



**Assembly Minutes
Wednesday, October 19, 2016
JDUC, Wallace Hall**

Assembly commences at 7:15pm

Palmer Lockridge shall henceforth be known as Speaker

Approval of the Agenda

Motion 1 – Moved by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez, Seconded by: President Tyler Lively

That AMS Assembly approve the agenda of the meeting of October 19, 2016

Speaker: Are there any changes to the agenda?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: I move that we omnibus motions 10 through to 15.

Speaker: Alright so we have moved to omnibus motions 10 through 15, so those all have to do with, uh, fall referendum questions. We need a seconder, uh, Vice President Walker. We will now vote on the motion to omnibus motions 10 through 15.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

MOTION PASSES

Speaker: Are there any other changes to the Agenda? Going once, going twice. Last chance. We are going to move to the vote then that AMS Assembly approve the agenda for the Assembly meeting of October 19th 2016.

No changes, proceed to a vote.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSENTIONS: None

PASSES UNANIMOUSLY



Approval of the Minutes

Motion 2 – Moved by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez, Seconded by: President Tyler Lively

That AMS Assembly approve the Minutes for the Assembly meeting of October 5, 2016

Speaker: Are there any changes to the minutes that anyone would like to make? Any changes to the minutes? Last opportunity for changes to the minutes.

No changes, proceed to a vote.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

Speaker's Business

Speaker: Thank you everyone for showing up early to today's Assembly. Uh, starting at 7:15 does seem to work quite so that everyone could make it here on time. Uh so I'm just going to take this opportunity to read the Queens Land Recognition Statement: Queen's University is situated on the traditional lands of Anishnawbe people uh where we live, study and work here today. Uh, other than that I have nothing else to mention.

Guest Speaker::

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: I would just like to invite Swati Naidu to come up and formally present the proposals that are being made to the university on a Smoking Policy. Uh, Swati is here with her team tonight so let's please give them our undivided attention for the next couple moments.

Speaker: And I'll just ask members of the Assembly to close their laptops during the present by the guest Speaker:.

Swati Naidu: Alright, I'm going to try to project my voice as loud as I can, so let me know if I am not speaking loud enough. So as Miguel said, my name is Swati and I work with Leave the Pack Behind, so we operate under the Student Health and Wellness Services at the health promotion office, and um we are hoping along with various other populations of student's um to bring a smoke-free policy to Queens. So our team is of a couple of students from the



undergraduate side, so this includes department of public health and we also have off campus stakeholders as well, so Patricia, she is sitting down at the end taking notes and she is also one of the members of our group and we also have the uh public health unit of Ontario, so we have various stakeholders on board with this policy. Um, so just a little bit of background, so smoke-free campus can be defined as one that prohibits the use of any tobacco products, so this includes cigarettes, cigars, pipes, vapes and e-cigarettes, there will hopefully be an exception for Aboriginal peoples, that is the goal, as it is used in their ceremonies on campuses. So we essentially formed around last year and we are kind of looking towards gathering various voices, so we have met with various on and off campus stakeholders and today I am coming to you guys as well, for the purpose that the AMS Assembly does represent a huge portion of the student voice and we are looking for your comments and opinions and what barriers you see facing this policy should it be implemented. It is important to note that this policy has not all been written yet, we are at a very introductory stage.

MAGGIE ZHANG: Just a student interest group, and so we are just here to hear about your guys concerns and we want to hear all ideas from you guys, because if the policy is gonna affect students, because we are like 90% at queens, so yea please feel free to voice any concern or thoughts with this idea.

Speaker: So we will open it up to the floor for any questions for the Speaker: today, are there any questions for the Speaker:?

Representative Carling Counter: I think it sounds like a really interesting policy, obviously it is in the best interest of everyone. I just wonder how would this be enforced, are you going to have people on campus whose job it is to make sure that people aren't smoking? Like I am just a little unclear as to how this is going to actually work logistically, if you could speak to that. Thank you.

MAGGIE ZHANG: Um so, because as Swati mentioned we are introducing this idea so that means we are hoping to form, uh, to work with the university and for the aspiring communities and hopefully you guys have reps and from there, writing policy and so there are two kind of components one being forcing a culture and students culture kind of thing where everyone is kind of involved. It's not one person's job or security's extra job but in terms of enforcing that culture, I think at the initial state probably will be more effective to have some kind of more concrete enforcement like tickets or fining, we will discuss that along the way, we don't have a lot of concrete stuff yet, but that's just some of the thoughts we have based on research.

Swati Naidu: It is important to note that various Canadian campuses that have gone smoke-free so if you take a look at Dalhousie for example when we first the implemented the smoke-free policy over there, you know it wasn't successful in terms of enforcement. But it is the idea of denormalizing the smoking culture are tobacco. Um so it took more of a student initiative driven versus like having law enforcement or where we ticket everyone.

Speaker: Alright, thank you so much. So we will move on to the Speaker's list. Uh so representative Milden will be first, but just to let Assembly know, I have started a Speaker's list,



so speaking next we have President Palmeri, then Chair Jamieson, then President Nelms. If I missed your placard just um give it to me again.

Junior Rep Julia Milden: I am really excited for this policy you presented. Um and I am really excited to take this initiative at Queens since it has taken since 2016 to get here.

MAGGIE ZHANG: Um, actually it has been more than 10 years.

Junior Rep Julia Milden: Oh Right.

MAGGIE ZHANG: Yes it has being on-going but never, nobody ever success like ever implementing it so we are kind of in another generation.

Junior Rep Julia Milden: I was just wondering what other universities in Canada have implemented this policy and what are the various degrees of successes it had?

POSITION Swati Naidu: Uh okay, so I actually have a list that I can read out to you. Um so chief among them is Emily Carr University, Acadia, University of Winnipeg, Dalhousie and Memorial University, and McGill is actually hoping to implement this by September.

MAGGIE ZHANG: Also, I want to add that out of university or college in Ontario no body is smoke free yet. So we are actually racing with everyone else, we definitely want to take the lead if we can and also a few colleges like Western and different, there are a few that are in kind of wanting to implement and bring towards that. But somehow it just kind of collapsed in middle of the whole process and reinforcement actually one of the contacts said it was one of the big back fires because the security or personal who is in charge of doing this kind of didn't do it anymore and it was a lot of bad stories. So it is definitely not an easy process and there are barriers and a lot of objects in the way, but in Ontario no one is smoke-free yet. But a lot of universities like McGill, Western, Ottawa U are looking at it and everyone wants to be first.

POSITION Swati Naidu: And it is also uh, good to note it's just that every University is different and so the barriers at each University are different from the next one. And uh Queens is definitely unique, so that is kind of why we are looking towards you guys, for you on the student side to raise the barriers like what students might face.

Patricia: Yea of course, there is a lot of research, just to your question um a lot of the people on the project found that it developed information and it overall promotes a more positive smoking culture.

President Alexandra Palmeri: Um just to echo the sentiment of Representative Milden, I'm really excited about issue tonight. Uh first I'd like to pose health care knowledge, which is some criteria that identifies mental illness disorders and substance abuse are notified under this I think it's about time we address issue on campus. So having said that I was wondering if the two of you can comment on little bit about the health benefits that would come to quit smoking, and



what resources in terms of mental health would be implemented on campus to help make the policy as successful as ever?

POSITION Swati Naidu: So it turns out our resources, so as I said earlier I work with Leave the Pack Behind, so regardless of whether you are an international or grad student or undergrad student, we offer free nicotine replacement therapy and at LaSalle and as well at the health promotions office. We also offer self-help resources as well. Um so we are trying to make our presence larger on campus, so more and more people are kind of aware of it so with this policy implemented it would ensure that leave the pack behind is really heard so people can get access to it and are aware that resources are available. Um, so we are not just dropping people who smoke to like figure it out on their own we do offer resources and most resources are free.

MAGGIE ZHANG: And again this can be done so that if we need these will be added in place and the resources would definitely be added for sure.

POSITION Swati Naidu: So whether it's like orientation week or whatever it takes to get us heard, um so that everyone is aware that we offer resources. And um to answer your other question about what the benefits of not smoking are, I guess it is just primarily you reduce your risk for a lot of diseases. There have been several studies on this and it is well documented so especially cardiovascular disease and lung related diseases all reduce over time if you quit smoking 5 to 10 years down line you'll have reduce your chance or risk of getting said disease, just as much as a non-smoker would.

Chair Brandon Jamieson: Two questions for you on the forcibility and legitimacy. Uh my first question is how you perceive this effecting designated smoking breaks at the University and the other question I have is how does this effect university property sidewalks and road and the city of Kingston and being off of Queens property?

POSITION Swati Naidu: I didn't really hear you

Chair Brandon Jamieson: How will this impact smoking breaks for employees of the institute as well as the enforceability of smoking on the sidewalks and etc.

MAGGIE ZHANG: Okay, that was a good question, because we got that question a lot from university that's their biggest concern. Um in terms of sidewalks unfortunately there is not much we can do, because it is not owned by local it is owned by provincial. So even though it is a bylaw in Kingston it doesn't matter and in term of the concern around the name is they are focused on the image, such as, KGH went smoke-free but all the smokers would smoke on the sidewalk, so that is a bit challenging for us and what we are trying to address is because Queen's students smoking break and the smokers think about the graphic of smokers compared to KGH students at queens where it's much lower than the stats at KGH. So it is the probability that the image would not be exactly the same, um but if you have any ideas we'd love to hear about it but that's one question we have no solution yet and we tried to figure it out, what is your first question?

Chair Brandon Jamieson: Yea smoking breaks.



POSITION Swati Naidu: The first point is I don't really know what to say we aren't really aware of it, so that is something we will look into. But going onto the sidewalks its really against the policy being implemented, like I can really see as soon as it is being implemented it might not be successful the first time around but it is really about denormalizing the culture around tobacco.

Chair Brandon Jamieson: Can I follow up?

POSITION Swati Naidu: Yep.

MAGGIE ZHANG: An also, we were talking about having the signage which will be really important. It might be awkward if someone says, 'hey can I smoke here' but you point at the signage and say, 'hey it is a smoke free campus.' That will help create that culture and environment and for your first question, it is essentially the same question from the equity branch as they mentioned it so we will have to look into and get back to you guys.

Speaker: A very brief follow up.

Chair Brandon Jamieson I would just like to know what other Canadian schools or intuitions have done.

POSITION Patricia: Um so most of the universities that have public road ways found the smoke free policy effective but its moving towards that more so then.

President Matt Nelms: Unfortunately, all of my questions have already been asked.

President Bhavik Vyas: Thanks so much for this interesting presentation. Uh, it is interesting that now finally after 10 years we are taking some action to this thought. Um my question is what does this actually look like, does this look like pushing smokers from outside buildings to outside on the sidewalk or being pushed on to the road, in areas where they can smoke, or is this paired with heavy awareness, where you are also providing them with more on campus support? So if kind of you could touch on both sides of that.

MAGGIE ZHANG: We are definitely hoping to get second approach. Uh because we are not forcing people to anywhere or taking their personal choice from them or anything like that. We really just hope to create a culture that will benefit most of us and also helping smokers who want to quit smoking, in that culture to help them quit. That's our main goal so as we've said we will provide lots of support for them who is struggling and it's about denormalizing the culture and supportive and encourage them to quit and benefit nonsmokers or second-hand smokers.

President Bhavik Vyas: Just a quick follow up, I understand and support that kind of cultural shift it's good that is what you are focusing on but in the short term obviously there is going to be that kind of cultural shift slow period. Physically when you are looking at it, smokers who will have to shift their activities before they consider giving up the act, so where do people who continue to choose to smoke go?



MAGGIE ZHANG: Okay so are you asking if we will have designated smoking areas, or if we will just push them onto the street?

President Bhavik Vyas: Yes, that is exactly it.

MAGGIE ZHANG: I think Western was kind of approaching with the designated smoking area. They are still working on it, but I don't know how effective that will be because some will create this beautiful place for smokers and for non-smokers we don't even have a place to have lunch. I think that approach needs to be discussed among different personal and eventually that decision will be made. But, we can't give you a good answer now but we will bring that to the future meetings.

Rector Cam Yung: Thank you very much for taking the opportunity to speak with us today. I think that this is a wonderful initiative, especially as the government has just announced that we need to focus more on public health and continuing improvements there. But what I want to know, and I know we brought this up in conversation prior to the Assembly, but maybe you could elaborate for the AMS Assembly now on how is this policy going to impact cultures that use smoking in their own cultures how is it going to impact and take into consideration so cultures that use smoking as part of culture?

POSITION Swati Naidu: As we mentioned earlier for the indigenous population we will have exception. They have ritual events and it's a matter of allowing them to have a permit for outdoors as well so they can do it wherever and whenever but obviously it is not set in stone because we are not the ones making the policy. But these are considerations for people who do sit in on this to look into and ideal we want indigenous populations. I know that there is also there's also like the Pakistani Student Association did shisha events and upon speaking to them they said this is true and you should shift towards a culture that doesn't promote commercial tobacco use so I know there is already a shift on campus.

Rector Cam Yung: Just to follow up, certain times you've mentioned that you wanted to promote a culture of moving away from using tobacco but my question is and the resources that you said are providing therapy or counselling or other resources. However, for some students there might be that stigma still of counselling being barrier to reach out for alternatives. How are you going to address that and how is that going to be something that you take into consideration?

POSITION Swati Naidu: It is just a matter of breaking that stigma and it will come with a lot of student engagement we aren't looking to like shame anyone. It is just a matter of shifting lens from the right to smoke to right to clean up for everybody and so we are also wanting to break the stigma.

Vice President Operations Vinith Suriyakumar: So I think it's a great idea to talk about how does it affect faculty, but not only faculty but Queen's staff, all the staff who may be smokers and maintain appropriate campus how do you think reactions will come from those stakeholders and based on this reaction how will u guys accommodate them?



MAGGIE ZHANG: So we promote other stake holders, so you guys are one of the stakeholders representing all students. So what we are doing now is just talking to people who care about you guys and regarding staff they are all piece in puzzle we have to approach them to hear from them to hear thoughts and concerns but great point, it is one piece.

Speaker: We are just going to ask our Speakers if they could please limit their responses to one minute, we do just need to move on to the rest of the agenda as it is quite long.

President Aniqah Mair: Thank you for coming out here, what I was wondering is how will you say what student or which person is an indigenous person? Will it be self-identification? And I have a second questions as well, how will forcing people who are smoking on campus to move off campus affect people with mobility issues?

MAGGIE ZHANG: Excellent point, um some of questions we will bring up to the stakeholders and I really like your second question. I don't think we thought about the idea, so that's excellent, and again we are not forcing people or creating barriers or making someone's life harder this is definitely not what we want to do. Um but those are the considerations we need to consider to accommodate special needs.

POSITION Swati Naidu: So we don't have answers right here right now, um this can be brought up with Stephanie, the Human Director of the Human Right's Commission, and we are looking to gain perspective and see what barriers kind of withhold us from bringing this policy, so I can get back to you.

Speaker: Uh, alright we are going to move onto the next question so we can keep things moving fast.

Vice President Evan Dressel: So speaking to problems that you indicated about clusters of people that other people brought up. Could that increase visibility of smoking on campus, since they are all clustered in one area?

POSITION Swati Naidu: It is quite possible but it is also important to note, uh, a 2013 survey the stats revealed that 8.7% of the student body identify as smokers. We are in the process of gathering the 2016 stats, but one of the health promotion advisors has maintained that the stats haven't changed significantly from then. So we are not thinking it will be a huge issue with goal of denormalizing.

Proxy Gwen Gorman: My question is, uh, I was raised by smoker. My dad smoked two packs a day and my problem is just that you keep saying that we can offer counselling or resources, but people who smoke don't quit unless they want to quit. So, uh, forcing them into this environment how that can alienate them. Also, if this were to be implemented I think you should offer a grace period where would could have smoking areas on campus before going entirely smoking free, but rushing in anyway is not going to change for the better. But I really appreciate what you guys are doing.



POSITION Swati Naidu: We aren't hoping the minute we implement it, that the next day there will be no smokers, you know what I mean? It's just implementing designated smoking areas is a pathway but at the same time it is also a stand still because this is something that is going to happen eventually. It's about shifting that culture and lens from right to smoke to right to clean air and even though the 8% of queen's students smoke there is 90 % of the population that doesn't and someone in that percent could easily have lung disease that can trigger by someone smoking and it is about promoting health and wellness.

Vice President Operations Dave Walker: Point of personal privilege I will have to leave assembly for a committee meeting.

Vice President Operations Dave Walker Leaves Assembly

Lower Rep Abigail Kingswood: Thank you for presentation, clearly the motives behind this policy are very positive. However, my concern is that it sounds like paternalistic and I am just not sure that's the best method to address, because if it doesn't affect everyone, except those small population who smoke. So I am just wondering if it would be more beneficial to address the issue solely on educational material rather than enforcement

Swati Naidu: Could you elaborate the term paternalistic please?

Lower Rep Abigail Kingswood: It just sounds very paternalistic and I just think perhaps it would it be better to focus more on education than enforcement, as it might not be best method.

Swati Naidu: So you are hoping that we bring more policy?

Lower Rep Abigail Kingswood: I just think education is good method to focus on the issue and focusing more on that instead of policy enforcement might a be better method.

MAGGIE ZHANG: That's why I am saying creating community culture everyone will be involved not just personals, specifically taking or giving fines we are not penalizing anyone it is more about creating culture. I totally I get your point its more about emphasizing the culture.

Patricia: Yea so what we are also talking about is more about having supportive environments and we are really trying to do is say it's not about enforcement it's not about having people handing out cards saying they can't smoke here. It's about aligning with education, not punishing them but making it easier for people and to support their process.

Commissioner Francis Campbell: So the current city bylaw is 3 meters form any entrance to a building and if there is public signage it varies from 3, 6, 12, 24 and so on meters. So do you know if after you factor in all those current public bylaws, do you know what space is left on campus for people to smoke in on campus? If you do know where they are smoking are you able to find out if students actually care where smokers currently are? Um, to follow up with that, if we are this would push students out onto public spaces. So have you consulted city bylaws to find out if you infringe on city bylaws forcing smokers into public spaces?



Patricia: Yea um so tobacco enforcement officer while we went and looked into some of the research, um so again it's not about enforceability and moving off sidewalks. The city's sidewalks are actually provincial, so it is impossible on the sidewalk but they were the current bylaws apply those have been left out but it is definitely something interesting to take into consideration.

Speaker: So now we have reached the end of the first round Speaker's list just recognizing that is now 8 o'clock now I do want to start moving on to the rest of the agenda, we do have like a number of motions to move through. I will recognize any member that really feels they need to speak to this point, but if not I would just like to move forward?

President Alexandra Palmeri: Uh okay, so the debate tonight was very good and I heard a lot of informing thoughts that were brought to table. I think the next step, it would be really helpful if we could provide hard statistics and education in smoking and what it is like to suffer from substance abuse disorder. I feel that we all kind of lack correct knowledge to make informed decision, however, I do know that you guys have a plethora of resources. I know at school we have PhD professors in health and that research says it improves the quality of health massively and if it were to be written I'd hope there would be 10 underlines under improvement of health. Moving forward I hope we recognize that a cultural change like this on campus would take time and not happen overnight it wouldn't be something where we say it's a smoke free campus and then everyone is smoker free... that wouldn't be realistic. What we are saying is we want to bring smoking-safety promotion and education to make Queens a leader in that movement going forward. If we underestimate power of change it would be disservice we need to educate our students on this issue, so I do want to say thank you to this group for bringing this issue to our attention.

Beating fists

MAGGIE ZHANG: We appreciate all your questions, concerns and ideas and we will try to bring them all out, thank you.

Applause

Speaker: Alright, I would just like to thank our guest Speaker's and our members of Assembly for being very involved in that conversation. We are going to keep moving forward through the agenda here, as we will move to item 5, which is the President's Report.

President's Report: President Tyler Lively

Speaker: President Lively do you have anything to add?



President Tyler Lively: I don't have anything to add, I only have something to take away. So the Kingston Area Tax Commission meeting this evening was cancelled, so I have nothing to update on in that respect.

Vice-President's Report

Moved over operations report.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: Nothing to add.

Board of Director's Report

Moved over as Chair of Board left for audit committee meeting.

Undergraduate Student Trustee's Report

Trustee Jennifer Li: Nothing to add

Student Senator's Report

Chair Brandon Jamieson: Nope.

Rector's Report: Rector Cam Yung

Rector Cam Yung: there is two things to add. One truth American reconciliation consultations are going to be taking place, one is this week and at 4:30 to 5 oh sorry that is 6 in McLaughlin hall. Second, the reason why I messed up today, is because we have started consultations with regards to commission policy at Queens. The work seems and it looks like I have a strong team moving forward.

Statements by Students

Speaker: So we will move on to item number 11, so this is an opportunity for any students and any member of assembly or member of AMS at large to speak.



President Bhavik Vyas: I failed Miguel two weeks in a row, my apologies I did not submit a report... sorry that is four weeks in a row.

Laughter

And so this is my report given orally. It's been a busy two weeks with homecoming as a premier highlight, it was awesome to see alumni engagement not only in the commerce program but as the university as a whole. I met tons of Alum from various faculties and they could not be more proud of you. We have launched something called the elective initiative, which is looking one at adding personal interest credits back into our curriculum to create better business leaders in the future. And to reinstate first year electives the priority is PIC over first year elective, but I just wanted to give you all an update on that. If you want to check it out and kind of see how we do these big ticket items go to www.beelectiveinitiative.org we have a Smith Alumni fund for Alumni from 1939 to 1960, many were not business graduates but they were actually graduates from other faculties. And I just wanted to share that I met a 100-year-old graduate that was actually an engineering graduate. And they said that they had a phenomenal time at Queens this year so whatever you guys did here was a good job! And now I I'm going to get more into some big things that we did. So we had an outreach Thanksgiving food drive, which is our most successful one to date, and we had an Alumni event at Ale house and we are looking into getting a general sentiment from our student face on affiliation OUSA from last assembly if any of you want to discuss, feel free to talk to me.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: First of all, thank you very much President Vyas for your apology I do appreciate it and I do hope that you submit your report moving forward.

Laughter

Secondly the AMS Cooperate Special General Meeting has been set for NOV 10th I believe at 7pm in Goodes hall room 141. I have sent everyone on the email list the dates and time for that. If you did not receive anything, please let me know. Next thing, we are in Wallace hall many members of Assembly have asked me and approached me to have Assembly in Wallace hall. I think it is something that we all can agree on it's a beautiful room, we all feel a little bit more important, a little bit better. It's just a nice place but if you guys have any feedback on volume or on any other rooms we can use moving forward please let me know, and let me know how you find yourself in this room versus others we have been in or may be in. The last thing is I would like to introduce everybody to my intern Cameron Yung, uh, sorry Cameron Raymond!

Laughter

Cam Raymond, he is going to be my first year intern, he will come to a couple of assemblies throughout the year so if you see him please say hi and take time to introduce yourself, thank you.

President Aniqah Mair: I just want to take the time to introduce everyone to our new Vice President of University Affairs.



Applause

Rector Cam Yung: I am sorry about all the mishaps and that I keep talking, but I just want to let everyone know that on November 2nd I will be having a brief meeting with the Fall Orientation task force, where I would be happy to bring some perspectives of student body on fall reading week if you want to visit during office hours or send me an email at [queensu ...uh...rector@queensu.ca](mailto:rector@queensu.ca) clearly I know my own email accounts quite well.

Laughter

But yes I would love to hear what your opinions and thoughts are and bring this to the task force on November 2nd, thank you.

Vice President Evan Dressel: Um I would just like to apologies that the entire ENGSOC committee won't be able to come to the corporate meeting as we have our own council on alternating Thursdays.

Question Period

President Darrean Baga: Uh, I have a commission for Commissioner Brockie. In your report you mention that Queens is part of an ADVOCAN just for the sake of Assembly could you explain about the federal lobby body and how your work with OUSA kind of compliments that?

Commissioner Leah Brockie: Sure, so if you were on Assembly last year you will remember that the AMS participated in an ADVOCAN, we are not going to do that this year because of the money so we are really providing the we support but won't actually be going. But it is nice because it doesn't overlap with OUSA because they are very different issues federally and provincially.

Representative Carling Counter: President Lively, I was just wondering can we get update regarding the fall-term reading week break task force? It's a bit of a mouth full.

President Tyler Lively: The task force met last week to discuss a fourth coming survey. As mentioned in my report and that survey should come in the next week or two. Once the survey goes out students will have few weeks or longer to put in comments and I would advise all members of Assembly to advertise that to their constituents. As well, the fall term task force will be doing some consultation they are I believe scheduled to be here at the next assembly. So I hope that is efficient and if anybody else wants me to convey to the committee please let me know.

President Alexandra Palmeri: Just one question I know Thursdays are a day when a lot of assemblies have their meetings so just a question for Secretariat Martinez. Last year we had issues for this date.



Secretariat Miguel Martinez: For the members of Assembly who have already expressed concerns for Thursday Assemblies, um yes we will still be reaching quorum as the number is still low. If any of the other members are seeking, excuse me, if any other members do have a time conflict on Thursday with the evening Assemblies, if not please let me know. As it stands, it does. As well, I would also like take a moment to tell all of Assembly the two reasons for why an Assembly would be held on a Wednesday vs. a Thursday. The first reason is it would be right before a long weekend, so it would give any members or anybody else who is interested in Assembly the opportunity to go home on the Thursday evening if they wish. The second reason being that the Thursday did not get approved by the Chaplin's Office due to a religious conflict for a religion.

Vice President Operations Vinith Suriyakumar: This is a question for President Lively, so in your report you mentioned that you will be going to city hall to talk about lobbying, could you talk more to us about it.

President Tyler Lively: As the Assembly may recall the AMS put forth a petition to ask students to sign on and support. We received a little over 500 signatures on the petition. Uh so our hope was to go and then present that petition to the Kingston area Taxi Commission and to speak up for student's interests. So the Taxi Commission is the body here that legislates any commercial transportation they put forward proposal and the regulations would effectively prevent Uber from working in Kingston, which I think would do a huge disservice to students. So we've decided to do something about that hopefully we can when they schedule their next meeting.

Speaker: Thank you President Lively. Are there any more questions? Last chance for questions. Alright, we are going to move on just before we do I would just like to remind the Members of Assembly to please project as loud as possible we want everyone can hear.

Business Arising from the Minutes

Motion 3 – Moved by: Commissioner Greg Kurcin, Seconded by: Vice President Carolyn Thompson

That AMS Assembly approve the Campus Activities Commission budget.

Commissioner Greg Kurcin: Thank you I'd like to talk about last week but we met past Sunday so let us know if you have any questions.

Speaker: My apologies for mispronouncing.

Laughter

No debate, proceed to a vote.



FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

New Business

Motion 4 – Moved by: Member Blair Wentworth, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly ratify Mackenzie Porter to the position of Judicial Committee Member for the 2016-2017 year.

Member Blair Wentworth: I am the Judicial Committee Chair for this year. Um, we had a fall hiring period as we didn't fill all the spots during the last winter period. It was very competitive there were a lot of good candidates Julia couldn't be here tonight unfortunately she has class, Mackenzie ill speak for both of them though. They were very very good during their interviews they both have a lot of qualities we look for we are very excited and proud to have them.

Speaker: Alright, so we will accept any questions for the individual to be ratified, are there any questions from Assembly?

Representative Carling Counter: Just a point of information, what does a judicial committee member do?

Member Blair Wentworth: Yea so a Judicial committee member is part of the nonacademic misconduct process. Um Basically, in laments terms we act as judiciary for system whereas judicial affairs act as the prosecutors for the system we are judges we would be vote on cases.

President Bhavik Vyas: What is favourite pillar of the nonacademic misconduct system and why?

Member – at – large Mackenzie Porter: I'd have to go with restorative justice, with a focus on rehabilitation and reconciliation which means queens students are not out casted in any way shape or form.

Member Ryan Pistorius: That's a good question, on the positive side of things but what is you least favourite pillar?

Member Mackenzie Porter: Good question, I would have to say I think they are all pretty good but one of them that does pose a slight problem with the peer ministered effect, as much as you don't like each other there is a slight chance for bias. But I am sure that won't happen.



No questions, proceed to a vote.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

Applause

Motion 5 – Moved by: Member Blair Wentworth, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly ratify Julia Carver to the position of Judicial Committee member for the 2016-2017 year.

Speaker: Julia could not make it to this meeting, but we are still going to vote on the motion. If there are any members in oppositions to this, please let us know.

Member Blair Wentworth: Same as Mackenzie, she was great in her interview. She really demonstrated everything we look for in a Judicial Committee member. Really had a comprehensive opinion on the system and was really just excited about the directions this was headed and we want to do a really good job to show the university that the students can handle this responsibility. So we are really excited to have her and we are sure she'll do a great job!

Speaker: So I will allow any questions for the chair if the Assembly has any questions.

No questions, proceed to a vote.

FOR: 28

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: 2

MOTION PASSES

Motion 6 – Moved by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez, seconded by: Member Rebecca Warrian.

That AMS Assembly approve the changes to Policy Manual 1, Section 4. Part A as seen in: Appendix Water.



Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Sorry one second

Flipping screen

Technology, I love it.

Laughter

Um I would actually like to make amendment to policy right now before it gets passed. The first amendment is pretty much to take out last line in I, simply because it was a personal mistake of mine. So, I would like to take that line out and add to policy manual 1 section 4-part A subsection 5j; and it reads all ruling by the CEO in the case of who can run a campaign may not be appealed to the AMS judicial committee. Um, it doesn't change the current policy that is in place right now, it only corrects wording for what is meant to take place. With the amendments that are being met it is to get stricter on the timelines and as well as to tell teams pretty much if you are going to complain to do it within 24 hours of yourself becoming aware of it the violation of the elections policy, so you can't wait two or three days after the violation has taken place to decide to take any action. So um, I am happy to take any questions. And I also need a seconder on my amendment to the policy

Speaker: Uh, is there anyone for seconder? Representative Jeans.

Sci' 18 Representative Julianna Jeans seconds

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: I find the amendment friendly.

Laughter

Speaker: Moving forward, we will move to debate on the motion.

President Darrean Baga: Under letter G, the permission for...uh, the requirement of 24 hours to report an alleged violation when the team becomes aware of the potential violation. But how will the CEO know exactly when potential violation occurs?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Just like with any type of complaint that ever exists, there is always some sort of proof that comes with it typically and what usually happens is the team would take a picture of when violation happens. So if there was posters left behind or whatever it was it is usually when they would take a picture and it would be digitized. Things would be done usually online which would time stamp it and that's how the CEO would make his ruling.

Representative Julianna Jeans: I do really like these changes. I just have an issue with wording. Just the term 'becomes aware,' I really don't think that's enforceable for the CEO to know when a person becomes aware of something. I just think that it would be a lot better if it was actually 'after violation takes place,' so you could actually put a strict time limit on it in terms of 'becoming aware' I just don't think as a policy it will let you enforce that. The other thing that I want to say was I would like to see some sort of stipulation put on CEO in terms of



how long they have to deal with the complaint. Just because I think that the CEO shouldn't have 5 days to deal with it and it should also be done in quick manner.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: In terms of the 'becomes aware,' as I had just previously stated it is usual in terms of the proof and will usually be followed by time stamp as well as a digitized copy. If they come with no proof then, we can't find team guilty or innocent without proof any complaint that doesn't have proof with it is usually dismissed. And also, I do appreciate your concern in terms of the CEO have time on ruling, that is definitely something I will be looking into. And I would also appreciate any comments on that by any other members of assembly.

President Aniqah Mair: I have the same question about enforceability the of 24 hours rule. And I just wanted to say that the when you talk about time stamps and that kind of thing, it is data about image that has also been coded with the image data. So that just can be changed very easily I'm sure there are plenty of free online tools to change that too

Laughter

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: My hopes are that anyone running for student's leadership wouldn't do that. Um, although I can't speak for the people who would be running but let's hope as student body we have the sense to not vote people who would manipulate evidence.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: So I just wanted to speak in favour of this motion and talk about the enforceability issue a little bit. One of the reasons this policy really came about is because we are trying to stop election and campaign teams from inundating the elections team at the last few days, when a lot of this is potentially getting down to the grind. So to avoid that this is very necessary allows election team more time to look at evidence. So that's really why it came about to help the elections team, it's obviously going to be something to work with and we are going to see how it works this year and any suggestions we can take them. I think this is a really positive step forward, because often times these violations and sorts is used as a campaign strategy and that's not really what the spirit of these campaigns are about. So we are trying to diminish that a little bit.

Vice President Evan Dressel: Um also to bring up another concern about the timestamp. It does not necessarily mean the person has looked at what they have perceived. So it thinks there need to be a... say if they get in email and let's say it is an email outside of their student email that someone sent it to and they don't necessarily check that one every day, it might bet 48 hours until they actually see the information and bring forward. So that's not necessarily a good measure as to say 'Hey this is when you should have seen it.' So if we are going off of that I think that we should also just extend the time to 48 to 72 hours, just to accommodate for someone's time to actually read emails. Also, I would just like to say I don't entirely agree with fully trusting candidates, that is why we do have the system and why it is in place because it is possible for people to do that and we want to know and it's not necessarily the best practice to have complete and utter faith in everyone that's running.

President Alexandra Palmeri: First off, a shout out to President over there for holding on to my notes, I would recommend it to anyone. Okay anyways, going back to this motion, I would



just like to speak in favour. I know people are hung up on the idea of 'becomes aware' and we previously mentioned the issue if there is an email you receive but you didn't see it, but when you become aware of it then you would report it. So if you did receive an email with information in it 2 days ago then you would say now I'm aware of this, now I can report it. Having said that, I think that you should report it when you become aware of them because why would you harbor an issue for a longer period of time, you know if an issue comes up you are going to want to report it as soon as possible. You are not gonna want to hold on to it as a sort of ammunition to bring up at the very end of the election season. I think that this will enforce accountability to candidates to be aware of campaign violations and I think that is important for our candidates to have that sort of in the back of their mind. So I think having that policy will allow them to be more aware and our election committee.

Representative Carling Counter: I am really interested in this policy, I think it is a really interesting one I can see as Vice President Dressel mentioned trying to balance the tension between what are the best practices and how are we going to get people to report this because we obviously don't want these election violations happening for anybody. Sort of balancing that with the campaign shadiness that happens every election, god knows why. So campaigns are very stressful time consuming process and I've seen people working around the clock and I have seen that you guys have done it, we have all done it. But is 24 hours enough time for the teams to find it cool down and report any potential violations? I'm just worried it's not enough time to sort of get over it. Because what if, god forbid you get an email at 3 a.m. that falls under a campaign violation, how do you handle that? Because it is late at night and no one checks their email and that just does not seem like there would be enough time in 24 hours to sort of handle it. So I think it is very good to have a short time frame because the campaign period is not very long but I'm interested in hearing your thoughts on maybe extending it to 48 hours which would allow more of a buffer for these sort of thing for people to report it properly with no errors; that is another thing, because if you are reporting it at 3 a.m. and you're emotional, especially if someone is attacking you or whatever it may be, you are probably more prone to error, so I would just like to hear your thoughts on extending it to a 48-hour period.

President Bhavik Vyas: Just a question, my apologies, but how long exactly is the timeline and with that what percentage is within that 24 hours?

Speaker: Alright, I am going to ask the Secretariat to answer that question.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: it looks like officer Warriian is very eager to answer, so I am going to let her do that.

Member-at-large Rebecca Warriian: The campaign period will happen on the 20th to 30th, so a ten-day period is when campaigns will be going on and any campaign violations. We recently had elections and that's just information session violation packages.

I just wanted to thank Vice President Thompson and Palmeri those who are in favour of the policy. Miguel and I worked on this a couple of months ago and we did it to protect ourselves and also protect other candidates running in winter referendum. Just because in the past elections we seen 72 hours has been abused and is campaign strategy and I think this will truly benefit. We



have put in place a comprehensive violation and complaint form for the nomination packages and um 24 hours I know a lot of people speak to emotion and I think 24 hours when you see a campaign violation you know it is enough time so everyone doesn't have to worry about in terms of checking your email your gonna see I and gonna know. But I think it's something to help us one election teams.

Vice President Operations Vinith Suriyakumar: I don't know how exactly to get an instantaneous photo, or for example is the photo attached to email? Or is the evidence presented to you in person how does it exactly work?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: It could be either or, it could be a printed copy of email, which someone would usually just click print screen to include the usual things that are in the email or they can forward email, which was originally sent to them or set up a meeting with chief to Electoral Officer to go over the details of the violation and then the Chief Electoral Officer and DRO of Disputes would look at the evidence and would make a ruling based off of the evidence provided.

President Matt Nelms: So I am not in favour. Simply I don't believe that 24 hours is sufficient for someone who might need a 48 hour is a bit reasonable. And I also pose a question about compound evidence so if there is any small violation that might not seem substantial but occur repeatedly, like something that spans over the course of 3 to 4 days, how would you deal with it?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: I cannot speak exactly to how the Chief Electoral Officer or DRO Disputes would make the ruling on their case; however, my assumption would be that penalties or any sanctions that they provide would escalate. And also the first one if it is small and is something that you can kind of be like, 'alright don't do it again,' would be warning. It would almost follow the procedures that the nonacademic misconduct system works with whether it is a written warning at first, whether it is warning of loss of deposit, or you can be fined or you can be blacked out during campaign. It depends on what it is and how many violations they repeatedly do that would be taken into account by CEO and DRO.

Speaker: We will move to President Vyas.

President Vyas does not speak.

Speaker: Okay, so we have reached the end of our initial Speaker:s list, so if there are members that do wish to speak for a second time. But, uh, Member-at-large Pistorius.

Member Ryan Pistorius: I really like this policy. And I kind of would like to take a little bit of a approach to it; if you imagine a grid, let's assume for a moment that our candidates are all actually trustworthy people. If they are trustworthy people then the goal would be when they become aware of something, that's fine and that policy is good. What about the 24 hours after violations take place, in this case again assuming that candidates are trustworthy people it potentially punishes them. Because what happens if they are only informed 24 hours after the



fact and the individual will get it 24hrs after that? They are punished despite the fact that they have done nothing wrong, it's the other team that is doing it. And so if we assume they are trustworthy it is better to have a system that has 24 hours after they become aware. If you say that they aren't trustworthy then sure they could falsify the evidence but that escalates things and makes things a lot more serious, so it is not good generally. So that isn't necessarily going to it but neither will 24 hours after that what will stop from forwarding email changing time. So if they aren't trust worthy candidates it's good to have protection's in place but avoid becoming cynical we need to assume to agree that the people who are running, let's keep in mind as well we need to ratify the Assembly to go through the election process, that those people would have a degree of trustworthiness. Also a side note, I wouldn't trust a CEO or Secretariat to know how much time is needed and certainly I wouldn't want to rush it, but it is always important to know even when it goes to the judicial level, they have 24 hours to meet. So the 24 hour also gives a consistent appeal program and policy thus far, so those are my two sense of data.

Beating fists.

Representative Tristan Brunet: I just want to make a quick point. Uh, this is an important matter and everything, but I would just like to make a quick comment that this motion is to like obviously people who are trustworthy they will follow the rules whether this motion is casted or not. That to say, this motion is mostly in set for those we can't trust to hold accountable, the way I see it.

Speaker: If there are no more members that wish to speak for the first time, I will give other members a chance to speak again.

Representative Julianna Jeans: So, I just really wanted to echo again, if we are doing this in the best interest of elections teams, so that teams are not bringing it up after and so everything doesn't get piled up. I think we need to have a more concrete system in place and this doesn't give enough protection to elections team as it doesn't give like a strict, 'this is what you have to do.' It is going to be very hard for people to get around that to, that's the point I wanted to make.

Representative Carling Counter: God, I am stuck on my chair. So, if a policy violation is reported after 24 hours is it not addressed? Cause I just, I think that 24 hours is a good standard to have that yes you should report these immediately. But is someone does choose to wait 2 or 3 day regardless of their motivation if someone is actually having a campaign violation that isn't being reported, should we just let the violation slide? Because it sounds like you won't prosecute a campaign violation unless it is within 24 hours. I would like clarification.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Um so whole point of this amendment to policy manual 1, is to not give teams the power to hold on to a complaint for multiple days. So pretty much, what it does is it helps us become aware of complaint as soon as possible and what it also does is um not only helps us to become aware as soon as possible, but pretty much allows us to address the issue faster. When something happens 24 hours after, let's say it comes to us 24 hours after they became aware...uh, they had the 24 hours it doesn't mean we won't deal with it what it means is that team can no longer file a complaint.



Representative Carling Counter: Okay.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Does that make sense? Um, however, like I would also like to address the fact that if 2 days later, the CEO or DRO or any one on the elections team or any member-at-large also finds this out, but they are not part of a team. They can address it if they can prove they found out 3 days after, then we will still address. The whole focus on this is simply we just want to put a little bit of pressure on person the team who wants to complain.

Representative Carling Counter: So just quickly following up, the member of the public can report at any time?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Absolutely.

Representative Carling Counter: Okay, thank you. Perfect.

Vice President Evan Dressel: I hate to play that devil's advocate but at the same time if we are still accepting complaints after... what's to stop a team from informing another member-at-large and letting them know about the potential complaint and then having them report for them?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Obviously there are many issues that are happening with this. When an individual files a complaint, um, we ask them their motive for filing a complaint. We ask them what happened, and if the complaint is originally coming from team and we find that out then, it is obviously a violation of this policy. Because it would be the same as team telling people what they have to do, so that is a violation of policy for a team to go up to a member-at-large and to tell that member-at-large you have to vote for me or you have to file a complaint. If a member-at-large does file a complaint, obviously the same things would happen, how did you find out about this violation and how can you prove that it happened so that if they did force them hopefully with the resources we have we could find its origination.

Proxy Bennett guess given the spirit of the policy with any document supporting, they were required to report immediately. That way it allows them to hold each other accountable.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: I'm sorry could you just repeat the last part?

Proxy Brunet: The ambiguity of the situation so that if you see something immediately then report it?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: A lot of things that will be happening throughout the campaigning period and the elections period, um, can be seen as tedious things. To tell someone to complain immediately, let's say something happens at 2 in the morning, who are they going to complain to at 2 in the morning? Which is why we allow the 24 hour period for that, I am not sure if I am answering your question correctly or not? If not if you could try rephrasing.



Proxy Bennet: It is more like the permitted vs required. Like holding each other accountable so that if someone else sees it they are going to have to voice it.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: So the reason why we don't require anyone to submit a complaint is it kind of goes with the spirits of the natural justice with the nonacademic misconduct system at Queens. That there is no obligation to complain, so if you see something you as individual are under no obligation to file a complaint, even if you know someone is involved or are directly involved. So by making teams required to file a complaint it would create conflicts within that, I believe.

Vice President Noureldin: So my question is, say someone reports their issue after 24 hours, does it matter how close to voting period that is? And will you be taking it into consideration?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Um, absolutely it does. Especially in terms of campaigns, especially if one of the sanctions can be a campaigning block, especially in the last couple of days. That is definitely a heavy consideration the elections team will be taking when making sanctions.

Speaker: Thank you Secretariat Martinez. So, we have reached the end of the Speaker's list, but there is a member that wishes to speak for a third time. I'm hesitant to go to a third level, just because it gets very cyclical, asking questions between the member and the Secretary or any other member. However, I will allow question from Vice President Dressel, but if there are no other new points, I look for members maybe we can look for a vote, but I will allow Vice President Dressel to speak.

Vice President Evan Dressel: I motion to amend the motion to read, 'within 48 hours,' just so we can allow for time for someone to make a complaint.

Speaker: So, we need a seconder for the motion. So, Representative Counter seconds the amendment. Uh, so we will move into debate on the amendment, is there anyone who wishes to speak to the amendment?

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: I do not find the amendment friendly.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: So just to speak to this, in the midst of an election 24 hours is a very very long time. These elections are ten days long so 48 hours it just seems like it is too long and when you are near the end of the election period and it is getting down to a couple days left. That is when they are constantly hammered with these complaints and that's when it gets hard for elections team because they can't handle it all and it gets messy. So, I would caution against voting on this amendment and I would stick to 24 hours just because it's a very long time in an election period.

President Tyler Lively: Would anybody on the elections team or perhaps the Secretariat be able to illuminate the Assembly on the number of complaints received during 2016 elections period.



Member-at-large Rebecca Warrion: I can definitely ask the officer from last year, I am talking to her right not. But just to say like we were inundated every single day like I would say per hour in those last few days we would get at least 24 complaints. If you guys would give me a few minutes I can her and get something more concrete.

President Alexandra Palmeri: To clarify the changes to 48 hours over 24 hours and against that amendment, I do still stand at 24 hours being efficient. For anyone who likes math, if you watch news things are reported we want to deal with it immediately you have the morning and afternoon or dinner to think it's not a massive invite to think over 24 hours about it maybe watch some Netflix, or slept. It is more than enough time to file complaint if the issue is that important you gonna want to deal with it immediately from experience she says 24hrs is ample time, I trust their expertise.

Beating fists.

Speaker: Is there any debate on the amendment? Last chance for debate on the amendment. Seeing none, Representative Brunet.

Representative Tristan Brunet: I'm just still a bit confused, like when this 24 hours' period begins. Like what is this definition of, 'being aware?' Like is it when they see the email or read it how do you know? Like it is still just confusing in my head.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: Uh the 24-hour period beings when they can prove that it begun, based on any record or incident itself or walked in room and said poster should be down by know but 24-hour period begins when they can prove it.

Speaker: Once again, this is the last opportunity to speak to the amendment.

Member-at-large Rebecca Warrion: Uh yea, just to give you some more concrete figures, I've talked to the direct provider of the CRO and it says throughout the campaign period on average in those like ten days, she is averaging the first 7 days to be around 15 complaints per day and then towards the end it was in range 40 to 50 in last three days. So yea, she said it was absolutely insane.

Speaker: So once again, last opportunity to speak to amendment.

President Tyler Lively: To clarify most of those complaints didn't come from us.

Laughter.

Speaker: Okay, seeing one other person

President Bhavik Vyas: Sorry, I didn't hear.

Laughter.



President Tyler Lively: Sorry I said, Bhavik, I said to clear the air most of those complaints did not come from us.

Speaker: Alright, so seeing no one else wishing to speak to the amendment, we are going to move to a vote. So all those in favour to change the amendment within 24 hours of subsection I, to within 48 hours, please raise you placard.

FOR: 0

OPPOSED: ALL

ABSTENTION: 1

AMMENDMENT FAILS

Speaker: We will move back to the original motion. So, moving back to my original Speaker's list we have one member so that was Representative Stonge.

Representative Patrick Stonge: Miguel, I think the whole point is to stop it from being brought up at last minute, and it was then said that we should have trust in the character of teams running. But we don't have that trust the teams running.

Speaker: Just looking at how many times people have spoken.

President Bhavik Vyas: I move that we call this motion to question.

Speaker: Thank you, we do have a seconder, President Palmeri. Uh, so, we are going to take a vote on whether we should call to question. Uh, so that means whether we should move to vote on this motion. So all those in favour of taking the vote on the final motion please raise you placard. So you are not voting on the motion right now, just that we should vote on the motion.

FOR: 27

OPPOSED: 3

Speaker: And any abstentions? Just kidding, there are no abstentions that is a trick question because it is procedural motion.

Laughter

Speaker: Uh, so moving forward again we will move to the vote on motion number 6, that the AMS Assembly approve the changes to policy manual 1, section 4-part A, as seen in appendix water, with the original amendment made by the Secretariat, at the beginning.

FOR: 20



OPPOSED: 10

ABSTENTIONS: 0

MOTION PASSES

Motion 7 – Moved by: Commissioner Keren, seconded by: Vice-President Thompson.

That AMS Assembly nominate three AMS Members to the Equity Grants Committee.

Commissioner Leah Keren: Pretty much, the Equity Grants Committee meets twice a year to grant money that goes towards activities, events, campaigns to promote anti-discrimination and anti-oppression on campus, so yea.

Speaker: Uh, so we are going to open nominations for the Equity Grants Committee, so it is any member of the AMS Assembly, so they do not need to be a voting member. Any nominations?

President Alexandra Palmeri: I would like to nominate President Vyas.

Speaker: Thank you, is there a second? Representative Jeans. President Vyas, do you accept the nomination?

President Bhavik Vyas: I happily accept.

Representative Julianna Jeans: I nominate Tristan Brunet.

Speaker: Okay, is there a seconder? Vice President Bennet.

Representative Tristan Brunet: I respectfully decline.

Vice President Evan Dressel: I nominate President Mair.

Speaker: President Mair, do you accept?

President Aniqah Mair: Yes, I do accept.

Speaker: And we need a seconder for that, Vice President Bennet.

Laughter.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: I nominate Representative Evans.

Speaker: Representative Evans. We need a seconder, Representative Counter, thank you. Representative Evans, do you accept?



Representative Benjamin Evans: I respectfully decline.

President Alexandra Palmeri: I would like to nominate Representative Wong.

Speaker: Representative Wong, is there a second? Um, President Gardhouse. Representative Wong, do you accept the nomination?

Representative Tiffany Wong: I accept.

Proxy BENNET: I nominate Vice-President Dave Walker.

Laughter

Speaker: Is there are second? Representative Jeans.

Vice-President Dave Walker: I think there is a conflict of interest, I'll respectfully decline.

Laughter.

Nominations are closed.

Speaker: Uh, so we will just have the members to stand up in their seats and we will just give them each one minute to say why they should be on this committee. And we are just not going to do any questions on this motion.

President Bhavik Vyas: I think I was nominated and fortunate enough to be an individual on this committee. But more seriously I think equity is incredibly important and at queens over my 3 .5 years, being a part of the Commerce Society, it put massive emphasis on equity. Being the leadership coordinator, completely redid the entire leadership curriculum to make sure the first years students and CEO's knew what it would be to care for any other person like you want to care for yourself and that's why I think should be on Equity Grants Committee.

President Aniqah Mair: I personally care a lot about equity, which is why I would like to be on this committee. Uh, I try to do everything I can to bring equity in to everything we do at COMPSA and to try to make it everyone role. I have a lot of experience dealing with equity like revising questions, making them as equitable as they can be and I just have a lot of experience doing that, so I think it would be great.

Representative Tiffany Wong: First of all, thank you so much for the nomination. I am really about fostering a positive environment for everyone and cultivating sense of social awareness that's what equity s fair and just unbiased ensuring all students have equal access to resources opportunities and different social groups those issue scan be address and so for example the committee stops people from entering equity is an open door and I believe in keeping door unlocked and open for students.



Speaker: All of the nominees spoke well to all their qualifications, and I would just like to as if all of the nominees can please step outside while we vote.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

Applause

Speaker: Alright, thank you to all three members, for being willing to serve on the Equity Grants Committee.

Motion 8 – Moved by: President Tyler Lively, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly strike a task force on student activity fees as seen in: Appendix Fire.

President Tyler Lively: This committee arises from sort of an ongoing initiative for a couple years now from AMS reviewing its student fee policies. The policies underwent a small revision last year in changes to eligibility requirements. But those eligibility requirements we never really acted upon. So what we are asking this task force to do, is to go back and look at those eligibility requirements and determine if they meet needs of AMS in terms of ensuring only groups who should get feed are getting fees. Second point is to then take those eligibility requirements and evaluate the current slate against those requirements. And then, the third is to then look at polcies and after groups get fees what are the sort of accountability measure that they are being held to. And sort of looking at the auditing programs for clubs and looking at record keeping and the potential for further reporting systems. That is generally how the committee will work, the committee is going to be chaired by the Vice-President of Operations Dave and I'll be on there along with the Chair of Finance Committee of board and that is because student fees do pose risk to us as AMS because if students don't spend fees the way they are supposed to be, then we are being negligent. So ideally, the committee will meet in couple months and report and prepare a presentation for Assembly and by the end of march have a report made. I am happy answer any questions on the committee and hopefully get some nominations.

Speaker: Okay, so I would like to note that the following motion, motion 9 is where we would normally nominate the AMS Assembly members for this committee, so that will come after this if this, should this motion pass.

No debate, proceed to a vote.

FOR: All



OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

Motion 9 – Moved by: President Tyler Lively, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly nominate three voting members of AMS Assembly to the Task Force on Student Activity Fees.

Speaker: President Tyler Lively would you like to add anything?

President Tyler Lively: Nope.

Speaker: Perfect, so we will move directly to nominations. SO we are looking for three voting members of Assembly to serve on this task force.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: I nominate Representative Kingswood.

Speaker: Representative Kingswood. Is there a seconder? Representative Wong. Representative Kingswood, do you accept?

Lower Rep Abigail Kingswood: Yes.

Rector Cam Yung: I nominate Vice-President Vinith Suriyakumar.

Speaker: Vice President Suriyakumar. Seconded by Vice-President Dressel. Vice-President Suriyakumar, do you accept?

Vice-President Vinith Suriyakumar: I do.

Vice-President Dave Walker: I nominate Vice-President Tyler Bennett.

Laughter

Speaker: No, he's a proxy. He's a proxy so we can't do that.

Representative St-ONGE: I nominate Representative Tristan Brunet.

Speaker: Looking for a seconder, Representative Jeans. Representative Brunet, do you accept?

Representative Tristan Brunet: Yes.



Speaker: Are there any other nominations? Seeing none, each nominee has one minute to speak to why they wish to be part of the Student Activity Fees Task Force.

Lower Rep Abigail Kingswood: Thank you for the nomination, yea I would love to be on this task-force because I think that transparency is really important and that in that each of them would be reviewed carefully and yea ensure that students know what they are paying for, thank you.

Vice-President Vinith Suriyakumar: I think I would be good because student fees is something at COMPSA we work very closely with ad well of working with us on how to improve is and I think it's important to evaluate how effective organizations transparency is already because they are most students do ask a lot of the time it's important to uphold each organization.

Representative Tristan Brunet: Yea I would be very interested working with committee and to echo Representative Kingswood comments on transparency, we do work for students and so we do have to make sure we do everything in our power even if that means looking at student fees. Then, I'd be more than happy to do that and it would lower the amount money we do have to pay.

Speaker: So I think again all three candidates were able to display their qualifications if assembly does have one questions, I will allow one question.

No question, proceed to a vote.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

Applause

Rector Cam Yung: I should get paid to open the door!

Laughter.

Omnibus Motions

Speaker: We will look into the availability of funds. So thank you so much to those voting members for being willing to serve on the task force. We are going to move to omnibus motions ten through to fifteen on the fall referendum.

Secretariat Miguel Martinez: So between motions 10 and 15 these are the groups or clubs or organizations that are up for ternary review. We are looking at where to the money is going so if



anyone has any questions please let me know and this is approval for club to be on fall referendum.

Representative Carling Counter: Why was Queens International Association Fee determined mandatory? I'm just curious.

Vice-President Dave Walker: It was just something that they were willing to run a couple of years ago and as these polices have been adjusted we figured that we would be moving away from what is an essential feel. So they took It upon themselves to go from a change to opt-out to mandatory fees.

No questions, proceed to a vote on omnibus motions 10-15.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

OMNIBUS 1/ MOTION PASSES

Motion 10 – Moved by: Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016: AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to an increase in the Queens Helping Haiti fee (subject to individual opt-out) from \$ 0.50 to \$0.60, an increase of \$0.10?

Motion OMNIBUSSED to OMNIBUS 1

Motion 11 – Moved by: Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to an increase in the Queens Concrete Canoe Team fee (subject to individual opt-out) from \$ 0.40 to \$0.50, an increase of \$0.10?

Motion OMNIBUSSED to OMNIBUS 1

Motion 12 – Moved by: Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.



That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to an increase in the Kingston Canadian Film Festival fee (subject to individual opt-out) from \$ 0.25 to \$0.50, an increase of \$0.25?

Motion OMNIBUSSED to OMNIBUS 1

Motion 13 – Moved by: Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to an increase in the Canadian Undergraduate Conference on Healthcare fee (subject to individual opt-out) from \$ 0.25 to \$0.35, an increase of \$0.10?

Motion OMNIBUSSED to OMNIBUS 1

Motion 14 – Moved by: Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to an increase in the Queens International Affairs Association fee (subject to individual opt- out) from \$0.80 to \$1.95, an increase of \$1.15. This fee was previously a mandatory fee in the amount of \$0.80 and was established in 2000?

Motion OMNIBUSSED to OMNIBUS 1

Motion 15 – Moved by: Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to an increase in the Queen’s Bands mandatory fee from \$4.00 to \$4.15, an increase of \$0.15?

Motion OMNIBUSSED to OMNIBUS 1

Motion 16 – Moved by: Member-at-large Matas Sriubiskis, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.



That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to the establishment of a \$0.55 fee (subject to individual opt-out) to support FreshSight Queen's?

Member-at-large Matas Sriubiskis: Had I been aware of the context of this meeting, I would have prepared a slide, but from personal experience being involved for 3 years in organization I can speak to the growth. So when I first became a part we were small and less know 16 members all consultants non for profit consultancy solve business problems for charity when I first came onto this small and approve the member first year application number around minimum like 20 member's local consultancies and working with clients over 3 years and private donors we've been able to improve working with ECG and KPP and World Wildlife Foundation. This national level and its contributed to financing unfortunately since then either change in their commission or for that reason we turn to AMS to seek for sustainable funding for more professional experience and nonprofit community.

No comments, proceed to a vote.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

MOTION PASSES

Motion 17 – Moved by: Member-at-large Jennifer Williams, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to the establishment of a \$0.25 fee (subject to individual opt-out) to support the Exercise is Medicine Canada @ Queen's University?

Speaker: Is Member-at-large Williams here today?

Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian: No but I have a speech for her.

Speaker: I'll recognize Officer Warrian for the introduction.

Member-at-large Rebecca Warrian: Founded in 2012 to encourage Physical activity. It was the first university that had exercise Canada as a campus club, we want to provide seminars around physical activity. We plan to use the student fee of 25 cents to use on campus and in the Kingston community to run events.

No questions, proceed to a vote.



FOR: 25

OPPOSED: 4

ABSENTIONS: 1

MOTION PASSES

Motion 18 – Moved by: Member-at-large Cierra Madore, seconded by: Secretariat Miguel Martinez.

That AMS Assembly approve the following question to the 2016 AMS Fall Referendum: Do you agree to the establishment of a \$0.05 fee (subject to individual opt-out) to support Queen's love146?

Member-at-large Cierra Madore: Yea so, our organization supports child trafficking victims. Um, local and globally around the world. And they have been staring this 12 years ago and built support shelters to support the children we continue mission at queens and members, we hold seven events throughout the year. So all of our fees go right back to love 126 and their commission, so what we are asking from AMS is some support for our expenses and as we continue to fundraise love 126.

Speaker: Thank you Member-at-Large Madore, are there any questions?

President Matt Nelms: I was just wondering; you were talking about working with many other organizations. So I was wondering would the money go towards developing more relationships with organizations? Or is it raising funds into a large fund?

Member-at-large Cierra Madore: So the 5 cent fee goes towards our initiatives at Queens as we are just starting to grow at Queens and our own money we raised last year we couldn't dentate 100 % fundraising. So having this will help us donate all the proceeds.

No questions, proceed to a vote.

FOR: 26

AGAINST: 4

ABSTENTIONS: 0

MOTION PASSES



Discussion Period

Assembly Governance as seen in: Appendix Air.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: This topic came up after meetings these meetings were really introduce for the first time last year but didn't come into effect until this year, and I think you guys did a really effective job looking at the budget. So we want to hash out and understand where you thought the se meetings should go at assembly committees speak to that and develop conversation from there.

Floor is opened up to questions from Assembly.

Rector Cam Yung: Um so the thing about this movement from taking it more towards committee level discussion appropriate in the sense that it gives us the aspect to discuss amongst people who are well educated on these issue and discuss it on not such a wide open basis. But this concern we see with it can be tide to board of trustees in closed sessions at committee level makes it hard to allow for discussion limits accessibility for student voice not to say this isn't a good idea it's just a concern I have moving towards committee.

Speaker: Uh yes, thank you very much Rector Yun.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: Am I allowed to follow up?

Speaker: Yes, I will allow you to follow up if you move is into Committee of the Whole so we can have a little bit more discussion. Moved by Vice-President Thompson, seconded by President Tyler Lively. So we are looking to move into Committee of the Whole, so this just allows for a better discussion and allows a little more back and forth, and is a little more informal. SO you don't have to stand up and announce you name every time you speak.

No questions, proceed to a vote for moving to Committee of the Whole.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

MOTION PASSES

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: So thank you for those comments a few things we talked a lot about closed session meetings. I think the meetings is so we can get in-depth with issues some people have said technical things get passed and we don't have capacity to understand what policy needs It says you have 40 hours week of school we want it to delve a bit deeper in issues and bring to assembly more people roundtable can give opinion so it is a bigger discussion to be had not just coming from three of us or commissioners but coming from all u at the table you are understanding it more and giving you a voice to be hear.



Vice President Evan Dressel: I would personally like to see some reports from all of our committees once they met because the whole point is we are making decisions and bring them. So like when we do the advisory boards for next year they entire assembly can see it happening. Everyone can get a great idea. I really like being in committee because not everyone in room can have knowledge on everything we discuss. Like I'm on campus actives advisory and now I know a lot but maybe not about the other so it would be harder to talk to every single one of those budgets because it is a bit unreasonable to expect everyone in this room to read all of them. So I am really in favour of committees and having them report on them.

Vice President Operations Vinith Suriyakumar: I would think transparency but also allow member sat large to see what they talked about.

President Aniqah Mair: I feel like there's a lot of pros and cons. I think one huge benefit would be as Vice-President Dressel said, it would allow us to go more in-depth on one idea, whereas Assembly there's a lot at once especially with schedule and at the same time is assumption because it happened at committee and people go in-depth that everything decide upon is correct and we end on up passing it. I trust their judgment, and the problem with that is we have large body here and people represent the students and so it would be good to not like, sorry I'm not being very eloquent you know.

Chair Brandon Jamieson: In most case I would like to echo sentences. So first of all, on topic, in theory I support idea of committees like Vice-President Dressel said it allows people to have more focused debate. But the problem is it assumes people attending committee did work. 3 years I've seen a lot and there is a lot of debate and discussion which is much more fruitful compared to when we didn't have committees and any discussion single question asked practice, I don't believe the discussion because more proactive clear mandate and academic welfare what you see in senate model where there is controversy its referred back to senate send back to committee last thing so little discussion view material in advance disagree at assembly contradicts what went into it already we don't agree on commissioner because we assume everyone else asked hard questions so that's my experience otherwise is support spirit of policy.

Trustee Jennifer LI: To echo the motion in spirit with committee transparency, so you could have 3 in-depth conversations and if you can summarize then the committee motion you present it as proof you don't have POI. This is because you can't summarize a 3-hour meeting in a 2-minute time period. My problem is members would have their voices heard about motions on table and those are my thoughts I think I would be helpful to have proposal to comment on not idea of the practice which can be different.

President Alexandra Palmeri: To go off of that, everything is helpful to break down committees we have in place based on functionality and just to echo what Trustee Li and Jamison, are you a Chair?

Chair Brandon Jamieson: No I am a Chair.

Laughter.



President Alexandra Palmeri: Certain times when committees are very helpful and others are not. So if we break down and figure out transparency and improvements, I was on advisory last year and this year we are trusting where they have gone but when they come to assembly last year some stand up and say they revised with Assembly isn't aware of what questions they were asked. So maybe we could have an executive summary on what expertise raised the motion to Assembly would be super helpful allows members to do necessary research. But I do disagree we need more accountability before meetings.

President Tyler Lively: I appreciate any comments. We are well aware of the transparency issue not everyone needs to comment on everything that happens. We spent 45 minutes talking about methods the Secretariat and CEO came upon issues that discussion can be sorted out by 5 people around table instead of 35 people hear as bi-standers the discussions aren't as fruitful. I think we can maintain broad input we need by moving towards more committee, this is a big move toward committee as nobody in audience is commenting on this vast thing we do students trust us committee structure allows 5, 6, 7, 8 people depending on the committee to engage in more in-depth consultation with students and listen to students instead of waiting for them to come to use and this body to be heard. What we are saying does the assembly generally agree with that broad sentiment? If so, then we can research what it looks like with other student associations and proper reporting and so everyone can fully weigh, so that is what I will say for now and I encourage everyone to keep it up but not for too long or we will miss the entire presidential debate.

Laughter.

President Matt Nelms: But maybe not that the trustees maybe not summaries the board as a whole. My question is will everyone have the capacity to get detail? I don't believe we have the capacity to dive in so deep into detail as a body of 35. Secondly, I do agree with statements made by President Palmeri a report at this level will allow people to see topics that were discussed provide fruitful material to allow a discussion to be fostered and so we get both representation and dig in further then people thing at current structure.

President Alexandra Palmeri: What would a structure look like interterms of set up?

President Tyler Lively: The big thing would be if we were to go all the way towards a committee structure. We would probably do what all other committee structures do and have this body sort of would meet once every month, or once every four weeks so it wouldn't affect the by-weekly society meetings. Um, yea, once every 4 weeks and these committees would meet once or twice per month senate type thing agenda is due a lot earlier so people can go over and review more in-depth documents. Something it could look like if you go to the Western UFC and you go to their council page they have governance calendar that shows you monthly meeting s are happening, when agenda material due and so you can see broad overview of the system looks like, we can reach out to counterparts there ask and discuss.

President Aniqah Mair: To hop back to the discussion about the number of people, I don't necessarily disagree. Every one of us is different and we all have different experiences and AMS Assembly is already a relatively small amount of the student body compared to those who are



students as a whole. Assembly as a whole is by having more people we have more experiences to draw upon and that means we might realize something that might not have been brought up at committee.

Vice President Evan Dressel: Um, so, also to expand on that. I do and don't like the committee structure in the fact that I like that we are taking some of these lower ticket items and put the to committees to assembly doesn't spend insane amount of time and instead of altering plans being embedded by others and reviewed by advisory board I like coming with report and saying here are big ticket items where we have NAM or fall reading break we couldn't bring that to a committee because it affects everyone for larger ticket items like that I feel it has to come to assembly.

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: You are absolutely right. The same with Alex, we need to research more in-depth on what this structure would look like and consult with you if we move forward things that affect students at the school need to come through.

Speaker: Thank you Vice President Thompson, anyone else wishing to speak?

Vice-President Carolyn Thompson: I just want to say thanks to everyone for participating. Um I think what we'll do is research different structure of what this committee level could look like and perhaps bring it back to Assembly to present to you and see what you like and don't about other schools well go ahead with that.

Speaker: So, we are still in Committee of the Whole, so we just need someone to move us out if we are done with the discussion. I'll recognize Vice-President Counter and Vice-President Suriyakumar.

Laughter

Speaker: It's a race.

FOR: All

OPPOSED: None

Adjournment

Speaker: We've reached the end of the discussion we will move to adjournment. I just want to thank you all for coming out tonight, and because he has been in to it so much tonight I want to recognize Representative Brunet, do you want to motion something?

Representative Tristan Brunet: Motion closes.

Laughter



Speaker: Seconded by Vice-President Dressel.

FAVOUR: All

OPPOSED: 1

MOTION PASSES

Assembly ends at 9:49 p.m.

