



AMS Assembly Minutes

*Meeting of Thursday, March 19, 2015
McLaughlin Room, JDUC*

Minutes are tentative until approved by AMS Assembly.

Attending:

AMS Executive - AMS President Allison Williams, AMS Vice-President Operations Justin Reekie, AMS Vice-President University Affairs Philip Lloyd

AMS Council - Academic Affairs Commissioner Colin Zarzour, Campus Activities Commissioner Michele Charlton, Commissioner of the Environment & Sustainability Leah Kelley, Commissioner of Internal Affairs Claire Cathro, Municipal Affairs Commissioner Ariel Aguilar, Campus Services Director Kanivanan Chinniah, Hospitality and Safety Services Director Alex Marshall, Retail and Design Services Director Dylan Trebels

Aesculapian Society –

Arts & Science Undergraduate Society – President Adam Grotsky, Vice-President Blake Butler, Representative Andrew DiCapua, ASUS Representative, Quinn Giordano, Representative Tamarra Wallace, Representative Rebecca Wieschkowski, Representative Forrest Donaldson, Representative Jason Verbeek, Representative Liam Dowling, Representative Steven Patterson

Commerce Society – President Kyle Beaudry, VP External Dipesh Mistry, VP Internal Betty Lu, Representative Bhavik Vyas, Representative Christina Peric



Concurrent Education Students' Association - CESA President Abbey Cressman, CESA Representative Dante Motillo, Representative Ellise Truong, Representative Adrian Chan.

Computing Students' Association – Proxy for President Erin Gallagher, Vice-President Christina Chan, Representative Vinith Suriyakumar.

Engineering Society –President Julie Tseng, Vice-President Alex Wood, Representative Dylan Braam, Representative Matthew Lawson, Representative Rigers Rukaj, Callen Hageman

MBA Students Society – President Joshua Hamilton, Vice-President Kamna Krishnan

Nursing Science Society – President Alexandra Palmeri, Vice-President Arryana Carkner

PHEKSA –Representative Matthew Nelms, Proxy for Representative Kat Telford.

Residence Society –

Ex-Officios – Rector Mike Young, Undergraduate Student Trustee Andrew Aulhouse, Board of Directors Chair Tuba Chishti

Regrets:

Social Issues Commissioner Emily Wong, Aesculapian Society Representative Zain Siddiqui, Aesculapian Society President Jonathan Cluett, Aesculapian Society Representative Alessia Gallipolli, PHEKSA President Jacob Bonafiglia, PHEKSA Vice-President University Affairs Mario Rotundo, PHEKSA Representative Kat Telford, Residence Society Representative Brittney Whallen, ResSoc President Nathan Utioh, Student Senate Caucus Chair Eric Rapos

Assembly starts at 7: 05pm

Speaker Chris Casher (hereafter referred to as **Speaker**):

1. Approval of agenda for the meeting of March 19th 2015

MOTION 1: That AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the meeting of March 19th 2015.

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

Motion (1) carries

For: all

Opposed: 0

2. Approval of the Minutes for the meeting of March 5th 2015

MOTION 2: That AMS Assembly approve the minutes for the meeting of March 5th 2015.

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

Motion (2) carries

For: all

Opposed: 0

3. Speaker's Business

Speaker: So first off let me start by welcoming all the new EngSoc members. If you want to speak on a motion, raise your placard, if you think I'm breaking rules or if someone else broken the rules, raise on a point of order, if you're lost raise your pinky and ask for point of information. Our final assembly is April 2nd, but that is the Thursday before the Good Friday weekend, who can make it to aril 2nd meeting? Please raise your placard. We should be good for quorum. Do we want to start an hour early? Does anyone plan on leaving Thursday night? Seeing none. Make sure you're there at the start. Maybe for better or for worse, I'm almost done as Speaker, April 1st is where the new speaker will be elected. If you know someone who should be a speaker send them here April 1st 7 o'clock to this room, everyone asks a few questions and votes. That's it for me.

4. Guest Speaker – N/A

5. Presidents Report

President Williams: The only thing to add, we are very happy to announce that AMS hired a new general manager, Lyn Parry. We're very excited to work with her and we're confident she'll be great.

6. Vice-Presidents' Report

Vice-President Reekie: Just two quick things, student fees, the 10% pay out for student activity fees is now at the front desk, please pick them up and communicate back to your faculty society, as well, if any faculty societies is changing their fees I need to know that ASAP, if I don't know about this I can't bring it to the Board of trustees and your fees will not change next year and if you change that I need to know that as soon as possible. Second thing, about insurance, the way insurance runs with the AMS, the AMS covers

all faculties societies in our insurance policy, if you are having any event, including any of your committees or clubs you must fill an AMS event sanctioning form in order to be covered and unless we approve it, you're not covered and would be held personally liable. I don't want that, I'm sure you don't want that. I am more than happy to answer your questions.

Vice-President Lloyd: Just a quick note, this weekend is OUSA General Assembly, if you are interested in keeping in tune with what we're talking about there is a link in our report and we will give a debrief when we're back.

7. Board of Directors Report

Chair Chishti: Nothing to add

8. Senator's Report

Speaker: Senator Rapos could not make it tonight; he wanted me to remind everyone that Senate Committee applications are due tomorrow.

9. Rector's Report

Rector Young: Nothing to add. I might add that if you're having trouble finding my report it's because it says Adam's name on it but its mine.

10. Board of Trustee's Report

Trustee Aulthouse: Not much to add, however, because I'm so rarely relevant I should highlight a few things. Immediately after the last assembly was the Board of Trustees March meeting. A few highlights, tuition 2015-2016 fees have been approved and if you have any questions I've found Academic Affairs Commissioner is the perfect place for that. MBA tuition decreased this year, I think that was to bring it in line with market and to increase tuition in other masters programs. We had Dean Susan Munn talk to us about Arts and Science, it was certainly interesting and very interesting presentation talking about new science courses at the Castle and provincial partnerships and general relevance and applications of arts degree, fun fact: given the average height of a Canadian adult, if you were to lay down every Arts and Science student from end to end, the length would stretch from Kingston to Miami.

11. Statements by Members

Vice-President Butler: Just wanted to thank faculty societies for taking part in Cover Your Crest, I don't have the total yet, the bag was huge and it broke a few times so we

brought in a lot of money, all these proceeds go towards pediatric wards in KGH and Hotel Dieu. Thank you for that, I will update with numbers when I get them.

President Grotsky: I wanted to apologize for not submitting a report, if you want to read it you can read it on queenasus.com.

12. Question Period

Representative Braam: Question for president regarding AMS salaried position and internships, will they also include internship for engineering and computing science students because it's supposed to be technical in nature? If they are not eligible, will the internship still be available for students for the internship including programs that don't have internships?

President Williams: We are discussing that currently, there are a few factors that play in. Yes, it is true we can't offer an engineering internship for example, because the technical compartments aren't met so you wouldn't meet the learning outcomes in our workplace. That said, depending on what departments are willing to do, there may be a possibility to have the courses attributed. Because we recognize it is more accessible to ArtSci students we are also looking to implement studies that align with courses so there is availability to get credit with AMS from any faculty, we're looking at setting up that program. It would be a slightly different mechanism to accomplish the same outcome.

Representative Braam: Does the university provide any financial incentive to internship program? So you would be saving money by offering an internship program?

President Williams: No it does not, there are some cases where different units can receive provincial funding but we are not seeking that.

Vice-President Butler: What will happen to the position for the controller?

Vice-President Reekie: We're going to take the term to transition Lynn effectively, she'll be overseeing both portfolios for now, and we will be hiring for that position. Lynn does have ideas for that position and how we can improve that, we are taking the opportunity to look at that job description to how we can change or enhance that and to look at it holistically and not rush it.

13. Business Arising from the Minutes

MOTION 3: That AMS Assembly approve the second reading of the amendments to AMS Constitution Section 17: External Alignment Committee as seen in Appendix E: External Alignment

Moved by: Alison Williams

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

President Williams: This is what we brought forward last time, happy to take any questions. We also have the policy amendment with us.

Motion (3) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

14. New Business

MOTION 4: That AMS Assembly approve the amendments to AMS Policy Manual 2, Section 6, Part D: Special Committee on External Alignment Membership as seen in Appendix A: External Alignment

Moved by: Alison Williams

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

President Williams: As I mentioned, this policy provides a more detailed backing for constitution change just passed. In spirit of what we amended, I do have an amendment for the policy change to ensure this is an effective body that can also include groups we would like to become affiliated.

President Williams: That changes read "...or wishes to become affiliated in the academic year of assembly immediately preceding", "...will vote on the *status* of its membership" rather than renewal of its membership.

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

President Williams: Friendly

Speaker: Reviewing potential external alignments, the addition of the language also broadens the scope of the policy manual changes being brought forward. When we debate this further please add the changes.

Representative Donaldson: I'd like to propose a small amendment... "3 voting AMS members"

Seconded by: Liam Dowling

President Williams: Friendly

Representative Wallace: Wondering how the chair will be decided if its' between President and Academic Affairs Commissioner? Will there be a vote?

President Williams: It's typically based on where the preference was and time was we don't have a formal election process. I would be happy to add an amendment that would just appoint the AMS President as chair.

Representative Wallace: I propose an amendment that only the AMS president be the chair and no option for the Academic Affairs Commissioner unless maybe there was a conflict

President Williams: I find that friendly, I think as the AAC typically works on externally alignment it's typically important for them to be in a role where they can have substantive discussion. The President has less substantive information to add.

Seconded by: Liam Dowling

Speaker: Underneath membership... the second point would be "The AMS President shall be the chair"

President Williams: Friendly.

Motion (4) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

MOTION 5: That AMS Assembly ratify Simone Markus to the position of Chief Electoral Officer for the 2015-2016 year.

Moved by: Allison Williams

Seconded by: Claire Cathro

President Williams: I am very excited to introduce Simone tonight, she showed phenomenal aptitude and great ideas; I'm looking forward to see what she does with her role.

Representative Donaldson: What is the biggest challenge you face this year?

Member-At-Large Markus: When I was the EngSoc CRO, I think the biggest challenge is getting over that apathy students tend to have. I hope to build off the energy I got this year and make a bigger campaign

Trustee Aulthouse: Congratulations, my question is, which faculty society will you run for next year?

Speaker: Serious questions only.

Commissioner Zarzour: So a lot of research around driving voter turnout that it's not around campaigns but rather creating a culture on campus of people who want to be involved. What is one obstacle and one idea you have regarding that?

Member-At-Large Markus: I guess one obstacle is to engage students in general, there's always the 10% that want to get involved. Engage student body through media, social media, etc.

Motion (5) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Representative Braam: PPP: I will be stepping out, I have a meeting for an hour.

MOTION 6: That AMS Assembly ratify Rebecca Herweyer to the position of the Chief Returning Officer for the 2015-2016 year.

Moved by: Simone Markus

Seconded by: Claire Cathro

Member-At-Large Markus: I hired Rebecca as CRO. She has a lot of great ideas and I have confidence in her and she has experience as a DRO and I think she'll do a great job.

Representative Wallace: How do you plan to engage with all seven faculties during elections?

Member-At-Large Herweyer: that's huge problem, last year, a lot of people would vote for faculties and not for AMS elections. We are trying to come up with a strategic plan to change this.

Rector Young: Congratulations to both of you being hired. It's great to see two females in these roles, with that, we've had some issues with a lack of non-male identified representation in leadership positions and running elections, I was wondering if you have any thoughts on how to address that issue on campus for your position?

Member-At-Large Herweyer: Simone had an idea about this, just to make good leadership roles more accessible, to make them more accessible we were thinking about have more casual setting, more open houses.

Motion (6) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

MOTION 7: That AMS Assembly ratify George Collister to the position of Judicial Committee Chair for the 2015-2016 year.

Moved by: Miriam Bart

Seconded by: Catherine Wright

Member-At-Large Bart: George was the successful candidate for Judicial Committee Chair. He was an outstanding applicant and demonstrated professionalism and insightful ideas for his proposal and interview process and I have full confidence in his abilities.

Rector Young: I was wondering what your favorite pillar is of non-academic discipline?

Member-At-Large Collister: There are so many good pillars so that's hard. If I could only choose one pillar it would be have to be restorative, it's fundamental to the student body.

President Grotsky: If you had to cut one pillar what would it be?

Member-At-Large Collister: Probably go with complaint driven. I'd love to get out there on a little snow plow and drive around campus and find students violating the code, vigilante style.

Motion (7) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 1

MOTION 8: That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendments to AMS Constitution, Part 4: Elections and Referenda as seen in Appendix B: Elections and Referenda.

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Tyler Lively

Commissioner Cathro: These are just some constitutional amendments to our current elections and referenda policy. They are fairly straight forward and they will be accompanied next week at the second reading with much more comprehensive elections and referenda policy package, we will have a discussion on that tonight to get some feedback, some things I will draw attention to, moving out how CEO and CRO are hired moving it to policy in conjunction with the way everything else is in our policy. As well as making Chief Electoral Officer and Chief Returning Officer co-chairs of the Elections Team recognizing they carry out fundamental functions of elections process, albeit, different ways. Those are really the only significant changes to the constitution as well as adding some general language about the spirit of elections and referenda and types of question that can be added to the referendum ballot, hopefully we can have some more discussion tonight. I am happy to talk about anything specific.

President Grotsky: Two questions, can you speak to why you wanted the co-chair model? Does the CEO remain the tie-breaking in this model or how does that work?

Commissioner Cathro: The CRO and CEO have very different roles, but in my experience they're different but equal. The CEO has the final say in all policy interpretations, etc., that wouldn't change nor would that change they are tiebreaking vote, however it's just recognizing that it's important that CRO and CEO both act as managers to the DROs. It allows them to report jointly to the CRO and CEO and for the CRO and CEO to work better in decisions around logistics. I truly believe that creating an even playing field is not only reactive but proactive. To allow CEO and CRO collaborate more and there's a more holistic and guided approach to planning and running elections.

President Grotsky: My next question, does that create a weird power dynamic?

Commissioner Cathro: The hiring would change, the CEO would not hire the CRO. That would come forward next assembly. They would be hiring by an ad-hoc assembly and hired jointly. It was fairly confusing this year in comparison to our other hiring procedures, it is important we look at the philosophy behind who is hiring CEO and CRO. It was changed from CIA hiring them so that the CIA wouldn't be hiring people and then potentially running in those elections. We still have the same issue with bias, looking at addressing that, I think there's less potential for that on hiring panels or not multiple hiring panels. Less people.

President Grotsky: If that policy were to fail, do you see it being a problem with a co-chair system?

Commissioner Cathro: We can change it, it can be debated next week, what we see is the best way to hire those positions based on this, the co-chair model is also further

explained in policy manual 2. If we're worried we can strike the wording co-chair from the constitution, we could discuss it next week, it would be in policy manual but not in the constitution, the hiring model doesn't have to stay exactly as what I proposed.

Rector Young: You spoke to how an ad-hoc assembly involves people who might be running in future years and that's an issue, is it possible we will revisit the idea of having the CIA hire the CEO and CRO?

Commissioner Cathro: The model I personally see working best is having CIA be on hiring panel for CEO and CRO, they can't run, and also that Miriam will work closely with Rebecca and Simone and because there is a working relationship, it is important that the CIA is involved in that decision making progress. The other stipulation is that the other people on the hiring panel be assembly members that have stated that they don't intend to run. Obviously we can't bind assembly members not to run, but basically that they have made a commitment at assembly that they don't plan on running. It's totally up for debate, happy to chat more about it, I'm all ears, we can talk about it in discussion.

Representative Donaldson: Just to speak about philosophy about why it was an ad-hoc committee of Assembly members, the idea was that it increases the independence of the office and more underneath assembly as a body, and increases accountability to members at large. I do agree we have a loop hole, my main concern with co-chairs, it puts in place a lack of clear chain of command, if there is a decisions to be made and consensus can't be found it leaves us where the system breaks down. By making them equal, considering how much more detail focus are given to CRO, I think it puts the CRO at a disadvantage, I look forward to talking about this later, I do think we can change this in policy, I move an amendment to strike co-chairs from it so it can be discussed.

Seconded by: Tamara Wallace

Commissioner Cathro: Unfriendly for sake of debate.

Speaker: Debate on amendment. To strike "co-chair"

Member-At-Large Lively: I'm currently the CRO. I agree with Claire and this is something we did discussed internally and if it would create an imbalance within Elections Team, they are distinct roles where the CRO is dealing with logistics of elections such as organizing meeting and creating marketing strategies, its completely distinct from the CEO role in ensuring a level playing field comes down to taking policy where it's not 100% clear and relieve those ambiguities on purpose so the CEO can make those decisions including all the factors that just can't be included. Ultimately, the job of the CRO is explicitly defined in policy, whereas the CEO deals with discipline and

ambiguities in policy. So it never really become a command structure, the Elections Team is distinct in that it is difficult to make it as the same model as other organizational structures -- I do think the co-chair works.

Representative Donaldson: In response to Tyler's point, I understand what you're saying, in the original policy amendments brought forward, we gave individual hiring to CEO to have strategic decision making in committee, because they're no longer the Speaker, we have to fill those office hours, increase responsibilities, my concern is that we're returning to status quo, responsibilities have plateaued. They have a lot more influence, I worry the CEO will be relegated to review policy.

Rector Young: This is more of a question, in policy with that change isn't it still that the CEO has veto power? So there is a final decision making power?

Commissioner Cathro: The CEO will still have final say and interpretation on policy matters. The team is responsible for conducting elections, but there is a level of involvement of CIA with finances, there's that level as well as regular involvement of CIA in policy, so important to incorporate the CIA somewhat into the functions of the Elections Team.

Commissioner Cathro: In response to Representative Donaldson, recognizing the changes came forward earlier this year to strengthen CEO position I was on board in those changes, however I see this as another way we can do that, by making them co-chair we can make the roles more collaborative. In the past the CEO comes when there's trouble then leaves. The CEO can be more involved and puts more responsibility and managerial requirements, they still will have responsibility and jurisdiction over final decision making, the responsibilities of CRO don't require much interpretation, I think the way we saw the Elections Team work this year was very collaborative and it is a good strategy and everyone was there, all hands-on desk. I understand your concerns and I think this a good way to address them

Representative Wieschkowski: Pass speaking rights to Donaldson.

Representative Donaldson: My main concern is, while that works, this year the CRO has been hired by CEO. Is the co-chair next year or grandfather in for the next year? This position has one chair which has hired another.

Commissioner Cathro: This will be a transition year moving over to this model, in Policy Manual 2 we have delineated the responsibilities between what is done by the CEO and what is done by the CRO. The next year will be an opportunity to look at how those responsibilities are divided so by next hiring period we found a policy that works. I don't envision the structure changing this year, it would be grandfathered in.

Representative Donaldson: This could cause problems next year, would be comfortable writing in that this would be grandfathered in?

Commissioner Cathro: Hiring will be grandfathered in, we won't get rid of Rebecca and Simone and then rehire other people. A lot of the other changes coming forward are operational and I don't think those should be grandfathered in, we don't write in policy that something will be grandfathered in, rather, it is in the minutes. For some delineating hiring responsibilities, there's a possibility that it won't be perfect next year but something that can be worked through.

Speaker: Voting in the affirmative means you want to strike the co-chair words out. If you vote against, co-chair wording stays where it is.

Amendment fails.

For: 9

Opposed: 25

Abstentions: 2

Speaker: Back on discussing the motion.

Motion (8) carries.

For: 35

Opposed: 1

Abstentions: 0

MOTION 9: That AMS Assembly approve the first reading of the amendments to AMS Constitution Section 7: Clubs as seen in Appendix C: Revenue Generating Clubs

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

Commissioner Cathro: There was recently some concerns brought to our attention about some clubs that are primarily revenue generating in their mandate, there is some concern about the legal status of some clubs, as well as insurance. With revenue generating activities, we don't have sufficient regulatory oversight for clubs that are revenue generating in their primary activity. Because our insurance covers them, if there were to be an issue that came out of their businesses, the AMS would be bearing the brunt of the risk and having no oversight or control. There are some issues around space which is problematic. The space we give to clubs is designated as non-revenue generating, it's against the Management and Operations agreement for them to be

carrying out revenue generating activities in club space. There are some clubs this will affect, we are happy to talk about that.

Representative Giordano: I have a question, how do we define a substantive part of the mandate?

Vice-President Lloyd: It's going to be a judgment call, as we said, if you are hosting a bake sale once in a while, that's not a primary revenue generating, but certain clubs have a lot of merchandise sales as a main part of their mandate

Representative Giordano: If certain campus space is used to plan revenue generating events, is that the same thing as holding venue generating events?

Vice-President Lloyd: No

Rector Young: POI, that came up with OXFAM who sells things every day. It's in policy it's for fundraising for charity so it's different. Does charity portion make it non-revenue generating?

Vice-President Lloyd: No, they would not be included in that, it would be basically be if we were providing a storefront.

Rector Young: Don't they have a storefront?

Member-At-Large Sherman: the space they used they don't book it hasn't been allocated, they use is through convention, its SLC allocated space.

President Williams: with Oxfam they're not designated to that space for their exclusive use nor is it specifically used to carry out commercial purposes, its same if they used our bookable tables, its different to do that and then to say it is for fundamental use for group to operate as a store.

Incoming PHEKSA President: If a club is primarily targeted towards to a charity group, is this club making revenue? What is considered acceptable revenue?

Vice-President Lloyd: Within ratification process there's a number of questions that would've tried to flush that out, the mandate itself would encompass that, that club the classify that, there's a number of questions that would allow us to be able to determine if revenue generation was a prime component.

Representative Donaldson: There's a been few question about what does this club fall under, can you give an example of a current club that would excluded by this policy?

Vice-President Lloyd: With all of this this year with clubs going under a lot of changes, looking at our polices, this is not an isolated policy change, just to make a note, there are a few club such as SHRC and Earth Centre, I do want to stress that we have reached out to them and have met and will discuss options, we don't want to leave them in cold and we want to make sure they are still able to fulfill their mandate.

Vice-President Reekie: For clarity, it's not that these clubs are going against policy, we're looking at the risk to our insurance policy, identifying those risk that has been looked at, and this is how it came out learning with our lawyer about how we cannot cover another corporate entity. With revenue generating, there are internal controls we don't have control over such as: are they charging HST correctly? Are there quality control mechanisms in place? Do they follow the cash handling policies of the university? List goes on and on. Without mitigating those risks we would be jeopardizing their autonomy as a club, we want to make sure all clubs are autonomous, but recognize that currently some clubs activities extend beyond the scope of what is fundamentally a club activity. Happy to take more questions.

Representative Verbeek: With reference to a club like SHRC which obviously provides valuable services to students what are your steps moving forward?

Vice-President Lloyd: When we met with them, we when through options, could their mandate change, could they be more incorporated with AMS? Could they come up at the SIC for example? A number of different options represent it, we left it to the club, and we're in the midst of discussing.

Member-At-Large Lively: I would like to ask a question of Executive, what criteria did you use to come to this decision? I know you mentioned risks, where do you draw the line in terms of that risk, as society we do take on risk in everything we do.

Vice-President Reekie: The only risk I identify if it's a business model, anything that has a clear business mandate, as we say a storefront, there's a lot of legal procedures even through government regulation that they must abide by and they may not know that which is primarily the issue – and that that will come back to the AMS if there's anything not being done currently. We want to make sure that everyone is abiding by all regulations which we cannot do with clubs because of their guaranteed autonomy, which is why we are being proactive.

Member-At-Large Lively: Given that this is a risk related matter, why wasn't it brought to Finance, Audit and Risk committee?

Chair Chishti: It did come up at our very last meeting, we talked about business and storefronts.

Member-At-Large Lively: I was chairing that meeting, I'd like to point out was that was I referring to was specifically this recommendation that the AMS would put forward in policy explicitly banning organizations clubs with revenue generating as their main mandate.

Vice-President Reekie: The Finance, Audit, and Risk Committee doesn't have purview under constitution over clubs, this body does, so this would be the best body. It's not under their mandate to dictate what the AMS does with Clubs.

Motion (9) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

MOTION 10: That AMS Assembly strike the ad hoc Queen's 175th Anniversary AMS Advisory Committee (terms of reference seen in Appendix D) for 2015-2016.

Moved by: Philip Lloyd

Seconded by: Justin Reekie

Vice-President Lloyd: I'm excited about this advisory committee, as many of you know the university will be celebrating their 175th in the 16/17 academic year, we have been invited to attend some executive committee meetings, we thought it would be great for students to have their say. Students were excluded in 150th, now at 175th they're trying to bring students in. Our involvement is to have a committee to make sure we have a say as to what happens as well as to formally plan projects. It's pretty self-explanatory, we're not appointing to it today, at April 1st will be added to committee, we're just striking it today. If you have any questions please let me know

Rector Young: I was wondering if you could clarify, would it be turnover, this committee is until 2017?

Vice-President Lloyd: Yes, for 15/16 year it's planning and 16/17 it will be implementation. Bulk of work will be done by the 15/16 group.

Representative Donaldson: Do you see any benefit for this being active during summer? Why I ask, it wouldn't be a bad idea to direct incoming exec to find that composition during the special assembly.

Vice-President Lloyd: I do see value, not only, I do find it necessary that they meet during the summer at least once a month, this would be something, on April 1st, will be added to list of committees they can apply for. A Nominating Committee will be struck and by hopefully July two assembly members will be chosen.

Representative Donaldson: That would keep assembly members out of some initial planning of how that committee is working going forward. There could be some value in making an exception in whether the nominating people those committees or taking a step back before we get back. Why include assembly members if they're not directly involved.

Vice-President Lloyd: Reason why I would say its fine, is because in May and June, a lot of AMS personnel here, who would be largely undertaking any initiatives within a service, for example, say hypothetically Tricolour wanted to have 175th line of clothing, or CoGro wanted to offer a 175th cookie, it would take a while for those managers to get up to speed with that service. I would say May and June meetings will be information gathering, in order to make it as effective as possible, I would want to make sure other people on the other committee are well. Point well taken.

Representative Wallace: I would like to note having VP Ops instead of president on this committee

Vice-President Lloyd: Primary reason, looking at VP Ops they are overseeing commissions and services. So having VP Ops look at all the services and see what services can do. The AMS president does have two of their reports on the committee, their primary functions will be served by their two reports. Hopefully VPUA and VP Ops will communicate.

President Grotsky: Cookie flavor?

Vice-President Reekie: Committee will decide.

President Williams: My joke.

Motion (10) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

MOTION 11: That AMS Assembly approve the addition to Policy Manual 1, Section 2, Part A, Subsection 15, as seen in Appendix E: Assembly Committees.

Moved by: Philip Lloyd

Seconded by: Claire Cathro

Vice-President Lloyd: Big juicy motion here, this was supposed to go in original motion months ago but somehow got lost, in assembly there's the standing committees as well as other committees, this will just put the list here, just refers to where you can find them, this does not include ad-hoc because they aren't in policy.

Motion (11) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

MOTION 12: That AMS Assembly approve the establishment of AMS Policy 4: AMS Non-Academic Discipline Rules and Regulations.

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Philip Lloyd

Commissioner Cathro: Essentially this is bringing forward a motion to create a new policy manual, and shift all our non-academic discipline to Policy Manual 4. The reasons for this – non-academic discipline policy has significant ties to university through SONAD etc. Its important policy is accessible to students. We felt this would be better served as a standalone policy manual rather than in the middle on Policy Manual 1. More accessible to students and delineating our non-academic discipline and procedures. Second motion after this will be moving to policy manual 4.

Representative Donaldson: POI, to make sure procedurally, does Phil have to be here for this?

Commissioner Cathro: I believe it only has to be the mover

Motion (12) carries

For: 33

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 3

MOTION 13: That AMS Assembly approve the movement of AMS Policy Manual 1, Section 5 to AMS Policy Manual 4 as seen in Appendix F: Non-Academic Discipline Policy

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Phillip Lloyd

Commissioner Cathro: Just as a follow up, moving non-academic discipline policy to new manual 4, for the reason I stated before happy to take any questions.

Motion (13) carries.

For: 32

Opposed: 2

Abstentions: 2

MOTION 14: That AMS Assembly approve the FYNIRS Program budget for 2015 as seen on the Assembly Google Drive to be included in the Campus Activities Commission budget for 2015-2016.

Moved by: Michele Charlton

Seconded by: Philip Lloyd

Commissioner Charlton: Not a huge or big difference from last year, couple things I want note, it does include their programming for the entire year, you will see they are budgeting for events and updating lounge. There aren't a huge amounts of differences from last year, we upped the landlord fee a bit and the revenue is higher from numbers from student affairs. Happy to answer any questions, mostly self-explanatory.

Vice-President Butler: I have a broader question, first, we were sent the Google doc but to find the actual budget there's a footnote at the bottom of the pages, why it was there and not explicitly stated so it's easier to find? Secondly, looking at budget from last year, it's a very small deficit, a lot of that seems to come from sponsorship, just wondering where they faltered in terms of that?

Commissioner Cathro: I brought this up when our budgets were passed. The way that budgets have been shared historically is through Dropbox where only assembly members had access, I moved to Google Drive so that all students can see the budget. It is an issue that we face, we don't have the ability to put it on the assembly website at this time. I probably forgot to tweet out the link this time – my apologies, I'll do that now. If anybody else has any suggestions about better ways we can share information happy to hear it

Vice-President Butler: Wondered why a footnote as to not explicitly in the document? People might have missed that.

Commissioner Charlton: I can't speak a huge amount to why the budgeted so much for it, the way that ORT sponsorship works, the way the faculty and revenue works, ORT will collect general sponsorship for all orientation week and divide that sponsorship to faculty based on percentage and size and I can imagine that they budgeted higher and

not knowing that. There will be handbook this year so there is accessibility to reach out to put an ad in the handbook.

Vice-President Reekie: I wanted to commend Commissioner Charlton for those budgets as they are a little confusing, I went over with VP Lloyd and with Michele, she did a great job and it is quite confusing. Hopefully over the next years it won't be so confusing.

Motion (14) carries.

For: 34

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 2

MOTION 15: That AMS Assembly approve the NEWTS Orientation Week budget for 2015 as seen on the Assembly Google Drive to be included in the Campus Activities Commission budget for 2015-2016.

Moved by: Michele Charlton

Seconded by: Philip Lloyd

Commissioner Charlton: A few things with NEWTS, last year they ran a \$14,000 deficit due to severe over budgeting. There was confusion about numbers that was miscommunicated that resulted in that deficit. Most of the budget is pretty much the same, the change is they're no longer going to ORT concert because there was consultation with students that found that less than 10% actually attend so why are we charging when they are not going. Happy to answer any questions.

Vice-President Butler: Another question, when we get to ORT section, it shows budget for 2014 and for this year, doesn't know actuals, is that because they are the same as projected?

Commissioner Charlton: Lots of confusing things we have found this year, how things are coded and reflected are different, the actual breakdown of numbers that's how we're filling out now, the numbers exists they're just not there.

Motion (15) carries.

For: 33

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 3

MOTION 16: That AMS Assembly approve the Orientation Roundtable (ORT) budget for 2015, as seen on the Assembly Google Drive, to be included in the Campus Activities Commission budget for 2015-2016.

Moved by: Michele Charlton
Seconded by: Philip Lloyd

Commissioner Charlton: The ORT budget is a little more complicated, there's 4 subsections, two self-generating and two which come from Assembly allocation. The two last year, only difference is ORT faculty social. Half the social is paid for last year and very similar. For training, again, very similar, last year they had a surplus. Only really big change is now we're now having to play for floor covering in the ARC. This balances what we're under and increase enrollment. Next two are more complicated, for concert StuCons inaccurate there by the way. The ticket revenue has gone up in 6% inflation, usually goes up 3-6%, we are expanding concert into quadrangle as enrollment increases. Insurance was for paid last year, should be 3,000 there. We did not use Environmental Health and Safety and we need to this year. Faculty has most amount of movement, for example, if it costs 10 to rent a truck, we charge the faculty that much. It's more estimating, it's more sponsorship target. Happy to take questions.

Vice-President Butler: Just two small questions, in regards to numbers from last year with variations, with cleaning supplies, 100 went to 2,000? Second one, more so, the wages for concert event a management and concert staff? Numbers were higher than given?

Commissioner Charlton: For the first one, the cleaning supplies one of the bands threw confetti and we had to clean it. As for the event manager, there was some issues with signing the contract, they were on contract for less amount of time that should have been.

President Grotsky: I know typically sponsorship come from ads, concern I've had is there always a religious group that puts an ad in it, I thought it was strange have a group put a religious ad in, I thought we should really have an equitable page where all religious groups on campus can put an ad in, was that planned for in sponsorship?

Commissioner Charlton: It's never planned for, word goes out to whoever wants it and sometimes those groups get back to us

President Grotsky: Can a discussion be had maybe behind closed doors to discuss appropriateness of accepting or putting in an ad for religious groups or first years? I feel like it creates a strange idea for first year students to see an ad for certain religious groups and not others.

Commissioner Charlton: There definitely is a discussion to be had.

Rector Young: It might be worth talking to the Champlain Kate Johnson about putting a page of resources that is representing to everything spiritual on campus.

Speaker: Anything pertaining to the budget?

Motion (16) carries.

For: 34

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 2

MOTION 17: That AMS Assembly approve the amendments to AMS Policy Manual 2: Space Allocation Committee as seen in Appendix G: Space Allocation Committee.

Moved by: Claire Cathro

Seconded by: Philip Lloyd

Commissioner Cathro: This was just clarifying; we have space allocation procedures, but we recognize we didn't have any broader rules about what that role of space allocation committee is- they allocate club spaces but they also deal with more spaces in the AMS. This just recognizes the variety of spaces allocated. Happy to take any questions.

Rector Young: I'd like to propose an amendment from Student Centre Officer to Managing Director because that is the current title.

Seconded by: Liam Dowling

Commissioner Cathro: Friendly.

Motion (17) carries.

For: all

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Representative Wallace: I would like to propose a 5 minute recess.

Seconded by: Liam Dowling.

Motion fails.

For: (?)

Opposed: (?)

15. Discussion Period

Commissioner Cathro: Earlier in the night we passed the first reading of the constitutional amendment, this generally is kind of some information about what we're hoping to bring forward about changes to referenda and elections policy. I understand these point forms aren't making sense – I wrote them late at night. I'll go through what I meant to capture. First, new timeline for election, first two days of what used to be nomination period would be for the purpose of holding information sessions as an opportunity to talk with Executives and as well, more information about the referendum. On the third, validation packages are due, nominations open on the fourth. The validation period for January referendum can happen in January rather than November. I found a lot of clubs came in January and I had to turn them away. This allows validation period to happen in same month. Nomination period goes to four and a half days, reason for that is reducing signatures. Campaign and voting days are the same. The validation period for January referendum are now in January. With nomination signatures, I printed off different election policies from student unions across Canada and had my interns go over that to what is commonly done, they found number of signatures to get on a ballot at UBC, I believe you needed 75 signatures. It is much lower. Basically we're making people get 800 which is above and beyond what is done at any other university. The point of the signatures is to make sure students are putting in the effort to get on the ballot and that there's a reasonable number of students on campus that support them enough to see their name on the ballot. Basically the 150 still an effort considering it's a shorter time period. Also, it would be changed so that signatures cannot be collected in classrooms, basically it's an effort to get signatures without random sheets in classrooms, allows for a bit more interaction and some personal contact between potential candidates. We put in some policy around acclamations. We talked at length about vote of confidence, to our determination with elections and need to have council hired before February, it is a tight timeline. What we've done is say that nominations packages are due Monday, this allows signatures to be checked so candidates can go on agenda when it goes out on Monday evening for Thursday's assembly. If only one team has submitted nomination packages by that time, a press release will go out stating so and any other teams can come forward in those days before assembly to get signatures to be on the ballot for Thursday night and this would occur if no teams come forward, they would have until Thursday night. Also, we're looking at putting in guidelines around social media, as far a structure of elections teams, the CEO and CRO acting as co-chairs and outlining their specific responsibilities. It would be beneficial to talk about role of endorsements in AMS elections and referendum around campus, I've outlined a number of questions there.

Rector Young: I wanted to share some of my thoughts of signature reduction, I'm not necessarily in favor of lowering it at all, it was mentioned that that is above and beyond what is expected at other universities, the AMS executive has more responsibilities and autonomy than many other universities -- that should be recognized. When a team of people that shows a commitment to get their name on the ballot, I don't think that 800 is

a barrier for teams running, I think it's a lack of perceived accessibility or a spotlight that you're under, I think those are some of the root causes, I don't think the signatures is the cause. With lowering the signatures, it's a lot easier to do, that essentially, one day spend in the Tim Horton's line, the point about class talks or doing them in class, while I'm in favor of engaging with potential voters, during nomination period you're not allowed to speak about anything you want to do in the position so you're really limited as to what you can do. There's not a ton of engagement you'd get anyways. For those stressed getting signatures, you should have a plan in place, we might want to talk about if collecting signatures in classes is something we see value in, I don't think the signatures should be reduced at all, it shows dedication.

President Grotsky: I'm going to disagree with Rector Young, if someone is passionate, I don't think the number of signatures is going to effect if they're going to run, they're going to do it to get the vote. I'd like to see a percentage rather than a number, perhaps even 2% to align with what AMS does.

Representative Donaldson: I actually think it's a smart idea to lower it -- although 150 is too low, 150 is the amount I had to get running for rep. I did that not through class talks, I went to different locations like CoGro and I kind of engaged that way, I think you're absolutely right when going to classes can lead to just passing a sheet around, my concern is, how will we enforce that? Excluding class nominations, how are we going to make sure that isn't abused and hurting reputation of other teams?

Commissioner Cathro: Enforcement mechanism is same if any other team is slandering another team. I don't think there's any issue as to how we deal with it above and beyond the regular campaign violations. One of the reasons why we're looking at reducing is because the timeline when the signatures are collected and when the agenda goes out, currently you can collect signatures until Wednesday at 5pm and then elections team is up all night checking names to add them to the agenda. Not good governance practice to send out the agenda with blank spots for names. So we were looking at how we can make sure names are on agenda in enough time to go out to assembly. Taking into consideration that fact the DRO, CEO, CRO are all volunteers, I don't think it's fair to make them stay till 4am.

Member-At-Large Liberty: If someone is going to go out and run for these positions, the number of signatures shouldn't stop that.

President Palmeri: I really like the idea that Grotsky mentioned with having proportions represented, having said that, I do feel concerned about the reduction. I would feel more comfortable with a proportion. If were looking to address issues with engagement, we can pursue other avenues such as campaigns.

Rector Young: POI - It is currently set as a proportion

Vice-President Butler: I agree with all points said, I think what Claire said, I think it's a fair point, I don't want these people staying up all night, but I don't want to take away from the signatures to do so, could we bump up the timeline?

Commissioner Cathro: This is what we're doing. They would be due Monday at noon so signatures are checked, less signatures, less time, so the agenda can be out by 7.

Vice-President Butler: If we are moving it up, I'd look then to look towards proportion and something higher than 150.

Representative Truong: I think 150 is very arbitrary and we should lower percentage to something like 400 so it still shows the dedication.

Representative Giordano: Was part of the logic behind 150 to make it easier in event of an acclaimed position, for alternative running team to get them quicker?

Commissioner Cathro: It was something we talked about, in the event only one team runs it's not an unreasonable amount, given that it is a short period of time.

Representative Giordano: isn't it 3 days versus 4 days?

Commissioner Cathro: Yes. Also, currently the nomination period is 10 days, this is 4 days, we have a lot of people who told us it's difficult to get 800 in 10 days. With the new model, you also only have two week days and a weekend so you're also trying to get more signatures from student body that may not be on campus as much. It's less than half the days, half of which are weekend days and half school days. Our concern was that if we make it a proportion of the student body, as enrollment grows, the number of signature grow, but you don't necessarily get more days so it becomes more difficult again to get signatures.

Representative Giordano: Has this number changed at any other point in history of AMS? Was it always 800?

Commissioner Cathro: It's currently a percentage, its 5%.

Representative Donaldson: Jumping off that, we could have a different nomination cap if no one acclaimed or applied. That is an unfair advantage by team coming in late but they might not have same campaign. About perceived accessibility about 800 isn't really the thing stopping people, I do wonder how much that has to do with smaller details like the amount signatures they have, and what the impact would be if we dropped it to

400? What about smaller teams, like RMS that ran a couple years ago, they wanted to make sure the issues they had came to light but not necessarily win? If wonder if we do have a smaller threshold, if any more one team is more status quo, if they don't feel their ideas can be if they have a lower amount of signatures.

Trustee Aulthouse: The signatures aren't the barrier, there's a lot of barriers, I don't think it's the signatures, it gets rid of a lot of joke teams. I don't see a harm in reducing numbers, maybe not so drastically, maybe the same as we have at AGM for quorum. The 100 hour work week and scrutiny you're under rather than the signatures is what stops people from running.

Rector Young: Donaldson, your point is taken, small details do matter. If teams are serious, they do what needs to be done. I don't want this to sound heartless when I say this, I don't mean to be, I don't think necessarily how late volunteers stay up should be part of this discussion. We should come to a number we are comfortable with, then make changes and we should ease the hours, we shouldn't do one because of the other, we have to look in isolation. I think we need to address that, I believe we should come to a number we're comfortable with.

Proxy Garcia: My neighbour's son back in Mexico is running to be mayor, in a municipality of 125,000 and he only needs 700 signatures. I want to bring that up so people can reflect on the number.

Representative Braam: Amount to run for MP is 100 signatures. The AMS threshold will be greater than those in parliament. Rural ridings is 50 signatures.

Representative Wallace: I was just wondering what would happen, this is unlikely, what would happen if no teams ran?

Commissioner Cathro: I put it in policy, basically that if not team came forward, press release would go out, they would have until Thursday, if no one came forward by Thursday Assembly would have the ability to decide what to do. It gives assembly the power to decide what to do.

Representative Donaldson: POI would that include AMS electing/nominating members of an exec?

Commissioner Cathro: That would be a discussion for that Assembly at that time.

Representative Braam: POI, I know this is the policy of EngSoc, in the event that no one runs, we have an "election" in council. We invite any members show up and are elected

there. Recognizing we are an elected body, we have the ability to make decision on students' behalf.

Speaker: The working amendments we have now is delegating authority to assembly. If other faculties have ideas, you can bring forward to Commissioner Cathro over the next two weeks and we can bring it up here. This discussion is to help form the amendments that will be brought forward. Anything that comes to mind please bring it forward.

President Cressman: Regarding info sessions being held on first two days, if there are already similar sessions held in first semester, it seems that earlier would be a better time to have these events just to get people thinking.

Commissioner Cathro: We don't have anything like that currently in policy. The feeling with having these right before nomination periods meeting where people can get information, they could come out and talk or candidates can get the low down on signatures. I do see the merit of having sessions in the fall to reach out to students.

Trustee Aulthouse: On the note of holding open houses to educate people about these positions, I think it's well-intentioned but I don't know if that does makes the difference, maybe if I knew less than maybe I would want to run. Holding them earlier makes sense, I don't know if anyone would attend those because who applies their hand that early I suppose.

President Grotsky: I think town halls are a great idea as they serve as more open house, if we more as insiders, students at large might benefit from sessions like that.

Rector Young: I think that we ought to try and educate people jobs as much as we can. If it is so that everyone knows about the intricacies of the jobs, and no one wants them, then maybe there is something systemically wrong. I'm completely in favor of town halls, I think it's more directed towards bringing people in who haven't been involved in student leadership or the "AMS bubble" to bring those people in, these are some of highest experiential learning opportunities we have at queens. If we show more people that they have opportunities it's really positive.

Commissioner Cathro: Obviously there are the teams are early gung-ho to run and have been planning it since first year. There are other teams on the fence, this year we saw they didn't quite make it over the fence. One thing we wanted to do was look at the barriers and what are the small things we can do for teams sitting on the fence to make it easier for them to want to run.

President Grotsky: I agree with Commissioner Cathro. To acclamation, I recognize the logistical nightmare of votes of confidence if they were to fail but I still feel the need. I

think is a bigger issue to have a team in place who lost a vote of confidence rather than have a team trying to figure out hiring commissioners and stuff like that. I think students have to be the voices that picks who leads their society. I'd love to find way to have a vote of confidence to make sure student voices are heard.

Commissioner Cathro: Most faculty societies do votes of confidence and I would love to talk to you guys about how you go about votes of confidence and what happens when they fail, etc. Recognizing there's a lot of details and we're running out of time, I support the sentiment, although I do think acclamations are used widely across Canada at all levels of government, there's merits on both sides. I've talked about it, I would love to see what faculty society procedures are and we could have a conversation about that.

Representative Donaldson: Appreciating that point, we do have some of our elections team here, I would like to touch on acclamation and having confidence vote, that's basically the mandate to govern, I do think the acclaimed team will have issues when they push for students the university will say 'according to who?' They don't have that mandate. I think we have to look at this strategically, the need for a mandate allows the incoming team to push their agenda to assembly and university even playing field, if we don't have that, I think it's more damaging than pushing back hiring by a week or two. Trying to negotiate or work with university and we don't want to put them at a disadvantage when they go to the university.

Representative Braam: On acclamation, a large number of people I talked to are disappointed that they didn't have a vote of confidence even though they were likely they were to win. People already have voter apathy, and by the AMS not wanting to hear whether people like these people, will increase voter apathy. I think we will see declining voter turnout in years to come as a result. I think moving away from acclamation is a good idea. On the topic of policies, EngSoc, if the vote of confidence is in the negative, we then have an election at our assembly with a notification of positions open 48 hours in advance.

Speaker: One sticking point between faculty society policies between ours, you have to run as a team with AMS. Some do, some don't. That was one thing that came up at our discussions.

Chair Chishti: Just because I've been here for a really long time, I've had a lot personal success with votes of confidence, fun fact: I've never won a contested election at queens, they've been uncontested. How many of you have seen votes of confidence in your societies? So EngSoc had two years, COMPSA has been two votes on confidence. I think part of the role of student leaders in general is to look at the process and optics. It's very hard to lose a vote of confidence. Even if you have one team, it forces more consultation;

it looks better on us to have done that. It makes it look like we have, optics matter; it should be something we consider.

Rector Young: I'm not on one side or the other with this acclamation debate, to the point that an acclaimed executive doesn't have the same negotiating power with administration, I think that's only in the case if they don't do their job. Every AMS executive, regardless if elected or acclaimed, has the same mandate to serve the undergrad population. I think it's important to think about the difference between faculty society vote of confidence fails or AMS executive vote of confidence fails, the society can recover from losing a vote of confidence. Given the inherent day to day necessity of AMS services, as a student, those necessary services, I don't think you can recover if you don't have an executive in place to run those services, that would be a delay of Taps, CoGro, Safety Services, that would hurt the society and thus the student experience for a year, you would have to work hard to bring that up. Even as I'm saying that, I still don't completely believe we shouldn't have a non-vote of confidence. We shouldn't really compare faculty society elections and AMS executive elections as being the exact same thing, because the effect on student life is vastly different.

Representative Braam: I fundamentally disagree with Young, for example the EngSoc, we hire our directors and commissioners at the same time as AMS does, even less of a timeline because we have already transitioned over. If vote of confidence, we look at a delay of two weeks, it's not an end of the world delay. There are other ways to delay in policy such as if a ratification fails we would have to reopen hiring that's a delay. Being afraid of how the timeline works is kind of cutting corners, we need to go through the best way possible. We should be able to get things done in a timely matter.

Trustee Aulthouse: I feel like the debate of faculty societies vs. AMS is irrelevant. Across the board a vote of confidence is easy to win. It's important to note that this was the first year in 20 years this was the first uncontested election, it's not the sign of a fundamental flaw. It's pretty easy to win as uncontested election, it's important that we develop policy if they don't win an uncontested election. Also on the note of voter apathy and voter turnout as a result of the acclamation, was voter turnout higher this year than it was last year with a contested election?

Commissioner Cathro: Yes.

Representative Giordano: A lot of concerns about legitimacy of an acclaimed government, personally, I would like to believe the university would not be so confrontational so to suggest that the AMS executive lack legitimacy to speak on behalf of students. If talking in practical purpose, winning a vote of confidence is not difficult, the question brought up, what would stand if they lost the vote of confidence, imagine

what we would lose if the executive lost vote of confidence, why would they lose the vote of confidence? If we have the mechanism, for more preventing risk.

President Grotsky: It's easy to win a vote of confidence, if you are going to lose a vote of confidence, you should not be in office, it's that simple, and we should evaluate alternate hiring policies. Maybe do a shortened period of ratifications to get them out sooner, you have to... (?) never mind the governance aspect recognizing what students want you have to have a vote of confidence.

Vice-President Wood: I'm with Rector Young on a couple points, earlier in the day I was very much for vote of confidence, I find that it comes down to how we view AMS, a great model of democracy or more of an organization than enables student life to have the best student life possible? Unfortunately, acclamation keeps student life on track, do we value that more than the idealized version of democracy?

Representative Wallace: I feel that when you vote for a team you're voting for current model of AMS as it stands. If we have systemic issues, there's always the question if things could be changed. By not having a vote of confidence, we don't allow the possibility that option no one's voting for anybody because there's something in the system that needs to be changed. By having vote of confidence, we give voters change to comment on structure of AMS.

President Cressman: If there is a structural issue in the AMS there has to be some kind of structure to resolve that, there is way to resolve that, in order to do that, it needs to be running. I'm in favor of the acclamation despite some of its shortcomings, I have a question, in terms of a lot people are on with vote of confidence, practical and functionally of AMS, can you comment on if by-election if vote of confidence didn't go through what kind of state would that put incoming year of AMS in?

Vice-President Reekie: It's one team that didn't get the vote of confidence? It'd be a huge detriment, I would disagree with the Rector respectfully, that yes the services are (?) but there's a lot of behind the scene no one will see until you're in office. I thought I knew the job and was completely overwhelmed when I transitioned into the role. Even things such as legal and insurance matters that you don't see every day, if those things don't happen the faculty societies can't run either. Thinking about this, I guess, it's important to think about if there is a vote of confidence, if vote down, who will do it? There will never be a perfect team, my team won by 60% that means 40% weren't happy with us, we are not a perfect team and there will never be a perfect team, what's great about the AMS is that there's a lot of control mechanisms internally in place if it's not a perfect team. There will never be that perfect team, in that case it is the governing body's job to make them accountable. In terms of consultation, if they are acclaimed to do that

consultations process it's this body's job that makes sure that they do that, I wanted to point that out, I'm happy to take questions on that.

Commissioner Cathro: Last year, I was hiring into week 12 and almost into exams, if you have a delay, we're not allowed to hire during exams - which can be overruled in extenuating circumstances, but you could be hiring when people aren't on campus. It was things like Judicial Committee, if they're not functioning, we have issues with functions we've been delegated to carry out by the university. I can't underestimate the amount of time spent by incoming teams on interviews, there is the potential that hiring timelines will be screwed up. If we didn't hire judicial committee on time, we wouldn't ratify by assembly for summer and we wouldn't have a committee in the summer and wouldn't be doing our job for university. Yes, hiring timelines can always be tweaked but we don't have a lot of play with, is my concern.

President Grotzky: The 60% is unfair because if you were in a competitive election. About hiring, I can sympathize with our hiring late, I think the paramount issue is if you lose a vote of confidence, you shouldn't be in office. Maybe we should have policy for these extreme cases though they happen minimally, once every 20 years, maybe you have to extend into exam period, to get people applying earlier, you have to find a way in these very extreme cases to still make sure people have what they want.

Speaker: This is more consultative. I would love to hear all the ideas people have as there are more people on the speakers list.

Representative Braam: Can we have straw-pole on how people feel?

Commissioner Cathro: I want to make the comment, obviously there a lot of people who feel strongly about vote of confidence. If you have an idea of what to do if it fails, this is your Assembly and your AMS so I encourage you to bring that forward. I can't do this alone, I just don't have time before the next Assembly. If you have ideas of what you want that to look like, I've said that I've run through everything I can and can't determine a way to make a vote of confidence work. I encourage you to bring it forward, because as much as I want to I can't make these changes alone, basically I need your help.

Speaker: Moving onto a quick discussion about social media. When speaking of lack of policy, policy was outdated in regards to social media. As CEO when consulting with new policy, I had ideas about how to put in policy common practices about social media and campaigns with social media and things they didn't like.

Rector Young: As I spoke earlier, seemed like I was on acclamation side, the reason why I am on the fence, if you're not able to win confidence vote than you shouldn't be in

office, at the same time all the staff in AMS, those people have been there for a while and thus the services will not be in complete jeopardy, if our AMS Executive (...) about them, and quite frankly, if there's something outrageous in the AMS team that would cause them to lose a vote of confidence, then maybe they would have troubles getting the signatures we talked about...my last point about whether or not we want to value student life and ability for students to have what they need day to day vs. having a perfect democracy, it's an interesting discussion kind of talking about how no one runs for EngSoc. I think it was mentioned that within the council people are encourage to run, they would elect executive, it sounds like we are comfortable in areas not have perfect democracy in order to make sure students have what they need. There are other areas where we are comfortable having elect reps make those decisions.

Member-At-Large Phelan: I'm CRO for ASUS, I wanted to state my position on the matter alongside Giordano and Grotsky. I do think if a team can't win a vote of confidence than they shouldn't be in office, in ASUS our policy states if a team fails to win a vote of confidence that election is postponed until the fall. I'm not suggesting that that's best practice, I think the point that's being made generally is yes a vote of confidence is important to student body, a lot of people asked me why there wasn't a vote of confidence in the AMS, a lot of people having that question shows there is a desire to have a vote of confidence. On the topic of endorsements our policy is very opaque about endorsements whether or not we allow them it doesn't really mention them, this year we did allow them, they were effective, we didn't see many problems with them, what policy would look like, validating that, what that process would look like... I'm saying we went with and way it works seemed to go well. I can't describe exactly how it went but perhaps a candidate with an endorsement can elaborate on that.

President Cressman: On the social media piece, we're actually putting a forward a change in our policy, what are you looking at putting in? One of thing things we're on the fence about is keeping pages up after campaigns end but not having posts or comments from candidates. As well, candidates have to change their profile photos once campaign ends but a lot of people who support those do keep those photos up... Those are some thoughts.

Speaker: Another issue we ran into, it makes sense to single out Facebook right now. To write good policy, it should apply to any unforeseeable social media platform. That's where ambiguity comes into play. As to what we're putting into play, putting in the standard practice we have already which is registering official accounts that you've used and allowing them to be up but you can't update them. A side note, whether or not you should be allowed to campaign or not during voting period, but that's another discussion. The issue of trying to get people to change their profile pictures, when campaigns have 100-200 people helping them out -- it's hard to get everyone on the same page, you want to make sure it's the same playing field. We were looking at

having these accounts registered and the team knowing exactly the accounts so they can better monitor them. More regulation in that sense. As far as having posters or profile pictures, that's more a complaint driven basis because it's impossible to police all 16,000 students. With the grey area, how you hold someone responsible if they're not the official page but official endorsement. If anyone has any thoughts on social media?

Representative Truong: Talking about the vote of confidence, this is the only AMS executive election I've seen, I'm disappointed by the election, and I didn't see any campaigning. CESA was uncontested but did have a vote of confidence with that they did classroom visits, I really would like to see a vote of confidence. I would it disappointed I didn't know about this. On the topic of social media, having to delete pages by the end of campaign, when I ran for second year rep for CESA I had a lot of people messaging me if I stopped running.

President Grotzky: On social media, I don't see the big deal about the profile picture thing, I think changing it, if you change it back to your picture, people can always go back and friends can unlike and re-like it and it can pop-up on your newsfeed, there's way to go around the profile picture. In terms of pages, it's not a big deal, events that pop up around the voting, it reminds them to vote, that might be a concern rather than a page. You probably can't police people's friends from posting, it's impossible to monitor, its important candidates don't campaign during voting period, beyond that, if people support them it's their own.

Representative Braam: A thought, Grotzky mentioned, campaign parties and election night parties, how does that fit into our policy? It's an off campus event related to a campaign its implying you're voting and how does that (...) when the voting period ends and should we be policing that?

Speaker: They're after the voting period has ended and therefore the campaign itself; the advertising, it is the major grey area. To realizing when discussing with this, we want strong procedures, but we want to balance that with student engagement. You don't want the events used in the wrong way, but some events can increase student engagement and voter turnout, yes some pages can be used in the wrong sense, but does the benefit having more people know about election, does it outweigh the cost of having them misused? That's one thing in my role as CEO that came up this year.

Vice-President Butler: Commenting specifically to social media, when I ran, my friends endorsed me and I didn't know the policy, for all them to keep their profile pictures afterwards, it would be difficult to message all their friends to take down the picture, it would be a long process. Once the discussion period goes for an hour, is that AMS policy?

Representative Donaldson: Speaking quickly on social media, I don't see how election night parties have all that much engagement attached to them? More broadly when you're talking about getting out the vote, couldn't that be solved by if AMS specifically get out the vote and mandate or campaign specifically if they want to get that vote out, they can add their friends (...) and maybe that way we don't get the concern of each specific candidate photo popping up reminding people to vote.

Speaker: If the AMS brings forward a fee such as the Bus-It fee, then you have the same image of crossover problem. I think the Elections Team Facebook page has 86 likes so... I don't know how many people that would attract.

Representative Giordano: I don't think having student government police election parties would do anything and I think the only thing it would achieve is ruin people's parties, the actual sanctity of the vote, I don't think...at the same time I would like to say in the vote of confidence, in a tumultuous an incredibly rare event that exec loses vote of confidence, we are afraid of what happens? What does happen? Is it possible we could designate certain services as essential services? Could an external body handle those services?

Speaker: One thing that came up in our discussion, having current executive hiring until new exec is hired. A lot of issues arise with that such as hiring panels need to be consistent throughout. That was one option explored.

Chair Chishti: I have something regarding social media, from a few years ago, in general when we do campaign rules, they may not always be objective, and I think that's okay, what we need to worry about, is first of all, for any complaints if they have a substantive effect... that should be the first criteria. Second one should be evidence. Without those two it's hard to do anything else. Another one, people aren't misrepresenting anyone else, anything else is irrelevant, for example with campaign posts or parties the only people you are inviting are voting in your favor regardless because those are your friends. In general for social media, we should focus on anything that would have a substantive effect on the outcome of election, anything else with evidence for, anything else gets to hazy to figure out.

President Hamilton: Can I pass a motion to adjourn?

Seconded by: Rebecca Wieschkowski.

Motion to adjourn passes.

For: 18

Opposed: 16

Representative Braam: Recall the vote.

Motion to adjourn fails.

For: 16

Opposed: 19

Speaker: Topic of endorsements.

Commissioner Cathro: Just some questions: What are the pros, what are the cons, one of the things is, what we concluded is that we have no regulations and we say nothing or do we want to ban them outright or if we want to have a middle ground. If a club is endorsing can they print posters? I put four guiding questions there. Should the AMS elections policy allow for endorsements, no regulations? What should the role of elections team be in regulating endorsements? What are relationships with team and people endorsing them?

President Grotsky: I have no problem with endorsements, we should find a way to regulate how groups decide on candidates if a friend is a chair and endorses a team. There should be vote inside a team, I don't know if we can mandate that.

Representative Wallace: As someone involved in clubs and government, I think it is a positive thing to have reach out of clubs, I am in favor of regulations, perhaps personal connections not because mandate of clubs put you club you want to make sure there's regulation. You want to make sure club is on board with endorsements.

Representative Braam: I'm a little on the fence, I think there's a lot of clubs not political in nature, a club as an exec with friends running, they endorse it. There are groups that might like to endorse groups, if we were to allow it, we would have to require that a club would have to have it in their constitution and members be aware of threshold of membership in the club as a way of requiring endorsements.

Representative Donaldson: I appreciate where the previous members are coming from, I am concerned about how invasive that is in club life. We should regulate to degree to which third party groups can campaign. If they want to provide endorsement, it can be on the Facebook page, the independence is maintained and benefit of endorsement is continued on. We have to make sure clubs cannot, if a club member wants to volunteer, but they cannot volunteer as president on this club. It's a middle road approach we could take.

Vice-President Wood: My view on endorsements, I'm strongly against it, if your club decides to endorse someone, if you have vote, the remaining 1/3 will feel pressured to vote. They're going to try to join these clubs so they can get all these clubs to endorse them and take student votes on endorsement. It discourages students that are less

involved. If they haven't been involved in one of the bigger clubs, there's a huge barrier for them to overcome before and compete.

Member-At-Large (?): I had two thoughts, in discussing if we're going to go through with allowing, it seems that it could pose a logistical nightmare whether or not an endorsement is legitimate, have a CRO or CEO sitting at each meeting deciding who is going to vote. I worry I could wind up having this verification process being clouded. Personally, I'm not sure I particularly care for endorsements, the process for them to be abused or manipulated because you may have a friend in a position is in constitution, there's too much room for turning an election in a popularity contest. Big thing is worrying about the logistical nightmare when they're already being stretched to their max. You're adding one more thing to the list.

Trustee Aulthouse: Given what I know about clubs, they're not looking for more regulation, considering we have issues like insurance which are very important with clubs, the issue of endorsement is not the necessary battle to pick, I don't see anything wrong system as is.

Representative Giordano: I'm split with this issue, I agree with some things Tim and Alex Wood said, alienation members of clubs that student government is too cliquey, that's not a feeling to protect, we want to make student politics as open as possible. Logistically, it seems really impossible to manage and I don't know if it's possible. The idea of endorsements can also be really possible, incentivizes candidates. It was demonstrated this elitist team could win. If a team was in touch with everyone on campus and was prepared to deliver, I think that would represent an effective team.

Member-At-Large Lively: I've had the chance to consider this when discussing internally, going to back to big concerns, the idea that the club exec might go against wishes on club and endorse and the club isn't happy with it, its dealt with through changing clubs policy, I know the Clubs Office has done a good job of this in terms of leaderships. In order to make it clear they have leadership in place, enables club membership if a club exec is acting out of place, they can be removed and dealt with that way. Going back to idea that is might just be one person might be getting all this club support. Going off what Giordano said, it's really not a bad thing, running for AMS exec is usually based on internal AMS experience. Allowing clubs to endorse, we allow people who are external to say 'my experience isn't within AMS' and being able to rally behind that. TO have an election that is dynamic. We're discounting clubs to an extent thinking that these are huge issues, it can become an issue, but the largest clubs on campus are well run. I agree with Aulthouse and Giordano, the best idea is to keep endorsement free as possible to let them focus on more pressing issues.

Speaker: Thank you everyone for your insightful comments, take all these ideas and thoughts please think about them, if you have any suggestions contact Commissioner Cathro.

Speaker: Motion to adjourn?

Moved by: Joshua Hamilton

Seconded by: Jason Verbeek

Adjourns at 10:32pm