

AMS Assembly Minutes – Thursday September 26th, 2013
Wallace Hall, JDUC

**Assembly commenced at 7:04PM, gavel repeats at 7:07PM*

Speaker Robert Thomson (hereafter referred to as **Speaker**): Welcoming and opening remarks.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the meeting of September 26th, 2013

Motion (1) that AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the Assembly meeting of September 26th, 2013.

Moved by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

Speaker: Any concerns regarding the agenda?

Representative Young: Amend my name in the agenda from “Alex” to “Mike”.

AMS Representative Jones: Proposal to move motion 9 to motion 10, and switch... All of the amendments in motion ten [...] have passed those.

Internal Affairs Commissioner Olver: It's in that order as the policy is meant to be more detailed, generally it's passed first. The constitution dictates what's in policy.

AMS Representative Jones: I would like to deal with the amendments first because if we don't deal with those we won't have a policy.

Moved by: Representative Jones

Seconded by: ASUS Representative Chinniah

Against: ASUS Representative Ruprecht, ASUS Representative Sherman, ASUS President Mason, Engineer 2nd Year Representative McElroy, Proxies.

Motion carries

ASUS Representative Chinniah: I propose, in regards to motion number 13, I'd like to separate the motion into two sections; one into policy manual, one into “50% plus voting members”, I'd like to separate that.

Speaker: What section is that?

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Appendix 14. I want to vote separately on “50% plus 3”.

Speaker: So the idea is to separate motion 13 to a separate motion that we can add after 13?

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Yes.

Moved by: ASUS Representative Chinniah

Seconded by: Engineer 2nd Year Representative McElroy



Against: None

Motion carries

Speaker: That will be new motion number 14, all remaining motions will be pushed down one. Any other amendments to the agenda?

Internal Affairs Commissioner Olver: I propose to switch the order of guest speakers.

Seconded: ASUS Representative Sherman

Against: None

Motion carries

Speaker: Any other motions to change the agenda? *[Pauses]* Seeing none, motion to pass the agenda.

Motion (1) carries.

2. Approval of the Agenda for the meeting of September 12th, 2013

Motion (2) that AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the Assembly meeting of September 12th, 2013.

Moved by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Point of order, is this the time to call for changes to the minutes?

Speaker: Yes.

Member at Large Lively: During approval of the minutes from the minutes last year, it shows that the speaker said that the minutes would be presented online, but they were not. I would also like to switch something I had said with VPUA Pritchard from the last meeting.

Against: None

Motion (2) carries.

3. Speaker's Business

Speaker: Speaker's business. First off, I want to welcome everyone to the gallery and all the new faces to the table. Quick reminder on what goes on here. Each motion can carry a maximum debate time of 90 minutes. If you have a point of information or privilege or order, raise your pinky. Please raise your hand if you want to be added to the speaker list, make eye contact with Commissioner Olver or myself. Keep all talking points directed to me. Also, a reminder that assembly starts at 7PM. We started five minutes late, which isn't too bad, but we don't want to go as long as we have in the past, so please be here on time. We have catering today, so, go ahead.



I'm supposed to make mention: green container is hot water, red is coffee. Attendance sheet is going around. Our voices get lost in this room, so please speak up.

4. Guest Speakers

A. Martha Whitehead, the Head Librarian

Hi, everybody. Thanks for having me, I won't take too much time. We have had AMS reps on the consulting, with great input from focus groups from students saying how much they love Douglas and Stauffer Library. We have a report now, no summary that you can look at, but we have some slides that you can look at to give you an idea of what is going on with the library. This is sort of a last chance to let us know what you're thinking.

Some haven't been to the education library on West, the archives, Douglas, etc. This is all planning we have done in the context of the student enrichment research. I mention that this is about study and learning space, I realize that there are times in the year where you can't get a seat in libraries, so this will provide more individual study spaces. There was an extensive process to determine what we will be doing, but feedback is still welcome. This is a twenty year vision. It is about enhancing the student learning experience and student learning opportunities.

Principles to planning this included: collection, sense of place, enough room for students. We want students to enter the library and feel comfortable and a sense of studying. A place that feel like a library. Accessibility is huge; big in Stauffer, not in other places. Fiscal environment, we have to keep in mind that whatever changes and renovation we are making have to maintain fiscal responsibility.

More graduate student space, more individual study space. Interesting new concept LINKS: there are multiple places that you like to study across campus, so we will not shut any study areas around, maintaining accessibility. Research prominence focused on collections, once of the best research collections in the country. Big part of this is the archives; very poor facility, so we would like to move it to Douglas. We are seeing a reduction in the current space of the facility. By moving the archives, we are limiting the unnecessary space that the library has to pay for. This is part of the campus master plan to renovate.

PICTURES: Refer to summary.

QUESTIONS:

AMS Commissioner Williams, A: I want to speak to the merits of this. The consultation was wonderful. One of the key points is that this creates more study space for students. We all know that there are a lot of demerits with study spaces in the library. This will increase the study space.

Director MacDonald: What efforts will be taken regarding media and advertising this?

Guest: Digital media and technology will be an important part of this. We will be creating a digital media studio. We are hoping to create an IT services department space in Douglas. In



terms of the technology being used, we'd still have the adaptive technology centre.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: It is getting progressively harder to find seats. Because enrolment is projected to grow, are we expected to create even more study space in the future?

Guest: We have created a twenty five percent increase in study space. We are looking ahead twenty years, so this should be adequate space to cover the expansion and increase in students.

B. OUSA Home Office

- Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance.
- OUSA began in 1992 when a new student alliance and avocation system was created. OUSA represents over 140,000 students at seven universities in Ontario; Western, Queen's, Waterloo, Laurier, Brock, McMaster (and their part time association), and Trent.
- Experiential learning, focused on effective co-op. Many great perspectives.
- Post secondary accessible, affordable, quality experience in Ont.
- REFER TO SLIDES

QUESTIONS:

Member at Large Lively: As you mentioned during your report, there are a lot of things for post secondary institutions to improve on. Because the province is broke, and given the fact that universities are loading up on bureaucracies, and given the fact that our degrees are worth less and less, do you think introducing private universities will reduce some of these concerns?

Guest: That's not something we have looked into. System growth, funding that goes into universities, To articulate and explore incentives to steer universities towards certain growth patterns.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Just to play Devil's advocate, the other organization (Canadian Federation of Students) that competes with you, what would you say that they don't do that you do that they aren't doing?

Guest: We don't compete with the CFS, we don't want to put a value statement on our or their operation. CFS statements are often principled and powerful. For example: they want free tuition. That's something easy to understand. I applaud them for their principles, but OUSA's stance on tuition is more realistic, for example, tuition freeze. We find the nuance in policy.

5. President's Report- Eril Berkok

AMS President Berkok: Just wanted to highlight one thing. The management and operations agreement that manages the operations of the Student Life Centre was signed at the end of the term three years ago; things were rushed, and mistakes were made. Given that the agreement is up, we are re-entering into negotiations in October. If you're interested to know more, come see



me. Also, we need two more people for the SLC council. If you are interested, please submit name and why you are interested. Submit it to Kristen [Commissioner Olver].

6. Vice-President's Reports

a. Operations- Vice President Nicola Plummer

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: Health and dental plan opt out has been extended until September 30. Wrapped up budgeting process. I've been speaking with the Dean of Student Affairs to see if there's opportunity to include a student run centre in the Isabel Bader Centre. I also encourage you to head out to Underground tomorrow night to see what's going on with Tricolour and Homecoming. Remainder is in report.

b. University Affairs- Vice President Thomas Pritchard

AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard: Two things to add to my report: AMS membership, decisions were made, people will be notified tonight. Myself, Catherine, Allison will be going to Toronto for something called Kingston day alongside the university and the city to engage with members of Provincial Parliament.

7. Board of Director's Report- Chairman Rico Garcia

Proxy Randall, Vice chair of AMS Board of Directors: No new reports.

8. Student Senator's Report- Senator Isabelle Duchaine

Senator Duchaine: The Senate, not very pretentious, we will be revisiting this. A couple of the ENG Senators and I will be varying differences over the past couple years between engineers and arts. We will re-evaluate GPA system and its successes. There is too much indifference regarding "A's" in Arts courses versus "A's" in Engineering courses.

9. Rector's Report- Rector Nicholas Francis

Rector Francis: No new reports.

10. Student Trustees Report- Undergraduate Trustee Andrew Aulhouse

Undergraduate Trustee Aulhouse: Just that the October board meeting is coming up. Should you wish to come out, email trustees@queensu.ca . Other than that, sorry for being late.

11. Statements by Members

Commissioner Williams, M: Reminder to send names for advisory committees to me by Monday.

NSS President Searle: We are re-branding our society. You may have seen our new logo and



crest. The society is planning to unofficially release the re-branding at the second homecoming.

12. Question Period

None.

13. Business arising from the Minutes

None.

14. New Business

MOTION 3: Approval of Minutes of the Special Assembly of September 21st, 2013

Speaker: Is there any conversation or concerns regarding this motion? Seeing none, motion to approve the minutes of the special assembly.

Opposed: None

Motion (3) carries.

MOTION 4: That the AMS elect an AMS Assembly Deputy Speaker.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Oliver: We want to elect a Deputy Speaker, in the event our Speaker is away, sick, cannot make it, one can fill in for him. You would also assist on the Elections Team.

Speaker: Now opening the floor for nominations for the position of Deputy Speaker.

“Nomination for President Scott Mason.”

Seconded

Declined

“Nomination for Representative Troy Sherman.”

Seconded

Declined

“Nomination for VPSD Mark Godin.”

Seconded

Accepted

“Nomination for President Purba.”

Seconded

Declined

“Nomination for Representative Jon Wiseman.”



Seconded
Accepted

“Nomination for Representative Chinniah.”

Seconded
Accepted

“Nomination for Representative Jones.”

Seconded
Declined

“Nomination for Representative Blair.”

Seconded
Accepted

Speaker: So I would like each of the candidates to make a quick thirty second to one minute speech on why they deserve the position.

ASUS Representative Jon Wiseman: Deputy speaker would be a great position. I can bring fairness and accountability and order. We had some issues with points of order last year, and I want to be able to step in if Robbie is sick, ill, need's to go to the washroom, Et cetera.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Representative Wiseman can't run due to his conflicting position as a deputy on the elections team.

Representative Godin: I think the role is really to support Robbie in his role. I would be more than happy to fill that role and take the ropes.

QUESTIONS

1. If you were a vegetable, which would you be and why?
2. As a speaker, you will often find yourself in situations of a tie, where you will cast the defining vote. What considerations would you make, or how would you go about doing this?
3. There are often cases within the Assembly where members will carry on about a specific point or we carry on too long about a specific topic. How would you go about having a productive assembly while allowing members of the gallery to speak. Essentially productivity versus rights to speak.
4. In the event that the current speaker has an emergency and has to step down, can you commit that time?

Representative Godin: I think the role is really to support Robbie in his role. I would be more than happy to fill that role and take the ropes.

1. Wow. I would be snowpeas. Reason is: there are many different ways to eat them.
2. In casting a vote, I would try best to think in a broader context, not just for assembly members in the room, but for the larger body. I would refer to the Commissioner of Internal Affairs for best course of action.



2. As debate moves forward, impose time limits and repeat points, and the amount one can speak towards a motion
3. I would be able to fulfill that commitment. I would approach it as a duty to take on.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: I'm more than happy to fill the role to “deputize” for Robbie, and upholding his rules of order and Robert's Rules of Orders.

1. I don't think I can win by answering this question. I'd rather be a fruit; sweet and colourful!
2. I'm president of other clubs where I vote in the event of a tie. So I vote in the way that doesn't change the status quo as to encourage further debate.
2. Time allocation, current speaker's policy, curb the points of information. Cognisant of the fact that you are only deputizing for Robbie.
3. I would be prepared to step into the roll. I have dealt with politicians before, I can effectively run an election.

Representative Blair: This past year I sat on my school board as a student trustee. I am familiar with Robert's Rules of Order. I also sat on a higher council. I would be well suited for this position.

1. Celery; it's simple and I like being simple.
2. Vote in the favour of those representing the assembly. To resolve a procedural motion, I would refer to the AMS rules.
3. In order to promote productivity, the speaker is responsible for eliminating redundancy, and on unique statements. Only that member's point should be allowed to continue.
4. As an elected servant by the students of Queen's, I would find time in my schedule to meet these requirements.

Speaker: We will vote the first time around. If the third place votes can change the position of the deputy speaker, we will have a revote between the most popular and second popular elected.

Vice President Godin was successful in garnishing enough votes to become the Deputy Speaker.

Speaker: Motion 4 to elect Representative Godin as the AMS Deputy Speaker.

ABSTENTIONS: Godin

Motion (4) carries.

MOTION 5: That the AMS Assembly approve the dates for the Fall and Winter Referendum period, as seen in Appendix A: Woo Referenda!

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Please approve the dates. This is the timeline that we're currently operating on. It was the same last year.

Opposed: None

Motion (5) carries.



MOTION 6: That the AMS Assembly approve \$50 as the spending cap for the referendum fee question campaigning, as seen in Appendix A: Woo Referenda!

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: The spending cap of \$50 is what it has been in past years. This can cover the costs of an individual group, and costs associated with it; chalk, poster cost, etc.

Opposed: None

Motion (6) carries.

MOTION 7: That the AMS Assembly approve 750 signatures as the amount required for nomination to the Fall referendum ballot, as seen in Appendix A: Woo Referenda!

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: We don't want to increase the 750 signatures. We find that given the ten day requirement, it can be difficult for smaller clubs to reach the quota, and given fake names, we don't want to increase the limit so the signatures are attainable. This amount of signatures is about 5% of AMS enrolment.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Regarding the 750 signatures, is there a definition of signature?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: We don't have a definition written out. But it is name and student number.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: And signature?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Yes.

Opposed: None

Motion (7) carries.

MOTION 8: That the AMS Assembly approve the amendments to Policy Manual 2, as seen in Appendix B: Intern Policy.

Human Resources Officer Hillis: This program has been led by the AMS for years, in order to maintain consistency with intern policy [...]

Opposed: None

Abstentions: ASUS Representative Chinniah

Motion (8) carries.

MOTION 9: That the AMS Assembly approve the amendments to AMS Policy Manual 1, as seen in Appendix D: Non-Academic Group Discipline.

Motion 9 had been switched with Motion 10 earlier in the Assembly.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: What's being passed out is an amendment to one of



the sections. It describes what is non-academic discipline and group discipline, and it answers some questions that have been coming to me. Where this is coming from... This has been in the works for ten years. NAD is 115 years old, and over the years we have indicated group discipline as a gap in our system. This was a priority for Internal Affairs to take on this year. Ways to improve non-academic discipline was signed by the Principal last year and the AMS President in a joint memo. There has to be another way to process complaints made against groups. Why now? Every year there are new things that come up, different commissions prioritize different things. The previous CIA focused on the review and research process of it.

In our current NAD system Judicial Affairs and Internal Affairs will evaluate whether there was a violation of conduct, forward it to appropriate body. The Judicial Affairs Office is the investigatory office; they conduct interviews and propose sanctions, which go to a Judicial Committee, which has been granted final authority on cases by Senate. It is peer ministered, so that everyone running the system is a student; it is not an administrator breathing down your neck. We understand that we are all growing and making mistakes, and we work to restore harm. All cases will be completely confidential unless the case goes to an open case. We are complaint driven. Jurisdiction was given to us by Senate. We don't take the place of the Criminal Code of Canada, we are holding Queen's students to a higher level of accountability.

First step with Group Discipline is a complaint comes in. Determine group or individual case. Group case goes to Group Discipline Review Committee. VPUA is there as an informational resource. CIA and Judicial Affairs that have authority. JAD Interviews everyone relevant to case, regardless, depending on facts, Alternate Judicial Committee gives final sanctions. In the event that the violation is from an AMS ratified club, our Clubs Manager will sit as an informational resource for what is best for clubs. If it is a Faculty group or committee, the AJC will be composed of four members of the society, including President, majority of votes from committee, and three members from regular committee. The Chair would be our regular Judicial Committee Chair, only there to vote in case of a tie.

How Sanctions work: Part of amendment, sanctions, if clubs are involved, sanctions outlined in section 10, part 5, 7 to 8, those are the sanctions we apply with NAD, suspension cannot be applied to clubs. Sections 2,3,4,5,6 are more serious sanctions. These would only be applied if the case is much more serious. Depending on the case review, this may lead to the de-ratification of the club. Clubs need to be held accountable for its members. Executives are responsible for ensuring that the Code of Conduct is being followed. Groups can be sanctioned in whole or in part. If one person did something wrong, we wouldn't sanction the whole group. For Faculty society, sanctions 1-5, 7, and 8 are relevant, including the suspension of being able to apply for a volunteer position within the society. There is also the possibility of entering a probationary period. The group could be subject to audits, removal of chairs of a committee, check in with President, Et cetera. No sanctions can be applied to ever lead to the disbandment of a Faculty group. If this were passed, we would bring this to the Senate of Non-Academic Discipline to put forth recommendations regarding discipline and hazing.

Representative Lively: Point of information on how something can be implemented. You can essentially add on punishment to the justice system, because this committee can't punish you. How does this effect the timeline of this committee? Say you're in the proceedings for a criminal



charge, will the judicial committee wait for the results of the criminal charge?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Yes, we would wait until criminal system had come to their hearing results before proceeding with any of our own sanctions in addition.

Representative Lively: Is that in the policy at the moment? Is it explicitly stated?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: I can't tell you where it is, but I believe it is stated. I don't have the JA operating manual on me, but it may be stated there.

ASUS President Mason: What mechanisms exist to alienate individuals versus groups? Is there a policy you follow?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: There are a few things that are a part of that. It depends on how the complaint is given to me, group discipline side, through our investigatory process. If through our investigation, we find that it isn't ingrained in the institution of the group, it would not proceed as a group discipline case. Initially, upon receiving cases, the Commissioner decides where it would go, and cases can be switched around once delivered.

NSS President Searle: Composition regarding faculty committees. This won't work for certain faculty committees. We have the same 100 students in all of the groups. It would be biased for me to pick three students to sit with me. Thoughts on that?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: There is a clause that when you're picking members to sit on this committee, you need to consult with the CIA to discuss who you were putting forward and why. Though that does raise the question, "what if we're on the same side and we're both biased". It is difficult to answer with smaller faculties. We are trying to adhere to a code of conduct that is very much based on the honour system.

Representative Searle: Could it be possible to add another clause regarding non biased members from another faculty to sit on the Committee?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: That's completely friendly. I'd be happy to add that. Additionally you can transfer the case over to the regular judicial committee with the unanimous consent of the alternate judicial committee. You could address concerns if you transfer the case over.

AMS Vice President of Operation Plummer: I would like to commend Kristen and Thomas. I had to work extensively with the Dean of Student Affairs last year regarding issues with Commerce Society that came across lines with the AMS and student code of conduct. This is a great way to address these kind of issues.

ASUS Representative Sherman: Can you comment on the consultation process?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Regarding clubs, due to the massive volume of clubs and the nature of the system, it takes a large time to understand. We went through our clubs'



manager, Clare. Last year she was a clubs' executive; she was a check and balance for us in determining whether this would be appropriate for clubs. In the past few days a few Club members have approached us, and it was at their recommendation that these amendments passed around earlier to section 13 were put in. Thank you for doing that, this is a policy for clubs and groups on campus.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Kristen did extensive consultation with the Faculty Presidents and the Presidents' caucus. Greg McKellar, our Information Officer, was also a crucial part in adding this. We're basing this off sanctions that are already being applied to clubs.

Representative Yassine: I want to speak to the definition of hazing. We had some concerns with the wording. It seems to be a broad definition. It could be something that some people consider “fun”, for example, the ASUS dance. Some may find that humiliating, some may find it fun. Remove the sense of “optional” participation.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: First of all, the hazing definition is tied up in the university right now. Hazing is something the university has started to focus on after attending a conference. The definition used is a clearer version of the internationally accepted version of the definition of hazing. The other aspect of that is that I want it to be clear that the AMS wants to protect orientation events. However, the university is looking into discipline regarding event behaviour, not events. For example, the dancing event, it comes through to the ORT coordinators, then to my desk, to look at and make sure it's in line with our liability and our conduct. Again, I understand your concern, we're trying to go off of the best policy that we have.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Just to add, the language is purposely vague because hazing could be so many things. Language is vague to encompass where a student feels harassed, so it's a mechanism if a person feels as if they have been targeted, now they have a body they can come to in order to express their concern. It does leave a lot open for people to express concerns, but we will never sanction to diminish the success of an event or get rid of a Faculty group.

Representative Jones: I would like to commend Commissioner Olver and the Executives for all of their hard work. But I would like to propose an amendment to section 14, part 1, to remove section 4 and 5, a fine not to exceed \$1000 to the AMS, and [...]. Main reason I'm bringing this forward is just for the AMS, I think that by removing section 4 and 5, we are eliminating a conflict of interest. The money shouldn't go back into the AMS.

Speaker: Is this amendment friendly?

Commissioner Olver: No.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: What is being amended?

Speaker: Jones would like to remove section 10, part 4 and 5, page 53.

Representative Young: Point of order, I believe that Representative Yassine put forward an



motion to put forth an amendment.

Representative Yassine: The definition is Appendix E, part 2, definition of hazing. The activity of something expected of someone. Want to change the word to 'required'.

Speaker: Commissioner Olver says this is not friendly.

Representative Blair: Clarify point of order.

Speaker: We will go back to Yassine's comment to amend the wording of hazing. Seconder to the motion?

Seconded: Representative Searle

Speaker: Opening the floor for debate.

Representative Searle: This is a good idea because it implies that things are optional or expected versus things that are required of an individual when joining a group or club.

AMS Vice President of Operations Pritchard: One of the reasons it's phrased like this is because groups in the past would get around the hazing issue by saying "they didn't have to do it", that's why this is phrased as optional, because students feel pressured to commit. It really is a semantics debate. It's an easy out for some groups by claiming that it wasn't a requirement to joining the team.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: That's exactly what I was going to say. In addition, the definition that is here, I worked with the human rights office extensively, by going through word by word on what would encompass the most. We feel as if "required" cuts it off, whereas "expected" encompasses the notion of forced intention.

Proxy: What about faculty traditions like, "Oh, we feel so good", booty shake, etc. Can we address the issue that faculty week has an aspect of peer pressure by having thousands of students committing to what could be embarrassing acts? Can we submit a clause? Thoughts?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Recap. So you're asking me about the protection regarding the more optional parts of frosh week? Like, "I feel so good" and booty shake... I can't believe I just said booty in assembly. I think that this is one of the cases where it evaluates the discretion of the system. It comes in that there's a complaint, it's passed. It's an event that I would argue that there is not undue harm. There are policies and protection in place. It's clear that that is not a hazing incident.

Representative McElroy: Just looking at the next point in Part 12 in conjunction with Part B, I don't see any change required. It doesn't mention Part B.

Representative Blair: I retract my statement.

Representative Lively: Just to clarify, so with regards to changing expected versus required, it



should be changed to required. I'm going to run through scenarios. Any activity that is expected of you going into the room. If you were to join the organization, there are a few things that I would expect of people joining a certain organization. And, a relationship with somebody is consensual; ambiguous. I think that it's got to change if it passes because if you're consenting to do something, you're accepting those choices.

Representative Menuz: We looked at this policy, one of the things that needs to be done is that we're looking at is that we require a lot of our students that could be defined as hazing. Things that could be expected isn't required, and peer pressure has a role in that.

Representative Simpson: Lively's statement was so ambiguous that there are arguments for and against his statements.

Representative Sheridan: I am in favour for keeping the wording as expected. When you say something is required of you, that may be something written down or documented somewhere, whereas expected falls under social convention. Students feel pressured into committing certain acts. If we change it to "required" then there are a lot of things that would not come under "hazing" because much stuff (for example, drinking mentality) is expected of you.

Speaker: So, all for changing the definition of hazing from expected to required.

For: 8

Opposed: 28

Abstentions: 1

Motion fails.

Representative Jones: We need to remove section 14, part 1, part 4, and part 5, regarding the payment of fines towards the AMS. This can cause really negative effects of how the money will be used. In addition to what I said before.

Speaker: Secunder to this amendment?

Secinded by Representative Lopez

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: I talked to Commissioner Faught about this last year. I have to disagree. As someone who has dealt with corporations on sponsorship, the conferences leave a buffer at the end of every year that has money not attributed to any sort of club. If this sanction is for \$1000, that money could be returned to the corporation. The only real sanction that would mean anything to clubs would be to take away money. I don't know anything that could be as harsh in regards to a sanction to these clubs, besides a possible community thing.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: We want to clarify that we [the AMS] don't keep the fines. If a group or individual is fined, the fines go to blue light renovations and creations. Restitution is something to undo harm. If there's something that requires finances to be fixed or dealt with, this is where the money goes.

Member at Large Lively: Financial penalties should be removed because they will not go to the



victims, nor will proper restitution will go to victims. If you're the victim of harm from a group, why should the money go towards another initiative? It's not the AMS that has been harmed in the first place.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: In a normal non-academic discipline system, monetary sanctions never go to the respondent. With fines, any fines are not restorative in nature. Fines are only used if the respondent ignores the initial sanctions. This way, students are held accountable to their actions.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: I disagree because it creates a perverse structure. If I'm suffering financially, I can claim that “so and so did this to me”, and receive financial compensation.

Proxy for Representative Simpson: Fines are a powerful deterrent, you don't want to explain that you are lacking money because you broke conduct. I feel like the threat of the fine is just, if a club were to be fined, it would be a serious PR [Public Relations] hit. I would move to increase the financial value of the fine.

Representative Jones: VP Plummer, there are a number of other penalties that are not being removed. For example; restitution, community service, Et cetera. This could be a huge time commitment. Section 4 and 5 have a negative effect on companies, and a detrimental effect on the student body. If we lose a corporate sponsorship over this, that's ultimately damaging the student body.

Speaker: Removing Section 10, Parts 4 and 5. Section 14, Part 1 referencing Section 10. In that, the new 14.1 would say “parts outlined in section 10, parts 1 – 3, 7 – 10”

For: 2

Abstentions: 3

Motion to amend fails.

Representative Menuz: On behalf of the commerce society, I want to thank Olver for her work. We also want to comment on the process that Kristen did for getting here. Kristen in conjunction with the executives. We feel this policy has been very well designed.

Undergraduate Trustee Aulhouse: Speaking broadly about this motion, we dealt a lot with hazing and administration at SONAD, I would like to commend Commissioner Olver, the administration will pass a motion regarding this if we don't and it would be much less favourable than what the AMS has provided us.

Representative McElroy: Section 20 'Confidentiality', just a small grammar point. Additionally, in section 8 and 3, and 4, you will notice a discrepancy in the time line for forms. May you clarify? It is on page 56.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: The time line is different administratively for the Clerk, though I'm trying to find where this is.



Representative McElroy: Section 20 has a grammar infraction, page 56 under Confidentiality. The other one, number 8, under 'Notice', and part 2 'Notice and Proceedings', it says 15 business days, then in number 3 part 4, it says return within 3 business days. There is a discrepancy in the number of days.

Speaker: Motion for five minute recess.

Seconded: Representative Blair

FIVE MINUTE RECESS AT 9:37PM, TO RETURN AT 9:42PM.

GAVEL AT 9:48PM; ASSEMBLY CALLED BACK TO ORDER. GAVEL REPEATS AT 9:49PM.

Speaker: Now, going back to debate.

Commissioner Olver: Amendments on the timeline that Representative McElroy presented have been sorted out, we will discuss after Assembly to go through detail, though all is friendly.

Proxy: Is this something that is very time sensitive that we have to get done tonight? Can we table this, do more consultation, and revisit this at the next meeting? Or would this hinder our relationship with the university? While I think that the consultation is very thorough, I think many people are uncertain.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: It is time sensitive in the fact that it is in the joint memo that this was something that was supposed to be done by the conclusion of the 2013 academic year in the Spring. The other thing too, is that we need to get this into Senate as soon as possible. We need to push to that body right away. I understand your concern, but the AMS has been looking into this for years. We're getting to the point where there has been a heavy saturation in consultation, so we would like to push this forward tonight.

Speaker: We have been discussing this motion for sixty minutes, must entertain the question.

Representative Tahiri: Motion to call the question.

Seconded

For: ___

Opposed: 26

Motion fails, debate continues.

Representative Marshall: I understand that this is time sensitive, but many are not comfortable with the draft in its current form. I suggest that we gather more student feedback on the issue.

Representative Duchaine: How does this policy contrast with the Athletics Code of Conduct and Discipline, specifically regarding hazing?



Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Athletics and Recreation policy does not have a different policy regarding individuals and groups. It doesn't outline a specific process between groups and individuals. It suggests someone conducts an investigation; no strict deadlines outlined as in our policy, etc. From there, it goes to a hearing, but what's colluded is that AAR, various athletes have regulations externally imposed on them that play a part in their cases, leading to the vagueness in their policy. It involves a ton of separate, external bodies, and the case will circulate until it finds a suitable external board (i.e. Doping, harassment, whichever).

Member at Large Lively: I have problems with this motion. First, the lack of appeals process, which is a large oversight. Everyone makes mistakes. The judicial committee is not, can not, get around that goal. We've seen courts with decades of cases, make mistakes. We appear arrogant in our ability to serve justice. What is the actual purpose of this policy? Are we implementing it because the policy is necessary, or because we don't have one? Does the university want us to have one? Is it necessary to serve justice, or is it here to serve another reason? Just because administration wants us to have a policy, doesn't mean we should give them one. We are here to serve the students, not the administration. We should vote it down and have more consultation. I don't think many students are aware of the implications of this policy. Students haven't been consulted. I would also like to expand on the notion of the fact that justice is not always served where there are set processes. It doesn't always work. I can name five separate incidences of innocent people in prison for decades. False accusation is something that permanently scares you. I'd like to leave off with regardless of the intent of this motion, we are setting the tools for oppression by limiting the clubs who do not have the voices of the majority. If we're going after groups, we're not focusing on the protection of the individual. There are many individuals who commit offences, but do not receive fair justice. I don't think that's fair.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Yes, this policy is needed by the university, though it is not something they are forcing us to do. The AMS agreed to this when the joint memo was created after concerns were raised last summer. We aren't simply serving the university, this was agreed to when the policy was reviewed.

Member at Large Lively: Point of information, so VP Pritchard, so regardless of what Assembly says about this motion, we're just here to put a rubber stamp on it and pass it along?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: No, that's not what I'm saying. We agreed to the development of a group discipline policy, and the specific framework of how that will play is up to the assembly. It's up to the Assembly to determine if this is the appropriate framework.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: I would like to clarify with what you said. This is a non-academic process, it will not follow your academic standing at Queen's or further on. This is completely separate from that. In the event of plagiarism, that is an academic and faculty issue. In regards to an appeals process, there is a line in here on appeals, saying that the process does not allow for appeals. This is because we don't have a body to appeal to. We would be giving Queen's administration jurisdiction to intervene in our discipline board, and have oversight on AMS clubs and aspects of Faculty Societies which they do not currently have. This would be detrimental to our progress. The other body could be the AMS Assembly, but due to complexities of the non academic group system, in addition to how the office is run, it's difficult to educate



this body, and it's not the purpose of AMS Assembly to be a Judicial Committee. Plus, it would blur the lines if the AMS should deal with non-academic, regular cases. As well as the AJC, as soon as I would get a case, I would contact the undergraduate faculty society, so it's going through the commission, through the review committee, through the regular investigatory process, then to the AJC. So there would be consultation with everyone involved. The sanctions are positive, though. We're restoring harm to the Queen's community; for example, an alcohol workshop. It is educational, not negative or detrimental. This is not used to target clubs; that's against the restorative nature of this system.

Representative Tahiri: I pass my speaking rights to President Mason.

ASUS President Mason: I think a few of us are uncomfortable with the policy being put forward, but I think it's important for us to pass this. Perhaps it would be best for us to pass this and the executives could have a mandate to discuss. I would hope that the commission stay open for suggestion if we pass this tonight, because I think this policy can be made better.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: This is far from ideal. Initially, there wasn't much consultation with other clubs. I am reluctant to the idea that this has to be passed to provide the executives with a mandate. I would like to entertain Pritchard and Olver with the idea of keeping their doors open for ideas.

Representative Blair: The feasibility of changing non academic group discipline so that it can be appealed at a peer based level, is it possible and process of changing the policy to be more accountable?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: It is possible to create a new appeals body, but it would be very complicated. It would require the creation of an entire other body, and this would have to be passed through tons of consultation and the Senate. Ultimately, it is feasible, but it would take a very long time.

Representative Blair: I think that we should aim for that opportunity in the future.

Member at Large Goodman: In regards to the fines discussed earlier, the point of this policy is to make victims of crime whole again. I don't think fines are the proper way to make them feel "whole" again. Is it possible to redistribute the fine structure, so the victims feel as if something is being done for them? My suggestion would be so that the victim is able to allocate the money to a charity of his or her choice. My second note is about the appeals again. You guys created the AGC to create this policy, why can't we make a separate board to help serve justice?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Your first point, I would argue that this policy is not directed towards making the students feel "whole". It isn't appropriate to allocate fines back to the students. It may create a strange incentive to file complaints. Your second point about the appeals process. Just to be clear, groups don't just have to accept the sanctions imposed on them, they are able to state their case and fight their sanction. Next, changes to the policy. Just to be clear, there are always open to changes at anytime regarding anything in the Constitution. I think that we have already undergone a significant amount of consultation. We



have done immense research. We are open to changes later on. If you would like to see changes two months from now or five years from now to this policy, those changes can be made.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Point of information. The member at large suggested that the victim of a complaint can direct restitution towards a charity.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Fines never go to the person making the complaint. Bonds and fines go towards the Blue Light Fund. If we wanted to change that, we would have to amend what percentage would still go towards the BLF.

Representative Lopez: It's great that so much consultation has been done. However, societies and clubs won't be fairly represented in this policy. There is room for more input. Many clubs and societies only found out about this policy on Monday when it was sent out in the agenda. I think we should aim for more equity in this policy.

Proxy: The time is now to pass this policy. The process has been extensive with making changes and undergoing consultation. We should pass this tonight.

Speaker: That takes us to ninety minutes of debate, so we must close the debate. I will pass the floor to Commissioner Olver for closing statements regarding this motion.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: I am friendly with making changes and continuing to meet with groups. This policy is written for the benefit of clubs and faculties. It is your input to this that is most important and that we value the most. I am friendly to making changes after this.

Speaker: Bringing this motion to question.

For: 38

Against: None

Abstentions: 2

Motion (9) carries.

MOTION 10: That the AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution Section 7.01.13, as seen in Appendix C: GNAD.

Motion 10 had been switched with Motion 9 earlier in the Assembly.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: Essentially constitution outlines our ability to do something within policy. What this is doing is giving the rubber stamp on motion nine.

Speaker: Seeing no debate, pass the motion.

For: 37

Against: None

Abstentions: None

Motion (10) carries.



MOTION 11: That the AMS Assembly appoint an RQU Director.

Director MacDonald: The position is for RQU for CFRC. Part of the two members on the board of directors, one is from the AMS, and another is an assembly member, or an appointed member by the AMS. The function of the role is to add advocacy to the student body. Moreover, this position carries a lot of influence.

Representative McElroy: Regarding this, is there any form of conflict of interest?

Representative MacDonald: There are no legal responsibilities in your roles, so there would be no conflict of interest.

ASUS Representative Sherman: Does the RQU have to be a voting member of assembly?

Representative MacDonald: There is no clarity provided by policy. We determined it was just from Assembly. There is no explicit clarification regarding voting or non-voting members, although seeing as my role is not representative, voting members would be ideal.

NOMINATIONS

MCELROY

Seconded

Accepted

TRUSTEE AULHOUSE

Seconded

Declined

CHINNIAH

Seconded

Accepted

MARSHALL

Seconded

Declined

PURBA

Seconded

Declined

QUESTIONS

1. What assets/ experience can you provide, given that the role includes financial management and resources?
2. Seeing as there are competitive radio stations and sources of music, what is the biggest change CFRC needs to make?



Representative McElroy: I've always had an interest in radio. I want to get involved in CFRC. It is a way to show that the CFRC is providing service to the AMS and to the student body, and that they are deserving of the money that we are providing now have a smaller staff. Their equipment is now quite an issue. This is imperative in the coming years. Additionally, licensing fees for music and such, and fees to SOCAN and seeing how they affect the operating budget of CFRC.

1. I don't have much experience in that role, but I have much interest in learning. I paid close attention last year regarding budgeting and what transpired between programming managers, and what changed within CFRC. There are a lot of challenges that CFRC is undergoing.
2. I love radio; it brings a lot of value. CFRC bring programming that does not have mainstream coverage or exposure. On campus, you have students who come across the CFRC, and become interested in DJ'ing, marketing, playing music, providing freedom to students to practice alternative media.

Representative Chinniah: I think I'll be good in this position because the CFRC's future would be drastically different without the AMS. We owe the university community a responsibility in ensuring that the CFRC makes a smooth transition. I am aware of the financial fears that the CFRC has been enduring over recent years, but I will ensure that the CFRC will leave the AMS stronger than when they were here.

1. CFRC's deficit in the past was due to organizational issues; the set up of their staff, roles, etc. The structural issues of the CFRC needs to be addressed. On the first part, I am leading a club with a \$20000 budget, I understand allocation of money in smartest ways possible. I think that the CFRC needs to be organized better, and needs to be given the tools to do so.
2. Community radio on campus fosters a welcome community for individuals to hone their abilities to develop further in their abilities. I would like to see the CFRC continue within the AMS, but at the same time, when the CFRC is released from the AMS, I think it can still function within campus as a community fostering organization. I think that this is a huge advantage that CFRC has to use going forward. It's a 91 year old radio club on campus.

MOTION 12: That the AMS Assembly approve the amendment to the AMS Policy Manual 1, Section 2B, Part IV: Rules of Debate as outlined in Appendix E: Gender Neutrality.

Proxy Young: I would like to pass an amendment to my own motion before I start. I would like to change the term "title" to "position". This motion is to conform the use of gender based pronouns (i.e. She, He, Mister, Missus), because some may not feel comfortable with identifying with a set gender.

Representative Duchaine: How will we address the speaker?



Someone makes smart-alec comment “We’ll call him God.”

Speaker: I’m down.

Representative Blair: Change the term “Must” to “Shall”.

Representative Searle: Out of curiosity, what happens when the committee moves to a whole?

Speaker: My understanding of committee as a whole. We can continue to use this policy or use first names. This policy is not applicable to committee as a whole, just to points of debate.

Motion (12) carries.

MOTION 13: That the AMS Assembly approve the amendment to the AMS Policy Manual 1, Section 2 Part A as seen in Appendix F: Assembly Voting Reform.

Member at Large Metusy: I’m a fourth year, this is my last year. When I came to Queen’s, I saw student government and all these positions. I really thought this was the school for me. I was hesitant to join AMS, and didn’t. This continued to first, second, and third year. What I’m getting at is, my experience, with this motion, I want to give the assembly a little bit more open opinion, to students who are too intimidated to get directly involved in student government. I want to show that assembly is our representative body, so by voting this motion, 50% plus one on secret ballot admissions. When you have votes, we can have role calls, “this member voted this way, at this time, on this date”. In essence and theory, this would provide greater accuracy.

Representative Blair: I believe that this would detract from the time of debate, and that in itself, would be a detriment to the students.

Proxy Randall: I agree with Blair. Most meetings went until 1:30AM. I agree that we should be held more accountable with our votes, not necessarily through roll call, but as a simple count.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: How about names of people who vote in a particular fashion. In ASUS, we count the number of votes. The definition of roll call is that you would ask each member how they voted.

Residence Society President Daya: I understand your take on the accountability and how we vote a certain way. I think that each President has an elected responsibility to maintain and efficient voting method, rather than having voting become a tedious process.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: We recognized the issue of efficiency when the goal plan was created; about how to make Assembly more efficient. Something the Speaker and I were discussing was giving everyone on Assembly a response card or iClicker to vote with, we would have the ability to easily pass those votes onto online systems. It would record names of voters. It would cost \$3000 to equip everyone at Assembly with one. We are continuously looking into this, though for now the AMS cannot afford this.



Representative McElroy: I pass my speaking right to Representative Blair.

Representative Blair: Not every Motion is procedural. Please be reminded, any member of assembly can pass if people truly seek those accountable votes, but it would be redundant to allow members at large to be permitted to vote after members of assembly have been voted into their positions.

For: 1

Against: 40

Abstentions: 3

MOTION 14: That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution Section 5.04 as seen in Appendix G: Substantive Voting Reform.

Member at Large Mattiussi: I propose an amendment to my motion. Instead of a role call, I think 50% plus 1 is a decent threshold for secret ballot. It is unattainable to have a 70% threshold for a ballot.

Representative Jones: Point of information, if we could be given context into why we would be want this?

Speaker: As of right now, we need five members of assembly to vote in favour of a secret ballot (for feelings that they may be ostracized).

Representative Tahiri: Last week at ASUS, a lot of students felt intimidated when voting on a contentious issue. There is merit in it, when things get contentious. We have had to happen in the past. I think it is a strong mechanism to have secret ballots.

Speaker: Motion to extend assembly by thirty minutes.

Seconded, carries.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: There wasn't anything in Policy Manual Number 1. Right now in the constitution, a secret ballot can be requested by the majority of assembly, or at the request of the Speaker. Is the problem that you always want it approved by a majority, or that you don't want it approved by the Speaker?

Member at Large Mattiussi: [scribe unable to hear]

For: 1

Against: 26

Abstentions: 8

Motion (14) fails.

MOTION 15: That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution Section 6.02 as seen in Appendix H: Open Council



Member at Large Mattiussi: It's nothing big, really. It's just that extra little step for students to have access to their student voice. It's just the reading, so from what I understand, you can pass it tonight and vote against it again another time.

ASUS Representative Sherman: The one worry that I have about this is the nature of sensitivity that AMS can have. We would be worried about having those disclosed. Would you hope that council acts as assembly, would you expect those minutes to be released as well, or could that stay secret?

Member at Large Metusy: Open. If everything is released, it adheres to the AMS advocacy of transparency.

Representative Blair: So to confirm, you would like the minutes made public? I'm moving to amend the motion to read that publicly of all council meetings, if you can please elaborate if there is such a differentiation between.

AMS President Berkok: This is already what we do over the summer. Due to the substantive motions we pass over the summer, we keep minutes, we just don't post them online. What I suggest is that the minutes for all the substantive motions that we pass can be posted. Then all the rest of the motions can remain substantive. Is that friendly?

Speaker: Friendly

Chairman Proxy Randall: You would have to eliminate section 3, there is no mechanism to allow a [camera?].

Representative Blair: Point of information, what counts as camera?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Basically when we go on camera, we just don't publicly release the minutes from our meetings the same way your faculties might. I think that it comes to the point that all AMS meetings will be open except for summer, with substantive motions being made public.

For: 37

Against: None

Abstentions: None

Motion (15) carries.

MOTION 16: That AMS Assembly approve the amendment to the AMS Policy Manual 1, Section 2 Part A as seen in Appendix I: Publishing of Assembly Minutes [Motion 16]

This is the second part of Motion 16, as altered earlier in the Assembly during Approval of the Agenda.

Member at Large Mattisusi: I might have mentioned this at the last assembly, I can't say I'm too impressed with this motion. I heard the concerns of the CIA at the last assembly. I would be



open to any amendments you have on this motion. It would allow members at large to have access to minutes quickly. It's not the easiest thing publishing minutes, but they should be released in a more timely and consistent manner.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: I'm the one who does the minutes with the scribe. My only amendment would be within five *business* days, if that is friendly with you.

Member at Large Metusy: Yes, friendly.

Motion (16) carries.

MOTION 17: That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendment to the AMS Constitution Section 6.10.08, 6.10.13 & 6.10.14 as seen in Appendix J: Assembly Committees- Constitution

Member at Large Mattiussi: So, regarding the constitution and regarding assembly committees, and this has no bearing on how you vote, but this is my favourite motion. I think it's pretty simple, I think it's common sense, I think it's just an easier way to open up a section. Delving deeper into that, these amendments I'm proposing are pretty simple. Things like giving notice agendas, announcing when and where they are. I call it the "5 W" amendment; who, the assembly – what, the agenda - where, when, why. I think this should pass because it's pretty easy to follow, it's an easy way to get people out, to get people involved, with a pinch of openness.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: I think we should pass this. I think that one of the rich constituents of the AMS is its committees. When you make committees open, that increases the engagement on the part of students.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Point of information. This wouldn't actually affect the committees that you're listing. The other committees that you're listing are commission. This can only affect Ad Hoc committees.

Proxy Young: Motion to extend meeting by 30 minutes?

Seconded by Residence Society President Daya, motion carries

ASUS Representative Sherman: Point of information: is ___ in standing as an Ad Hoc committee?

ASUS Representative Tahiri: Quick question: so these committees, when I think committees, I don't see why that needs to be recorded. Just to clarify, these are committees that discuss substantive, contentious, and controversial topics.

Member at Large Mattiussi: If there ever is a situation where a committee is dealing with a pretentious issue, we have that option available.

Representative Blair: How exactly would a committee in this case justify going into camera? And if the committee is going into camera, if they can only discuss when is under certain topics?



AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: The reason a group goes in camera, or assembly goes into closed session, is when it's in the best interest of the society to. We don't take going into camera lightly, but we will if we feel that the information is sensitive from administration, or if we aren't quite ready to release it.

Representative Blair: It's also to cover ourselves. I'm looking to protect the interest of the committees.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: That's something to think about; the ability to go into a camera session. In the end it's for the benefit of the society. We don't go into it for reasons that don't benefit the society and the student body. We use camera sessions to hide sensitive and personal information. The group has to decide if that's something they want to do as a society.

AMS President Berkok: As Pritchard said, my one concern with this is constitutional change. Right now, the nomination committee doesn't have a standardized form. Right now, it's fine, but if nominating committee has a standardized form regarding questions for nominations. Just because if that was to take place and there was sensitive personal information being discussion there may be problems.

ASUS Representative Sherman: I was looking in the constitution, special consideration is in the constitution.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Unfortunately, the online copy is outdated. It was updated last year.

For: 2

Against: 26

Abstentions: 11

Motion (17) fails.

MOTION 18: That AMS Assembly approve the amendment to the AMS Policy Manual 1, Section 2 Part A as seen in Appendix K: Assembly Committees- Policy

Member at Large Matiussi: I really do appreciate the information for the nominating committee, it is quite important that there is the clause, or there was the clause, and I still like to fight the motion. We can talk about amendments, we can talk about different ways to protect that information, but I think that these policy changes can bring spritz of “friebreeze” to assembly.

For: 9

Against: 16

Abstentions: 12

Motion (18) fails.



AMS President Berkok: I'd like to applaud Member Matiussi. He saw something he wanted to change, he brought it forth. Let's give him a round of applause.

Clapping ensues.

For the following motion, the Speaker steps into the gallery to avoid conflict of interest. The newly elected Deputy Speaker takes the Speaker's place.

MOTION 19: That AMS Assembly pass the first reading of the changes to section 2.02.03 of the AMS Constitution as seen in Appendix L: Running in Elections

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Previously this constitution stated that the HRO and the executive officers cannot run in the subsequent year that they hold office. Now we want to extend that. This is something the previous executive considered, but they started with the changes of the HRO. One of the reasons we put this forth is we feel that elections are integral, but many of our members should have the practice of the fall referendum period, followed by the winter referendum period, but also so members can focus on their responsibilities regarding elections. Something else, we feel that it is important that members receive a proper transition. Now, they wouldn't be given a transition by someone who was involved in elections, etc. We feel these positions are integral to running the elections, we feel that the best way to do that would be having this in the policy. We don't want to restrict anyone from running, but their responsibility when taking on the role is to run the election, not in it. The other part of that is they can still run for office later on. They just can't run in the academic year that they hold office. You wouldn't be able to quit and run for that academic year, but you could run in following years.

Residence Society President Daya: Would this be effective as of this year, or next year?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: So that's something we considered. The most responsible thing would be to implement this now, but we can't give the current members a restriction to run for office. We were thinking of granting a grace period for members to resign, so we could have another member take his or her place by the end of October.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Would it be appropriate to omnibus this motion and the motion afterwards?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: No.

Representative Fleck: I'd like to say that I support this motion, but with regards to the grace period, we should give them the chance to run in this year's election because they came into their job not knowing they couldn't run.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: It should be clear that this is the elections team. It was made clear during transition that they shouldn't run for elections.



Senator Duchaine: Point of information regarding AMS elections and elections that AMS oversees. Would this apply to other the elections that the AMS oversees?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: What you're getting at is the next motion. Unfortunately, we can't put in the Constitution barring them from running in faculty elections. In the statements of responsibilities, I want to continue this for members to not run in any AMS election, or any election during our electoral time period.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: No offence, but seeing as the CIA oversees the election process, why is everyone but the CIA included in this motion?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: We didn't include it because while they manage elections, it isn't technically integral to their job description. They don't fill electoral needs, only supervisory. That is why the decision was made, because they are not involved in the election team, nor involved in the electoral process.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: I manage finances and budgeting regarding the election team, but I have no access to anything else.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: But the CIA still oversees the entire process. They take a leadership roll over the DRO, HRO, Et cetera. If they are still even slightly involved in the electoral process, why is she exempt?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: The CIA position is a supervisory position. She makes sure that people are carrying out their jobs. That position couldn't be influential over the election team.

Member at Large Thomson: I have some things to say about this motion. I stand on its merits. I am here because I love student government; it provides opportunities for students to rise over their constituents. The problem with student government is that there is a one year turnover with a poor transition. I support the idea of this motion, however I personally have concerns. The elections need to be run fairly. I never had the interest in running for an elected position, but I always knew that if the opportunity arose for me to apply for a senior position, I would consider it, quite possible take it. I was never told that I would be prevented from running for a position. The CIA last year had never talked to me about this last year. I want to make sure I can give an effective transition. My concern is entirely personal; I get the reason, I get the flaws. However, I would have liked to even be consulted on this idea, which I was not. If it's possible for this motion to be tabled pending further consultation. It's hard for me to decide. I would like the executives to reconsider this motion. You could be affecting my plans in the future if you implement this.

Director Bone: Point of information, I'm wondering if, when you entered this role, if you knew this role would be twofold in regards to Speaker and CEO.

Member at Large Thomson: Yes. I've always thought of running as a possibility, but it's hard for me to let this go about now that there is – *interrupted*



Director Bone: My question was about the role itself.

Member at Large Thomson: Yes.

President Mason: Motion to extend meeting by thirty minutes?

Seconded by Representative McElroy, motion carries.

ASUS Representative Mason: I'd like to state that I believe this motion is unreasonable, and I'm shocked that this motion was put forth with little consultation. I do see the merit in having this passed. I'd like to draw your attention to Appendix L. After working with elections with ASUS and AMS, I find it weird that the CIA is not included in this list. While I don't personally agree with this motion, I feel it's only fair that we're inclusive all of the members of the AMS even slightly associated with the elections. I feel like we should amend the motion to include the CIA.

Seconded by ASUS Representative Tahiri

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Not friendly.

Speaker: We will now open the floor to debate on this amendment to include the CIA.

President Mason: This is a motion to include the CIA in the list of barred members from running for elected positions. The CIA has great influence over the members of the election team. I can tell you first hand that the CIA has great influence in the elections. I encourage you to vote for my motion, and strike down the motion at large.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: This is a supervisor position. The CEO is elected by assembly. They do serve as a CEO /CRO team, completely unrelated to the CIA. I would really stress that the CIA's role in elections is to prep and ensure that the election gets there in regards to budgeting and financing. What I would more like to see in the future, is to amend policies so that the CRO and DRO can only be elected by the assembly to ensure no influence at all from the CIA. This would make the AMS more separate from the election process. I would strongly recommend you vote against this.

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: My only addition to this is that the only thing that I have done with the elections team thus far is assist with the budgeting and financials. I hired the CRO and current deputy in April, budgeting happened over the summer, mostly finished by June. From that, the main thing I consulted on was writing emails and interpersonal things like that. I have no access to any information.

For: 24

Against: 6

Abstentions: 3

Motion carries. Amendment added, debate continues.

Proxy Randall: Continuing, I think it's unfortunate that the amendment got passed. I would like to speak in favour of this. You were elected to represent a large number of students. You have to



consider who you're voting for. You're voting for "is it best to have a CEO run for election?". I think it's gracious for the executives to provide a grace period for members to step down. Going back to the policy, it's not in the best interest of our constituents to pass this motion.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: In light of this amendment, I move to table this motion.

Seconded by President Berkok

For: 24

Against: 11

Abstentions: Not permitted

RECOUNT- SEEING AS SOME MEMBERS DID NOT VOTE

For: 27

Against: 10

Motion (19) tabled.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Point of information, I noticed that members voted differently from their votes. I did notice that some people voted differently in the two times that people votes. I think we should reconsider the vote. Motion to reconsider to previous motion (the motion to table).

Seconded by Representative Mason

For: 13

Against: 24

Motion to reconsider fails.

MOTION 20: That AMS Assembly approve the amendments to Policy Manual 1, Sections 2 and 3, as seen in Appendix M: CEO.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: This is different, but along the same lines. These ones apply to the statements of responsibilities. Essentially job description. So both pieces are addition 2.08 (CEO should not be eligible to run in any election that the AMS oversees, incl. Undergrad trustee, executive elections) and 3.13 regarding the CRO and DRO. It basically says in their description that they can't run for AMS run elections or elections held around the same time. For the record, AMS does not hold authority over COMSOC's elections.

President Mason: I value everyone's opinion. If you vote in favour of this, it's not going to hurt my feelings. However, I think that this motion restricts the opinions and actions of a very important volunteer of the AMS. I would like to state that had this been implemented last year, I would not be here. I would like to vote in lieu of a grandfather clause for the Speaker. The speaker is an under appreciated role; it isn't easy to do. By limiting their ability to run in



elections, we are restricting their actions.

President Fleck: I do see the merit in this regarding the AMS elections. Speaking from the ENGSOC perspective, we have our own CEO and elections teams. I can see this being restricting regarding preventing the best possible people from doing their jobs.

Vice President Tahiri: I would like to applaud the executives for the noble initiatives. Students make fun of us for being too serious. I personally think that it would be a fear factor, this would be a disservice to the members of the AMS. Perhaps if we provided an amendment to remove certain members from the motion. I strongly encourage everyone to vote the motion at large down. I would like to propose the amendments to strike faculty society executive, undergrad trustee, and rector from the motion
Secoded by Representative Mason.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Not friendly.

Deputy Speaker: We move into debate on the amendment.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: I wanted to make the point that if the CEO decides to run in any election, they are compromising the integrity of all elections under AMS. There's countless elections that use VoteNet, If the CEO runs, he is compromising the VoteNet system.

President Mason: I would like to speak to two things briefly. Removing the three positions would make this policy more fair. I would like to remind assembly that the CEO does have connections to VoteNet, but as the VPUA stated, the CIA handles their finances.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: Point of information: CIA and executives handle finances. Not just the CIA.

Undergraduate Trustee Aulthouse: The fact that the CEO doesn't just oversee the AMS elections, it seems contradictory to the policy of elections.

Representative Jones: I echo Plummer. I like this motion better than the previous motion. The grace period is gracious.

Vice-President Tahiri: If the undergrad trustee and rector become contentious, I amend to change my amendment. My amendment is now just to include the faculty society executives.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: The main problem this is getting at is that it is taking away from the main election. We don't have the person best equipped and best handled to do the election anymore. I know it's a tricky situation, but it's for the best for the society election. For the point of Olver being involved in finances, we're all equally involved. She just put in the credit card purchase, and I signed it. It's no more involvement than that. It's really not a big deal. The idea of resigning has come up several times. The problems we face is that is a member of the executive team waits until December to resign, we don't have any time to hire



replacements. For them to resign in December, and we're struggling to find someone to fill the position, I would be fearful about the repercussions seen in the election.

ASUS Representative Wiseman: Motion to extend motion by thirty minutes.
Seconded by Representative Sherman

ASUS Representative Sheridan: Just to speak to the concerns that were just raised by Pritchard regarding timeline and resignation, would it be possible to put forth a date that the officer could announce their interest in running for a elected position or resigning. Is it a solution to put forth a date?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs: Yes, if that's something you would like to propose. If that makes it more amendable, I think it's a good idea. They would have to go through the referendum period, and they are losing the transition period, so I'm not unamendable to that idea, but I don't know that it gets at the problem. They really need to experience that first referendum period to have a healthy transition. I'm open to the idea, but it doesn't do what this needs to do.

ASUS Representative Sheridan: I disagree with this amendment. I think that the CEO should not be allowed to run for this position. There are 1500 other AMS positions. Why run for the one position that has a clear conflict of interest. In fact, every speaker in the history has been asked how they plan to run election period. I think that it's not right for the CEO to drop his responsibilities. If you're running for this volunteer position, and you decide to resign, then you're taking the opportunity from someone else to be in your position. There are many other opportunities in the AMS, there are only about six that put you in conflict of interest. I expect you to uphold your commitments, like I commit to mine. I expect that you would fulfill your job description of CEO.

President Fleck: I don't think you can compare positions of the Speaker to any other position within the AMS. I think there is a small bit of similarity with other positions, but I don't think there's a job with a high amount of similarity to the Speaker out of 1500 jobs available within the AMS.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: So as it stands, can they quit? Is that what you're saying? The way this reads, technically they could. It was in the constitutional amendment that they couldn't quit and run in the same year. It could be reflected in the amendments to change that, but technically yes, they could quit to run.

Amendment to strike faculty society from the list of the motion.

For: 24

Against: 8

Abstention 3

Amendment carried, faculty society no longer included in the motion.

Deputy Speaker: Moving back into debate on original motion.



ASUS Representative Sherman: It's also important to understand that this is a commitment to the assembly, like how we made commitments to our constituents. I think for the CEO to quit to run in his own personal interest would demonstrate a lack of commitment. That is clear as day, there are no secrets when the CEO runs in an election. I know there is a great responsibility when someone takes the CEO position, but you owe it to the people who will be running in elections for you to uphold your duties.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: Technically, they could quit and run, but then they would be in direct violation of their responsibilities. So, you could break up my position into two specific goals or responsibilities. One would be government. One would be to oversee to daily operations; corporate. The budgeting is done in the summer. I draw the comparison in that, if I ran in the election and I knew that I would spend a four month vacation and I would not complete the budget, I wouldn't be fulfilling my job, and I'm being unfair. Just draw the comparison of me not leaving in the summer to the CEO not quitting to run.

Senator Duchaine: You cannot be an unbiased person representing an election by managing an election, while plastering up posters of yourself to win your own election. Ultimately, student leaders must first be committed to the people they represent. For the past two years, my predecessors went on to be AMS executives. There are five election positions within the AMS, and those five people should be made explicitly aware of their job duties, and that they can't quit to satisfy their own interests.

Proxy Randall: I would just like to urge all Assembly members to put yourself in the shoes of your constituents, not in the shoes of the CEO.

President Searle: I believe that when you run for a job, you should be held accountable. But for the people in the position right now, I believe that is unfair to implement the motion now. I feel we should make a grandfather clause to satisfy those currently holding elected or voluntary positions.

Proxy Young: Point of order, were you (President Searle) making an amendment?

Representative Searle: Yes, I would like to make an amendment to amend Section M, to say that the motion should be grandfathered in, meaning that those holding the position right now would be exempt from the original motion.

Seconded

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: Not friendly.

Deputy Speaker: Moving into debate on the amendment.

Representative Searle: Going off of how Thompson claimed that he was not consulted regarding this motion when he came into the position, it's unfair to him and any other member of the current Assembly to be restricted from running in the AMS elections when we were not made aware of this at the times we came into our positions.



AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: I'm debating tabling this because we don't have a choice, we have to pass the budgets tonight. I'm struggling with what to do right now. There might be the policy that, with two thirds vote, we can extend past 1:30AM. I feel like this is a time sensitive motion, but not as time sensitive as the budgets. I will wait until we finish this amendment, but then I will motion to table the motion. It's in the policy to pass the budgets tonight (within September).

Deputy Speaker: Seeing as it is against our constitution to go past 1:30AM

Proxy Randall: It's just that with this amendment, I think this is unbelievable in this forum. This isn't about personal politics. If this motion makes sense for elections, then it makes sense for this year. I have to implore for assembly to put yourself in the shoes of your constituents and act in their best interest, not in the current Speaker's.

Proxy Young: I strictly want to talk about how some of the comments have become personal. As difficult as it is, given that we know each other on a personal level, we have to look at this logically. It is our responsibilities as student leaders to not make this personal. I would advise people to not make this personal and about everyone else in this room, and just about your position and your job as representing students.

Representative Mason: I think at the least, if we're going to pass this amendment, we should speak to the individual most effected by such a motion. I would ask that members of Assembly to respect the opinions of others.

Representative Hennick: I want to echo what Scott said. This isn't about personal politics, this isn't about whether I like Robbie, this is about creating individual opportunities and experiences. We can't adversely effect someone who didn't know that this was going to happen to him.

Senator Duchine: I do not think at all that our jobs provides opportunities to students.

Member at Large Goodman: As one of the few constituents left this late at night, I am in favour of this. I feel as if it is fair to support the motion, in addition to the grandfather clause.

Director Bone: I want to comment on the fact that people keep saying that they didn't know that this would happen. They did know their job description, and it states your job requirements in your description. They knew what they were getting into when they volunteered for the role. Step down if you do not want to or cannot fulfil your role.

Proxy Simpson: I'm not sure how a grandfather clause would help this. Personally, I feel as if signing up for a position and leaving it for another position is unprofessional. I think applying for a position, then realizing that you can “up” your position is disrespectful to your constituents. So I really don't see what the interest in grandfathering this in.

Amendment to “Grandfather” the motion into Constitution.

For: 21

Against: 13



Abstentions: 3
Motion to amend fails.

Representative Aharon: Motion to extend meeting by thirty minutes?
Secoded, motion to extend carries.

Deputy Speaker: Back to debate on original motion.

Representative Blair: Motion to call the question
Secoded by McElroy

For (calling the question): [the rest of Assembly]
Against: 4

Deputy Speaker: Calling the question to the original motion, we have a closing from Vice President Pritchard.

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: At this point, the motion isn't what was intended, or an effort to have a flaw free election this year. As of right now, I have quite a few concerns with the addition of the amendments. At this point, the executive no longer supports this motion, and we will re-evaluate at a later point.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Point of information: do you plan to open this at a later point?

AMS Vice President of Student Affairs Pritchard: It's complicated, I have to figure out the amendments with the Constitution. If it wasn't the exact same policy or motion, then it can be re entertained.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: I think it's unfortunate what the motion looks like now. I feel as if we did not do enough consulting.

Deputy Speaker: We are not voting for the amendments to add to the motion. We have strike faculties from that original motion and grandfather clause.

For: 12
Against: 19
Abstentions: ____

Motion (20) fails.

Representative Mason: Motion to return to to previous speaker.
Secoded by Representative Chinniah

Deputy Speaker: Friendly.

Speaker Thomson returns to his position with Assembly.



Proxy Young: Is it possible to call a special assembly to evaluate the remainder of the budget by the end of September?

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: I think that we should break Constitution to look at these budgets. We only have twenty minutes left in the night to pass these budgets. Come and talk to any of us about the budget, if you have any questions, come talk to us this week. If the assembly is comfortable with breaking constitution, I would like to encourage it.

Senator Duchaine: There is precedence for this, last year's budgets were passed in October.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: I am a firm believer in the saying that nothing good happens after 1AM. I believe we should move the budget to evaluation in October.

Proxy Randall: I believe we should come back to this at a later date.

AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer: I think this could be passed within the first twenty minutes of our next assembly. Send questions to myself, Pritchard, or Berkok. We can add the budget to the next assembly very easily. It does help with getting the consolidation out there. It's very easy for me to get this together. I say it's very possible, it still falls in line with my budget schedule.

Proxy Young: Motion to table Motions 21 through 26.
Seconded by Representative Marshall

Speaker: To table the motions 21 to 26 to the next meeting, whether that be a special assembly or the next assembly.

Motion carries.

15. Discussions

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: We are entertaining the idea of having volunteers to come in and help Members at Large with when to speak, rules of debate, etc. If anyone has any feedback please let me know.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Do you propose we give an honorarium?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver: No honorarium. It would be roughly two hours a week. They would be here from an hour and a half to two hours. There would be three or four of them hired, and they would help the members at large present their ideas, and let them know when to speak.

ASUS Representative Chinniah: Can we make them wear cute outfits?

Commissioner of Internal Affairs: There might be an HR thing with that...



Speaker: Any concerns other than cute outfits for volunteers?

Assembly raises no concerns.

Representative Law: Motion to adjourn assembly?

Secoded by Representative Sherman

Motion carries.

Assembly adjourned.

