Engineering Society Council Minutes

Thursday, January 22nd, 2015

Beamish-Munro Hall (ILC) 313

Speaker: Nick Hetherington

Secretary: Oleg Baranov

Meeting Begins: 6:00 pm

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

**Motion 1:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of Thursday, January 22nd, 2015 as seen on the EngSoc website.

Moved by: Eleanor McAuley

Seconded by: Nick Hetherington

Opening (Eleanor McAuley): I want to give a big welcome to the newly elected AMS executive team, as well as the two candidates for the position of student trustee.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any more debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 6:08 pm (28 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

1. **Adoption of the Minutes**

**Motion 2:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of Thursday, January 22nd, 2015 as seen on the EngSoc website.

Moved by: Oleg Baranov

Seconded by: Eleanor McAuley

Opening (Oleg): I hope no one has any more additional motions to add to the agenda for tonight.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 6:10 pm (27 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

1. **Speaker’s Business**

Nick Hetherington: Welcome to what has been an excellent start to a great council. There is pizza, and presenters and speakers. We will eat after the presentations. We have a lot of things on the table, so keep that in mind when speaking. The next order of business are the presentations from the Student Trustee candidates. You have a two minute opening.

Mike Blair: My name is Mike Blair, I’m a second year civil engineering student. I’m here to talk to you about the position, my background, and to answer any questions you may have. The Queen’s Board of Trustees oversee all the financial matters with respect to the university. The Student Trustee sits on the board, and their job is to represent the voice of students on the board. I was a student trustee in the past in high school, and have been extensively involved in the AMS during my time here at Queen’s.

Jennifer Li: Hello all. Thank you for hosting us tonight. I’m excited to talk all of you about my platform. I have been heavily involved during my time here at Queen’s. My platform is based on close interaction with the student body. I hope to engage effectively with you guys, and be an active participant within the Queen’s community.

Peter Davidson: Mr. Blair, could you please which one committee you are most excited to work on, and what item on that committee you are most excited to focus on?

Jennifer Li: I am most excited to work on the Finance Auditing and Risk Committee.

Mike Blair: It’s a very interesting balance that one must strike in order to balance the interests of students, as well as the protecting the interests of the university. I too am excited to work on the Finance Auditing and Risk Committee.

Frank Hung: What are you going to do to ensure that you are receiving feedback k from students that are not heavily involved in student government?

Mike Blair: I was thinking of organizing randomized tutorial questionnaires. These could be handed out to students in all Faculties, and would provide a direct source of feedback.

Jennifer Li: There is already a great form of discussion available, through the AMS assembly. I’m going to make it a point to be available on campus to the students. I am also going to make it a point to attend club events, in order to collect additional feedback.

Matt Slavin: How do you plan to ensure that your voice is head at the board table?

Jenifer Li: I plan on developing relationships with other members of the board to make sure that my voice is heard.

Mike Blair: Effective relationships with the faculties and societies is the most important for this position. I know a lot of the executives from my experience at Queen’s.

Jennifer Li: I’ve learned a lot preparing for this campaign. However I am ready for the challenge, and am looking forward to it.

Mike Blair: the student trustee has such a valuable

Nick Hetherington: We will not have a presentation from the AMS executive.

Alex Savides: If you could outline the three main points of your platform that would be great.

Catherine Wright: We are all about the small practical changes. The first one is the continuation of the ReUnion Street Festival. There is a lot of work that needs to be done to continue that. Enhancing the value of your student card. An example of this is pursuing the payment of services. The third point for us is University Finances. We don’t want the university to shaft students through their inability to control costs.

Alex Wood; How are you going to deal with the resigning of Annette Paul?

Catherine Wright: Unfortunately we can’t comment much on that. One of the things that we are looking for is WRL will be looking for a new executive director within the next two months. There is an opportunity however to look at the transition of past executive, and learn from that.

Andrew Crawford: What would you say is the single greatest issue all the students of the university face at this moment?

Catherine Wright: We think that all student issues are being led by increasing enrolment. How can we make sure that the Queen’s is still high quality, despite the increased enrollment, is what we will be focusing on during out time at the AMS.

1. **New Business: Motions 3-9**

**Motion 3:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

That council approve the policy changes to κ: Student Development μ as seen in APPENDIX CLUBS

Moved by: Alex Savides

Seconded by: Alex Shieck

Opening (Alex Savides): So, this policy outlines what it means to be a club or design team, as well as their obligations and expectations within the Society. Additionally, it explains what it means to be ratified by Council. There is one controversial section in the policy with regards to de-ratification, which I am happy to discuss.

Frank Hung: There appears to be a spelling errors within the policy.

Alex Savides: The person responsible for the safety of the design teams is Dean of Engineering. That is the reason for which the team must meet with the Dean, prior to ratification. My apologies for the grammatical errors present.

Alexander Rey: Our apologies for the grammatical errors present. Overall, ERB went through all the policies, and are generally happy with all the changes.

Mike Wetton: Why is the de-ratification process is streamlined to one executive, as opposed to two?

Alex Savides: The way it has been set up, mirrors the AMS policy directly. Additionally, in the chance that the de-ratification must happen quickly, it would be easier to get a hold of one executive, as opposed to two.

Andrew Crawford: Can we add to the motion that the opinion of the Dean is then passed along to Council?

Nick Hetherington: That should be fine. We need that in writing please.

Matthew Lawson: How will the team be notified if they are de-ratified from the Society?

Alex Shieck: Receiving notification vie email should be sufficient.

Michelle McKay: May I suggest that an email is sent out to the team the same day as they are de-ratified. This is just to avoid the spread of any rumours.

Dylan Bram: I think that this is appropriate.

Alex Savides: All of these amendments are a great thing. Thank you for bringing this up. At the end of the day, it’ll make the policy that much better.

Andrew Crawford: I think we’re not getting into a much broader topic. This is an issue that could be addressed individually.

James Gibbard-McCall: Are clubs not allowed to compete in design competitions?

Alex Shieck: They cannot attend competitions, representing Queen’s University.

Alex Savides: The main difference is that design teams have the approval of the faculty, faulty sponsor, as well as finances and development from the University. I hope that makes sense.

Dylan Bram: Part two of my amendment is ready. This specifically has to do with de-ratification at Council. To reiterate, the team will be notified by email immediately after de-ratification, explaining the reason for de-ratification. Additionally, the design teams should be present at Council immediately after de-ratification.

Andrew Crawford: Could we be de-ratifying a team while they are away?

Alex Savides: All travel details are confirmed before departure, therefore we would not be stranding anybody.

Andrew Crawford: I would still like something in policy that would outline that. Just to make sure that we are lot stranding students while they are away.

Motion Passes: 7:55 pm (32 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

**Motion 4:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council Ratifies the Micro Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Design Team, as a Competitive Engineering Design Team

Moved by: Jacky Su

Seconded by: Krysta Peralto

Opening (Jacky Su): Since the last time I was at council, the team has found a faculty sponsor, and team operating space. The faculty sponsor has relevant research experience, and could greatly benefit the team. The room is in McLaughlin Hall.

Alex Shieck: This is a great group. They are mostly composed of first year students. They have a lot of passion, and have developed a great plan. The issue comes down to what is a design teams. I think that they would make a great club, and are unfortunately not ready to become a design team.

Andrew Crawford: Can you please list the ways in which this team doesn’t meet the requirements of being a design team?

Alex Shieck: They have not had a meeting with the Dean. Additionally, they do not have a signature from the Faculty Sponsor to present at Council. The space they have allotted to them is mostly storage space, not suitable for work.

Frank Hung: Does anyone have a problem with this group becoming a design team?

Alex Shieck: Design teams normally start as a club, and then develop into a team. At this point, they are not ready to become an individual design team. Additionally, this group does not year meet the spirit of what design teams are.

Andrew Crawford: What are your issues with becoming a club rather than a team?

Jacky Su: I think that we are more suitable to become a design team due to the amount of interest that has been shown.

Peter Liberty: What is the functional difference between the club and a design team?

Nick Hetherington: Is there any debate on the motion?

Alex Shieck: The difference mostly consist in the way they are viewed by the university administration, and by others outside the university.

Dylan Bram: I would like a bit more information about the interest’s survey. Did it specify the difference between a team and a club?

Jacky Su: In the interest’s survey, we specified that this would be a design team. Additionally, our faculty sponsor has experience in aeronautics and microsystems.

Andrew Crawford: I think this initiative could succeed as a team or a club. The faculty sponsor has very relevant experience, and could benefit them greatly.

Jacqueline Craig: It’s evident that Jacky has done a lot of footwork over the past year. What happens if he isn’t ratified here tonight?

Alex Savides: I’ve been working with them throughout the year. In my experience, these initiatives become teams after first being a club when they are ready to compete with other universities.

Nick Hetherington: The motion is not able to be considered by Council.

**Motion 5:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

That council ratify EngRugby as an Engineering Society Club.

Moved by: Mike Wetton

Seconded by: Alex Shieck

Opening (Mike Wetton): So EngRugby is a great initiative. We want EngRugby to have some of the benefits of being a club, as opposed to just an event. The EngRugby coordinators are here to answer any questions.

Kristy Tu: Why does this go under athletics?

Alex Savides: The reason why is because they are becoming a club, and then athletics is going to be struck down all together.

Alex Wood: Currently EngRugby is subsidizes by the Engineering Society. Will they still be as a club?

Peter Davidson: Currently the net budget of EngRugby is $0.00.

Owen Larson: Clubs get a rollover from year to year. This is something that could greatly benefit us to continue our growth. Specifically, for the purchase of team jerseys.

Jacqueline Craig: What other benefits are there in being a club rather than an event?

Mike Wetton: Becoming a club will greatly benefit EngRugby with respect to having more insurance, and support from the Society.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any more debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 8:18 pm (24 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

**Motion 6:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the policy changes to κ: Student Development as seen in APPENDIX CUT and to γ: Hiring and Transition as seen in APPENDIX CUT AGAIN.

Moved by: Alex Savides

Seconded by: Mike Wetton

Opening (Alex Savides): This is essentially cleaning up the policy with respect to athletics and EngRugby specifically.

Alex Wood: Do the first year athletic reps fall under the athletics policy?

Alex Savides: No.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any more debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 8:26 pm (28 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

**Motion 7:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

That council accepts the policy changes to μ: Conferences and Competitions as seen in APPENDIX CONFERENCES.

Moved by: Michelle McKay

Seconded by: Eleanor McAuley

Opening (Michelle McKay): Both conferences have come through Council in the last few months. Eleanor and I essentially cleaned up the policy with respect to conferences.

Matt Slavin: How exactly are the co-chairs selected? Specifically, what is the appointment committee?

Michelle McKay: Alex Cavalier will be making a friendly amendment to that.

Dylan Bram: I would also like to add the modifications from the clubs de-ratification policy, to the conferences de-ratification policy.

Kristy Tu: Why are some conferences listed under being financed through sponsorship and delegate fees, and others aren’t?

Eleanor McAuley: Previously it was not stated how individual conferences must be funded. The reason some are left out, is because some conferences have a different financial structure, which varies from year to year. Additionally, Michelle is going to make a conference charter template, in order to keep the structure of conferences more organized.

Michelle McKay: The charter reiterates the conference mission statement, the committee members, and general information about the conference.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any more debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 8:37 pm (28 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

**Motion 8:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the policy changes to μ: Conferences and Competitions as seen in APPENDIX FYC.

Moved by: Ryan Cattryse

Seconded by: Eleanor McAuley

Opening (Ryan Cattryse): This policy will essentially clean up the financial organization and operation of the First Year Conference. Specifically, we won’t have to use the big bank account of EngSoc. This will make the overall financial structure better.

Erin Murphy: How detailed is the FYC budget going to be?

Ryan Cattryse: That will depend on the decision made by next year’s Director of First Year. My suggestion would be to make the budget as detailed as possible.

Alex Wood: Why move this from an events to a conference, if it’s an event just for first year students?

Ryan Cattryse: This is done mostly to control the rollover of money from year to year. By extension, this will help the conference grow from year to year.

Eric McElroy: I would like to voice that there is a lot of money that is put into this conference every year. By making separate budget lines, it will become a lot more transparent where the money is going, and how it is being spent.

Stephen Martin: I just wanted to express my concern, that I don’t believe that the conference is sustainable without money from the Engineering Society.

Carolyn Fisher: I’d just like to point out that the First Year Conference doesn’t benefit just the first years. It has ramifications to all years.

Peter Davidson: I just wanted to bring forward that for other conferences ratified the annual contribution from the society was $200.00, and over $3,000.00 for the First Year Conference.

Dylan Bram: First Year Conference is a lot different from any other conference. It focuses specifically on first year students, and thus it is very difficult to find support for the conference from outside resources. Additionally, it would make more sense to have this under the Director of First Year’s portfolio.

Mike Bodley: Is there room for growth within the conference itself?

Ryan Cattryse: This year ticket sales were not as big as past years. It will be my suggestion to the incoming director of First Year to put more effort into marketing of the event.

Jamil Pirani: I’d just like to point out the importance of this conference to the future development of the Society.

Kristy Tu: In order for the First Year Conference to become sustainable, is to be ratified as a conference.

Peter Davidson: Just for the sake of information, last year the FYC generated a profit of $1,000.00.

Michelle McKay: I believe that $1,000.00 came from an anonymous donation.

Matt Slavin: I think what we need to focus on is this is better served as an event under the director of First Year’s portfolio, rather than ratifying it as a conference.

Michelle McKay: So there are several things that have been brought up. I personally think that the FYC should be ratified as a conference. In terms of the logistics, the way FYC is run is identical to other ratified conferences. Sponsorship for all conferences can vary greatly from year to year.

Dylan Bram: I would like to echo the point Matt Slavin has made. FYC should be put under the portfolio of the director of First Year.

Alex Shieck: Has there ever been a year when the sponsorship was outweighed by the money given by EngSoc?

Ryan Cattryse: No it has not.

Peter Davidson: From a financial standpoint it would be better to move FYC under the portfolio of the director of Conferences.

Dylan Bram: If we are going to by ratifying FYC as a conference, we should be doing it properly. They should come to council with a presentation, and be ready to answer any of our questions.

Alex Savides: I motion to table the motion.

Motion Passes: 9:35 pm (26 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

**Motion 9:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

That council approve the first reading of the changes to By Law 9: Society Supported Initiatives as seen in APPENDIX FIX BYLAW.

Moved by: Eleanor McAuley

Seconded by: Alex Savides

Opening (Eleanor McAuley): This is essentially fixing the list in this by-law section. Besides that, I think everything else is good. We are specifically focusing on conferences, and EngRugby.

Ryan Cattryse: I’d like to amend FYC from this motion.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any more debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 9:39 pm (21 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

**Motion 10:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

The cost of $881.40 be approved to hire a lawyer for an initial assessment of the incorporation of the Engineering Society.

Moved by: Peter Davidson

Seconded by: Morgan Roff

Opening (Peter Davidson): Incorporation has been a long term topic of the Engineering Society. The board of directors is now taking it upon themselves to lead the way with incorporating the society. Overall, it’s an old idea that keeps coming up. In general, it has finally become advantageous for us to incorporate as a society. This fee would cover a 3 hour meeting with a lawyer, and all additional legal fees.

Andrew Crawford: Would the results of this meeting with a lawyer be brought to council?

Peter Davidson: Naturally.

Matthew Lawson: What are you hoping to get out of this meeting?

Peter Davidson: Unfortunately, we are not lawyers. At the end of the day, we simply need some professional legal advice.

Peter Liberty: What are the effects of incorporating?

Jay Young: That is one of the reasons that we are looking to coordinate a meeting with a lawyer. Most of it has to do with liability.

Nick Hetherington: Is there any more debate on the motion?

Motion Passes: 9:48 pm (24 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)

1. **Break – 9:50 pm**

Break ends: 9:55 pm

1. **Executive Reports**
2. **President**

Carolyn Fisher: Elections are happening. It’s really busy. Sci’ Formal finally has a theme, it’s a toga party! AutoCAD workshops now have a waiting list.

1. **VP (Student Affairs)**

Alex Savides: Read my report for more information. Most importantly, director applications are now online.

1. **VP (Operations)**

Peter Davidson: My report is pretty brief. The Imaginus poster sale is happening. I don’t know many details yet, but email me if you’re interested.

1. **Conferences**

Michelle McKay: Last weekend FYC ran quite smoothly. It was a good time. QSC and CIRQUE are selling tickets, so make sure to get those. My FYPCO and I launched the internal conference website, so take a look at it. We’d love some feedback. We’ve also looking at the hiring timelines for conferences, to make them more convenient for students.

1. **First Year**

Ryan Cattryse: FYC ran very smoothly. We’re going to be starting transitions soon. FREC hiring is also coming up, so try and help out your FROSH and grand-FROSH.

1. **Internal Affairs**

Eleanor McAuley: I’ve been working on the policy that came to council tonight. Make sure to spread the word about “50 and Go”.

1. **Design**

Alex Shieck: TBOG went to Kelowna, and forgot to pay for hotels. It was dealt with.

1. **Services**

Mike Bodley: You can read through my report. Most importantly, our two Science Quest Directors were hired.

1. **Communications**

Stephen Penstone: As of today EngSoc has 2000 like on Facebook. We’ve been putting a lot of time into the “50 and Go” campaign. Hopefully we can set an all-time record.

1. **Information Technology**

Eric McElroy: I’ve had an email conversation with Steven Hunt today. We now have unlimited access to Lynda.com. Which is really exciting.

1. **Events**

Mike Wetton: Fix and Clean is happening a second event. EngWeek was a lot of fun. I’d also like to tell everyone that if you are ever doing anything at Fluid, make sure to get a contract from them.

1. **Faculty Board Report**

James Gibbard-McCall: It was one of the shortest meetings ever. The big news is that we now have a new laser.

Stephanie Reed: We talked a bit about international enrolment. There working hard to get more international students.

1. **Alma Mater Society Report**

Dylan Bram: It’s been a fun week for AMS. The new executive has been appointed, and the Student Trustee debates have been happening. Also, we saw the redesign of the JDUC, and it does have a bridge.

1. **Senate Report**

Alex Cavalier: Senate has not met yet. Nothing to report.

1. **Board of Directors Report**

Morgan Roff: The board has not met yet. Nothing to report.

1. **Engineering Review Board**

Alexander Rey: We went over the ED team reviews, and over the new policies that were presented at this Council.

1. **Club Reports**
2. **ChemEngChem**

Ryan Cattryse: There’s a BNOGNO tonight. There’re also discipline nights coming up. Finally, they’re meeting with the faculty to discuss curriculum issues.

1. **Civil**

Valery Brown: We had our industry fair today it was pretty good.

1. **Apple Math**

Jacqueline Craig: This week we’re being social, and informational next week.

1. **Geological**

Frank Hung: We won an event at BEWIC, and working with CEO to sort out the clothing issues.

1. **Year Reports**
	* 1. **Sci’ 15**

Matt Slavin: We have met. Iron Ring ceremony is on Marc 15th, and we’ve working on ideas for a ThankQ gift.

* + 1. **Sci’ 16**

Stephen Martin: Super-semi is coming up. Stay tuned.

* + 1. **Sci’ 17**

Curtis Lindsey: We started selling semi-formal tickets. We’ve sold a lot of flasks. And we’re having another night at Clark soon.

* + 1. **Sci’ 18**

Avery Cole: We’re planning an event at Fluid for this term. Won a few events at BEWIC. Everyone is going to discipline nights.

1. **Statements and Questions by Members**

Alex Shieck: Why is the Engineering Society here? What are we really offering students while they are here? So how does this relate to up and out hiring policy? Essentially do we hire the best people to do the best job, or do we hire new people to allow them to grow?

Andrew Crawford: Can we motion to committee of a whole?

Nick Hetherington: Yes we can. Just a reminder that the chair still stays in control of the discussion.

Peter Davidson: In short, the up and out policy was created by last year’s executive. Its spirit was trying to cycle as many people through the Society as possible. For example, a manager would not be able to take on a position of staff.

Alex Shieck: Right now the policy is up for interpretation. That’s why it’s important that the policy is honed, and remains consistent through the years. So I’ve gone through a lot of policy, in order to see in what way this can be best utilized. Overall, EngSoc mission statements focus on the growth of the Society, not the growth of the individual. As an example, we have had a director of service applying for the position of a head manager of a service. So is that fair with respect to other applicants? And should we sacrifice the quality of services, in order to give someone an ability to learn on the job?

Mike Bodley: Something that Alex Wood and I is that there are positions within the Society that are for personal growth. And other, for which we need the best possible person for the job. So what are we trying to discuss here?

Alex Savides: The wording of the up and out policy in some places shies away from the spirit of the policy in some places. Thus, it clearly needs to be reworded.

Dylan Bram: Can I advise that we put in an introduction that describes the spirit of the policy. This should clarify any further discussions on the policy.

Alex Shieck: Still however, are you guys here for the betterment of the 500 or the 3000? I’m just interested to know.

Andrew Crawford: To echo what has been said, there are position within the Society that are for personal development, and others that need experience.

Carolyn Fisher: I’d just like to clarify that no one gets hired for personal growth.

Alexander Rey: The up and out policy was designed with the best of intentions. My suggestion would be to set a motion for changing parts of the policy, and bringing it to Council at a later time.

Mike Bodley: Personally, I think this is a discussion for a different night. We’re starting to talk about the very essence of the Society, and now is not the time for that.

Alex Shieck: The reason I brought this up now is because people are applying for positions now, and it’s important for them to know how decisions this year will influence them later on.

Matt Slavin: The issue I have is that here are so many people in the society that are not in this room, that think they can take on any job within the society.

Erin Murphy: The up and out policy is really most limiting to the members of the executive, and the director of services.

Alex Shieck: I just don’t think we should ever have a policy that limits people from applying for a position.

Andrew Crawford: This is overall a very touchy subject. At the end of the day, you have to determine what kind of job you are hiring for.

Meara Hampton: I personally have had the impression that if you’re not involved in EngSoc from first year, it’s really hard to break through. Just having that past experience is something that can greatly benefit you in further going through the ranks.

Stephen Martin: I think it’s important that as a Society, we portray an image that we are welcoming people who are willing to work hard and try new things. We’re not here to simply have the most efficient system possible, but also to grow the people.

Dylan Bram: Overall, making a policy that doesn’t allow directors to apply for positions below them would benefit us in the long run.

 **Motion to Close:**

Moved by: Carolyn Fisher

Seconded by: Peter Davidson

Motion Passes: 11:20 pm (28 for, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions)