**Engineering Society Council Minutes**

Engineering Society of Queen’s University

Thursday, November 26th, 2015

Dunning Hall, Room 27

Speaker: Ryan Cattrysse

   Secretary: Lianne Zelsman

*Council begins: 6:04 pm*

## I. Attendance

Ryan Cattrysse: Please use your clicker to indicate that you are here. Click 1 if you are here and 2 if you are a proxy.

*Attendance taken: 6:04 pm*

## II. Adoption of the Agenda:

### Motion 1

Whereas: It’s the final council of the year;

& Whereas: Let’s get this show on the road!

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of Thursday, November 26th 2015, as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Julianna Jeans

Seconded by: Ryan Cattrysse

Opening (Julianna Jeans): We have one change to Motion 5. It should say that council approve the “second” reading of the changes, not the first.

**Motion Passes: 6:05 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

## III. Adoption of the Minutes:

### Motion 2

Whereas: There was a lot of discussion at last council;

& Whereas: It was typed up and recorded by our lovely secretary.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of Thursday, November 12th, 2015 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: 6:06 pm (32, 0, 0)**

## IV. Speaker’s Business

Ryan Cattrysse: Welcome to our last council of the year. I would like to give a big shout out to Tyler Snook for stepping in when I had midterms. Congratulations Tyler, you have been voted the second best speaker for council this year. Anyways, please refrain from using acronyms, or at least define them before you use them. Today’s agenda is very long, but it is our responsibility to debate these motions accordingly. I would encourage you to not take that lightly. We are trying to be efficient today. If many people are saying the same thing, I may sum up your argument.

Sam Anderson: Because we have a large amount of rather meaty policy changes, and they are not all printed out, can we use our laptops for today’s council? I think people should be able to look at what is happening.

Ryan Cattrysse: I will let you know for each motion. Just so you are aware, you have two minutes to open each motion and three minutes during the debate. The mover also has two minutes to close. Just so you know, we have very nice candy this council. Just take one the first time around. Please be aware that it is not peanut free.

*Council breaks: 6:10 pm*

*Council resumes: 6:12 pm*

## V. Presentations

### i. Undergraduate Student Trustee

Jennifer Li: Hi everyone, thanks for having me. I am a third year Con-Ed student with a history major. I am here to talk about my role and issues facing the university. As an icebreaker, I want to play a little game. I am going to give you three facts; two will be truths, one will be a lie. One: I have never been to the Tea Room. Two: I can eat my weight in sushi. Three: I have two dogs. I am sorry, I have never actually been to the Tea Room, but I hope that I will soon. I also really love sushi. I am your Undergraduate Student Trustee. I hope that after today you can have a better understanding of what I do. Here is some history: Queen’s was established on October 16th, 1841. We are older than Canada as a nation. Next year is our 175th anniversary! The Board of Trustees governs all financial and strategic matters at Queen’s University. We provide oversight to ensure that university actions support the mission, vision values and strategic goals of the school. I sit on the Board to give a student perspective to ensure that the Board’s decisions are reflective of all the changes that students want to see. Some examples of issues overseen by the Board are the new stadium revitalisation project, the non-academic misconduct situation, and budget. Queen’s needs to generate revenue that does not completely rely on student tuition. As Queen’s has raised a large sum of money up to date, it is a vote of confidence in our ability to be a leader. We want to be able to diversify revenue and contain cost. Queen’s has a fundamental mandate to be a balanced academy, maintaining a balance between teaching and research, while still focusing on student health, safety and wellness. The changes to the non-academic misconduct (NAM) system are essential. As not many people completely understand the situation, please reach out if you have any questions. Julie Tseng is another great resource for information regarding NAM. As the results of this review will affect the operations at Queen’s, there needs to be a student voice in the decision. I know this was a lot of information, so if you ever have any questions reach out to me at trustee@ams.queensu.ca.

Matthew Lawson: Thank you for coming, it was a great presentation. On the last slide it mentioned internationalization. As you were too rushed to go over it, would you like to expand on that topic?

Jennifer Li: There are not enough university aged students in Ontario. To maintain our caliber of students, Queen’s must reach out to international applicant pools. However it is important that we recognize the difficulties that international students may encounter at Queen’s. We need to prioritize these issues, as I have found that not many people notice them until they are talked about. The school has released its comprehensive international plan. Having international students is a source of revenue for Queen’s as their tuition is not capped by provincial regulations.

Sam Anderson: You mentioned the collective agreements. In terms of our ability to give feedback on our professors, our faculty has found the University Survey of Student Assessment of Teaching (USAT) evaluations ineffective. Many people here are working on creating more efficient feedback systems. What is your stance on the issue? Or more broadly, where do you think the opportunities lie for students to be able to give better feedback on learning through the collective agreement?

Jennifer Li: That is more of a Senate focus, so I cannot really answer your question. Things that are more academic focused are normally Senate based. I would suggest reaching out to your Senator.

Sam Anderson: I understand, our Senators are well appraised. The issue comes from the staffing perspective. I just wanted to voice something that is very important to us engineering students.

Jennifer Li: Moving forward, I think the only option would be to go through Senate.

Alexander Rey: Who will have the final say over NAM? Is it a Senate issue? Or the Board of Trustees?

Jennifer Li: The review is undertaken by the Principal and his advisory committee struck specifically for the issue. There are many check points before it finally reaches the Board. Before the final decision is made, there are many opportunities for changes to be made.

Alexander Rey: If the Board voted against it, would it just die even if the Senate approved of it?

Jennifer Li: Hypothetically yes, as that is technically how it would work. However I do not see the motions being shut down.

## VI. New Business: Motions 3-13

### Motion 3

Whereas: ChemEngChem have requested an accelerated timeline for their BED Fund proposal;

& Whereas: FTIR’s are cool and would enhance ENCH 398 significantly;

& Whereas: Money from the chemistry department was raised to match the difference;

& Whereas: The ChemEngChem Club Execs voted unanimously to approve the BED Fund purchase;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve spending $10,755 from the BED Fund for buying FTIR equipment as outlined in APPENDIX “CHEM”.

Moved by: Jacqueline Craig

Seconded by: Chris Angelatos

Opening (Jaqueline Craig): ENCH means that it is referring to Engineering Chemistry (Eng Chem). The purchase of Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) equipment is being proposed. Eng Chem is adding a new course this year and they were looking to upgrade their spectroscopy equipment. This type of equipment is some of the best that you can get. It will be used by Eng Chem, chemistry students and grad students. We are paying the amount proportional to what the Eng Chems would use. This kind of equipment is what the BED (Better Education Donation) Fund was made for. All of the ChemEngChem students have said that they want the equipment. I think it is a great purchase.

Ryan Cattrysse: You may use your laptops.

Sam Anderson: This sounds like a cool purchase. Is there any mechanism in place to ensure this equipment remains accessible to undergraduate students over the years and not just end up with grad students?

Jacqueline Craig: We looked into that. They are building the curriculum for their new course around that equipment, so that it is totally embedded into the course. This will start this winter. That is why the purchase is coming now.

Eleanor McAuley: It says that $13,000 was obtained from somewhere. Where are these funds coming from? Are they coming from the chemistry faculty? Are they coming from student funds?

Jacqueline Craig: The faculty of chemistry is paying for the other half. This is something that undergraduate engineering students would not otherwise have the opportunity to buy. However grad students with big grants could. This way we can ensure that undergrads have the opportunity to access this equipment as well. This equipment seems like a good investment for the BED Fund, as it will make a big impact on the Eng Chem program. Everyone is very excited.

**Motion Passes: 6:30 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 4:

Whereas: The events budgets are constantly being updated from the initial budget due to errors in estimates or logistical changes;

& Whereas: We should be as transparent with our finances as we can.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the update to the Events Position and Operational budgets as seen in APPENDIX “EVENT BUDGET THING”.

Moved by: Jerry Haron

Seconded by: Jane Ferguson

Opening (Jerry Haron): Way back in September we passed our original operational budget. Included in that were my personal Events expenses and the Events operations expenses. Throughout the year we have been going over the budget and have found that some things have changed. Sometimes we need to ask for things that are not in the budget. We thought we could be a bit more transparent with a whole new budget. Please take a look at it on your laptops. Jane Ferguson and Andrew Crawford have taken a look and said that it looks good.

Ryan Cattrysse: Laptops are allowed to be open.

*Chloë Harkness leaves and proxies her vote to Avery Cole.*

Sam Anderson: Can you highlight the changes that you think are the most significant?

Jerry Haron: It turns out we made a mistake and the Movember budget was not originally included. However it turns out that Movember is on track to make quite a bit of money, around $1,500 of net revenue, which will be donated to the Movember society for cancer research.

Andrew Crawford: For those that don’t have their laptops open, the net change to the bottom line is only about $60 to the total expense. That’s really the only net effect on this.

Jerry Haron: Many of the budget lines got removed as many things ended up being donated to us. For example, for the External Relations Committee (ERC) parade we did not actually end up needing a driver. Some things were added on to various parts of the budget. Promotional materials were added to EngWeek.

Matthew Lawson: So have made changes to the budget since it was given to the Executive Director (ED) team back in the day? Did you already have this budget before hand? Or has it been changed since you received actuals from the months?

Jerry Haron: It has been changed since receiving actuals, so this is the most updated version.

Matthew Lawson: Are these reflective of the actuals? If so, why are they not just represented in the actuals?

Andrew Crawford: Because it was never presented, we felt it was right to show what was spent for transparency reasons. We made a mistake and we want to show you what actually happened so that everything adds up.

Sam Anderson: The Events portfolio works in a way that you have budgets open and shut throughout the year. Do you think having the ability to look at and reallocate the budget was beneficial and makes sense for the Events portfolio?

Jerry Haron: Yes, especially since events are so big and constantly changing. When we budgeted back in the summer, we could not foresee the future. For example, the EngWeek chair was changed, and when he hired his new committee, they had to update some of the budget lines. We also planned to have trivia at EngWeek, but since Clark does trivia now, that had to change. Moving forward I think we might do this every year, as it is really good and transparent.

Andrew Crawford: Just as an additional note, I discovered a line in policy that states that we are mandated to present our pre-actuals before the new team is elected. The current plan is that we are on track to present in January.

Sam Anderson: Good for you.

Eleanor McAuley: Did you change anything in your personal budget as well?

Jerry Haron: I did. They are mostly decoration changes. In the summer it was promised that the decorations for the Dean’s Wine and Cheese were cool. Turns out that they did not exist, so I went out and bought them. The faculty agreed to pay for them. If you have any questions, please ask.

**Motion Passes: 6:41 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 5:

Whereas: The Executive-Director transition process leaves much room for improvement;

& Whereas: Better aligning term of the positions is one of these improvements;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the second reading of the changes to By-Law sections 1, 2, 4, and 9, as seen in APPENDIX “BACK TO THE FUTURE”.

Moved by: Andrew Crawford

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Opening (Andrew Crawford): This was presented for its first reading last council. These changes are to alter the term of the Executive Director (ED) team to better align with how things are run throughout the year and to ensure that there is not a crazy overlap of work. This will not apply to the current team. It will be grandfathered into the current timeline. Next year’s team will start in March, but go until the end of the following April.

Matthew Lawson: Have any past Directors been consulted on this? Has anyone felt that they have extended the period in a time where it might not need to be extended, especially since it will be extended into the winter exam period?

Andrew Crawford: This was an issue raised by Eric McElroy. Burnout is an issue Executive Directors do tend face. Though this issue is closely related, it will need to be addressed on its own. Though this new timeline keeps you around for longer, you have a longer time to transition into your role. This way you will come in better prepared and hopefully be able to better keep up with everything. I understand that it is a very busy academic time, and for someone to have to learn their role and execute it, it can be a large burden. The extra time given to them will actually help.

Julie Tseng: One thing that is interesting is that about half of us are actually in fourth year. As a very senior team, with a large amount of varied experiences, it could help with the transition of the new team. As the new team will be on for a longer period of time, we hope that this extra time will help slow the transition so that the next team is not just thrown into the deep end. All three of our Exec have been very committed to making sure that the next team is transitioned in the best way possible to avoid burnout.

Sam Anderson: I like the changes, I think it is a good idea. I was not here last council, so I apologize if this question was already asked. Please correct me if I am wrong. How will this change the hiring process for the positions that are hired by those Directors? If someone works under the portfolio of a Director, will their position not take into effect until May 1st?

Andrew Crawford: So to clarify, your concern is for people hired under the Directors? I think that it will operate very much the same. We will still have the transition period before hand where you do not have official power, but are still able to get things done.

Sam Anderson: I understand that it would not be a big red flag in policy, but this could affect situations where we assume that a specific person is the official person in a role. This will change the hiring that happens at the end of the year. I know that EngLinks runs many of their workshops at the end of the year, though it does not actually say in Policy who can run these workshops. Are there other places in which we have more regulated roles, where we need to specify that the position will begin earlier?

Alex Wood: To my knowledge the only thing affected would be the Board, as that changes at the Annual General Meeting (AGM). All of our managers have their contracts go until the end of April. I am not sure about EngLinks. I think the actual transition dates are only set for the ED team. It is up to their discretion what the transition dates are for the positions below them. I do not see where we would run into any issues.

Eleanor McAuley: I think that once we shift all of Council to operate from a May 1st to May 1st term, it will alleviate many of the issues.

Tyler Bennett: What currently dictates the date that ED team transitions over? What has historically dictated this?

Andrew Crawford: The ED team transition date is normally based on the AGM meeting, which is normally the first or second week in March. Historically, I think it is “just because”.

Jay Young: It was just a transition originally so that there were both sets of people here at the time, so that they can transition properly into their roles.

**Motion Passes: 6:52 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

Ryan Cattrysse: Could everyone please close their laptops. Thank you.

*Julie Tseng leaves and proxies her vote to Jacqueline Craig.*

### Motion 6:

Whereas: With By-Law comes policy;

& Whereas: You all know the drill;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to Policy Section γ: Hiring and Transition, as seen in APPENDIX “BACK TO THE FUTURE II”.

Moved by: Andrew Crawford

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Opening (Andrew Crawford): So these Policy changes literally change three words in the Policy Section: Hiring and Transition. It discusses the incoming team shadowing the outgoing team. Does this mean that everyone needs to stick around until April 30th? In the terms of what shadowing is, no.

Stephen Martin: That is an interesting thought. If something were to come up that needed to be addressed at the end of the term, which the incoming person could not handle, would there be a measure of accountability to make sure that the outgoing person would handle it?

Andrew Crawford: That is actually how it works right now. If anything happens from March to April, it is handled by the incoming person. As of AGM, they are the official person in the role. However, you can run into issues on both sides on how to handle accountability. Does that answer your question?

Stephen Martin: Here is an example. If a serious situation occurs that needs to be dealt with, the outgoing person might have the mindset that since they only have the position for six more days, the problem could just be pushed off until it becomes the incoming member’s responsibility. What if the incoming member is not yet skilled enough to take on the problem? Is this something that the Exec would need to take on? What ensures that there is a level of accountability on the outgoing member to make sure that they actually do the things that need to be done near the end of their term?

Andrew Crawford: Currently, there is nothing in place to combat that, however one suggestion is to move the “honoraria” so that the Exec cannot receive it until the incoming team has confirmed a proper transition. For Directors, I think that there can be an assumed level of trust and accountability that the Exec will hold their Directors accountable.

Matthew Lawson: In regard to hiring, conferences get hired during the leeway period. Who will be doing the hiring? Can the old Director exert authority and do the hiring? Will there be a change in who hires those people?

Andrew Crawford: As it stands all incoming members hire the people below them. One thing to note is that Policy states that the Director doing the hiring must be the supervisor overseeing the position for the majority of their term. If this was not the case, it would mean that the outgoing Exec could technically hire the incoming ED team.

Ryan Cattrysse: Could a constitutional guru look to see who can actually hire a position?

Erin Murphy: Now that there is a more extended period of time between when the new Exec are elected and the old Exec are leaving, will the new Executive still be consulted in major decisions that could potentially affect them?

Andrew Crawford: I believe that there is a line in Policy that states that alongside shadowing the Exec they will be consulted in the decisions being made.

Stewart Jensen: We already have this weird gap with the services, as AGM already happens after I hire the incoming people. I feel like it wouldn’t be that big of a change to have that happen for conferences as well.

Avery Cole: I am struggling to find a conclusive answer about hiring as it is very spread out throughout the policy manual. I do not think that policy will cause us too many problems. I think that we could definitely have the correct people in the hiring panel.

Alex Wood: Policy does not necessarily read that the hiring must be done by a specific position. It does basically say that anyone can sit on the panel as long as they have received hiring training. So I think we will be good to go.

**Motion Passes: 7:04 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 7:

Whereas: We currently mandate management team size;

& Whereas: This makes it hard to reorganize management teams to best fit service needs;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to Policy Section η: Services and Corporate Initiatives as seen in APPENDIX “LES BEREAUCRACY”.

Moved by: Stewart Jensen

Seconded by: Andrew Crawford

Opening (Stewart Jensen): To give you some history, last year Mike Blair brought a motion to add another manager to the Tea Room service. I do not think that these kinds of decisions should go through Council. We already have a large amount of oversight, so adding Council on top is a bit excessive. We pass all of our budgets independently and give our managers power to hire teams independently. I do not understand why this is the one area where Council gets to dictate what they can do. I think this can really inhibit the new management team from being able to undertake their vision for their service. For example if Campus Equipment Outfitters (CEO) wants to hire a new manager, they would need to bring it to council, which could potentially cause many problems.

Julianna Jeans: Can you go over the amendments that you have made?

Stewart Jensen: I added a sentence to specify who will get to make the decisions. I took the power away from Council and gave it to the Vice President of Operations. I took out the part on sustainability, as there are other reasons why you would want to add a manger to the management team. For example if a mental health person is needed, that is not something you can really put a dollar value on.

Callen Hageman: Do you believe that this change is needed for every service equally? Did you talk to the head managers of all of the services about this?

Stewart Jensen: Though this does not really affect the iCons, I think it affects the rest of the services pretty equally. I have consulted all of the head managers and they are all behind this decision.

Alex Doig: The Engineering Review Board (ERB) looked at it, and we were satisfied when the VP Ops was given the accountability.

Andrew Crawford: This actually brings the current manager hiring policy in line with the current staff hiring policy. One thing we realized is that if a service wanted to create a new manager position, they could just create an equivalent staff position, which is very underhanded. In terms of if this is relevant to every service, I feel that it is the most relevant to the Tea Room. However, it could definitely come up as an issue to other service management teams.

Avery Cole: I would like to point out that there is currently a 100 word job description for every management position in policy.

Stewart Jensen: I think those position descriptions are in there to act as a guide for what positions are available in the management team. We are not planning any major shake ups in our management team structure. I hope that the management teams would still come in and hire pretty much the same roles each year. It would be encouraged that anyone adding new positions would add in a description to policy. In the future a motion could be put forward to add that language into policy.

Eleanor McAuley: The way that I interpret it, this is already the minimum requirement we have set to allow the services to run properly. I think this is good as it allows new management teams to try things out for a year without being held back by council.

Matthew Lawson: I do agree that less bureaucracy is better, but I also believe in oversight. With students running corporate initiatives, there is always a risk. I do not believe that having to come to council to explain your ideas is an undue hardship. I do not believe that having no oversight, especially for portfolios that have such a large financial aspect to them, is a good idea.

Andrew Crawford: Could a constitutional guru check the Board policy to check if new positions need to be presented to the Advisory Board? I think it is the intention that any new positions would need to be presented to the Advisory Board, so they would still act as the oversight. I also believe there is already appropriate oversight for financials.

Avery Cole: The services must submit capital and strategic plans.

Bailey Piggot: I believe that there is already the appropriate amount of oversight in place, as any new positions would come to Board. I do not think Council is the appropriate body to accept or deny new positions as they are not really involved with the services.

Stephen Martin: I agree with what has been said. I do think it might be good to consider having them have to do a presentation at council when new positions are proposed. I think it is important to keep the Council informed at all times, so that we can make good decisions regarding the rest of what we do here.

Callen Hageman: If the Advisory Board let Council know what was going on with these changes, just so we stay informed, that would be great.

Stewart Jensen: I agree with that. I do imagine any big changes would be presented. I wouldn’t be opposed to add in some language to policy so that new positions must be brought forward as an informational presentation.

**Motion Passes: 7:17 pm (32, 0, 0)**

*Brandon Tseung leaves and proxies his vote to Austin Greisman.*

### Motion 8:

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

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

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Ryan Cattrysse: Laptops will be allowed for this motion.

Opening (Alex Wood): The reason this is broken down into four motions is that that each aspect of the restructure deserves its own debate. The idea of the “shuffle” is to move the Director portfolios to where they make more sense under the Exec. We will move the Director of Conferences to under the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA) as they have the best knowledge of the resources available to conferences and groups on campus. The Director of Integrated Technology (IT) will be moved to under the VP Ops. The Director of Human Resources (HR) will be under the President, as we are changing the mandate of what HR was at its original inception. We are hoping to turn it into more of a real director position, instead of the position being mainly focused on surveys for services.

Erin Murphy: I am clearly behind, but could you go over what specifically is changing in the HR portfolio and what they are going to do?

Alex Wood: That is coming at a later motion, but the idea is that in its current state it is completely focused on the services. This has to do with the fact that it is currently in the Operations pod. In that setting, HR is very focused on services, and focuses mostly on surveys and hiring. Putting it under the President will expand its scope so that it is looking from more of a society wide focus. It will give the President a higher level of oversight with the person making decisions about hiring sitting under their portfolio.

Sam Anderson: There are many interesting changes here. I applaud the work that went into putting the report together. Just a comment about moving the Directors under different Exec. In my experience, there was not a lot of direct support between the Exec and Directors, though that may be different for this year. But I do not think we currently have a system in which there is a great benefit from the pod structure. In moving these Directors around to different portfolios, how would we make sure that these pods are actually beneficial?

Alex Wood: I will be honest, the pod structure was pretty weak last year. This year we have focused more on a full ED structure, in hopes of moving towards more of a successful pod structure. The way oversight works varies much with the team. I see where you are coming from in getting proper support from Exec. Even this year, I have found that there are some Directors I support more than others depending on who wants to be more independent. I think it really comes down to who the manager is. We can never guarantee that they will be the best managers, as they are just the people that won the vote. I think it also adds a fun aspect to the team, as there was some inner pod rivalry between the pods. I think the pod structure has its weaknesses, as does the full ED structure. It comes down to how good the Exec managers are. For us, the pod structure has been nice as you get different opinions in a smaller group.

Callen Hageman: I noticed that you moved the Director of HR directly to the President. With the HR role expanding, do you think the President can still adequately support the position?

Alex Wood: I see what you are saying and it does come down to an issue of support. I would say that the Director of Conferences is equal in size to the HR portfolio, even with it expanding. I do not think it will really add more load to the President. The idea is to change more of the spirit of the position. I worked with Alexander Rey quite a bit in September and March. I did not see him much in October as he was so focused on Staff Chats, causing him to move away from student affairs. The portfolio change is more to change the spirit of the position. I think the Exec can definitely support them, as equity is definitely increasing throughout the society. The society needs to work on a cross support system to ensure that Directors get the correct support from the correct place.

*Sam Grant returns and reclaims his vote.*

Stephen Martin: I wanted to shed light on the opposite side. Having been Director of First Year before the existence of the pod structure, I felt very well supported by the President. That was very helpful for me, especially as a second year, with having the guidance of someone with twice as much experience as I had. I am very confident that the three Exec this year are doing a good job. The thing most valuable for me was that every week I met with Emily Fleck (the President at the time) and went over what I was doing, and how I needed her to help. I think it is very important to communicate in person, face to face, as texting is not as effective. I recommend for people to meet each week, as even an hour meeting with your Exec can go a long way.

Eleanor McAuley: If a Director is not be able to finish something from their role, it would be the respective Executive’s job to take over that duty. With the new portfolio shuffle, would the appropriate Exec feel comfortable dealing with situations specific to the Directors that are under them? For example, if IT were to go down, would the VP Ops feel comfortable dealing with those issues?

Alex Wood: Just because a position is overseen by a single Executive, if someone had to leave their ED position that position would not necessarily only be taken over by the single Exec. At the end of the day it is a team and the responsibly would be spread out over the entire Exec team. Other ED members could even offer support. I think the entire system would help out if a Director were to leave, not just the one Executive in charge of them.

Andrew Crawford: I think having a pod structure is very beneficial. It is good to have Directors handling similar things to be overseen by the same Exec. For example, events, conferences and design together represent many of the events on campus. Operations would oversee services, IT and finance, which all interact with each other. There is a large amount of cross pollination. Having it all under one Exec, so that they know what is going on in a specific area is very valuable. Keeping that knowledge in a specialized stream is very useful.

Sam Anderson: I know you compiled all of the information on the restructuring into the report, but what specifically are we voting on right now?

Julianna Jeans: This motion is just to move those three Directors around in By-Law.

Avery Cole: We are just doing the first By-Law reading right now. Next council will be the second reading.

Alex Wood: I do not have much left to say. Thanks for your advice, I appreciate the debate.

**Motion Passes: 7:36 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 9:

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to By-Law 2: Rules of Order and By-Law 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in APPENDIX “REEEEEACH”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Opening (Alex Wood): So this is one of the bigger additions for the night. Here is some background. I feel that something missing from the society is an outreach focus, to both the Kingston community and to other universities. We are very sheltered in our bubble here at Queen’s, as we are in our own little area. It is very easy to forget you are even in Kingston. EngSoc really only does four or five outreach events, and only two or three really give back to the community at all. Compared to other EngSocs across the country, or even just to other student societies on campus, we do far less. For example the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society (ASUS) has many charities that they support. The AMS is constantly advocating for the students to the city. There is an Outreach Commissioner in the Waterloo EngSoc. McMaster has an entire role devoted to the topic. I think it is important that we gave back to our host community. At the end of the day, we are Kingstonians for four years.

Alex Cavaliere: My comment is from the perspective of also being a part-time employee for the city. I think this is a very positive motion. One thing we tend to forget is that we are part of a larger community. Many people do not know that GoNuts is the longest standing fundraising event of the Kingston Rotary Club. Kingston is our home for four years or more, and a Director of Outreach to help facilitate initiatives is a very positive thing.

Meara Hampton: I think this is very important. However what I do not understand is that when we restructured the society a few years ago there was the removal of the position of External Communications. How is this any different from that position?

Alex Wood: Outreach and External Relations sounds similar, but in scope they are very different. External Relations was very focused on inter-university relations with the Engineering Student Societies’ Council of Ontario (ESSCO) and the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES). The External Communication portfolio was mainly going to these events and conferences to represent Queen’s Engineering. This was back when we only had four conferences. Outreach has the option to expand to inter-university outreach, as the only one who currently does that is the President. The External Communications position was sort of transitioned into the Director of Conferences. So outreach in my opinion will be focused on improving community outreach in Kingston. However we want to leave it open so that there is the potential to expand our outreach to the greater Ontario area or farther. I see how they are similar, but Outreach’s focus is primarily on community events. One point I want to make is that other societies at Queen’s are doing a large amount of amazing things. The ASUS Commissioner of Community Outreach runs the after school Buddies program, the Alzheimer’s outreach program, the ASUS Community for Environment, the autism partnership, cancer triad, Global Initiatives, Friends 4 Inclusion, Heart and Stroke, Lost Paws and Kids 4 Kids. EngSoc supports the Kingston Rotary Club and does Fix N’ Clean. That is it. In comparison, it does not look very good.

Matthew Lawson: I think that is a vast understatement of what EngSoc does for the community. We have Engineers Without Borders (EWB), FIRST Robotics and much more. Please acknowledge that. I was also told to mention that Eric McElroy does not love the name. He would much rather it be called the Director of External Relations. He says that “outreach” makes it seem too much like outreach to the engineering community and not to the Kingston community.

Alex Wood: I would like to apologize on behalf of the clubs, I was speaking more specifically for what EngSoc does. I do acknowledge that our clubs do many things for the community. In regards to the name change, I would not be strongly against it. If there is a strong opinion against the name, I am happy to hear suggestions. At other schools they are called Public Outreach positions. It really comes down to what you think “outreach” means.

Nikhil Seth: My main thing is that I want to make sure that it is very well defined what the portfolio and mandate of this new position will be, so that it is very clear what they need to do.

Alex Wood: I do not currently have all of the policy drafted up, however I will be compiling a secondary report when we get down to the actual policies. I mentioned briefly before that I do not have any exams, so I will be spending a large amount of time staying in Kingston to work on EngSoc stuff. During that time I plan to rigorously define what these positions do. I do not currently have them, though I do have the rough outline. A more thorough report will come before next council. I am happy to answer any questions you may have about these new positions.

Tyler Bennett: Are there any qualitative examples of events you plan for the role to run? What would this incoming Director role look to do?

*Chloë Harkness returns and reclaims her vote.*

Alex Wood: It comes down to trying to establish yourself when you have a new position. They will be taking a few things from the Director of Events portfolio, such as Fix N’ Clean. I think it will just be more events where they are giving back to the community. For example Events did the Swab Drive, which was great. Some ideas would be to set up a soup kitchen program or a clothing drive. Much of it comes down to meeting with members of other societies to see what they do and potentially joining them and adding an engineering spin to what they are doing. I would love to see more charity events. They will be overseeing the clubs that do community outreach events. I would not expect them to run many events personally in their first year, but in years to come I would like them to move in that direction.

Alexander Rey: I think this is a fantastic idea, but I wish there was more of a focus on external relations with other schools. These will be our coworkers in the future. They are very valuable. This position is less than it was originally proposed to be as the By-Law does not indicate that they would work with anyone outside of Kingston. I think this is very restrictive. I think focusing on these inter-school connections is crucial.

Sam Anderson: I have a few strong reservations towards the idea. It is very unfocused. If you look at the responsibilities of the position, it has a media relations component. However media and community relations are very different things. There is someone who communicates with media. Then there is someone who gets out and works in the community, which is more what this role should do. We need to look beyond what EngSoc does for our students, as we are not the only service provider. The AMS provides many opportunities and we should find ways to help engineering students to get involved with those before we try to stick our name on many band new initiatives. If you are looking at what EngSoc is supposed to do, we are supposed to serve our own constituency. I think it would be irresponsible to allocate money away form that scope. However, I think that our role as engineers is to give back to society, which is important in order to get the most out of our degrees. Most people do not engage with the city even though there are many engineering specific ways for us to give back. Why do we not get together and design a Sci-Formal type project to redesign the community center? That being said, I think we should support this new position, as I believe these issues can be worked out.

Alex Wood: Thank you for those comments. In terms of public relations (PR) vs community relations, the idea behind it was as follow: we had an incident with a TV station when interviewing for GoNuts. The outreach position would need to deal with such issues when working in the community. That is where I was coming from. Much of our outreach initiatives can add to our degree and by letting more people know about them, it adds even more value. Many companies look for students that give back to their community during their undergraduate career. I have been told that many of these companies are looking for charitable components that show that engineering students want to give back. It is a convoluted argument, but I think we are adding more value to our degree by providing these opportunities for our students. It also benefits the Queen’s Engineering name as a whole. Hopefully if we get a good name in Kingston we will be seen in more of a positive light, rather than just being remembered for those few times when something goes wrong. We need to improve the industry’s opinion of our school.

Eleanor McAuley: I am in support of the new position, though I have some questions. Our purpose statement in the constitution says that we will advocate for our members. I think that this position allows for us to do this, so it is important. As we have mentioned many other groups that do outreach, have we thought of collaborating with these people? I think it is important that this outreach person is just the outreach person, and does not also become the public face. That is the President’s role.

Alex Wood: In terms of collaboration, I am definitely looking to have this person collaborate with other societies. I think that taking what other societies have and applying them to our society is very beneficial. For example an Equity Officer is a position that other societies have, that we do not. I have seen how beneficial this role is in other societies. This year there is an equity caucus. I would love to talk more with the AMS about it. I want people to be able to sit down and discuss what they do. In regards to PR, a large part of it was added because I expect this person to be at the community outreach events and will be in the public space. However if we do not want a Director level position being our main media contact, we can put this on the President. But keep in mind that the President is very busy and having this person to help would be very beneficial.

Julianna Jeans: Something Julie Tseng mentioned was that the day after the pole was stolen, which was the first day of classes, she was bombarded with people contacting her about the event. Having someone to help with the situation would have been very helpful for her.

Jay Young: I think it is important to expose our students to these organizations that are out to improve the greater good. Many of our events are very big and happen within the community. I think it is important to be able to buy ourselves equity in the community. We want the community members to look at us in a better light when they see us in the city.

*Eric McElroy returns and reclaims his vote.*

Emily Townshend: While I am mostly in favour of this motion, we have had a long and tricky history with charitable donations and how they fit with our mandate. The spirit I have gotten from our membership is that people are okay with us going out to physically help out in the community, but people get upset when the society is just writing cheques to charities that not everyone in the society agrees with. I caution that it is very important to make sure that the charitable aspect is focused on doing things in the community themselves, rather than just cutting cheques for charities. We as a society pay student fees to have ourselves covered. Any additional support to the community is great, but people should have the right to decide to buy into that.

Taylor Sweet: I was wondering what the timeline for the implementation for this position would be? What Exec portfolio would this fall under?

Alex Wood: The idea is that we get the By-Law second reading done right after the break, as ED applications go out very early second semester. We want to get these changes in so that we can implement them this year. The position would falls under the President, as it is very externally focused, which the President needs to be involved in.

Nichola Trinh: What does Eng Rugby have to do with outreach? Have you considered involving Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) in community outreach?

Alex Wood: When looking at the clubs, a discussion about WISE came up. We were not sure whether to put it under the Professional Development portfolio or Outreach. We decided to put it under Professional Development. Eng Ruby was another one that we looked at. Eng Rugby travels to other universities and they represent us outside of the campus. That is why we put them under outreach.

Andrew Crawford: Eng Rugby does not just compete with other schools, they also compete with local Kingston teams. There is a bit of outreach. Just to give a quick overview, I have seen that the vagueness of the position has been brought up. Alex Wood has brought up the point that he will still develop the position. In terms of the debate on whether it should be more community focused or externally focused, I think the intent is more the local external outreach while still keeping the possibility to expand. I want to say that this is an aspect of our society that we are falling short on. Eng Rugby was one of the best ways that I felt that we engaged with the Kington community and other schools. It was a low level way in which we could engage and interact with people in the community. I really did benefit from it and felt more like I was a part of the Kingston community. I am very strongly in support of furthering our engagement in the community.

Alexander Rey: How does the role expand into the wider inter-university community when in By-Law it is strictly defined as just part of the Kingston community?

Alex Wood: There has been a great deal of debate on whether it should be focused on inter-university engagement or just Kingston outreach. I tried to be somewhat vague with the wording to allow it to expand beyond the Kingston community, as we have been quite divided with people’s opinions.

*Brandon Tseung returns and reclaims his vote.*

Loralyn Blondin: After we took our hiatus from the CFES, we are now slowly building that relationship back up by attending the conferences. I think what we are missing is interacting with the Kingston community. I think the inter-university relations are growing on their own, but the community outreach is not.

Jacqueline Craig: One thing I would like to mention is that I think the Santa Claus parade and Carol Service are both religious events that not all of our members prescribe to. My hope is that they look at forming partnerships that are outside of that scope and are sensitive to these issues.

Alex Wood: We do not actually say that we have to do a Santa Claus parade in Policy. Though we can definitely pass on that opinion that it is not what all students support. Just note that it is not mandated in Policy. It is just something that the External Relations Committee (ERC) choses to do.

Stephen Martin: I think the biggest issue with this position is the matter of scope. I think this debate is mostly because having to handle both inter-university relations and outreach would be very overwhelming. I think that another matter of scope is where we to set our target goals. Alex Wood brought up the matter of what ASUS does, but it is important to keep in mind that ASUS has more people at their disposal than us. It is often said that we are busier than they are, based on perception. Emily Townshend brought up the point that we do not want to just be cutting cheques. A big resource that we could give them is our time, which we are already very thin on. The biggest way this could be successful is to simply collaborate on what already exists. We can have our own events to parallel what ASUS has, but let us not try to reinvent the wheel. Overall I do support this.

Alex Wood: I would be thrilled to collaborate with other student societies. Engineering does at many times reinvent the wheel. I would very much be in support of using our engineering skills for the community’s betterment as Sam Anderson suggested. In terms of external communications, my original thought was that this would be completely a community outreach focus. In talking with Directors, I am trying to add in the external communications aspect, though I am realizing that it is very half hearted. My own opinion would be to focus just on the community outreach. I do not think we need a position that is specifically to reaching out to other universities, as we already have Directors—such as the Director of Conference—that do that in their portfolios.

*James Gibbard-McCall leaves.*

Eric McElroy: I missed the beginning, but I believe that I have been caught up. In general the idea behind this is very positive, but my concerns rely mainly on the vagueness. I do not want to see another vague directorship pop up and not have a clear plan or direction. I think the naming is confusing. Director of Outreach sounds like they are trying to outreach to the people in our own society. I would like that to be clarified. Is it external? Municipal? This should be very clear in Policy. Another concern is in terms of the coverage for the university. What are other groups doing? The AMS has an entire commission that does work with the community. Are we trying to reinvent the wheel? Why are we trying to cover similar areas? I would like to see a five year plan before approving this, so that we know where we are going. I do not think that we can afford to head forward without having a future plan.

Alex Wood: In terms of vagueness, that has come up a few times, based on me being torn between two ideas. Within By-Law it focuses mostly on the Kingston community and I would be happy to clarify that. In terms of the outreach aspect, a point was made that the faculty officer is entirely in charge of outreach. Outreach means something different to everyone. I mentioned earlier that I am not particularly attached to the name. I by no means want to reinvent the wheel and would like to work very closely with the AMS and other groups. However those groups do not have the best outreach when it comes to engineers and I want to build a culture of outreach within our society that cannot be done by those other societies. As already mentioned, I have no exams and plan to spend two weeks at the beginning writing those five year plan reports. I will preferably get them to you before the break begins.

Eric McElroy: You mentioned before that the focus will be on Kingston. How will the media liaison work if there is something national?

Alex Wood: That was in part because they would be able to help the President with the internal Kingston media groups. We need someone well versed in community relations—a sort of PR position if you will—to ensure the things we are doing to help our degree get some exposure. The President got very overwhelmed during the pole incident, and by having someone else well versed in media relations would be very helpful. I hope that they will become the primary person to promote these outreach events so that the community can know about them.

Gwen Gorman: I would like to say that I have faith in Alex Wood that he will be able to clear up the ambiguities. Though I believe there is an element of vagueness that is important in this sort of position so that we can expand in further years. The five year plan brought up is very important, but this sort of position does need some elasticity. When you go into an interview and they want to know what we have been doing do help the community, this sort of the thing is very important. As engineers we take an oath to the society, so we should by no means turn this down. You keep saying not to reinvent the wheel, but if you can change the size and customize its features, why not? We as the people of this council have an identity that we need to upkeep, and we need to have our own identity from the AMS. With a follow up plan this would be fantastic.

Stewart Jensen: In terms of scope, I think we already sort of made the decision about external relations versus the community. I think the question is, do we want to have our president spending time doing external communications? That has been a big focus for this year. Is that the best use of presidential time? If not, we should have someone else focused on that.

Alexander Cavaliere: I would like to call the question. I think that we keep coming back to the same point that we are in favour of the Director of Outreach, even if specific details are worked out later.

Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Alexander Cavaliere

**Motion Fails: 8:34 pm**

*Debate continues.*

Alex Wood: Note that there are multiple versions of the same By-Law section. In the case that not all of the motions pass, we cannot have all of the information in one document.

Sam Anderson: I would like to continue the debate, because I would like to do a good job of this. I appreciate Eric’s point about throwing people into roles with a vague mandate. I think that our past success with this sort of thing comes from having an exclusive portfolio. Alex Wood said it well when he mentioned that community relations is something that we can either do well or that we can mess up. We need to have the President involved, and have this person focused on the community. There are very different reasons for wanting to reach out to the community from wanting to reach out to other schools. I think this position should start out very focused on our relation with the community. If that is done well, then we can expand later in the future.

Eric McElroy: I would like to propose an amendment on Sam’s point regarding trying to narrow the focus. I propose that all mentions of Director of Outreach change to “Director of Municipal Relations”. I also propose that we move point C.13.a.ii that says that the Director of Outreach would work “alongside the President as the primary external media liaison for the Society” to the Director of Communications instead.

Alex Wood: Unfriendly.

*Debate begins on the amendment.*

Eric McElroy: I have proposed this because of two things we think are important. One: to have someone to liaise with external media. Two: to have the position laser focused to the Kingston community. This amendment puts something that should have been in the community portfolio from day one, into it, which is external communications. I think the name change gets right to the point and makes the position very clear.

Loralyn Blondin: I feel like changing the name and changing part of the spirit of the motion are two very different things and I do not know if we should vote on them together.

Jacqueline Craig: I think that when we look at making this new position, we need to think of how the students will look at what the position does. I personally do not care what happens to Kingston after I leave, and I am sure that I am not the only one that feels that way. I would much rather see someone working on bettering the Queen’s Engineering name by getting us on the radar somewhere else. I think that the word “municipal” in the name ties it down to Kingston too much and does not allow the position to expand.

Meara Hampton: I know part of this motion is to move some clubs from under the Director of Design to the Outreach position. One club involved is EWB, which is an international club, and would thus not be covered by “municipal” relations. This speaks to the importance of expanding outside of Kingston. I do not like the municipal name.

Andrew Crawford: Just a note on the idea for the media liaison to be the Director of Communications, that is already sort of in Policy. That is a role that has already been specified. As this is just the first reading of the motion, I do not think we should be discussing changing two Director portfolios. They need to be dealt with individually, and right now we are only focusing on the one.

Stephan Dobri: I like the idea of focusing this on municipality. Engineers do not always have best reputation in the community. It would benefit us to reach out to the community more. Touching on Jacqueline Craig’s point, if we do something positive in Kingston—if done on a large enough scale—it could get national news coverage. I do not think we should restrict the description to just the community as it could expand to outside of it.

Sam Anderson: When discussing the “value” of our degree, I want to clarify that I did not mean to improve the value of the “name of the degree”. It is more that the students should understand that our program is about working together and giving back. I think we might be putting too much emphasis on the ED structure and not enough on the impact. We can market it how we like, but I do not think people should really care too much what the name is. What is more important is how the person will actually be impactful. We need to think about what projects they will actually take on. In terms of EWB, I do not think we provide much support to them, as they are very competent. We are just a point of contact. I do not think that that is indicative of that role. I think that the new initiatives for this position are more important. It is not about picking a glamorous opportunity to give back to. It is just about giving back to someone in the first place. We need to pick a reasonable project and get it done.

Alex Wood: I really appreciate those points. EngSoc supported clubs do not get much oversight from EngSoc. The point is that EngSoc can offer support if required, but their mandate is not to control or run clubs like EWB. They are just there to help out. I am loving this debate, it has been amazing. From my understanding of the Communications portfolio, it is pretty swamped. Yes we could move Communications Team to an actual Communications Team manager, but I think that the Director of Communications needs to focus on our internal advertising. They are sort of the equivalent to Studio Q. It is up to council whether Communications should be focused on management of the Communications Team or whether we should completely change the mandate of the Communications Director and make them more of a marketing person. They will not have time to do both.

Siobhan Powell: Since we have been talking about the wording, I would like to advocate that “outreach” means “action”.

Laura Penstone: As far as being a media liaison, this was a bigger job during frosh week. Leah Ferrie, Julie Tseng and I were in constant communication during frosh when the media outlets came to the events. When people wanted to interview the frosh leaders, we had a bit of a prep session. That was a part of my job early on, but not so much lately. In terms of sending someone to deal with media, it is important to send the most knowledgeable person and have a sort of prep session ahead of time. In terms of the Communications portfolio, I am pretty happy with how it is working out right now, even though it is fairly busy. I think that it is important that the Director of Communication can oversee the different managers and that they have the obligation to watch over how the society is perceived.

Breighann Merry: I do not know if you can amend a motion about By-Law at its first reading.

*Debate on original motion resumes*.

Emily Townshend: We have been going around in circles. Yes, we are Kingston for four years. I realize most people leave and do not care about what happens to Kingston, but I think that is a problem. We do not care what happens when we leave, but the community will always care. We do not have much equity to what we take from the community in terms of things such as noise violations and property management. When the community sees frosh week, they do not see the AMS. They see us, the purple engineers. I think that it is important to focus on the equity in the local community, as some of us will stay here after we graduate and it is important that our employers do not hate Queen’s students.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Callen Hageman

Seconded by: Avery Cole

**Motion Passes: 8:59 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Matthew Lawson: I am in favour of minimizing the scope. I do not think that they should have to act as the media liaison. Putting external communications into that same portfolio is too much. The outreach person should focus on outreach.

Alex Wood: The current topic of debate is whether or not this public-relations aspect should be in the portfolio. I am open to the idea of removing it, I just want to improve community relations, and I am fine with the laser focus on it. Can we do a straw poll? Do you believe that the PR aspect should be tied in with this portfolio?

Sam Anderson: When you say public relations, are you referring specifically to media?

Alex Wood: I am looking at it from a PR marketing standpoint. I will rephrase: do you believe that the Director of Outreach should serve as a media liaison?

*Council conducts a straw poll on the topic. All members, not just voting members, may vote in a straw poll.*

Eric McElroy: I would like to call into question Mr. Wood’s claim of timeline shortness.

Julianne Jeans: Alex Wood was referring to how the positions are put up before the elections council.

Eric McElroy: I do not see how having the positions go up a few days later is that much of problem, as long as it is done properly and ensures that the position is well formulated. It cannot just be passed on principle, things need to be well thought out, well-reasoned and well planned.

Ryan Cattrysse: The first voting into By-Law is mostly voting on the spirit. Details may still be changed before it is brought back.

Alex Wood: Second council next term occurs during the campaigning period. We lose many members of council during that period. If we put the positions up on the 22nd, that means that the Director interviews would be happening for many days in a row. I want to make sure that our hiring schedule has applications due by the 3rd the latest, so that teams can hire all Friday night, Saturday and Sunday and be done by Monday. That way the 48 hours of Director hiring does not affect people’s mental health, as for me it was very hectic last year. Beyond that, I realized that I do not really have a five year plan made for this quite yet. Most of this is for the spirit of the positions and I think that most people agree that the spirit is good.

Eric McElroy: How far does the spirit of this motion go? Where is the line drawn between spirit and the other things?

Ryan Cattrysse: I would say that you agree with the spirit if you agree with the outreach position and most of the roles in which it entails. Alex Wood could still switch around one or two minor roles, but most would be defined by the spirit we pass today.

Nick Rupar: Could Alex Wood amend where the PR position goes? Would that still be within the spirit of the By-Law?

Ryan Cattrysse: Because that is one of the many duties, I would say that yes, he can amend that within the spirit before the next reading. That one point is okay, but more than one would not be.

Sam Anderson: Can we just take this motion off the table and add a new motion to the agenda with the amendments?

Ryan Cattrysse: Alex Wood himself would need to take it off himself. Or someone needs to table it.

Stephanie Carswell: I would like some clarification. Laura Penstone brought something up about how our media relations with external outlets currently stand. I think that even though many of us are in favour of moving direct media relations out of the Outreach portfolio, they still might be someone to speak on an event that is happening, as they would most likely be the most knowledgeable person on that event. I do not think it should be a part of their role to be required to speak on stuff, but in many cases they may be the most knowledgeable and the best person to consult. We can benefit from media taking note of our activities and I do not think it should always fall on one person to explain what is going on. The President is currently the main point of contact, but they should be able to defer to someone who may have more specific knowledge on what is going on. I think it is more about finding the most suitable person to handle the specific events. The President and Director of Communications could be primed to make sure that we put a consistent message forward to the media.

Alex Wood: Based on the straw poll, I will be removing the media relations aspect of the portfolio. We cannot do it in this motion, but it will be removed given the opinions of Council. This does bring in a good point that we should get a media relations person that is specialized. I will be looking into bringing in a new position such as a “media relations officer” under the Communications portfolio in the future.

Andrew Crawford: Does everyone actually understand what is happening right now?

Eric McElroy: I would like to motion to table the motion.

Avery Cole: Note that a motion cannot be amended while it is on the table.

Kevin Corey: Since we have heard the media relations thing is going to be struck, does that not mean that the rest will be moving forward in the spirit that we want it to?

Avery Cole: If it is tabled, we can move to reconsider it at any time. If we reconsider it we cannot amend it and it will still be on its first reading. But a person can remove and resubmit something very similar.

### Motion to Table the Motion:

Moved by: Eric McElory

**Motion Fails: 9:18 pm**

*Debate continues.*

Andrew Crawford: I would like to move that we move to a committee of a whole.

Ryan Cattrysse: This means that you do not need to be put on a speakers queue, but there will be no limits to how long you can talk.

*Quinlan Hickey leaves and proxies her vote to Alex Doig.*

Andrew Crawford: I retract that motion.

Eleanor McAuley: I think that most of us agree with this in principle, so I would like to call the question.

Ryan Cattrysse: I am not allowing that call to question because there was a preamble.

Sam Anderson: We are going to have sixteen Directors, which is more than twice the people that operate on that level in any faculty society. Down the road we need to consider what the best way to manage these sixteen Directors is. Is three people managing sixteen good enough?

Eleanor McAuley: I would like to call the question.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Eleanor McAuley

Seconded by: Tyler Snook

**Motion Passes: 9:21 pm**

*Question called, so council votes on motion.*

**Motion Passes: 9:22 pm (30, 0, 2)**

Let it be noted that Eric McElroy, Stephan Dobri and Matthew Lawson abstained.

*Emily Townshend leaves and proxies her vote to Richard Hum.*

*Council breaks: 9:24 pm*

*Council resumes: 9:28 pm*

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Stephan Dobri

**Motion Passes: 9:29 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

### Motion 10:

Whereas: The Director of Human Resources was created two years ago;

& Whereas: The tasks are not feasibly completed by a single person in that director position;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to By-Law 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in APPENDIX “SURVEY GIZMO”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Opening (Alex Wood): So this is a fairly major shift, even though it is only a change to a few lines in By-Law. The Director of Human Resources (HR) was originally created to lighten up the Director of Services’ portfolio. They were to look at Staff Chats and other feedback surveys from staff. Equity has not become more of a concern as we do not have a position dedicated to it in the society. Alexander Rey has been working a large amount with the services this year. People do not understand how long it takes to run Staff Chats, so a part of this is to give the Director of HR the ability to deal with HR rather than doing feedback work. We are to introduce a new officer position to deal with equity. It is definitely something our society needs. This goes along with moving HR to under the President.

Ryan Cattrysse: Please remember that we are trying to move to non-gender specific pronouns.

Sam Anderson: I just have a clerical note. PAQE is Positive “Allies” and Queers in Engineering, not “alliance”.

Ryan Cattrysse: We will have that fixed.

Andrew Crawford: Please note that the motion actually reads wrong. It should be Bylaw 8: Engineering Society Directors.

Julianna Jeans: That is my bad, it should read that we are changing By-Law 8 not By-Law 2.

Alex Doig: The Engineering Review Board (ERB) has taken a look at the Survey Gizmo appendix. We liked what we saw. The only issue we had was with the line about officers. By-Law is pretty inconsistent as to whether it includes descriptions of the officers. We thought it might be beneficial to include a quick blurb about each position.

Alex Wood: By-Law is meant to cover the rules of the governing body. Since Elections Team is a large part of that, it has a description in By-Law. That is why the elections officers are detailed in By-Law, but other officers are not, as they do not relate directly to the governing body.

Eric McElroy: Since we cannot amend this right now, my understanding is that no one will do Staff Chats?

Andrew Crawford: I believe that is still embedded in Policy. The roles of the Director of HR are also embedded in policy.

Avery Cole: Yes. Since this is its first reading, this will not be reflected in By-Law directly after this reading.

Eric McElroy: I just wanted to clarify what we wanted By-Law to be in the spirit of this motion.

Stephen Martin: You mentioned that a part of the reason you wanted to do this was so that the HR Director could do some other things. Could you touch on some tangible examples of what those other things are? I was on the Committee of Inclusivity last year, which I think was very successful. How do you see the Committee of Inclusivity fitting in with this proposed Equity Officer position?

Alex Wood: The Director of HR would do training, as that is the biggest weakness in the society. Our officers get very little training besides hiring training. Everything is basically based on previous experience. In terms of the kind of training, I would say that they would give general EngSoc training and equity training (such as positive space, mental health, etc.) in correlation with the Equity Officer. I think that if I make it so that anyone who manages people requires this training, this would take a lot of time for the Director of HR to do.

Kristy Tu: What kind of relationship would this officer have with the service managers and staff?

Alex Wood: The way I see it is that this would work very directly with the services. We are trying to make the Director of HR more overarching. Though the Director of HR would still be involved to some extent, I think the Staff Chats would mostly be done by a new officer. The Director of HR needs that additional support person to get them through all of the surveys and feedback. I think the rest of the society is missing out on the resources that could be provided by the Director of HR, as they are currently only focused on the services. We would like to make the position more society wide.

Evan Dressel: I would find the Equity Officer very helpful. I personally wanted to get the mental health training for my First Year Conference (FYC) Committee and First Year Project Coordinators (FYPCOs), as when you are in charge of so many people, it is important to have this training to make sure that everyone feels comfortable. If anyone wants this training, you currently have to go through Alex Wood, who is very busy. Or you have to go through the AMS, but they do not give you a very engineering based discussion. I am hoping that Gwen Gorman can touch on the set of training we got from the AMS. I found the training from Alex Wood more beneficial than the training from the AMS.

Andrew Crawford: As I currently oversee the Director of HR, the Director should exist so that we can develop and support the human resources of the staff and volunteers of the society. This move to add the new officers allows that. The training would be a small part of better developing the officers and staff. Another part would be through the Corporate Feedback Officer, who could help identify our shortcomings in regard to how we are operating. I want to make sure that the purpose of the portfolio was clear.

Mike Blair: What is actually being debated right now? Is it the changes to By-Law 8?

Andrew Crawford: Yes.

Alexander Rey: I wanted to propose that all future Directors of HR must be named Alex, but I realized that I cannot do that. I think this is a more significant change than just indicated by the two lines in By-Law. The Director of HR is very Operations portfolio based and is very much a behind the scenes role. It is largely focused on dealing with hidden things before they become large issues. There is more to the position than may appear at the surface. Our Committee for Inclusivity is fantastic, but this officer will be creating one more person who is of a higher profile in that area. The exact role of the Corporate Officer is still to be defined due to confidentially concerns and figuring out who does what. Right now we are voting on the spirit of having another person who will allow for the Director of HR to move more towards training and the society as a whole, and away from operations. HR in a Director position does not have the capacity to make decisions, as having HR exist under Operations greatly limits the position. By moving it to more of a training and advisory role will allow it to better match the role of a Director.

Julianna Jeans: Please note that By-Law B.10 now reads the “President” and not the “Vice President of Operations.” That was changed a few motions ago.

Jacqueline Craig: I was the Director of Academics for six months before I got mental health training and I really think I should have gotten it early. Especially when my position is to help people with academics, which is already a sensitive topic. EngLinks just got this training and we worked to make sure the training was specific to what they need in order to do their job. Just a point for the Director of HR topic: I am currently running Staff Chats for EngLinks and they took me a net five hours to compile the survey, send in the emails and talk with each person, which is not that much extra time on my part.

Alex Wood: I could be in error for how long the Staff Chats take, but the compilation stage still takes a while. When I picture training, I mean to get multiple 30 to 40 person sessions that allow for discussion within smaller groups. You might think that it is a waste of efficiency, but I think it really gets people to understand what is happening. Having 200 people lectured at in a large hall is not as effective.

Gwen Gorman: As First Year Project Coordinators we received training from an AMS representative. Training is much better and much more intimate in a smaller group. In the end it is worth it to have the special attention towards ensuring engineers are training engineers. Engineers experience a large amount of stress. I found the AMS training to be very fluffy. As someone who has struggled with mental health, I do not think that the training was in-depth enough to train engineers. I think that having that special attention in the society would be crucial not only for the success of the people in positions, but also for the success of the people they are ultimately responsible for. This leads to a stronger sense of empathy among peers. Something important that we always talk about is having a safe space, and one-on-one attention is the only way to achieve it.

Mike Blair: I take great caution with the fact that we are really just creating names and are tasking the Exec to create the definitions. Let me know if I misunderstood this. We are debating on the projection of what we think these positions mean in order to determine if they are needed. I caution you to not compare organizations across campus to each other, as they are all different. Just because one organization has an Equity Officer, does not mean that we need one as well. It does not make sense to approve this tonight, and then later craft what the positions mean.

Alex Wood: The second reading of By-Law and the introduction of Policy will come at the same council.

Ryan Cattrysse: This will not be put into By-Law until after the second reading. This way when you are debating what the motion is doing, you will also be deciding on the name at the same time.

Mike Blair: I think it would be more beneficial to have what the positions actually do on the table at the first reading.

Chloë Harkness: Have you put any thought into the specific tools and resources that will be provided to the Equity Officer? Or will that be the responsibility of the Equity Officer to go out and find? I know that the AMS and HR office have many trainings set up that are already well established. While being on FREC Committee I met with those people and helped them to make their training more engineering specific.

Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Avery Cole

Seconded by: Tyler Snook

**Motion Passes: 9:59 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Alex Wood: In terms of AMS training, I agree that they already do a good set of training. The training that I got and gave to our group was training that I got from ASUS, which mostly originated from the AMS. One thing I worry about is the time commitment. If we want to do groups of 20 to 40 people, it is hard to get someone from the AMS to commit to doing that many training sessions. Having our own person to lead the charge on that, to be the main point of contact working with AMS to craft that training to be engineering focused, would really help. I have been looking into tools to provide the officer. The Committee of Inclusivity is great, but the issues that arise just report to council, and then they kind of just dissolve. Having an officer specifically devoted to that kind of stuff would be very useful. I am currently sitting on Equity Caucus. I would have them be our main representative on that caucus. The one meeting I went to was very informative. Having one person to collect all of these equity and mental health resources would be incredibly important. I would say that they would sit on the Committee of Inclusivity, look to expand mental health programming and help to craft equity training.

Stephen Martin: I would encourage the following to be considered. Training is awesome. On a personal level I would be very interested in this type of training. But note that training can take a large amount of time. When I was the Director of First Year, positive space training was eye opening, but took a very long time. I have heard the statement that the “Engineering Society needs to be a good boss” thrown around. I think that in order to be a good boss, we need to use our time wisely. We need to cherry-pick the important things. We are looking at the positions as a resource for people to go to when they have HR issues. What is the motivation for people to go to the Director of HR for these resources? Alexander Rey said that he is very much in the background. How do people know to go to this person? On another note, people managing is difficult. Adding many individuals under the Director of HR will take up a large amount of time. Has there been any consideration to adding just a single individual under that Director? Do we really need two separate positions? Having one person would lighten the load.

Alex Wood: Those are awesome points. In terms of EngSoc specific training (day-to-day training and EngSoc resource training) it is something that I would want to do at the end of winter term with as many people hired as possible. At this point this could be when you just sit them down and lecture at them in a large group. It is not ideal, but it would get many people done all at once. I would put the equity training as a separate set of training. I agree four hours is a bit much. The equity training should be done in smaller groups. Having HR work with equity, they will be talking to every officer in the society and working closely with all of them. In terms of the motivation for people to speak to these positions, whenever one of the officers has a mental health issue or peer support issue, they will remember that it was the HR Director and Equity Officer that taught them how to deal with that. They will remember that they can always go to those people for support. My expectation is that both the Equity Officer and Corporate Officer portfolios would grow. I worry that if the positions grow, if we tried to combine them into one, it would be very overloaded.

Stephen Martin: In terms of Staff Chats taking too much time, you need to streamline it. We have now done them for a few years, so we need to make them more efficient so that they take less time. Do you think that people will actually apply for these positions?

Alexander Rey: It is something that is more challenging to streamline than it appears, as we are not working with just one organization. We are working with separate services that all have different speeds of operation. EngSoc as an entity has never done this before, which is why it may take more time to streamline.

Eleanor McAuley: We talked a large amount about training. As a Director I found it very useful to give the training I was given to the people underneath me myself. I think hiring others to give training is useful, but having people give the training themselves to those underneath them can be very beneficial. That idea should not be scrapped.

Matthew Lawson: Has there been any consideration in putting the Corporate Resources Officer under the Director of Services? That is what the Director of Services used to do, so it would make sense.

Alex Wood: We have not really looked at that, as it is currently a part of the HR portfolio. I know Stewart Jensen is very swamped, though I would be happy to hear what he has to say.

Stewart Jensen: I do not think that it would be too crazy, as it sounds like there is already a pretty good process figured out. The Director of Services is already sort of a part of delivering the Staff Chats anyways, so it does not sound like a bad idea.

Andrew Crawford: One of the reasons we used the Director of HR is that they are not working under the same portfolio.

Sam Anderson: I have reservations on the name “Corporate Resources Officer”. It is yet another CRO and I think that the word “corporate” is confusing. As someone who is potentially working under the President’s portfolio, it is unclear what “corporate” means. I also think that it is a bit uncanny. We should be able to provide roles that align more with industry jobs. I think you could call it something better.

Jacqueline Craig: For when the new Equity Officer comes, it think it is important that they look at how the society touches religion. In regard to training, I do not believe that everyone is capable of doing all types of training. You need to be a very empathetic person to give mental health training. There are some trainings that you can pass on to others, but there are specific ones that require a certain type of person. Having one person who embodies those qualities to give those trainings would be a good idea.

Eric McElroy: We like to do many things that have already been done and we forget things that have happened in recent history. It was said that “traditions live and die in a year”. It is important to look closely at this position, as the “Corporate Officer” role is literally why we created the Director of HR two years ago. It was put into a Director role so that it would remain sensitive and confidential. These are two potentially great positions, but do we really need them? Are we filling a role that could be better served by other people?

Eleanor McAuley: In terms of putting the new Corporate Resources Officer under Services, I think that it would limit what we are aiming to do. We want to do Staff Chats on more of a society wide basis, such as for Orientation Week and Sci-Formal. Putting this position under Services would hinder its ability to do that. In terms of Directors being busy, you just need to accept that it is going to be a busy role. I do not think that being busy is a good enough reason to create new positions. Yes, there is point where mental health can become an issue, but that is why there are many support systems in place.

Alex Wood: Point well taken. I do not think we should get to the point in these positions where they need to reach out to mental health resources. I know many people do not go towards Director positions because of the large time commitment. We are incredibly busy as engineering students and we want to keep these positions as accessible as possible. We need to have enough positions so that they may remain small enough so that you can take them on and still do well in school at the same time. Some Director positions have a good balance and some do not. Every year is different. Some years the position may be more swamped than others. I would caution that yes, we are trying to expand the society, but we are also trying to make sure people have time to live their life while still holding these positions.

Kristy Tu: I think that the Corporate Resources Officer is in itself a title that is very intimidating. If we are actually breaking down what their job is, it involves conducting and delivering the Staff Chats and ensuring compliance with the Ministry of Labour. In my opinion if something is so extreme as to violate the Ministry of Labour, it should be completely in the mandate of the Director of Services to handle, and should not need to fall on another position. In watching where Staff Chats sort of circulate, I think it is best to keep them under the Director of HR. Directorships are busy and time consuming, but we do Staff Chats for a reason, and I think they should stick with HR. A Corporate Services Officer is not something that should be needed. I am proposing not putting that officer into Policy.

Alex Wood: I agree that maybe the Corporate Resource Officer in its current state is not the best. But part of the reason that we are trying to offload Staff Chats to another position is because we want to expand them to other parts of the society. Part of our mandate is to increase the professional skills of our students. But in its current state, all of our other volunteers and positions are not receiving any sort of feedback. We would love to expand the Staff Chats, but that becomes very overwhelming. We need to split it up, as they cannot be done by the head of a committee. Having Directors run them would run us into confidentiality issues. Ideally we would have a person that runs surveys all year. At this point I would love them to still have some presence in the services, as the Director of HR is valuable to them, but I think it needs to spread to the rest of the society. This new position will see the Staff Chats on more of the society side and potentially take on other projects throughout the year.

Eric McElroy: I mean this in no offense, but at the end of the day, Directors are just busy people. To just say “oh we can offload the work onto other people” reaches the point where there needs to be a line where people have to take responsibility for things. One of the big things with all of our services is that the volunteers need an exit interview that says “was this what you expected this position to be, was it the time commitment you expected, and did you enjoy your time?” This is something ERB could run.

Nick Rupar: I am the IT manager this year and we currently have a project to do that. It will encompass exit interviews for most of the positions.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Galvin Niu

Seconded by: Kevin Corey

**Motion Passes: 10:28 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Eleanor McAuley: I think the point that has come up is that we do not give our volunteers and other positions adequate feedback. We have developed a problem, but have only proposed one solution on how to best give constructive feedback. I do not think Staff Chats are the solution. I think we should think about how we can solve this problem in the best way possible.

Stephan Dobri: When I was Orientation Chair, we sat down with the Actions and Techs to discuss how the week went for them. It was very effective and did not take much time. We then passed the information on to the incoming FREC Committee. It is something that can work across the board with many positions.

Eric McElroy: In respect to mental health, I feel like there are already many great resources available. Trying to step on top of the other resources is not ideal. There are already great resources on campus for mental health training. We should use them.

Alex Wood: I should provide some clarification. The “mental health resource training” does not just cover how to help a friend in a mental health situation, but it also covers which resources to direct them to. The equity position would not really be someone to actually fix your problem, but more someone who can direct you to the correct support. The idea was not to have them step on the toes of the Peer Support Center or the Engineering Wellness Centre. You never want to give bad advice, so most of this advice would be to help direct people in the correct direction.

Avery Cole: I like this debate, but this might not be the best avenue to brainstorm ways to fix all of the services.

Kristy Tu: Has any thought been given to removing the Director of HR position, and moving it to outside of the ED team? Some points have been brought up about the Director of HR not being about to give feedback to the Director of Services because they are on the same team. It becomes difficult to not have bias. If you remove them, then they are not swayed towards the services and can do their own thing. Has it been thought that their role as a general Director could be unnecessary? There are many extra things that they do not really need to do, such as council and office hours.

Alex Wood: From my experience with the HR Officer at ASUS, she does exactly what you are describing. She is on the outside. But the dynamic with the team gets very weird. The fact that you only have a single officer that does the same amount of work as a Director, but is not a Director, makes them feel like they are not a part of the team. Because technically, they are not. Yes, they would not need to do office hours or council, but they would still need to operate a large position, without being included in the team dynamic. This leads to a feeling of extreme loneliness. I do not disagree that moving director positions into officer positions is a bad idea, but at this time I believe having a single HR officer would be particularly unproductive, unless we were able to shift many other Executive Directors to officers. I have just heard bad experiences with having weird sub-tiers within teams.

Callen Hageman: We have been debating this for a very long time, and much of it is going away from the spirit of the motion. I do not think that this is the place to debate this.

Stephen Martin: This is the exact place to debate. In council we have a whole bunch of really intelligent people who have been elected to represent a whole bunch of really intelligent people. This is an area where there are lots of people contributing.

Callen Hageman: I was not saying that this was not the body to discuss stuff, I just meant that I think it is getting out of hand.

Sarah Taylor: I motion to call the question.

Stephen Martin: If this does go through, and we vote no, then we cannot bring back another motion with the same spirit until AGM.

Eleanor McAuley: There are mechanisms in place to reconsider a motion. So it is not completely unable to be brought back.

### Motion to Call the Question:

Moved by: Sarah Taylor

**Motion Fails: 10:40 pm**

*Debate continues.*

Sam Anderson: We are getting away from the impact and are instead debating how these responsibilities will be carried out. I would much rather a person who is very excited about HR be able to develop their own portfolio. We are trying to decide where we want to go, and then later get the people to decide how we want to do it. I also believe that we can technically decide to not hire a position that is listed. Vice versa, I think that we can hire a position that is not listed. It is worth having time for the VP to be able to develop some policy and determine if it is something we agree with. In that sense, we should move away from discussing how the individual roles under HR will be carried out.

Eleanor McAuley: You are correct, there are definitely many cases in policy where we hire positions that are not listed, such as the FYPCOs.

Andrew Crawford: My opinion at this point is that we need to develop these things better.

Eric McElroy: We have had a good discussion. Although the premise of an equity officer is nice, I would very much encourage Alex Wood to withdraw his motion and come back with Policy and By-Law that fit with what council has reflected tonight.

Alex Wood: The Corporate Resources Officer will either be removed or reassessed. I still believe passionately that we need an equity person, but thankfully it is not as time sensitive as the Director of Outreach. I will be coming back with an Equity Officer motion, as I believe that is the most important part of this policy. I would like to withdraw this motion.

**Motion Withdrawn: 10:46 pm**

### Motion 11:

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

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

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to By-Law 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in APPENDIX “I HATE CLUBBING”.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Julie Tseng

Opening (Alex Wood): The Director of Design is a position that was created based on the position of the Vice President of Student Development. It has a portfolio that includes all of the design teams and clubs. When you need to deal with fifteen design teams and clubs, there is only so much you can do. The Director of Design teams is very knowledgeable about design teams, but not necessarily about the clubs. The best person to support clubs is not necessarily this Director. We would like to make sure that the executive officers for the clubs are knowledgeable. I think that some of the teams and clubs need to be moved around to better fit with others that share the same interests.

*Emily Townshend returns and reclaims her vote.*

Stephan Dobri: To give some context, some design teams make sense to be kept together. Some clubs should be kept together. Some clubs and design teams make more sense together. For example there is one club that focuses on biomedical engineering technology. It make sense for it to be placed with design teams. The person in charge of each of these groups should be knowledgeable about their specific needs. Different clubs operate differently. For example Queen’s Project on International Development (QPID) and Engineering Without Borders (EWB) operate very similarly, but do not make sense grouped in with the design teams.

Alexander Cavaliere: In the ten page report, I could not find information on where Positive Allies and Queers Engineering (PAQE) will go. Have the groups being moved around been consulted on which Director would best benefit them? Have the groups not being moved also been consulted?

Alex Wood: PAQE is not currently included. In regards to where they will be assigned, they should continue to operate under the Director of Design for now. Another thing that was discussed was PEP Talks. There has not been much consultation with clubs, as it has been difficult to reach out to them this year. Stephan Dobri organized a design team roundtable, but not many clubs showed up. Many of them are just very distant and will only come to us when they really need help. It makes more sense to put them under where they can receive the most helpful support specific to their needs.

Alexander Rey: What are PEP Talks?

Kristy Tu: Professional Engineering Perspectives Talks.

Eric McElroy: When would this be effective? Will Director Dobri keep working with the clubs he has already spoken to? Or will they be removed from his portfolio immediately?

Alex Wood: Things will stay in their current state, but will take into effect for the next team.

Sam Anderson: What is the best way for us to support our clubs? Is putting them under Directors actually the best way? Clubs are independent initiatives. We can support them by giving them marketing resources and by connecting them to the correct people, but what would this look like for different Directors? How would it look for the Director of Professional Development to have Women in Science and Engineering (WISE) under their portfolio? How will they actually help the clubs and teams beneath them? It is not really our job to boss them around. Though we do not want to tell them what to do, we still want to be able to support them logistically. For example if we had an Equity Officer, having a specific club report to them while they are trying to do training can become overwhelming. I think we should have a centralized source to be the point of contact with the clubs. I think having a single point of contact, much like the Clubs Manager for the AMS, is the most useful thing to do. I do not know how any of these Directors will actually add value to these clubs.

Alex Wood: I appreciate those points. The idea is that we are trying to support these clubs in the best way possible. For example if Robogals goes to the Director of Design to ask about getting more high school opportunities, they will direct them to the Director of Outreach. It just adds another barrier. We are trying to associate them with the Directors that have the most knowledge on what these groups need. We do not offer much support other than with the basic banking stuff, so we want to find resources that are the most applicable to each of the clubs individually. Their Directors can check in once in a while to make sure they are doing alright.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Second by: Tyler Snook

**Motion passes: 11:00 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Avery Cole: The acronym is wrong for Queen’s FIRST Robotics Team. It is actually QFRT.

Jacqueline Craig: I have contact with the discipline clubs, which are very similar. Sometimes they ask me how to do things, so I think that it works out well for them to have one main contact. I also wanted to commend us on having a good debate. It is very important to stay calm and collected. Great job guys.

Siobhan Powell: I would like to speak to Sam Anderson’s point about it being useful for clubs to have a specific Executive Director. As the executive director of the Fuel Cell team, I can say that having someone that knows the club well and being able to provide resources is very valuable.

Andrew Crawford: Our general manager has been around for a very long time and I think he has seen how our relationship with clubs has evolved over time.

Jay Young: Clubs are all over the place unfortunately. The Director of Design is a new position. We originally wanted this position to help these clubs and teams flourish. This has been very successful with the design teams but not so much with the clubs. I am not saying that X is better than Y, but I think that the clubs could definitely be supported better by people with passions that go along with their needs.

Emily Townshend: I think it is very presumptuous of council to tell clubs which resources they need. For example, some clubs just want to be left alone. I think there should be someone in charge of linking clubs to resources only when they ask for it, instead of telling them that they need them. It is not in our mandate to tell them what they need.

Alex Wood: The idea of this position is not to tell the clubs that they can only talk to this person. It is more to have a mandated person in society whose job is to reach out to the clubs. In the past, we have not really connected much with specific clubs. By having someone with the job of reaching out to the clubs to let them know about the available resources helps to create a better knowledge base. I technically oversee the clubs, but I can only tell you what some of them do. Having a Director responsible for knowing what each of the clubs do is very important. It adds a more personal element to our interaction with the clubs. I think it is a much better arrangement than the one that we currently have.

Kristy Tu: I was previously in the position of the Director of Professional Development. I worked closely with PEP Talks. Their main point of contact was the Director of Design, but they would then get forwarded to me when they needed assistance. I just advise that whatever gets done is clear, so that the clubs understand what their clear path of supervision is so that they understand that they belong to someone specifically. Be careful with what gets placed where. Right now WISE is under Professional Development, but I would argue that they would more appropriately be under Outreach.

Alexander Cavaliere: As this is just the first reading of By-Law, we are voting on the spirit of the motion. If following further consultation we find that a club should be moved elsewhere, could that be done within the spirit of the motion?

Ryan Cattrysse: The spirit of this motion is to move the clubs to where they best fit. So yes, I would say they can be moved.

Eleanor McAuley: What do you mean?

Ryan Cattrysse: We are putting the clubs where they fit best. So moving them to different places is still in the spirit of the motion.

**Motion Passes: 11:11 pm (31, 1, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 12:

Whereas: First Year Conference has previously been entirely funded by EngSoc;

& Whereas: First Year Conference still needs financial support to run successfully;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the spending of $2,000 for First Year Conference 2016.

Moved by: Alexander Cavaliere

Seconded by: Evan Dressel

Opening (Alexander Cavaliere): First Year Conference (FYC) is a conference that hosts approximately 200 first year students and helps them with their transition into being an upper year. The conference discusses topics such as grocery shopping and choosing disciplines. Previously the FYC has been entirely funded through the Director of First Year budget, but last year specifically we received $9,500. We have now been moved to being a special event under Policy and are thus are required to be self-sustaining. Although we have tried to do so, we are asking for $2,000 to ease the transition into being a self-sustaining event.

Andrew Crawford: I have already met with Alexander Cavaliere previous to this to review to discuss whether they can cut costs. The answer is yes. I agree with the spending of this money. They have shown very good drive to reduce their costs for the program they want to run. I think they are well on their way to becoming self-sustainable.

Alexander Cavaliere: In terms of diversifying offerings, last year we spent most of our budget on food, which was not the best way to manage money. We are using a much lower percentage of our budgeted spending money on food this year. We are introducing things such as a case competition and a semi-formal event.

*Alexander Cavaliere proxies his vote to Loralyn Blondin in order to avoid a conflict of interest.*

Jacqueline Craig: I know that one advertising point was that you would get $70 worth of food. How does this fit in with that?

Alexander Cavaliere: Last year’s food was budgeted at around $900, though they actually used much less. I have been able to re-estimate the cost of the food while increasing the caliber of the food we are offering. This year we have found a caterer that can offer a full prime rib for less money than the lower quality food from last year. For the ticket price and getting $70 worth of food, we are not skimping out on the quality. This year we raised our ticket price from $20 to $30 dollars per person in an effort to increase the revenue for the conference. The reason this motion is coming so late is because we did not want to ask EngSoc for money unless we really needed it. We still want to keep the conference accessible for as many people as possible.

Rigers Rukaj: I wanted to ask about the jacket patches. Who do they go to?

Alexander Cavaliere: We send out a feedback survey following the conference to all of the delegates about what they would like improved. We also ask whether they are interested in purchasing the FYC jacket patch. Because I cannot say for sure how many would be interested, I have budgeted for about 50. If for some reason we do not get this response, and do not require 50, we could save some to be sold for next year. If there is no interest, that line may come out entirely. It is a bit up in the air.

Rigers Rukaj: I am not entirely sure how this works, but could you instead make the net revenue 0 so that it is not adding to the total conference cost?

Sam Anderson: Where is the revenue from the sales?

Alexander Cavaliere: The reason that the line is not in the budget is because until we run our feedback survey, we do not know how many people will want a patch. Provided we have the funds to do so, I intend to purchase those patches. If we sell those this year, then that is revenue we have not budgeted for. But for now I have budgeted for them without the potential revenue. We want to be able to set this event up well for the next Chair of FYC.

Evan Dressel: Just in regard to purchasing FYC jacket patches, if they are not purchased by the students, it is a good purchase for the future committee. It is more useful for them to have the jacket patches on their jackets before the event so that the first years can see them and wonder “how can I get one of those”.

Alexander Cavaliere: We had a few left from last year and have already used them as raffle items.

Matthew Lawson: Good job. I am in favour of giving you the $2,000. Where can I get a ticket?

Alexander Cavaliere: Unfortunately FYC is just for first years.

Matt Whittle: I know from personal experience that that sort of benefit is not given to other committees. Also they cannot even put the patches on until April, so is there really a rush? In my experience, you normally pay for your own patches, so I would expect that from FYC as well.

Stephanie Carswell: On a different note, I would like to applaud you on positive jacket bar culture. It is cool because first years could say “look I was on this cool committee” or “I went to this awesome event” and promote the positive jacket bar culture.

Tyler Bennett: You have over budgeted a bit for the jacket patches. They would be closer to $7.

Andrew Crawford: For clarification, could you explain what would be cut if you did not get this money?

Alexander Cavaliere: The jacket patches would be cut, as well as the case competition. I budgeted approximately $1,000 for the competition, as I do not really know what supplies we will need for it to run. The cost for the case competition is still very much in the air as I do not have the specifics from our local business partners. We can potentially reduce the costs of the thank you gifts, printing and food. While there are not many large items in the budget, we can reduce costs in many small places. One thing to note is that things like the cost for renting the hall is pretty set in stone.

Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Kevin Corey

**Motion Passes: 11:31 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes.*

Jacqueline Craig: I am pretty sure that you do not need to pay to book an auditorium for a student event.

Alexander Cavaliere: When I booked Stirling for our preconference event, I was informed that there was a charge.

Eric McElroy: If you want to use the projector you need to pay.

Nick Rupar: Assuming the motion passes, but the things you are still unsure of end up costing less, what would you do with the extra money? Would it be put in the bank for next year? Would you give it back to EngSoc?

Alexander Cavaliere: That is something myself, Andrew Crawford and Evan Dressel would need to discuss.

Ryan Cattrysse: You do have rollover until the next year.

Andrew Crawford: Note that they actually already have a $1,000 rollover right now. It puts them at risk if they break even this year, so having a rollover from this year would be a good thing.

Alexander Cavaliere: We would not have been able to run our preconference event and get off the ground if we had not had the rollover. These are difficult to do with no funds.

Emily Townshend: Putting something in a budget that you have already bought is sort of a sketchy practice. In terms of the mandate for FYC, it is to help transition first years to upper years. How does the case competition actually help with this?

Alexander Cavaliere: You are correct in saying that that it is a large part of our mandate. But our mandate does not end there. For example we bring in keynote speakers to speak about how to get the most out of their degree. We also discuss future electives and other things that do not always pertain specifically to second year. So our mandate is expanded past just helping the transition.

Andrew Crawford: In Policy it says that FYC is to help provide information to first years on the degree they are pursuing.

Stephen Martin: Being a part of shaping FYC as an old Director of First Year, I know that a big part of FYC is for it to be attainable and easily accessible. This is why the tickets are only $30, which is much less than most conferences on campus. It helps to push people and is a good introductory event. It will hopefully give them a good experience.

Alexander Cavaliere: We are also an introduction to conferences as a whole. Manyfirst years have never been to a conference and do not see the value in them. That is why we are hoping to show them how valuable conferences can be. We have partnered with other Queen’s conferences, such as the Queen’s Global Innovation Conference (QGIC). We are hoping to set a professional environment and introduce first years to the values that conferences can have.

Eleanor McAuley: You mentioned that you applied for a Dean’s donation. Was that successful?

Alexander Cavaliere: Yes. My 60 page application was completed. We asked the Dean for up to $10,000. This was when we had estimated food costs to be significantly higher. We received $1,000. On that note, no past FYC has received a Dean’s donation. Now that we are in the door, we can indicate to them how we spent their money, why we spent it and help them to see the value in our conference. This will hopefully help us to receive more money in the future.

Bailey Piggot: We are getting really far into the operational details, but in my opinion they are not really part of what council should do. At a certain point we need to have faith in the people we hire. In their expert opinion if they think it is worth $2,000, I trust them.

Eric McElroy: I think this is great work. I am voting yes.

Alexander Cavaliere: If you have any more questions, please approach me at any time. I hope that we can position FYC to become a full-fledged conference in the future.

**Motion Passes: 11:43 pm (32, 0, 0)**

Let it be noted that Stephan Dobri abstained.

### Motion 13:

Whereas: Policy mandates that a proposal be brought forward regarding a summer IT position at this time;

& Whereas: These proposals should be specific and include detailed timelines and requirements;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The proposal for the Summer IT position be seen at the first Council of the winter semester.

Moved by: Andrew Crawford

Seconded by: Alex Wood

Opening (Andrew Crawford): It was mandated by Policy that we would have a summer IT position. We would like to present this at the first council coming back from the winter break.

Eric McElroy: It makes sense. Let them bring this to council once they have this prepared. Please vote yes.

*Alexander Cavaliere reclaims his vote.*

Eleanor McAuley: This is so that they can bring this motion to council later than Policy states, so that they can better formulate what this person will do.

**Motion Passes: 11:46 pm (32, 0, 0)**

## VII. Break

No break was taken.

## VIII. Executive Reports

### i) President

Julie Tseng not present. Read her report for information.

### ii) VP (Student Affairs)

Alex Wood: It is all in my report.

###  iii) VP (Operations)

Andrew Crawford: I have one thing to bring up from Julie Tseng’s report. A proposal was brought forward at the last AMS assembly regarding student fees. There is an open discussion happening about it.

## IX. Director Reports

### i) Academics

Jacqueline Craig: EngLinks had mental health awareness training, it was very successful. The Centre for Teaching and Learning is currently reviewing our educational goals. They are looking for perspectives, and there are currently no engineers signed up. It is a busy time for academics. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me. I was supposed to meet with Dean Clapham, but that did not happen this week.

### ii) Communications

Laura Penstone: We just had our fun engineering photo booth to raise spirits. The faculty is now doing one. Note that we did it first. We gave out approximately 90 Timbits.

### iii) Conferences

Loralyn Blondin: A big project moving forward is to make the Queen’s Engineering Competition (QEC) more of a legitimate competition and bring it more up to par with other Universities such as Waterloo. I want to hear everyone’s feedback. If you have been to the Ontario Engineering Competition (OEC) or QEC, please get in contact with me so that I can hear your ideas.

### iv) Design

Stephan Dobri: Good evening. I think the Crawford “quite frankly” count is at two tonight.

### v) Events

Jerry Haron: Hi, I am Jerry. The ERC Santa Claus parade happened. Shout out to Stewart Jensen, he was a gem. The float was great. The Battle of the Bands event for Movember is this Friday. Carol Service is this Sunday. On Tuesday the Tea Room will have games out for the Chutes and Lattes event.

### vi) Finance

Jane Ferguson: It is all in my report.

### vii) First Year

Evan Dressel: The First Year Project Coordinators played a commerce team in laser tag and we won.

### viii) Human Resources

Alexander Rey: It is all in my report.

### ix) Information Technology

Richard Hum: I am trying to get all of the websites back online. Send me an email if you feel the need.

###  x) Internal Affairs

Julianna Jeans: Some important dates to note: first council next year is January 7th, AGM is March 8th, and the banquet is March 12th.

### xi) Professional Development

James Gibbard-McCall not present. Read his report for information.

### xii) Services

Stewart Jensen: If anyone here has a car and wants to make $40 a week, apply to be the Golden Words Distribution Manager on EngSoc Apply.

## X. Question Period

Richard Hum: Andrew Crawford did you have anything to say about the events sanctioning procedure this time?

Andrew Crawford: No

Matthew Lawson: Any update on the ILC TVs?

Jacqueline Craig: Yes, they will be in soon. Simon Smith is currently trying to find a time to install them that works around the exam time when room booking is busy.

## XI. Faculty Board Report

Meara Hampton: There is nothing to report.

### Motion to Extend Council:

Moved by: Kevin Corey

Seconded by: Loralyn Blondin

**Motion Passes: 11:55 pm**

*Council extended by 30 minutes*.

## XII. Alma Mater Society Report

Callen Hageman: AMS was supposed to be really interesting this week, but nothing too exciting happened. The student fees are being reviewed, moving them from mandatory to optional. Nothing passed in policy. Golden Words is up for discussion tomorrow at 3 pm in the AMS board room. There was a big discussion on election policy planned, but it did not happen. There was a statement on the referendum for AMS that happened. In the closed session, AMS decided to nullify the results of the election. Everything on the ballet for the fall referendum will be on the winter ballot instead.

Alex Wood: The discussion regarding Golden Words is about changing it from a mandatory fee to an opt-out fee.

## XIII. Senate Report

Emily Townshend: Senate meets this week, the agenda is up on the website. There is nothing too controversial this week.

Brandon Tseung: Under the Principal’s report in the Senate report there is the non-academic misconduct package, read it if you have time.

## XIV. Engineering Review Board Report

Alex Doig: We are continuing to look at policies. Continue to send those in.

## XV. Advisory Board Report

Bailey Piggot: Board met on Monday. We heard the mid-year reports from services.

## XVI. Club Reports (Sunny Group)

### i) Apple

Siobhan Powell: No big updates. We have been collecting BED fund ideas and gotten cool feedback. An interesting suggestion was to subscribe to some journals.

### ii) ChemEngChem

Representative not present.

### iii) Civil

Stephanie Carswell: We do not have much going on right now. We have sold our merchandise. Everything is wrapping up. We reviewed our course evaluations we run with the faculty. I have a meeting next week about our faculty industry open house. Our inner tube water polo team made the playoffs. The civil trip is not looking the best. The trip is supposed to go to Boston, but as it stands the trip will be canceled.

### iv) Geological

Alexander Cavaliere: We ordered clothing. We are planning the Fur Cup tournament against mining.

## XVII. Year Reports

### v) Sci’16

Eric McElroy: Thank you to Laura Penstone, as we are having a video made to promote the thank you gift. It will be really cool, look out for that.

### vi) Sci’17

Nichola Trinh: A Sci’ 17 takeover is happening right now at The Underground. We are also ordering cups and straws. We are debating what we want them to say. We are getting stickers. We are posting our reports on the Facebook page. We are also working on drafting a letter on behalf of Sci’ 17.

### vii) Sci’18

Chloë Harkness: Tonight the rest of our committee ran a successful Smash Bros tournament. We are running a design contest for merchandise.

###  viii) Sci’19

Benji Christie: We have the semi-formal coming up. We are trying to make that a big event. We have the Bewic Sports tournament coming up. Jacket pickup is happening soon. We are going to sell hot chocolate. We are getting ideas for what people want for merchandise by posting a poll on Facebook. We have our dodgeball game against commerce coming up. We are deciding on the details.

## XVIII. Statements and Questions by Members

Andrew Crawford: Just a note that the matter regarding Golden Words is not the AMS specifically reviewing the Golden Words student fee. The VP Ops just put in a proposal to change what student fees are. There are three types. There is a claim that Golden Words is not offering an essential service to all students, so it will become an opt-out-able student fee.

Alex Wood: Because of what happened in the fall referendum regarding the Chief Electoral Officer (CEO) position, they will be hiring a new CEO for the AMS. Matthew Lawson and Julie Tseng will be sitting on the hiring panel.

Eric McElroy: One thing I forgot to mention is for Sci’ 16. Go to Summer Hill on December 7th, we are doing a big year photo. There will be hot chocolate.

Emily Townshend: Just a reminder that the December 6th memorial service is happening on December 4th this year. Please come out.

Ryan Cattrysse: Thank you for putting effort into all of the debates. I realize that it was a long one. If you have any suggestions on how we can run council better, please let me know.

### Motion to Close:

Moved by: Eric McElroy

Seconded by: Tyler Snook

**Motion Passes: 12:11 am**