

## AMS Annual General Meeting (Tuesday, March 22, 2011)

*Meeting is called at 9:00 p.m.*

*(MAL – Member-at-large)*

**Rob Lee (Speaker):** A few things I would like to talk about during Speaker's Business. My apologies, I actually do not have the chair.

**Safiah Chowdhury (AMS President):** According to the Constitution, the President acts as speaker of AGM, but I would like to "bequeath" my powers to Rob Lee

**Rob Lee:** Apologies for being premature. First motion on the agenda, approval of the Agenda for the AGM on Tuesday, March 22, 2011. Opening, Mr. Macbeth

**Calum Macbeth (AMS Commissioner of International Affairs):** This is the portion of the agenda where if you want to add a motion or remove a motion, this is the time to do it.

**Tyler Ball (Member-at-Large (MAL) and Editor-in-Chief of the Queen's Journal):** On behalf of the Journal, I would like to withdraw motion 6 in order to focus on motion 5 and we also want to increase our accessibility to students. Since launching the Team Journal campaign, we regret any division this campaign may have caused but we have learned the importance of engaging with students and having everything accessible. By removing motion 6, we don't want to impose any further policies on Assembly, but reiterate policies that already exist, but we want to make that more clear to students.

*Motion to withdraw from agenda Motion 6:*

"That AMS Assembly approve that all concerns relating to Queen's Journal content should only be brought to AMS Assembly if the complainant's issue is not adequately resolved through the process outlined in the Queen's Journal Grievance Policy."

*Moved by Tyler Ball, seconded by Rachel Kuper.*

*Motion carries.*

**Wesam Aleyadah (MAL):** I move to add a motion to the agenda that reads:

"That AMS Assembly strongly recommends the renting of a bouncy castle and provide pink fluffy unicorns dancing on rainbows inside the castle to be the responsibility of the incoming AMS executive and council to make it available to all undergraduate students by November 15, 2011."

*Seconded by Robyn Laing*

*Motion carries, now added to the agenda as Motion 6*

**Rob Lee:** Further debate? Seeing none, closing, Mr. Macbeth.

**Calum Macbeth:** No closing.

*Motion #1:*

“That AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the AMS Annual General Meeting of March 22nd, 2011.”

*Moved by Calum Macbeth, seconded by Chris Rudnicki*

*Motion carries.*

**Rob Lee:** On to Motion number 2, approval of the minutes for the AMS General Meeting of March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010. Opening, Mr. Macbeth.

**Calum Macbeth:** These minutes are a year old, but this is the protocol. If anyone here that was also here a year ago and feels like they were misquoted, this is the time to correct it.

**Rob Lee:** Any corrections? Seeing none, closing Mr. Macbeth

**Calum Macbeth:** No closing.

*Motion #2:*

“That AMS Assembly approve the minutes for the AMS Annual General Meeting of March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2010.”

*Moved by Calum Macbeth, seconded by Chris Rudnicki.*

*Motion carries.*

### **Speaker’s Business**

**Rob Lee:** Third item on the agenda, speaker’s business. First of all, protocol for those of you not as familiar with Assembly. This is my first AGM as speaker. Everyone has a vote and everyone can talk on the issues on the agenda, but there are certain opportunities that you will have to speak, please adhere to them to maintain decorum. Please state name and position when you want to speak. We will go through the speaker’s list, according to the line at the podium. If someone has not yet spoken, they will get priority ahead of you if you have already spoken (per motion). Further to that, I would strongly encourage anyone who has trouble hearing or doesn’t know what’s going on to quietly ask someone who’s near you, and if you can’t hear because of a technical problem, please let me know. Any such issues is known as a point of personal privilege, which you can interrupt the current business and speaker’s line. Point of information is if you have a factual question or have facts to present relevant to the debate. Point of order is when we deviate from our rules of order, as found in AMS Policy Manual 1.

A few things for all of you consider now that I’ve covered how the meeting will work. I would really appreciate it if everyone did their best to listen to what’s being said, especially during contentious motions. There’s nothing worse than if a point or question is raised that has already been brought up. Please refrain from using smart phones or computers. Second thing is respect. We’re all here because we’re passionate about student issues, so please bring the same respect to this debate. Respect what other people say by listening. That also means no applauding, laughing, smirking, rolling of eyes. If anything of that sort happens, I may have to ask you to leave. If you really disagree with something that has been said, you can get up and talk about it, but the only means through which we should be debating is through the podium. The only time I will permit applause is if there is a unanimous motion, with no abstentions. Lastly, please be prepared and concise if you choose to contribute to the debate. I will point out if any points have already been said; this meeting should not be cyclical or repetitive.

One last thing, speaker elections will this coming Thursday at Assembly. If you have any questions about the position, please come talk to me afterwards.

*End of Speaker's Business.*

**Item #4a, Judicial Affairs Report, Presented by Brandon Sloan (AMS Judicial Affairs Director)**

**Brandon Sloan:** I am the AMS Judicial Affairs Director for the 2010-2011 year. I'm going to try and keep this as brief as possible. Every year, the person in my position is required to give a full report to Assembly. My position is unique—I am employed by Assembly, not the Executive. To keep myself accountable, I have to report to Assembly.

I'm going to talk about how the Non-Academic Discipline [NAD] system works—philosophy, common violations and sanctions. Then some statistics. Some successes and challenges. Some upcoming changes for 2011-2012 and then closing remarks.

NAD is a three-tier system, in effect for 113 years. Only NAD system in all of North America that is peer-based. Something students should take a lot of pride in. Upon attending Queen's, every student is required to sign the student code of conduct, a set of rules regarding behaviour that every student is expected to abide by. Any violations can be brought to the NAD system.

There are three parts to the NAD system. The first is the Commission of Internal Affairs [CIA]. Second body is the JAO [Judicial Affairs Office]. We're responsible for meeting with witnesses, collecting of witnesses. Upon completing this task, we present this to JComm [Judicial Committee]. They are the ones who determine if the sanctions are appropriate for the harm done. They are responsible for ultimate judgment.

Now about philosophy. We always look to restore harm done. We are not punitive like the CDN legal system. We work to restore equilibriums. We are entirely peer administered. We feel as though this is very important. As students, we are better able to relate to the trials and tribulations that Queen's students face, better than Administrators.

We are not adversarial; we are non-policing. We don't actively seek violations. Everyone that comes through our door is innocent until proven guilty.

Finally, we are complaint driven; we don't look for violations. There has to be proof from the complainant that direct harm has been caused to them.

We are committed to natural justice. Everyone has a number of rights that we have to uphold--right to legal representation, translation, innocent until proven guilty, etc. This is one of the major tenets of our system.

Common violations include non-compliance with Campus Security, city officials, and Student Constables. Also, vandalism and mischief, number of alcohol-related violations (illegal sale of alcohol, open alcohol, etc.); assault and battery at various campus establishments; campus noise complaints; false fire alarms; unauthorized access (e.g. onto roofs)

A student who goes through the system may find a number of different sanctions. Restitution—we can fine students up to \$1,000, all of which goes to the Blue Light program. We can also issue bonds up to \$1,000. Also, there are non-monetary sanctions—letters of apology, up to 50 hours of

community service, educational sanctions (e.g. educational seminars), loss of privilege (prohibition from campus outside of normal hours, pub bans, bans from StuCon events) or even recommendation to University Senate regarding possible suspension or expulsion, the most serious sanction.

Last year in total, NAD saw 47 cases. This year we've seen 73, 36 of which have been in this semester. This is something we haven't necessarily prepared for, but are dealing with. Last year, in winter semester there were only 5 cases. 10 in January, 4 in February, 20 in last 24 days. To date, we have issued \$1075 in fines, \$1000+ in bonds, dropped 14 cases for finding that there was no violation. More information on this can be found at [www.myams.org](http://www.myams.org).

Some successes this year. We've built some positive relationships with new members of Queen's administration. Calum [Macbeth] and I met with the new and now outgoing Provost Bob Silverman and interim DSA [Dean of Student Affairs], John Pierce. Great allies in University administration and we've relied on them for back support. Also improved relations with Campus Security exponentially. We've made new contacts, especially considering their annual turnover. With the new Campus Security case supervisor, we've been provided with more information and one on one contact with parties involved. They've also filed more cases with us, demonstrating that they have more confidence in our system and are more supportive. We've also made stronger ties with ResLife; MCRC has their own NAD system, but they've agreed to put forward non-residence cases of their residents to us; overall better relations there. We've also had a successful recruitment push, such as through the Agenda and pamphlets. We also did a poster campaign surrounding legal issues with keggers and gave increased training to 1001 orientation leaders.

One thing we didn't get to do with regards to awareness is an awareness campaign for the winter term, but the increased influx of cases has made it difficult to fully implement.

New initiatives for 2010-2011: We had a very distinct change in role in my job as director. In the past, the director was responsible for delegating these cases to deputies in JAO. This year, all but one case has been delegated to my staff, to provide them with more responsibility and experience. I took care of more administrative tasks.

We also created a community service database—a hard cover book with 18 different local organizations where students who have to complete community service as a sanction can complete their hours at. This also makes it easier for us to verify that these hours are completed.

We created a new position joint between JAO and JComm called the Judicial Clerk. There used to be a clerk in both divisions but with the drastic drop in cases last year, we amalgamated into one position.

Also, we have had increased NAD training for our office. All of my deputies this year also opted to receive additional training with positive space.

Also, partnership with JAO and CAC [Campus Activities Commission] for the Queen's Model Court initiative—new conference this year, involving cases that were legalistic in nature. Overwhelming success. A lot of the participants in that conference have applied to our office for the coming year. Thank you to Lara [Therrian-Boulos] and her chairs for that.

Next is the establishment for the JAO intern program. Originally, first years are not allowed to be involved in our office. But for the first time in 113 years, a first year student was able to participate in our system. While they didn't handle cases, they learned more about our system and

procedures and participated in QMC. Great way to involve first year students.

Also created form 12, establishment of guidelines for writing an effective letter of apology. We used to receive poor letters of apology that weren't really effective so the new form allows us to address that.

Also create online NAD modules. Issues of discrimination can intersect with what our office does, e.g. issues regarding homophobic, racially discriminatory comments are made. Working with Daniela [Aquilje, AMS Social Issues Commissioner] on this. We provide literature on how their conduct may have intersected with these issues. With Daniela's help, this will be up and running for Sept 1, 2011.

Also established club NAD policy. This allows us to apply sanctions to clubs if they are in violation of code of conduct. This is currently in the works with myself, Calum, Josie [Qiu, AMS Clubs Manager], and Chris [Rudnicki, AMS VP University Affairs].

I'll end with the challenges that we are facing.

First is the caseload for the winter semester, something that was not anticipated. With 20 cases in 24 days, it may be a damper on what we are able to accomplish. Many of these may transfer over to next year, so my successor may spend a lot of her summer months investigating these. A lot of these cases need 40 days of investigation, so we may run into the summer.

Next is our challenges with the APB [Administrative Pub Bans] committee. When a student threatens the safety of the liquor license held by Bruce Griffiths or safety of students and staff at campus pubs, they are subject to an APB. APB committee meets after incident and assesses the situation. It is a necessary function of our society, but because NAD cannot impose sanctions immediately, which poses a risk, we have the APB. But the problem we have is that APB is inherently punitive, there solely to protect liquor license and to protect safety of staff and students. The APB does not allow letters of apology, allow other types of sanctions. It's something that has troubled me this year and I hope in future years we can evaluate it.

Last issue I have is the Student Constables. They haven't been a significant complainant this year. The problem that StuCons have with us is that in the past our system has failed them. The StuCons have a difficult job, often facing students who are belligerent and violent, and I can understand that it's difficult to place faith in a system that can occasionally let them down. In the past, StuCons have filed cases with us where they have been displeased with the outcome. In the upcoming year, I hope the office helps in restoring the harm done. Our system is great that allows debate on how each sanction can restore harm done. Even if they may disagree with the sanctions I have proposed, ultimately it's for the greater interest of everyone involved.

Those are my main concerns. Thank you to all of my staff who have worked so hard this year and best of luck to my successor, Allison Sprout. I have a wonderful clerk who jumped in at the last minute and two first year interns who have also done a phenomenal job.

**Rob Lee:** Now time for any questions anyone may have about something Judicial related.

**Mike Cannon (ASUS Representative to AMS):** Just a quick question regarding the length of time that a trial takes. Is there a time limit? If not, how long do they normally go for?

**Brandon Sloan:** There are a maximum number of days where a case can be open before going to

JComm. We also try to reach a settlement with the student, which we feel is inherently more restorative. But if a student chooses to go with open hearing, we have minimum of 40 days between filing of complaint and appearing before JComm. The reason for these deadlines, it allows students looking for legal representation or representing themselves to form their case and to prepare information. In the event of the summer or winter holiday, we can ask for an extension with JComm chair and they can deem whether it's appropriate or not.

**MAL:** Is it possible for JAO to be a second resource for students who are employed with the AMS with regards to demerit system? Right now the only resource is the HRO [AMS Human Resources Office] can the JAO act as a second layer?

**Brandon Sloan:** That would have to be done in consultation with the Ontario Labour Act. Right now with demerits, we would cede authority to any body that's better apt to deal with these things. For example, we don't deal with sexual assault because there are better resources on campus and within Kingston to deal with that. So if a student has any problems with demerits, we would cede to the HRO. I can't speak to where you would go after that if the student still has issue with the HR Office.

*No further questions.*

**Rob Lee:** Now I'd like to call on exec for State of the Union.

#### **Item #4b, State of the Union, Presented by AMS Executive**

**Safiah Chowdhury:** I would like to preface this with talking about the campaign period. We were subject to lot of skepticism. There was generally a lot of apprehension about us as a team and many people spoke quite poorly use. Hopefully throughout our year in office, we have proven otherwise, that skepticism was unfounded. We are going to refer to our 40-page platform as a guide. We want to be entirely honest and be quite objective in our report.

First thing was defending tradition in homecoming. this started with us publishing a Know Your Rights guide. We gave it to residences, pubs, put it online and put it out as widely as possible. We were also part of a fall planning matrix involving KGH, policy, admin, city hall and we met regularly (along with Hilary Windrem), so that we could keep student interests in mind. We provided resources for students who have grievances with police and this was part of our mandate that students' rights were upheld during our weekend. I met with Principal Woolf to find out exactly what was necessary to bring HC back in the fall. Unfortunately, HC is not returning in the fall. IT was put on another three year hiatus. We believe we lobbied as hard as we could with the administration. At the end of the day, to bring HC back, it's up to individuals, up to student body, ultimately up to Principal. This is a long term problem that needs to be addressed by the whole of campus.

Next we have solar panels.

**Chris Rudnicki (AMS VP University Affairs):** This was certainly a contentious point during election, something we knew had to be addressed right away as soon as we got elected. We worked with SGPS and other campus groups to lobby with the administration for solar panels on campus. We had quite a successful campaign. This Dec, BOT approved a contract that will see 9 of our rooftops blanketed with solar panels. From admin estimates, we're looking at 1.2 million in revenues for the school. The negotiations with the solar company are still ongoing, but we are trying to get students jobs with this company, and an independent solar company also has

indicated interest in work with students.

**Ben Hartley (AMS VP Operations):** Next is credit/debit at CoGro. I liken this to health care in the US. It's been tried more than once and it's failed more than once. But this year we had a different strategy. We focused on differentiation. Currently, 30% of sales is through credit/debit and a lot of their success is thanks to the Director and the outstanding management team.

**Chris Rudnicki:** Another big plank was about an equitable AMS. The first thing was an equity grants program, to provide \$5,000 to equity groups on campus. We passed equity grants earlier in the year to four deserving organizations. Next was a promise we pseudo-failed at, to have the Positive Space stickers colour coded by year. We came to understand that it was not our place to make such a program on behalf of the program. The PS is not under the AMS, so we apologized to the coordinator as such. But we built a relationship with the PS Coordinator [name?] and something we want to continue through the year.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** Next portion was halal and kosher to Cogro. This has not happened; there was research in summer and fall. My interns and I worked on this, we called up multiple people in Toronto, Montreal, and Ottawa. Difficulty in ensuring that it would come to campus, something that we were unable to achieve.

**Ben Hartley:** What needs to happen is a national provider that we can use to bring to campus.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** The database that we compiled is available for all students. But there is a halal option now at Mediterra, however, we still see a scarcity of Kosher options.

**Chris Rudnicki:** Next up is the one-stop academic shop for syllabi, USATs, exam bank, etc. We underestimated the extent to which IT issues impact our initiatives. But despite IT issues, we are ready for launch next fall.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** Kingston Summer Jobs program. The employment opportunities coordinator this year and City of Kingston was crucial to the success of the program this year. We wanted to create a student jobs database; it was not completed this year, but we hope it will happen in the near future.

**Ben Hartley:** Consolidating the AMS services; Tricolour Outlet and TPS. Tricolour Outlet saw a small decline in volume. We amalgamated not just sales but physical space as well. We thank both management teams for making the amalgamation such a success.

**Chris Rudnicki:** Next was putting our clubs database online, which thanks to Josie Qiu and the clubs team, it was success. Also, our clubs manual is complete.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** We also met with Principal and Provost to discuss academic plan writing team. The principal did change the timeline of academic writing; we worked with student senate caucus to ensure we have student representation on this body. Chris is the conduit through which this student representation was facilitated. There was a town hall, emails sent out.

Finally, all-access pass to the AMS. This is probably where we've failed the most. We did create a guide to Assembly for assembly member and any student who enquires, but agenda was not online as quickly as we expected.

**Ben Hartley:** Transition system. Through HRO, we have been switching to different incentives

for transition, involving operating manuals and exit polls.

Next one is the alumni speaker series. It has been an absolute pleasure working with QSAA. WE brought in Ali Velshi, John Stackhouse, Leslie..., etc. [get names from Ben]. This has helped launch a long partnership between AMS and QSAA.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** Next was supporting to Queen's Athletics. All of the presidential emails include an underrepresented athletics team. We also had a mayoral debate in Grant Hall--much of this was thanks to Hilary Windrem. Another thing that was not in our platform but took up most of our year was the SLC.

We worked on the Operations and Management agreement, which turns the AMS from a 14.7 mil to 16.3 mil corporation. Huge win after 20 years of work. We have some complications on the way, but we'll get past them. We also have a new SLC constitution.

All of this could not have been done without our council. They are the ones who have made all of this happened. They did most of the legwork and even though this was our platform, we didn't accomplish all of them without council.

**Ben Hartley:** We project to end the year with a surplus, restricted funds are doing well and the Board of Directors are introducing a 3-year long term plan to make all of the services profitable or neutral in three years.

**Rob Lee:** Now time for a select number of questions?

*No questions.*

**Rob Lee:** That ends item number 4 on the Agenda. It's now time for executive reports. President's Report, Ms. Chowdhury.

#### **Item #5, President's Report**

**Safiah Chowdhury:** There is an assembly this Thursday. The only thing I will state is that there will be a campus memorial on March 29th at 7 pm in Wallace Hall for Robert Mason; a member of the community we lost just before Reading Week.

#### **Item #6a, Vice-President (Operations) Report**

**Ben Hartley:** Three things that I will prioritize for the end of my term. The transition of the SLC financial system. The second will be the outsourcing of the AMS website--we may have put the ball down on at the beginning of our term but hoping to pick up again. And with regards to APB, personal goal to resolve some of the concerns raised today about the policy. Thanks to JAD and QSC staff, they are both here. Hopefully we can find changes that both groups will be comfortable with.

#### **Item #6b, Vice-President (University Affairs) Report**

**Chris Rudnicki:** If you have any questions about what I mentioned, please contact me. Academic Planning Task Force--you can have your say at [queensu.ca/saptf](http://queensu.ca/saptf). Or please email me at [vpua@ams.queensu.ca](mailto:vpua@ams.queensu.ca).

**Rob Lee:** Board of Directors report, Mr. Lawrence.

#### **Item #7, Board of Directors' Report**

**Alex Lawrence (Chair of the AMS Board of Directors):** I would like to thank everyone, especially members of Assembly and incoming Assembly members for attending ACGM downstairs. We had a number of lengthy presentations about financials of the AMS for the future. I will announce the directors for next year that were just elected:

2 year Directors: Robert Gamble and Angelina Fomina

1 year Directors: Nicholas Fulford, Andrew Witzke, Mitch Piper

Rob Lee: Now the Student Senators Report, Mr. Chowdhury.

#### **Item #8, Student Senators' Report**

**Ross Chowdhury (Chair of the Student Senate Caucus):** Rather than provide a description of what Senate has been up to. I have decided to take this opportunity with so many people here not typically with what Senate does to go over what senate has done throughout the year. Senate is University's highest academic body. We moved to the Provost model this year. The Provost is VP Academic and Chief Financial and Academic Officer of the University. The provost manages the day to day runnings of the university to the Principal can focus moreso on international reputation and advancement. The APTF (academic planning task force). AP came to senate in Nov and a committee was struck with 1 admin, 1 staff, 3 faculty and 2 students (including Rudnicki). I was quite pleased with this composition. The publicity associated with this has been excellent, building transparency into the planning process. Optimistic to end of April for final conclusion. There are many ways for you as a student to participate. Talk to Chris or myself; we'd love to hear your opinion. Somewhat associated with this is the SOLUS and PeopleSoft transition, which is separate from the Academic Planning--SOLUS is run through the University Registrar, although the Senate has had to deal with concerns raised regarding it. Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the academics of the university. We on University continue to see the ramifications of the budget cuts and it is hard times ahead, reiterating a statement made by Principal, Provost, and students alike. We are not out of the woods. My replacement SSCC has just been elected, congratulations to incoming ASUS Senator and incoming SSCC Doug Johnson.

#### **Item #9, Rector's Report.**

*No Rector's Report.*

#### **Item #10, Statement by Members.**

**Derrick Dodgson, incoming Engineering Society President:** The events of the last week and opinions communicated to me by my constituents have compelled me to make this statement.

I am very proud to be a Queen's student. One of the primary reasons for that pride is the idea that we Queen's students are not here only to go to class, get a degree, and leave. There are so many of us who seek to make a meaningful contribution to our community, and we become very passionate about what we believe is best for that community. That passion may lead us to

disagree and to argue, but that productive dialogue is inherently good for Queen's and its students.

What is absolutely inappropriate is the translation of those arguments for and against ideas into attacks on a person. In doing so, we are no longer contributing to our community; we are harming it.

Yet this has been done. The advertisement on page 17 of the March 18 issue of the Queen's Journal, and posted on teamjournal.ca have taken a civil and legitimate debate process and turned it into a witch hunt. The inclusion of a student's name, picture, and conscious distortion of facts are completely uncalled for. The ad as printed, and posted online, deliberately attempts to demonize Ms. Pleavin for actions and motivations that she has at no point done or had. Now that – as of earlier this evening – the minutes from last AMS Assembly have been distributed, it can be clearly seen that this is the case.

Constructive discussion should be encouraged. I want to make it clear that while I don't necessarily agree or disagree with various statements made and articles written over the last week I am proud that they have taken place. I am however very disappointed that this informative exercise has been overshadowed by a terribly misleading and personally harmful attack ad.

Speaking as the President of the Engineering Society, I stand firmly in support of students' rights to not be subject to this kind of treatment. Ms. Pleavin, Queen's students, and the Queen's community deserve better. Thank you.

**Robyn Laing, ASUS VP:** ASUS is planning a series of discussions surrounding Academic Plan, called Academic Plan and You. Everyone is welcome to attend, but is based on disciplines in Arts & Science. Natural and physical sciences will be tomorrow; social sciences on Thursday. We're hoping to go back to a group discussion regarding Academic planning, hopefully generate lots of feedback and discussion. Hope to see you there.

**Lauren Calloway, ASUS Rep to AMS:** Announcement on behalf of QUIC. QUIC is pleased to announce the launch of PFF community leadership program. Offers fellowships to students who are proactive and leadership oriented looking to work with communities in international locations. To be eligible, you have to be a Canadian citizen or perm resident and a full-time student at Queen's. For more information contact [communityleadership@queensu.ca](mailto:communityleadership@queensu.ca) or quic.queensu.ca. App deadline...

**Member-at-Large, incoming QTV Exec Producer:** QTV is hosting the first ever Queen's lip dub. We will be filming the campus with everyone lip dubbed singing to We Are Golden. Mandatory meeting on April 2nd, registration is open until next Tuesday.

**Rob Lee:** Announcement on behalf of EWB [Engineering Without Borders] exec. Upcoming event run by Engineering, but anyone can attend. Open bar + good cause = this Friday's EWB gala. If any of you would like to attend, it's at Zappas. Tickets are still available. \$55 for 4 DJs, sponsored by numerous groups. Open bar, as well as appetizers. I'm going to be at the VIP table. This Friday, EWB, end of year gala.

Further statements by members?

*No more statements.*

### **Item #11, Question period**

**Andrew Yaworsky, MAL:** I'm not sure if this is the right forum. But I have a question to direct towards the Journal, regards to the ad that was placed in reference to Vic Pleavin. Who paid for the ad and how was it decided that the ad would be placed? It seems to be partisan and I was curious as to the process.

**Tyler Ball:** The ad that ran in the last Friday's issue, we would characterize that as an in-house ad. We run them all the time, such as the one that we ran for open editorial board, for Journal elections, to encourage people to contribute and volunteer for the journal. We characterize them as an internal promotion of our own initiatives. This promoted our own initiative to protect our editorial autonomy. It wasn't paid by an outside body, space allocated technically as content in the Journal and paid for by our advertisers who pay for our publication.

### **Item #12, Business Arising from the Minutes**

*No business arising from the minutes.*

### **Item #13, New Business**

*Motion #3:*

"That AMS Assembly change the name of the "Student Health Fee" to the "Student Health and Counseling Fee".

*Moved by Safiah Chowdhury, seconded by Chris Rudnicki.*

**Rob Lee:** Opening, Ms. Chowdhury.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** This came forward after we went through our AMS student fees. We did establish a fee for the HCDS, but the current wording of the fee only goes to a specific area of HCDS so we're proposing this name change so it can go to both health and disabilities in HCDS. Increases the options where this money can be channeled towards in HCDS. But we did not specify disabilities as there are government grants available for disabilities funding and as such ancillary fees cannot supplement operating costs for disabilities-related initiatives.

*Motion passes.*

*Motion #4:*

"That AMS Assembly approve the Queen's Pride Project fee question seen in Appendix ONE."

*Moved by Althea Green, seconded by John Atalick.*

**Rob Lee:** Opening, Ms. Green.

**Althea Green, MAL:** I am the current director for Queen's Pride Project, this past Pride Week March 14 to 19, we were able to interact with 600 individuals. We're pleased with this and the turnout, we only scratched the surface for what is possible. Due to funding, we were still limited to speakers and our locations for our events. We are asked why we did not place this fee on referendum? This was my misunderstanding about how the process worked but it has been rectified. It has been discussed with AMS Assembly and will be thoroughly transitioned to next year's team. We would like to increase our opt out student fee from 50 cents to 55 cents. It may not seem like much, but it will mean a lot for our team. QPP is for supporting and celebrating all

queer students and queer identities.

*Motion carries.*

*Motion #5:*

“That AMS Assembly repeal the motion from the March 10th, 2011 Assembly meeting as seen in Appendix TWO.”

Moved by Tyler Ball, seconded by Rachel Kuper.

**Rob Lee:** One point of clarification on this motion. This is a substantive motion, not procedural. There will be regular debate and in order to pass, will require a simple majority. Any questions about that, please come talk to me.

**Tyler Ball:** To provide some background. Two weeks ago at AMS Assembly (March 10), we spent 45 minutes trying to impart this motion’s repercussions, but I was cut off before we were able to fully express our concerns. I made an editorial decision to expose this issue to as many people as I could. I regret any division this has caused. Our intention was to further discussion on the issue, both online, in print, and at assembly, because I feel we didn’t have a chance to outline all our concerns at AMS Assembly two weeks ago. But many students don’t know how the Journal fully operates and I think this had impact on how the motion was voted on. So basically, the AMS stands as our publisher and they provide us with a student fee. In concert with that, we use revenue from advertising (roughly two thirds of our revenue is advertising). We are accountable financially to the AMS and we report to Journal Board that oversees our budget and finances throughout the year, from everything from staff functions to honoraria to buying equipment. In addition to that, we have editorial autonomy, the only buzz phrase journalists like. It allows us to produce content without interference from the AMS and without this, the AMS would certainly interfere with our journalism. We need this protection in this bylaw so we can produce a newspaper students want to read, and make us more accountable to students. If we don’t have diverse set of content, no one will want to read it and then we can’t sell ads. We wish to repeal the motion as passed on March 10 and we feel that any discussion or recommendation from the analysis of our content would directly violate the AMS’ own bylaws and policies. We don’t discourage discussion about our content and the movers of the motion are welcome to do so, but not through AMS assembly, the highest legislative of our publisher. A directive coming from AMS assembly is in line with their own bylaws. We’ve realized through this campaign that we need to become more transparent. We want more criticism. We want to become more transparent that take issue with our coverage, which can include more commenting our website and summarize and simplify our Journal policy. We want students to come directly to us with their concerns. They can follow the grievance policy already outlined in Journal policy. It goes through Editor’s in Chief and Ed Board and Journal Board, who are best equipped to address these concerns and to reach an amicable solution. People need to follow grievance policy and protect our policy, not circumvent them by bringing them directly to AMS assembly.

**Rob Lee:** Debate on the motion?

**Tuba Chisti, MAL:** First of all, let me tell you my biases. I’m not a Journal staff or on EngSoc. I’m a proud ArtSci, I tend to work mostly outside of the AMS. While I understand the purposes of this motion, and I agree with editorial autonomy and that the motion in and of itself is not harmful, what it means for Journal editors is scary. And the blogs written by Journal staff and editorial staff are great, but it’s hard to support the Journal after the attack ads on Vic Pleavin because that’s not how to go about it. It’s a misuse of the Journal. By doing something like that, by calling Assembly egotistical, by calling Engineers a faculty that cannot read. Everyone has

biases, but to write something like this is so offensive, and there's no way to realistically make reparations. So while I agree with editorial autonomy and don't believe that the motion should have gone through in the first place, I don't know how I'm going to vote on this. Also, I'd like to commend Vic Pleavin for keeping in class and not resorting to the same attacks.

**Tyler Ball:** The comment about engineers not being able to read was on my personal twitter account and no way representative of the Journal's opinions.

**Dave Sinkinson, Business Manager/MAL:** As business manager, I have zero editorial control. I can't control what's printed at any point. I sell ads so the paper can run. Dodgson made a good point that we do really want a productive dialogue, as does everyone else in here. Tyler also mentioned transparency. I come here armed with some statistics to help educate on information in the Journal. I got the feeling at Assembly that the sentiment was, "why not? why not have this information"? The information that would be produced from this motion is irrelevant to the operations of the Journal. Currently, the Journal between Feb 19 to March 21st had over 50,000 visits to its website, 30,710 absolute unique visitors. That's important to know on how to sell our online ads. I can tell you anything about that. We have 783 unique email addresses signed up for the Journal email update. We deliver 6,000 papers to a number of places on campus. Approximately 5,000 to 5,500 are picked up every single time. This motion has nothing to do with the financial operations of the Journal. This won't assist us in selling ads or writing the paper. That's what makes me uncomfortable. Why would you do this if you didn't intend to make some sort of change afterwards? The data is not useful. I hope that everyone in this room, when considering voting for or against this, understands that this data has little or no bearing on any function of the Queen's Journal.

**Ashley Eagan (Retail Services Director and incoming VP Ops):** I am speaking tonight on behalf of the incoming exec with regards to this motion. As involved student leaders who were present at the assembly where this motion was passed, we wish to speak in favour of repealing this motion. The complex relationship between Journal and AMS has been difficult to manage and many students at the Journal and MAL feel that a content survey violates this relationship and spirit. We do not think that the original intent was to cross that line, but we agree that this motion steps close to a line that the AMS should be near. The survey has ambiguous implications for the reporting and content of the journal. It undermines the reporting done by the staff at the Journal and the work done by the Editors-in-chief for each paper. The student engagement the Journal has helped foster this past year has been outstanding. The editorial from this past Friday's issue says quote, "the Journal does not oppose the motion... but the forum..." and in this we agree. The existing grievance policy and open election process for the Journal is robust for students to bring forward their grievances. We encourage every member to vote to repeal this motion and to recognize the inherent dangers of the original motion to editorial autonomy. AMS Assembly is not one of the channels through which grievances towards the Journal should be brought forth.

**Ross Chowdhury (Outgoing Student Senate Caucus Chair):** I stand before you today, asked to speak on behalf of somebody for whom I have the utmost respect, both as an individual and a student leader.

The previously confident Victoria Pleavin, ex-President of The Engineering Society, is not speaking to you directly, because she has been made to feel emotionally unsafe participating in our campus democratic processes, due to the actions of The Journal.

In spite of this, she wished to speak about the current motion, since it's the response to a motion she moved at last assembly. Specifically, she wished to convey the original intentions of the motion, in order to clarify some current misconceptions.

Several weeks ago, Ms. Pleavin came to AMS Assembly with many motions that aimed to direct the AMS Executive and its Council into taking various forms of action on Assembly's behalf. The point of this exercise—as stated and written about—was to make Assembly a more active participant in the every-day actions of the AMS. Using Assembly as a body to merely fine-tune policy and rubber stamp budgets and reports is a waste of time for student leaders, regardless of which society they report to.

The current situation arose from the motion Ms. Pleavin put forward that tasked the Media Services Director to perform an audit of the media services in the AMS, to compile data on how much of their content was directly relevant to student interests. Again, the entire point was to task the Media Services Director to act on behalf of Assembly.

On the floor, the motion was amended to only include The Journal, instead of all media services, by the Media Services Director. This was discussed in advance as being due to possible legal ramifications for CFRC and the complexity of QTV, which was agreed upon.

Regardless of what was changed, the intentions were still the same. These services could benefit from receiving data about their performance, in regards to their mandate of serving students. This data could be used for strategic yearly plans, by having the Journal's Editor in Chief decide that they want to attain a certain percentage of directly relevant content every week or month.

Furthermore, even if the management of *this* volume of the Journal decides not to use the data they're given, a future volume can use it as a stepping stone to start their own plans.

Or maybe no Journal management will use it. But at least there can be some comfort in knowing that this resource exists, much like all of us students who take comfort in knowing there's a full library of resources we may or may not use.

Many people have said that “this will force The Journal to change its content.” This is only true if the Journal lets the data they receive change their content. As it has been reiterated many many times, the Journal *does* have editorial autonomy, and the motion submitted does not change that fact.

Employees of The Journal were present for the original discussion of the motion at Assembly, many of whom contested that the content reports resulting from this motion should not be reported to Assembly but instead to the Journal editorial board. Unfortunately, no one made the formal amendment to make this happen.

It was expressed to the Media Services Director that a way to resolve that issue would be to move to reconsider the motion so that the report would go to the Journal Editorial Board. If the motion under discussion today fails, it is the opinion of Ms. Pleavin that someone enact that change to clarify and reinforce the intent of the motion.

Speaking personally now, I am strongly of the opinion that internal Data, particularly collected over several years, has the potential to be incredibly useful

The motion being discussed indicates tasks to be carried out by people, with the intelligence to understand intent. The intent of this motion is to provide The Journal with a potentially helpful report, particularly if they choose to use it.

David Sinkinson presented some statistics, saying ‘more information, more power’. Being able to tell me how many e-mail subscribers is awesome, and it’s useful. The usefulness of data produced by this report has the potential to be useful to those deciding it’s content: the editors of The Journal.

We can clarify this motion—the results of the report can go the Journal, who can then use the data.

Please remember the idea behind bringing this motion, and the idea that a large majority of AMS Assembly voters agreed with two Thursdays ago. As mentioned, the motion passed can be edited for clarity, but repealing its actions does Assembly, the Journal, and all AMS students no good.

**Jesse Waslowski (ASUS Representative to Assembly):** Please vote for what you think is right with regards to the motion itself and to keep concerns about the attack ads separate. If you agree one way or the other with the motion on itself, then that is what is relevant. Anyone who is interested in rectifying the situation with regards to the ad, please refer to section 15.01.04 in the AMS Constitution.

**Tuba Chisti, Point of Information:** I will be voting in favour of this motion, but I don't agree with the campaign whatsoever.

**Rob Lee:** Sorry, that is not a point of information, but if you would like to get on the speaker's list, you can rejoin the line.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** I would like echo what Jesse said about the attack ads. As an exec, we agree that attack ads are uncalled for and does not have a place on this campus. But it does take away from the motion on hand. We would like to commend Miss Pleavin for the last few motions she has brought to assembly. Assembly does have a role in tasking the Exec and Council. As an exec, we did abstain from this vote because it was related to tasking our exec and our council. But in retrospect, the original motion does take away a lot of the resources and time that we have. There are certain things we'd like to accomplish in a month and a half; something like this takes resources away from our MSD and for this reason, we will be voting for this motion, voting to rescind the motion from last assembly, because we can't task the Journal to do this and it doesn't have any teeth.

**Sarah Kwong (Media Services Director):** I definitely think the past two weeks have been interesting. There is a level of regret of the campaign. It made the conversation divisive. For me, I've been involved at the Journal for three years in different capacities. First as ad manager, production manager, and right now I work with Dave, the current business manager, and sit on J Board [Journal Board]. I know the modes to engage with the Journal. There was an a-ha moment in the past couple of weeks is that the ways in which students can engage with the Journal isn't necessarily the most clear. You can write a letter, an op-ed, submit a comment, submit an article. There are all these avenues to engage the Journal with their content that doesn't involve in Assembly, that may have been obvious to me but not to everyone else. What this motion, as it reads tonight, it speaks to the recognition that Assembly may not be the best body to address this issue. Data itself to be collected isn't the issue, it's the body through which it is to be done by. Assembly are your representatives. They have been elected to speak to your concerns and are accountable to you. For me, I see a conflict of interest where the Journal wants to be critical of the people you've elected and as well, the Assembly, should be able to task whoever without any repercussions. In hindsight now, there is a conflict with an unbiased approach to this. I want to see this engagement with students that Tyler touched upon earlier. Make those avenues very clear in a very easy to understand format on the website. If the people in this room don't know how to engage with the Journal, the dialogue that happens is one sided. This is where the discussion should start, that students should understand how to engage with the Journal so they know how to get their thoughts on campus events, suggest a column, write a story. IF they don't know how to do that, the Journal needs to improve and Tyler has admitted that's something to be improved upon and that's what Tyler is working on.

I have a financial responsibility to Assembly to task the Journal and to ensure their finances are in

order and it's difficult for me who sees my relationship as Media Services Director at arms length from all the editors. I'm not their boss, the boss is you guys, their readers. The first step is engagement and the second step is for you guys to engage with the Journal. Something that was mentioned in the discussion around the original discussion, is how would photos fit into that data? Blogs? online content/ Do you count double if it's online and in print? Understanding that Journal Board that has members at large, SGPS, AMS, VP Ops, Eds in Chief, Staff, Business manager, gives a really good understanding of the Journal. They're the ones who can provide that framework on how something can be done. I think understanding that Journal Board is the best avenue for this is the main thing to take away from what I'm trying to say. Assembly is a body that follows process and it does it quite well, so let's follow process that Journal has been tasked to follow with finances and editorial grievances and task the Journal Board to determine if students want this data.

Tyler Ball: Thanks to Ross Chowdhury for clarifying the original intentions of the motion. Important, because the Journal was not consulted with the original motion. But the point is not whether this data comes to JBoard, whether it's used by Editors, or even if it's helpful. The point is that it comes from AMS Assembly, the body that is only tasked with overseeing our finances and should be editorially separate from us. We need to be removed from them so we can report on them effectively. Most of the issues that students care about go through Assembly. So if Assembly is auditing our coverage when the majority of the coverage is about them, it's problematic. It's obvious that since this is coming from AMS assembly and the original motion was so vague, I think that if this survey was enacted, that AMS Assembly would probably talk about it and the results would be discussed. That's where we have the problem. If it starts being discussed by AMS Assembly, talking about our content, it's like this one small step, one giant leap for student government. Once you cross that threshold, how far will it go? Once you have the conversation about editorial content, where does it stop? Editorial autonomy for the Journal and any other media services, we're not going to lose it through one giant fight with Assembly. IT's going to be lost inch by inch through process, through debate, through motions like this one. It's not where it goes and where it ends up, it's with who's issuing the directive.

**Andrew Yaworsky:** I've heard a lot of terms tonight and I'm dismayed at the change in argument. We've heard lots of statements of integrity of Journal, their independence, their accountability, the slippery slope. The main purpose of the original motion was not to tell the Journal what to publish but to hold the Journal accountable. Right now, the Journal can publish anything they want, because of journalistic independence. I'm not bringing that independence into question, but concurrently, we have a mandatory that goes to the Journal. And it changes the argument. It is an independent body for reporting on campus, but it also has to be responsible to that mandatory fee. Because I pay the mandatory fee, regardless of the amount, I would like to believe that the Journal will then represent me on campus. We have other services on campus that are provided through the AMS and they have metrics through which we measure their success. I don't feel that it is untoward to the Journal to impose metrics on them so that we can gauge how successful they are as per their mandate to run a campus newspaper that is by students for students. It's not to take away the independence from the Journal but to make them accountable. If we had these metrics in place, would we have had a full-page, in colour ad that at going Journal rates, works out to about \$1,100. I wonder how that would reflect in these metrics. With a full page ad being \$800 and colour for \$350.

**David Sinkinson, Point of Information:** For a student rate, it would be approximately \$800.

**Andrew Yaworsky:** I would be interested to see if we would have had the same reaction if there was some oversight or review of the content of the Journal. SO for myself, I am voting for this, I

am voting for accountability. I want the Journal to be accountable. Also, regardless of whether or not your Twitter account is private, being an Editor in Chief demands a higher level of responsibility. What you have your twitter account can be held against you because your actions in your personal life reflect on the Journal.

**Mackenzie Dixon (MAL):** I'm not going to address the response to any of the debate that went on March 10. Before I begin, I would like to preface that it is my firm belief that the editorial autonomy of the Journal is to be protected in any case. At the same time, it says that the purpose of the Journal is to give an account of events relevant to students in the constitution. Moving on from that, I'd like to address the slippery slope argument, that the pro-this repeal motion has taken, is that by having this data and having this discussion, this is one more step towards the removal of the editorial autonomy. Solely talking about the content of the Journal does not effect how the Journal makes its decisions. Having a discussion about the content of the Journal is a positive for the Journal in and of itself. The whole idea of any publicity is good publicity. As the motion stood on March 10, it is solely to examine and report. IT wasn't to editorialize, judge or comment on what the Journal has done, but solely to look at what it has done with regards to campus. I encourage this body to vote down the repeal and reevaluate the original motion. I think that in any case, having this information at the beckoned call of the Journal would be valuable and I would completely support any efforts to change who provides this information, where this information goes, and whether this information even turns public. But it would be a mistake to turn a blind eye to having this information. Because I can't think of a case of information not improving any body.

**Rob Lee:** In 20 minutes, we will have to call to question. But we are still in debate.

**Mike Bass-West (NSS Vice-President):** I would like to call attention to the comment Mr. Ball made earlier regarding his comment made on his twitter account. I would like to point out that an article was written in the Journal covering the AMS Exec's actions following Jacob Mantle's racist comment on a friend's Facebook page. I would like to recommend Mr. Ball's resignation as happened to Mantle in 2009, but that would be pointless since he is on his way out. Instead, I would like to call upon Tyler Ball to consider the public nature of his twitter account and possible ramifications.

**Tyler Ball:** Mr Yaworsky, you brought up a theory of publishing an issue with nothing that corresponded to student interests. That's a good point and a theory to explore. Because of our financial accountability, it works both ways. It's a parallel relationship because we have editorial autonomy, we also have financial accountability. It's not in the eds in chief's best interests to ignore student interests. We as a newspaper have lots of ideas and it turns out that for the most part, we have a pretty good idea of what readers want to read. If not, I encourage people to use our contact policies and our methods of communications in place. because of this financial accountability, if we published an issue that doesn't have anything to do with student life (like about bricks), then we don't have readers and we won't be able to sell ads. Just having a student fee does not cover our costs. I think it's not in our best interests to disregard our readers' interests, because of that, our idea, what students want to read, in student interests, is probably different from what AMS Assembly's perspective is. Because our readers are incredibly diverse, we have lots of diverse sections, like sports, A&E, supplements, dialogue, news, etc. It also speaks to another part of our mandate which is important which is within the first four points of the Journal's by laws, to educate our own staff, volunteers, contributors and provide a meaningful journalism experience for those that are interested in getting involved. This mandate is analogous to almost every service and commission in AMS. The AMS provides valuable experience to everyone involved, as do all the faculty societies. John Stackhouse was here about a month ago

and he says about 10 members of his newsroom are Journal alumni without proper journalism degrees. For a newsroom with less than 100 staff at the most prestigious news outlet in the country, that's a pretty good accomplishment for a school without a journalism program. And that's why we have to write about a diverse set of stories, that's why we need to write about sports, foreign policy in Israel, Libya, Japan, these are things that are happening and students want to read student perspectives on them and students want to write about these perspectives. That's why an audit of student activities and events is pretty ambiguous. how do you make criteria for that? I have an idea what the intent of the motion may have been, and I don't think anyone wants to read a Journal that's just a newsletter for the AMS Assembly and faculty societies. If we're not covering something, email us, call us, tweet me at my twitter account. That's how all newspapers work. If your local paper isn't covering something you don't like, they you call them. The system is not broken, we don't need accountability editorially because that's in conflict with AMS' own bylaws.

**Cenk Aytimur, Point of Information:** How much does students fees comprise the Journal budget?

**David Sinkinson:** About a third of the operating budget of the Journal. The student fee is \$6.54. The rest is from advertising revenue, subscriptions, and bound journals sales.

**Jesse Waslowski, Point of Information:** I think the motion is unclear and that is causing people to misunderstand it. If you vote in favour of this motion, you would be voting against the motion earlier by Vic Pleavin, and I would like the speaker to clarify that at the end.

**Tuba Chisti:** I want to say that maybe I started this, so maybe I should stop it. We should just focus on the issues at hand. I know it contradicts what I said earlier, because I think those were important issues. But let's focus on ideas relevant to the motion itself, but Twitter feeds and such can be debated at a later time.

**Sarah Kwong:** I would like to reiterate a couple points. The conflict between AMS Assembly and the Journal that I addressed when I initially spoke, is the Journal keeping elected reps accountable and the AMS keeping the Journal financially accountable. We are here tonight at AGM, we're all students, we all have a vote. There are some issues that need to be resolved regarding the process itself. But what I am trusting in is student engagement, is that the reader, the students present here, are willing to be engaged. Propose an article, submit an op-ed, submit a comment. When the data analysis is done, make sure it's done with proper process. There are processes available currently and I'm asking you to repeal this motion tonight, not because the data analysis is not valuable, but the process of going through Assembly is conflict with their responsibilities with one another. Let's use JBoard to set the parameters regarding the data, use ed board. And the discussion there would come from people knowledgeable about the inner workings of the Journal. But I'm asking right now to repeal the original motion because Assembly is not the right process. I'm asking you to vote in favour of this motion.

**Andrew Yaworksky:** I just keep finding that the argument is being misrepresented here. One of the statements was how are we going to make a metric to gauge this. This motion isn't a reflecting on how the data would be used or how qualitative it would be, but since the Journal does not have this data currently, it would be valuable. Yes, this could be done through JBoard, but I can't help think, who watches the watchmen?/

**Troy Mannel, MAL:** Since there seems to be a lot of strong support for a survey of content data, I would like to ask the Journal as a whole if you would look at a way to which you could collect

this data?

**Sarah Kwong:** JBoard is tasked with being watchmen of the Journal and tasked with keeping the Journal accountable financially and with the Journal grievance policy, it goes through Editors, then ed board, the JBoard. It is in fact a kind of watchmen of the Journal. It's not just the editors who sit on it. IT's myself, the VP Ops, members at large, who can be anyone. There's also an SGPS member at large, members from ed board themselves, and a member from the AMS Board of Directors, so it covers a lot of bases there for keeping the Journal accountable. In terms of the direct question, could you reiterate?

**Troy Mannel, MAL:** My question is regarding that there does seem to be strong interest towards a survey of Journal content. Does the Journal plan to investigate a process or a way to do this?

**Sarah Kwong:** I think that there has been comments by both sides regarding the fact that the Journal wasn't opposed to a data analysis, just the suggested process. I would make the link that the Journal wouldn't be opposed to doing a data analysis, with the proper process followed. More specifically, it would be as easy as sending an email or showing up to the Journal House at 190 University or calling or tweeting at them, asking for a breakdown of content. The editors can then bring that to JBoard, who would be the best body to determine the parameters where the data analysis would be conducted.

**Rachel Kuper, (Managing Editor), Point of Information:** All of our JBoard minutes are available on our website and can be found there after being approved two weeks after the original meeting.

**Rob Lee:** We have now hit the one hour mark, so we must entertain a call to question.

*Motion to put to question.*

*Motion fails.*

**Mackenzie Dixon, Point of Information:** In response to Miss Kuper, I would like to point out that there are no JBoard minutes from 2011.

**Elamin Abdelmahoud, MAL:** To the Journal, You guys are great. This is to address Mannel's question. What is the purpose of this audit and what is the next step of this audit? What if the audit finds that there is not enough content related to student engagement. Or if the result of the audit says that there is enough student content. Either way, the audit is redundant, and is a pure waste of time. It's a rhetorical "let's talk about this" motion, whereas the next day Tyler Ball can make an entire issue about kittens, and he has the power to do that, because his rights are protected by students. Therefore, the original motion is entirely useless, so please repeal it.

**David Sinkinson:** Going through the Twitterverse, I recently saw a tweet from someone in this room that says, "The Journal is not opposed to doing a data analysis. So what's the problem?" And I think that's a really good question. We are not opposed to doing a data analysis. The problem is where this happened, at Assembly, and it's also not useful. My main point is that this doesn't really have anything to do with the Journal having any more useful data. It just seems as if it brings up the question of editorial autonomy to this body, and that's why everyone is so uncomfortable.

*No further debate on the motion.*

**Rob Lee:** Closing, Tyler Ball.

Tyler Ball: Who watches the watchmen? Good question...

**Rob Lee:** I'm glad we've been able to have a bit of a laugh tonight. But we can laugh about me or about my jokes, but laughter about comments about other people's debate points or jokes about other people's debate points, that's what I was talking about. We need to keep the debate respectful.

**Tyler Ball:** Who watches the watchmen? In a large part of the Watchmen story is told through newspaper clippings and the main character writes to a newspaper in the story. The fictional newspaper in an alternative universe, I'm guessing they had editorial boards, letters to the editors, an opinion section. I'm going to assume they took those very seriously and they valued the avenues readers could take to hold them accountable. And we value them just as much as the Journal and because of how much we value them and the grievances that are brought upon us, that's why we think we have a system that's efficient. Granted, we need to improve it, we need to make it more transparent, we want students to be able to get involved, or write, or be critical, or argue with us. Hopefully you'll see that in the new website. We will be making those methods more transparent on our website, simplifying our policy, how we relate to our publishing company. We need maybe a little more exposure for our system, but that's why everyone should vote down the original motion. I think a survey of content is a great idea for readers and I'm going to think of ways to do that so that it's not coming from AMS Assembly. Because our staff have their hands on so much of what students hold as important issues. When we go to Queen's, we do so many different things, one of those things is the Journal, one of those things is the AMS Assembly. the AMS Assembly helps us by funding so many of these extracurricular activities. So we need to be able to be critical and keep them accountable, and we don't want to be afraid to do that because we're concerned that they'll survey us in a negative light. That's why you should vote yes to this motion.

**Andrew Yaworsky, Point of Order:** t's been brought to my attention, if in terms of voting for this, it could be a secret ballot? Some people may feel uncomfortable with an open vote.

**Rob Lee:** Any member of AMS can request a secret ballot, and we came prepared. The way this will work, everyone will have to show your student card again when you vote, and the members of new council who were manning the registration votes. are going to check the sticker on the back to check you are a valid registered AMS student. On the little motion, ballots that are super official, please put an X or check in yes if you are voting in favour of the motion or no if you are voting against. If you wish to abstain, please write abstain on the ballot. Further to that, on the recommendation of Mr. Jesse W, I will clarify what voting for and against the motion means. Voting for means to vote to repeal the motion that was passed on March 10. Voting against means to leave the original March 10 motion as is. If you don't want the Media Services director to conduct an analysis of the Queen's Journal... [insert the original motion], vote yes. If you do want that to happen, vote no.

*Secret Ballot on Motion 5*

**Rob Lee:** While Mr. Macbeth counts, we will proceed with the remainder of the agenda. Because I have lost my gavel, I will use my iron ring instead. Point of information, the iron ring is a really cool ring.

**Chris Rudnicki, Point of Information:** What is the Iron Ring made of?

**Rob Lee:** Mine's actually made of stainless steel. Now we've eliminated the original motion 6, but there is a new motion 6: "That AMS Assembly strongly recommends the renting of a bouncy castle and provide pink fluffy unicorns dancing on rainbows inside the castle to be the responsibility of the incoming AMS executive and council to make it available to all undergraduate students by November 15, 2011." Opening, Mr Aleyadah.

**Wesam Aleyadah:** As a student, it has recently come to my attention that the demand for a bouncy castle with pink fluffy unicorns dancing on rainbows has increased dramatically within the last week due to the rising temperatures and clement weather conditions.

As a student, I feel it is my duty to bring this motion to the AMS Annual General Meeting (AGM) as it is of high importance and relevance to a large portion of the undergraduate Queen's community.

It is the mandate of the AMS to provide valuable services to Queen's undergrads based on the necessity and demand thereof. As such, I feel that it is my responsibility to bring this important motion forward at the AMS Annual General Meeting (at which every undergraduate student gets a vote) and to ensure that the AMS respond to this overwhelming student demand.

The true purpose of this motion is to illustrate the fundamentally flawed nature of the practice of the Annual General Meeting, both in the AMS, and within Faculty Societies.

The AGM allows every student a vote, but does not take adequate measures to ensure that the AGM is attended by a significant portion of the Queen's undergraduate community. While every student is ultimately responsible for choosing or not choosing to engage in the democratic process, the AMS recently switched to an online voting system specifically to combat voter apathy and to ensure every student is informed of their right to vote and given ample opportunity to voice their opinion. The AGM does not afford this opportunity in any realistic way.

The AGM is held every year in a venue that is not capable of accommodating the entire student body. While it is unrealistic to EXPECT every undergraduate to attend, the fact that it is EXPECTED that no more than a few hundred will actually attend (typically no more than 100-300, around 1% of the undergrad population) is indicative of the fact that the AGM is EXPECTED and acknowledged to receive limited attendance and limited student input, thus defeating its purpose and giving disproportionate power to a body that is NOT accurately representative of student opinion.

The current structure and practices of the AGM allow student interest groups to pass motions that may (or may not) be not be passed at referendum. In other words, if you gather enough people (around 50 friends should do it) and have them attend the AGM with you and vote for your motion, YOU TOO can force the AMS to construct something like a bouncy castle. With pink fluffy unicorns. Dancing on rainbows. Or even pass a mandatory fee increase.

this motion passing will prove that even more ridiculous motions can be passed. If this motion doesn't pass, it still proves that it ended up at the Agenda and that discussion was had, and despite a few people that didn't vote in favour, it may have passed. What if I had proposed a \$10 fee?

**David Chou (Hospitality and Safety Services Director):** This is purely for logistical reasons, I propose a friendly amendment. We have had difficulty finding unicorns as of late and they are not

pink. I do agree with the emotion overall, and moreso, there needs to be accountability. The amendment I propose is:

*(amendments are underlined)*

“That AMS assembly strongly recommends the renting of a bouncy castle and provide pink fluffy unicorns dancing on rainbows or their reasonable equivalents inside the castle, to be the responsibility of the current AMS executive, to make it available to undergrad students by April 30th 2011.”

*Mover agrees to friendly amendment.*

**Kevin Imrie, MAL:** I’m going to take a moment to speak less to the unicorn aspects and more to the representative aspects of the motion, which I believe is the intent when Wesam brought this motion forward. One of the important things that Assembly does and one of the great things about Queen’s is that it is entirely student run, and in the way we operate our governance structure and corporation. Wesam has pointed out effectively a flaw in the system that we are currently undertaking and while I’m not worried about bouncy castles, I am concerned if someone was going to try to bring a mandatory student fee to AGM.

**Leslie Yun (MAL), Point of Information:** All student fee changes or introductions do need to be brought to Assembly before coming to AGM.

**Kevin Imrie:** Thanks for the clarification, but the inherent flaw still remains. But I think that this is a great chance to reassess what is weakness in our current systems.

**Tuba Chisti:** I think it’s important that we do everything we can do to accommodate them. Just the fact that we have it in Ban Righ is a problem, because it tells us that there isn’t going to be that many people. Even looking at this room now, when we have 14,600 students, this turnout is discouraging. It’s amazing being able to see all these students and discuss relevancy to student issues, and I know everyone is so busy with the working matters of the AMS, but I think more of an effort can be made to reach out to students and see what students care about. We care about bouncy castles and students are sleep deprived, so a bouncy castle may make students more optimistic. And it may help recruit future students and we somehow need to have a system where students are represented more and that they have an avenue through which they can bring their issues. The AGM is advertised, but more can be done.

**Rob Lee, Point of Information from Ross Chowdhury:** Capacity of Ban Righ is 750.

**Desmond Wong, MAL:** I’d like to speak in support of the motion. I think the addition of the castle and unicorn will be welcome during low morale and stressful times. Also, Queen’s would be the first university where we would have not one but two castles as a resource for students.

**Amanda Judd, MAL:** I would like to speak in favour of the motion. Others have covered why castles and unicorns are a good thing. But also, I would like to express the hope that more will be done to get more people out to AGM. I’m grateful for this debate and I would like to support this debate and myself, incoming Communications Officer, and Andrew Boldanza, incoming Marketing Officer, we’re taking notes on anything that can improve the forum of communication. If you do not feel comfortable speaking publically, please come talk to us or email us at [newcomm@ams.queensu.ca](mailto:newcomm@ams.queensu.ca) or [newmarketing@ams.queensu.ca](mailto:newmarketing@ams.queensu.ca)

**Elamin Abdelmahmoud:** Many of you might wonder why I popped my hood since I last spoke. The reason is because I would like to quote Drake, “I’m really too young to be feeling this old...” but this conversation came up three years ago when many of you weren’t here. But I would like to share some of the ideas that were brought up at that time. You are putting a vote to the entire population that if they can come, they can express their opinion and vote. And yes, Wesam, like you mentioned, you could bring 100 friends and sway the room. But that’s not supposed to be the purpose of AGM, and ultimately people that care will still come out. Moving AGM from Grant Hall to Ban Righ won’t necessarily change things; it only makes a difference of 150 people. If 900 people showed up, we could take this out to Tindell Field and vote there. But there is a clause says that quorum is 100 people and most of the time quorum is not meant and we proceed at the discretion of the speaker. Yes, the AGM is tricky business, but I don’t think that policy should be changed and it’s an avenue for people to speak their minds. I know that Facebook, twitter, Journal ad... what other ways are you suggesting for people to market AGM? If you truly care about issues that are brought to AGM, you’ll come out. I don’t think it makes a mockery of democracy. We need to have an AGM in order to preserve democracy. We need at least one time a year where students can show up and have their concerns directly addressed. I don’t know if AGM is an institution that we should be messing with. It’s a communication problem, but it’s a general student body has stuff to do problem.

**Safiah Chowdhury:** I’m not going to speak to unicorns dancing on bouncy castles. I once has plastic burn from jumping on a bouncy castle. Just to bring it back to relevancy. The purpose of the motion to make AGM more democratic. I largely agree with the sentiment that AGM can be used as a forum can bring forward fees and pass them. About \$300 of current student fees were passed at AGM. So, at this Thursday’s assembly, there’s going to be a first reading of a constitutional amendment that will change quorum for AGM from 100 members to 2% of AMS society members (about 280 people). This was an idea that was floated to us from OUSA general meeting where other schools have this quorum, to ensure that you have good representation of student body present, so that anything moving forward can represent this body. The first reading is this Thursday. I encourage more feedback on this and please come to AMS Assembly this Thursday at 7 p.m.

**Rob Lee:** This Thursday’s assembly is also when speaker elections are going to happen.

**Jesse Waslowski:** I am in support of many things that have been said and would like to echo what has already been said. I would like to emphasize a personal example that I believe is relevant. This is what got me involved in student politics in the first place. The AMS clearly has a large issue in terms of getting people out to either their assemblies or AGMS and would like to emphasize the necessity of community and it was at the AGM last year where I sat with Vic Pleavin and others and between them and the motions going through, my interest sparked, and I’d like to think that if others, if we were to advertise the AGM as one of the most important forums that AMS as, particularly in residence, that would be a good policy to put forward.

**Paul Stillman (CESA Representative to the AMS):** Two years ago at the AMS AGM, Ban Righ here was packed. Why? Because there was a certain fee that was going through, a whole group of students was behind it, the Athletics Fee. You couldn’t find a seat but when the vote was finished all the varsity athletes and their friends cleared out. But people who were never involved with student governments were here. But with this bouncy castle motion? Everyone here is already engaged. You’re not going to get more people out here by passing this motion, so if this passes, it’s not going to help us get out the people we want to get out here.

**Kenji Ferguson:** A bouncy castle on campus, if advertised properly, would highlight that it was

passed at AGM. But in addition, the problem with AGM is more of an interest problem. My first AGM was two years ago, and the discussion there was what turned me off student politics for a while. Most people there argued from one point of view. In order for a balanced debate, you need student opinions from many different sides of the table.

**Wesam Aleyadeh:** With regards to the concerns raised by the person before the last comment, It was just a matter of luck that my motion was the last motion. After getting my own flash mob of people who supported fluffy unicorns, we may have left too. The problem is not getting enough people out there, it's fixing the constitution because the constitution itself is flawed.

**Matt (?) (Engineering Society Representative to AMS):** Motion to call to question.

*Motion to call to question*

**Morgan Campbell (Incoming AMS President, outgoing Undergraduate Student Trustee):** Can we change motion to cap the speaker's list?

**Rob Lee:** I apologize, I can't do that as this is a procedural motion.

**Morgan Campbell:** Just so people know, I'm okay not speaking.

**Rachel Kobric, MAL:** Motion to cap the speaker's list.

**Mackenzie Dixon, Point of Order:** Motions have to be made from the speaker's list so the motion to cap the speaker's list can't be made from the floor.

**Rob Lee:** Yes, that's correct. Morgan Campbell, you can speak next.

**Morgan Campbell:** There are two motions that are coming forward this Thurs. at regular assembly that will address some of the concerns raised here. Actually, there's three! So I encourage everyone to come out to discuss how we can modify policy to better meet the needs of students. I encourage you to vote against this because I don't think it's an effective use of student dollars.

**Heyton (?), MAL:** If you put a bouncy castle in the JDUC for an entire year and that's what was accomplished at AGM, you would 100% increase the number of students you had at these meetings. Because that's something that's relatively humorous and it will click in people's minds. Despite the fact that this motion was brought here on the point that anything can be passed, ironically it might increase attendance.

**Andrew Yaworsky:** I was going to comment how I like pink fluffy unicorns. But regardless of whether we vote for this or not, we're here. You have to respect the effort of the people who came here and put forward their motions. Regardless of your opinion of them, people took the time to put forward this motion, open the agenda, and have it put on the agenda. I would rather have 15 of these motions than 5 that don't make a difference. It shows that people do care, regardless of your opinion or the subject matter of those motions.

**Tuba Chisti:** I want to say one thing. What Mr. Abdelmahoud and others have said. The thing is that there are all these students who might care about these issues who just don't know about them. We all pay AMS fees, we're all members of the AMS, so yes we're all here but what about all the students who don't know about this. There are people who don't know about these issues. Are we only looking for students who go out to seek the AMS and who seek to get involved.

**MAL, Point of Interest:** If quorum is not met at AGM, and the Speaker decides not to waive the rules, what would happen?

**Rob Lee:** They can proceed with normal business, All the motions that are passed will be open to discussed in the future. They're not binding and can be revisited. Anything that passed could be reversed very easily.

MAL: At assembly?

**Rob Lee:** It would be at the next Assembly. Also. please keep your debate points exclusively to AGM relevant to the point that this motion was trying to achieve.

**Mike Bass-West:** Motion to call to Question.

*Motion to call to question.*

*Seconded by Rob Staalduinen, COMPSA VP.*

*Motion carries.*

Rob Lee: Closing, Mr. Aleyadah.

**Wesam Aleyadah:** Regarding some concerns that were brought forward. The purpose of this motion is not to say that students should not have a vote but that this democracy we talk about AGM is not really there. Furthermore, even 300 people would not fully represent all of the students at Queen's. Also, with regards to wasting student dollars, we have many events that "waste" student dollars. If students want it, then it's not a waste of student dollars. I'm saving the AMS from embarrassment by not bringing to referendum. Passing this motion will add another good personal feel, it will give the AMS exposure and what is better than pink fluffy unicorns. I have some quotes for the castle, ranging from 195 to [...?]. In closing, I believe this motion is important to keep us all accountable and ensure the AGM is democratic. It really shows that student voices are heard, I've said all I've wanted to say. We need another way of fixing this before it's too late.

*54 in favour, 56 against, 6 abstentions*

*Motion fails.*

**Rob Lee:** We'll now reveal the results of motion #5. Before I announce the results, I know that that last motion was humorous in nature so I wasn't too specific about the groans. This is much more controversial, so I encourage all of you to stay silent and listen to the results, and nothing else. No outbursts would be appropriate.

*75 in favour, 44 against, 3 abstentions.*

**Rob Lee:** Motion from the Assembly meeting on March 10 has been repealed. That brings us to the end of business.

*Motion to adjourn, moved by Victoria Pleavin and seconded by Cenk Aytimur.*

**Rob Lee:** Thank you to everyone here for your engagement. This has probably been one of the most impressive assemblies of the entire year. This is my last assembly of the entire year. Thank

you to everyone with good debate points, helpful points of information. I really do appreciate that. I strongly encourage all of you to stay active. And as I mentioned, we have the speaker elections this coming Thursday at 7 pm in the Maclaughlin Room. Peter Milliken will be helping run the speaker elections, he was the first ever speaker at the AMS Assembly. Thank you all, very much.