

***AMS Assembly Minutes – Thursday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014***  
***Grant Hall***

---

*\*Assembly commenced at 7:00PM*

**Speaker Robert Thomson** (hereafter referred to as Speaker): It's 7:00PM. Figured our last one might as well be on time... COMPSA and PHESKA are still missing.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** We have quorum, we can start.

**Speaker:** (at 7:02PM) Welcome to the AMS Assembly of Thursday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014. Let's get right into it.

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the meeting of April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013**

**MOTION ONE: That AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the Assembly meeting of April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2014**

Moved by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

**Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** I am looking to add a motion tabled at the September 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. This would be a change in the constitution, and would limit the CEO, CRO, DRO, and CIA from running in elections.

*Seconded by: Eril Berkok*

*Motion carries.*

**Speaker:** It will be added as motion number twelve at the end of new business.

*Motion (1) carries.*

**2. Approval of the Minutes for the meeting of March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

**MOTION TWO: That AMS Assembly approve the minutes for the Assembly meeting of March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014**

Moved by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** I sent an email out to all of you regarding a request to redact names within the minutes. I'm leaving that up to Assembly. I have been receiving concerns about why I didn't do that before hand. My understanding is that I must provide a full account of what happened each meeting in the minutes; to redact the names without being mandated to do so wouldn't be fulfilling my job to Assembly. I would encourage anyone who would like to start a discussion about this to do so. We would redact them to address the safety concerns of some students, or keep them to ensure for future reference that the speakers were AMS members. I suggest redacting the names- I can put a note at the top confirming they are AMS members.



**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Would it be all names, or some?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** I've only been asked to redact two names; the mover and seconder of a motion. I don't want to assume that everyone who spoke doesn't want their names in the minutes.

**Speaker:** Questions or concerns about previous meeting's minutes?

**Residence Society President Daya:** Has the speech that I read on Duchaine's behalf been changed?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** I corrected them, but forgot to send them out. There is another round of the minutes. It includes Senator Duchaine's speech read by President Daya.

**Speaker:** Any other concerns about the minutes?

*Motion (2) carries.*

### **3. Speaker's Business**

**Speaker:** On to speaker's business, and as I will lastly say, that's my business. Welcome to the last meeting for this academic term. Every other Thursday, it's been like a weird dining experience with my family. I've watched discussion, debate, and a lot of fun things go down. It's been a productive year at the table. It's been a great year for me this year. I can't wait to pass on the torch. We're going to move into the election of the speaker for the 2014 – 2015 year.

**ASUS President Mason:** I nominate Steven Smith.

*Seconded*

*Accepted.*

**ASUS President Tahiri:** I nominate Trevor Davis.

*Seconded by: Jon Wiseman.*

*Accepted.*

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** I nominate John Stanley.

*Seconded by: Irfan Tahiri.*

*Accepted.*

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** I nominate Michael McGill.

*Seconded by: Charlie Prussky.*

*Accepted.*

**Undergraduate Trustee Aulthouse:** I nominate Chris Casher.

*Seconded by: Nicholas Francis.*



*Accepted.*

**ASUS Representative Wiseman:** I nominate Proxy Grotsky.

*Seconded by: Kanivanan Chinniah.*

*Declined.*

**Proxy Grotsky:** Given the potential conflict of interest, I will respectfully decline.

**Engineering Society Representative Savides:** I nominate Matt Slavin.

*Seconded by: Dylan Braam*

*Accepted.*

**Chairman Garcia:** I nominate Emily Fleck.

*Seconded by: Nicolas Francis*

*Declined.*

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** I nominate Troy Sherman.

*Seconded by: Jon Wiseman.*

*Declined.*

**Speaker:** I'll entertain four questions from assembly. Do you guys – wow, there's a lot of you. Do you want to go up on stage?

**Undergraduate Trustee Aulthouse:** Do any of you intend to run in any elections during the year?

**Member at Large Smith:** There is a potential, afterwards, I may run for President of the Queen's Debating Union.

**Member at Large Davis:** No.

**Member at Large Stanley:** No, and I have no plans to make any plans.

**Member at Large McGill:** I'll be in fourth year, it'll be impossible.

**Member at Large Casher:** Same here.

**Member at Large Slavin:** Same here, no future plans for running.

**Senator Duchaine:** What do you think the largest responsibility of the CEO/ Speaker should be?

**Member at Large Slavin:** The most important responsibility is to maintain and compose the respect of this body. The position has to maintain a positive reputation for the AMS in the meetings and how assembly is portrayed to the outside. I'm not an AMS insider. I know how the AMS is viewed from the outside. I know what the speaker does to advertise the body. Within meetings, he's charged with maintaining decorum, and that assembly can maintain efficiency.



The speaker must be good and knowledgeable of the rules of order. You need to establish a clear precedent from the start, so there's no wiggle room for interpretation so no one can misuse their position. I have knowledge in this position from my own faculty society.

**Member at Large Casher:** I agree with everything he said. It can be summarized into the word education. Understanding the rules and processes, so discussion is productive. We want to ensure that we're being productive, that everyone is heard, but people are safe and comfortable coming to this body, and they know the process so they can contribute. It shifts to the role of CEO. The best way to avoid the breaking of rules is ensure that we are announcing the rules. We need to make clear guidelines about what happens if you break the rules. This role needs to have a proactive role in assembly, not a reactive.

**Member at Large McGill:** I think the most important role is to ensure that this democratic body runs efficiently. I sit on ComSoc assembly, and we have a problem with being too efficient. I can bring not the lack of debate, but the order. I can show that I can command a crowd effectively. I think there are two sides to the position. Effectiveness; I act as the ombudsperson for ComSoc. I'll bring that to the assembly. The second thing is respect. It's important to respect each other. Anybody who knows me knows I'm easy going. I make awkward situations easy going. I'll never make anybody feel like their voice can't be heard.

**Member at Large Stanley:** It's hard not to say a lot of what's been said. The role is fully understood by us six. As speaker, your role is to ensure debate is efficient and procedure is followed, but while maintaining a safe, accountable, equitable space for everyone. Members at Large come into assembly for a reason. They come in because they feel so passionate about something. It's not their job, role, or responsibility to come in and talk about the issue. To come in for the first time is intimidating. I think the speaker is supposed to ensure that everyone is given a chance to voice their opinions. As CEO, you ensure that rules are followed during elections, but you're also required to educate the broader AMS community on voting dates, the teams, and why you should care about the AMS. With the addition of four volunteers in the speaker's office over the next year, you need someone who can manage people responsibly, and I think I can do that.

**Member at Large Davis:** We're all dancing around it, but the ultimate role is to maintain efficacy. It comes down to two aspects; efficiency, decorum So first, efficiency. Procedure is helpful in a rules-based organization. Tradition maintains an important part of this assembly. Procedures aren't a tool or obstacle to accessibility. I like looking to precedence. Maintain the right to reply to maintain effective debate. Next, decorum is important in general meetings. Controversial issues come up, and the discussion degenerates to a point where everything is personal and not accessible. With Members at Large or less assertive members of assembly, when they feel too intimidated to engage, or too conflicted to engage, it's important to be opening and accommodating. The CEO finds inaccessible due to rules or complexity of issues. Issues of contention and eligibility will arise. We avoid motions upon motions upon motions, and situations where no one knows where we're at. We must maintain the efficacy.

**Member at Large Smith:** It's hard to add more. I'll say it simply. Order is critically important. The speaker helps maintain that. If rules are maintained, there should theoretically never be a



problem. The speaker needs to be there in case problems do arise. The rules of order apply to the CEO. It's seen as an addendum to the speaker position. I worked with the CEO, and watched how the position operates during election season. You need to have a crystal clear understanding of the rules and orders. The election season is so intensely critical. You need to have a clear mind on it.

**Speaker:** Next two questions will be limited to thirty second responses each.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Describe the relationship between the CIA and speaker, and how you plan to work together throughout the year.

**Member at Large Smith:** On a personal level, the relationship between me and the incoming CIA, we knew each other from the castle. On a more general level, that's what it needs to be. It needs to be collaborative and apolitical. It needs to be collaborating and understanding what needs to be done.

**Member at Large Davis:** I think it's a relationship of consultation. The CIA helps with ambiguity. Speaker should never seem to be subservient to the CIA or other assembly members. The speaker has to be functionally and knowledgeably independent, but he has to feel comfortable going to the CIA when issues or doubt arises.

**Member at Large Stanley:** During assembly, the speaker will use the CIA for additional information. During the lead up, while the CIA is preparing for assembly, she'll solicit information from the speaker. I'm committed to making that work.

**Member at Large McGill:** The role of the CIA, when it comes to assembly, is the design, whereas with the speaker it is implementation. Assembly is well thought out, effectively put out by the speaker.

**Member at Large Casher:** I could not agree more. I think it has to be collaborative and supportive. If this works well for me, I'll be relying on Claire. However, the two positions are apolitical and independent come elections. Elections are serious, and there has to be a distinct separation between the bodies.

**Member at Large Slavin:** I think the relationship is two-fold. It's seen in the lead up to assembly. The two positions are making sure they are on the same page. They have to be the two most knowledgeable people in the room when issues are being discussed. During assembly, the speaker adjudicates issues that may be contentious, while the CIA looks up precedence regarding the issue at hand.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** One of the major portions of the speaker's role is to be a neutral arbitrator of assembly. What conflict of interest do you have with assembly, and how will you manage it?

**Member at Large Slavin:** I would say the only conflict would be ties of the faculty. I have a lot of experience, and I know a lot of people. I have confidence in my ability to move past this. I



have done lots of hiring, demonstrating my ability to move past this.

**Member at Large Casher:** My involvement with the AMS has been fairly extensive, but next year I don't have commitments. I have had experience with the NAD, and that contributes to the experience I have being a neutral party between my peers. I can step back and judge the situation, and make a proper decision based on that.

**Member at Large McGill:** Mine would be with my faculty, but I'm currently the ombudperson. It's in my role to be unbiased.

**Member at Large Stanley:** I'm finishing my fourth year now. I have relationships with people on assembly currently, but I know no one coming in for next year. Having a lack of personal relationships with people on assembly will make the role easier.

**Member at Large Davis:** I have no personal relationships with people incoming. I would maintain the policy. Through my previous positions, I have maintained consultation with Peter Milliken, the most influential speaker. I've discussed my problems with him before, and he's never steered me wrong. That course of action would be well maintained.

**Member at Large Smith:** I'm currently a StuCon, and I am applying to be an assistant editor of the Tartan. I would deal with conflict of interest, should it arise. I would be interested to throw the issue on the floor, have assembly vote on it. I would avoid having to do that.

**Speaker:** That's all the questions we have. Please say your names and leave.

**Member at Large Smith:** Steven.

**Member at Large Davis:** Trevor.

**Member at Large Stanley:** John.

**Member at Large McGill:** Mike.

**Member at Large Casher:** Chris.

**Member at Large Slavin:** Matt.

**Speaker:** Members of assembly, because we have so many people, we'll do a preferential vote. Please rank the people you would like.

**Representative Gallipoli:** Can we have the names said again?

**Speaker:** From left to right on the stage, it was Steven Smith, Trevor Davis, John Stanley, Mike McGill, Chris Casher, and Matt Slavin.

**Speaker:** For the sake of you sitting here for a bit, can I have a motion for a five minute recess?



*Motioned by: Kyle Drever*

*Seconded by: Adam Grotsky*

*Assembly resumes at 7:44PM.*

**Speaker:** Scott, how does this work?

**ASUS President Mason:** You're going to stand up, announce the new speaker, but with no clapping. Then you stand up. You can leave, or you can stick around and help them.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Stage rage.

**Speaker:** I can't. I have an exam I have to prepare for!

**Speaker:** Mike, do you want to get the candidates?

**Member at Large Young:** Where are they?

**Speaker:** I don't know. Wait, did we lose them?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** I'm the new speaker!

**Speaker:** Actually, it's Kanivanan.

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** What?

**Speaker:** Moving back into speaker's business for the last time. I want to congratulate, reminder, no clapping, all candidates. Congratulations to Chris Casher, the new CEO and Speaker for the 2014 – 2015 year.

**ASUS Representative Mason:** May everyone please join me in giving a standing ovation to Robbie Thompson.

#### **4. President's Report**

**AMS President Berkok:** First off, I apologize for this report. It should have been put in the latest agenda. You may already know, we released an op-ed in the Journal today. It pertains to the risk to the student experience from administration, and liability versus culture. If you have questions, please ask during question period. It's something that had to be said. We want to start a discussion. On a similar note, a policy paper with principle's concerns and recommendations will be released soon. Keep your eyes out for that. For the JDUC long term plan, the model is now completed. We haven't even seen it yet. This consultation will not be taken lightly. We don't feel it's wise to have consultation done during the month of April. The next executive and SLC team will be taking this on. This will be our student union building. New thing on JDUC commercial tenants, that's in there, too. The April senate meeting we have coming up discusses the enrolment



targets for the various faculties. It's an important meeting to be at. It's also the policy for program closures. It'll be an extremely important senate. We need student voice there. April is challenging to do that. This is it. You'll hear a lot of this tonight. We have 27 days left. I've spent six years here, and it's been a thrilling ride. Thanks for the chance you gave me to serve you.

## **5. Vice President's Report**

**a. Vice President of Operations Plummer:** Thank you. The only thing to add is that I have completed the student fee slate. I'll be sending it to all presidents. I expect feedback tonight, because I see you all on your computers right now. Groups such as EngSoc that have a number of optional fees, please look over them to ensure group names are correct. For the student fee slate, we took off summer and spring fees. They weren't being properly assessed. Along with what Eril said, thanks for such a rewarding year.

**b. Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** Thanks. Two things quickly. Today I had my last meeting with the Board of Trustees. We made a draft statement for approval for May. Basically it's a university wide commitment for wellness and safety. Thanks to the incoming Campus Activities Commissioner, Michelle Charlton, who invited me to the new play of Spamalot. It was really good. Now, since Eril and Nicola both thanked you, I guess I have to. This has been my second year on assembly. It's been such a great year. I know what it's like. I hope you have great years in the future, wherever you may be. Hope you've had a great year.

## **6. Board of Director's Report**

**Chairman Garcia:** Nothing much to add. I want to highlight that we approved the AMS specific framework. We'll be monitoring progress in the coming year. There is a transition day tomorrow with incoming members of the board. Our last meeting is April 10<sup>th</sup>. It was a very successful year, with the salary grid, AMS specific free, et cetera. Thanks to the executives. I worked closely with Nicola, but I was able to see the hard work that every executive put forth to make this university a better place. Thanks to the board.

## **7. Student Senator's Report**

**Senator Duchaine:** Hi. First of all, thank you everybody for welcoming me at various assemblies. I'm going to formally introduce my successor. I'm excited for Eric. He's a second year SGPS member within the school of computing. I think he brings a great deal of broad perspective to the chair. Congrats to the new vice chair. She'll do great work. A bit more about my report. EngSoc, I don't know if you read it, I want to stress that the dean of your faculty was persistent that you need a thirteen week term. She stated that she had been consulting students about this, and apparently students are overwhelmingly supportive of this. I don't think that's entirely accurate. If you have other statistics, I encourage you to bring those forward. If you want, I will counsel you to take that up with her. I know it can be intimidating, especially when starting out, to meeting with the dean or the head of program about these issues. You can't say, "Yo,



you're doing this thing that I don't like, but you're big and powerful and rich and know a lot more than I do". Sometimes they yell. It's scary. You need to reflect more broadly that it's sad. We're speaking for students that we represent. We make decisions that impact the lives of thousands. Like thirteen week terms. On the issue of issues, I was forwarded an email with an agenda for the committee on academic development numbers for 2015/ 2016. Some faculties are increasing at an alarming and unsustainable rate. Without calling names, the most number of this is in arts and science, applied science, engineering. For engineering, they've capped enrolment at 682. They'll be going up to, one second, I have the number.

**AMS Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** Point of information, it increases by fifty.

**Senator Duchaine:** ArtSci will be increasing by 350, but that number will be closer to 400. I'm disappointed that they're continuing to increase enrolment after such a strong feedback from students. This will put a strain on all services. We drafted a motion to the ArtSci faculty board that changes must be approved before going to strategic enrolment board. We don't have the opportunity to critique this. This is a massive oversight of the university. We need to look at the actual impact that this will have. I will be meeting at 10:00AM tomorrow with them. I'll be meeting with the dean of ArtSci about this, and the incoming ASUS president about my concerns specifically for the faculty for ArtSci as the main driver for this increase. I don't think this will be enough to stop the increase. Being totally candid, I'm leaving Queen's in twenty four days. I'm totally down to rattle some bangs before I go. I'm not sure how confidential the figures are. I'm going to assume that because these three bodies are all advertising and talking about these numbers, I assume they're supposed to be public. If not, then woopsies. Bye, I'll miss you all.

## **8. Rector's Report**

**Rector Francis:** I would like to say a few things. First, thanks to the exec for the work you've done this year. I think it's almost timely hearing Isabelle's remarks about the new numbers in enrolment that they're projecting. Clearly there's still distrust between student leaders and administration. They've told us multiple times that they won't be increasing enrolment. We were told that they would be dedicating spaces to upper years in residence. This is a huge slap in the face to us. This is such a strain on the new residences. This is the problem we discussed in the fall. I want to highlight, one of the most meaningful events of the year is the alumni awards gala. Rico Garcia is receiving the student award. He's already received the Tricolour Award. I will refer to him in my report. Last thing, as some people said, this is my last assembly. I've seen some of the most horrific debate happen, and I've seen people cry and laugh. This year was one of the best years I've seen on assembly, and I'm not just saying that.

## **9. Student Trustee's Report**

**Trustee Aulhouse:** My term doesn't end until Spring 2015, so I'll be here next year. No goodbyes for me. I'll go over the things I'll be doing before September. First week of May, there's a Board of Trustees meeting. It will be the first meeting for incoming Rector Young. We will have a board retreat in Toronto over the summer. We'll be talking about challenges facing



Queen's. Over the summer, I'll sit on the senate board retreat planning committee. I'm looking forward to making that more productive. Although it's not my final assembly, I know it's the final assembly and weeks of many people here. I just want to make a quick statement on people who are invaluable, not only to Queen's, be to me. These three individuals impacted my time at Queen's University. Nick Francis has greatly impacted me. I don't know what I can say about him. He came into this position, a job that everyone has gotten burned for, and he revolutionized the office. I value the work that he's done. He's a role model for me, and I would have been so lost at the Board of Trustee meetings if it wasn't for him. Now, throwing back to second year. I've seen the work that Eril has done. I was a naive senator, and he was the caucus chair. I've been so impressed over the past two years with the work that he has done, but also his humility in doing the work. The work he has done this year has been incredible. The AMS has been lucky to have him. After first year, Rico Garcia, I would not be here without him. When I was in first year, I was his intern when he was ASUS President. I looked up to him. I'm honoured to call him a friend. He's one of the best AMS Presidents we've ever almost had. I will miss him next year. You guys will all go on to do incredible things. Thanks so much.

## **10. Statements by Members**

**AMS Commissioner of Municipal Affairs Wright:** Now, onto a scene change. On behalf of the MAC, I want to recognize Heather with the Civic Responsibility Award. She has made a significant contribution to the Kingston community. Heather was the United Way co-chair in the 2011/ 2012 year. She has done a great job in her outreach to students. Her work on the United Way committee was appreciated, gaining great reviews from the United Way branch. She was also the Deputy Affairs Commissioner last year. She welcomes over one hundred people to Queen's campus. Now, in her final year, she volunteers with Telephone Aid Line Kingston, or TALK. Heather has done a fantastic job. I'm honoured to present this award to her. I'd appreciate it if we could give her a warm, standing ovation.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** This has been a concern brought forward by students. This is in relation to the MIAS motion of last assembly. In the online forum Reddit, a member of assembly made a discussion post asking people on the Internet how they should vote. Students have come to me upset about this. You're accountable to your constituents, not the internet. People are concerned about this being on an online forum. It is a post made by a voting member. I will not say names, because this is an issue between the member and the president of the faculty society, but it was inappropriate. If you're concerned about how you should vote, talk to students, talk to your faculty.

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** Given this is the end of the year, the presidents and I would like to say a few words. We have been doing our best to navigate policies and bring forward thoughtful discussion to our faculties and societies over the past year. It has been difficult. We could not have been luckier to have a better leader guiding us. He's always quick to respond and help us with our individual issues. His wisdom was critical to us. We want to leave him, the president of all the presidents, a gift from all of us, from all of our societies and faculties.

**AMS President Berkok:** I don't know how to respond. I'll try my best. I want to thank everyone.



**Chairman Garcia:** Point of order, he wasn't called upon to talk!

**AMS President Berkok:** Thanks to all the presidents that I've worked with. It's been a fantastic few years working with the presidents caucus. This year has truly been the best. It's the most cohesive group I've had the pleasure of working with. It's been such a pleasure to serve all of you guys. I don't know what exactly this is, but I'm excited to find out.

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** Open it!

**Residence Society President Daya:** Open it!

**AMS President Berkok:** Oh my god, it's a pocket watch that says "president of the presidents".

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Yeah, so it's my last assembly, I want to stand up and say a few words. Thanks everyone for making this year really fantastic. I came into the realm of student politics after being really upset with it over the course of my first year. I could not be happier that I got involved. For those of you who don't know, I'm going to take over something that's been a running joke at this assembly. I'm taking over the Tartan. We're accepting applications for assistant editor. Few people I want to thank are Scott and Irfan. They mentored me into this position and taught me a lot throughout my time on ASUS. Thanks for being a fantastic exec team. Next is Rector Francis. I met him at QMP for the first time this year. He's someone I can talk to, and he's a role model for me. Senator Duchaine, the first week I sat on ASUS assembly, she invited us all to QP to talk to her about an issue going on. Unfortunately, I was not 19, so she changed plans and took me to Cogro. Her dedications and commitment is something we should all strive to achieve. Isabelle, thanks for all of your mentorship, you leadership, and everything you've given to the Queen's community.

**ASUS Representative Wiseman:** Firstly, I'd like to commend Director Reekie on his new look tonight. Secondly, I have a box of Oreos, tweet me at jonwiseman if you would like them. More serious business, this is my last AMS assembly this year as a voting member. Thanks to everyone here at assembly for what has been an awesome year. There are many people who have influenced me this year. If I were to thank everyone, it would take a long time. This is probably the highlight of my year so far. I can look back at this thirty years from now and say, "Hey, I did something great". Thanks to the exec on the publication in the Queen's Journal. We cannot let these institutions be taken out of the hands of students. Cha Gheill to everybody.

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** I am honestly not sure about why people aren't happy about leaving assembly. I'm not upset. We just should recognize a person tonight. I think she deserves a huge round of applause. She's been here from the beginning to the very end, and she's always here early, and that's our scribe, Samantha Sibley. Her minutes are always detailed. She works hard to create a record of what we do here, and that preserves everything that's said at assembly.

**Director McDonald:** I have one question for co-worker for Reekie. As you can see, he's wearing a tiara. Why?



**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** That's for question period.

**Social Issues Commissioner Williams:** Next week, there's a launch party- it's April 8<sup>th</sup> at 3pm. It's completely gorgeous, and I'm really happy with it. If you have anybody in mind for the Robert Sutherland award or anti oppression award, please let me know!

**Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainability Robinson:** On April 13<sup>th</sup>, we'll be walking around the district picking up garbage released by the melting snow. If anybody wants to help out, that would be a fun thing to do.

**MBA Representative Drever:** A lot of people are saying goodbye, I will take a tad bit longer. Two things, first of all, the definition of magic. I know that sounds strange. The definition was taught to me this year. It's about turning an idea into reality. The MBA students are only here for a year. It goes quick for us. Some people would say we're shooting stars. Here's what it comes down to. Rector Francis and Berkok has said it to me a couple of times. In the past, MBA has had little involvement in the AMS and assembly, and I apologize for that. I apologize for my previous alumni and faculty. We need your help in the future. Going forward, we need you to call upon us. Help us help you. We have a lot to help you with but we don't know it. To turn these ideas into reality, we need to be collaborative. To get back to this shooting star bit. All of you here tonight, all of your classmates, you guys are the stars that light up the sky. You're the reason people look up. For that, the MBA has come here tonight. Thanks for an amazing year. God bless. Keep it up.

## **11. Question Period**

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** I have a question to Director Reekie, I noticed you're wearing a tiara from the play Frozen. I want to know which princess in Frozen he is supposed to be. Why the one princess? Why not the other?

**Director Reekie:** It is Anna. I am Anna, not Elsa. I'm a huge Frozen fan. It was a transition gift given to me by President Marshall. I'm wearing it after a request by Nicola Plummer for \$20.

**Rector Francis:** In light of hearing about the increase in enrolment targets, I have some questions for the AMS exec. In light of this, what are the next steps? What can we be doing? I'm looking for some sort of concrete strategy for what's next.

**AMS President Berkok:** I'm a member of the strategic enrolment management group. My impression going into it was there would be more consultation with all members of the groups. It's composed of all deans, the AMS, and a few provosts. My impression was there being more consultation before it was shuttled off. It was an expedited timeline. There was not a lot of chance for us to get our opinion in. As for next steps, I think there are two angles. Isabelle is following up through ArtSci channel. Second is central service. We need to evaluate if we can support this increase. Will this be too much of a strain on our services?

**Rector Francis:** I have a follow up. Are we okay with these increased numbers? Do we want



more students? Do we know how services can supply? Do we want that happening? If we do, what the hell is the mandate of the strategic enrolment management group? There was no consultation done when they brought up the residences. I'm not getting upset at you. I'm just upset. I know you and Arig sit on this group. Has there been discussion about consultation with constituents? Were we ever supposed to know about this before it came to senate?

**AMS President Berkok:** There are a few circumstances given under the final meeting. We received the agenda twenty-five hours before the meeting. The agenda was a seventy page document. By the time the meeting took place, there was no time for consultation. This is not a done issue. There are members around this table that will work through it.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** I want to point out that this is all confidential. I will ask if we can move this into a closed session discussion topic. I have a lot of thoughts, but I don't want them in the minutes right now.

**Senator Duchaine:** If we can add in the minutes explicitly that I was the one who brought up the numbers and information on this. If there are any issues with confidentiality, I'll deal with that.

**Rector Francis:** The AMS stance on increased enrolment, as I understood, was that we cannot increase this anymore. You mentioned a shared services perspective, do we support this? If there is support from the shared services, do we still want this?

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** Our stance wasn't that we don't absolutely want more students. Just that each student that comes here needs to have the same opportunities, the same experiences. We need to ensure we have supports available for everyone. This includes having upper years in residence, having grad students in residence, the HCDS. It isn't just about dealing with more people on campus. There are a lot of nuances in the Artsci numbers that may change perspective with how students are coming to campus. If we're looking at students as well, certainly we looked at capacity in a big way. We didn't think the campus could accommodate that many people. We want the students to have the same body of experience. I do have more to say on that, there was a report released that I've been working diligently. I think we could discuss that offline or in a closed discussion topic. As a jumping off piece for that.

**Rector Francis:** Just my last question, clarification on the process, with the agenda we heard from Senator Duchaine, if that is passed at senate committee, does that mean that the 2015 year will have a final decision on the enrolment numbers?

**Senator Duchaine:** The term used is "projected intake". For example, the Bader International Centre says they want 120 students to attend the Castle Program, but last year they only had 103. I'm sure Eril can clarify.

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

**MOTION THREE:** That Assembly raise from the table the motion to approve the Orientation Roundtable (ORT) budget for 2014, as seen on the Assembly Dropbox, to be



**included in the Campus Activities Commission budget for 2014 – 2015.**

Moved by: Campus Activities Commissioner Gareth Savage

Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

**AMS Campus Activities Commissioner Savage:** So, there are three budgets up for debate tonight. The first one is the ORT budget. The budget has been in the Dropbox for over a week. I'll give a highlight about it. Why are we passing orientation budgets now? This has to do with the timeline of orientation planning. Unlike the rest of the AMS, the chairs of orientation committees are hired between November and January. We need to make sure the funding is approved so they can use the money in September. Really, they have to be passed for the summer. This is the last opportunity we have for debate on this. If you have any concerns with the budgets, we need to reconcile those tonight. I'll direct your attention to a couple things. In the ORT budget, consolidated page, the first sheet there, there's a good overview of the content, highlighting the general operating expenses and leader training. The allocation from assembly only goes towards those two parts. That's because the concert revenue is from ticket sales. Faculty expense, to explain how that works; one of the functions of ORT is a means of resource sharing throughout orientation week. University resources are shared efficiently throughout the week. This ensures that everyone has what they need throughout the week. Everything is built by ORT. They seek out sponsorships that subsidize those costs. It's done through the ORT coordinator, working full time to make sure we can subsidize those costs as much as possible. Not much else to note. Just wanted to convey the structure. I'm happy to answer questions. I know Erin Mcguire can answer questions, too.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** I just visited the link, and it's a dead link. Is there a new link?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** I sent another one out. I can do that again. I sent a Dropbox link two weeks ago. The one I sent on Monday works. It's a different link.

**Campus Activities Commissioner Savage:** I just opened it and it worked.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Point of information, we need to vote on raising this first, then debate it.

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** Motion to raise motions 3,4,5 from the table?

*Seconded by Brendan Goodman.*

*Carries.*

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** I'm just wondering, why instead of having an assembly allocation, which in the bid scheme of thing is small, is there no opportunity to increase revenue from other sources, like concert revenue?

**Campus Activities Commissioner Savage:** Can you clarify that?

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** It's \$30,000 out of \$200,000 budget.

**Campus Activities Commissioner Savage:** The reason being, half of those expenses are directly



being replaced by the frosh fees, leader fees, et cetera. They are internal operating expenses. This is the same rationale behind training. What complicates the budget is the faculty revenue streams. It's important for the sake of transparency. The \$30,000 is divided straight down the middle, between general operating and training. This is something we can't afford just through faculty fees.

**Vice President of Operations Plummer:** Point of personal privilege, I know this is something in my budget presentation in the fall, and there were a lot of questions from EngSoc. This is something that we need to look at critically. If you haven't looked at the budget, please take five minutes to look through it. I don't want you to pass it, then come back and critically question it.

*Motion (3) carries.*

**MOTION FOUR: That Assembly raise from the table the motion to approve the New Exchange and Worldly Transfer Students (NEWTS) budget for 2014, as seen on the Assembly Dropbox, to be included in the Campus Activities Commission budget for 2014 – 2015.**

Moved by: Campus Activities Commissioner Gareth Savage

Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Point of order, can we vote to raise it from the table first?

**Speaker:** We did.

**Campus Activities Commissioner Savage:** I want to highlight a few things. It looks different from the ORT budget. I want to ensure that you're looking at the final version two budget. Our budget almost doubled overnight from incoming students on exchange from the school of business. It's shown a lot of potential for growth. A couple things, first of which is the line that appears under actuals and budgeted amounts. You'll see in budgeted amounts from last year, it's empty. It was never built into the subsidy. I don't know why; it throws off the budgeting. It's going to really, pretty much guarantees you'll have a surplus left over. It makes things more transparent. It's a considerable amount of revenue; it's more than the allocation from assembly is. That amount is going against the ORT costs. It's something I wanted to highlight, but for the sake of transparency for budgeting, it's more accurate to ensure we're getting to zero at the end of orientation. You'll notice a lot of the expenses are significantly high. They'll be experiencing a lot of growth this year. If there are specific questions, the NEWTS chair and Head Gecko are at the back. Please defer questions there.

*Motion (4) carries.*

**MOTION FIVE: That Assembly raise from the table the motion to approve the First Years Not in Residents (FYNIRS) budget for 2014, as seen on the Assembly Dropbox, to be included in the Campus Activities Commission**

Moved by: Campus Activities Commissioner Gareth Savage



Seconded by: Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

**AMS Campus Activities Commissioner Savage:** Hello again. This is the third and final budget for tonight. I want to draw your attention to this line. It was previously absent from other budgets. This is different from other orientations because it's an extended thing throughout the year. This is more of a program than a week of orientation. It's a committee that runs throughout the year. The committee also runs a series of small events throughout the year. Not much to add here except another new source of revenue; the alumni dinner tickets, the dinner and clubs presentations. That's really all I have to say. Particular questions can go to the co-chair in the gallery.

*Motion (5) carries.*

**MOTION SIX: That AMS Assembly approve the amendments to the AMS Constitution, as seen in Appendix A: Billz and Budgets.**

Moved by: Vice President of Operations Nicola Plummer

Seconded by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** This is just a second reading of the constitutional changes that came from last assembly. Questions? I can answer them.

*Motion (6) carries.*

### **13. New Business**

**MOTION SEVEN: That the AMS Assembly ratify William Simonds as the Judicial Affairs Director for the 2014 – 2015 year.**

Moved by: Member at Large & Incoming Commissioner of Internal Affairs Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Member at Large & Vice President of University Affairs Elect Philip Lloyd

**Member at Large Cathro:** I'll get Will to come up here. Throughout the hiring process, he demonstrated a lot of knowledge of the Judicial Affairs pillars. We're looking forward to having him on the other side of the table. He'll do a good job in the investigatory job as the Judicial Affairs Director. We'll do two questions.

**Member at Large Young:** What is one skill that you will bring to this position?

**Member at Large Simonds:** Well, it's more of a quality than a skill, but true understanding of the Queen's history, empathy towards students and bringing the understanding of the history as an institution to have a successful NAD system, understanding of the circumstances and needs of the students. I want to bring my non adversarial manner to the pillars of the system.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Why is it important that NAD is peer run? What issues do you foresee regarding peer run NAD in your term?



**Member at Large Simonds:** It's important because no one other than students can understand best what we're going through right now. If you're an admin and you receive a student that has made an infraction, you're more punitive. The time since you were that age is long gone, so you'll have a different perspective. If you're a student administering this to a peer you will see the issues that drove them to do this. You can ensure restorative measures to ensure this won't happen again. We need to keep this a peer administered system. It allows us as a community to set the line of appropriate versus inappropriate. If an administrator is doing that, they're overstepping. We should be deciding that as a student community, what we want to accept, and what we want to represent us.

*Motion (7) carries.*

**MOTION EIGHT: That the AMS Assembly ratify the decision of the Commission of Internal Affairs to grant the Queen's Genetically Engineered Machine Team an exception to the AMS Constitution section 7.01.09, as outlined in the AMS Constitution section 7.01.10, as seen in Appendix B: QGEM**

Moved by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

Seconded by: Member at Large Clare Bekenn

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** So, myself and Vice President Pritchard reviewed their application and saw nothing wrong. The main reason for approving them is that they do not have a student fee that would be directed to these positions. The agreement if they brought this forth was that if they ever got a student fee, it could not go towards this payment. I will pass my speaking rights over to the club representative that is here.

**Member at Large Chan:** Thanks, Kristen. I'm Matthew. We're the only student run research team within the AMS. We participate in competitions at MIT. In this competition, we'll be genetically creating microorganisms at an event that hosts over 200 international teams. It's relevant because it is student led, and has a multidisciplinary nature. You know what it means to be student led. You're the oldest student government around. You know how important it is for students to collaborate to bring ideas to the tables. Undergrad research is discouraging; I don't get the chance to design my own products or research. I don't have the opportunities to design my research. Most of the innovative things come from students who have a wide variety of expertise and experience. They make creative solutions to these problems. To talk about the point of order, the proposal, we're requesting an exemption that stipulates that we cannot serve members with remuneration. What we offer to AMS is valuable. Without salaries, we restrict the number of potential applicants. People who need to work to pay rent, groceries, tuition, this restricts them from applying. We want to make it financially accessible.

**Senator Duchaine:** Thanks for coming to AMS assembly. I know I see you working at Cogro quite a bit, it's nice to see you out of there and in my zone. I know what it means to be part of clubs, unfortunately I have not had a lot of opportunity. My parents made a large contribution to my studies, but I know a lot of students do not have the opportunity to join clubs that do not have financial remunerations. I think this is important to making these positions accessible to all



students.

*Motion (8) carries.*

**MOTION NINE: That the AMS Assembly approve the removal of AMS Policy Manual 2, Section 4, Part E, as seen in Appendix B: AMS Membership Bursary.**

Moved by: Vice President of Operations Nicola Plummer

Seconded by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** You may recall me talking about making this bursary a fund. This is taking it out of our policies. It's no longer a contribution from the AMS specific fee. Next week, we'll pass a motion to turn this into a restricted fund. The AMS membership bursary will be included in the general bursary. The exec believes that this is good. Student Awards is better equipped to do this. Money to support this is uncollected student fees. This year it was \$40,000. This initiative can be supported for at least eight years given this number. This is removing the policy from Policy Manual 2, and it will be added to board manual policy.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Are there any concerns with this not being passed at the board? If so, would it come back to us?

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** I mean, potentially the board could not pass that. Even if it doesn't pass, I think this should still be removed. We could still continue with this bursary.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Follow up, if the board were to not approve it, would the \$5,000 be a limbo? Who would decide what is done?

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** If board doesn't pass it, I would recommend to Justin to add it to the budget anyway and follow up in the fall. No matter which way, the policy would have to be removed. We're not equipped to work with this bursary.

*Motion (9) carries.*

**MOTION TEN: That AMS Assembly approve the amendments to AMS Policy Manual 1, Section 2, Part A: Assembly Policies, as seen in Appendix C: FISCAL AWARENESS**

Moved by: Member at Large Mark Godin

Seconded by: Vice President of Operations Nicola Plummer

**Member at Large Godin:** This is in response to a lot of discussion about creeping growth to the society, which is driven to increase fees. There is a general lack of financial awareness. This is designed to complement things like the assembly finance committee. Anytime there are financial implications, like adding committees, the financial number must be added in a motion. This motion won't impact us today, but hopefully over five years, you will see a difference.



*Motion (10) carries.*

**MOTION ELEVEN: That the AMS Assembly approve the Student Senate Caucus Policy, as seen on the Assembly Dropbox.**

Moved by: AMS President Eril Berkok

Seconded by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

**AMS President Berkok:** For the better part of a year now, we've been crafting this at caucus. This would make it an actual body. Right now, the only mention of the caucus was limited to a few lines, and it definitely doesn't talk about the expectations of how it's supposed to be run. This discusses membership, responsibilities, elections, and the removal of the chair and vice chair. This is a joint policy, as it was already passed by student senate caucus. Hopefully, changes will be done in tandem with each other. If there are amendments here, we'll have to make them at other bodies as week. I hope you pass it here.

**Senator Duchaine:** This is the absolute the worst thing ever. No, no, I'm just kidding. I want to say that this passed unanimously. It has so much time put into it. It provides much needed clarification to what senators do. Senate is a non-constituency representational duty. When I'm acting as a senator, I'm not supposed to think about the students. I'm supposed to think about the best interest for Queen's University. It doesn't matter if it will screw over students or faculties. Personally, I think what's good for Queen's as a whole is also good for all students. Like the chair of the board says, you need to check your constituency at the door. It means that I'm not accountable to the AMS, or Scott, or Irfan, or ASUS, similar to how you're responsible. You can't make a motion here to make me vote a certain way at Senate. That's not how it works. That being said, often we'll historically search for feedback. We've been open with engaging with students who elected us. It says we're continually bound by your policies. There's a section in ASUS that says if a member is absent for three assemblies, then there's a motion for their impeachment. Because we're members of ASUS assembly, we fall under that. It's a loophole about overall responsibility. Could EngSoc try to get rid of their senators? Maybe-ish. That would come with a challenge to the charter of the university. Further on to that, there were discussions to segregate trustee and senator elections from faculty elections. I was against that. I think a lot of students get engaged on various issues, and contributing to them is good. I thought, "No man, that's not cool". Senators work quite hard. It's just the odd fixing of how they fit into your assemblies. This clarifies the chair and vice chair, what we do, what we should do. This is good to provide framework in our work as representatives at Queen's University.

**Rector Francis:** Briefly, sitting on this for years, this is a huge improvement. I remember the day Eril started putting this policy together. Congrats. This is one of the legacies you leave. Though it may not be one of the flashiest ones, it impacts a lot.

**Member at Large Young:** I've had a few interactions with the importance of this senate body. I think student senators will maintain a crucial student voice in the coming years. To make their jobs more codified is a very timely change considering the issues facing us from administration today.



*Motion (11) carries.*

**MOTION TWELVE: That Assembly approve that \$10,000 from the Special Projects line item of the Vice President University Affairs Assembly allocation be provided to the Queen's Summer Innovation Initiative in the form of stipends for the 2014 cohort.**

Moved by: Academic Affairs Commissioner Allison Williams

Seconded by: Commissioner of Internal Affairs Kristen Olver

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** I sent out a letter to everyone that outlined this further. Hopefully your presidents have more background on this. First thing, yes, it's \$10,000. It's coming from the line item from assembly allocation. This is what's left in that budget line. It would have gone unspent. It's not beneficial for us to have money carry over. This money would go towards the stipends. If you recall when working on the innovation policy, this opens up access. This is one of the major expenditures. It costs \$13,000 to put one student through. It's not that we'd be funding a certain number of students, just the stipends. The group is in an interesting financial place. They're about to gain a large amount of money to carry them forward, but they're having difficulty before they get there. Through donations and funding, they can barely get there. This is pulling away from the operating funding of these student's academics, because they have to work. This is in our policy, in line with that. The AMS doesn't have that much programming for students engagement in entrepreneurship. This isn't a group that is going away. If we're doing activities to the government, out funding will become through that. This group is provincially recognized. Moving forward, we have raised concerns in the past. It's something we need to have a stake in. It's something that we can effectively speak on. Now is the moment for us to get involved. To ensure that it's doing importance, serve all students. I'm happy to take questions.

**Rector Francis:** I'm really delirious; I'm trying to track this. Can you clarify why the AMS feels this is the best use of this money, to go towards a division of the university that can apply for grants and get funding from other sources? Why is this the best use of this money? I understand that this is for the innovation piece. I'm asking this as a general question so we can get debate.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** There is no other use for that money. In terms of why, as I said, innovation and entrepreneurship has an increasing appetite. Students want to engage in it. The AMS has not been well placed to provide that. This organization provides funding, training, and resources that can assist students moving forward in that particular field of learning. It separates the initiative from the connector. The connector should be institutionally funded. As we've said, QIC has gotten revenue. I would say the QSII is an offshoot of that. I would say that while the campus linked accelerator is something that shouldn't be directly funded, I think the branch should be. We are not in a position to serve our students directly. I think it's important to come forward with statements. This would be a substantial player on campus. The province will follow these groups for what they provide students on campus. They have to play a larger role because that's what we've told the province. It would ensure that we leave more on the table for discussion on how it should grow and evolve.

**Rector Francis:** Point of information, clarification. So, does the problem you're trying to fix be



the inclusion of other faculties? This money would be ensuring that if a nursing student applies, that they're accepted. Would the AMS money sponsor that student?

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** Nursing students are not included in this. The students that are assured are Engineering, Applied Science, and Commerce.

**Member at Large Godin:** This is a big touch point for engineering students. I've had the pleasure of working with this for the past two years. I think Alli has learned a lot over the past year about entrepreneurship. I think this would be a great opportunity to inject money into this to have a say at the table. The people are intelligent. I like what they have in front of them. We should bring a student voice with a dollar attached to it.

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** I have full confidence that they'll use this funding beneficially for a lot of students. However, I'm wary about the fact that, I feel that in funding them, we might be funding an initiative that the university might not fund in the first place. Essentially, we're just paying QSII for a seat at the table, for a voice, and that's not right.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** I'll separate this once again. It's a thought conversation because they are linked. QIC should be funded. They are substantive in their role on campus. But this money would be exclusively going to QSII. I don't believe they should fundamentally be funded by the university. The money they have is funding from alumni. This is an initiative that follows the QIC branch. Because it was so linked to QSII in the beginning, they are tied to each other, but they'll move into a partner initiative. Again, I would say that the AMS should not be funding QIC. The university has committed to the idea that this is important moving forward. This allows students to launch a start-up. It's a bit smaller, but it's a little niche. That's how I envisioned it.

**Chairman Garcia:** We discussed this at the last board meeting. Up to the motion, it was a discussion of \$8000. We wanted to hear discussions and opinions from assembly members, then we would address this at the board meeting. I want to hear pros and cons. I do have a conflict of interest. I'm not speaking for or against it. I would like to see a little more discussion.

**Senator Duchaine:** I'm going to ask Garcia what the thoughts of the AMS board was. My concern is buying a seat at the table. It sets a dangerous precedent. The university is asking us to take part in the discussion, but we need to pay them for it. We give them money from student fees already. I don't have a broad perspective in terms of what the AMS should be doing with their money. I understand that we should always have a seat at the table because we pay money for tuition.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** This is not something that our money will be going to. This is beyond bias. This allows the AMS to provide funding to a part of our organizations not receiving as much. It can provide substantive benefit, but is not currently getting that. We don't provide an opportunity like this, but when we are evaluating a valuable opportunity, we should support them. We need to see how we can support this, and shape its evolution in a certain direction. There are other reasons other than buying a seat to get involved in this.



**ASUS President Mason:** Given the fact that QSII is fully funded this summer, where is this money going to go?

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** That's not been clarified.

**ASUS President Mason:** Follow up, from my perspective. QIC approached ASUS a few months ago saying that they need money. It's my understanding that they got money from ArtSci and got the remaining money from a private donor.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** They have some moving money that may have gone towards stipends.

**ASUS President Mason:** So, this money is not going to stipends?

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** They had other moving money allocated to stipends, now they can put money towards other things.

**Aesculapian Representative Broussanko:** What's the time frame for diverting these funds elsewhere? Obviously we can't do it at this meeting, but what about a special meeting? Given that this money can't carry over and it has to be spent, how long do we have to get rid of it?

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** So, the money in that budget line is for a specific project that did not come through due to obstacles. It will be an advantage fund application. At this point, it's not earmarked for anything else. There's not a project that will come up in the next twenty days that would cost that much money. This is the only real push about where to put it.

**Aesculapian Representative Broussanko:** We're being given the ultimatum of "fund this or nothing". I'm wondering if it's better to fund nothing.

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** We budget money to spend. If you don't spend it, it just doesn't get spent. Ideally, it's nice to have that money earmarked for a certain project to go towards something else.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** I find this concerning. Just because "one of our projects wasn't completed" due to barriers, it's assumed that we'll just move the money to buy a seat at a table that might give students benefit. That's not something we should set a precedent in doing. We'll give you money to sit at a table with you. It doesn't make sense. They already have funding. We're saying "don't worry about the students; put that money towards something else".

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** The policy we just passed last assembly means that we can move the money around in that way. We agreed on it. Secondly, we're not paying money for the table. This provides a lot of negatives. This is something the AMS can't support.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Point of information, it should be noted that there have been undertakings that have been done that has given them money.



**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** Point of information, my last point was that this is related. Without the allocation of the money, this program cannot run if they get this. We're saying we recognize this money to fundamentally exist. You need more money than just paying students. Yes, it makes sense to say that we're paying students. There's a certain amount that goes to students. They don't have stipends secured for next year.

**NSS President Walsh:** Clarification, I realize that there isn't a need for the money this year, but what happens if we don't give them money? Does it just roll into next year and give it to a new project?

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** It's the same way that a federal government would work. You see them at the end of a fiscal year spending money. This would just be posted into the operating fund.

**Residence Society President Daya:** I would like to pass my speaking rights to Rector Francis.

**Rector Francis:** Two things. First is a point of information. Could you clarify that again?

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** Basically, we can't roll over that money. It will sit in an account somewhere. It might not even be cash; it might be accounts receivable. It would be written off as a surplus. I can't explain this again. Okay, so yes, at a snapshot in time on May 1<sup>st</sup>, we have a surplus, but that's only for a second. We have money going in and out. We wouldn't be able to operate during the summer without that extra money. Our operating fund acts as an internal reserve, we can't borrow from a bank, so this is our bank. You can't get that money back. It's retained earnings. In a corporation, that would become retained earnings. Our retained earnings is the operating fund.

**Chairman Garcia:** Advantages?

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** Funds are pooled together. The fund can be used as a one-time donation to a project or program that benefits all AMS members.

**Chairman Garcia:** That's where the second part of the funding would come from?

**Rector Francis:** My concern with this is that the program this summer is fully funded. What I'm sensing is that this contribution is to buy a seat at the table. If it is, the precedent we set is that we give the university money in exchange for a voice. This goes off of the discussion about the distrust between admin and student. Can we really trust them that they'll give us a seat at the table?

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** Point of information, to clarify, the program is not fully funded. The stipends are. It costs more money to run the program. Based on info given to me, the program needs more money, but they have stipends. If this doesn't pass, they just don't get the money. The second portion is that this is contingent about a partnership agreement. This would mean that now our logo is on their stuff. What I would say is that it gets us a seat at the



table, but we can work with them moving forward. It's outlined in this agreement. The money is specifically earmarked for the stipends so they are fully funded. President Mason is correct, those sports are fully funded. That was part of the board motion.

**Academic Affairs Commissioner Williams:** In closing, I don't have much more to say. This is one area where we can support an area of student life that we don't have a lot of coverage in. There is a lot of appetite for this. We have the policy and stance approved, but we don't have a way for the AMS to engage. This way, we could participate. It makes sense for us to do this in this manner. It's more QSII, a smaller program, which happens to be associated with QIC.

*Motion (12) carries.*

**MOTION THIRTEEN: 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.**

Moved by: AMS Vice President of University Affairs Thomas Pritchard

Seconded by: AMS President Eril Berkok

Appendix L: Running in Elections

**2.02.03** Incumbent members of the AMS Executive shall not be eligible to run for re-election but shall be eligible to run in a subsequent year. The AMS Human Resources Officer, Assembly Speaker/Chief Electoral Officer, Chief Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officers\*\*\* shall not be eligible to run for an AMS Executive position in the academic year in which they hold or have held that position.

\*\*\*Amended in September by Assembly to include the Commissioner of Internal Affairs.

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** As I explained when I added this to the agenda, this was tabled very early in Assembly. It is concerning who can run and who can't run in elections. We initially put forth two motions; a constitutional change and policy change circulating the CEO, CRO, and DRO job descriptions. It failed. This motion was tabled. This motion changes the policy, Kristen sent it out. Already in policy, the human resources officer and executive cannot run in an upcoming election for AMS executive. You could not quit then run. You can't be HRO, then in October decide to quit then run and leave us incapacitated. We motioned to add the CEO, CRO, and DRO added to that policy. They cannot run in elections. Assembly added the CIA to that. I think it's pretty straight forward where it's at. I look forward to discussion.

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** Amendment to the motion, addition at the end of the policy to read faculty societies?

**AMS President Berkok:** Friendly.

**Senator Duchaine:** I'd like to commend the exec on bringing this forward. I think this speaks to a gap we had in policy earlier. I think the judicial affairs director might be added to this list.



Would that be appropriate? Question to the CIA or VPUA.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** The JAD is not involved in elections at all. I don't think it would be appropriate to add them to this policy because they have nothing to do with this.

**Rector Francis:** Clarification, you said the JAD has zero involvement. Isn't in extreme cases when the CEO or CRO can't take on the election, does it not go to the judicial affairs committee? Can election issues not got to them?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** There's a difference between the judicial committee chair and the judicial affairs director. It's done by the CEO. If need be, they can consult anyone they wish. It literally can be anyone. JCOMM is involved as you can appeal the decision of the CEO to them, which is not related to the JAD.

**Member at Large Simonds:** I would just like to raise a point of concern with the amendment about barring the CIA from running. I'm worried that the amendment was added when the CIA ran in the same election period as the CEO last year. I think a lot of the issues and perceived issues that led to that amendment is a lack of knowledge of the CIA job duties. During election times, the CIA is fairly removed from the entire process. It is the CEO charged with the election. Having a CIA who runs in an AMS election, as long as the CEO is not running as well, there should not be any issues. I'm worried that we're throwing the baby out with the bathwater. The CIA is an experienced person, and I'm worried about the repercussions of not having a qualified person run.

**Member at Large Godin:** I want to make sure I'm responding. Point of order, what is the status of the amendment Hennick brought up?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Friendly.

**Member at Large Godin:** Two points. In regards to the CIA, I speak from experience. If the CEO is mandated to not run, there is no explicit need for the CIA to be present during elections. The CEO already has sufficient knowledge in the form of the executive and permanent staff members. There is other help there. The CIA is just advisory. I would like to amend to remove the CIA. I don't know how this works. I don't know if you can do that. It was amended to add it.

**Speaker:** Do I have a seconder?

*Secoded by: Broussanko*

**CESA President Marshall:** Point of information, who hires the election team?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** The head of the elections team is the CEO, elected by Assembly. The CRO is hired by the CIA and anyone else that is on the panel. Deputies are hired by CRO.

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** We're going to say not friendly. Not because we don't agree with it, just to have debate on it.



**CESA President Marshall:** Who hires the election team? Is that not a conflict? They're hiring an election team potentially working their election.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** It's in the same way that NAD is at arm's length from assembly. I hire the JAD, but I can't fire them. The point of elections is that if the commissioner was not there, the people of the elections team would not feel like their job was at risk. They are accountable to assembly, not the commissioner.

**Member at Large Godin:** Direct response: I think your concern was that the CIA in their election bit would have decision making over elections. The CRO has no decision making power. Speaker has the power vested in them by assembly.

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** I would like to echo Marshall's concerns. I think they're valid points. Having members of a team that have been hired by the CIA may create hesitancy for the opposing team to that of the CIA. I think you generally acknowledge that there's hesitancy with going to the HRO with employment grievance. The CIA indirectly hired JAD, and they hired the JComm chair. All of these people are accountable to the CIA. I think it's only appropriate for the CIA not to run in an election. The CIA is also an impeccable resource. I'm not saying that Cashier is not the best. Speaker Godin was great as the speaker, he didn't need the counsel or guidance of the CIA, but there might be a time in which there is guidance needed by the CIA.

**AMS Vice President of Operations Plummer:** In the interest of full disclosure, I ran with the CIA last year. Regardless of if you think he or she can run or not, there will always be a perceived optics issue. There will always be an inherent disadvantage for them running because someone will always bring it up. I feel like it's important. As someone who ran through a nightmare election with the CIA, it's really not easy. It's always an issue.

**Member at Large Sherman:** As another member with experience in this area, I'd say we tested it out. It was controversial at best. It raised questions about legitimacy. We see that perceived conflict of interest as actual conflict of interest. As long as they operate outside of the scope of the CIA, I think it will always be perceived as a conflict. If your students feel a conflict, that's something they have to consider. The CIA does sit on hiring panels for the DRO, though it is logistic. Having managed a campaign, our primary contact is the CRO or DRO. The only time we worked with the CEO is in major things. That's something to keep in mind, they were hired by the CIA.

**Rector Francis:** I take Plummer's point to be a fantastic point; the optics. My issue goes beyond that. I see it as a potential inhibitor for students to run. I think Chinniah's comments about the advisory role that the elections team can go to, it's under the CIA's job description to oversee elections. Even though there is a disincentive to run because of the optics, I wonder how much we should weigh that in our considerations for this amendment.

**Member at Large Young:** I think the trickiest part is if the CIA runs, is how will that position be handled?



**Member at Large Godin:** I would like to speak to my own amendment. Thanks to everyone for their opinions. I think we're getting tangled into the actual job description of the CIA. It's my opinion that the CIA doesn't have influence. They don't direct the elections, although it is perceived that way. I stand by my first statement. I don't think the CIA is important to elections. I don't think it would put the CIA at a disadvantage. There may be perceived conflicts of interest.

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** There are a lot of points about where the CIA is somehow touching elections. That makes me uncomfortable. Whether it's helping or acting as an advisor, it feels uncomfortable to have them participate in those elections. For that reason, I won't be voting in favour.

**Member at Large Simonds:** Going off of everyone's points, issues raised against this amendment are perceived conflicts of interest. They do not warrant the voting down of this amendment, rather a proactive separation from the CIA from the election at large. In regards to helping the perceived conflict to show that this is not true, that is a more productive stance. I want to reiterate, the CIA has huge amounts of experience that they can bring to the AMS.

**Speaker:** All for the motion to remove the CIA.

*Motion to amend fails.*

**Speaker:** Returning to debate on the original motion.

**Trustee Aulthouse:** I recall what I was going to say. More in terms of getting back to the speaker. I don't think it's just a conflict of interest. Their job is to run assembly and run elections. If they leave their position to pursue elections, it's just then leaving your job. They get elected to that position. The Head Gael doesn't bail on frosh week. For their integrity, they should be fulfilling their job. It's fifty percent of their job.

**Member at Large Godin:** I was only half way through my point. Second point to Hennick's amendments. I would like to oppose the amendment. I know it was accepted as friendly.

**Speaker:** We would require a motion to amend that because it was friendly.

**ASUS President Mason:** Point of information, Mark, could you restate the amendment?

**Member at Large Godin:** Hennick made an amendment to restrict them from running in faculty elections. I believe members can oppose a friendly ruling.

**Member at Large Young:** Point of order, would it not serve the same purpose to create the amendment to stimulate debate?

**ASUS President Mason:** I believe Godin is correct that if it is seconded, it can be visited.

**Member at Large Thompson:** If it's friendly to the mover, it's changed. Someone can motion to amend afterwards. You can motion to amend the motion in general.



**Member at Large Godin:** I would like to motion to remove the latest change to the motion.  
*Seconded by: Scott Mason*

**Speaker:** Opening debate on the motion to remove the amended section.

**Member at Large Young:** Point of information, can we get a ruling on the amendment.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** It was ruled friendly.

**Speaker:** Opening debate on the motion to remove the amended section moved by Hennick.

**Member at Large Godin:** I'm sorry, it's gotten terrifically messy. I wanted to open a conversation on this. I don't think it's the role of the AMS to create a mandate on running in faculty elections.

**Member at Large Young:** Point of order, I'm sorry. If Godin proposed an amendment, and it's friendly, we can't revisit it.

**Member at Large Sherman:** Want me to go tell him? I'll go tell him.

**Member at Large Thompson:** The amendment is friendly. If you disagree with it, you have to motion to remove the amendment.

**ASUS Representative Chinniah:** While I respect the autonomy of faculty societies, when one takes a job with the AMS, you make a commitment. You need to take a leave of absence to run in a faculty election that the AMS supervises. As a condition of taking employment within the AMS, you cannot leave to run in an election to what you're supposed to run. To those who have done that before, I hold nothing against you.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** I'm going to support this amendment. I think the AMS should not be mandating who gets to run in faculty elections. Responding to Chinniah's points, it's been stated. Although they are running the election, they're at arm's length. Once you get to faculties, you're further than that. For ASUS, we have our own people to deal with that. It's no longer just the AMS elections team involved, it's specific faculty teams. In the case of the CIA, they don't hire faculty elections teams. It makes no sense to bar the CIA from running in a faculty election.

**Rector Francis:** Point of information, clarification. In terms of the jurisdiction the AMS has in restricting their staff to run in an election, there is not legislation on that, but the faculty would have to bar them. Is that correct?

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** Basically, the point is we don't have jurisdiction over the faculty, but the positions. You would all be agreeing to that. That they should stay in the position and we can add that as a job requirement.

**Rector Francis:** Essentially, you're not meddling in the affairs of the faculties by doing this. Just



changing the job description. But if they wanted to, they could quit their jobs and run in an elections, unless the faculties prohibited them to. Just for clarification.

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** Theoretically, we have no control over that aspect. We can prevent them from running the AMS and trustee elections. If they quit and decide to run in one of your elections, they can't come back to their previous jobs. It would be up to you to see if we uphold our job description.

**ASUS President Mason:** I support this amendment. I think it's right that the speaker is banned. If you're administering an election, you shouldn't be eligible. However, I think faculties and societies are outside of the jurisdiction. I would like to reiterate that there will always be an issue with optics in running. I think we should keep in mind that the speaker is a volunteer position. There is no glamour associated with it. There is a long line of individuals who have been speakers and have gone for other positions. With careful planning, when I was AMS speaker and I ran for ASUS president, we arranged this with the CIA. I felt good as a speaker that I was still fulfilling my requirements.

**Member at Large Sherman:** Couple things. First was Goodman's remarks about conflict of interest. The faculties would be administering the elections. The issue is that they are doing a job, as ratified by this body, and they're taking away from an individual who could have fulfilled this job. I'm worried about things that will slip through the cracks by leaving their job. With the AMS not being able to meddle in the affairs of faculty/ societies, and maybe someone can clarify this, with constitutional amendment, faculties are bound by that. Would they not be bound by this because our constitution overrides theirs? We have people running for these positions, they are leaving their responsibilities, and leaving others to fill their spots. It's unfair. You have to fulfill the terms of this position. That is the nature of these unique positions. It requires those kind of job descriptions.

**CESA President Marshall:** I think the fact of the matter is that the speaker has taken on a position with an election responsibility. The AMS enjoys oversight on the faculty elections. We should not be making this amendment because three people have done this. There is always the issue of stepping down.

**Aesculapian Representative Broussanko:** I think we should have some actual debate. If we're going to limit the eligibility of those positions in running for elections, we would have to include people from having part time jobs, exercising, or any number of other ludicrous things that would constrain their time. I think people here are responsible and can prioritize competing things. I think we would place the burden on them to complete their roles. If they think they can complete two responsibilities at one time, good on them. If they fail, then we can look to impeaching them. I think this is an unnecessary and presumptive assumption. Regarding the conflict of interest with running in other faculties, in the faculty I represent, I have no idea of what the possible impact could be. It would be negligible at most. I think the points of this motion are just circulating upholding two commitments at one time. I think there's no difference between juggling other commitments.

**ASUS President Mason:** Point of information, could the member clarify his stance?



**Speaker:** I'll reiterate the amendment.

**ASUS President Mason:** Point of information, is this not an amendment to remove faculties and societies?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Was it to remove the faculties and societies, or everything?

**Member at Large Godin:** Everything.

**ASUS President Mason:** Are you supporting this?

**Aesculapian Representative Broussanko:** I think so, yes.

**Residence Society President Daya:** On Goodman's comments, I'm forced to think that there's two ways to think of this. The state of the removal of the person would carry on a new role. I'm in favour of this amendment. When someone is thrown into this, we're losing a valuable piece of this.

**Proxy:** I would like to respond to comments made by Sherman about people holding competing jobs. There are many people on assembly who choose to run for positions next year that may allow their positions to slip. To limit a subset of the AMS because they may not be able to fulfill their jobs is assumptive. If we're going to limit everyone from running, why don't we say that no commissioners can run? They might not be able to finish their jobs. Why don't we say representatives, directors, et cetera can't run. It makes no sense to say that their jobs might slip a bit when we have not seen them act in that job.

**Director Bone:** Last year I was the campaign manager for TNL. I dealt first hand with elections team. The CEO had to step in as the speaker stepped down to run in a faculty election. This is to preserve the integrity of elections. Having people leave to run in an election compromises that integrity. There wasn't a policy in place. The integrity of the election was compromised. We're trying to stray away from this. I encourage you all to not vote in favour of Godin's amendments, but rather vote for Hennick's. People being thrown into these positions is a pressure. It was a whirlwind for the individuals thrown into the CEO positions, and having Godin thrown into the speaker position. These people who are the deputy speakers, expecting them to step up and do fifty percent of someone else's job is unfair.

**Member at Large Young:** To address Goodman's points, I think the offer that there's a difference in the job description might be of merit. Half of the speaker's job is to be the CEO. Like Bone said, it compromises the integrity.

**Rector Francis:** I want to follow up on Bone's comments. None of it compromises the integrity, rather the individual and their job following it. The speaker's job is neutral, to facilitate discussion. They are meant to be neutral. They step out, put themselves in the public scope, and take a stance on issues that we discuss at this assembly. If he or she were to facilitate a discussion



on those issues, we would be aware of their bias.

**Aesculapian Representative Broussanko:** Point of personal privilege, are we debating the amendments to bar the speaker, and other people, from running in faculty elections? I think Rector's points are more trivial to the original amendment.

**Speaker:** Originally there was a specific amendment- that motion failed. The amendment we're now debating is about the friendly amendment made to the executives.

**ASUS Representative Wiseman:** I would like to pass my speaking rights to Sherman.

**Member at Large Sherman:** I want to talk about the concerns raised by Goodman.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Point of order, I wasn't able to respond to Member Sherman without getting speaking rights.

**Speaker:** He did.

**Member at Large Sherman:** Concerns brought forth by Goodman, how they're different or not. As the DRO or CRO, fifty percent of your job is election based. Unlike any other commissioner or director, they don't oversee it. The only election I could get involved in is a municipal election. The CEO administers the elections for the AMS. If you're doing that, it's your one job description. I think that that is where the job description is. I think it's important that when it comes to the speaker, there is that division. Member at Large Thompson, what was your email address at the beginning of this semester?

**Member at Large Thompson:** It was ceo@ams.

**Member at Large Sherman:** It's literally in the email address! You're going to be doing emails from that address. Regardless of if it's an AMS election or not. You get the full package. We had six candidates up here. You can't cherry pick the job description. You're taking away opportunities of people who may have really wanted to administer the job, specifically the election. Either you fulfill the commitment, or you are taking opportunities away from other students who may have done a good job.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Point of information, to the crafters of the policy, would this policy bar people from relinquishing their roles, or would it bar them from taking a leave of absence and coming back?

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** You cannot quit and run in an election, then return to your job.

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** I want to speak a bit to why I put forth the amendment. I think the issue isn't the conflict of interest. It doesn't entirely exist in this capacity, but I think it exists in experience. After running a campaign last year, looking back, there's no way I would have been able to run a campaign effectively if I were also a member of the AMS elections team.



I don't think it's possible for someone to say that they can effectively divide those priorities. They've dropped their election responsibilities in order to pursue a campaign. It's exactly why I think my amendment is necessary. The fact that there's no way for someone to run a contested campaign while helping another election is not fair to our constituents.

**Member at Large Thompson:** This is an interesting perspective. I feel like I should speak on my experience. We're struggling with the idea that the position is twofold. It's a very long term commitment. You can't run for two years in a row. Maybe separate the roles. I know constitutionally this doesn't make sense, but then it would clarify the issue of someone who wants to run an election versus facilitate discussion.

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** Point of information, you said you are barred from running for two years. What do you mean?

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Because you can't run the year you're in the banned position, and which has ramifications into the next year. It limits your opportunities for two years.

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** You could have run in the election the year before.

**Member at Large Godin:** In closing, the reason I brought forward the motion to amend to remove an amendment is that I don't think the AMS has the right to bar an individual from running in an election taking place at the same time as theirs. To be perfectly clear, I'm proposing to remove the amendment deemed friendly earlier regarding faculty societies. Voting yes means removing the amendment.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Would this amendment mean that even in the case that under the purview of the AMS elections team. Let's say ASUS took their elections in house, would then they be able to step down and run?

**ASUS President Mason:** It bars them.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** But because they are under the prevue of the elections team.

**Commerce Society President Hennick:** Would assembly like me to read out the amendment?  
*Reads amendment.*

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** That answers my question.

**Speaker:** Move to vote on the amendment.

*Motion to amend fails.*

**Speaker:** Returning to original debate

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** You guys are going to hate me, I want to propose an



amendment. Added on to the “currently cannot run for an AMS exec position. Shall not be eligible election nor assist in AMS executive campaign”. This would stem from some issues in other governmental processes.

*Seconded by: Scott Mason*

**Speaker:** Friendly?

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** I have a point first. The CIA and the HRO already cannot do that for sure. That's in our policies somewhere. The CIA and HRO definitely cannot. They cannot support a campaign.

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** Would that cover everyone covered by this policy?

**AMS Vice President of University Affairs Pritchard:** No, technically not. Anyone who will substantively work on a campaign has to email the CEO, they deem if it's okay or not. I hope that the CEO would deem that the CRO or DRO supporting a campaign is not okay. You could put it in a description; it wouldn't fit in this policy. That's how we handle it everywhere else.

**Speaker:** May I get a motion to extend assembly?

*Moved by: Kyle Drever*

*Seconded by: Scott Mason*

**ASUS Representative Goodman:** I remove my amendment. Can I motion to call the question?

*Seconded by: Proxy Blake*

**Engineering Society Representative Braam:** How many people are on the speakers list right now?

**Speaker:** Zero.

*Motion to call the question carries.*

*Motion (13) carries.*

**Speaker:** Seeing as there is no topic in discussion period. I need a motion to adjourn.

**Commissioner of Internal Affairs Olver:** Quickly before we adjourn, Event Services have been kind in waiving the fee for us. Maybe you could help us with putting the stuff away. That would be really sweet. Thanks!

**Rector Francis:** Great debate. I want to congratulate the new speaker, Chris Casher. Great job!

**Speaker:** Thanks. Now I need a motion to adjourn.

*Moved by: Kristen Olver*

*Seconded by: Rehgan Walsh*



*Assembly adjourns.*

