

# **AMS Assembly minutes - Thursday, November 22<sup>nd</sup> , 2012**

*Wallace Hall in John Deutsch University Centre*

Assembly starts at 7:06 pm.

**Speaker Scott Mason** (referred to as Speaker): Welcoming remarks, welcoming two new ASUS reps Greg Allen and Ali Zahid.

## **1. Approval of Agenda**

**That AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the Assembly meeting of November 22nd, 2012.**

Moved by Commissioner of Internal Affairs Liam Faught, seconded by Vice-President of University Affairs Mira Dineen.

**CIA Liam Faught** wishes to move discussion period A on fraternities and sororities to immediately follow the Student Undergraduate Trustee's report. Seconded by Member Tafti.

Unanimously approved.

**ASUS Rep Lively** moves a motion to change Rules of Order in Policy Manual Part 1 procedures. Wishes to make an amendment to have the new policy read that Assembly packages must be distributed to members 72 hours before Assembly instead of 48 hours. Seconded by ASUS Rep Basilio. This is added to the end of new business.

*Motion (1) carries.*

## **2. Approval of Minutes from November 8<sup>th</sup> , 2012.**

**That AMS Assembly approve the minutes for the Assembly meeting of November 8th, 2012.**

Moved by Commissioner of Internal Affairs Liam Faught, seconded by Vice President of University Affairs Mira Dineen.

**Student Senate Caucus Chair Eril Berkok** asks for the minutes to have consistency when referring to his position. Different titles were used and he prefers the use of Student Senate Caucus Chair.

*Motion (2) carries.*

**3. Speaker's Business**

**Speaker** : I would like to welcome the new ASUS Reps Greg Allen and Ali Zahid to AMS Assembly.

**4. Guest Speaker - Dr. John Meisel**

**5. President's Report - President Doug Johnson**

**President Johnson** : Not much to add between the last Assembly and now. Refer to my report for specific details. We have been spending a lot of time gathering information for the discussion topic tonight.

**6. Vice President's Report**

**Vice-President Tristan Lee** - Not much to add to the report, you can refer to that for more details, just wanted to let you know that we are making the process of giving out cheques more secure.

**Vice- President Mira Dineen** – I have nothing to add to my report, but I can take questions now.

**Speaker** : You can take questions during Question Period.

## **7. Board of Director's Report - Chairman Rob Gamble**

**Chairman Rob Gamble:** Sorry for not submitting a written report. One thing we did do is approve a loan to the SLC for the JDUC tiling project. We have also been reviewing salaries for AMS remuneration reviews.

## **8. Student Senator's Report - Senator Eril Berkok**

**Student Senate Caucus Chair Berkok** - Only two things to add, the Senate Agenda is now on our website and we will be having Student Senate Caucus this Monday. I'd like to congratulate the new ASUS Reps to Assembly.

## **9. Student Trustee's Report - Undergraduate Trustee Lauren Long**

**Undergraduate Trustee Long** – If you are thinking about getting involved, run for the Undergraduate Trustee! It is a two year commitment with no honorarium. Primarily responsibility is to represent undergraduates. You observe the Senate, sit on Student Senate Caucus meetings, and sit on various senate committees and AMS Assembly. You also attend events as they come up, work with administration and different student leaders. If you are interested feel free to book a meeting with me!

## **10. Rector's Report - Rector Nick Francis**

**Rector Nick Francis** – Just to add to Lauren's report, this is a very strategic role, and one that I work with very closely. If anyone is interested, I can speak to the work relationship I have with

the Undergraduate Trustee. I'd like to thank Dr. Miesel for speaking tonight, he has been a professor for many great leaders of Queen's and Canada. Update on the meetings and discussions around enrolment in residences. SGPS had a meeting and Principal Woolf talked about the changes in provincial government, talked about the residences issue and enrolment, they had similar concerns as undergrads, but their concerns were more concerned around their constituents and how they would live with undergrads. I've met with the Provost and Principal on the issue, and communicated AMS concerns to them.

**Claire Casher** motions to open the agenda.

*Motion carries.*

**Casher** moves a motion to move motion (3) to be voted on before the Discussion period.

**Seconded by VP Affairs Dineen.**

*Motion carries.*

**ASUS Rep Lively** motions to move statement by members before the discussion period.

**Seconded by ASUS Rep Rotman.**

*Motion fails.*

Motion to close the agenda moved by **Director Randall** seconded by **ASUS VP Jacobs**.

**That AMS Assembly ratify Samantha Soto for the position of Orientation Roundtable Co-Ordinator for 2012-2013 [Motion 3]**

**Casher** – I am here to introduce Sam for the new Coordinator position. This position facilitates all orientation weeks for incoming students to Queen's. We had a fantastic applicant pool this year, but I am thrilled to have Samantha for the position. I have the utmost confidence in her

and her previous experience with Nursing Orientation Week. I have nothing but good things to say and I highly recommend her for this position.

*Questions for Ms. Soto*

**President Boomhouwer** - I would like you to identify each faculty orientation week, and name one event they have done.

**Soto** – I would gladly state every orientation week that exists, but due to my lack of experience with actually being a part of them, I could not name specific events. However I can name events from each orientation week I am familiar with. Nursing and engineering have joint events as well as Nursing and CompSci. I am more than happy to explore Commerce and ArtSci events in the future.

**MCRC President Chishti** – Why are you so passionate about orientation week?

**Soto** – I am the only person from my graduating class that came to Queen's. Orientation week opened me up to activities, traditions, resources, and social scenes at Queen's. I love to see the faces on frosh when they find out how awesome Queen's is.

**Speaker** - As per policy procedure, could you step outside Ms. Soto. Debate is now closed.

*Motion carries.*

*Discussion Topic A) Fraternities & Sororities at Queen's*

**Vice-President of University Affairs Dineen** - I would like to thank all of you for being here, and all members at large who choose to come here. Doug and I are going to present something to kick off discussion. Tonight we will go through the background of this issue, catch up on our report, go over the AMS Constitution where it applies to this issue, give you the current context,

and summarize our package and results. At the end of this presentation we will give you our view as an executive.

**President Johnson** – The ban has been in place since the early 1930s. In 1932, the Principal was notified of interest in a Medical Fraternity, Nu Sigma Nu. In 1933 the Senate passed a motion to not allow frats. In 1934 academic calendars were made to make it known students cannot join any frat around Kingston. In 1934 the AMS passed a motion stating that any student who joined a frat would lose their athletic and social privileges. In May 1934 students formed a medical fraternity. In 1934, the AMS court revoked those students' privileges.

**Vice-President of University Affairs Dineen** – We saw a medical calendar from 2003/2004 that indicated the ban on fraternities was still in place. In recent years the AMS has been asked questions about the ban, whether it is enforceable, is it in line with Queen's values, and what action would the AMS take against a complaint. In the current context we need to recognize policy is 80 years old and needs to be reviewed. There is an established fraternity in Kingston with AMS members part of the fraternity. Questions have been asked about what actions we would take against these members. We sought legal counsel from our lawyer, the university lawyer, and we included that in our package to the AMS. Over the last few months, the three of us believe that due to the exclusionary nature of frats, we need to keep them banned. The AMS mission statement states that the AMS needs to be accessible to all members, and so AMS members should not be excluded from joining groups. The Society should not condone or facilitate the development of fraternities. Some policy options moving forward are to develop a society policy banning fraternities from affiliation with the Society and access to Society resources, establish a Society policy on fraternities, reaffirm or amend the AMS constitution

clause on fraternities, maintain the existing ban, strengthen the ban on membership to include privileges in the Society.

Outstanding questions moving forward, we currently have a policy stating AMS members cannot be members of fraternities. The constitution is ambiguous with regards to what we do with complaints. If the Non Academic Discipline System received a complaint and sanctions are applied, the student could appeal to the USAB. The outstanding question is would the USAB overturn the case? Do you agree that frats should or should not be a part of the Queen's University undergrad experience, and what policy options should we pursue moving forward?

**Representative Tafti** – What do you mean by the term exclusivity?

**Vice President of University Affairs Dineen** - The idea in ratifying a club is that any member can join. Although there are some exceptions in accordance to the Human Rights code, there is no human rights basis for why a fraternity can be exclusive.

**Member at Large** - I am a member of a fraternity, and what I would suggest is the AMS not ratify fraternities, but allow students to pursue what they wish off of campus. The AMS and SGPS cannot provide all services to students, if they find an opportunity off campus why should they not be able to join it, other clubs on campus have international governing bodies. Students deserve these opportunities.

**Point of Information Representative Basilio** – The AMS does not actually prohibit bodies that are mostly student oriented, which is why political parties, Rotary club, and the Masonic Order can all form on campus.

**Member at Large** - I joined the fraternity in my first year, I tried to get involved on campus but got shot down. Despite this my frat encouraged me to keep trying and I moved forward and saw my potential. I ended up sitting on the AMS Assembly. My Queen's career is being part of a frat, and students should be able to have their own personal Queen's experience.

**Representative Prescott** – I'm sure we can acknowledge there are fraternity members here today, under this policy why can they sit on Assembly? We need to ask ourselves why have a policy if it isn't even enforced, all we are doing is paying lip service to this, why don't we maintain the status quo.

**Representative Basilio** - The ASUS representatives have actually gotten together and drafted something we would like to see discussed. We feel it would be productive to argue towards something. We would make the policy essentially say that the AMS would not ratify the fraternities, but would not ban students from joining them.

**MCRC President Chishti** – The closest things to fraternities right now would be residences. We should consider what this means for the community. The first conversation should be the effects this has on our community, the maybe go on to the ASUS recommendation.

**Representative Prescott** – My question then following what Ms. Chishti said would be what constitutes the Queen's Community? I do not think it is under the purview of this administration to say what that is. Freedom of association is enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Who are we to decide who associates with whom?

**Member at Large** - Joining a fraternity does not take away from the Queen's experience. Sometimes you need to see if it is right for you, if it is, why can't you join it? We do not steal

from residence, because that only happens once. If we aren't recognized by the AMS we can't take from residence.

**CESA President** – I recognize everyone has their own experience, no matter who they are. However, making your experience fit into an exclusive community is elitist. If making an experience has to be against the mission statement of the AMS or the university, we should make sure we do not have these organizations. It is up to the purview of this body to decide if you can associate with them or not, it is our responsibility to foster something appropriate for the university as a whole. If this association is contrary to the aforementioned parties beliefs, we should stop students from associating with them. What do they offer that the community doesn't or cant offer?

**Member at Large Point of Information** – We stand for academic success, brotherhood, philanthropy, and athletic/academic achievement.

**Representative Rotman** – I am a member of a fraternity and it is something I don't flaunt due to the negative stigma associated with it. I have found nothing but acceptance at these fraternities and not all of them can be painted with the same brush, some were actually founded to address systemic issues in universities. The fraternity I am a part of shaped my cultural identity, I don't expect you to understand this, but I do expect you to respect it. This is not a failure of the AMS, it is just a choice I made because I felt it would contribute to my identity. I have been heavily involved in campus life for two years; my spirit is not diminished because of my involvement in an outside, and I am no less involved in campus life because of my commitment off campus. To be honest the arguments that erode our spirit are hurtful. We need to recognize the idea that the AMS need not recognize these organizations, but that does not mean students should be banned from participating in them off campus.

**Member at Large** – In first and second year, I was dating a member of a frat, and I wanted that experience as a woman. I do not affiliate with these people anymore, but I am concerned with how they are being painted by students. I spent a lot of time with these guys and during those times I never felt disrespected or marginalized. All of these people were friendly and respectful to my friends as well. I was proud to be affiliated with them and to hear that they are exclusive is upsetting, I was involved and a part of this frat community as a woman. These men formed a bond with each other we should not separate.

**Representative Lively** - Whether or not it is the responsibility of the AMS to dictate university culture, it is the responsibility of the AMS to ensure students can experience the best experience possible. In order to do that we need to give them the opportunity to associate with whom they want. What is elite is to sit here as a body of 40 people and decide what the student experience is.

**ASUS President Whittaker motions** to open to agenda seconded by **Representative Prescott**

*Motion carries*

**ASUS President Whittaker** - Makes an amendment to the current policy to change the wording that removes the enforceability of the ban. Seconded by **Representative Basilio**.

**Representative Haney Point of Information** – What are the rules of order in making an amendment to the constitution?

**Speaker** – We are in discussion period, it will be placed at the end of the agenda.

**MCRC President Chishti** – Didn't the AMS executive say we wanted this next Assembly?

**Vice President of University Affairs Dineen** – On behalf of the three of us, we are strongly opposed to this, this is an 80 year old policy -

**Representative Prescott Point of Order** – Calls the question

**Speaker** – I apologise, but since the question has been called by a member I will have to cut you off.

*Motion fails*

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to close the agenda. Seconded by **ASUS VP Jacobs**.

*Motion carries*

**Vice President of Operations Lee** – It is important that on such a big topic the focus is not on current frats, but the idea of them.

**Member Plummer** – It is necessary for the discussion to also revolve around the current frat, it gives us an idea of what we are dealing with, or what we would be dealing with if there were 10 frats here.

**JRHC President Schuculski** – I would like to know what a general frat structure is.

**Member at Large Point of Information** – The majority of Frats are organized by an international organization. There are a certain set of rules, such as no kegs and no alcohol to minors are in place.

**Social Issues Commissioner Conway** – Most of my comments are based off student comments at other universities. I am opposed to these organizations because they are financially, sexually, and racially exclusive. In the US 86% of off campus sexual assaults occur in frats.

**Representative Rotman** - There is a way to organize policy so that there is not a massive proliferation of Greek Letter Organizations (GLO). Many need university recognition to exist. When we talk about on campus what do we mean? Does that mean no association with Queen's or no Queen's members can associate with frats. It is possible for them to exist and not use AMS resources.

**Representative Hanley Point of Information** – Both current frats state they are affiliated with Queen's, not Kingston.

**Representative Rotman** – That is a mistake we have repeatedly addressed. We need to distinguish between Canadian and US campus cultures and realize frats operating in each are different.

**Director Randall** - Lets not delude ourselves into thinking drinking and hazing do not happen. U of Alabama had to close frats due to these issues. The AMS should dictate how students act, but we need to realize town and campus relations are fragile and allowing frats will only but more stress on that relationship. Secondly most Alumni are opposed to frats, this would cause a divide in alumni with frats and without. If public funding to the university keeps getting cut, we need more of their donations.

**President Johnson** - The resounding alumni opinion is that frats and sororities should not be allowed. They feel they would create a faction between the 150,000 current alumni and future alumni. They believe their loyalty is to Queen's and frats would cause students to choose only one to be loyal to. They feel the niche frats fill are allowed filled by campus resources, and new alumni would experience a different Queen's than they have.

**Member at Large** - The critique that a drinking culture is promoted is unfair. AMS backed clubs do the same thing. We should not only think of current alumni, but future alumni. When I come back and my friends are gone and professors dead, there is a fraternity I can visit.

**Member at Large Chinniah** - It is heartening to see so many members favour freedom of association and anti-oppression. We should be free from the coercive power of an elitist body such as the AMS. If the AMS really believes in basic freedoms, they would allow us to divorce ourselves from them.

**Vice President of University Affairs Dineen** – Can you substantiate your claims?

**Member at Large Chinniah** – The AMS forces me to join, in that sense it is oppressive because it does not allow me to not associate with them.

**Representative Prescott** – I find the indulgence of logic leaps very amusing. We've come to a point where we don't even want to act on this now, we just had a motion bring forward a plan of action, and we don't even allow it on the agenda. Why are we just talking in circles and paying lip service to the issue instead of coming to a solution.

**Representative Basilio** - Following Member Prescott I would like to say there is a cap on discussion.

**Representative Rotman** moves a motion to extend discussion period by 45 minutes, seconded by **Representative Tafti**.

*Motion carries.*

**Member at Large** – I am the former SIC and I have similar concerns as Commissioner Conway.

**Member at Large** – I attended a conference on GLOs in Phoenix. The biggest thing for frats is brotherhood above all. There are scholarship funds that are available, students are allowed access. While campus culture is a concern in the US, they differ campus to campus. The students on your campus dictate the culture and how it will operate. It is not the frat. This is persecution against the human rights code.

**Vice President of University Affairs Dineen** – We have spoken at length about this, the human rights code does not apply to these organizations. We also need to consider the AMS mandate as an organization.

**MCRC President Chishtie** – We've had this discussion for a while, since there are huge ramifications we need to do our due diligence.

**Member at Large** – I joined a frat first year, it has group dynamics and it's philanthropic. Why can't I join this off campus?

**Vice President of University Affairs Dineen** - The executive does not think this should be strengthened to get rid of voting and other privileges. The current policy is not clear, that is the issue.

**EngSoc President Wheeler** – Many members feel uneasy telling the community who they can freely associate with. Another issue is people here are on frats, and like that experience. Any action right now would do a disservice to the community, if we want to make an informed decision we need to do research. It seems negative from the alumni and Kingston.

**Member at Large Point of Information** – The city bylaws state you can have Greek letters on your house.

**ASUS President Whittaker** – I like the idea of a referendum, and I will move a motion to open the agenda to direct the AMS executive to draft a policy that captures the spirit of our discussion and bring it back to Assembly.

**ASUS President Whittaker** moves a motion to open the agenda. **Seconded by Representative Basilio.**

*Motion carries.*

**ASUS President Whittaker** – The AMS Assembly directs the Executive to develop a draft policy that captures the spirit of the discussion. Seconded by **Representative Boomhouwer.**

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to close the agenda. Seconded by **Boomhouwer.**

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to end discussion.

*Motion carries.*

## **11. Statement by Members**

**Representative Rotman** - I am disappointed we had to end our discussion. Not once have we heard what it means to be on campus, and it is hurtful to talk about how a GLO takes away from our university. It is ludicrous to talk about this without identifying what it is to be on campus. The idea that having an allegiance external to Queen's is bad because I give my money away to something other than Queen's. This is exactly the case with political parties, why are we only using this argument on frats.

**ASUS VP Jacobs** – Reminder that applications are due tomorrow for our camps coordinator position.

**Director Arnone** - We reopened the position of business manager at CFRC, we contacted a successful applicant tonight.

**MCRC President Chishti** – I want to commend the executive for changing policy with regards to financial accountability and spending at the annual John Orr dinner.

**Member at Large** - GLOs will not take over Queen's or the AMS. Campus culture is the student, if they do not want them to take over they won't. We should be more concerned with students today, not alumni. The AMS is private, but we should still abide by our Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

**JHRC President Schukulski Point of Order** – Statements being made are on a discussion we have closed.

**Speaker** – With respect, this period is for any member to give a 3 minute statement on anything.

**Vice President of Operations Lee** – I would like to make it known I am disappointed discussion was closed. Our intention as an executive when we move forward is that we have been given the power to come back with an amendment to policy. We would bring this up for discussion in the next Assembly.

**Representative Rotman** – There has been a lot of discussion as to whether or not the Charter is applicable to this situation. I think the Charter spirit still exists here.

**Member at Large** moves a motion to go into recess for 5 minutes. Seconded by **Representative Simpson**

*Motion carries.*

**Assembly recessed at 9:58 pm.**

**Assembly start : 10:10 pm**

**Representative Lively** - I'd like to commend everyone that participated in Movember. In reference to President Chishti, I say we go further and make permanent staff members should be scrutinized more. If these 1 year people do their jobs, they should have to earn their salary before they dip into a discretionary budget to 'appreciate' themselves. If one thing Cape Breton has taught me, it is not the amount of hours you work but what you get done. I am also disappointed about the discussion surrounding equity grants. We debated \$600 for an hour and a half, and spent half of that time on \$15 million. We need more incentives to get people out to AMS meetings, and that involves using social media and creating a conducive environment for discussion. If you have to ask a question 3 times to get an answer, why would I come back to ask more questions? I'd like to point out that the reports and agenda needs to be published with enough time for people to read it and form an opinion beforehand. If your report is not submitted 48 hours prior to a meeting, you should not be able to come here and discuss your report, unless there is a 2/3 vote. Although it is good to make Queen's more accessible, there is no guarantee that the Accessibility Fund, which students pay \$3 for, are going to get what they put in. It should be the responsibility of the university to make the university accessible.

**12. Question Period**

**Representative Prescott** - My question is directed to VPUA Dineen. Something that had arisen in our discussion period earlier was that we are not legally bound to the Charter, if that's the case, that this being a public institution, as a student of that institution, if this organization is not going to adhere to the main tenants, can I opt out as a public individual of the AMS.

**VPUA Dineen** – You are commenting on my earlier comment that the AMS is not bound by the Charter. We are not, but we are also a government. There is actually a policy clause to adhere to the Charter. I also invite you to substantiate your claims that the AMS is oppressive.

**Representative Prescott** – The term oppressive is used for things other than oppression based on race, sexuality, religion. Oppressive can also mean that someone or something comes into my life and tells me how to act outside the realm in which it falls. That is oppressive and illiberal in nature. I should have the right to remove myself from that organization; I should go to Queen's but not be in the AMS. Why can't we opt out?

**VPA Dineen** – It is mandatory to be a member of a student union. You can opt out of membership but have to pay the fees.

**Representative Rotman** – This is directed towards the Executive. What measures would the Executive take to enforce the ban on fraternities?

**CIA Faught** – The sanctions that can be imposed are in Policy Manual 1 under non-academic discipline.

**Representative Lively** – To the Executive: It seems that the Exec and Assembly as a whole reserve the right to limit freedom of speech and Assembly, does the executive feel this is oppressive?

**VPUA Dineen** – I do not need to answer the second part because I do not think the first part is true. We have expressed our interpretation of the constitution, we have concerns about GLOs on campus, but we have not taken a stance on the ban on membership. We should get out of QP and move to the motion that was added to the agenda.

**Representative Lively** – You did not answer my question, and I've noticed a couple of members used words that can be seen as offensive. There is a difference between something that can be offensive and something that can offend. We should be able to have an adult conversation and use words that can be interpreted as words that can offend.

**Speaker** – As a facilitator of discussion, we need to make sure everyone is comfortable in discussion.

### **13. Business Arising from the Minutes**

### **14. New Business**

**Commissioner Greene** moves a motion to open the agenda. **VPUA Dineen** seconds.

*Motion carries.*

**Commissioner Conway** moves to move motion 18 to the top of the agenda. **Representative**

**Simpson** seconds.

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Basilio** moves to close the agenda. **Representative Haney** seconds.

*Motion carries.*

### **Motion 18**

Moved by ASUS President Whittaker seconded by ASUS VP Jacobs

**Representative Rotman** - I have to say I find this motion worrisome, I think that since the situation is a contentious one as many people as possible should draft this policy. I am distraught that Assembly, which is responsible for the constitution of the AMS, would delegate power away.

**VPUA Dineen** – I am concerned that Assembly would take longer in drafting a document than we would. The Assembly can task the Exec in representing the people in a certain way, and we are happy to do that.

**EngSoc President Wheeler** – Either way, the draft will come through Assembly.

**Representative Prescott** – I like that this motion comes forward with an action plan, my concern is that in the case we cannot let whatever the Exec comes up with to be the only course we have. I encourage other members to come forth with policies.

**President Johnson** – Assembly is not delegating away power, we are happy to come back with a policy that echoes the discussion of tonight. This would not be the opinion of three people, we are coming back with the spirit of the discussion.

**Representative Basilio** – I heard mention that people are disappointed discussion was cut short. We cut short a discussion that was going nowhere and now the exec can come back with a draft that captures the spirit of the discussion.

**Representative Rotman** – I think a referendum on the issue is important, however I'm worried how it will play out in terms of what side would be represented as pro and con.

**President Johnson** - Referendum questions come through Assembly, so the wording comes through this body.

**MCRC President Chishti** – Recognizing all the debate that happened, I'd like to call the question.

*Motion carries.*

**SSCC Berkok** moves a motion to extend Assembly by 60 minutes. Seconded by **ASUS VP Jacobs**.

*Motion carries.*

**That AMS Assembly approve amendments to Policy Manual 2, Section 1 Part D:**

**Orientation**

**Roundtable, as seen in Appendix A: Knights of the Roundtable [Motion 4]**

Moved by Claire Casher, seconded by VPA Dineen.

**Commissioner Casher** - The ORT is a group that helps organize the different orientation weeks.

To strengthen the ORT it is healthy to oversee policy and tweak it where possible. I've spoken with coordinators from the past 3 years and taken into account what they have said I've put a package together. The result of this was the changes you see today, there are not significant changes.

**Representative Basilio** – Is this time sensitive?

**Commissioner Casher** – It is time sensitive in the sense we are in the process of hiring ORT directors.

**Representative Basilio** – Something this substantive coming out a few hours ago with a former director coming out against the motion needs to be analyzed more.

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to table Motion 4. **Representative Allen** Seconds.

*Motion carries.*

## **Motion 5**

**That AMS Assembly approve amendments to Policy Manual 1, Section 7 as seen in Appendix B: Re-Referendum.**

Moved by Ali Tejpar seconded by VPA Dineen

**SSCC Berkok** moves a motion to remove the current Speaker as chair. Seconded by **ASUS President Whittaker**.

*Motion carries.*

**The Chair of the meeting is now Representative Basilio**

**CRO Tejpar** – This is an update to policy and creates a policy on social media. The changes are not too drastic and brings policy to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We will also make it no longer mandatory to hold a debate on West Campus, among other small changes.

**Representative Lively** - The main problem I see is that the CRO has to approve online material. The campaign period is 10 days; can this be done in a timely manner? If people post stupid stuff on the internet it weeds out the good and bad candidates.

**CEO Mason** – This is true however there is no current policy on this. It is easy to send things to the elections team and have them approve, nevertheless we need some purview over the material.

**Representative Lively** – Policy should be more reactionary than preventative. If you want to take action against what they said take action afterwards.

**CEO Mason** – This is reactionary, it allows us prevue over online material.

**Rector Francis** – Online media is very dynamic and content can change instantly. Is there enough time for this to be approved by the CRO. It can become a large barrier for teams to get approval on media, reacting to something is a better approach.

**Director Arnone** – The option to abstain and not checking a box is unclear. It makes it sound as though abstaining is an option.

**CEO Mason** – With respect, I feel it is quite clear.

**UGT Long** – I'd move a motion to amend 6.05. Seconded by **Representative Lively**

**ASUS VP Jacobs** – By keeping an eye on the Tweets and Facebook updates is akin to monitoring what we do period. I would support the idea of approving a Facebook header, profile picture, some content in the about section, but the online scene is dynamic and bad posts can separate one time from another.

**Representative Hanley** – On live updates, it is more practice that needs to be changed not policy. In EngSoc the CRO is made administrator of Facebook pages.

**CRO Tejpar** – Sounds good, but we can leave that up to the discretion of the Elections Team.

**Representative Lively** – I like the amendment to make sure the dynamic updates are not censored, it is more after the fact.

**Rector Francis** - I still take issue with this proposed amendment, the issue is can a candidate put up Facebook events or pages immediately. This can cause conflicts between teams where one puts one up before the other one. I think the wording should not be prior to posting, but in some sort of close proximity to when it is being posted.

**VPOps Lee** – Our websites were approved the day before going online. The same could happen on Facebook and Twitter, approve it the day before and go from there.

**CEO Mason** – Policy can never really hope to cover everything and there are advantages to leaving this at our discretion year to year.

*Motion 5 carries.*

**Director Randall** moves to omnibus motions 6-10.

*Motion carries.*

*Motions 6,7,8,9, and 10 are now Omnibus Motion 1.*

*Refer to the Assembly Package for exact wording on these motions.*

**UGT Long** – My concern is that the Journal endorsement comes out the first day of voting and happens because of a press schedule. Would Assembly entertain the motion to move voting days on day back so we could get an endorsement out before the actual vote.

**MCRC President Point of Information** – Changing the date won't do anything because the Journal can publish whenever. These coincide with AMS assemblies; the motion would not change anything.

**UGT Long** – From my understanding it is not the Journal’s intention to publish on the same day as Election Day.

**VPOps Lee** – We cannot dictate when the Journal can and can’t publish, they can just as easily do an online edition the day before.

**VPUA Dineen** – I don’t think it is in the interest of the Assembly to tailor our election dates to one publication.

**UGT Long** – I still do not want to withdraw my amendment, I think it is valuable people vote on this. Motion is to amend voting days to the 30<sup>th</sup>/31<sup>st</sup> of January.

*Motion fails.*

**Representative Lively** – If we pass an amendment on January 17<sup>th</sup>, would that carry over to this referendum?

**CRO Tejpar** – Yes

**Representative Prescott** – Who provides the funds for the spending limits?

**VPUA Dineen** – The spending limits are approved by the CIA budget. We budget for 3 executive teams and it comes from the AMS specific fee.

**Member at Large Chinniah** – If, say the CEO, has been instructed with an emergency, can they complete the election that day, or is there a deputy system?

**CRO Tejpar** – Policy does include measures in case something happens to the CRO, CEO, or CIA.

**Member at Large Chinniah** – If I were a candidate and a member of the elections team deciding to run, what would happen to the election itself.

**CEO Mason** – If a member ran they would have to make their own arrangements for a deputy to fill their position, or there is a plan coordinated with the AMS.

**Member at Large Chinniah** – IF the CIA ran for election what would happen?

**Director Randall** moves a motion to extend Assembly by 60 minutes. Seconded by

**Commissioner Greene.**

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Prescott** – How do we vote on selecting a new CIA?

**CEO Mason** – New members would need to be ratified by Assembly.

**VPUA Dineen** – All salaried staff need approval from their supervisor before they can run and they need to have a plan of action.

*Omnibus Motion 1 carries.*

*Motion to return the chair to CEO Mason carries.*

## **Motion 11**

**That AMS Assembly approve amendments to the AMS Hiring & Appointment Policy and Procedures Manual, as seen in Appendix D-1: HI In The Mix, and Appendix D-2: HR Report to the Board of Directors & Assembly.**

Moved by Laura Skellet, seconded by VPOps Lee

**Skellet** – Over the past few months myself and the VPOps have done a review of HR policy. The new system we have come up with is a hybrid of a lottery and review system. Applications

would initially be weeded out by certain qualities the manager is looking for, and from there successful applications go to the lottery.

**VPO Lee** – We need a system that helps both the applicant and the manager. This is the best system given the high volume of applications. A lottery does not necessarily have to be used, a manager can weed out applications and come to an amount of successful applicants that do not need to enter the lottery to get interviews, however if the volume of applicants is high it can be used. This new system analyzes basic qualities and from there the applicant gets to a lottery or interview. It also passed the board of directors.

**Chairman Gamble** – We had an extensive discussion during the summer and what the implications would be. There are a number of amendments concerned with the corporations and other are not. I'd encourage members to debate amendments.

**Representative Basilio** - I was previously opposed to this system, and I still believe it is not the best system. I recognize constraints, and I compromised on the hybrid system. I would like to amend that you can ask a maximum of 3 questions in coordination with HR, and the total word count can be 750. Toughening up the first stage means less people have to go through the lottery.

*Amendment debate*

**VPO Lee** – I feel that 2 questions are enough to evaluate interviews, if a manager has to start reading 1,000 words on 500 applications, they may be less inclined to read them thoroughly.

**Representative Prescott** – It is of course possible that a longer application means less applicants.

**VPO Lee** – My concern is that this would be detrimental to some services. We do not receive a lot of applications at some services, but receive hundreds of extras for services such as Walkhome.

**ASUS President Whittaker Point of Information** – If this policy gets approved by the Board, in what way does Assembly approve this?

**VPO Lee** – It is unclear where final jurisdiction lies. My understanding is that decisions with the board, Assembly could overturn. I brought this up to Assembly earlier and though it was only responsible to do so again.

**ASUS President Whittaker** - A lottery system is inherently inequitable. The spirit of Representative Basilio's amendment was that there is more to judge before you hit a lottery process.

**VPO Lee** – It is not realistic to read through all of these applications thoroughly. The lottery was chosen because of its efficiency. Services do not require you to be a good writer, so it does not make sense to get rid of someone because they can't write. Group interviews are used, but we cannot have every applicant into a group interview. These groups would start to reach 10-15 people, applicants who are nervous speaking in front of others are at a disadvantage and although I recognize social skills are necessary, it's usually on a small basis such as groups of 3-4.

**Skellet** – The questions are used to get criteria from the applicant, it is designed to see their interests and basic skills.

**MCRC President Chishti** – We should advertise this more clearly and maybe getting people to

**Director Randall** – We want to consider as much information from the applicant as possible, but managers are in a period where they are not paid and do a full course load. It is more

informative to do interviews. Certain services benefit from group interviews but others do not, this policy has been crafted over the past 8 months and current managers have been heavily involved in this policy. We saw this work and not work during the fall hiring period, and that is what necessitated the change you see today.

**Member at Large Mann** – If you ask applicants to do a lot more work on the application and they get rejected they look negatively on the AMS.

**CESA President** – When you receive applications does every single person read they application or do they split up?

**VPO Lee** – It varies, in my experience it is divided among the employers.

*Amendment to Motion 11 carries.*

*Motion 11.*

**Representative Prescott** – We have a flawed HR policy in hiring. What would Assembly think if we had an extended hiring period so we had the ability to let hiring last longer, get better people, and replace those who are fired.

**MCRC President Chishti** proposed an amendment to 6.06 seconded by **Representative Prescott**

*Debate on amendment*

**Director Randall** – I would contend that from an operations standpoint I'd rather applicants apply to jobs they want to work or are best suited for.

**MCRC President Chishti** – I think we forget people need jobs. Maybe someone really wants to work for Walkhome, but that does not mean they do not want to work for another service.

Maybe people just want to be employed and an interview can weed people out who do not want jobs.

**VPO Lee** – The number of these amendments is an operational issue. I will say that these amendments are not final and need to pass the Board.

**Representative Basilio** – You are saying the amendments can go to the Board and they can debate, change, and vote on them? Would it come back to Assembly?

**VPO Lee** – It is not clear, but it is clear that the Board does need some say, we do not know who has the ultimate decision here.

**Chairman Gamble** – It does say in the Constitution the Board has the final say, and it is worrisome these amendments are coming up on the fly, we need to carefully consider our policy.

**Representative Basilio Point of Information** – If we approved these amendments could the Board overturn them knowing the student body approved them?

**Chairman Gamble** – I can't say what would happen, but if it came to it, the Board could overturn them.

**Member at Large Mann** – There is nothing wrong with transparency, but mandating this caused a disincentive. You cannot underestimate what would happen, it is not something we should hide but also not advertise. 75% of students find out about the AMS through applying for jobs.

**Representative Prescott** – My question then becomes at what time do we make our hiring process a fantasyland, and not prepare students of what the real world actually asks. This is simply a fantasy and it would be a great opportunity to inject some reality into the policy.

**Representative Allen** – The chances of getting into Med School is slim, but the result is good applicants.

**Representative Lively** – People who really want a job will apply regardless of their chances. If people are finding out about the AMS through applying for jobs that is a failure of this organization.

**VPO Lee** – I understand that we are in a bubble at Queen's, but it is ridiculous that you call the work we do a fantasy. All these processes are applicable to the real world. I'd like to withdraw our original motion and talk to our lawyer to see whose jurisdiction this is.

**Representative Basilio Point of Order** – Don't we need unanimous approval of Assembly to withdraw a motion?

**Speaker** – The mover has special control over their motion.

*Motion 11 is withdrawn from the Agenda by VPO Lee.*

**SSCC Berkok** moves a motion to extend Assembly by 30minutes. Seconded by **Commissioner Conway**.

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to open the agenda. Seconded by **Commissioner Greene**.

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to move Motion 16 to the top of agenda. Seconded by **Representative Erin**.

*Motion carries.*

**Representative Basilio** moves a motion to close the agenda. Seconded by **ASUS President Whittaker**.

*Motion carries.*

## **Motion 16**

**That AMS Assembly elect \_\_\_\_ as Deputy Speaker**

Moved by CIA Liam Faught, seconded by Mira Dineen.

**CESA President Lloyd and Representative Simpson are nominated.**

**Commissioner Greene** – Could you please outline experience you've had running anything like this?

**Simpson** – I was CIA for my school, it is small but we had many nominations and elected positions. We had to deal with contentious issues last year and it is not easy to disqualify people, which I have done. I am good with staying true to policy.

**CESA President** – I've been reviewing policies for CESA elections. I have helped facilitate among other things. I do not have direct experience, but I have had worked in them.

**Representative Basilio** – Do either of you know of any scenario that is absolutely possible right now where you will have a conflict of interest?

**Simpson/CESA President** – No.

**Caileigh Simpson is elected Deputy Speaker.**

## **Motion 12**

**That AMS Assembly approve the Fall 2012 Club Grants, as seen in Appendix E: Take It Back To Tha Club, and on the Assembly Dropbox.**

Moved by CIA Liam Faught, seconded by VPA Mira Dineen.

**CIA Faught** – The Clubs Manager has used good methodology in reviewing who should get grants. Many different factors were considered. The system rested on a % of funding for different activities. Applicants have to sign a form before they get the cheque saying they will use the funding for what they got approved for.

**Representative Rotman Point of Information** – On the hiring policy, I was wondering what the definition was of common interest and what clubs fall under this.

**Clubs Manager** – A club that does something at specific times, a chess club for example.

**Representative Lively** – What is the definition of a public service club? I've noticed that organisations have put on events before the club grants were given out, and they were not awarded grants retroactively. When you award these funds, you have an appreciation of what these groups spent the money on. If necessary, the grants committee should have to meet before or in reaction to these events. Some of these events are the best thing on the list, but some do not get grants because they can't be rewarded retroactively.

**Clubs Manager** – A public service club is essentially a group that goes into the community and does something to benefit the community.

**Member at Large Chinniah** – If the clubs have received grants, do you know if there is overlap between AMS grants and other grants?

**Clubs Manager** – That has been a focus for me, and I can see cross overs because I sit on the clubs grant committee. I collaborate with MCRC, ASUS, SIC, and the CES.

*Motion 12 carries.*

### **Motion 13**

**That AMS Assembly approve the Fall 2012 Equity Grants, as seen in Appendix F: Equitay, and on the Assembly Dropbox [Motion 13]**

Moved by Commissioner Conway, seconded by VPA Dineen.

**Representative Prescott Point of Information** – Will we debate motion 11 at the next Assembly?

**VPO Lee** – We will consult with the Board and other parties to see who has final call on the policy, if Assembly does have the final call we will come back.

**MCRC President Chishti** moves a motion to adjourn. Seconded by **Representative Rotman**.

*Motion carries.*

**Assembly adjourns at 1:20 am.**

*All New Business will be moved to the next agenda on January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013.*