Engineering Society Council Minutes

February 6, 2014

Beamish-Munro Hall (ILC) 313

Speaker (Deputy): Alex Savides

Secretary: Caitlin Stewart

Meeting Begins: 6:01

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

**Motion 1:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of Thursday, February 6th, 2014 as seen on the EngSoc website.

Moved by: JT

Seconded by: Alex Wilson

Opening (JT): Hope you guys had a good two weeks. I am adding a presentation from Maria. The policy that was printed out about hiring, there have been a couple additional changes on the website.

Dylan Braam: I am here to speak on motion 4, but I have to leave for a quiz. Could we possibly move that up to motion 3?

Alex Savides: Could we do a straw poll please?

JT: Due to the straw poll, that change will be unfriendly.

**Motion to move Motion 4 before Motion 3:**

Moved by: Dylan Braam

Seconded by: Mike Wetton

Motion Fails: 6:03

Alex Savides: Is there any other debate?

Leslie Chaplin: Can I give the mining report before 7:45?

JT: That is friendly.

Sam Anderson: Can motion 5 be moved any earlier, possibly before 7, because I have to go? You know what, never mind, that’s fine.

Motion Passes: 6:06

1. **Adoption of the Minutes**

**Motion 2:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of Thursday, January 23rd, 2014 as seen on the EngSoc website.

Moved by: Caitlin Stewart

Seconded by: JT

Opening (Caitlin Stewart): If you ever find any mistakes, or need me to change something in the minutes, please let me know now, or email me at 11cs51@queensu.ca. Emily, Peter and Matt, thank you very much for emailing me those changes, I fixed them up and I will send them to JT with any of the other changes found today.

Alex Savides: Is there any debate?

Motion Passes: 6:07

1. **Speaker’s Business**

Alex Savides: We have a big council with lots of important motions tonight. I will probably be enforcing speaking limits, which will hopefully get everyone moving. We will be starting with presentations.

1. **Presentations**
	1. **Alumni Relations**

Holly MacNeish: I will be going over what I have been working on and the next steps in my portfolio. I was getting a lot of emails from alumni looking to get involved. A lot of them were from Sci’88 specifically. Their opinion is that they want to do more than just donate money blindly to the school. They want to have more of an alumni-student relationship rather than an alumni-faculty-student relationship. We started with the Sci’88 career panel discussion which went really well. What comes next? I have been working with the faculty on the academics side, and they have some strong opinions. We have also been working with the advancement people who deal with funding, who are working on a similar initiative, alumni themselves, the ED team, Peptalks, conference coordinators, design team captains and the student alumni association. We came up with a starting list: career panels, career guidance from people with a personal connection, informal mentorships, and professional development workshops. If alumni are looking to get involved but don’t know how, they could email the future alumni relations officer. Faculty involvement could involve bringing in alumni for guest lectures or phoning them in class. Getting them involved with design teams would be excellent as well- alumni connections could really help with the technical aspects of many projects. There are some issues that could arise. We would be sending students to alumni vs alumni coming to us. We also don’t want to have conflicting data systems or conflicting correspondence. The current status is that we have talked to stakeholders and everyone seems pumped. We are sending out a survey to alumni to get their thoughts as well as to start an initial contact list. What happens next is to pass a policy to add this new position and to hire it. My idea would be to use the alumni interest survey to guide the position. Overall, I see this going the same way as the director of communications this year, with a vague initial idea and letting the position form itself over the year. I hope that sounds interesting and let me know during question period if you have any questions.

* 1. **EngConnect – Maria Lahiffe**

Maria Lahiffe: Hello everyone. I am the outreach coordinator for the faculty and I have been beavering away over here. I really want to make sure that I get in touch with students and I want to get some actual communication going to have a link to you guys. Outreach is very broadly defined. Dean Woodhouse hired me because she wanted to have more of a sense of what is happening with the stewardship of the Queen’s engineering brand and to make sure that it is being done so responsibly. I need to work on building some reporting capacity in you guys so I can pass information onto the Dean. What I would like is to open a dialogue, but this is really big forum to do so with. Maybe I could get some contact information today to get a smaller group together to get a dialogue going. Anyone who is interested would be great, but one person from each department at least would be great. Once I have that contact information, we could book a room and order some pizza. I love teaching and helping people to get better at whatever they are working on. I am lonely over there so I would love for anyone to drop by and say hi and let me help you with any problems that you have. Thank you.

* 1. **Union Gallery Presentation**

Jesse Wardell: We are located on the main floor of Stauffer library, kind of tucked away. We are a student driven organization and one of only two non-profit art venues on campus. Our mission is committed to providing students with exposure to the arts. The reason we are coming here to talk to you is that we went in to reinstate our non-mandatory fee, but we lost, losing 15% of our funding, therefore having to cut shows and things we can do with students as well as professional bodies.

Camille Montoya: What we do is we provide visual arts exhibitions that are both student and professional shows. We provide student artist talks and performance events as well as experiential learning opportunities, mentorships and internships. We have a wide base of volunteers that are very diverse. We also take part in on and off campus collaborations like art ignite and film festivals. Our attendance is over 5000 a year and we offer services to a wide audience including a tri-annual newsletter and catalogues on exhibitions. We have both a local and national profile.

Third Presenter: How we operate is that we provide opportunities for students who are interested in arts administration or learning from professionals. 55% of our funding comes from student fees. 28% comes from the University for costs like maintenance and rent. Other funding comes from grants, which is on a year to year basis. 11% is from private sector support, like sponsorships and fundraising. I am also going to go over what we are here for today. We believe that the contemporary arts provides a lot to the world and to Queen’s. We are trying to reinstate the programs that we had to cut due to our financial issues. Through supporting the reinstatement of our fees, we are trying to bring those back and start up some new awareness programs, as well as to establish some programs to provide opportunities for people to engage. If anyone has some questions?

Michael Blair: could you clarify why you need our help? Are you seeking general support, or are you wanting to reinstate your student fee?

Third Presenter: We are going to AMS assembly to try and get our student fee reinstated. We are just looking to help inform everyone, so that you can make an informed choice to support or not support us then.

Doug McFarlane: How is your total attendance recorded?

Third Presenter: Volunteer employees count heads. Someone is in the gallery at all times and they would be in charge of taking attendance.

Eric McElroy: With regards to grant funding, is there any room for growth in that area?

Third Presenter: Yes, we have someone in charge of that, but recently we have had one grant cut, so it has seemed to be a little more difficult. We are always looking to find more grants though. There are general grants, but sometimes if we bring in a show we can get a more specific one.

Eric McElroy: You mentioned that you provide a group space, is that paid for?

Camille Montoya: Yes, we rent out our space for events not related to our shows.

Mark Godin: Do you have paid staff that are students?

Third Presenter: Our 2 paid staff are professionals that facilitate our experiences.

Mark Godin: Why is it a mandatory fee?

Third Presenter: Even though all students may not take advantage of it, our service is available for anyone at Queen’s who is interested. Much of our funding comes from sources that are not stable, which is why it is important for us to have this.

Mark Godin: Why AGM and not referendum?

Third Presenter: Voter turnout is usually not really good at the referendum.

Camille Montoya: We also wanted to present it face to face and not online.

Third Presenter: A large part of that is that the impression that we were getting last time is that we could do some more outreach to let people know who we are and what we do. Thank you so much for having us.

1. **New Business: Motions 3-7**

**Motion 3:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council elect \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ as the Junior Senator for 2014-2015.

Moved by: JT

Seconded by: David Huitema

Opening (JT): This is how it is going to work. If you know someone who is interested, you nominate that person, the nomination is seconded and the nominee then chooses whether or not to accept.

Emily Townshend: I nominate Alexander Cavaliere.

Doug McFarlane: I second.

Alexander Cavaliere: I accept.

Madeline Poirier: I nominate Alexander Rey.

Brad Loker: I second.

Alexander Rey: I accept.

Peter Davidson: I nominate Alex Wood

Matt Lawson: I second.

Alex Wood: I respectfully decline.

Sam Codrington: I nominate Rory Lootsma.

Sam Anderson: I second.

Rory Lootsma: I accept.

Alex Savides: We will entertain some questions in a bit, but first of all take a few minutes each to tell us a bit about yourself and why you want to be in this position.

Alex Cavaliere: Hi guys, I am the first year webmaster. I stated getting involved right at the beginning of the year and I have become very interested in this position. I didn’t run in the election because I hadn’t decided yet. Since then I have talked to Emily, sat in on a session and gotten really interested in it. I spoke very closely with Emily Townshend and the current student senate caucus chair as well as the current rector. I feel like I am very qualified for this position.

Rory Lootsma: I am very interested in getting involved in the queen’s community. I was very involved in high school but I want to get more involved here. I was nervous to run in the election, but I am very interested in the position. I am interested on sitting on SOARB, the academic development committee and the scholarship and bursary committee. I would love to get to know you all because I am passionate and a hard worker.

Alex Rey: For those who don’t know me I am the junior chair on ERB. I am a policy guy. I love it. Whether or not its university policy, I was involved in shaping the campus master plan. I am also very interested in the politics of things too. I think involving yourself at the university is also extremely important. Senate is all about bringing people together, which I think I would be really good at.

Doug McFarlane: Can you please tell me why senate is important and give a few examples of what you would do to help make it better.

Alex Rey: Since it is the highest decision making authority at the University, you cannot overstate its importance. I would love to present the interests of the engineering society and make sure that when we are implementing plans and policies, we consider student opinions.

Rory Lootsma: I also think it’s extremely important due to the governing boards and because you get to give your opinions. I think I would do a great job by committing to getting our points across, especially with frosh week and the 13 week semester. It’s important that those issues are addressed. There is also the issue of the removing of the fine arts program, which I would also like to address.

Alexander Cavaliere: I want to bring my voice to senate. Sometimes we see changes that don’t reflect our needs. I want to bring the voice of students to the table so that everyone can make sure that a fair decision is made where students and faculties are both represented.

Carolyn Fisher: Senate is a great resource to the Engineering Society and vice versa. Since none of the exec sit on senate, communication is an issue. How can we become a more cohesive group?

Rory Lootsma: As I understand right now, senate gives information at the committee and at the meetings. You guys are going to a 3-person exec nest year. EngSoc needs to hear the issues that are addressed. I would love to email and bring them up at EngSoc meetings.

Alex Rey: Congratulations first of all. Working on ERB this year, communication has become really important. I think having a recurring time each week would allow for this communication to take place.

Alexander Cavaliere: A weekly sit-down meeting would be best, as I like to talk and discuss and not get shut down. It’s important that these issues are addressed and talked about and not shut down by walls of formality.

Peter Davidson: I am curious as to which senate committee that you are most looking forward to working on and a goal that you have for it.

Alexander Cavaliere: Definitely SOARB. Working on putting through a policy manual for frosh week and defining casing would be big things. Defining bullying is also a big one. We introduced a bullying policy at my high school and I have worked with many different bodies and governments, so I am well versed. I am also concerned with survey taking and would like to work on this.

Alex Rey: I would go with SOARB too. During the summer I run an overnight camp. I spend a lot of time working to get 16-17 year old staff to work to the best possible outcome. Knowing how people actually work is important to define policy, so this insight could really improve orientation week.

Rory Lootsma: I could have said SOARB, as I am passionate about frosh week and hazing and I have an open mind about it. I also would like to go to the admissions and scholarships committee, which I think is really important and special to me. I also really like the academic development board, as they have some important issues to be dealt with and think I could help.

Meghan Brunner: This position involves a steep learning curve. What have you already done to prepare and what are you planning on doing?

Alex Rey: I have sat on boards for non-profit organizations before which gives me insight. As a board, you want to find the best possible result. Having done this, I know how people cooperate together, and I know how people work. Keeping this in mind, moving forward, it is all about face to face conversations, which I would undertake.

Rory Lootsma: I appreciate the huge learning curve and that I am a little behind. I have done research on what goes on in senate and I feel like I could sit in on meetings and learn about upcoming issues. I believe I will be staying in Kingston over the summer, so I could sit in on meetings during that time to catch up.

Alexander Cavaliere: I have already gotten a guest past and sat in on senate to watch the proceedings, as well as followed the minutes and policies. I have opened lines of communications with the rector, Emily Townshend and well as the student caucus. I am familiar with members of EngSoc as well. I will continue to keep up these lines of communication so I can hit the ground running in September.

Michael Blair: You will likely face opposition about frosh week. Will you defend it exactly how it is today?

Rory Lootsma: I am confident, so I have no problem going against the issues. Frosh week is amazing and I would like to keep frosh week how it is, while hearing the other opinions of course.

Alexander Cavaliere: As much as I would like to keep the traditions of frosh week preserved, I would like to understand the issues that are brought forward, while trying to maintain the week. There are valid issues being brought forward, so I am open to change and discussion to promote moving forward.

Alex Rey: My short answer would be no. If we have the mindset that we are not willing to change, we will get nowhere. Once people see how important frosh week is for engineering, through communication and making people aware of it is, we will keep it going. Compromise is the spearhead that keeps everything moving forward.

Robert St.-Onge: There is a conflict under bylaw 3.8.1.d. Technically Alex Rey would have to step down from ERB before running, even if it just a technicality.

Alex Rey: I will do that then.

Peter Davidson: Who can vote?

Alex Savides: Voting members of council.

Michael Blair: Could the current ERB chair please speak on the correlation between senate and ERB?

Madeline Poirier: I don’t see any conflict of interest occurring, but if any ever did, you could step down temporarily.

Matt Slavin: technically you couldn’t hold two votes on council.

Mark Godin: It can be dealt with later, so it is technically a non-issue.

Dylan Braam: The senator term starts later, so he could step down when that happens.

Doug McFarlane: Since ERB is not a voting member of council isn’t it not an issue?

Matt Slavin: No, it is still an issue.

Emily Fleck: There is precedent for this happening, as it has happened before.

Alex Savides: Due to the precedent, we have good grounds to stand on to just do the vote and see what happens.

Alex Savides: Congratulations Alexander Cavaliere.

Motion Passes: 7:04

Alex Savides: We will now have a pizza break.

**Motion 4:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the policy changes in gamma and eta, as seen in APPENDIX OPPORTUNITY.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT

These changes only be applicable to individuals who submit applications after reading week.

Moved by: Sam Crème

Seconded by: Chris Reid

Opening (Sam Crème): I’d like to make a friendly amendment to this that it be applications submitted after reading week due to the extended director apps. There is essentially 3 things that this policy will be changing: service rehire limits, an up and out policy, and reappointments. The policy version that went out in the council email is not the most recent one because I had a meeting with ERB on Thursday. We changed the word year to term, and added a line that a student may apply to a position that they have overseen if the application period has been extended. The new version can be found online.

ERB Opening (Madeline Poirier): We have looked over this policy extensively. We got a letter of concern about smaller groups and committees, and about how the most passionate people for the position would not be allowed to apply. This is why we added in the change that those people could apply if applications were extended.

Matt Slavin: The policy looks great. One thing though, if there is ever a gray area, or if a person feels like they would benefit from someone applying, I think there should be a notwithstanding clause. If people feel this way, they could make an appeal to a neutral body, I picked ERB, that they want to apply for the position. If they were passionate about it, they would have a case to do so.

**Motion to Amend the Policy:**

Moved by: Matt Slavin

Seconded by: Eric McElroy

Opening (Matt Slavin): I would like to add a point onto the end of the section that reads something along the lines of: if the student wishes, he or she could appeal this policy to the ERB if he or she feels that they have sufficient cause to do so. ERB’s decision on this matter would be final.

Sam Crème: The reason I am saying that this is unfriendly is that it kind of defeats the purpose of having the policy. For example, group interviews for service staff it makes the other people very uncomfortable or intimidated with that person in the room. If those people are looking for other employment opportunities, they could look elsewhere outside of their previous portfolio into things like the AMS and other volunteer opportunities.

Sam Anderson: I am uncomfortable with the term ‘preference should be given’. I don’t think it’s fair to apply a qualitative filter to certain people. I don’t think this policy has the necessary tools to be effective based on the subjective term preference.

Sam Crème: The only time we talk about preference is in the case of a manager and director. It’s pretty clear in those situations. If someone has been a director or a manager before, you can do other positions at the same level, but preference should be given to those who have not had those positions before. These positions are very time intensive and the ones that teach you the most, so they should be accessible to as many students as possible.

Dylan Braam: Is it possible to put in something in the policy for people who are currently in those positions?

Sam Crème: That is already in the policy.

Alex Wood: For me the issue is financial need. Should someone need that part time job to pay the bills, I don’t think they should be prevented from doing that in a service that they really love. This is a great reason for the appeal process that was suggested.

Sam Crème: The financial need example would only apply to the director of services, VPOps and the president. They could plan ahead for this, so for anyone who needs the financial aspect, I don’t think they wold do that to themselves. My other point is that this up and out could only possibly affect those three people, but the good it could do is for a lot more people.

Michael Wetton: Sometimes financial situations do change, so in this case, you might not be able to plan ahead for that. I think this amendment process would be great for the students in question.

Cole Halenda: I think that having the up and out policy does help the financial situation for students. There aren’t just a few students with financial difficulties, so it allows everyone to have the opportunity rather than a few.

Michael Blair: On the matter of the three positions, president, director of services and VPOps, on them considering their ineligibility, is that not effectively discriminating people that are in financial need from applying for those positions?

James Gibbard-McCall: I actually agree with a lot of what the policy said, but the amendment discussion is interesting. I think as long as it’s a stringent and tough enough application process for the appeal process, that would provide people the opportunity.

Lowell Rose: The way I understand it is that there is something in the policy that allows ERB to take a look at the case and make a decision?

Matt Slavin: It brings them into the fold as a neutral party, as well as if there is any gray area about who is directly supervising who.

Lowell Rose: I like that ERB could have this power, like last year with a previous issue of conflict of interest. Was it in ERB’s purview? Putting this amendment in place could help with those conflicts, but it could create other problems with other decisions they may not be able to make.

Jay Young: We as a society have no mechanism to track anyone’s financial situation, nor will we ever have that capability.

Robert St-Onge: I just want to say that I think it’s dangerous to use the mess with ERB before as precedent for right now.

Eric McElroy: One of the goals of policy is to account for as many cases as possible and to account for cases that might pop up. So for unforeseen circumstances, this amendment is great so that someone doesn’t have to come back later to add it into policy to deal with any issues.

Madeline Poirier: It is my understanding that currently with hiring policy, ERB handles any grievances that people have, so I believe this amendment is unnecessary.

Neil Pandya: I think the spirit of this amendment is great, but there really isn’t any way that you can verify the financial need of any individuals. The three positions that Sam mentioned are fantastic on your resume that will help you more in the long run.

Doug McFarlane: I think that we are focusing too much on the example of financial need. I don’t mean to call anyone out on that, but we need to focus on the amendment as a whole and not just that specific example.

Mark Godin: Having a clause to void policy is generally poor practice. I think the policy stands and the tone of it is to avoid those circumstances well, so I would advise against the amendment.

Matt Slavin: It is a notwithstanding clause on purpose. It is not meant to be something to be abused, if there was any way to write that into policy anymore, I would do that. I didn’t mean to create a monster, but I think it is a good amendment to have for those cases that may come up.

Michael Wetton: I think that it would be a great amendment, however I do understand where people are coming from. ERB would not be accepting every appeal that came through, that is their job. Giving them that policy that says go to them to review this specific thing would be a benefit to everyone.

Michael Blair: This policy obviously deals specifically with people, employees and elected positions. I believe that this policy does not appreciate certain circumstances. For me, this amendment is critical to my support of this.

Neil Pandya: I think adding this amendment into the policy leaves an opening for misinterpretation. It’s not the spirit of it, but it could open a gate to abuse the policy.

Dylan Braam: I think it’s good to have in there. Whether or not, it’s going to end up that people will want to challenge the policy. I think it’s good to make people aware that they have the power to appeal it and go to the ERB.

Emily Fleck: Just with regards to the abuse of this policy, I think it would be. Using a personal example, if this policy applied to me, I would definitely want to appeal as I will be taking a 5th year because I love the society and would love to take a hired position. I do think that it would be abused.

Dylan Braam: My point is that regardless of whether or not it is in policy, people like the president know that they can make these appeals to ERB, so it is a moot point and it should be put in policy

Eric McElroy: What about the however in there about managers and directors? Doesn’t that also leave ambiguity?

**Motion to Call the Question:**

Moved by: Sam Anderson

Seconded by: Michael Blair

Closing (Matt Slavin): I think all of the points have been made are great, but I want to echo Eric. I think its good practice to have these clauses just in case we face these situations that we are not expecting.

Madeline Poirier: If we are having this amendment, could we have time to cross-reference the grievance procedure?

Matt Slavin: The question has already been called.

Motion Passes: 7:43

Alex Savides: Now we will vote on the amendment

Motion Passes: 7:44

Alex Savides: Now we will begin discussion again on the main motion.

Lowell Rose: In the section that says eligibility of previous volunteers and employees, it mentions extraordinary circumstances. How would you define this without bringing it to ERB?

Eric McElroy: I think adding the amendment does clarify that this would go to ERB, and clarifies what the process is.

Dylan Braam: In the policy it talks about the limit on rehiring staff is up to 30%. Could someone tell me what the current rate is?

Sam Crème: It varies from year to year, with waves of young staff. Last year at Clark for example, it was 35%. I talked to all of the service managers to decide on that specific percentage.

Nick Hetherington: I am in support of this policy, but I would like to express my concern about a phrase where it says directly or indirectly, can I get clarification?

Sam Crème: We are actually in the process of creating an organizational chart to clarify this, which will definitely be out before the AGM. What I would mean about this is that the Director of services directly oversees managers, but indirectly oversees the assistant managers and staff.

Meghan Brunner: I am uncomfortable with this policy because we can’t tell people what their experiences can and cannot be. I will be voting against this.

Amanda Seliga: It says you can’t apply for a position you have already held, but then there is a 30% rehire policy, so how does that work out?

Sam Crème: That should read volunteer position, because it is talking about everyone except for staff. I will friendly amend that.

James Gibbard-McCall: About talking to the services about the 30% rehire rate, these people already have experience. If they can only apply for manager it creates a bottle neck and the other 70% cannot be rehired. Is this a problem for the services?

Sam Crème: Training is not an issue, anyone with no experience can apply. However, it is easier to have been in a lower position before manager. There will also still be trained people who could teach the new people.

Amanda Brissenden: Clarifying your adding the term volunteer position. Does that apply to larger committees such as the communications team?

Sam Crème: How the policy now reads is that if you have been a communications team member before for example, you cannot be rehired as that unless the application process has been extended, but you could apply for a higher position.

Eleanor McAuley: Now with the addition of the volunteer in there, it doesn’t apply to managers, is that what we want?

Sam Crème: Instead of volunteer, it will read no student position, excluding staff, to fix that.

Michael Blair: With all of these amendments, does the exec still have confidence that the vetting process is still good and do you have confidence that this policy should be passed today?

Sam Crème: Honestly, I am somewhat disappointed that nobody brought any concerns to me in the past couple weeks. I brought this up four weeks ago and sent out the policy a week and a half ago. I would have loved to hear feedback, but I heard none. The point of this policy is to take what is already written in the preamble of the hiring policy and make it more firm, and written in. Without this, it is really hard to give everyone the same opportunities and to give as many people as possible those opportunities. The spirit behind this is to make our hiring process more accessible to students and I believe that this policy is the right move.

Eric McElroy: Regarding some of the positions that are hired for design teams and clubs, does this policy apply to any of them?

Sam Crème: I do believe that the director of design would still be able to be part of any design team they want, but the director of conferences would not be able to apply for any conference chairs.

Mark Godin: To be clear, the director of design does not have oversight over any of the design teams.

Michael Wetton: We’ve been making small amendments here and there, so no offense, but I do not think I have had enough time to look over this policy. I was not here four weeks ago in council, so I do not believe that as it currently stands we should be enacting this. I think we should put out a straw poll to all engineers.

Alex Savides: Just a small reminder for everyone: you do not need to reiterate other people’s opinions because that is cyclical.

Amanda Brissenden: It is important that we think about the other students that we are representing. The arguments that we are having are about one or two people who hold higher positions. We represent the thousands of others as well. I have spoken to people who felt really disadvantaged, so it is important to remember those people who this policy will really help. I believe the intent of this motion is great, so please keep that in mind.

Emily Townshend: I really do think that this is over policing and that we are over stepping our bounds. I believe that we can’t tell people who are really passionate about their volunteer positions that they can’t do it again. I believe that we would be driving away really great people.

Sam Anderson: Along a similar nature, I would like to ask the questions about the director of academics. Would they be barred from being an EngLinks tutor?

Sam Crème: If you were a director of academics, they directly oversee that program, so you wouldn’t be able to be a tutor.

Lowell Rose: If you had a larger committee, such as the committee on inclusivity, without a fixed number of applicants, what happens if someone wants to be on it again where their experience is beneficial? Would they still be barred?

Sam Crème: I don’t know the exact logistics with regards to the COI. If you have already sat on the committee before, you wouldn’t be able to come to council to be hired, but if there were additional spots, you could apply directly to that externally.

Neil Pandya: How was the 30% rehire percentage determined?

Sam Crème: For example, the AMS has a 25% rehire policy, but they have a lot more staff than we do. 25% would have worked for the tearoom or science quest, but it would not have worked for Clark because they have only 30 staff. 30% works though because one returning staff could be on each shift in order to train the new staff.

Sam Codrington: On a more trivial note, with the amendment on the website, C.11, there is a typo.

Sam Crème: That is a friendly amendment.

James Gibbard-McCall: I like the spirit of the policy and I think the amendment made earlier might bridge the gap. For EngLinks tutors especially, I think that is why we had the amendment, and I do like the spirit of the policy and giving more students opportunities.

Steph Van Raay: I know it was mentioned that we are kind of restricting people from experiences. I think we should look at it as we are trying to give people experiences that haven’t had any before. Once this is all figured out over the years, the mindset will come around.

Eleanor McAuley: The policy now reads no limit for management rehires, what does it entail now?

Sam Crème: That line is just to say that if a manager is hired that was previously staff, it would not count in the rehire limit. This is a good thing that we are trying to encourage, so it shouldn’t be counted.

Eleanor McAuley: Is there any way that this could be clarified for people like myself who are not used to reading policy?

Mark Godin: I think the answer to your question might already lie in another section of the policy.

Shane Dibblee: I just want to say, I have been listening to all of this debate. First of all, it should be kept in mind that service positions are not charity, they are jobs, and so financial need should not be taken into account. I think people are focusing a lot on the negatives of the ‘out’ part of the policy because there are many opportunities outside of the EngSoc and outside of Queen’s. This policy is fantastic for people who are hesitant to apply, so I am very much behind this policy.

Jay Young: One recurring complaint we get is that the society is too clique-y, and I think this policy starts to fix a lot of this issue. It also helps to promote one of our mandates which is to help people develop their soft skills within these positions. It’s about bringing it back to individual constituents.

Robert St-Onge: I have heard all the same things about clique-y-ness and I believe this is a great step to start to fix this. I will be voting yes.

Stephen Martin: I have been hearing a lot of tentativeness on this. I think to some extent we are policing, but we need to make people realise that there are opportunities outside of the EngSoc. Another thing is that the dynamic can change if a manager becomes a staff position. I am going to use a camp reference. If I were to drop down and work as a counselor again, it can be really dangerous for the people around you, even if it’s in terms of the way people see you, because they still see you as a manager. This policy is legitimately a real way to take action to encourage other people instead of discouraging some, so I think we need to keep that in mind.

Alex Savides: This brings us to the end of the speakers cue.

**Motion to Call the Question:**

Moved by: Michael Blair

Seconded by: Sam Anderson

Motion passes: 8:16

Closing (Sam Crème): I hope everyone at council can see what the exec is trying to do for the greater student body, and that the up and out only applies to one portfolio, so it is not limiting people that much. If you plan your time with EngSoc ahead of time, you don’t have to be limited.

Motion passes: 8:18 (Emily Townshend abstains)

**Motion 5:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council elect \_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_\_ to sit on the External Relations Committee, which will work to achieve methods to continue and develop external communication relationships in the society, for the first year of its existence.

Moved by: Sam Anderson

Seconded by: Emily Fleck

Opening (Sam Anderson): Just a note before I give my opening, I will be amending it to approve the changes in appendix COMMUNICATIONS. The committee would consist of members of council and non-members as well as some additional ED team members. They would make a report on opportunities of external communications.

Emily Fleck: I know this combines an election with a policy change, so if people aren’t comfortable with this, I understand. I think this motion is well-aligned with the decision to step down from ESSCO.

**Motion to Open the Agenda:**

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Neil Pandya

Motion passes: 8:21

Eric McElroy: I’d like to separate the motions to have the policy approved before nominations and elections for the committee occur.

Sam Anderson: That is friendly.

**Motion to Close the Agenda:**

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Carolyn Fisher

Motion passes: 8:22

**New Motion 5:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council move to approve the changes in appendix COMMUNICATIONS.

Moved by: Sam Anderson

Seconded by: Emily Fleck

Matt Slavin: It says that this committee will report at the AGM, and that it excludes certain people. Will it be formed and then report at AGM and then be dissolved and rehired?

Emily Fleck: This committee was modeled after the COI structure. Given the timing on this, it’s not ideal. I felt that we would elect the committee today and then it would carry through until next year. In terms of people who are not eligible, there aren’t too many exclusions, just the ED team.

Matt Slavin: It’s tough to define an incoming director, so I don’t know how you would want to handle that. Technically we don’t have a director of conferences until they are ratified at the AGM, so I don’t believe the committee should be formed until the AGM.

Mark Godin: There are two paths we could go with. One, council indicated that they wanted this committee formed as soon as possible, so we could do that to get things going ASAP. We could also work on the mandate of council that the intention is clear, or we could just wait because it isn’t that big of a deal.

Sam Anderson: I think it would be ok to move forward now. Also, it reads that the chair could not be an ED member, but nothing excludes any of the general members from being on the ED team.

Emily Fleck: It took a second for this to register, so I apologize, but the president and the director of conferences sits on this committee, but cannot be chair.

James Gibbard-McCall: Just because there are upcoming director hiring, how will this work?

Sam Anderson: We are not barring anyone, so this shouldn’t be a problem.

Matt Slavin: Thank you for clarifying. I have a new issue, there are new voting members of council after the AGM, so how will you account for this?

Sam Anderson: I would be comfortable with passing the policy now and tabling the election to the AGM.

Alex Savides: Any more debate on the actual policy changes?

Motion Passes: 8:30 (Cole Halenda abstains)

Sam Anderson: Before we get into that motion, could we do a straw poll to see if people are comfortable electing the committee right now? I will retract my motion in that case.

Alex Savides: So now we will move on to motion 6.

**Motion 6:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the changes seen in APPENDIX HIATUS.

Moved by: Emily Fleck

Seconded by: Doug McFarlane

Opening (Emily Fleck): This is the follow up to our discussion on ESSCO. We are not voting on whether or not to leave CFES, it is on our attendance. To take one year to see where else we could use this money is very interesting and beneficial. The point of this motion is that we would notify CFES that we will not be attending for one year. The way the policy was written is that any policy that mandated us to attend the conference was stricken, but membership remains.

Matt Lawson: If we are maintaining our membership with this, I think we should still send a voting member to plenary, as we shouldn’t be giving up our power to vote. I also don’t think it isn’t within our right to tell people that they shouldn’t be allowed to go to NICWE. If people want to fund their own way, they should be able to do so.

Emily Fleck: Just to acknowledge the NICWE point, we wouldn’t be budgeting for them, but individuals could go on their own, but not through the EngSoc. I don’t think it makes sense to send a voting member to plenary as the purpose of this motion is to not go. We can discuss though.

Steph Van Raay: NICWE is not a conference that you have to send a specific person to, but if there was a certain amount of money we could put towards people who want to go to any conference they want to, that would be great.

Matt Lawson: I know conferences is considering this, but it doesn’t really fit into this motion.

Matt Slavin: Policy changes are permanent, unless amended at another date. So just keep in mind that this change is permanent unless we change it at a later date. I think purposefully not sending someone to vote when we are maintaining a vote with our membership is not right. For conferences, I don’t think we should limit the opportunity of personal development for our student. I think we should either sever all ties or stay on fully, and I don’t think we should sever all ties.

Meghan Brunner: Can WISE still send people?

Mark Godin: Yes.

Steph Van Raay: I just want to make sure that we are not telling anyone that they can’t go to conferences?

Emily Fleck: Yes, we are not forbidding anyone from going to conferences, it is just to try and redirect funds, perhaps make a fund for people to go to any conferences that they feel beneficial.

Michael Blair: I just want to confirm that this is not about preventing people from going, but more like re-allocating funds?

JT: Yes.

James Gibbard-McCall: What is the difference between having a fund and providing support through our membership?

Emily Fleck: This fund would be an application for a partial subsidy for personal development and not for the benefit of the society as a whole.

Matt Lawson: Membership in CFES allows students to attend CEC, which is another reason that we are maintaining our membership and not cutting ties entirely.

Matt Slavin: Just to confirm, my opinion is that we are cutting our legs off as voting members of CFES because we are not providing support for sending members to vote on behalf of our society. I am strongly against this motion.

Alex Wood: We have already cut off ESSCO, so if we stop CFES, we are going to be cutting off all ties all at once. In my opinion, I think we should stay with CFES and see how our ESSCO cut off affects us first, also to not leave the external relations committee all alone in its first year of existence.

Mark Godin: The reason we are maintaining our membership is to not cut ourselves off from CEC. The reason we are not going to the conferences though is because it is not worthwhile for our money for what we are getting out of it. This thought is several years in the making.

Peter Davidson: I was wondering if CFES has any policies regarding our actions?

Matt Lawson: If you don’t attend plenary with a voting member or proxy, you enter a state of bad membership, but I am not really sure what the implications are. The cost of this this year was a lot, so that we could evaluate how good this is for us. We could still send one member to plenary for under $1000 for both voting conferences to keep our voice heard.

Matt Slavin: I keep hearing we want to do this properly. Does ending up as a member in bad standing sound like doing this properly? I don’t think so. I think we are focusing too much on the financial aspect.

Mark Godin: To clarify, to remain in good standing, we simply have to send a proxy, which can be a member of any school, so we do not have to pay for them to go.

Sam Crème: It is pretty significant for us to ask any student to miss a whole week of school or their winter break since we get very few days off. Especially with a 3 person exec. Getting everything going for the semester with those key people gone was definitely a detriment.

Stephen Martin: We spent quite a while talking about furthering people’s development and opportunities. Sending people to conferences is not always about benefitting the society as a whole, but building individual’s skills, and I think we should keep focusing on helping people do that.

Matt Lawson: I knew I was going to miss that time from the get-go. Same with any of the positions, so I don’t think that that should be a deciding factor for this motion. People take pride in that too.

Jay Young: We would not be in bad standing if we went through the appropriate mechanisms. If we re-allocated the funds properly, we will provide more opportunities for students. Also, everyone has heard all of the presentations and if you can look to your constituents and say that that $1000-$5000 is worth what we get out of it, then vote this down, but otherwise, you should vote it through.

Emily Fleck: We shouldn’t be alluding to the fictional fund that doesn’t exist, but it should be noted that the funds would go towards the benefit of students

Matt Lawson: I completely support that we wouldn’t be stopping people from attending conferences on their own dime, but I do have issue with us losing our say in plenary. I don’t think proxies are utilized properly, so I believe it would be extremely beneficial for us to send one member to do just that.

Eric McElroy: In the policy there was a removed line from the director of conferences about CFES, does that mean that that responsibility is removed?

Mark Godin: It prevents them from attending conference, but not from liaising.

Emily Townshend: I was in favour of the ESSCO motion, but I think this is too much too quickly. I don’t think half pulling out and just not going is the way to go.

Closing (Emily Fleck): I haven’t prepared a closing, but I do believe our presentations haven’t been worth the money. Again, we are not completely pulling out, just taking an evaluation year, and I do see the value of using the money in better ways. I do hope that you vote in favour of this motion.

Motion Passes: 8:59 (Eric McElroy, Matt Slavin, Emily Townshend oppose)

**Motion 7:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the changes to By-Law 2 in its first reading as seen in APPENDIX ATTENDANCE IS FUN!

Moved by: Matt Slavin

Seconded by: Matt Lawson

Opening (Matt Slavin): I propose a few small changes about council and voting and attendance. I am interested to hear everyone’s opinions on this. If you are not at council 15 minutes after the gavel, it will count as an absence. Two of these and your funding gets cut. We will take attendance at the start of every council meeting just to keep accountable. For proxies, if you proxy your vote to someone, it means that that person will vote the same way that you would, in a responsible manner. Also, maintaining an attendance that would be publicly available. For voting, I would like us to speak I or yes, or no, rather than just holding up the placards. I feel like too many times this body seems like a rubber stamping body. For each vote taken at council, I feel that every vote for, against and abstentions should be noted, as in the numbers, to keep everyone accountable and to make sure that if anyone wants to know, they can see how council is voting and if the votes are close or not. If you have any issues about anything, please bring it up.

Neil Pandya: I am proxy-ing my vote to Amanda.

Mark Godin: Perhaps this could be separated into two separate motions? For verbalising, I think it would be too messy. I think that when you raise your placard or your hand, that is sufficient. Roll call is fine, but I don’t feel that yelling out your vote would add to the decorum. AMS does not actually record the number of ‘for’s and ‘against’s for every motion, so I don’t see the point.

Robert-St Onge: About 9f with proxies, I don’t think that that’s necessary because there is no way to enforce that.

Nick Hetherington: About proxies, I think that it is difficult to determine what the person you are proxy-ing for is thinking, but it should be mandated that you have some sort of communication so you know how your person would want to vote. I would like to make an amendment to 2.9.h when it reads add in offending member should perform a musical number for council at the next meeting.

Matt Slavin: Friendly

Mark Godin: I object to that.

Meghan Brunner: As do I.

Shane Dibblee: I also object.

Alex Savides: That makes the motion unfriendly, so we will now have discussion on the motion to amend the policy.

Amanda Brissenden: Does that apply to people who have a reason to be late?

Matt Slavin: No.

Mark Godin: Although it is hilarious, it is not suited to the context of our bylaws.

Robert St-Onge: It could also make coming to council intimidating.

Shane Dibblee: It also goes against the intent of the motion to make council more serious.

**Motion to Extend Council by 30 Minutes:**

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Emily Townshend

Motion Passes: 9:10

Alex Savides: Now we are voting on the amendment.

Motion Fails: 9:10

Alex Savides: Now we will continue the discussion of the original motion.

**Motion to Amend the Motion:**

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Eric McElroy

Opening (Alex Wood): I’d like to propose an amendment that extends the 15 minute late time to 30 minutes.

Doug McFarlane: That would be covered under extenuating circumstances.

Matt Slavin: Yeah, 30 minutes is too long

**Motion to Call the Question:**

Moved by: Matt Slavin

Seconded by: Eric McElroy

Motion passes: 9:12

Alex Savides: We will now vote on the amendment.

Motion Fails: 9:13

Emily Townshend: I really like the number of votes for and against noted. I have sat on councils where long term memory is important. The exec could go back and see if motions are worth bringing back, so that is good. I’d like to amend the yeah or nay to yes or no.

Matt Slavin: That is friendly.

Eric McElroy: It would be a very nice piece of accountability to see what the split was. It would be useful for gaging past opinion and for people to see what the contentious points are. It is my favourite piece of this policy,

Robert St.-Onge: I am going to motion to table this motion since it has not been seen by ERB, and there are lots of holes and amendments needed.

**Motion to Table the Motion:**

Moved by: Robert St.-Onge

Seconded by: Matt Black

Motion Passes: 9:16

1. **Break – 9:18**

Break Ends: 9:23

1. **Executive Reports**
2. President

Emily Fleck: I don’t have a lot to report on. A quick reminder, tab night was moved forward so I really hope you can all attend. The EngSoc AGM has been scheduled for March 11th. At that AGM, every student has a vote. Thanks to Madeline Poirier for helping with ED review. Other than that I have just had a bunch of meetings. One thing that was not in my report was that currently Sci formal has room designer applications out, and they also need to hire an art manager. There is a line in policy that says the VPSA can waive hiring requirements for a specific instance. We are going to therefore be hiring an art manager from the pool of room designers. This is not typical, but we really need to fill this position. If you have any questions, let me know. For our engineering hymn, would the new executive please lead us?

1. VP (Student Development)

Mark Godin: Quite a bit has happened. CIRQUE happened and space conference the weekend before. Both ran very successfully with excellent speakers. OEC happened this past weekend, in which we had 14 delegates. One of our teams actually qualified for CEC. The t-bogs team just got back, and I haven’t checked in with them. Coming up we will be doing a major cleanup of the design team space and getting rid of anything nonessential.

1. VP (Academic)

Chris Reid: Could not attend.

1. VP (Operations)

Sam Crème: Last Monday we had a board meeting that was great. Otherwise, I have been doing day to day office stuff and starting on transitioning with Peter. I have been planning for the transition period with signing authority and payroll things. Coming up I will be finishing off a few last projects like the financial review.

1. VP (Society Affairs)

Doug McFarlane: Congratulations to Alex Savides and to everyone who ran. Moving forward, I have very little to report. Director applications were due yesterday, but the director of IT and conferences were extended. Both will be due on Friday. We now have some practice playing with the online application system, and it seems to be working well.

1. **Director Reports**
2. Communications

Neal Hougham: There isn’t too much going on. We have now posted all of the position manuals for all of the directors online for everyone to have. You can use that to prepare for the interview if you want.

1. Events

Elizabeth Prendergast: There isn’t too much going on with me either. ERC has a huge event going on that is a snow fort competition. It hasn’t happened in two years, so they will be building all night. Fungineering dodge ball is on Saturday. I have also been working on developing event coordinator training with my FYPCO.

1. External Communications

Matt Lawson: I will be leaving tomorrow for the FYC with Stephen and some first years. I have also been in contact with U of T, and they are going to be hosting a pub night. A lot of people have been asking about the director of conferences, so there is good initiative there.

1. Finance

Amanda Brissenden: Not too much has been going on, just the same old stuff. I am getting organised so that everything makes sense to whoever gets hired.

1. First Year

Stephen Martin: Last week I ran a FREC interview help session, which was decently attended. Andrew Crawford was able to come out, which was great to provide good knowledge. A lot of people have been asking about the director of first year which was both cool and sad. With the FYC budget, things have been worked out. A lot of what it was involved significant communication errors. When all is said and done, all things balance out for the most part. The actual loss worked out to be quite minor. If you are interested in seeing that, I have prepared a document that shows the old budget and the new one, so I can get that out to you.

1. Information Technology

Alice Wang: Quite a few things have been happening. I found a solution, so next council I will be bringing a motion. Other than that, computer managers will have some how-to things up for you guys on the website soon. AMS started to fully convert their email servers to office 365 as well.

1. Internal Affairs

JT: The elections team and I have met and are making a plan for the rest of the year for year exec elections and such. David has done some really awesome work, so hopefully we can keep that going. I met with Karen Merrill about evaluating the EngSoc awards, especially the ones that have monetary value. Cheers to Pippa for putting the Olympic theme together, she is awesome.

**Motion to Extend Council by 30 Minutes:**

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Emily Townshend

Motion Passes: 9:37

1. Professional Development

Holly MacNeish: We had the AUTOCAD workshop and the software actually worked, yay IT. The instructor is available for a second session which I will be advertising for soon, but priority will be given to the waiting list. There is still no word from PNG, but I have been talking to someone from the Dalhousie MBA program to promote it and business careers for engineering. With regards to the alumni relations presentation I gave today, if anyone has any questions or opinions, let me know.

1. Services

Cole Halenda: The biggest news is that Tearoom and golden words got their student fees, which is a big deal. We are also entering the hiring hump right now, and all of the applications are out. Science quest school year coordinators applications are also out and due the 26th, as well as instructor apps. I made a whole bunch of posters and dumped flyers everywhere, so hopefully those are working. I am also looking into getting a manager hiring banner in conjunction with Neal ordering the new society banner. Also, CEO is having a winter sale coming up on Tuesday from 10:30 to 3:30, there is a Facebook event, so go and check it out.

1. **Question Period**

Shane Dibblee: Mark Godin, when you mentioned there is going to be a design team dumping of stuff, is anything going to be scavenged?

Mark Godin: If you want to come down by all means, but I think it’s mostly going to be trash, and nothing of value.

Sam Crème: I wanted to touch on Holly’s presentation. The idea is amazing and I think it would be really great for student development, as well as for alumni wanting to keep in touch with students. I could see this position becoming a director position down the line as it grows. I would encourage you guys to keep this idea in mind and see where you can take it because it will be really beneficial for the students.

Matt Lawson: Holly, I really liked the presentation. Have you thought of making it a Directorship? It might be stifled as an officer role. For Cole, how much would the banner cost and is it worth it?

Cole Halenda: My intention was that it would be used in years to come and generally since hiring for service positions is so extensive, it would be good to have it extremely visible in the ILC, but if we wanted to make it a general hiring poster, we could talk about it.

1. **Faculty Board Report**

Peter Davidson: We haven’t had a meeting yet, but there is one this week.

1. **Engineering Review Board Report**

Madeline Poirier: As I said, ERB met this week to go over the hiring policy. I personally have been busy with ED reviews, so we will have lots of great feedback to pass onto the future DHR. I am beginning to work on transitions, and I may bring policy changes about hiring next council on timelines and transitioning.

1. **Alma Mater Society Report**

Nick Hetherington: CFRC had their fee passed with an excellent presentation, I learned a lot. There was also a presentation on the campus master plan. I learned a lot and if you have any questions, come speak to someone who was at AMS. Nick Francis, the rector, also mentioned something about being disappointed about campaigns.

Mark Godin: I think he was referring to social media and people bickering online. I will say that poor behaviour was way less this year.

Eric McElroy: We have passed the first hurdle for CFRC, but it will be coming to the AGM.

1. **Senate Report**

Emily Townshend: Congrats to Alex Cavaliere on his new position. Senate has not met, but there is a lot going on. SOARB has a lot of new members. Engineering and ConEd has a loose alliance, so I am excited about that. The policy committee has a first meeting, so I am cautiously optimistic about getting a policy together. If you would like to have input on this, please contact me. Another thing to note is sub-committee openings, which happen on a rolling basis, are a really good way to get involved. We need good people, so please apply. Coming up to senate is program closures. We don’t have a way to close a program, so we can only suspend it indefinitely. We are looking into policy on how to make that permanent.

1. **Board of Directors Report**

Shane Dibblee: We had a meeting last Monday and it went really well. We heard final wrap-ups from frosh week and sci formal. We also heard from science quest and the new Sci formal committee, who are taking their issues in stride.

1. **Club Reports**
2. **Engineering Physics**

Not present

1. **Electrical and Computer**

Colin Liberty: not much has happened since the last report. We had a pancake breakfast and we are planning another one because it was a big success. We are also planning some BBQs much further down the road.

1. **Mechanical**

Cayleigh Shepard: We are working on distributing merch, got our Bed fund in, and working on starting a logo contest.

1. **Mining**

Matt Black: Orientation night was a great success, we put orders in for our department GPA patches, and last meeting we restructured the mining club exec and number of members.

1. **Engineering Chemistry**

Nick Pilotis: We are thinking about starting up a brewery design team. The next step, which Chris Fitzgibbon has gone into detail on, is talking to Clark about getting a homemade taste testing thing going. The tough part is dealing with the legality of things.

1. **Year Reports**
	* 1. **Sci’ 14**

Steph Van Raay: The yearbook is still under way, but we are meeting all of our deadlines. Apple rep, can you pass on a message that we still need photos that are not iPhone photos. Also, our iron ring after party has been planned with the Grizz, but we are still trying to organize a class photo on iron ring day.

* + 1. **Sci’ 15**

Matt Slavin: We had a hockey event that some people came to, and we are still looking into streaming some Olympic events, but other than that, not much on the go.

* + 1. **Sci’ 16**

Nick Hetherington: Not too much is going on. We have a semi-formal tomorrow evening at Clark, and we are looking forward to it. It is called P.S. I love Clark. We are also selling flasks with our year crest on them.

* + 1. **Sci’ 17**

James Gibbard-McCall: We are starting to determine our year motto, and we are collecting money for last man standing bars finally. Our semi-formal went well from what I heard. Our website went live an hour ago without us knowing, it is Sci17.ca.

1. **Statements and Questions by Members**

Matt Slavin: I would like to make a note that I get that this council was long, but policy debated hours into council should be debated as well as policy at the beginning of council, so I think tabling the motion was in bad form. I would like everyone to think about that.

Mark Godin: The Senate on academic discipline was a hot topic at senate, so please get informed. There have been some interesting journal articles on it, and it is important to have a voice! With the campus master plan, the very important document is coming public march 8th or 9th. A lot of potentially big changes could be made on campus, so please read it because it could affect you. There was also a laptop found belonging to Dave Mcfarquar, so please notify him if you know him. Student fees are coming to the AGM of the AMS. Union gallery, CFRC journal, QTV and AMS are all asking for an increase of fees, which works out to dozens of dollars of non-optional fees. Come out and vote, or talk to your AMS representatives.

Amanda Brissenden: Sci Formal is hiring room designers and a potential art designer, so please spread the word or apply if you are interested.

Alice Wang: With regards to the extenuating circumstances for being late, what if you were waiting for the bus and it never came? Also, anyone can contact me through email about the director of IT if you would like to know more about the position.

Nick Hetherington: I would like to commend the executive on the up and out policy. I think it is great at dispensing the clique-y-ness of the society and I think it is great.

Doug McFarlane: Most of it was done by Sam, so great job to her. I recently had a meeting with Joanne Rosten, the imbedded personal counselor. She has been working for 20+ years, focused specifically on addiction. She wanted to meet with me to reach out. One idea I had was having a session about peer pressure with drinking. If anyone has any ideas about how she can connect with students, please let me know. She is a great resource, so let me know if you have ideas or need to talk to someone.

Steph Van Raay: I felt last year that there wasn’t enough nominations for the EngSoc awards, so I encourage you to nominate people, and get the word out. They are an amazing opportunity to acknowledge people that deserve it.

JT: We have been working on evaluating these awards to make them more relevant. The nomination packages will be out next week with specific and clear guidelines about eligibility and nominations to make the process smoother.

Eric McElroy: I encourage everyone to come out to the AMS AGM. For CFRC we are asking for a 2 dollar increase, but we want to be able to present our case as clearly as possible, so if you want to learn more about this extremely valuable station, please come and talk to me.

Robert St-Onge: Tonight was the geo discipline night, so if any of the first years missed it, please don’t hesitate to come to any of us to ask questions.

Alex Cavaliere: The Sci’17 semi-formal was extremely well done. We were even receiving complements from the StuCons. We had food and mocktails, great behaviour and an amazing event.

Peter Davidson: On Monday I went to a meeting with Doug and Eric and Morgan Roff and Alice about the IT People. It was really exciting and they really want student input in stuff which was amazing. I thought it was a fantastic time, so if you are interested, please come talk to me or Doug. There was even pizza!

Sam Crème: I hope to see you all at Clark in 5 minutes

Eric: CFRC is broadcasting live from there in an hour too!

Alex Savides: Despite all of the criticisms about this council, I think it was run really well and we didn’t get too bogged down. Thanks again for listening to me talk for so long too. I know I have been up here a lot, so thanks.

JT: Good job to Alex for filling in for Alex. We had a heavy council, so great job. Sam did an awesome job with the up and out policy. Someone had a question today in the tearoom and she sat down with them to discuss it with them which was great. It is our responsibility to talk to our constituents.

Matt Lawson: Also a thank you to Caitlin who has been typing for 4 hours.

JT: Now for the funniest things in the Agenda. The bronze medal goes to Neal for saying I ate dirt. The silver medal is a split between two people, Matt Slavin and Amanda Brissenden, who both said termites. And the gold medal goes to Neil for saying Lemon pepper tarantula! Congrats guys!

**Motion to Close:**

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Matt Lawson

Motion Passes: 10:15