a statement. That being said my biggest issue is with the large amount of misinformation in the public. The fact is that most of the students now are not aware of the current proposal. I would argue that before we make a statement to represent our constituents, we need to inform them on what is going on and let them know that we are working together to come up with a solution together.

Sam Anderson: I think everyone here is passionate about this issue. What must be clear is the shear importance of our action as the Engineering Society. We are a well-oiled, top down administration. When I sit on SCAP and give my opinion on something, it is very much just the opinion of one student. The reason we have an Engineering Society is to express the opinions of all students. To present a unified voice. We need to do our best to create that unified voice. It is crucial that we are able to channel an opinion like this, even if it means we need to do a referendum. To be honest, I do not think we have a large amount of time to act on this. We should either pass this now, or decide to hold a referendum and hold a special meeting of council to approve our position. The students will only be asked once. Do you think your constituents will be mad that we made a strong stance against the changes to Orientation Week? Or will they be mad that we did not use our chance to save it? Coming up with a decision as a unified front is our ultimate goal.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Sam Grant

Seconded by: Mike Blair

**Motion Fails: 10:27 pm**

*Debate continues.*

Austin Greisman: I would like to propose an amendment. If you bring this up with the faculty, they may not care too much about our opinions. By itself, this statement might not make that much of a difference. However if we added something to make it clear that it could harm incoming students as well as the university itself, it might be more powerful.

Alex Shieck: Unfriendly.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Nick Rupar

**Motion Passes: 10:29 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Alex Shieck: As a member of the Senate Orientation Activities Review Board (SOARB) I can say that there is a large portion of the administration that believes that Orientation Week is a risk to the university. Keep in mind that they may not see a reduction of the engineering orientation as a bad thing.

Mike Blair: I caution this amendment because of its reference to the broader Queen’s community. Our scope is just within the Engineering Society. We do not have the legitimate ability to be able to speak for others outside of our society.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Matt Lawson

Seconded by: Mike Blair

**Motion Passes: 10:32 pm**

*Council votes on the second amendment.*

**Motion Fails: 10:33 pm**

*Council continues to debate first amendment.*

Brandon Tseung: Speaking from experience, we should not take risks with the Senate. If they have the ability to move forward quickly, they very well might. But what I think will happen is that all of the student Senators will discuss the issue with each other, and come to a collective agreement. We rarely vote against each other. I think most will vote it down, should the proposal go through to Senate.

Sam Anderson: I think it has been made clear that the faculty may actually have an interest that benefits them, with the potential increase in academic days. This would mean that their interests are technically against ours.

Alex Doig: It looks as though many people have left.

*Peter Liberty leaves and proxies Emily Townshend’s vote to Jerry Haron.*

Stephanie Carswell: I want to speak to one of the things that Jacqueline Craig mentioned earlier when discussing the relationships that have been built around the discussions involving FRW. While I do think that they are important, I also believe that some of the people we have been building them with are in the position to ruin the relationships by steam rolling over our opinions. I think that it is very important that we take some sort of action early on to be prepared without having to use any language that would be disrespectful. I think that the current motion as it stands is in very plain, emotion free language. This is important in order to prevent negative connotations being attached to it. In terms of our stance on ruining relationships with the faculty, we need to realize that they are not always just looking into the best interest of students. Sometimes their actions may be taken in the interest of themselves. I still think getting more student input in some form of a poll would be very beneficial.

Andrew Crawford: One option that has been ignored is that the Exec, especially the President, do hold the authority to voice the opinion of the students. Being elected to represent the students as a whole, Julie Tseng can make a position by representing the will of the society as a whole. If a letter were to be issued, it would be signed by the President regardless. This discussion is happening as a form of emergency measure. However in my mind, it is something that should be done by our Exec. Right now it seems we have acknowledged that we are not unanimous in our decision on what to voice. In my mind this is not the best way to go about it. The council is most effective when it operates thoughtfully and through detailed preparation. Making rash decisions is very difficult. I am not saying that the Exec should override the council’s opinion, but your membership has given the President the power to represent everyone. We can take our time with this. If something comes up, we can act quickly.

Alex Shieck: Julie Tseng is our one person, but so are our Senators.

Andrew Crawford: Senators do not represent engineering students. They are elected to represent themselves as undergraduate students.

James Gibbard-McCall: Just note that there are more faculty members on Senate than there are students. Everyone here is to give their opinion for their constituents.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Matt Lawson

Seconded by: Alex Shieck

**Motion Passes: 10:45 pm**

*Council will now vote on the motion.*

Alex Shieck: Thank you all so much for staying late. I really believe that it is a very important issue. If you think that this is the best position to take for your constituents, please vote yes. If not, please vote no.

**Motion Passes: 10:47 pm (21, 8, 1)**

Let it be noted that Matt Whittle, Nick Rupar, Stephan Dobri and Alex Shieck abstained.

## XX. Continuation of Statements and Questions by Members

Jacqueline Craig: Exciting news! Julie Tseng was elected for the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students President. She will take office in April or May. Congratulations to her. I just thought that I would let all of you know that I will be going to the AMS Academic Commissioner, as well as others, to let them know what we just voted on. I believe in complete transparency. I just have to say that I was a little disappointed that it did not come from a more involved or quantitative process.

Stephan Dobri: When will our degrees change from BSc to BaSc?

Matt Whittle: It will not be implemented until next year at the earliest.

Alex Wood: Just a note that the engineering alumni have been writing BaSc for years anyways.

Andrew Crawford: If anyone has any questions from my report please ask.

Chloë Harkness: Many people said that on top of what we just voted on people would like to see some sort of referendum. Will that be happening? Also what would happen if we decided we wanted to change our statement?

Jacqueline Craig: There are currently not concrete plans for how or when.

Julianna Jeans: From what I understand we could use our next meeting, or an emergency meeting, to propose a retraction of the statement.

Evan Dressel: The closest massive referendum we are having is our actual elections. Or if we deem necessary, we could use something like Survey Gizmo. I will not be as accurate, but would be faster.

Eleanor McAuley: Thanks to everyone for being nice.

### Motion to Close:

Moved by: Jacqueline Craig

Seconded by: Alexander Cavaliere

**Motion Passes: 10:54 pm**