

ALMA MATER SOCIETY OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY INCORPORATED  
2015-2016 AMS Board of Directors Open Session Minutes

January 11<sup>th</sup> 2016, at 6:00PM  
AMS Board Room, John Deutsch University Centre, Kingston, Ontario

**ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER**

The January 11<sup>th</sup> 2016 meeting of the AMS Board of Directors was called to order at 6:06pm.

**ITEM 2: ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Present:

A. Aguilar, Student Director  
M. Blair, Chair  
K. Chinniah, President  
A. Dungca, Student Director  
E. Fuller, Media Services Director  
G. Giannopoulos, Student Director  
Q. Giordano, Vice-Chair  
S. Harper, Hospitality & Safety Director  
N. Kalergis, Corporate Secretary  
D. McConomy, Community Director  
E. McElroy, Student Director  
L. Parry, General Manager  
K. Beaudry, Vice-President (Operations)  
S. Letersky, Vice-President (University Affairs)  
D. Coderre, Community Director  
M. Lindsay, Community Director (call-in at 7pm)

Guests:

N. Patel, Director of Student Life Centre

Regrets:

Q. Giordano, Vice-Chair  
A. Dungca, Community Director

**ITEM 3: APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda of the January 11<sup>th</sup> 2016 meeting of AMS Inc. is adopted, as presented.*

**Moved:** D. McConomy  
**Seconded:** E. McElroy

All for.

**Motion unanimously adopted at 6:08pm.**

**ITEM 4: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of the November 29<sup>th</sup> 2015 open session meeting of AMS Inc. are adopted, as presented.*

**Moved:** A. Aguilar  
**Seconded:** K. Beaudry

All for.

**Motion unanimously adopted at 6:09pm.**

**ITEM 5: REPORTS**

**ITEM 5.1: CHAIR OF THE BOARD**

- More training for student directors (April annually and perhaps a second time in second semester); maybe a perk to advertise for the Board and better focus discussion at Board level (M. Blair)
- External facilitator from the School of Business? (A. Aguilar)
- Maybe, it's a practice by other Boards for governance training. Not appropriate to leave it to the Board Chair. (M. Blair)
- I think it would be a good idea, especially to have some consistency in the training from the point of view that some Board chairs will be quite conscientious about it. Depending on their time frames, they might not be able to provide as much time towards it. Outside facilitator might be worthwhile. (D. McConomy)
- To promote benefit of serving on the Board (relevant to shareholder election) opportunity that could be advertised a lot more. Point of interest that the Rotman School of Management – their students serve on Not For Profit Boards and something we could promote as well. (A. Aguilar).

Report ended 6:11pm.

**ITEM 5.2: PRESIDENT**

- On Fall Break, we did a survey where we tested Fall Break proposal, which involved cutting through orientation and moving it a date early. All the faculties are very divided so we will be meeting with Assembly to determine a course of action. (K. Chinniah)

- What is the proposal most realistic? (D. McConomy)
  - o Students don't want to take any days off the four days of pre-study. They don't want to shorten orientation week. This proposal would move the move-in date by a date early and condense orientation week for either faculty or residence orientation. Preserves pre-exam study. University will not move the move-in date the week before because it'll affect everything. (K. Chinniah)
- What is the impression you get on the senate committee on the break? (D. McConomy)
  - o Their proposal involves Thanksgiving week being a reading week and involves moving in a week early and losing two days of pre-exam study. (K. Chinniah)
- If the major reason for this is student mental-health, especially first year students, they won't be sure what their problems are at the end of Week 4 or 5. (D. McConomy)
  - o Other universities have a fall reading week. (K. Chinniah)
- Non-academic discipline review: there has been no progress that will form the next system. Something that will be done this term. They will be wanting to put a contract on the corporation on what responsibilities and authority and those contracts might add to the risk held by the corporation. (K. Chinniah)

Report ended 6:19pm.

#### ITEM 5.3: VICE-PRESIDENT (OPERATIONS)

- Ready to go for the next referendum and working with Jon very closely. There will be over 30 fees for the next one; we have moved some forward from the last campaign which is why it's so high. As well, it is a \$1 fee, not \$1 free, in reference to the student groups. (K. Beaudry)

Report ended 6:20pm.

#### ITEM 5.4: VICE-PRESIDENT (UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS)

- Special Projects Grant coming forward, due on the 29<sup>th</sup>. I have \$7,000 to allocate to student groups around campus, as well as internally in the AMS although its not the priority. Will be busy working with lobby organization on students with disabilities on campus. We will do a presentation this Thursday on the results moving forward. We are in an agreement to receive \$10,000 yearly for a property standards program – students trained by city to go out to put review student housing. Have not worked the financials but Board will be more involved. And new executive in a month (S. Letersky)

Report ended 6:22pm.

#### ITEM 5.5: HOSPITALITY & SAFETY SERVICES

- November 28<sup>th</sup> did not do well so we will advise next year's time to not do that. (S. Harper)
- Why is Thursday more expensive than Saturday? (D. Coderre)
  - o Staffing more people (busier night) (S. Harper)

- Draft sales have been down, shifting away to sangria. Profit margin is not as high on sangria. (S. Harper)

Report ended 6:25pm.

#### ITEM 5.6: RETAIL SERVICES DIRECTOR

- P&CC is much higher due to colour sales. Revenue last year was lower due to course packs. (K. Beaudry)
- Because we've seen a trend with the people in the budgeting, they wouldn't accept that it's continuous. (D. McConomy)
- Tricolour clothing has been doing phenomenal – over \$3,000 more than in November, December numbers should be even higher. Bus tickets are down over the three streams. We've traced back through numbers and attributed to the week in September that we loss. We figured we would get it back. December is not out yet but we will see. Marketing issue as well – haven't been pushing the bus as much as they should be. (K. Beaudry)

Report ended 6:29pm.

#### ITEM 5.7: MEDIA SERVICES

- Comment about competition – did not understand that we've been providing them with volunteers and now we're going to stop? (D. McConomy)
  - o In the initial discussions with Station 14, we agreed to send volunteers to shadow their staff. Station 14 would send three less people and let our volunteers work for them free of charge so they were paying for half the staff they normally have. Had another meeting with Station 14 and Athletics, and Station 14 will be staffing their own games fully without using our volunteers. Decisions made with the Director of Athletics and Recreation. (E. Fuller)
- Getting any feedback with being unhappy with the coverage? (D. McConomy)
  - o Athletics was unhappy with some basic mistakes that Station 14 was making. I don't know if the teams themselves notice the difference because they don't interact with the crews (E. Fuller)
- Is website advertising included in any of the revenue drivers for the Journal?
  - o They're in the report. We've seen the numbers significantly down to what we budgeted. There has been some tech issues with advertising. I don't think we'll see a significant uptake. (E. Fuller)
- We did have reason to believe that there would have been changes but may have been too optimistic (K. Beaudry)
- What info do we get back in terms of web advertising and penetration? Are we getting any big data or information that might increase the attractiveness of working with the Journal? (D. McConomy)
  - o With the Journal website, I haven't seen all the analytics we can get. In most web analytics, we can see demographic, location. There may be a way to utilize that information. (E. Fuller)

- If it is available, how much are we using it to our advantage? We should be leveraging all of those investments. (D. McConomy)
- How many viewers are there of the website?
  - o I don't know for November and December but for beginning of September to October 22nd, it was 200,000 page views. (E. Fuller)
  - o Compared to last year, it was 100,000 views for the entire year. (K. Chinniah)
  - o Seems to indicate we have an opportunity. (D. McConomy)
- What is the community outreach program Walkhome started? (G. Giannopoulos)
  - o Every Tuesday the staff go to do the lunch hour (E. Fuller)
- Is the GPS fully implemented? (D. Coderre)
  - o Patrons are more receptive, helpful for the shift coordinators. (E. Fuller)

Report ended 6:39pm.

ITEM 5.8: GENERAL MANAGER

No comments or questions.

ITEM 6: NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 6.1: QSC STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE INCREASE PROPOSAL

*WHEREAS increases to the student activity fee of an AMS service requires Board approval prior to being placed on the referendum ballot.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors approve the option of a \$1.00 increase for the Queen's Student Constables mandatory student activity fee on the 2016 Winter referendum ballot.*

**Moved:** K. Beaudry

**Seconded:** K. Chinniah

- What do you mean by the option? (D. McConomy)
  - o The Board will vote, then moved to Assembly for a 2/3 vote. We need to give the first "stamp" before it goes. We're basically acting as a nomination. (K. Beaudry)
  - o Historically, the last time it went was 2011, because the Assembly has the right to exercise the option. (K. Chinniah)
  - o We're giving the students the option to improve. (K. Beaudry)
- In 2011, student fee was increase by \$1.66. Increased the wage by \$1 as well. We don't have the incentive we once had for the wages to increase applicants. We don't have a lot of selection. Other issue is to be more accessible to the students. We offer a \$12 flat fee to clubs. (S. Harper)
- Are we here to value the process or the merit? (A. Aguilar)
  - o The merit. (M. Blair)
- I would just do the 8% across the Board instead of the same dollar value across the Board. (D. Coderre)

- Idea is that we are going out to students to ask for \$1 more instead of the percentage. (K. Beaudry)
- When was the other time before 2011 it increased? (D. Coderre)
  - 1988 was the last time it was updated. (K. Chinniah)
- There was surplus of \$31,000. If TAPS were to increase in popularity, would you have way too much money? Increase in TAPS is causing more money then you thought you needed. (A. Aguilar)
  - In the budget, we received \$4,200 grant divided in between Walkhome and StuCons. (S. Harper)
- Maybe focus that it will be the second increase in wage for the last 18 years. (D. Coderre)
- It's \$12 for club, \$12 for each services that use it, for orientation week is \$12 but \$13.50 for each senior that works, then we get athletics to pay cost. (S. Harper)
- If you're an external group or business, such as Athletics, you'll pay cost + 10%. For Orientation and TAPS is \$12, then AMS club and faculty society, you will get a discount. Athletics does not count for a lot of revenue. Only 10%. (K. Beaudry)
- When you say charge cost, you're charging marginal cost – not the admin cost. (K. Chinniah)
- Do we need to commit to this pricing scheme? My concern is if we lay it out and then we decide at some point that we will do something else, I am getting to the point that one of the things we should have a serious talk is about the entire wage structure beyond the scope of this discussion. I don't want to get locked into a situation where we don't have any flexibility on. Should say subject to change. (D. McConomy)
  - Motion is just to approve the increase. We are not approving the assumptions in the proposal. (K. Beaudry)
- If you think this is hard to push through, could you charge through committees that use StuCons? Such as Orientation week fee increased. (D. Coderre)
  - Only the students participating in Orientation week paying for the StuCons. (K. Beaudry)
  - Great proposal by discounting the clubs because it is a higher risk area because we rely on the clubs to submit sanctioning proposal. (L. Parry)
  - Any group that wants to run an event with alcohol needs StuCons (E. McElroy)
  - Also cheaper to use StuCons that external source. (A. Aguilar)
- How do people feel about \$1? Should we pushing more? This nets out right around \$0. Maybe could be a bit more or less. (K. Beaudry)
  - Going with the \$1 sounds like the right compromise. (D. McConomy)

**Motion adopted unanimously at 6:58pm.**

Michael joins at 6:58pm.

ITEM 6.2: COMMON GROUND FACILITIES MANAGER PROPOSAL

*WHEREAS the Board has authority over service personnel and the approval of capital expenditures.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors approve the annual remuneration of \$14,816.38 to the Facilities Manager of Common Ground, a position with an 8-month term.*

**Moved:** K. Beaudry

**Seconded:** K. Chinniah

- Mainly to deal with issue of high amount of hours CoGro managers work. They don't have as much recruitment. Almost double the amount of apps for TAPS then CoGro. They have high hours so they don't put any work into other aspects of the job. (S. Harper)
- So these managers that are splitting the 150 hours of shifts per week, they're also getting paid \$14,816? (D. Coderre)
  - o Yes
- What's changed? People don't work as much as before? (D. Coderre)
  - o The addition of the Brew. We do overwork them. We don't get the same retention. Might make it a bit more accessible if we lower the amount of hours.
- How does their salary is paid by the TAPS managers? (D. Coderre)
  - o Work more and are paid \$500 less. (S. Harper)
- The underlying theme is that if we look at the hours they are expected to work when we settled on the \$14,000 compensation. Their hours are more individually than one expected. (D. McConomy)
- Outside of shift managers, depends on your portfolio. Over the last couple years with the Brew becoming more popular, it is slowly increasing the number of hours. Not the same with the Underground because that's based on the number of events per week.
- Is one enough? (D. Coderre)
  - o I would use one more for the year. Having a larger team means there's more people and personality to deal with. I recognize the stress we are putting on this student. 30 hours of work plus 3 courses is a lot (S. Harper)
- What motivated you to put together this proposal? (M. Blair)
  - o I'm in close contact with the other managers. Hard to watch them be mentally stressed out from these positions. (S. Harper)
- How many 12 month managers do you have now? (K. Chinniah)
  - o Four. (S. Harper)
- To save money, condense some 12 month to 8 month? (K. Chinniah)
  - o Something to look into. I would not add another 12 month manager. (S. Harper)
  - o Can look at other options like 10 month so they learn before September starts. (S. Letersky)

**Motion adopted unanimously at 7:05pm.**

**ITEM 6.3: STUDENT LIFE CENTRE AGREEMENT**

*WHEREAS a resolution of the Board is required to enter AMS Inc. into contractual agreements with third parties.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors ratifies the “Student Life Centre Agreement” between AMS Inc., Queen’s University at Kingston, and the Society of Professional and Graduate Students, as presented.*

**Moved:** K. Chinniah

**Seconded:** S. Letersky

- This is following up on the proposal that Ali discussed last year. The timeline took longer than anticipated. Lyn is going to start off because she was there when it started in 2014/2015.
- We became out of contract at the end of April 13. The three parties being SGPS, AMS, and the university was planning to continue to negotiate. Ali took the negotiations forward with Queen’s. SGPS and ourselves agreed that the funding formula was not done in a fair way. Space was allocated whether it is revenue producing but not on quality of space. The student societies and AMS in particular got a lot of space in the JDUC compared to the university and the Queen’s Centre. There was one agreement and it consolidated what should have been two agreements. One is policies around the Life Centre and that belonged to the three parties and the other was a management agreement. We wanted two separate agreements. All of that was negotiated and we did get quality of space into the factors. It has taken a long time to separate the two agreements and fully document them. The first agreement was not well written that were not well understood and became understood through practice. It didn’t technically change anything, just documenting for clarity. Same voting, same people at the table. Third mandate in making changes to the Tri-party agreement. A lot of operational decision making was done with the SLC counsel. High level individuals (Dean of Student Affairs) and was not practical to make decisions, approving CapEx when they didn’t understand and couldn’t meet frequently enough. Operational approval structure changed. Operating level and SLC counsel continue to exist for a more strategic point of view and that the SLC is doing what is intended to do. Five year agreement. Expanded from 3-5 because no one wanted to go through this process again and people were happy with how it is going. (L. Parry)
- In terms of Section 13 for the cleaning, repairs, etc. for exclusive space – say we had a huge flood in the pub and required the repair, would we be on the hook for all the costs to fix everything up or does Queen’s pitch in? (A. Aguilar)
  - o You would have to look at the reason why. If it was structural, then Queen’s would be responsible. (L. Parry)
- For major things, we are responsible for, we do have insurance. (D. Coderre)
- More so about territory. (L. Parry)
- Who would we characterize as the biggest concession? (M. Lindsay)
  - o Concept of the quality of space. People being the university were accepting of the concept but working through the financial models for the result of moving to a quality of space restructure kept everyone in a similar financial obligation. Ultimately, more costs being by food services but offset by university’s reduction in cost. Ali and Kevin (SGPS President) held firm on that. That’s where we came through and got what we should. (L. Parry)

- The university pays a certain chunk and food services pay another and they see it as two separate entities. It gets funded through different budgets. They're cost went up significantly, although the university's cost went down. Overall, it stayed the same. The university was not happy with that but we weren't going to compromise. (L. Parry)
- What does the agreement say about the approval's process to renovate the space? Do we need the approval of the university for the more transformational things? (M. Lindsay)
  - o Each individual can make changes to their own exclusive space but all within the greater policies of you can't do anything without involving physical plant services. All of us need to adhere to those procedures. (L. Parry)
- Would it be fair that if we want to reconfigure the layout of the P&CC, we can do that? And if we have to change the pub, we need to follow the procedures? (M. Lindsay)
  - o If it's structural, Queen's has to be involved and can't suggest on an outside contract and depends on dollar value as well. We just don't get the attention because we don't have the resources. (L. Parry)
- We have the map of where our exclusive space is, how can we expand or retract that space? (M. Blair)
  - o This agreement will allow us to make that much more efficient than ever before. (K. Beaudry)
- In Schedule A, it still says Alfie's instead of Underground. (G. Giannopoulos)
- Also need to change to 2016 from 2015 (D. Coderre)

**Motion unanimously adopted at 7:21pm.**

**ITEM 6.4 MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT**

*WHEREAS a resolution of the Board is required to enter AMS Inc. into contractual agreements with third parties.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Directors ratifies the "Management Agreement" between AMS Inc. and Queen's University at Kingston, as presented.*

**Moved:** K. Beaudry

**Seconded:** K. Chinniah

**Motion unanimously adopted at 7:22pm.**

**ITEM 6.5 DELEGATION OF CHAIR'S ELECTION AUTHORITY**

*WHEREAS the Chair of the Board has the responsibility and authority as per the bylaws to administer the election process of new directors.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT all responsibilities and authority assigned to Chair of the Board in the bylaws with respect to the election of Directors of AMS Inc. are transferred to the Vice Chair of the Board, effective immediately until the conclusion of the 2015-2016 term.*

**Moved:** D. McConomy

**Seconded:** K. Chinniah

- Only thing is delegating the authority to Quinn for the election. The motion might have to exist because the bylaws do not say.
- Why not AMS assembly? Why not the Board of Directors? (M. Lindsay)
  - o Not sure. (M. Blair)
- Wondering if we could table this to get advice for the AMS Assembly to do this. (M. Lindsay)
- Is it just the second part in the motion that the incumbent intends to participate? Whereas transferring the responsibility to Quinn is the main thing? (E. McElroy)
- Should we just have Assembly just approve your eligibility for another term? (A. Aguilar)
  - o I would be comfortable with that rationale for voting for it. I would encourage you to go to Assembly to give their thoughts. (D. Coderre)
- If it's supposed to be an experiential thing for students, I could see that being the AMS' concern as a whole. Which is what they apply to all other Director positions. (D. Coderre)
- I don't think we need an ordinary resolution or special resolution. (M. Blair)
- It's really an internal matter whether the chair can delegate this responsibility. I think it's a Board decision with delegating the responsibility instead of Assembly telling the Board how it should operate with itself. (D. McConomy)
- We could also do a special resolution with both Board and Assembly approval. (M. Blair)
- I would advise making your position known at Assembly so if there are any objections, you'll hear about it at Assembly. (D. McConomy)
- Only thing I would say is that the Board has the responsibility to pick amongst it's membership, but we are asking for the Board Chair's person authority for the election to be moved to another person. Maybe Assembly has a bit more authority in that respect. (M. Lindsay)
- Would it be fair to say Greg is the keeper of the knowledge of bylaws? Maybe get his advice so we don't make a fast decision. Or another person with that expertise (D. Coderre)

**Motion tabled.**

ITEM 7: DISCUSSION

No items for discussion.

ITEM 8: ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn.

**Moved:** K. Chinniah

**Seconded:** E. McElroy

**Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:34pm.