

AMS Assembly minutes - Thursday, March 21st, 2013
Wallace Hall in John Deutsch University Centre

**letters and numbers beside motions are direct reference to those presented in the agenda*

**assembly commenced at 6:30 pm*

1. Approval of Agenda of the meeting of March 21st, 2013 [Motion 1]
2. Approval of Minutes of the meeting of March 7th, 2013 [Motion 2]
3. Speaker's Business
4. Guest Speaker
5. President's Report - President Doug Johnson
6. Vice President's Report
 - a. Operations - Vice-President Tristan Lee
 - b. University Affairs - Vice-President Mira Dineen
7. Board of Director's Report - Chairman Rob Gamble
8. Student Senator's Report - Senator Eril Berkok
9. Rector's Report - Rector Nick Francis
10. Student Trustee's Report - Undergraduate Trustee Lauren Long
11. Statements by Members
12. Question Period
13. Business Arising from the Minutes

That AMS Assembly ratify Apollonia Karetou as Judicial Affairs Director for 2013-2014.

Motion to ratify

Motion (3) carries

That AMS Assembly ratify Ali Zahid as Marketing Officer for 2013-2014.

Berkok: Focus of Marketing Office next year will be market research. Zahid shares this vision and has a great deal of enthusiasm to drive the office forward with this vision.

Pritchard: Zahid presented an incredible proposal and will do a great job in the role. Please keep in mind that we are in the middle of transition.

Member Lively: What are some of the new initiatives that you would like to put in place?

Zahid: Want to get a lot more students engaged and involved in the corporate and government side. 90 second video after each Assembly to summarize the events and engage students. I have many other initiatives I would like to undertake.

Member Prescott: In five words or less why do you deserve to get the applause [ratification] tonight?

Zahid: Because I am awesome.

President Lloyd: Name one initiative undertaken this year that you would like to continue.

Zahid: Want to continue the blog and expand it by introducing the “soapbox”. Interactive feature to promote dialogue. Like Reddit for debate and discussion.

Spekaer closes speaker’s list, Zahid leaves

Motion to ratify Ali Zahid.

Motion 4 carries

14. New Business

That AMS Assembly approve the addition of Section 3, Part L: Housing Grievance Centre to AMS Policy Manual 2, as seen in Appendix A: HGC.

Moved by: Troy Sherman

Seconded by: Mira Dineen

Sherman: We tabled this at our last meeting in order to run the policy through our legal counsel. This revised policy encompasses our lawyer’s advice.

Prescott: I notice the Residential Tenancies Act was removed as an area covered by the Centre. Why has this been removed?

Sherman: That was done at the recommendation of our legal counsel. Volunteers will still be knowledgeable but it will not be codified that the Centre advises on that topic.

Motion 5 carries

Motion to de-omnibus a series of motions that had been omni-bussed earlier

Motion by Johnson
Seconded by Prescott

That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution, Section 19: Transition, as seen in Appendix B: Lost In Transition.

That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution, Section 2: The Society and Executive of the Society, as seen in Appendix C: No More Years.

Mira: This deals with two separate issues. Deals with what we thought would be appropriate and in line with current policy. Covers the removal of the Executive. This amendment explains that the policy shall apply to the Executive-elect where reasonable. This would provide clarity to assembly in future when these sorts of issues come up again.

Liam: This is in the absence or unavailability of an Executive member. There is a section that relates to the removal of the executive. Another section that deals with the hiring of commissioners, and council – this is worthy of clarification. There is another point that deals with officers – also needs to be abundantly clear.

Mira: Statement that current members of the Executive are not able to run again – the society would be limited in its functioning if one of us were to take off at any point. Also says that the AMS HR Officer should not be able to run for office. If they win they would be on the hiring panel for staff. The HR Officer also has access to confidential information that is housed in our offices.

Prescott: With the previous VPOPS elect resigning, and the new VPOPs being elected by assembly, will that be codified in the constitution now?

Mira: Yes that would codify what happened this year.

Scott: Any further debate on motion?

Lively: Objection that this will apply where reasonable and as appropriate for the executive elect. Instead it should be placed in the sections where they belong. Given the incident that happened earlier, I think certain members of assembly would argue this because the spirit of the policy is for executive members currently in office. I think we should go into this section and lay it out explicitly.

Keenan: even were this in place, section 2.04.04, assembly could reject the appointment as an option and still call an election.

Haney: likes how it is worded right now. There are still things in the constitution that 5 years from now could still come up. I like how it is right now as a safety net catch-all.

Rotman: In terms of amendment, I think it is more of a bandaid, and we should dive deeper and explicitly mention how situations that come up should be treated. Regarding HR Officer – could they resign from position to run in election anyway? There would be a perceivable conflict of interest?

Mira: even if they resigned, could there still be a conflict? This prevents them from running in the whole time in which they would be in office. Unlike other positions where you could pull things together and make it, work, you would not be able to in this position either.

Rotman: Supplemental – how would this be enforced?

Mira: They could not get on the ballot, so they would not be eligible to run.

Prescott: Present to the members today a lament on the sad state of affairs of the student government. We are trying to codify a very objectionable action. We are now placing this into the constitution. To see us go forward in instilling this into our constitution is very concerning to say the least. I understand that it gives us constitutional authority, but speaks again to the disillusionment and disconnect of this body to the greater campus. There are many students out there who voted for their team; it is up to the students to decide who will fill the office again, not a representative democracy. I understand that we need this transition model in place for operational reasons, but speak again to what do we really stand for. Lament for the status of these affairs; what do we stand for? Do we stand for 15,000 students? To think that we can just take all of their thoughts and desires and place them into the highest body that controls their powers? If something changes, let's just replace with somebody else. We are assuming that all will be fine with whatever happens. We are saying that our voices matter more than the voices of our students – that is why we are in such a sorry state of affairs. Issues at hand are really what make this the immature society that it is.

Forrest: Propose an amendment to add the words in 2.02.03 that the CIA will also not be able to run.

Scott: seconder. Move into debate on this amendment.

Forrest: Motion 7, section 2.02.03; add commissioner of internal affairs into it.

Mira: considered a lot and had that discussion at assembly. There was not an appetite for restricting students from running. Reason why we didn't include CIA, because the sentiment we got was that we need to be very careful with how we decide to restrict a student's right to run for election. Felt that HR officer is so extreme or severe that it warrants being put into the constitution. I feel confident that the society will put other things in place to make things run smoothly. We believe these are completely separate issues.

Forrest: Explain why I'm bringing this forward – this is not a judgement on the job that Liam Faught has done, this is a response to the fact that as CIA, that position in a very broad sense oversees the election. Sets up election policy. CEO and Assistant CEO are stripped of their right to vote. They must be completely impartial. This is not that radical an amendment. The CIA should always be seen as someone who cannot shape how the election takes place, and how it goes. We need to ensure that students will continue to have faith in the assembly and the student body. Must uphold standards in this institution.

Isabelle – speak against this motion. Recognize procedures in their own faculty societies should consider their own policies and how they should be changed if this should pass.

Lively: Somewhat disconcerting. Don't want to offend CIA Faught. Reiterate what forrest said, we need to hold our people that oversee the election to a higher standard than this. We must realize that we're almost taking the easy way out. We are putting a Band-Aid on this situation – not taking away other conflicts of interest that should be considered and are important. I would like to hear the opinions of

members of assembly, must hold people to a higher standard, and uphold certain rights. What was the original intent of this motion? I don't like the idea of assembly deciding who can or can't run. You're accepting that you are giving up your right to run for AMS exec. Assembly should be focussing on the fact that this is voluntary in nature.

Philip: firmly believe that the elections ran relatively smoothly. I see no problem, and I see a major difference between the cia and the human resources officer. We can't really transfer info from cia to anyone else. Don't see the major benefits to this.

Prescott: Speak to a couple things. I take an affront to the language being used. If it is enshrined in someone's job description they are stripping the rights themselves. To commissioner Duchaine's post, our own society allowed its CIA to run and I don't agree. If one person jumps off a bridge- should the rest of us do that as well? The AMS is setting a dangerous precedent for the faculty societies.

Matussi: I would like to speak in favour. Although I am not the best at AMS minutia, I very much admire the effort to bring complete neutrality to the CIA position to give us the most effective elections processes. Thanks for listening!

Lively: to address President Lloyd's point. The CIA has hired the entire elections team and the people responsible for overseeing the elections team and where we did not have problems this year it is clear that the position can be abused.

Haney: I do agree with the sentiment of the amendment. The CIA knows so much about Assembly and it would be a shame to take away their opportunity to run.

Pritchard: I have the experience of two elections. There was very little difference in the elections when a CIA ran and when they didn't. I found no large gaps or concerns as a candidate. The CIA is always handled really well by the CRO and CEO and it did not suffer without a CIA.

Faught: The only things I want to add as points of clarification. The CIA does not hire the entire elections team, the CEO is elected by Assembly and they are the primary decision maker. To inform how people might vote, if you feel the CIA hiring the CRO and DRO is an insurmountable obstacle then vote in favour- but if you feel that students can use better judgement and overcome this then vote this down. The hiring panels provide a second check on conflicts of interest and other people in the room take a second look at the decision making process, bringing concerns to the HRO.

Lively: my apologies for misconstruing the information and thank you for the clarification.

Motion does not carry.

Returning to speakers list.

Randall: it is always Assembly's decision whether or not to utilize their right to appoint an Executive member. By putting this amendment in it makes everything make sense. In the constitution there is no process to remove an executive elect and this clears that up. It gives it more reasonable interpretation for all other parts of the constitution. The student body needs the right to remove an executive, elect or otherwise. If this situation happened one week after the election, the Assembly has the right to strike a new election. This makes the constitution more clear.

Lloyd: who do we stand? We may disagree on the best interests of students, but we are all here to serve them. We as elected representatives need to consider the consequences of every decision we make. Hosting another elected for one individual that election puts everything at a standstill, we're delaying hiring and day to day operations of the AMS. What are the benefits of that? They do not outweigh the benefits of having an entire election. Please everyone keep that in mind.

POI: Haney: is it possible to un-omnibus the motions? There are two distinct debates going on right now.

Motion to de-omnibus (6) and (7). Motion carries.

Donaldson: I agree in a broad sense in that we had constitutional uncertainty. Concerns that this excuses the actions of a few weeks ago are fair. I hope that future societies will keep such actions in check. My concern is that the policy is too vague. By addressing section 2 and 6, but leaving the rest to interpretation is concerning. I hope the members vote this motion down.

Dineen: to clarify, it does not make sense to say that every reference to the executive refers to the executive elect. This is putting into place guidance, that where reasonable, the references do apply. We hope to offer assembly that discretion.

Lively: ultimately it is at the discretion of the Speaker to interpret the policy, but adding where assembly deems this reasonable, can the speaker still interpret?

Faught: Judicial committee has the final interpretation. But Assembly often does that work before it gets to that stage. This is definitely an area where Assembly would make the decision of whether or not to extend the executive definition to executive elect.

Prescott: assembly can basically undo things that have been written in as they see fit. As much as I would like to think Assembly may choose not to appoint- they will not do that no matter how important this is.

Dineen: I take offence to the assertion that the decisions that are made here are due to chummy ness between Assembly members. We had thorough discussions before making these decisions.

Prescott: the elitism we have seen will continue to be enshrined in the constitution by approving this motion. If we want to continue to see students move further away from this society then sure, vote in favour. It has become chummy chummy and this is extremely offensive. We want our money back as the society continues to misrepresent our needs. We want out.

POI: Lloyd: on Sunday we actually thoroughly discussed how we can engage better with students.

Prescott: to further this point, for those of us who feel that the society does not represent us this further creates that divide.

Young: I fully believe the Assembly has the best interests of students in mind. I trust those I elected to stand up for my needs. These concerns should be raised at faculty society assemblies- not here.

Lively: Assembly deserves the right to call an election if they wish, should an executive resign. This policy is making it a lot easier. By putting it to the students we give them the chance to let us know what they want. We need to consider the costs and benefits. We are disenfranchising students and by doing this we are pushing students away. We are taking away part of the democracy and one of the greatest pillars on which this institution stands. The benefits of this do not outweigh the costs.

Motion to Call the Question:
Motioned by James Simpson
Seconded by Commissioner Conway

Carried

Motion (6) carries.

Motion (7) carries.

That AMS Assembly approves the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution Section 10.02.02, as seen in Appendix D: NAD.

Commissioner Faught opens: in the AMS constitution there is a series of enumerated types of cases that the NAD does not deal with. We are simply adding weapons as defined by Queen's policy. There were incidents of this in the past. Under the current constitution the AMS would be tasked with dealing with these and this should not be so. This was in the agreement between Doug and the Principal and we are fulfilling that obligation.

Chisti: this is a great move and follows the residence system. This makes a lot of sense.

Lively: these cases should be referred to the policy. How does Queen's define weapons?

Dineen: Queen's has a weapons policy. It is available on the campus security website. A weapon is defined as a manufactured device designed to injure or kill a person. Further definition is found on the Queen's website.

Faught: we forward cases that are not for us.

Scheculski: does this simply relate to possession of weapons, or also use of them?

Dineen: University weapon policy is that you cannot store or carry these weapons but you can apply for exceptions through campus security.

Motion (8) passed unanimously.

That AMS Assembly approve the amendments to the Hiring and Appointment Policy & Procedures, Section 16: Eligibility of Previous Employees, as seen in Appendix E: It Can Never Be An HR Thing.

Dineen: in the discussions that we have had regarding the HRO running for executive, many of the challenges if they ran would also come in to play if they decided to apply as a head manager or another management position. We have gone through why it is important that the HRO is fully committed to that position throughout this time. They should not be able to apply to be a salaried staff member or a service staff member as they have access to all of the HR files in the AMS and we feel strongly that the position must be non-political nor out in an awkward position.

Lee: this does not preclude them for applying in the following Fall.

Whittaker: I would like to make an amendment so that where the restrictions are waved the executive must give notice that the restriction has been waved to Assembly. Seconded by Lively. This will give more accountability to this motion.

Lee: if anything this should be reported to the Board of Directors.

Dineen: the only thing the executive could wave this for is a volunteer position and I don't really see the purpose of having to report it. This is not friendly as I am struggling to see the importance of this. Who are we doing this for and why?

Prescott: I would like to speak in favour of the amendment. I understand the logistics of it and it should include the Board. But students should not that exceptions have been made considering the amount of information the HRO has access to.

Dineen: I don't agree with a blanket broadcast but it would make sense for the HRO to state any conflicts of interest in situations that may arise. These situations are handed up to the VPOps.

Donaldson: if we trusted the HRO's ability to make the right call to not get into a conflict of interest then we would not have this amendment in front of us. The points raised are good ones.

POI: Dineen: we brought this forward due to the conflict of time and conflict of interest. They are hired for their judgement.

Lee: the main concern for them being excluded is the conflict of interest as they would have access to all other applicant information and potentially their supervisor's information as well.

Last call for debate on the amendment.

“in the instance where the restriction is waved, for the VPOPS must include a notice in their report to the following assembly.”

Amendment carried.

Haney: why is the word incoming executive used rather than executive?

Lee: it should read executive, not incoming executive.

Haney: motion to remove incoming.

Seen as friendly.

POI Lively: Concerns with President Lloyd's proxy, given that he did not tell us he was leaving and it was not announced to Assembly. The proxy did indicate that he was not a member of Assembly and has since joined the group. His statements are disingenuous and I would like that noted in the minutes.

Haney: what position are not okay for the HRO to hold?

Conway: deputies do a lot of hiring, roughly 20 hours, and should thus not be open to the HRO.

Randall: the HRO collects all of the information and it is more of a conflict of interest issue rather than that of time.

Haney: motion to amend 16.10 to add “should they determine that a conflict of interest does not exist.”

Seen as friendly.

Prescott: given light of this amendment which was deemed friendly, then I think this defeats the purpose of putting this in the constitution as we are giving the executive the full right to determine a conflict of interest.

Dineen: I would add that this is not a constitutional amendment and it specifies that the executive to wave restrictions, and would not have the right to wave eligibility for salaried or staff positions.

Motion (9) carries unanimously.

That assembly appoint two members to the Sutherland Prize Committee and Anti-Oppression Awards Committee.

Conway: appointing two members to the Sutherland prize and anti-oppression award committee. Looking to appoint two people, who must be from two different faculties. You get to hang out with Nick Francis for a while. Sutherland prize is for a graduating student who is from the African diaspora. The second is recognition for a staff member who has excelled in anti-oppression work.

Rotman/Whittaker nominates Prescott. Accept.

Tuba chisti accepts.

Members invited to the front for questions.

Randall: could you both provide us of your understanding of oppression and anti-oppression.

Prescott: oppression is when your liberty in society is being infringed upon. It is very important that we reward individuals who work in anti-oppression fields.

Chisti: oppression is about not being recognized or being unflavoured because of who you are, your background and anti-oppression is the work being done to tackle that.

Pritchard: we're looking at those that have contributed to anti-oppression on campus. Why do you personally see value in this work?

Chisti: I often didn't feel safe on campus and I found a community of people that taught me that no matter who I was I was always welcome here. And we must recognize that work.

Prescott: grew up in a northern community as a person of colour so I have experienced oppression and have seen what it does to people. We must recognize the people who work in anti-oppression. It is important to those who fight against oppression, in an inclusive manner, with the aim of removing it in society, receive recognition.

Scheculski: oppression is a subjective term. Often those that are oppressing feel that they're being oppressed. When you hear about these situations, how do you determine who is being oppressed?

Prescott: as someone who has experiences oppression, it is important to remember that we're working towards reasonable solutions to these issues. When choosing a recipient it is important to notice that people are working to gain recognition for anti-oppression in society.

Chisti: it comes down to each individual's definition as we cannot define what makes each individual uncomfortable. There is not one overarching contributor to oppression.

Young: how have you approached working in a term to come to collective decisions?

Chisti: we must declare our own biases and do our research before we go in. We should just talk about the information that is available.

Prescott: that is the important nature of what a committee does, we must work disagreements out in a respectful manner and have respectful discussions. This is the basis for having these committees, so we can have a collaborative approach to the picture. Each committee member should have that spirit.

POI Dineen: can we vote on these individuals separately? Split the people, not the committees.

POI Young: what happens if one or both of these members is not ratified?

Motion for clause by clause voting.

Motioned by Mira Dineen

Seconded by James Simpson

All in favour of member Prescott. Motion carries.

All in favour of member Chisti. Motion carries.

Voting on the motion itself. Motion carries.

Scott: end of new business, we are going to move into discussion period.

5 minute recess

15. Discussion Period

AMS Teaching Issues Committee's report on SOLUS and Course Registration

Caitlin Costello and Matt Costello lead a discussion on SOLUS and course registration, based on a report prepared by the AMS Teaching Issues Committee.

Volunteers of the committee encountered problems with enrolment and registration and realized this was an issue that affected many students.

See attached Power Point presentation.

C. Costello and M. Costello led Assembly members through the attached Power Point presentation.

Duchaine: We are looking for faculty-specific recommendations to add to this report. We will

compile a series of action items that the AMS can move forward with.

Schekulski: University exam timetable was recently moved to SOLUS. You can no longer see your month at a view. You have to use the weekly view function. This is frustrating. I was barred from seeing my exam schedule and believe it was due to an outstanding balance in fees owing for a course. If students can't access the exam timetable due to financial reasons, that is concerning.

Duchaine: barred from accessing _____, not from accessing your exam timetable. This is concerning and I will seek to address this issue.

Berkok: How much consultation has been done with IT Services. Is this a technical issue?

C. Costello: Working mostly with OUR but also with IT Services. IT needs to address a technical issue before being able to address the course waitlist issue. Neither IT Services or the Registrar are making it a priority.

Berkok: This issue could be raised at the IT Advisory Board, which President Johnson sits on.

Duchaine: We are currently running an earlier version of SOLUS. If we make modifications, we may also need to upgrade the version of SOLUS we have. This may be a barrier to the course waitlist initiative.

Zahid: School of Computing still has not been consulted on this issue. Making a course waitlist shouldn't be too hard to make.

C. Costello: I'm a Classics major and I need to take a lot of History courses. You need to wait for History majors to enrol first, contact individual professors and ask for a seat in the course.

Duchaine: Waterloo interdisciplinary programs, before they are created, must have bi-lateral agreements with other departments in order to support them.

Zahid: Can undergraduate assistants able to secure spots in courses for students in their department?

Haney: I went on an internship and returned to Queen's. My registration did not work as my status as a student was cancelled. My undergraduate assistant was great and helped me get into all of my courses. I had to do some of my own work to get into electives. What are the issues with Google Chrome? I used it and it worked well. 4th year engineering students in geological engineering have the most elective options. You have fewer elective options in earlier years. It would be prudent for engineering not to lump 3rd and 4th year together. It's challenging to fill elective spots.

Zahid: People don't always update their Chrome for Java, and then it is not compatible.

Prescott: Point of information. We are in discussion period. We don't have to stand up.

Speaker: You could motion for committee of the whole.

Prescott: But we are in discussion period.

Long: That's just for committee of the whole.

Prescott: Many students want a course waitlist. How do we push for this big issue?

Duchaine: If we are facing increasing enrolment, these issues are not going to improve. These issues will only get worse.

VP Liu (ResSoc) : Why can't waitlists be implemented until 2016? Is it cost?

M. Costello: SOLUS training was only recently completed in September. We suspect that they are unwilling to go through training again. The Registrar just got over a lot of issues. We suspect they are hesitant to completely change registration again. There has also been high turnover in staff in the office.

Liu: So it's training?

M. Costello: We want it to happen as soon as possible. We suspect they want to delay it. We feel that the AMS endorsing the implementation of a course waitlist would be an important step.

Schekulski: I would like to retract my previous statement. I am now able to access my exam timetable.

Long: SOLUS doesn't let you register in courses that have a conflict. My schedule can only work sometimes with conflicts in them.

Duchaine: You would need permission to enrol in conflicts. Someone in your department or the Registrar would be able to enrol you through a permission code.

C. Costello: Interdisciplinary students could be helped by accessing permission codes.

Long: QCARD let you enrol with conflicts, why won't SOLUS?

Duchaine: It's related to enrolment constraints.

Director Randall: There needs to be more communication between departments. IN creating degree plans, keeping enrolment in mind would be preferable.

Berkok: I did an internship with Computing and I did not have this problem. This may be an isolated incident. Discusses options for upgrading SOLUS through Oracle.

Zahid: The website qcumber is a syllabus bank and will soon be a waitlist. It is questionable to me that the University will not implement this. Why don't we let students build it?

Duchaine: SOLUS cost \$33 million. This is the going price for SOLUS. A lot of the fear of making the changes we are discussing is related to Guelph. Guelph purchased PeopleSoft about 10 years ago... Guelph had to buy a new product. McMaster is probably going to spend \$42 million on their product in terms of pulling in information from OSAP or calculating needs based assessment.

Tuba: I need to take courses for my degree. Not enough courses are offered. Lalala

Prescott: Why did we not include a waitlist from the beginning?

C. Costello: We were not given a reason. This is partly on the Registrar but also on students. Students were consulted in the process of establishing a course waitlist.

Duchaine: There was a great optimism that SOLUS would be functional. A great optimism.

M. Costello: We do not have any impression that the Registrar has any malice or is in any way out to get students. It's a reality that training and turnover and cost are all issues.

Duchaine: Turnover is a reason behind the slow and pedantic change.

Haney: I wanted to discuss the academic advisement report. It is so bad that our faculty advises us to not look at it. This is a feature that we pay for that is useless. Examples are tech electives that are not labelled correctly, changes between year requirements, course number issues, lists of mandatory courses are inaccurate. The admin puts together an academic advisement report that they send out rather than using SOLUS.

Conway: Came to Queen's with transfer credits from high school. SOLUS has not been able to process this correctly. My advisement report is also incorrect. How is your time ticket determined?

C. Costello: If you already have course credit, the system can sometimes mis-identify you. First years have the first enrolment slots because they can only take first year courses. Fourth year students are next, in order to meet registration requirements. When third and second years enter registration, we encounter problems. There are multiple days of enrolment per block, and slots are granted at random. You can be really lucky and get the first enrolment day for all four years, or you can be really unlucky. We could not identify a way to make the system better.

Member Sarah Witiuk: As a potential modification to SOLUS. The system looks robotic. Moodle now has a picture on the homepage. Does the SOLUS technology enable a picture in its interface that could link students to a help guide?

Savides: You mentioned we are using version 7 of PeopleSoft.

Duchaine: Correct. The system is PeopleSoft

Savides: Why did we upgrade to a system released in 1997?

Duchaine: I do not know.

Student Senate Caucus Chair Berkok: I would like to provide context for why the waitlist option was cut. Software development is complicated. What was the process for determining the priorities? Back to the topic of the student survey,

C. Costello: We could get an idea of how many people want to take the course and this could alert the Registrar to an issue and they could try to offer more spaces in the course.

Berkok: Point of information. May be valuable to go to faculties to get enrolment data for a longitudinal picture. Additionally, one of the reasons we may have a version from 1997

Lively: I haven't had too many problems with SOLUS. I would like to ask a question. I know you have consulted the administration and I thank you for your excellent report. What are we doing to push these recommendations to the administration and is there anything this body can do to push those priorities? I'm probably going to graduate by 2016. It's time for the administration to justify the large amount of money they take from us to pad their own salaries. The SOLUS system, although we need IT professionals, this is for the students and it's time that they stopped making excuses and catered to the students.

Duchaine: Worked in the Registrar's office. The new Academic Affairs Commissioner will continue to work on these issues during regular meetings with the Registrar and I am working to ensure a smooth transition assists with this.

Simpson: Did you talk about what happened with the admissions issue in medicine?

Duchaine: No.

Simpson: We were all declined after being offered interviews. Before we found out we got in, they posted a deposit to our accounts. There are some issues still there.

Duchaine: The situation right now is better than it was two years ago. We want to move out of crisis management to address the issues students have raised.

C. Costello: The Registrar did add the swap feature, which has been beneficial. The Registrar is making improvements and we don't want to discredit them there.

Schekulski: Point of Personal Privilege: I'd like to raise a topic of discussion to be raised after this topic for venues of AMS Assembly for next year's meetings.

Faught: I intend to distribute a year end survey addressing a number of issues, including space, to pass this on to Kristen. If you think a discussion topic is still necessary, by all means go ahead.

Speaker: Would you like to withdraw your motion?

Schekulski: Yes.

Accessibility of Referenda

Zahid: Have a discussion about the accessibility of referenda – is 9 days enough time for this?

Liam: Correct with what he has said. There are a couple methods of establishing student activity fees – referendum vs agm. What do we think about the thresholds for these processes. These are the variables at play.

Zahid: I'm not sure if we advertise all of this stuff.

Haney: LOVE the current timeline. Well known that you can get most of your signatures from a couple very large classes. 9 days is more than reasonable.

Prescott: 9 days is more than sufficient. Speaks to how amenable students are to getting a fee approved. 9 days is more than enough, and if anything what could be improved is the marketing process to let students know how to get their fees on the motion sheet.

Lively: Working off Prescott's statements, along with the club ratification process, it would be possible for the clubs manager to hold some sort of workshop to let clubs know what the process for getting or raising a student fee is. 9 days is enough time. It's about how much effort you are willing to put in to get those signatures. Don't deserve a student fee if you don't want to put in that required effort.

Liam: point of information. Clubs manual that was recently completed will be sent out to all clubs upon ratification/re-ratification in april/may. This package includes a lot of the information that Tyler Lively referred to in his comments. How to establish a fee is right there in front of you.

Rotman: Not a secret that I'm not a huge fan of the opt-out system. Threshold we have right now is fine. It shouldn't be easy to get a student fee. Lowering the threshold is not a good solution. Not hard to get the signatures within 9 days.

Sarah WHithoahkn (witiuk): I have some feedbacks for the assembly. It has been said that you can go to superpsych, but it's not always that easy. I might not agree that I want my money to go to concrete toboganners, but I know that other people might want to give their money to that group, so I would sign the form. This discussion isn't about opt-out, it is about the referendum. Next point. Is it not the student, not the AMS's decision who gets student fees? How do you make it more accessible? More marketing? Or less signatures? Assembly shouldn't appeal to those who know about it, the body should appeal to those who don't know about it. Gives personal story about trying to get all of the signatures for queensevents.ca. It was HARD. I believe that this system could be more accessible to those who do not have the resources to get those signatures.

LiLi: want to add to my earlier comments. There are other variables at play. The method of collecting signatures could be a different route. Maybe we should use online petitions to collect signatures. As Sarah said it requires a lot of manpower to collect the signatures. One person is at a disadvantage when trying to get a fee. Elections team needs more than one day to verify the signature lists. Professors hate the

nomination forms. Next referendum is not until October, but we should look at this before then. Sarah is right saying that level of marketing is another variable at play – can always do a better job at getting the word out there. Hopefully that can be done better by next year's team.

Conway: are you talking about winter or fall referendum?

Zahid: both.

Prescott: Signatures to get 5% is important – important check to ensure that we are not overburdening the election process. 750 is a good benchmark from which we can set what we would consider to be appropriate to put on the ballot. It takes some legwork, and some work on behalf of the society. Work of students to get these signatures.

Forrest: Commend member at large and the representative for bringing this up. Love discussion period. Greatest concern from member at large is marketing, not extending the time period or changing number of signatures. Comment on the online idea that was brought forward – I understand the point that you're making, but I do think there is something to be said about going out to classes and interacting with students face-to-face. I want to see more clubs getting more and more involved.

Rotman: From my comments before, might seem that I'm against the advertising process, but I am not. This is not just a student fee problem, it is also an elections process across the board. There is a barrier in knowing that this is happening. Not totally opposed to an online petition. Still has to be legitimate, but most online petitions would have trouble verifying whether students or not. You are making it a bit too easy through an online platform. Perhaps the threshold should be raised if it is through an online platform.

Lively: echo rotman's points. Online format is a little too easy. You could incorporate something with student IDs or net IDs. We need to put in the effort to have the system in place if we are going to. There is a lot we can do to let people know that this is happening. How can we be more accountable to our membership?

Haney: Point of Information – do you have minutes for October 8, 2010? There was a team that came forward from eng who did not have all of the signatures but were still put forward to referendum.

Faught: from what I remember there were extenuating circumstances, and assembly decided to compensate for that. This is not a precedent we want to set. I will try to find the minutes.

Lively: Member at large could have come forward to assembly saying that they were working alone and were having trouble getting signatures. We really don't want to get into the habit of doing that though.

Randall: if someone didn't get the required signatures could they still come to assembly to challenge the speaker and get their fee on the ballot?

Speaker Mason: it is my understanding that yes, you could overrule the decision with a 2/3 majority vote.

Lloyd: following up with Faught, if you are putting together a package about this then I would recommend inviting individuals to come speak to you to give feedback and to help with this process

Duchaine: I wanted to reiterate my support for our current system. We have the highest number of student fees collected by any Canadian universities and our process is an incredibly open and accountable process. The on the ground effort is important to reaffirm the system's value in the community itself.

Witiuk: I wanted to make one comment regarding those claiming that if we made it more accessible student fees would be too easy to establish. This is not a fair assessment. These fees going to referendum are mostly opt-outable and support students doing what they do best. I don't think you can liken making something more accessible to making it too easy to accomplish. I look forward to bringing this to Assembly in the future.

Motion to extend. Motion carries.

Motion to cap the Speaker's list. Motion carries.

Faught: a lot of the concerns raised deal with the marketing and advertising of these things but there is always room for improvement and that is something we are committed to building upon. I commit to including this in my transition manual.

Lee: I would echo a lot of Liam's statement. 750 signatures are certainly difficult, but it should not be easy to get a student fee. A lot of restrictions are in place so that these cannot come about on a whim. The VPOps has the authority to decline fees before they get to Assembly. I don't think it should be easy. Yes there is a lot we can do to upgrade our current system but the system works quite well as it is. The system does not make it easy, but I don't believe it should.

Secret Ballots

POI Rotman: I have noticed that the doors to this room are locked. Are they usually locked? Is there a reason for this?

Isabelle: I can respond to this. We can ask the SLC staff to open the doors for us.

Lloyd: I apologize for bringing this up for the second straight time. We spent some time talking to some Assembly members regarding our direction for the next Assembly. We are leaning towards allowing secret ballots but having the votes recorded in the minutes. This would alleviate the social pressures but still allow for accountability. I wanted to ask Assembly if there is anything we should be considering moving forward?

Rotman: I was frustrated that my previous request was over ruled by a roll call vote. I am looking to fix this issue as going from a public to private to public vote seems wrong and backwards. We have to balance the need of students to know how their representatives vote with the need of the security of our students, and ultimately the integrity of the votes. Having a secret vote, the faculty society votes could be recorded in the minutes that are released at a later date, or should we consider publishing their names? Once the minutes are released, despite possible controversy surrounding the issue, the hot headedness surrounding the debate will have dissipated and the environment will be more relaxed.

Prescott: I also find it intriguing and disconcerting at the same time that we were able to go from a public vote to a private vote and back to a public vote. The policy has to be fixed to address this. You should not be able to usurp the private vote, as is written in the policy, for safety reasons regarding intimidation. You do not see secret votes in the House as they are representing ridings, the way we represent our constituents. We have to get rid of the intimidation factor and also maintain the accountability factor. I like the idea of the vote count and distribution being released later for our constituents.

POI Lloyd: do you think the names should be included with faculty distribution?

Prescott: I like how people can remain anonymous, but perhaps a hybrid model where it is secret but people can learn afterwards, with a time buffer, it may be good for the representative side of governance.

Scheculski: there is a certain amount of time after a vote is made whereby people have the opportunity to appeal. Would it be possible to have a model where you have the record of vote distribution but it is not released until after this time threshold for appeal is over?

Faught: there is no set timeline in our policy to the extent which you have generalized.

Lively: I am somewhat confused by these mixed systems of role calls and secret ballots. The system where names are not included must take priority over the other systems. It is possible that we vote in a certain way, and there are consequences to those votes, and even a two year period would not address these concerns. Consider nominating people to various committees. Our representatives should have a right to keep their votes secret. Ultimately it is not the same people as the federal government. There are people here who can deny you moving up through the organization and people may view you in a negative light based on how you voted and deny you these opportunities. Ultimately democracy requires that when you vote you are not coerced in any matter, whether that is physical or other sorts. I place the secret ballot over anything else and policy should reflect that.

Lloyd: I propose a straw poll to give me direction for the motion I am drafting for our next meeting.

Rotman: the roll call is the override, or a request, to recount the vote. It does not override a secret ballot. The policy also seems to be too silent on a secret ballot.

Lloyd: would you be in support of a motion whereby secret ballots would be allowed but there would be a record of the votes?

Motion to limit speaking time to one minute. Motion carries.

Lee: it is fine that we have secret ballots as long as the names are published afterwards. How would your constituents feel if they could not know how you voted? When you take on a public position you should take responsibility for your vote.

Plummer: question about the roll call- why does it take precedent?

Faught: there is no policy on secret ballots, only that on roll call.

Plummer: at no point should these votes be completely secret. Faculty societies should vote in a block as they are technically voting the same constituents.

Haney: the entire section needs a greater rework. The voting template has to be redone. When one style is voted in it cannot be changed throughout the duration and cannot be switched from roll call to secret ballot and likewise.

Donaldson: let me respond to member Plummer. People should not vote as a block. They need to vote based on what they heard from their constituents and what they ran on in their platform. Members can filibuster through a secret ballot.

POI Haney: a filibuster is normally done through speech, not procedure.

Chisti: two things I would like to share. I disagree about voting in blocks. Not all of my residents feel the same way and thus they need to be represented differently by their elected leaders. A lot of people request secret ballots because they feel it is needed for them to be able to express their vote. But this cannot happen by majority.

Young: I agree with Prescott in that we need to be accountable to those that elected us. We also have to protect ourselves from criticism. I would like to propose a hybrid model.

Pritchard: I actually don't like secret ballot at all except for in extreme cases where there is danger present. As elected members we have to be accountable for our decisions. People should be able to come in to my office and freely express why they did or did not like how I voted on a motion. With secret ballots they cannot do this.

Lievely: do we keep individual voting record on motion?

No.

Prescott: I would propose a tiered/hybrid model. We would have the regular votes. We could have a secret ballot. Speaking to what member Pritchard said, we have to find a system that is open and transparent. We would lose representation if it is entirely public.

Duchaine: I love sitting here watching how my elected representatives vote. This should be afforded to all students so I am very much in favour of keeping things transparent.

Lively: what it comes down to, and what our constituents should be worried about, is how you speak to a motion and how you express the views of your constituents. If our constituents are concerned with how we are representing them then they would be here to listen to the debate. If someone asked me how I voted I would absolutely tell them.

Lloyd: I appreciate everyone's comments. I would be happy to discuss this outside of the room!

Speaker's Last Word: our apologies if we didn't have your placard tonight. My successor will be chosen at the next meeting so please spread the word.