Engineering Society Council Minutes

February 25, 2016

Dunning Hall Room 12

Speaker: Ryan Cattrysse

Secretary: Caitlin Stewart

Meeting Begins: 6:00

1. **Attendance**

Ryan Cattrysse: If you have your clickers, please press one if you have your own vote, and press two if you are a proxy. We are also going to manually count if you have your own vote; please hold your hands high. Thank you very much.

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

**Motion 1:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of February 25th, 2016 as seen on the EngSoc website.

Moved by: Julianna Jeans

Seconded by: Ryan Cattrysse

Opening (Julianna Jeans): I have one small change – strike second discussion period (advisory board). That’s all for me.

Ryan: Any more debate?

Motion Passes: 6:02 (30, 0, 0)

1. **Adoption of the Minutes**

**Motion 2:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of February 4th, 2016 as seen on the EngSoc website.

Moved by: Lianne Zelsman

Seconded by: Julianna Jeans

Opening (Lianne Zelsman): Let me know if you need anything changed.

Caitlin Stewart: I would appreciate it if you are patient with me getting back into the swing of things, and please help me with your name and positions, friends! Good to be back for one last council.

Motion Passes: 6:04 (30, 0, 0)

1. **Speaker’s Business**

Ryan Cattrysse: Welcome everyone to our last council of the session. Caitlin is filling in as our secretary as Lianne got an unforeseen promotion. Please state your names and state your acronyms before you use them so I don’t go insane. We have a long list today so buckle in and let’s get going.

1. **Break (of the pizza variety) – 6:05-6:10**
2. **Presentations**
	1. **Queen’s Space Conference: A Year in Review**

Ben Luymes: As you will notice in the motion, we were on probation this year due to a breach in hiring policy which involved the decision that we were unfairly hired as a few rules were broken. This was not allowed to happen and we weren’t allowed to hire a committee. Therefore, we had less time to plan as we had to hire in October. There isn’t currently any detailed policy on probation, but as specified at the beginning of our probation, we had our finances frequently audited and it was stipulated that we would have meetings with the EngSoc and be monitored throughout our time. The meetings didn’t really end up happening, but we thought that was fine as we were being monitored and things were fine.

Jasvinder Singh Kundi: We want to talk about the success of our conference. We had a competition within the conferences – between QCBM, CIRQUE, and QSC. We had higher admission costs due to less time to get sponsors. We had a growth in delegation, and also had more external delegates. We also had 8 schools involved, bumped up our speakers, and boosted our public attendance by approx. 600%. McMaster sent the largest group, but we had a 60-40 split between Queen’s students and external delegates, which will help the conference grow.

Ben Luymes: After the conference we heard a lot of great things. We had an amazing speaker who does work with open space orbitals. They shared stuff about the conference and let others know about it. We were also featured in a Journal article. We had a great lineup of speakers – the main highlight being Robert Thirsk, but we also had presidents from multiple Canadian Space companies.

Jasvinder Singh Kundi: Lawrence Harris was principle investigator in space industry, as well. Both our speakers and delegates enjoyed our conference equally as much. We want you to understand our growth going forward. We want to get Roberta Bondar, Robert Thirsk again, Marc Garneau, and others. We also hope to increase long-term sponsorship opportunities. We grew our conference so much this year and had nothing but positive feedback from delegates and speakers alike.

Loralyn Blondin: I would like to commend you on the amazing job you did, especially with external delegates. What are you passing on via advice to the next generation?

Jasvinder Singh Kundi: I would say to take advantage of the available resources – EngSoc especially. We didn’t use this enough this year.

Alex Doig: You mentioned that certain probationary terms were not met. Why did this happen?

Ben Luymes: I am not sure why they didn’t happen. The few terms of our probation were audits, finances and status meetings. The other two happened, but for the meetings, we were never contacted to have them.

Alex Wood: The main reason the meetings didn’t happen is that they were meeting regularly with the Director of Conferences, and everything seemed to be going well. They have done a stellar job.

Matt Lawson: You showed ticket prices going up due to a lack of sponsorship. It is also true that CEEC and other conferences have high prices. Are you looking to cap your prices going forward?

Jasvinder Singh Kundi: We want to graduate to the Canadian Undergraduate Space Conference eventually. We want to be the forefront of this in the country because there is nothing like it right now. We want ticket prices to go down while delegates go up. We do feel that the extra time would have helped us with sponsorship and to have a full committee would have also helped.

Ben Luymes: With ticket prices staying high, we could offer the delegates a lot more. This year it was mostly to cover hotel costs.

* 1. **Updates on Fall Reading Break**

Tyler Lively: Orientation week is on the mind of the university right now, if not the focus. We are dealing with real mental health concerns, as well as having the university looking like they are addressing mental health concerns. With the current proposed plan, classes would start on the Wednesday after Labor Day, leaving three days for orientation week. This could involve moving some of the O-week days to the weekends, or it could involve just cutting it, that would be up to SOARB. I’ll give some background: in 2013, it was looked into having two 13 week terms with no week-long breaks. They looked into having a broader consultation about having a fall reading week and received negative feedback, especially from students. There was similar proposal feedback from September, but the opinion was evenly split. Organized by support by faculty – engineering strongly opposed, but other faculties were close to 50-50. For some further background, and something interesting and unusual: after the first day, we saw a divergence of opinion to a strong opinion on the no side. We believe this is because of an effect of rallying colleagues and friends to vote the same way. For next steps, it is very clear based on the feedback that this is a very divided university, so it is tough to advocate for either side. There are flaws in the process, as this was not seen outside the Committee on Academic Procedures until Tuesday. We are looking for more outside feedback. Please write your feedback to the Queen’s University Senate, not Dean Woodhouse, as this will have a bigger effect. That will be presented when senate goes to vote on this in April.

Alex Shieck: For the survey that was sent out, I didn’t put in a response because I am on SOARB. Did the question display how this plan would affect orientation week?

Kanivanan Chinniah: Yes, it was clear that it would affect O-week.

Stephan Dobri: Do you know of any information that shows whether people think that having a reading week will help mental health?

Kanivanan Chinniah: The Principal’s Commission on mental health had a specific recommendation in it to evaluate fall reading week. There is no specific evidence saying that it would help directly, but a lot of people are talking about it in the context of mental health.

Erin Murphy: Referring to the SCAP report, what type of turnout did you get from students (how many people responded)?

Tyler Lively: about 4030.

Eleanor McAuley: Moving forward with proper process, what is your plan?

Tyler Lively: Good question. The issue we are facing now is that it is going to be decided if we are going to do it or not this year. We are going to call for process at the Senate meeting. We hope it is voted down. If so, this could be tabled for a couple years, or they will appoint a group to discuss and detail this further.

Kanivanan Chinniah: We can’t do it without you. We need people to email senate@queensu.ca. Focus on the fact that the first time we have had this proposal was Tuesday, so it is not realistic to expect this to be approved in two months’ time. We need to express that SCAP failed to meet the minimum standard of a community process.

Stewart Jensen: Is there a breakdown at this point in the three day o-week between what is faculty and university orientation?

Tyler Lively: At this point we can’t dictate which days are which. This would be up to the faculties and SOARB.

Stewart Jensen: They clearly seem to want this. Is there any recourse that students have?

Kanivanan Chinniah: It is one man’s agenda right now, professor Morelli. He is trying to push this through without any thought of how this will really affect students, and he is using his own agenda.

Eric McElroy: Many people in this room believe that Jordan Morelli is nothing more than a wonderful professor who is very conscious of student well-being. I won’t tolerate any attack on him like that.

Kanivanan Chinniah: He doesn’t seem like that. He seems to be trying to force this issue not based on other feedback. There are options that we can pursue after showing hesitation with the process.

Jacqueline Craig: With this coming from SCAP, again to McElroy’s point, this is not just coming from one person, it is also from other members of SCAP.

Alex Shieck: Is it clear that students can vote more than once?

Kanivanan Chinniah: We eliminated that possibility by tracking netIDs.

Alex Cavaliere: A few weeks ago, this body voted on a statement related to fall reading week. Have you seen that create any waves within the AMS or Senate? Also, the survey had a questions related to pre-exam study days. Can you comment on those?

Tyler Lively: The question on the survey was if one day needed to be cut, which one, faculty or university? 85-15 were for a university orientation day being cut. As far as the statement, I have not heard any impact with SCAP or Senate. None of us managed to anticipate that they would move forward with this so quickly. What we have to do now is to de-legitimize SCAP, asking students to do all of those things to raise concerns with the process that SCAP is following.

Jacqueline Craig: Do you have a unified plan?

Kanivanan Chinniah: Our plan is that we want the university to start this working group. Now that there is an immediate issue at senate, we have to make sure that the senators know that this is an issue. We came here today because you invited us to come quite urgently. Our plan right know is to notify the senators to notify their faculties on the process, specifically that it doesn’t include a broad section of the community, and they ought to do that.

Tyler Lively: What we’re dealing with is that there is now a motion for senate, so the university will not strike a working group to discuss the feasibility.

Ryan Cattrysse: We are going to limit your responses to three minutes now, just so you know.

Alexander Rey: I commend you on taking the position to oppose it on process grounds, which is exactly the right way to go about it. I have a question about the survey: do you think the results are still particularly valid since the proposal has changed so considerably?

Kanivanan Chinniah: Of the people that said no, the overwhelming majority said no because of the disruption to faculty orientation. In this proposal it remains that it would disrupt faculty orientation, so we thing it is still valid.

Alexander Rey: More broadly, how does it affect the other faculties?

Kanivanan Chinniah: It is actually is across the board that students oppose the effect on orientation week. All the students that opposed, did so because of the disruption it would cause to faculty orientation.

Brandan Tsong: I have to leave for a midterm so I am proxying my vote to Rachel McConnell.

Emily Townshend: What is being proposed is less a prescriptive thing that faculties can either take or leave. How will the inconsistencies with this work, and what will the education to the faculties in this regard be?

Kanivanan Chinniah: We are privately telling that to all the Deans, but right now we are focusing on the process angle. That is something that we will be considering at a later time.

Evan Dressel: Could you elaborate on the process that was taken on deciding this reading week and who was consulted? What is your timeline in the consultation of the senators?

Tyler Lively: This discussion has been going on for some time and a lot of people have been consulted, but we don’t believe that this feedback has been incorporated. I don’t have a vote there, so it is frustrating and concerning. We talked about the negative feedback from town halls and related meetings. We aren’t listened to, so we need the student voice.

Kanivanan Chinniah: We will be doing a package to give to the different faculties. Two weeks from now will be when we bring the rest of everyone on board.

Emily Townshend: What is your plan with the adult senators?

Kanivanan Chinniah: We have existing relationships with each of them by way of individual lobbying and/or emailing each of them. We are not sure if we will include the student senate caucus yet. We will make sure they all hear from us though.

Stephan Dobri: You mentioned you are talking to senators so they will talk to their constituents. How will you make this information more readily available (i.e. an Appendix with all of the actual breakdown in it)? I think it is necessary to get that information out to all of the students.

Kanivanan Chinniah: The last time we sent an email to everyone about fall reading week, we got 4000 responses, so we will do that again.

Tyler Lively: Students are passionate about this. When we sit down with our marketing manager, we are going to leverage the word of mouth effect.

Alex Shieck: Are you for or against this plan?

Kanivanan Chinniah: The AMS is officially neutral.

Alex Shieck: If this goes through, over the summer all the student members will be gone, and it will be difficult for student members to skype in. SOARB will shoot this down. The numbers realty start swaying it. How do you get that larger voice? How are you getting other groups to come forward with a group voice?

Tyler Lively: The current proposal is that this would start for 2018. With the student members of SOARB, they are not going to talk about the contingency until student members are back, under my suggestion. In terms of leveraging the people who are here now and will be in April, we are going to be talking to senators, informing students, and developing a communication plan.

Alex Shieck: There is a decent case history of motions being brought to SOARB that are controversial to students in the summer and being steamrolled by the adult members.

Alex Cavaliere: Have you given thought to how this will affect departments that are split between different faculties (complementary studies in engineering, for example)? When is this being voted on at Senate – two senate meetings in the future? If so, this is right at the end of exam period and many students will be gone, therefore making it hard to ensure numbers to draw attention to it. Is this meeting date new?

Tyler Lively: It has been known since January. We were hoping to get it into the March Senate meeting. The wording wasn’t finalized until February, so there is not much we can do at this point.

Mary McLachlan: I am back now, so I can take my proxied vote back.

Eleanor McAuley: You really need students to share their voice. What are you doing directly to go to faculty societies to explain that you are trying to attack the process? This has been very useful – are you planning to do this elsewhere?

Kanivanan Chinniah: We were planning to do that soon.

Jacqueline Craig: I invited them this week because it was my last council and I thought it would be beneficial for me to be here.

Alex Shieck: You are representing a spectrum of students. Has the AMS taken a stance against the procedural process?

Kanivanan Chinniah: Yes, after the assembly this week.

1. **Discussion Period: Discipline Club Summit**

Alex Wood: The weekend before reading week we sat down with the discipline clubs and had a chat about discipline club relationships with EngSoc. The major stuff that came out of that included event sanctioning, and we had a good discussion. For a few of our deliverables: we are meeting with Kyle tomorrow to outline a solid document detailing what type of events you need to be sanctioned and need a StuCon for, as it is a very broad definition currently. We are also looking into developing a safety and security bursary to supplement the cost of StuCons for events, and this will be our biggest change. Additionally, we are looking into an events bursary. We want to give them more funding because they don’t get a lot. The amount of the bursary is yet to be determined, but the clubs could apply. The interest was expressed on this vs. just giving them more money, as there is more accountability this way. We are also talking more about requiring more training, especially for the presidents. They will have to receive training soon. What are your thoughts on the changes as of right now? One last thing – not all of this will be coming to AGM, some will be passed over throughout the weeks so we don’t rush through.

Jacqueline Craig: A clarification for the bursary – will the safety and security one be open to other groups, or just for discipline clubs?

Alex Wood: Ideally it would be open to all groups, but this is not flushed out completely. The events one would just be for discipline clubs.

Eleanor McAuley: How do you see this process working? As in x bursaries for x dollars?

Alex Wood: I sit on two different bursary board with the AMS, so we are looking at a similar process. There would be a committee elected from council that would look at the proposals once or twice a year. There would be a minimum amount of time you must give the bursary in order to get it, and it would also layout specific guidelines.

Eric McElroy: Are there any discipline club reps that were there that could speak on whether it was valuable?

Erin Murphy: I proxied this meeting for Sam Grant and took notes. I thought it was valuable. You got to hear both sides - EngSoc and student groups, specifically with regards to risk and liability. Well covered also was training that is to be implemented. One of the big things we came to the conclusion to is that people should have various types of equity training including positive space, as well as basic EngSoc training available to everyone, not just people who sit on council. Also ensuring that the president of each discipline club should have both positive space and equity training and PSC.

Alex Cavaliere: I was also in attendance. I would like to say it went very well and I’d like to thank Alex Wood for having this summit. If you read his report, it outlines some details, and I am in favour of all of them. On that note, I am glad to see there is a motion coming tonight on some of these things. Geo has had some tough relationships with the society this year, so I am waiting to see the action taken on these now. If things happen as discussed, I will be happy with the outcome.

Alex Shieck: There has been a generally bigger push for StuCons at events. Previously you could use alternate security at other locations. Has there been a shift in this? For example, the Mining banquet: one of the organizers had a tri-pub ban and couldn’t attend the banquet he planned. Will you have to go with StuCons in the future?

Galvin Niu: I will be proxying my vote to Lilly Nicholls as I have to leave.

Alex Wood: Generally the rule of thumb is that StuCons will be required for off-campus events where alcohol is served. Not necessarily for hotels. At venues with their own security (i.e. Fluid, nightclub), that would be acceptable, otherwise it would need to be approved.

Alex Shieck: What is the difference between a bar and a hotel that has a bar? To everyone, be careful when you state things as facts, sometimes this has not been true in the past.

Alex Wood: The difference is that hotels don’t have their own security, therefore you are liable, where bars do.

Jacqueline Craig: The consensus seems to be that it’s a good thing. What are your hopes and dreams with this?

Alex Wood: I am excited that the presidents will be getting training. The trouble with event sanctioning is the lack of communication between the AMS and the discipline clubs. I am looking forward to having this group meet more regularly in the future (twice a year). This helps share ideas, improves communication, improves relationship with EngSoc, and between disciplines. That is my dream; that more joint events will happen. I would like to thank everyone. The biggest thing that I am trying to figure out is if everyone is ok with bursaries. Before we go forward, can we do a straw poll – who is on board for the bursaries? We will do more looking into the event bursary.

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

**Motion 3:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council remove Queen’s Space Conference’s probationary status and reinstate them to full non-conditional ratified conference status effective immediately.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: JT

Opening (Alex Wood): To begin I am going to make a small amendment due to a chat regarding finances. I am going to change it to read “effective upon attaining good financial standing with the Engineering Society.” The idea is that there is currently an external account and they are in the red with their EngSoc account. We have to make sure this is all fine before we restore them. They did amazing things this year, I hope you reinstate them.

Alex Cavaliere: As chair of a similarly-timelined conference, I want to commend Jas and Ben on their work this year.

Loralyn Blondin: I would like to echo that, they did an amazing job.

Alexander Rey: I think this motion shows a really good framework for how well the probation period can work. I think the space conference did an awesome job this year.

Eric McElroy: I commend them on their conference. Regarding the actions that were taken last year, I think we need to review the policy regarding probation. Is there going to be some recourse for groups regarding the validity of their probation? The space conference probation regulations were not very specific and not even followed/enforced. I hope that this will open a further discussion on the topic.

JT: Often times you don’t see something going wrong until it goes wrong. Since we didn’t have a framework for implementing a probation, it goes to show how important it is to do that now. We didn’t do it before, but we are committed to making sure that the next team has the information and gets the initial work that we have done. I encourage you to keep the next exec accountable in this effort – it is also everyone here’s responsibility to convey your desire to have this more mandated process. Apologies to space conference for the bitterness and tension at the beginning. I didn’t attend the conference, but I still have great things to say about them.

Stephan Dobri: With starting this process with the next team, could I ask any of the space conference members about the probationary measures and what feedback they have for that process moving forward?

JT: I think what you are getting at is for the chairs who experienced this process, what elements that applied to them for this year do they think would be valuable to be applied to a standardized process?

Jasvinder Singh Kundi: I would recommend that it be taken into consideration to rebuild this process from the ground up. None of the things that were presented toward us were solid or had any consequences. We followed everything, but it wasn’t the probation that led to our success, it was our hard work.

Motion Passes: 7:25 (30, 0, 0)

**Motion 4:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council approve the recommendations of the BED Head Board for the purchases of each discipline proposal listed here: Apple Math, Civil, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Engineering Physics, Geological, Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Mining as seen in APPENDIX “BBBEDDD”.

Moved by: Jacqueline Craig

Seconded by: Mark Tamming

Opening (Jacqueline Craig): I yield my opening.

Mark Tamming: I am the BED Fund manager. We are proposing to spend approximately $60,000 on things this year. We worked hard with the disciplines and vetted them with discipline reps and the board. If you have any questions, we can answer them.

Evan Dressel: Can we open our laptops to view the full reports?

Ryan Cattrysse: I will allow that if you put them away after this motion.

Jacqueline Craig: I would like to make a change to the motion regarding a few specific totals. Under the section Mechanical – Toolboxes, the total is $1285, not $4760, changing that subtotal to $12,605. Also under the section Mechanical – Tele. Equip., the total is $4760. These changes make the new total $57,042.90. I also want to mention and thank all of the people who worked so hard on this. Chemical is not in here today because they have already been approved.

Siobhan Powell: Thank you to everyone who worked on this. I think the Geo sums also do not add up.

Jacqueline Craig: I will fix that as well.

Mark Tamming: The summary sheets have the error, not the actual proposal, which should be fine.

Alex Shieck: Some years we don’t spend it all, some we do. Can you speak to this for this year?

Mark Tamming: We collected $120,000, and are proposing to spend about $90,000 in total. The first year rep was not able to propose ideas, not to his fault. He did get feedback, but couldn’t find a place for it to go.

Jacqueline Craig: I also wanted to thank the first year rep, he did an awesome job.

Erin Murphy: Are there reasons that certain things were rejected in the file?

Jacqueline Craig: The notes of the BED Head Board are not there, so the exact reasons things were rejected aren’t there. But as standard practice, they weren’t put out. If you have any questions, I would be happy to take them.

Evan Dressel: Why was Civil’s projector denied, when others were accepted?

Jacqueline Craig: $400 was a lot to spend on a projector screen. If it was needed in these new buildings, they would have come with it. The other ones were more required at their specific locations.

Erin Murphy: Why was the Mechanical micro-indentation repair rejected?

Jacqueline Craig: The cost was to supplement the faculty to repair it so we thought it should come under a faculty budget line. We hope that the BED fund should be used to its fullest extent, so that’s why that was redirected to another source.

Emily Townshend: I would like to commend council for fighting on not spending money. I am happy we are spending this on good things.

Avery Cole: The numbers for Geo do add up, there is just more than one of something which was not written down.

Jacqueline Craig: Thank you to everyone who has been in this process. Thank you for listening to me. Thank you to all those who put this together. We took a lot of council’s feedback from last year for the BED fund and tried to incorporate it as best we could. That being said, the BED fund coordinator position is awesome and will be hired soon. Thank you for being invested this year. They are all A+ things to spend the money on, so I implore you to vote yes.

Motion Passes: 7:37 (30, 0, 0)

Sam Grant: I would like to proxy my vote to Alex Shieck as I have to leave.

**Motion 5:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council approve of the changes to By-Law 6: Departmental Clubs as seen in APPENDIX “PRESIDENT-TRAIN”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Julianna Jeans

Opening (Alex Wood): This is what we spoke about briefly earlier. This is the most obvious concrete result coming out of the summit. The bylaw as it currently stands says that they may receive training, so we would like to make it mandatory. This is a sign of good faith that we will be following up with ideas brought up at the summit.

Alexander Rey: How does this work being the last session of this run of council, it being the last meeting of this council session?

Julianna Jeans: The second reading of this motion will be at AGM.

Alex Cavaliere: I would like to draw attention to a fact that I hope will be amended for the second reading: changing this to be under obligations, not rights and privileges.

Stephan Dobri: Can you go into more detail about what this details?

Alex Wood: Officer training hasn’t really happened in the past years. There is supposed to be financial, hiring, and EngSoc training. I would like it to include equity training as well. We are adding it like this with the stipulation that it is included but not limited to so we can add that in later.

Eleanor McAuley: I would like to propose an amendment for the motion to read that this is the first reading of the amendment to the bylaw.

Alex Wood: Friendly.

Siobhan Powell: Has there been any consideration of extending this to design team captains?

Alex Wood: My dream is that this will eventually extend to anyone who oversees volunteers.

Stephan Dobri: In that case, please work with the AMS to make sure that teams don’t have to do the same training twice.

Alex Shieck: In the past financial training has taken place in the beginning of both semesters. Take into account that design teams are transitioning every couple of weeks, and during the summer, so twice a year might not work.

Steven Martin: I think this is a great way to legitimize the relationship between the engineering society and the discipline clubs.

Motion Passes: 7:44 (29, 1, 0)

Amira Gill: I have to go, so I am proxying Paige Leedale’s vote to Emma Howard.

**Motion 6:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council approve the changes to the Engineering Society Policy Manual, as seen in “APPENDIX MAKE IT RAIN”, and as described in “APPENDIX UMBRELLA”.

Moved by: Jane Ferguson

Seconded by: Eleanor McAuley

Opening (Jane Ferguson): I yield my opening to Eleanor.

Eleanor McAuley: I am the polished chair of the advisory board. Alex Crawford and I have been outlining some ideas where our policy can be fixed, specifically with financial policy. We want to fix it first, and then change it later. There are substantive changes and formatting changes. I will outline the substantive ones: the honoraria section has been changed, going to John Orr. We are also changing the amount limitations. This will make it more flexible but still overseen by council. We also moved the financial policy sections around, causing some name changes.

Erin Murphy: Specifically with regards to line taking out specific director team thank yous: I am a former director and you do work ridiculous quantities, and I fear if we remove the stipulation that these people will be thanked, we will forget to properly say thank you. Putting in 40 hours a week is not easy, and I think it should be rewarded.

Jane Fergusson: We are already accounting for that in the budget, so removing it just gives us more flexibility for what we can do with the appreciation.

Alex Shieck: In the last couple years, there have been times that motions have been brought forward to remove the honorarium for directors. They have been overwhelming support to keep this appreciation. If we don’t have this in writing, things get forgotten. The executive honorariums are written into to policy, why are you taking our the directors?

Eleanor McAuley: The executive one is a larger amount of money, potentially involving taking care of tuition to alleviate financial hardship. There are clear stipulations on how this is done which are not as flexible. We removed the ED honorarium as we thought it limited the scope of what the thank-you can be. If it’s in policy, it has to be what is in there. Good transitioning can alleviate any concern of it getting left behind.

Quinlan Hickey: I need to proxy my vote to Alex Doig.

Sarah Taylor: I need to proxy my vote to Hazik Ahmad.

Matthew Morcoccia: I need to proxy my vote to Tyler Bennett.

Ryan Cattrysse: We have to do a quorum count, so please raise your hand if you are a regular voting member with your own vote.

Julianna Jeans: We are at 19, quorum is 18. Keep that in mind.

Alexander Rey: I think that as a general rule, this motion makes a ton of sense. We don’t want to be prescribing these thankyous – this creates limitations and adds to the bulk of the policy manual. It makes sense to remove them from a government standpoint.

Alex Shieck: I fully agree there doesn’t need to be a specific thing in policy, however I do believe there should be something. Sometimes transitioning is not done well, and there can be many interpretations of the same policy line. Can we put something general in there as a reminder to those in the future to make sure that these people who are working generally thankless jobs get their thank you?

Eleanor McAuley: One of the big reasons of removing it is removing the hierarchy of the thank yous. There are others, such as design team captains, that also put in a ton of work, and their thank yous have been taken out of policy. It removes a hierarchical issue as how this process works. I agree that honorarium is an issue, and might be moving forward, but I don’t see what is in there right now solves any of the problems that have been brought up.

JT: We have discussed this at length, and evaluated the type of appreciation that we provide. There is no doubt that these people give a ton of their time towards these volunteer position. I spearheaded this discussion, and can see it being added as a line in the president’s responsibilities to ensure this group is appreciated if we are looking to include it in policy in the future.

Jacqueline Craig: I have heard a lot of repetition, but I think we have heard them enough and now need to move on.

Matthew Lawson: I completely support this motion. It should be up to the manager how they appreciate the staff beneath them.

Alex Shieck: I agree that everyone needs appreciation, and I wish that everyone should have a line that says appreciate these people. The one thing that you can’t avoid is that we have gone from a bunch of people with reminders to appreciate to a single group has actually made things more hierarchical.

Eric McElroy: I would like to draw to the attention of council line b.13, which is not actually changed, but we are past this deadline mentioned.

Jane Ferguson: I am not sure the last time this happened.

Erin Murphy: The last time it happened was before Shwane Kowee.

Jane Ferguson: Since this hasn’t happened in the past couple years, we didn’t deem it necessary to bring it. We are working on it and will make sure it is passed on to the next group.

Jacqueline Craig: Who is on the speaking queue?

Ryan Cattrysse: You.

Jacqueline Craig: I yield

Closing was yielded.

Motion Passes: 8:04 (26, 1, 3)

**Motion 7:**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council approve the changes to section Theta of the Policy Manual, as shown in APPENDIX “MAKE IT HAIL”, and as described in APPENDIX “GIMME SHELTER”.

Moved by: Stewart Jensen

Seconded by: Tyler Bennett

Opening (Stewart Jensen): To give some background, we had some conversations with the management team this year and they were confused about EngServe payments. We wanted to improve the transparency. It has been pretty widely supported. There is a list of major changes – context: Terminology, #3: two major expenses are billed up front, including the general manager’s salary, Jay Young. We want to move away from a flat monthly fee to a usage fee (from beginning to the end of the month). We want to recognize that his time is variable and changes throughout the months. Point 2: managers will no longer be able to sign. There is no need to approve it ahead of time. Rent is not negotiable, so it is not necessary to approve. The 4th point is to help the management team understand when they are budgeting, a flat fee transitioning to a more variable one. EngServe pays general manager’s salary, rent, and things like that. This is done as the bookkeeper moves funds from one account to another.

Eleanor McAuley: I have to leave, so I would like to proxy my vote to Taylor Sawadsky.

Emma Howard: I would like to proxy back to Paige Leedale, since she is back now.

Eric McElroy: I have a question regarding the impact bit in GIMME SHELTER, can you answer?

Stewart Jensen: No, I’m sorry, I didn’t write it.

Eric McElroy: I don’t see how this is broken down and how the impact will be monitored (ex. Doubling expense to EngServe). Particularly Science Formal doesn’t have a lot of wiggle room to play with. This provides some more transparency now, but is not actually more transparent.

Stewart Jensen: We haven’t been tracking a lot of the usage in the past. We don’t know if what we are paying for is accurate, or that we are using it all. We don’t have the information, which is why we are estimating now. Once we have the information in the future it will be better.

Eric McElroy: It also covers insurance and things like Golden Words and Clark– does the engineering society also hold liability insurance?

Jay Young: There are two special insurances. Clark has one for a dirty booze game, and Golden Words has one for liability and slander policy.

Closing (Stewart Jensen): Vote yes.

Motion Passes: 8:13 (30, 0, 0)

1. **Break – 8:13-8:20**

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

JT: It is all in my report. I wanted to clarify one thing in particular, though. During the reading week presentation, they proposed a working group. To my knowledge, we were the only ones opposed. During assembly, at the end, they asked assembly to bring a motion to the floor without things being done yet. My argument was on due process in that things should be developed before the group was formed. Though I vocally opposed it at that time, no one did bring it up on the floor. I encourage the next team coming in to continue to press on the AMS exec to come to council more frequently to speak to these issues. For fall reading break, it is important to get the information out there. I compare it to the bus-it fee which we could see everywhere – I would like to see something like this. Incoming ED team please lead us through the engineering hymn

1. **VP (Student Affairs)**

Alex Wood: All in my report.

1. **VP (Operations)**

JT (for Andrew Crawford): It is all in his report and he regrets not being here.

1. **Director Reports**
2. **Academics**

Jacqueline Craig: It is mostly in my report. I would like to agree with everything JT said. I would like to formally apologize for the comment against a certain professor, I don’t think that was appropriate. I would also like to express the sentiment about being kept out of the conversation with this issue. I was left to believe things were going one direction, when they were going the other. With BED Fund, congrats to everyone. Contest ideas will come later. The EngLinks coordinator position application was extended; ask Taylor for more information, she loved the position. EngLinks management team positions are also up, and staff positions will be going up soon. Congrats to Dan Tamming for being the new director of academics. Thanks to everyone who has read all my council reports.

Galvin Niu: I will take my vote back from Lilly Nicholls.

1. **Communications**

Laura Penstone: This weekend we have another LinkedIn profile picture event if you need to upgrade those selfies. I would like to congratulate Heather Simmons, the incoming director of communications, and I have written a letter: Congratulations Heather on joining the Penstone dynasty. Lucky for you there were no Penstones left. Well, there is one, but we’ve instructed him to be neither seen nor heard. I have to say I’m disappointed with how well I know the incoming executive because of how quickly they’ll learn how much nicer you are than I am. I’ve thought a lot about what I’d like to see with the future of the communications portfolio. I’ve listed a few of the most important ones: May the EngSoc Twitter continue to be solely used for the purpose of Tweeting @KanyeWest. May the EngSoc Facebook continue to like its own posts. May the EngSoc Instagram continue to favourite the images published by the l.penstone Instagram account. Best of luck Heather. You’ll be great.

1. **Conferences**

Loralyn Blondin: Congrats to Taylor Sweet, the incoming Director of Conferences. Congrats the debate team for moving up to the Canadian engineering competition. Many of the co-chair positions are up, many will be going up soon – hype these positions! The Queen’s Global Energy Conference is this weekend, and the environmental conference is after. Congrats to all of the teams, amazing job, and great working with you all this year!

1. **Design**

Stephan Dobri: We had the design team night at Clark, it was awesome. Do it again, but budget more for Clark, less for food. The rest in my report. Max is the new me.

1. **Events**

Alex Wood (for Jerry Haron): There are a number of events coming up: Engvents is running an open mic night at Clark on Saturday – if you participate, you get a free beer. ERC is posting a fan bus to our junior hockey team’s game (they have EngSoc jerseys). They are 7-9 year olds, and you will get free hocho, so let your friends know. This is all free, and it would be great if you could come to show some support. It is this Sunday, and the event is on the EngSoc Facebook page. They have had a great winning streak this year, so they deserve a good cheer section.

1. **Finance**

Jane Ferguson: Big congrats to Connor McMillan who is the next me, even though he couldn’t make it tonight. I hope he is having fun reading the transition docs. Just to build on something Eric said earlier: we will be presenting actuals, hopefully by AGM. I will talk to Crawford more about that. I am looking forward to the month’s end and getting everything wrapped up.

1. **First Year**

Evan Dressel: I am super excited to be spending time transitioning to the student affairs portfolio. Allan will be next DoFY, happy to welcome him to the fan, you will get your sappy letter in your transition documents.

1. **Human Resources**

Alexander Rey: Thank you for letting me submit my report even though I missed the deadline. We are hiring half of the society right now, with the other half in the fall. If you want to be involved in any capacity, service, equity manager, design teams, conferences, keep your eyes open. Shoot me an email with any questions. FREC survey went phenomenally well. We got a lot of useful data to improve our process. We had the HR service hiring town hall, which went well. We had a number of people show up and got tons of feedback and interesting opinions. Service hiring info night had lots of attendance. Monday, March 2nd is the hiring fair – learn about positions, it will be catered by the tea room. In other news, my YikYak was voted off the screen to promote service hiring night. As the first non-Alex in the role, I am sure Rachel will face great challenges. I got the opportunity to use survey gizmo – look forward to that next year. Thanks guys.

1. **Information Technology**

Richard Hum: I would like to congratulate Robert for being the new me, otherwise it’s all in the report. Thanks for putting up with my stuff all year, it’s been fun.

1. **Internal Affairs**

Julianna Jeans: AGM is March 8th, the agenda will be circulated and posted on the website to make sure you are prepared. For the EngSoc banquet, we sent out the RSVPs, please do this ASAP. The engineering society awards form is due this Saturday at 10:00 pm, and the awards will be chosen on Sunday. For the Mark Lathan Award, it allows you to upload a resume. The Sci’17 year elections will be in Dunning 215 at 7:30 on Feb. 29th. I am waiting for Sci’18. Sci’16s will be at Clark on Wednesday. Thank you to Glen for doing the clickers, thanks to Leanne for being a great secretary, thanks to the elections team.

1. **Professional Development**

James Gibbard-McCall: Not here, in his report.

1. **Services**

Stewart Jensen: We are hiring the head managers this weekend, the weekend after is assistant managers, after that is staff. Golden Words is still open for heads, as well as assistants. March 9th is the staff application deadline. This is how I got my start in the society, so I recommend it. Big thanks to the managers, awesome working with you, you were always motivated and kept me going. Thanks to the ED team as well. Congrats to Tyler Snook, he will be a sweet replacement.

Tyler Bennett: Golden Words apps close at 5:30 on Friday, 26th.

1. **Question Period**

Alex Cavaliere: JT, you mentioned that we have strange timing for turnover, can you clarify?

JT: we do a complete handoff with everything up until the AGM. The majority of the faculty societies turn over in May, so we just have different timing.

Steven Martin: A question for Dobri: Which executive is your Lucius Malfoy?

Stephan Dobri: I have heard “Give it here Malfoy!” from JT so many times. I’m just going to go with Crawford.

Alex Shieck: On the event to go see the hockey game, I would like to remind people not to go intoxicated.

Alex Cavaliere: Julianna, will there be pizza at election nights and if not, why?

Julianna Jeans: Not at Sci’17-19, because it wasn’t in my budget.

1. **Faculty Board Report**

Tristen: Nothing to report.

Alex Wood: There has been a meeting since last council, but not a ton that happened. Overall, we had a presentation from the head of graduate studies for engineering. Across the board the number of grad students has gone up, with a big percentage being international students. We also had major presentations regarding how complaints will be registered regarding the first year program – Lynann Clapham gets lots of angry comments from parents. They are looking to make committee (a sub-committee of faculty board) that all the complaints will go through. This committee would also oversee USATs and approve Profs put forth to teach courses, ensuring a better feedback system.

1. **Alma Mater Society Report**

JT: We met the Thursday before reading week. The first half was spent attempting to gain quorum. We ratified the incoming commissioners. Ryan received an award from the Commerce society, so congrats to him. Most importantly there were three motions and all three asked for explicit consent from members of assembly for lobbying for three separate topics, rather than go through a federal lobbying organization. This was of great concern to me because of process. To give some history – the AMS has never federally lobbied on any issue. To give the general student opinion through this – students don’t think their student government should be doing any federal lobbying. It had never been done before in the past, and I would have like to receive more forward notice. They spoke about federal lobbying as a responsibility of the AMS. We amended it to make sure that they would have to discuss with other universities before doing anything. Second two were not touched, as we didn’t have quorum by that point.

1. **Senate Report**

Emily Townshend:Our degree name is officially changed to Bachelors of Applied Science. Relating to the Professional Masters of Earth and Energy Resources Leadership Program in Arts and Science and Applied Science, some concerns raised at the meeting: not enough perspectives from indigenous peoples, and not enough consideration of avoiding fossil fuels. This concern was sparked by the divestment committee’s findings that we need to be educating rather than divesting. The fall reading week proposal was presented as a notice of motion, differently than presented at AMS. When questioned why the consultation process was not iterative, the response from the chair of SCAP was that the process had taken enough time already. The proposal, as I mentioned before, demonstrated little appreciation for how interconnected the different faculties and schools are, which Dean Woodhouse spoke about. Several stakeholders that senators thought should have been consulted were not. The response, again, was that consulting those bodies would have taken more time. Provost Harrison has decided to strike a task force to decide our response to the calls to action found in Truth and Reconciliation report and what implementation might look like. Specific ideas include Faculty of Education students receiving training on incorporating indigenous teaching methods into the classroom, and having every student complete one mandatory course in indigenous studies. I’d like to take a moment to impress upon council that one voice is one voice at Senate. Even if we send the statement from EngSoc to Senate (which I don’t think has been done), that will be treated as one voice. Us presenting a united front in this case is not as powerful as each individual member. To that end, if people would be interested in co-signing a statement to be read on the Senate floor, I can set something up to this effect. The difference in this case would be the names of everyone being read out rather than the monolith “EngSoc council”.

1. **Engineering Review Board Report**

Alex Doig: We received and resolved a complaint.

1. **Advisory Board Report**

Bailey Piggott: We will be looking at Sci Formal and frosh week soon. The election of new board members is happening at the AGM. This is great business experience and a great opportunity, as overseeing EngSoc services and Sci formal, you get to see strat plans and budgets. It is not a huge time commitment, we only meet a couple times a month. Tell your constituents that this is a great opportunity.

1. **Club Reports**
2. **Apple**

SiobhanPowell: We are happy at the approval of BED fund. We are planning to attend trivia at Clark with Math and Stats people. We are also working on planning banquet and will soon be having elections.

1. **ChemEngChem**

Alex Doig: We are planning a second round of merch and planning banquet.

1. **Civil**

Alexander Rey: I am the proxy for Steph. We are in the middle of planning for banquet and elections. Civil bonspiel is tomorrow at the curling club. We are also finishing our Turcke evaluations.

**Motion to Extend Council**

Moved by: Tyler Snook

Seconded by: Loralyn Blondin

Motion passes: 8:59

Alex Shieck: Mining is back in the hands of mining.

1. **Geological**

Alex Cavaliere: We are doing a second round of merch, and planning our fur cup hockey game (we have sick jerseys) against mining.

1. **Year Reports**
	* 1. **Sci’ 16**

Eric McElroy: We are currently working on our yearbook, and forever year exec elections are coming up next Wednesday at Clark, Sci 16 only. Iron ring is coming up soon, so we are really excited about that. We are all just about done, and really excited about it. For our ThankQ gift, we are collecting ideas, so if you have any, bring them to us, there is a link in the AllEng. Check out the video too. We are also trying to get rid of our merch, slowly, so we don’t have to leave it for you guys to deal with, like was done to us.

* + 1. **Sci’ 17**

Nichola Trihn: The big thing for us is Super-Semi – March 6th. It is open to all years, and is a great chance to celebrate Eng, and celebrate summer. The ticket cost is $20, which gets you dining, dancing, DJ, and desserts – so if you want the D, come on out! Join the event on Facebook – there will be updates with ticket selling times.

* + 1. **Sci’ 18**

Chloe Harkness: Our coffee house was right before reading week. We are going to do one last event, something at the Underground. I am looking forward to passing things off to the next exec, including a couple of unfinished projects.

* + 1. **Sci’ 19**

Paige Leedale: We are currently doing voting on our year motto (in the second round), so that should be done by Monday. We have a Fluid St. Paddy’s day event and will be starting to sell tickets to that soon.

1. **Statements and Questions by Members**

Tyler Snook: When do we name the frosh?

Julianna Jeans: The last council of the school year.

Loralyn Blondin: Reminder about the hockey game – bus sign-up is in the discussion thing on the Facebook page.

Alex Shieck: An update for SOARB – we have not heard of the proposal, so I am going to look into that. Commerce satisfied its terms of probation, which is still on, but we are happy so far. James Gibbard-McCall is now the co-chair of SOARB, which is a great moment for engineering – moving a lot more towards pro-safety, not anti-fun. With Faculty members, some are against everything Frosh Week. One thing I will caution is that while there is always due process, keep in the back of your minds that administration has proven that they are willing to go around that. My position ends mid-summer – if you are interested in applying, it is a tough, but important job, so sign up! On another note, I was with the QSC on external relations, and almost every other student society has a vice president of external relations, or just below that level. Queen’s had little external reach, and other schools have so many amazing events with this – someone should look into this to branch out to other schools.

Alex Cavaliere: JT, you mentioned issues with federal lobbying – can you expand?

JT: Forgive me if I mess up the explanation, and I would also like to add a disclaimer that my personal political beliefs are not involved, my opposition was on process. For some political context – the current government is undergoing their strat plan process and budgeting. This time from March to April is the best time to lobby on what the students wants this government to focus on. There are provincial levels of tuition grants, OSAP, ex., and there are also federal ones that they wanted to lobby more for. Also for undergraduate research and youth employment opportunities – there is currently lots of money here, and they think it will be cut. The third one is about international students in Canada – there are places in policy with weaknesses regarding working and living in Canada. It is tough to find employment off-campus. If you want more details, I can provide some more information.

Erin Murphy: I am an international student and you cannot work off campus without an additional work visa.

Alan Goodman: Applications are coming out soon!

Emily Townshend: For how to know when to get StuCons at events, you can ask the head StuCon – he is paid for office hours. If you are having StuCons for events, give them way more details and it will save you money. Also, apply to be a StuCon if you are interested. Included is $800 worth of training and a security licence that you can take with you where you go, plus a free comedy show with every shift.

Taylor Sawadsky: EngLinks coordinator application was extended, and it is a great opportunity, I loved it, so please consider it and ask lots of questions. The incoming ED team is hosting an interview practice session this Saturday – we will give practice and feedback. The location has recently changed to Goodwin 247, and you can sign up for a timeslot on the link of the event.

Jacqueline Craig: Congrats to all the first years who chose their discipline, which was due today – tell anyone who hasn’t to do it right away – take advantage of this opportunity. Also, question for Emily Townshend: I am graduating this spring, what will my degree be?

Emily Townshend: If you are graduating this spring or this fall, you will receive a Bachelor’s of Science, and after that you will receive a Bachelor’s of Applied Science.

Alex Shieck: I reached out to some alumni on this topic, and as long as you are honest you’re your intentions, you can write what you want.

Breighann Merry: A reminder that AGM can change the constitution. Right now, the executive or its delegates having power within regular academic year is not really defined – something to think about changing/defining.

Julianna Jeans: The reason that was brought up is that there is a motion coming.

JT: This statement is in response to external university relations. I had time to think about it this year. We have a standing committee on council called the external communications committee and discussed the direction it should head in, after the decision was made to stay with the CFEC. The committee is in the process of outlining a document to define what the mandate of the committee will be – my suggestion is that it includes that we are active participants in the things that go on with other schools. The idea is to have more people to think about how we interact with other universities and organizations and how the money we spend on it is being used. We could need to mandate a report to council to keep them accountable. We are trying to ensure we get more perspective and not stay within our little bubble, and to generally improve communication

Jerry Haron: There are new applications out on EngSoc apply coming soon. I highly encourage everyone to apply for chair and committee for events, they are all great experiences, and come out to the hiring fair as well (March 7th).

Alex Shieck: I have a question regarding the external committee – sometimes meeting frequency is not adequate. Sometimes outreach is not that great, and it is sad that we are missing out on collaboration and spending time with other schools. If it is a committee, someone should be in charge of the contact information. Other things coming up – nominations are a great way to appreciate people (EngSoc awards). A comment for AGM – a big part of AGM is giving feedback after (tips for improvement), which helps avoids tunnel vision. Please show up and give feedback on how to improve the society. We all want it to be good for all of the students. When we applauded going from 19 to 20 with quorum, which is only half of us showing up, so try and be here when you can because it is extremely important.

Alexander Rey: I was wondering if I wanted to be on Board and also apply to be on ERB, is that alright?

Bailey Piggott: The only restrictions for Board are that you can’t be a manager, can’t be a chair for Sci formal, and can’t be a director.

Lianne Zelsman: Secretary apps are up. It is a fun time, if you know anyone who wants it.

Julianna Jeans: The winner from the book this council is Jay young, “otherwise known as Young Jay from the streets.”

Emily Townshend: I’d like to share a personal anecdote – I didn’t win, but I still cried for an hour and a half because someone thought of me and nominated me for an award. I wouldn’t be here if that didn’t happen, so do it because it is really important.

Ryan Cattrysse: Collective awwww and clap for everyone, discipline reps, directors and exec!

**Motion to Close:**

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Alex Cavaliere

Motion Passes: 9:29 (30, 0, 0)