**Engineering Society Council Minutes**

Engineering Society of Queen’s University

Thursday, February 4th, 2016

Dunning Hall, Room 12

Speaker: Ryan Cattrysse

   Secretary: Lianne Zelsman

*Council begins: 6:03 pm*

## I. Adoption of the Agenda

### Motion 1

Whereas: It’s Potluck council!

& Whereas: Let’s get to the good stuff;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of Thursday, February 4th 2016 as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Julianna Jeans

Seconded by: Ryan Cattrysse

Opening (Julianna Jeans): Hi everyone. There are no changes to the agenda. Thanks for participating in the potluck.

**Motion Passes: 6:05 pm (33, 0, 0)**

## II. Adoption of the Minutes

### Motion 2

Whereas: Lianne is pretty great;

& Whereas: So are her minutes;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of Thursday, January 21st 2016 as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Lianne Zelsman

Seconded by: Julianna Jeans

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

**Motion Passes: 6:05 pm (33, 0, 0)**

## III. Attendance

Ryan Cattrysse: We will take attendance after our break.

## IV. Speaker’s Business

Ryan Cattrysse: It is Potluck Council. Be careful of allergies. If you are unsure of something, just ask. Please be safe.

## V. Break

*Council breaks: 6:06 pm*

*Council resumes: 6:28 pm*

Ryan Cattrysse: We are going to take attendance. Please click 1 if you are here, 2 if you are a proxy.

*Attendance taken: 6:30 pm*

## VI. Presentations

### i. CFES Congress 2016

Julie Tseng: This is a debrief of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES) Congress. It was a weeklong conference that Lora, myself and Brett attended during the first week of second semester. It was hosted by the University of Calgary. I went there as a representative for our school, Lora went as the Director of Conferences, and we selected Brett as a delegate. The sessions were aimed at professional, personal and societal development. The new executive were elected, as the Congress acts as their AGM. There were discussions about the direction of the organization. Some highlights were as follows. Adopting the stance of 30 by 30, in regard to the female engineers in the Canadian workforce. Building a partnership with McGill. Meeting other society presidents. Some areas of improvement could include fixing issues with the logistics of the conference. The way that many events were organized, it was very exhausting. I think we now have a chance to be highly active due to the current change in leadership.

Loralyn Blondin: One of the biggest highlights for me were the post presentation discussions. All of the delegates would start up conversations, and it was interesting to hear opinions from different people. There was discussion on the leadership stream, and it was cool to hear how awesome of an experience it was. In terms of improvement, there was still a moderate drinking culture. I think there should be more non-alcohol centered socials. Some presentations were hit or miss, and should have been reviewed beforehand. However, I do think that the drinking culture is diminishing. I think it would be valuable to bring younger delegates, such as a first year delegate in the future. There is a potential for us to host a CFES conference in the future.

Brett Crowley: Highlights for me also included the conversations after and in between the presentations. They had a large amount of value for me. Some topics that were discussed were diversity in engineering, the engineering culture and how to have a good balance between professionalism and fun. It would have been nice to see more workshops. I believe the conference could be shortened. It is a very intense atmosphere. Positive change is evident. Julie Tseng will do an awesome job in her new leadership role. I am glad that I was there.

*Questions period begins.*

Erin Murphy: Last year we took a hiatus from CFES. What do you feel that we have gained or learned from rejoining this year? Are there any potential outreach opportunities outside of Canada? Is there any way for us to learn from other schools in the United States?

Julie Tseng: The tone of our involvement in the organization has changed. We do not pay for travel or organization fees. We were funded to go. The direction of the conversation has also changed. What are we gaining? There are a couple of large partnerships that we did not know much about. I met the heads of the American version of CFES. They do a program where you can go and take a course in Europe. The only thing you have to do is pay for flights. CFES has a partnership with them, but not many people make use of it. I think the organization can do a better job facilitating that. They have a Canada-wide school mailing list. We could promote things that way. I think we do a large amount of learning and sharing, which is a good thing. Our society has been developing for many years, and others can learn from us.

Andrew Crawford: Julie and Lora are on the Executive/Director Team. Brett, I know that you have been very involved in Engineers Without Borders (EWB), which is also a national organization. How would you compare EWB to CFES?

Brett Crowley: The EWB national conference was actually the week after. Why I like EWB so much is the dedication from the leadership, which I also see in CFES. Both organizations are committed to making the engineering experience better for everyone in Canada. I think the creativity is important. The younger students really help with this, as they are not already biased by the ideologies that are being phased out. The level of energy is great.

Matthew Lawson: What opportunities are there for students to bid on conferences?

Loralyn Blondin: There is Congress. There is also the President’s meeting that happens at the beginning of the year, as well as the Conference on Diversity in Engineering and the Canadian Engineering Competition. A group of people from your school would plan the outline of what the conference will entail, and they go to Congress and bid on it.

## VII. New Business: Motions 3-4

### Motion 3

Whereas: This Hack-a-thon is unique and not like any currently ratified conference or competition;

& Whereas: Robots and artificial intelligence are the way of the future;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the ratification of QHacks as an Engineering Society Competition.

Moved by: Loralyn Blondin

Seconded by: Rakan Al-Shawaf

Opening (Rakan Al-Shawaf): I am a second year civil engineering student. I am the co-chair of QHacks.

Jennifer Nguyen: I am a fourth year economics major. I am the logistics and marketing coordinator for QHacks.

Rakan Al-Shawaf: The hackathon is a 36 hour event where students from all over come together to create a new product. They have the 36 hours to make it and then they compete for prizes.

Jennifer Nguyen: We are doing this because it would be a huge leap in technological and innovation advancement. Most other schools have a hackathon, so it is time to put Queen’s on the map. We have had a large interest and response from applicants. About 1200 people have applied so far.

Rakan Al-Shawaf: We want EngSoc on board because most people that show up are engineers.

Jennifer Nguyen: Major sponsors include Microsoft and TD. Business representatives from them will come to QHacks, making it a good networking opportunity.

Rakan Al-Shawaf: Everyone who applies as a delegate gets their resume sent to those companies as part of their sponsorship package.

Jacqueline Craig: How many students going?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: 250 applications are accepted, both internal and external. About 1200 have applied. Most of them are from Waterloo and other schools outside Queen’s.

Eric McElroy: I have concerns about how the event will run and continue to be run in the future. I believe you have scheduled use of the ILC for these 250 delegates. To what extent will they be using this space and how will you ensure that they act as good stewards of the ILC?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: We are not using the ILC exclusively, we will also be using Kingston Hall. We have over 50 volunteers who will be involved in clean up. It is in my best interest for it to be clean as I use the ILC as well. In the future we are going to make the event occur earlier in the year to make sure we can fit everyone. Since it is going to be week nine, we only took ten group rooms. The rest will be in Kingston Hall.

Ryan Cattrysse: Laptops will be allowed for this motion.

Eleanor McAuley: Are you AMS ratified?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: We are AMS ratified. We will be banking with them instead of EngSoc.

Taylor Sweet: I am interested to know how you plan to use the EngSoc’s resources. Why would you approach another student body? You are already ratified by the AMS, so why are you approaching us?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: It is more about having the EngSoc’s recognition. For resources, there is not much we will need in the future. We want to run this the engineering way. For this year, it is really about being recognized; having EngSoc’s blessing.

Alexander Cavaliere: You mentioned being the first of your kind. How do you differ from Code the Change? Also in the constitution attached in your proposal, it includes the names of the individuals on the current committee. Why are you including their names? That seems weird.

Rakan Al-Shawaf: Code for Change creates something for charity. This is more for students making a product for themselves to show off skills to recruiters, less about doing charity. It is a completely different spectrum.

Loralyn Blondin: There was an error on our part. Can I motion to amend to strike the names from the constitution?

Ryan Cattrysse: Yes.

*Motion amended to strike the physical names from Policy, but the position titles are left.*

Callen Hageman: I am really excited about this. I signed up for this personally, as did my brother. Many emails that I have been getting are from Major League Hacking. Could you touch more on that company? What are they about?

Loralyn Blondin: I pass my speaking rights to Jennifer.

Jennifer Nguyen: Major League Hacking is a massive organization that works with student hackathons all across the world. They have helped answer any questions we have had about running such a large scale event. They help us 24/7. They will bring some hardware to help the hackers at our event.

Matt Whittle: In my experience with these kinds of hackathons, though an amazing experience, many groups tend to struggle if they are not given a focus. Will the hackathon have a theme or focus?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: At the moment we have not restricted anyone to themes. We close applications tonight. After we choose the delegates, we might make a theme. However it is important to note that most hackathons are theme-less. Our sponsors might host their own themed events. For example, Microsoft could ask you to use a certain product in your creation. But we do not have a specific theme.

Matt Whittle: One issue I have seen in the past is that there are many students with different skill sets. What kind of support are you getting from sponsors in terms of software packages? What support are you giving to students who have diverse skills sets, such as business students without coding backgrounds?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: For computer science students the event will allow them to show off their coding ability. For engineering students, they will also be able to show off to companies. For business students, there are still many opportunities that do not involve coding. For example they could focus on marketing and graphic design. The business students will need to create things like the logo and designs.

Loralyn Blondin: I pass my speaking rights to Jennifer.

Jennifer Nguyen: For support, we are providing mentors for the event and many business representatives from companies are coming to help out. We have workshops throughout the event such as Introduction to Java and HTML.

Emily Townshend: How much does it cost to attend?

Rakan Al-Shawaf: It is free. We are offering bursaries to external delegates for transportation. It is completely free for all delegates. There will be six meals provided. It is all funded by sponsors. Nobody ever pays for hackathons.

Matthew Lawson: It seems pretty well run, but who in the committee has had experience running conferences?

Loralyn Blondin: I pass my speaking rights to Jennifer.

Jennifer Nguyen: I myself have run two hackathons, Hack the 6ix and Hack Berkley. Many of our other team members have experience running events.

Rakan Al-Shawaf: I also run EngVents. Come to Open Mic night.

Rigers Rukaj: Thank you for bringing this opportunity for us. For the external delegates, do you have a goal plan? Would ratifying with us make EngSoc part of the hiring process?

Loralyn Blondin: I pass my speaking rights to Jennifer.

Jennifer Nguyen: We are doing a 50/50 split with external and internal delegates. Many external delegates are coming from schools such as Waterloo, University of Toronto and Concordia.

Loralyn Blondin: The hiring process will use the same process as other conferences.

**Motion Passes: 6:59 pm (33, 0, 0)**

### Motion 4

Whereas: Groups affiliated with the Engineering Society sometimes don’t follow the rules;

& Whereas: There should be a level of punitive action before de-ratification;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to Policy Section ε as seen in APPENDIX “PROBATION”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Opening (Alex Wood): This Policy is coming in response to events that occurred prior to the summer with the Queen’s Space Conference (QSC). Some unfortunate things happened and punitive actions had to be taken. Since Council was not meeting until September it would have been nice to have some Policy in place regarding action that can be taken for groups that are not following Policy set by EngSoc. Right now it currently stands that the only way we can present punitive action is by freezing their accounts or de-ratifying them. It would be nice to create a probationary process that involves greater oversight from EngSoc to make sure things are going well. I got the Policy from AMS and altered it slightly. I really like that the probationary actions cannot last more than a year, because there is normally turnover of the committees. It will make sure new incoming members are not punished as well. I hope it never has to get used, but it is important to have.

Eric McElroy: Under what rules and authority was the QSC subjected to probation? Why was it never brought to the attention of Council at the next meeting? In A.3.2.b why does the President have the authority to enact disciplinary action if it is also going to Council? It should be Council making those decisions. Under A.3.3.c I think it should just say “activities and events”.

Alex Wood: The reason the President has the authority is based on the de-ratification Policy. There are certain cases where we need to distance ourselves from groups quicker than Council can assemble. For example, in dangerous situations where we do not want to be affiliated with them. It is a last resort type measure. I would prefer that it would always come to Council, however there may be circumstances where it is unable to. The reason the QSC situation happened the way it did is because in the summer the Exec served as the EngSoc Council, with Council requiring to be notified. I am certain that within the first two meetings back I did talk about the incident. I did not bring any motions because the events had already occurred, however I did speak about it so that EngSoc was aware of what had happened. We do not have any Policy in place for online voting, so that would not work. The AMS had attempted that, but it got attacked and never went through. There is no official Policy on how to do it and we cannot do it in the best possible way. That is why we had Exec just follow the procedure.

Alex Doig: For Policy consistency, A.3.3 should read “where the Engineering Society Council or President of the Engineering Society” and “may be administered by the Engineering Society Council or President of the Engineering Society”. Who ultimately decides the measures taken?

Alex Wood: It would come down to the situation. I would be happy to add the following phrase: “the following disciplinary actions may be administered by the Engineering Society Council or the President of the Engineering Society”.

Matt Whittle: In terms of the fees and bonds, it seems we would be financially punishing a club or group for making a mistake. Why would taking money from them fix anything? For a group that gets student money, how can we justify taking money from them?

Alex Wood: The fees and bonds punitive action comes into effect if they are not following budgeting Policy, e.g. if they used budget for something outside of the EngSoc mandate. I have heard of groups in the past in the AMS that tried to buy something and trade it for something else.

Erin Murphy: As former Director of Finance, I know any receipts students put forward are looked at to make sure there are no Policy violations.

Alex Wood: They will not get through EngSoc’s finance system, but they could try to do something where they buy an iPad as a prize, but try to trade it for beer.

Erin Murphy: Under A.3.2 it says that any EngSoc member can be disciplined. Why is this necessary? Do we have the authority to do that? Why do we do this separately from the Non-Academic Misconduct (NAM) system?

Alex Wood: It is for situations where a single member has disregarded Policy without the knowledge of the other members of the group. It would not make sense to discipline everyone. For example, we could put that specific member on probation. The idea is that in these cases you do not need to punish the entire group, rather just a certain individual. For the disciplinary actions mentioned, they are mentioned right below it. I do not think they will be on the NAM level. These issues could potentially go to NAM, but there are many offenses that break EngSoc Policy but do not fall in the range of NAM.

Eleanor McAuley: As it currently stands, do we think this public of a body is the best place to carry out such decisions regarding punitive action of an individual? If someone makes a large mistake, do we really want it to be that public for that one individual? Should this really be the first step?

Alex Wood: I believe that was originally added because I copy and pasted it from the AMS policy, where they reserve the right to punish individual AMS members. In light of good arguments, I would feel comfortable to make a change so that we do not have the ability to punish a specific member. But I would like to hear more opinions.

Taylor Sweet: I believe there is a conflict between A.3.5 and A.3.6 in Policy. A.3.5 discusses increasing severity for repeated offenders, but A.3.6 recognizes that there may be a 100% turnover of people. If you increase the severity each time for repeated offenses, would you not be punishing the new members for the mistakes of past members?

Alex Wood: The wording of it is meant for a situation where a group is put on probation but continues to violate Policy. Then further action, and severity, would be required. I think that a majority of the time, we are a reasonable bunch and if a new group of people come in, the actions of the previous people should not be held against them.

Avery Cole: The way it is currently phrased it kind of seems like it is either-or between bringing a matter to Council and having the President make the decision. Could we add a line saying something like “if not possible to bring to Council, have the President...”.

Nick Rupar: Could you think of a situation where immediate action of the President would be required?

Andrew Crawford: In situations like improper freezing of an account.

Nick Rupar: The way that it is said is that we would not actually freeze their accounts, as student fee money is not really under our control. If it is a bond situation after the fact, could it just not be brought to Council?

Alex Wood: In terms of student money, as soon as it is that group’s money—after it leaves the student’s pockets—we can freeze that money. That is kind of the reason why we need to have this, as there are instances where we would need to freeze the account right away. A situation urgent enough not to wait for Council but not enough that we would need to call an emergency Council.

Sam Anderson: I have a few concerns. I think first and foremost Policy is a set of guidelines of how to best run the organizations. Our policy is not self-consistent and should not just be enforced as law. The direction and spirit of AMS Policy might be different. It is not about breaking the Policy, but rather about doing a poor job in your role. The discipline system at this school is based on the Student Code of Conduct, which are fundamental rules we follow. But we should not try to enforce AMS Policy. People break Policy quite often. For example, the agenda should be on the website, which it is not. Why is ERB not mentioned until the end? If we do want to have a body, I think we need to be more specific and more careful. I do not like Council deciding what the punitive action should be, or the President for that matter. Neither are considered natural justice.

Alex Wood: Points well taken. I do believe it is important for us to have measures in place that can be implemented during worst case scenarios. Not having measures in place is what led to the QSC incident earlier. We had to go through it alone. We brought ERB in as more of an advisory body. We want to determine the correct level of the offense. Groups need to receive punitive action that is appropriate to their situation. Another issue is when ERB is not in session. It does not run over the summer. We need to have some system in place. For the President, I was basing it mostly on the past de-ratification Policy. It is important for the Executive to be able to make decisions quickly, especially since Councils are two weeks apart. Then the Exec can justify any decisions they have made to Council. If Council disagrees, they can appeal it. I am happy to hear more thoughts, but it is a good system to have in place. I do not intend for this body to become the NAM system, but I think we should have the ability to issue punitive action on behalf of the society, as it affects the society. We place trust in these groups when they hire under our banner. I think all of these punitive actions are reasonable and appropriate for offenses lodged against the society.

Alexander Rey: Would there be a situation where this would come to Council rather than being resolved just by the Exec? That would seem like the faster process. If this is the power you want to give to the Exec, maybe allow it to stay within the Exec and allow Council to confirm the decision later.

Alex Wood: I do not think Exec should have complete and utter power. They should always be accountable to Council. Having Council be the primary body, there are situations where you would want to let in Council. If the QSC issue had occurred when Council was in session, we would have waited for the Council’s opinions.

Eric McElroy: I cannot find in Policy when the summer session of Exec actually starts.

Alex Wood: I am not sure where the exact timelines are mentioned, but we are not supposed to run any extracurricular activities after the Friday of week 12, which I think includes Council. I believe it also states we shall strive to never run events past that date.

Breighann Merry: Just to clarify, the only part that has been changed is A.3.7 for changing it from “individual” to an “individual or group”?

Sam Anderson: What I was getting at is why are we not using ERB at all?

Emma Howard: Can you punish a member on the behalf of a ratified body?

Alex Wood: I have not heard anything from people in terms of reasons to keep individuals as part of the Policy. I will remove individuals from Policy so this Policy will only apply to groups.

### Contest to the Amendment:

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Matthew Lawson

*Debate begins on the amendment.*

Eric McElroy: Striking any mention of individuals does not seem like a good move. It was previously existent in this section in Policy prior to these amendments. I think a more prudent move would be to move things around to different sections. It is an important element of Policy, but I do not think the Policy is currently structured well enough to distinguish between individuals and groups.

Callen Hageman: As per the four things that EngSoc can do with the new Policy to punish a group, three of them cannot apply to individuals. For example you cannot freeze a person’s bank account or de-ratify them. What disciplinary actions would be put under individual punishment?

Erin Murphy: You can de-ratify a person.

Emily Townshend: I am in favour of making it a group and individual. I do not think we as a body have the authority to take money from our members. The reason the Judicial Committee has the authority to do so is because it is delegated by Senate. I do not think it is appropriate for this body to enact these bonds against individuals. I do not think Council is the place to punish individuals. I have seen it happen, it was disgusting. The person went to the Journal about it. I think Exec or ERB should be the ones to deal with individuals.

Alex Wood: The scope of this was originally to implement group Policy in order to formalize what had happened with QSC. However, I like the points brought up about individuals. As I do not think we can draft good individual policy tonight, I would like to withdraw this motion. I will return after discussion with members after we decide if we want to create new Policy to detail what we can do to individuals.

*Motion withdrawn.*

## VIII. Break

*Council breaks: 7:35 pm*

*Council resumes: 7:41 pm*

## IX. Executive Reports

### i) President

Julie Tseng: I had the privilege of sitting on the Award Selection Committee for the Tricolour Award. It was a very enlightening and inspiring experience. Everything else is in my report. Shout out to Sci’19 for trying their best to win back the Engineering-Commerce Cup, unfortunately it was the third consecutive year we have lost. I would like to have the Sci’19s lead us in singing the Engineering Hymn.

*The Engineering Hymn is sung.*

### ii) VP (Student Affairs)

Alex Wood: Everything is mostly in my report. The Discipline Club Summit is happening this Sunday. If you have not been contacted, please let me know. It is a sit down between the Exec, Director of Internal Affairs and the Discipline Clubs. The end goal is to come up with better Discipline Club Policy. It is from 2:00-4:30 pm. I did not include the room number in my email, it is in ILC 331. I will send it with the next email and agenda. I am looking forward to it.

###  iii) VP (Operations)

Andrew Crawford: In terms of an update on the IT projects, I want to apologize as I said that I would bring an update. My update is that I have delayed many projects that I want to do, things such as financial policy and the Capital Fund. I have had to push the IT discussion to next Council. Sorry.

## X. Director Reports

### i) Academics

Jacqueline Craig: The EngLinks Coordinator application is up on EngSoc apply. It is in a different format this year, so if you have any questions email me. I am happy to have Taylor back as the EngLinks Coordinator. I appreciate what she does in the role so much more since I had to do it for two weeks. Better Education Donation (BED) Fund proposals are underway. The discipline clubs are writing their proposals and will be coming to Council in the near future.

### ii) Communications

Laura Penstone: Everything is mostly in my report. This week I had to do something that I was hoping I would never have to do: I had to cancel the snow fort building competition.

### iii) Conferences

Loralyn Blondin: I am pleased to see QHacks went through being ratified. The Queen’s Global Innovation Conference (QGIC) was on the weekend. The Conference on Industry Resources Queen’s Engineering (CIRQUE), the Queen’s Space Conference (QSC) and the Queen’s Conference on Business and Mining (QCBM) are all this weekend. The Commerce & Engineering Environmental Conference (CEEC) applications are due tonight. The Conference Chair applications will be going up in the next few months.

### iv) Design

Alex Wood: Everything is in his report.

### v) Events

Alex Wood: The snow fort building event was cancelled. Everything is in his report.

### vi) Finance

Jane Ferguson: Everything is in my report.

### vii) First Year

Evan Dressel: It has been a great past two weeks as Julie Tseng did all the work. She was the Dad temporarily. The All-Disciplines night went really well. Some things for the next few weeks include getting Discipline Reps for Speed Dating. I need one representative for each discipline, though potentially a few from each stream to represent different options. I am excited to see the new Director of First Year. I am working on the transition manual.

### viii) Human Resources

Alexander Rey: I am jealous that the Communications Team got a shout out on Yik Yak and HR did not. Here is some exciting news: if you are lying awake at night and you have great hiring ideas, or if you just want to yell at me for a while, next Wednesday we are having a hiring/HR Town Hall in the Tea Room. It will be the first ever Tea Room open bar. Hiring and HR are very important for the society. We are looking to implement a survey for feedback about the process. The services hiring information night is happening after reading week. If you are think of applying, or want to know anything, come to the services night.

### ix) Information Technology

Richard Hum: It is all in my report.

###  x) Internal Affairs

Julianna Jeans: It is mostly all in my report. Next session of Council is the week after reading week. Other than that, the awards nomination deadline is Feb 27th.

### xi) Professional Development

James Gibbard-McCall: Richard, I am happy tents make you so much happier than bikes do. Alexander Rey I am not sure if your definition of open bar is the same as mine. I was expecting to just be able to guzzle tea. I sent out a survey recently about technical skills people would like to learn. Scour the All-Eng for my survey so we can figure out what you guys actually want. We will be having an event for first years where people come and talk about the opportunities in their field on Sunday.

*Andrew Crawford and Galvin Niu proxy their votes to Jane Ferguson and Lilly Nicholls respectively.*

### xii) Services

Stewart Jensen: All Head Manger applications are up on EngSoc apply. Next week will be hiring for Assistant Managers, if you are not ready for the big chair yet. There are a bunch of smaller chairs. I am actually leaving to work at Clark for the awards ceremony. It is going to be a banger.

## XI. Question Period

Callen Hageman: One question to the Director of Communications. Who got Yik Yak famous?

Laura Penstone: The Yak was a screenshot of the notification that the snow fort event was cancelled.

Julianna Jeans: It said “I guess we should have seen this one coming”. It had over 300 up votes.

Evan Dressel: Alexander Rey, for the Tea Room open bar, is it just for average tea and coffee? Or is it for… all? *Evan does a lovely “all encompassing” hand gesture.*

Alexander Rey: Please do not just come because you want free drinks. We actually want people to come and share feedback. There will not be any Chicken Pestos. It will probably just be tea and coffee.

Erin Murphy: I am the finance person for my Year Exec and Mining Club. I have noticed that some of our ledgers are behind. Is there any plan on when they will be updated?

Jane Ferguson: It should be updated in the next couple of weeks. December just got handed in. In the next couple of weeks January should be done.

## XII. Faculty Board Report

Meara Hampton: There is nothing to report.

## XIII. Alma Mater Society Report

Kevin Corey: The AMS meeting started off with a presentation from Peter Wolf, the Vice-Provost of Teaching and Learning. He talked about fixing up some classrooms and is looking to showcase past and current student work in a manner to show how proud we are to be Queen’s students. The Peer Support Centre and Academic Grievances Centre amalgamated. Most of the problems brought to each one tend to overlap. Many of the Commissioner of Internal Affairs’ duties in Policy became the job of the AMS Secretary. The job was divided because it was strenuous. We had the best voter turnout out of all of the faculties, but the other faculties seem content with how their elections work. All of our meetings are brought to you by a Live Stream. There are some funny screen shots you can get your hands on.

## XIV. Senate Report

Emily Townshend: I went to Senate alone. Tisk tisk, Brandon.

Brandon Tseung: I was sick.

Emily Townshend: Many others did not show up as well. We approved the new international Master’s degree in chemistry. The faculty of Fine Arts changed its name. We found out that Fine Arts and Arts are separate faculties. The Senate Orientation Activities Review Board (SOARB) report was very bland, which was great because it means Orientation Week is safe. The Chair terms are now two years. Many sub-committees are hiring. The application process is pretty easy. Get involved.

## XV. Engineering Review Board Report

Alex Doig: We are looking at doing an Executive/Director Team review soon. We are currently investigating a grievance.

## XVI. Advisory Board Report

Bailey Piggot: We met last week, with just the Board. We had a discussion on long-term planning and Capital Fund. Expect to see Policy at Council soon. The Board elects new members at AGM. If you want business experience, feel free to ask me questions.

## XVII. Club Reports (Happy Group)

### i) Eng Phys

Taylor Sweet: Not a whole lot is going on. We had our Pool With Profs event. We had at least 15 professors show up, it was great.

### ii) ECE

Sarah Taylor: Our website is still down, but we have a new Facebook page. The fourth years have their showcase projects on Feb 11th. The EngVents open mic night is on February 27th. If you perform you get a free drink ticket.

### iii) Mechanical

Tyler Bennett: We had our event with professors as well. It was a success.

### iv) Mining

Sam Grant: Our BED Fund proposal is all done and on its way. Our orientation is tonight, if you get to Walter Light fast you can still make it. We also have a social, where we are giving free cups to first years.

## XVIII. Year Reports

### v) Sci’16

Eric McElroy: We are trying to get rid of all of our merchandise. We are in the process of gathering ideas for the ThankQ Gift. There is a promotional video staring myself and Stephen Martin about it. There are many great pictures from Throw Back. Elections are coming up in March. We are collecting year book photos. If we ever get our website back up, we want to do a cool timeline photo gallery thing. Lastly, our crest is not in Clark anymore. It is not on the wall, we would like it to be restored.

### vi) Sci’17

Nichola Trinh: Next week we will start sending out tidbits for marketing of Super Semi. Super Semi is a big semi-formal with all of the years. We are looking to get buses to transport people there and back. It will be a cool time to hang out with friends, frosh and FRECs. The Sci’17 candy grams are cute and great. We will be handing them out next week. They are a bag of candy with the Sci’17 stickers we ordered.

### vii) Sci’18

Chloë Harkness: We just got our Year Exec shirts. We are ordering some new merchandise in the next couple weeks. We are having a Coffee House in the Tea Room soon. There will be snacks. It is not limited to Sci’18.

###  viii) Sci’19

Benji Christie: We had the Engineering-Commerce Dodgeball tournament. It did not go that well. We are working on our Year Motto, getting some surveys out. We deposited some money for Fluid. It is going to be an all-ages night, get the word out.

## XIX. Statements and Questions by Members

Eleanor McAuley: We may have said Super Semi is the 12th of March, it is actually the weekend after.

Taylor Sawadsky: I think Super Semi is on March 6th. Thanks to everyone that applied for Director positions. It is an awesome opportunity, make sure you check EngSoc apply.

Nichola Trinh: We will verify the date of Super Semi.

Tyler Bennett: It is the 6th.

Emily Townshend: Science Quest is hiring, the applications are up. You need to apply on both SWEP and EngSoc Apply. It is fantastic summer camp experience. Feb 11th is the deadline for SWEP. It is the best summer you could ever have.

Alexander Rey: Thank you to everyone who applied for Director. I am sorry for all of you who realized there were repeated questions. EngSoc Apply has been a bit of a mess in the last week. If you are doing an EngSoc Apply application and it looks weird, let me know. I can check it out and try to fix it.

Jacqueline Craig: For anyone looking to apply to Senate sub-committees, they are not a very large time commitment. The one I was on, we met for four hours first and second semester.

Erin Murphy: Sci’16 just posted their first Instagram. Follow the account and like that photo.

Alexander Cavaliere: The Tea Room has compostable cups. Why are we using styrofoam cups for this potluck?

Julianna Jeans: It was all stuff that we already owned. We did not buy anything.

Ryan Cattrysse: FREC Committee is currently hiring, so if you have extra food bring it to them.

Julianna Jeans: If no one has any strong objections, I was going to leave the extras for the next time we all meet.

### Motion to Close:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Eric McElroy

**Motion Passes: 8:17 pm**