

AMS Assembly Minutes
December 3rd, 2015

Motion 1: Approval of the Agenda of the meeting of December 3rd, 2015

Moved by: Jon Wiseman

Seconded by: Kanivanan Chinniah

President Chinniah: I'd like to omnibus motions 10 through 12. I would like them considered as one motion.

Vice-President Alex Wood: I would like to discuss them individually so I will be voting no.

President Chinniah: This is not a Stephen Harper style omnibus. The fact is, these are all in the same spirit, like motion 11 and 12 literally change one word.

Speaker: We will now vote on omnibussing motions 10-12.

In Favour: All except for 6

Opposed: 6

Motion Carries

Vice President Beaudry: I would like to add a discussion period to the agenda.

Vice-President Alex Wood: I am in approval of adding a discussion period, but it has become regular practice to adding discussion periods. I would like to express my dislike of not having a notice ahead of time. I would like to see this practice reduced in the future.

Vote: All

Opposed: 0

Motion Carries

Speaker: We will now vote on the approval of the agenda.

Vote: All

Opposed: 0

Motion Carrier.

Motion 2: That AMS Assembly approves the minutes for Assembly of the meeting of Thursday November 19th, 2015.

Moved by: Jon Wiseman

Seconded by: Kanivanan Chinniah

In Favour: All

Opposed: None

Speakers Business

Speaker: We would like to acknowledge that Queen's sit on the lands of the Anishinaabe territory.

Guest Speaker

President Chinniah: I would like to introduce Jordan Morelli, Chair of the Senate on Academic Development to discuss the topic of a Fall reading week.

Morelli: Thank you for having me tonight. The current proposal going around for consultation is here. When we started out, the original intention was to see if we could add instructional days to the academic term. It very quickly became clear that there was a little appetite for that, but there was a growing appetite for a Fall term break. We are now trying to find a way to incorporate a Fall term break. We have surveyed what other schools are doing. Queen's is one of the few without a break in the Fall term. Some schools have tied it to Thanksgiving, which is what we are proposing, but in some cases, they have added an extra day. Other places it is tied to Remembrance day. Sometimes it is a full week, sometimes an extra day. The proposal we have is to add a full Week tied to Thanksgiving. We currently sit at 59 instructional days in the Fall. This is the lowest anywhere in the country. For the most part that is okay except in engineering. If you fall below that they will lose accreditation. As a proposal, we will be brought to 61 instructional days in most years. The long and short of it is that we will move everything a week earlier in order to allow for a Fall term break. This means orientation will start a week earlier, and classes will start immediately after Labour Day. In this round of consultations, there has been

some feedback already, and we have considered as many permutations as possible. We were fairly confident that this was as good as it could be, but it has emerged that in what I have heard from students especially, is in order for us to do this, we go from four pre exam study days, down to two. One of the main motivations for Fall reading week is to improve student mental health. This result has had many students state it is detrimental to their mental health. The only way we can fix that is if we move orientation week a little bit and changing it slightly.

The proposal that the Dean of Student Affairs has suggested, and I think it makes a bit of sense, is that O-Week would move earlier, but it would start on a Saturday, not a Sunday. This makes move in day on a Saturday. I heard from many students that this is not a big deal. From the point of view of mental health outcomes, putting exams over too many days is a good idea. This is not the proposal that is not out there for us right now, but it is emerging as a fairly strong alternate possibility from the consultation going on right now.

My personal, individual sense is that either this proposal, or the one I just mentioned, one of those two options are kind of the two leading options that allows us to do everything we need to do to improve mental health outcomes for students. I am happy to take questions right now. I don't know how much there is allotted, but I am at your disposal.

Rector Young: Thank you so much for being here, I guess just a few questions on what would be possible and what wouldn't be. Right now, it looks like two days were added from 59 to 61, is it possible to add those back to our pre-exam student days. Maybe the two days could come out from the full week break? The focus is that there is literature that supports the two day break before exams.

Morelli: I do agree with that. There doesn't seem to be much evidence either way about a Fall term break. We heard certain anecdotal things suggesting longer is better. We thought that this would be a bit of an experiment no matter what we would do. The best thing we felt is that we try it as a full week to see how that it goes. Your math is right, if we were willing to stay at 59 days, then we could do what you said. There is two problems with that is that we don't wish to stay at 59 days, we want to get 60 days. We want 12 weeks. The other reason is driving some of this, was that the expectation or anticipation that Remembrance is likely to be declared a national Holiday. That could all happen within one or two years. In anticipation of that, and knowing engineering cannot lose a day, we thought we could have a day to spare. Part of the reason for 61, the reason 61 show sup

there, is that some years, to get 60 we would end on a Monday. I don't anticipate anyone would show up in my class if all I had a Monday. The thinking was it should be at least a Monday/Tuesday.

Vice President Wood: One worry that has come from both of my own experiences and my constituents, that by backing orientation week by one week, that requires people to be back a week to two weeks back. That drastically affected my employability. Employers have stated that they don't like this, and one thing that we worry about in terms of backing up is by moving everything back you are kind of reducing employability by students.

Morelli: We have heard that before. By moving that a week earlier, we move to where other Ontario schools are. I don't disagree with you, but my understanding is that many people involved in orientation are paid people. Irrespective of that, it is a choice to get involved in orientation week.

Representative Bevans: This does lose one week of work for students. A number of internships in my field of study end with August. One of the things I am proud of, is the strong tradition of volunteer work. I think it would be a point that it isn't a paid opportunity always.

Morelli: There is two conflicting choices here. The one choice is it comes with preserving orientation week as a full week. Having to drop down to two pre exam study days, or cutting into orientation week and getting these four pre exam study days. That is a trade off involved. The trade off between moving one week back or not is a trade off between Fall reading week or not.

President Jamieson: I would want to echo representation Bevans. A lot of students say that it is a voluntary option and it does put students in a financial hardship. Also, it is important to note the Faculty of Arts and Science is the only one that has a paid orientation week position. The petition also, is that students signed it, without knowing the consequences of it were. The last thing, is that it sounds as though, that the key driver of the project is student mental health and wellness. Absolutely I am a huge advocate for student health and mental well being. There isn't a conclusive evidence that a break would help mental health, and a Fall reading week may encourage students to walk away from their problems. We should be promoting awareness, properly teach students how to student. I would like to give up a Fall reading week for the university to make sure student mental health is looked upon in other ways, like ensuring proper student habits, etc.

Morelli: Having a Fall break does not encourage students to walk away from their problems. It gives them an opportunity to take a break and look at their problems. The hope is students, during a reading week, is they will catch up and get sorted out before it is too late.

Speaker: In the interest of time, we will now cut it off here.

Morelli: Best feedback mechanism, “Queen’s Sessional Date Proposal”, the first thing that will pop up on Google is this website. There is an 80-page document there and a spot to put comments.

President’s Report

President Chinniah: I would like to first acknowledge Morelli for his presentation. We do appreciate him taking time out of his busy teaching schedule to come talk to us today. I want to know that this will be the last assembly for certain people. I want to recognize them before they leave. It is the last assembly for Connor Bevans who is destined to go on exchange. I would also like to acknowledge that it is the last assembly for the executives of the MBA. On behalf of the AMS, we found the contributions of the president of the MBA interesting. I also want to welcome some people to their first assembly, Kate McDonalds and Victoria Chapell who are in first years who will be joining us in the future.

Vice-Presidents Report

Vice-President Beaudry: The first update is the audit is moving along very smoothly. I am going through them with the clubs assistant manager. We were hoping the Campus dentist will open soon, but it will be in the first week of January.

Vice-President Letersky: Some of the topics discussed at Queen’s Park in Toronto, is assessing work-integrated opportunities across all faculties and tuition. We also talked about the upcoming funding formula. It will actually set the stage for the next five to 10 years, or even longer. What we have really pushed is to move away from a model of per student funding.

Board of Directors

Chair of the Board Blair: I will comment what the board has to say about proposed changes during the motions.

Student Senate

Senator Brockie: Senate met on Tuesday. SCAD was busy. In regards to undergrad program, a Bachelor of Health Studies (Honours) is now available online. Also, Senate approved the certificate in academic writing. It was passed that it is only offered to distance studies students.

Rector's Report

Rector Young: First thing, the Tricolor Award nominations are due December 23rd, 2015. As you will see in my report, I have plans to look at bigger long term projects. Sometimes you get caught up in the day to day, and I am getting nostalgic as people talk about the elections.

Board of Trustees

Trustee Li: We will meet this Sunday. If you have any questions, please reach out.

Statements by Members

President Chinniah: I forgot to mention one more individual who is unfortunately not going to be with us again, Carkner. I would like to thank her for her service to the assembly.

Rector Young: I think it is important to recognize that there are some people on campus with mental illnesses that know strategies that can help. So I guess just to be careful that we don't sometimes categorize all those with mental health illness into one category.

Question Period:

Speaker: Are there any questions?

Business Arising from Minutes

None.

New Business

Motion 3: That AMS Assembly nominate one voting member of Assembly to sit on the Special Committee of External Alignment.

Moved by: Lively

Seconded by: Chinniah

Commissioner Lively: We would like nominations right now.

Trustee Li: President Palmeri.

President Palmeri: Respectfully decline.

Representative Li: I nominate representative Dowling.

Representative Dowling: I'll accept.

All in Favour: All

Opposed: None

Motion Carries

Motion 4: That AMS Assembly approval the Fall Equity grants as follows: 2300 to the ASUS Equity and Diversity Commission, and 700 to the Human Rights Office.

Moved by: Alex Chung

Seconded by: Sarah Letersky

In favour: All

Against: 0

Motion Carries

Motion 5: That AMS Assembly formally ratify Vasanth Ranganthan as the AMS Assembly member of the Radio Queen's U Board.

Moved by: Max Garcia

Seconded by: Jon Wiseman

Motion 6: That AMS Assembly ratify Meaghan Peirce as the 2016 Orientation Roundtable Coordinator.

Moved by: Danielle Kimmerly

Seconded by: Sarah Letersky

Vice-President Beaudry: What is your one major goal?

Meghan: One of the major goals is to be more approachable and be able to reach out to first years more. We also want to incorporate all faculties and groups through intergroup relations.

Rector Young: What is your favorite part about orientation week?

Meghan: I was one of the shyest and most frightened people, and being able to come to such an open experience is something I loved doing.

Representative Hagerman: What event in all of the nine orientation weeks we run at Queen's are you most excited to see.

Meghan: I am excited because I have only seen a few groups. I am not sure what one I am most excited for. I am excited for all of them.

In Favour: All

Opposed: 0

Motion Carries

Motion 7: That AMS Assembly approve the changes to Policy Manual 2, Section 8, Part C, as seen in Appendix A: Back to Back"

Moved by: Peter Liberty

Seconded by: Jon Wiseman

In Favour: All

Opposed: 0

Motion Carries.

Motion 8: That AMS Assembly approve the changes to Policy Manual 1, Section 4, as seen in Appendix B: Charged Up.

Moved by: Jon Wiseman

Seconded by: Rebecca Herweyer

Moved by: Jon Wiseman

Seconded by: Rebecca Herweyer

Jon Wiseman: We will allow campaigning on election days, for online only. Also, restrictions will be lifted on posters to encourage creativity within those running. We hope that these changes will lead to better engagement during the campaign, as well as a higher turn out from voters. Lastly, our chief returning officer is in the back to take questions, and I can take some as well.

Representation Hagerman: One question I have Jon, is that you are expanding campaign days to include online campaigning during voting days, but wouldn't it be more effective to, rather than advertising for specific candidates, is to advertise voting? We had a specific team that boosted voting in EngSoc, as opposed to one candidate.

Commissioner Wiseman: I am open to this, but that being said, I think there should still be something on the candidate. We have seen it done in federal, provincial, and municipal elections. The campaign continues on campaigning days.

Rector Young: As it stands now, are candidates allowed to, one election days, say go out and vote?

Commissioner Wiseman: No.

President Garcia: Is there limits on budgets?

Commissioner Wiseman: That is coming up next.

President Tseng: One the note of poster limitations: How we have things is 11 by 17 posters. Our building really has only one area to put up posters. If there were to be multiple elections, I can see a certain monopoly over things, like bulletin boards if there is no size or quantity regulations.

CRO: For the poster limitations, this wouldn't take away all of the restrictions that certain buildings only have. We are basically just wanting to eliminate these restrictions from us, because restrictions already exist in each buildings. Also, it isn't down to us how teams want to spend their budgets. We basically are just trying to cut the rules.

Vice-President Wood: So just a couple of points. The first one is about the posters. Expanding off what President Tseng said. If we are not limiting poster size, were someone decides to print off bulletin board size posters, defacing posters can occur. In a lot of cases, people weren't getting any special approval. In just campus buildings it is kind of a free for all.

President Jamieson: I think there is a lot of other costs in running campaigns. I am hesitant to totally subscribe to the belief that everyone is going to wash campus in posters of themselves.

Rector Young: The only experience I can offer is my own. When I did my campaign, I had never do campaigns before. For me personally, having the rules there gave me a rough idea of how many people would be doing. To try to give them a blank slate, it could be overwhelming.

CRO: Kind of the idea, is that the AMS Elections team is trying to promote student engagement and turnout. It is harder when you are reaching so many faculties. A lot of schools do this, and candidates already have a base on social media. The AMS Election page only has about 300 likes. Candidates aren't necessarily going to say, vote for me, vote for me, they are just trying to get people to vote in general.

Vice-President DiCapua: One of the most important thing, is to keep voters informed. Informed voters is developed up until voting time. I support this online promotion. It can be very stressful for a candidate sitting there in limbo.

Representative Lawson: All of the campaign materials in one central location, all your doing is pushing everyone to that centralized location to where that platform is available. All campaign material doesn't disappear, you aren't bombarding everyone. I am just in support of the EngSoc model.

President Jamieson: Just in the interest, these discussions are not really meaningful. We have numbers that back up a claim, and these discussions are

unnecessary.

Commissioner Wiseman: If you are an AMS member, you do not need speaking rights. The second thing, is you will be glad to know, all information with regards to poster sizes in different building will be made clear.

In Favour: 22

Opposed: 8

Abstentions: 4

Motion Carries

Motion 9: That AMS Assembly approve the spending limits for the Winter Elections, as seen in Appendix C: Know Yourself.

Commission Wiseman: This is not binding to the Rector elections. If these numbers are not approved by SGSP, then the Rector numbers will revert back to the normal.

Rector Young: It has been discussed with the AMS that obviously the Rector Budget is significantly lower than the AMS executive budget. Conversations for changes are happening now.

Commissioner Wiseman: A sliding budget is a good suggestion, and this will be better considered by my successor. Time is running out for this year, so I hope that my successor looks forward into funding formulas.

In Favour: All

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries

Motion 10: That AMS Assembly approve the changes to Section 6 of the Hiring and Appoints Policy and Procedures, as seen in Appendix D: started from The Bottom, the changes to Section 14 of the Hiring and Appointments Policy and Procedures, as seen in Appendix E: Best I Ever Had, and the changes to Section 24 of the Hiring and Appointments Policy and Procedures, as seen in Appendix F: Hold On, We're Going Home."

Moved by: Eva Kapnnoudhis

Seconded by: Kanivanan Chinniah

Manager Kapnnoudhis: My name is Eva Kapnnoudhis, and I work as the talents acquisition manager. As well, I assist in some of the elements of hiring. Some background: Proposals are three to five page documents that are required of all AMS staff applicants. They are primarily geared towards getting a good feel on an applicants thought process. As a no experience necessary employer, this is important. We believe as of right now, proposals are deterring applicants from applying. We actually did a bit of research. I held a focus group, and took people who are working currently, who were new AMS full time staff, and one thing we found from that is that proposals are cited as the number one barrier for applications. They also seemed very much of an advantage to current internal AMS members. They also required a high degree of specialized knowledge, so we do recognize that it is important for applicants to get a very good feel for why they are applying, since these positions take a lot of commitment. The vague requirements do not give a good basis on which they can undertake this research. As well, we found that a proposal does not indicate or translate into future success. There is a lot of transition process in training that actually assist them in where they are going to take their portfolio. The policy change that we are talking about replaces the proposals to a set of questions. We need to assess their thought process and seriousness of position, however, we just think that proposals in the way they are functioning right now are deterring applicants from applying. 60 salaried staff were hired this year, from only 80 applications.

These questions (shown on screen) will let us assess applicants based on potential, rather than current experience.

Chair Blair: Our last meeting of the board we discussed the proposed changes here. We discussed it in principle, and the board wholly agrees that proposals should be replaced with questions.

Representative Dowling: Quick question about the wording. There is currently a maximum of three questions. This is a little binding. Also, the last sentence, the list of questions shall be consistent with every position in the AMS should be amended to include full time salary staff.

President Chinniah: Only three is because too much knowledge is currently required, anymore may be too much. We want to keep it as simple as possible. We are certainly open to changing it though.

Member at Large: Why those questions? Second: Why only those questions? Third: Why those questions to all salary positions.

Kapnoudhis: The first question is geared towards assessing applicants knowledge of knowing really the demanding characteristics of these jobs. The next two, works to address your next points. What we did with these questions, we did hit on what the specific challenges. We hope the applicant gears those more specifically to the position they are applying for.

Chair Blair: The board also agrees with this version of 6.03.

President Palmeri: I just want to highlight that I do appreciate this change. I think it is a reasonable solution for the barriers. It does so that it allows applicants to be reflective and have a little more direction and creativity as well.

In Favour: All

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion Carriers.

Motion 11: That AMS Assembly approve the change to Policy Manual 1, Section 4, as seen in Appendix C: Headline.

Moved by: Alex Wood

Seconded by: Jon Wiseman

Vice-President Wood: This motion comes as a result directly from my constituents. Not at a slice of the team, but my constituents were reasonably so that they were not involved in the voting process. This is something we tried to add last year. The idea is to essentially eliminate acclamation, despite the precedent for it in the past, and replace it with a vote of confidence. There is a protocol to follow if vote of confidences are to fail. If it fails, individual elections will occur. If the vote of confidence fails, that means the team system has failed twice.

Representative Dowling: Last year these concerns were brought forward: Individually choosing executive members can be detrimentally due to the team dynamics. As well, a vote of confidence delegitimizes the voting process. A

possible process if the vote of confidence fails is the impeachment policy.

President Chinniah: Let me make a controversial statement: Acclamations are preferred to vote of confidence. I prefer also, students to be able to say no to certain teams. Last year, it was brought up that the only instance students can say no, is when only one team is running. I prefer the ability to say no when a bad team is running. When there are two bad teams running, as of right now there is no chance to say no to two bad teams. Abstentions don't count towards the final toward. I am a bit more uncomfortable only accepting a no vote from students if there is only one team.

Vice-President Wood: The spirit of this motion is to due what my constituents wanted. I would be happy to consider an amendment that also adds the ability to say no when there is multiple teams. The purpose of this motion is to eliminate acclamation so students always have a vote.

President Chinniah: I propose an amendment to amend the motion as follows: Strike J entirely, and instead add a K.

Rector Young: Don't we need to vote to have a new motion since this changes the spirit of the old motion.

Speaker: I rule that we have this as a separate motion. As it stands, we are debating the motion from Vice-President Wood, if someone would like to propose a new motion/amendment, they may.

Vice-President Wood: I prefer to pass this section now, since it is of different spirit. We can still pass the new motion tonight, but I would like to pass my motion tonight.

Representative Rukaj: Lets take a vote: Would you pass the motion the way it is right now? (Strople)

Vice-President Wood: I would like to withdraw the motion, and bring it back within the hour.

Motion 12: That AMS Assembly approve the changes to Section 6 of the Hiring and Appointments Policy and Procedure as seen in Appendix H: Energy

Moved by: Sarah Letersky

Seconded by: Kanivanan Chinniah

Vice-President Letersky: Now, we want to have a lottery and not everyone will get interviews, With the increase in the amount of applicants for part time positions, this is putting strain on the hiring officers.

Rector Young: Quick question, do we still see it necessary to have applicants submit answers to question?

Vice-President Letersky: Too many people may apply without it then.

Member at Large: Is this a threshold for this to take place? Also, what if you do the lottery, and not enough qualified applicants were found?

Vice-President Letersky: It is not typical for us to reach the 3-1 threshold at the SLC, for example, so it would not kick in. The second question: If there is not enough suitable applicants: That can already happen as of right now.

Representative Li: Do you think with this lottery you take away equal opportunity for those not picked in the lottery?

Vice-President Letersky: We hire on a no experience necessary basis, so this is in our understanding the most equal process.

Representative Li: Does that take priority over the fact that all students should have the opportunity to be interviewed?

Vice-President Letersky: The other aspect we looked at, is students aren't having their basis of skills judged off just two questions.

Vice-President Wood: We just passed this motion that created these written questions that will be asked to all applicants. This system devalues them to some extent, since most of this falls on the interview process. It is easy for someone to make a generic one they put in for six or seven different positions.

Vice-President Letersky: What we have seen over the last few years, is unfortunately students do that anyways, and at that point they do not receive an interview. When they are writing their questions, those will be used to gauge whether or not they get the job.

In Favour: All except for 1

Against: 1

Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries

Discussion Period

Long Term Bursary Program

Vice-President Beaudry: We are piloting a small version of this starting this January.

Commissioner Kimmerly: We identify clubs who aren't getting bursary funding. Some club events can be very expensive. Right now, we are just looking to make projects more sustainable in the long term. The first question we have, is do you think this long term bursary idea should be funded by a student fee or an assembly allocation?

Representative Dowling: I would like to enter committee the whole.

Motion Carries.

Speaker: You don't need to state your name or stand now.

Representative Bevans: Another argument for the student fee is it puts further power in the hands of the students if it is an opt out fee. If the point is to put power of this into the students hand, then this maintains that principle in the new policy.

Representative Dowling: I would be in favour of an assembly allocation. If it is opt out, maybe students won't approve it?

Vice-President Crawford: Can we do both?

Vice-President Beaudry: The bursary is not seed funding for the group, and it is for the individual student attending the event. The AMS currently has a disjointed bursary system, and having both would make things pretty complex. As you add on, the system becomes more fragmented, and having two monetary methods does not help the situation.

Strople shows 16 for allocation, and 12 for student fees

Commissioner Kimmerly: Should there be a criteria for clubs/groups to participate?

Representative Dowling: Would it ever be in the situation where a club decides that they don't want to do this program?

Commissioner Kimmerly: That could possibly happen, and could go under the arguments of against.

Representative Logan: Comment on the point representative Dowling made, is there any reason why a club wouldn't want this program?

Commissioner Kimmerly: I don't know why they wouldn't want to be.

Representative Lawson: Restricting clubs is going in the opposite direction. I think it is better to put criteria on what people can apply for.

Vice-President Hayes: We do kind of accommodate international travel in ComSoc, but we just cap it at a certain amount.

Strople shows 24 for yes, 4 no.

Commissioner Kimmerly: Do you think this should be a part of the CAC bursary program in the system?

Fall Hiring Period

Harper: Some reasons I believe we should eliminate the Fall hiring period is the entire staff would get proper training and work together as a team. Also, customer service and training for staff would improve. Process is detrimental to service productivity. Fall hires feel excluded – they have different experiences.

Commissioner Lively: Some of the arguments against are, that opportunities are being taken away from exchange students and first year students. Exchange students won't have a chance to reapply for the positions for example. These are also financial opportunities as well. These jobs provide students the chance to finance their schooling.

Emma Fuller: Other services: QSC already does not conduct fall hiring due to certification requirements, Tricolour Outlet does not conduct fall hiring due to their large volume, StudioQ, P\$CC, and WalkHome could continue to hire in the fall due to lower training requirements.

President Toft: I actually do kind of support this idea, I have actually noticed some of the repercussions of Fall hires at both Common Ground and QP, and so one of the things is slow customer service.

President Jamieson: I think something that is important, I would be curious to know how Fall hires feel about it. Do they feel their experience has been affected? I totally understand the issues going along with the training, but the only thing holding me back is our mandate. Our first commitment is to provide as much opportunity for students as possible. Does this come into contradiction with our first mandate.

Commissioner Lively: First and foremost, I think offering good services to our students is our primary goal. As well, something we noticed is Fall hires have much lower rehire rates. We see that because they are not getting the training in the work place.

Chair Blair: The board frequently considers the social values of our organization. When we look at the social value, we need to look at the social value of our staff and the patrons and students who actually use them. We should also look into the number of positions, but also the quality of positions.

President Palmeri: I would like to emphasize that it would best to seek meaningful experiences and ensuring the quality of these experiences is sufficient.

Representative Lawson: Just curious, maybe mentioned earlier, the number of people this affects. I can't imagine it is a huge number.

Harper: Approximately 60, but we will increase the amount of spots within other organizations that require less training.

Vice-President Crawford: The people talking about AMS' mandate is to offer opportunity, it doesn't actually say.

President Toft: I know people who work at CoGro and Taps who aren't exchange students and first years, so I was wondering if you could talk about that.

Vice-President Letersky: Some students we hire in the fall because they apply for work study. Quite a few of those students apply in the Spring and may not have gotten in.

Vice-President Beaudry: Tying our services to an average business doesn't hold a lot of weight.

Strople shows 1 abstention and 4 opposed

Referendum

President Chinniah: The issue at hand, is the fact that there are some clubs that went to specifically the Fall Referendum, that in the event were not successful, could go for their triennial review in January. Most people think they are going to pass without difficulty. That is not the case. One of the initial proposals was to have a second referendum in the winter. What we actually discovered, is that there is precedent in the past, where that due to errors on the behalf of the AMS, the AMS has actually extended the triennial review process by one year. In 2007-08, there was a fee ReLab, AMS passed a motion that there was a lack of awareness, and was granted a one year extension. In 2009, we also did the same thing for the Kingston Youth Shelter, where the AMS assembly passed a motion where the AMS ruled a one year extension. So what we think is the prudent course of action, for the groups that will be participating in the winter referendum period, is they can get an extension. I welcome any comments or feedback on that. Does everyone agree with this?

Representative Dowling: This would only apply for student groups that are under triennial review?

President Chinniah: Yes.

Strople indicates everyone is in agreement with the proposals.

Student Fee Structure Feedback

Vice-President Beaudry: This is relating to the student fee eligibility. In future

years, eligibility is now dependent on the definition passed on the November 19th Assembly. We collected opinion and to see how people agree or disagree with this new definition.

Mandatory Fees must only be established if they are essential to student life or put in place to maintain a primary facility for a student. If one becomes displaced in the next years, they will have to convert at their next triennial review. They can seek a higher opt out fee, or a fee in the same amount.

Some comments were made about the accessibility fund. They really would like to know how much the university has put towards a similar cause, to see how much the student body is putting in. Quite a few wanted to opt out of the athletic fee, and a review of that is on going. Queen's Band, no one really argued that they weren't valuable, but along a similar vein of the accessibility fee, there was a comment about the university contribution towards the band. A few arguments made was that the main benefit from the band is alumni relations. Student constables, there was some comments on a higher fee to subsidize the cost of having clubs use student constables.

Vice-President Crawford: The reason that the sentence was added was because within the proposal, the group could increase their fee, and usually it would be a 50% increase to make up for the mandatory opt out change.

Representative Rukaj: Just to add on to that, I believe some people at the discussion that establishing a new opt-out fee is different from maintaining a fee. I brought up a sentence could be added to differentiate between this.

Vice-President Crawford: Thank you Kyle, these session were really valuable, and it wasn't something you had to do, but you did do it.

Vice President DiCapua: I motion to open the agenda.

Seconded by: Brandon Jamieson

All in Favour: All

Opposed: None

Vice-President Wood: I would like to move that the changes in the document that were just e-mailed to all of you be made to the acclamation policy.

Speaker: Is there any debate on this addition to agenda.

In Favour: All
Opposed: None

Motion Carries.

Agenda Closes

Exit Committee of a Whole

Vice-President Wood: So, there has been a fairly large change from the original motion. We have added the none of the above ballot. What we removed is basically what our process would be in the case of a non-confident vote. As it currently reads, it would leave it up to the future assembly who ran into this situation to deal with it. What we noticed with this, and other decisions is a lot of it is based on precedent. We are passing it to a future assembly to set the precedent. I would like to hear what people think about how people can react to a failed vote.

President Chinniah: I credit most of commissioner Wiseman's knowledge of policy. It was quite good. The reason we left it as broad as possible was we wanted a future assembly to be able to make a decision that is best for them at that point and time. We can't predict many variables, so that is why we left it as broad as possible right now. One thing to also acknowledge is the likelihood of getting a none of the above is very small. Because of that, if it did happen, it would have had to be an incredibly exceptional circumstance, is to provide for as much discretion and latitude for the next assembly as possible. That is why we did it this way.

Representative Hagerman: I just think that this is in a completely different spirit. What does a vote of non-confidence state?

President Chinniah: At the University of Windsor, none of the above is an option. IN 2014, a set of candidates got acclaimed, and there was a campaign to vote a non-confidence against them. It is very possible for this option to exist in student government. The Windsor example is interesting to note. In the event that there is a vote of none of the above, that the election is deferred until the next academic year.

Vice-President Wood: So kind of going off of that point, I definitely appreciate it,

but I will say that the AMS does typically follow precedent. Yes we give latitude for them, but policy is open to make changes to. If someone decides they don't want to do it this way, they can. In the case of this happening, it tends to be a very high-pressure time. People's thoughts might not be in the best place to make this decision, which is why it may be best to have a policy in place.

President Palmeri: I think it is important to have a mechanism in place. To draw a parallel in the nursing world, as I often do. We know it is possible that things go wrong. In the event that there is an extreme exceptionality, we are prepared to know what to do, and knowing what to do in extreme circumstances does provide better results. This would be doing the future assemblies a service.

Vice-President Wood: I would like to make an amendment to the motion. Essentially it would be added to under Section 7.

In Favour: 19

Opposed: 3

Abstentions: 1

Speaker: Is there any debate on the motion?

In Favour: All

Opposed: 0

Abstentions: 0

Motion Carries