

###### Council Minutes

Thursday, January 23, 2020

6:30 pm, Dunning 11

Speaker: Thomas Wright

Secretary: Dana Fahey

*Council begins, 6:34 pm.*

# I. ATTENDANCE

Zaid Kasim: Hello, I know it’s weird seeing me here, Ben stepped down for the week to run in the upcoming election, so I’m here. Before motions I want to acknowledge a great loss of life, flight PS752 crashed, killing all 176 people on board which included 62 Canadians. I’d like us all to take a moment of silence to pay our respects.

# II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

##### Motion 1

Whereas: An agenda was made;

& whereas: we need to approve it;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the agenda of the Council meeting of Thursday, January 23rd, 2020, as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Zaid “IA in Training” Kasim

Seconded by: Thomas “IA at heart” Wright

**Motion passes, 6:37 pm**

Zaid Kasim: I’d like to amend the agenda. First move the QBACC press before CDE presentation. Get rid of the motion about QBACC. Also get rid of the director changes presentation and have it as our opening.

# III. Adoption of the Minutes

##### Motion 2

Whereas: It’s been two weeks since the last council;

& whereas: Dana made the minutes for it and they need to be approved;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the minutes of the Council meeting of Thursday, November 21st, 2019, as seen on the Engineering Society website.

Moved by: Zaid “Making middle names is hard“ Kasim

Seconded by: Dana “Reading the minutes isn’t” Fahey

**Motion passes, 6:38 pm**

Tyson Wilkins: It’s been much longer than two weeks since last council.

Zaid Kasim: The minutes reflect that fact.

# IV. BREAK

*Council breaks, 6:38 pm.*

*Council resumes, 6:41 pm.*

# V. Speaker’s Business

Thomas Wright: To begin, let us acknowledge that Queen’s is situated on traditional Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee territory. We are grateful to be able to be live, learn and play on these lands.

# VI. Presentations

CDE Presentation

Abbey Ford-King: This was actually a while ago, but I’ll be giving the presentation on my experience now. Here are some acronyms for clarity so were all on the same page. Main goals were to attend and see what other societies were doing in terms of ED. It was widely attended, but there were fewer people in a Director of Social Issues position there because it is rather new. My major goals were to learn more, develop EDI initiatives, and make connections with other schools. I wanted to invest time in campaigns to implement here and new positions for my portfolio, as well as create the possibility of inter-school initiatives. Here’s all the stuff I went to, I’m open to answer questions about anything on this list. My main takeaways? The conference was well-meaning, although I found it to be rather surface level, a little more critical thought could have been put in. They could have gone into depth rather than say things most people there already knew. I made a lot of connections and heard about what others were up to. I was able to join the ESCOO working group, and learned some things we could implement in HR. I have some comments on how Queen’s could improve the conference, if they were to host in the future. We could collaborate more on initiatives in EDI, we could gain a lot from some training and policy stuff. Overall, I felt it wasn’t very organized which made it difficult but I made lots of connections which was really excited about. From what I learned there, I want to implement some things and have some new goals, like some changes to policy, modifying and adding some new positions, and maintain the connections I made. Based on the value of the conference, its potentially not the most valuable for a director to attend in the future, as I felt I had already been exposed to most of the content there based on all thee training we undergo. It would be more beneficial for clubs and their leaders and delegates to attend. I’d also consider putting forward the motion of hosting it, because I feel we are well equipped and have a lot going on in EDI. Any questions?

Carson Cook: You said it was not most valuable for a director to attend, but would it be possible to use those initiatives you picked up if a non-director was sent?

Abbey Ford-King: It was more the networking part that gave me the ideas, which I feel a director could get at other networking events. The training itself didn’t spark that.

Kaija Edwards: Do you think any schools had anything for women in technology, or were doing anything interesting?

Abbey Ford King: That was one of the areas of the conference that I found disappointing. The Resources for Women in Tech seminar was more of a resume workshop. A lot of the events weren’t clear what they were going to be, and didn’t have the content I had expected.

Melissa Young: I find I get a lot from the other delegates when I go to conferences, is there value in sending the Director of Social Issues so that other universities can get values from us? Since the Director of Social Issues is arguably the most valuable person for that purpose.

Abbey Ford-King: It is valuable to share and help others, but I think the Director of Social Issues could prepare delegates for that rather than go. Because the delegates would still get more value out of the conference themselves and be able to share with others as well.

Qbacc Presentation

Nick: Hi everyone, we’re from QBACC here to make our presentation for your information, regarding endorsing our group. We do lots of initiatives, from to make it cheap and accessible to hold events, hosting rallies and of course our corner-stone campaign, the divestment campaign. We’ve been on this for three years now, and our motion has been sent to the board of trustees twice. We go to groups like yours to discuss what divestment really is, so that everyone is informed.

Sam: We’ll explain, divestment is the removal of investments from stocks for financial reasons, which Queen’s has done four times in the past.

Nick: Scientific work shows that the impacts of climate change are apparent, and the results are far reaching, from refugee crisis’, biodiversity loss, agricultural issues, and urban impacts. Countries that aren’t equipped to deal with these disasters are at the highest risk for issues like these.

Sam: Internationally, a 2 degree increase on average worldwide is the limit that all countries have agreed to stay under. 1.5 degrees is the optimal goal for everyone, however is not required.

Nick: The exact limit is 1.5-2 degrees. It’s tough to estimate where and how to measure these emissions, but the approximate equivalent would be 280 GT of Caron Dioxide. Globally, 860 GT of emissions were released last year. To give you an idea of this scale, about ¼ of this is equivalent to the carbon emissions from all the fires going on in Australia.

Sam: In all reserves, we have right now in the world about 500 GT, which is far more than we can afford with these limits. Canada’s econ is tied up with these resources, we can only afford to burn 15% of it, companies base their stock prices off what is in their reserves which is dangerous.

Nick: It becomes very simple, climate change is real, and we need policy and real transition to fix this. Divestment is the logical next step.

Sam: Divestment won’t significantly hurt us, if we’d divested in 2012 we would have made 137 million dollars in returns.

Nick: Obviously we can’t predict the long term too much, but precedents have been set. UCal divested in October, University College in London divested as well. It’s caught on. Concordia has made moves as well. Top institutions have realized the necessity of these actions.

Sam: There is a moral precedent, all companies pollute which we’ve established needs to change, but such issues can’t be fixed overnight. Oil companies on the other hand are interested in expansion, rather than transition away from oil and gas. This is a mentality that we cannot support, and by investing we support the notion of expansion.

Nick: Oil companies have been trying to mitigate the pressure on them lately. They are publicizing their investments in renewable energy, but it’s just a small fraction of their reserves that is going into this, which is not the direction we need. A study at Yale showed that oil groups outspend environmental groups ten to one. Few oil companies show practices that are in line with staying below 2 degrees. Our goal is that we want to pressure the government make environmental policy, pressure businesses to become environmentally friendly, and pressure the government to make programs for those working in the oil industry, so that the transition to renewable energy will not leave them suffering.

Sam: There needs to be transition, and a timeline to do so and hold people liable. Not expansion, transition. We aren’t talking about shutting the taps off immediately. Queen’s should embrace this change.

Nick: Oil is embedded in our society, and we are heavily dependant on it right not, but it is not sustainable. We need to keep our quality of life without reaching this two degree threshold. QBACC recommends that by 2025, Queen’s reach out to the 19 companies we are invested in who are involved in oil and gas, where we recommend they adjust their plans for the future, and show us how they will be part of the solution and transition. Companies that show us they plan on being a part of the solution rather than the problem will not be part of divestment. Deniers of climate change who refuse to change will be subject to divestment.

Sam: Engagement with companies to show us clear timelines and consequences, that’s what were looking for. If companies could not comply with these requests, we would divest. Push Canada to become compatible to below 2 degrees.

Nick: There are winners and losers in the industry, we want to be rewarding the winners with our investments, not the losers.

Sam: We want them to make their investments more socially responsible.

Nick: As we’ve said, Queen’s has divested four times so far, we think it’s time we invest better in the first place. Some companies have been implicated in bad things. We don’t want to invest in companies who have improper morals, and we want to give money to companies we want to grow. Also, there are no systems in place at Queen’s for having an argument here about topics like this. We want the Dean to create a platform and space so to have these sort of wide scale discussions that effect all of Queen’s, so that groups like us will not have to go from group to group. Setting these conditions for continued investment, and sending the message that we believe in this and should act as intelligently as possible. Put pressure on the government and industry, both have a big role to play.

Sam: Queen’s has an opportunity to be a leader on this issue, 24 departments from Arts and Science have endorsed us already, plus 60 clubs, and the great turnout at the climate the strike shows the students to care. The Alma Mater Society has endorsed us as well, as well as ASUS and Queen’s Law.

Nick: We ask that the Engineering Society endorses us as well. When the board is deliberating our request, we want to show them that there are big groups that support this movement, not just radical environmentalists that want this. We need to be in the world, not just watching it pass by. Investments are an obscure way of showing that, but an effective one. We hope you support us. We can say that ASUS and the AMS had jurisdiction over this. There is a precedent set on campus for you, although obviously it’s your decision. Any questions?

Felix LeClair: What proportion of our portfolio is in the sector where we want to divest, and of that proportion, how many of those companies would we be looking to divest from by 2025?

Nick: The short answer is about 5%. Queen’s has several funds. The pension is getting amalgamated soon with that, which we won’t be messing with. In terms of all the companies we’re looking at, we’ve gone through them all, and we don’t see them doing anything substantial. Our personal goals are a 30% reduction and we don’t see anyone showing that they will get there. Shell has made advertisements, but not results.

Sam: 19 possible companies that we would review and divest from if they don’t change in that 5 year period.

Felix LeClair: Is it safe to say as of today they all won’t reach our target?

Nick: Yes, they’re opening dialogues with shareholders about their wishes. Shareholder engagement has consequences.

Andrew Vasila: What are the four past divestments? And how are you serving as a liaison for those companies?

Nick: In brief, the first was in the 70’s, a Chile mining company which we divested from because it gave money to the government to terrorize civilians. That causes us to implement a principle, where if you can prove workers are treated the same as they are here, they are okay to invest in. The other were a textile company in Bangladesh which was based on labour standards, and a South African company was giving money to the government to buy weapons. It all comes back to giving money to groups to do things we don’t like, either directly or indirectly.

Sam: We didn’t have an official representative, they’ve struck up a committee to talk about socially responsible investing.

Nick: Queen’s has external funds managers, they’re making a survey where we’ll get some questions in. Science based targets, supply chains, companies havaing a positive impact, etc. There’s lot sot learn about sustainable investments, and people are looking into creating principles. There is lots of research to be done.

clearing debt

Jinho Lee: This was a conversation that happened in September about affiliated group debt. A lot of groups are in debt, and I was planning on clearing it. After discussing, I’ve decided that isn’t necessarily a good idea, as that may cause them to think they’re allowed to lose money on things they think we should cover. The Director of Finances and I are coming up with a clearing debt policy for next council. These are the groups that are currently in debt. We are planning on clearing the First Year Conference as there is no more FYC, and Queens Global Innovation Conference as they were deratified. For the rest, we will be coming up with separate policies for how we should be clearing debt.

Andrew Vasila: I appreciate the transparency; can you give us an update as to which of these groups have not altered their strategies to alter debt habits? Some is old debt and some is a consistent deterioration.

Jinho Lee: That’s basically proving if they have the ability to stay financially stable. That will be part of the policy discussion.

Zaid Kasim: Right now, there are 2 groups that have already happened, both QGEEC and QEC both happened and made money this year, both are on proper course to be debt free. The rest have gone through the works, and we’re looking towards all conferences making money this year. Can’t yet speak to clubs and teams, we’ll be having discussions with them yet.

Felix LeClair: OEC is from when we hosted in 2010, that’s a decade old. We put in a bid for that again. Being that that’s old debt, is it reasonable to have on the docket? Even though it’s a long timeline, is it reasonable to hold them accountable for that?

Jinho Lee: I did not look at that date, I was more looking at the current ones. I’ll take a look at that and bring it up when I bring the motion.

Carson Cook: I’m confident that’s from last year when QEC worked on sending delegates to that years’ OEC, not from when we hosted it. Not all the sponsorships came through and we went into debt.

Zaid Kasim: Adding a point, we had expenses for OEC this year, and stuff is happening with the budget, so some of that is partially part of that, but will be wiped regardless.

# Viii. Discusion period

qbacc endorsement

Matt Julseth: As a society, lots of teams and clubs get sponsorships coming from oil and gas companies, how will our support of this group effect these sponsorships?

Abbey For-King: They don’t have a good idea on how the implications reflect on us specifically, there are lots of faculty connections there, much more than most of the other faculties here. If we decided to support this, we really don’t know what it would mean. Perhaps we could focus on supporting endorsing QBACC rather than divestment itself.

Andrew Vasila: While this is a great initiative at its base, there are two things to consider. The overall precedent, in the past we’ve divested due to geopolitical situations and human rights issues. This on the other hand is due to a global initiative. We have a lot of strong ties, especially in geological, mining and chemical engineering, and a strong alumni community in oil and gas. And whether it’s from faculty sponsorships, or team sponsorships, we should consider the effects this endorsement would have. 5% is being held in these companies, there are funds that prioritize these mentalities. There are steps we can take, but making sure we are still making an informed decision, and the implications that this really means for us and our society and the campus.

Peter Matthews: Before we vote, we have to decide whether we’re even allowed to. Could someone expand more on what policy says about the situation?

Abbey Ford-King: We’d be voting for whether it’s in our mandate to endorse groups at all, and move forward with this particular group at a future council. There’s nothing like this in policy, so were looking for that today.

Zaid Kasim: Good question, we’re talking about whether the Engineering Society should endorse political groups in general. In general, I believe we shouldn’t take political stances. Within our constitution, that represents everyone, and by choosing a group you alienate a group of students, which is against your constitution as a society.

Natalie Arpin: Consider that a lot of grads and people in this room could go on to work in oil and gas, and this could hurt potential opportunities as graduates. I don’t think it’s up to us to hurt those careers, and options for those students. This is a decisive issue between students in o9ur faculty, this isn’t something we can represent easily, we shouldn’t be backing political organizations. It will be important that we get broader student feedback on the issue, to get better views on the faculty’s consensus, rather than just the loudest opinions.

Carson Cook: I’m not a representative of constituents, and these are not opinions. Keep in mind, climate change as a whole is bad, and hurts the earth which is bad for all engineers. Progressive people look at Queen’s and will often see us as behind the times, and whether that is true or not, it is often the perception, which would hurt us and the rest of the engineers. Whatever weighting is attached. Voting members here may not totally understand the constituents they’re representing. In that case, a lot of consultations or referendums are necessary. In terms of if council has the power to vote on this, the answer is that we do. As a whole, we have aligned with political groups, last year we engaged in the SCI, and the AMS and CFES engage in advocacy, and on climate change. We’re the highest power in Engineering Society, and are allowed to and have in the past aligned on issues. Not saying one party is bad or good, just saying we can take a stance.

Kaija Edwards: Should we make this decision for everyone? I would say no, because as student leaders we have a responsibility to do something, but we need to present other ways to support them. We can’t speak for everyone, since we know that there are engineers here that don’t support this. We could work with QBACC to set out individual endorsements in the society which gives people more freedom. We also discussed things being social issues and being political. If we choose that we don’t have the right to support them, we still need to produce a statement, not so much putting pressure, just a statement on what we want to see for the future.

Felix LeClair: Since I have a lot of experience with alumni, something important for us to realize is that the Engineering Society, although not the biggest, still has a lot of power here. It has been one of the most independent societies on campus, when others work with the AMS, the weight they add behind them is relatively little. In the Engineering Society, we do have the power to support political stances, at the same time I hesitate to say we should. Instead as we’ve done in the past, what was done was the society independently stated they would request something be done. Wherein we would make our own divestment on our own portfolios, that would hold up with our string of independence, and do our part without aligning ourselves with another body we don’t control. We’ve rarely directly endorsed something, but have put out our position on matters.

Delaney Benoit: To clarify, this is not an argument of divestment, it’s of endorsement. Advocacy and endorsement are different things. We don’t traditionally endorse groups, which is why it’s here, we weren’t even sure if this was in our mandate. Even council can’t make the decision for the whole student body, if we were to move forward with this, it would be about whether this is up to council vote or a referendum.

Mason: Do we have a definition of what a political group is? If the Engineering Society is to say we will never endorse political groups, we’ll have to explain what that entails. What makes someone a political group, conservative or liberal is easy, but is a special interest group a political group?

Noa Wyman: I agree with that, I’m confused as to what we’re voting on, endorsement of political groups or just this situation. This has been referred to as a political group, and this group has been referred to as that but I’m not sure why. Whether making this vote is saying we’ll endorse groups going forwards or just QBACC. I’m confused as to when a group comes in with science, we can argue that that’s politics, it’s science.

Zaid Kasim: I’m confused too. None of us understand which is what this conversation is about. What is a political group? Do we endorse that? If we do at a later council we’ll bring a motion to support this group specifically. If we decide we should consider them a political group, well then make policy, and define that.

Noa Wyman: Is what we’re voting on today on QBACC or political groups?

Felix LeClair: We aren’t making an official vote, were doing a straw poll to gage the outlook.

Abbey Ford-King: It’s also on political groups specifically.

Tyson Wilkins: Do we have the power? I think we do since we are elected representatives. The point of us being here is it do things like this. That we shouldn’t endorse endorse political groups on the grounds that they’re political? Everything we do is political, but now it’s climate and we’re backing up? Backing up to pass responsibility, seems like a cop out to me because we get money from oil and gas. Not taking a stand is how we got here in the first place.

Jonah Opler: I think as a society we should take full advantage of our power, and the rights we have. As LeClair said, engineering is so influential on campus, so why should we sit and wait on the sidelines? we shouldn’t be afraid to represent our students.

Kaija Edwards: We’ve got representatives for plenty of social groups, but now social issues like climate change are becoming the same as political issues, which is a tricky overlap. We’ve already made these choices to establish these groups, if someone wanted to ratify a group that says climate change is fake, in the same vein we have climate change representatives, and can guarantee that there are people that don’t like that. There are some that hold biased views we don’t support, we’ll always upset someone, it’s more of a question of moral rights. I’d like to retract that I said we can’t make this decision, we have a responsibility to push things forward, someone will always be unhappy, what will bring us forward?

Nick Neokleous: Climate change is important, regardless of whether we back them, it won’t be the be all end all. That’s important to remember, if we choose to back they won’t necessarily choose to divest, and vice versa.

Proxy: We’ve talked a lot about what we stand to lose, but we should consider what we stand to lose from not taking a stand. What effect could that have on our reputation and our enrolment.

Spencer Lee: Supporting any political party could have direct effects on the society itself, inaction could see similar results. For the fact that if we sit by and a big event comes by like this, several other groups may look poorly upon this.

Helen Rotenberg: I think personally from what I’ve seen, I don’t think engineers are clearly pro or against divestment, we’re very well split on the issue. Engineering Society is representative of the student body and their opinions, not representative of just the opinions in this room. There is a lot of division in o9ur faculty on this particular topic, so we should take it to the student body. For a lot of people the stakes are high, it’s a career at stake. We’re very much involved in this, it’s very controversial, so if we move forward it should come to referendum on this particular topic, since we are aware of the extent of the division and should get a proper representation of the faculties opinion.

Natalie Arpin: Consider what endorsement means, it’s a club we have no control over. No ability to affect the decisions they make in the future or have warning of said decisions. Are we willing to take the risk of endorsing a club with no control, which anyone can look back and say we supported them? Could affect our reputation, that’s definitely a conversation that needs to happen.

Carson Cook: We need to talk about that. Everything is political. Focus on whether we should endorse groups period. We do have the power. It’s not bad to go to referendum. It’s a strength to know when you aren’t able to fully represent your constituents. Whatever decision is set, that is the democratic process. It means as a whole the Engineering Society has decided to do something and that is what should be done. Maybe it angers 30%, but if it is what was decided democratically, that is the right thing to do.

Delaney Benoit: The word political can be removed, here we don’t really endorse any groups that we’re not a part of. It’s the fact of the endorsement and not so much what they’re doing. We’re not just talking about divestment, this opens a lot of opportunities for these situations in the future. Is this something we want to take on or focus on what is internal?

David Hoskin: As elected representatives, it’s our duty to represent the people. If we choose we’re capable of that. What kind of groups? How? Who? Instead of saying we endorse this group, we could say we support this specific idea they have in mind.

Peter Matthews: If we endorse them they can then change their views afterwards. If they went against our views we could then vote to remove our endorsement. They aren’t saying to immediately divest from all oil and gas, just in five years the ones that aren’t making an effort.

Ryan: We can endorse this idea in other ways outside the actual group.

Andrew Vasila: Endorsing groups vs statements, and removing the politics from elements. This is not the same as endorsing a candidate, but rather a concept. Issuing a direct statement, and whatever we decide as a committee or referendum. As an Engineering Society, we are presenting an informed topic. And for the most part we are talking about constituents that are that are educated, informed, and active.

# ix. Discusion period

BED fund

Thea: We are the BED Fund! This is the team, I’m Thea, the head manager.

I’m Sia, I’m the outreach manager.

Thea: Helen is our Director of Academics. In your student fee, you paid $60 to the BED Fund. We use the money to buy better equipment for the engineering students. There are representatives from each discipline who propose potential purchases.

Past things that money has gone towards include TV’s in the ILC, chairs in the computer room, a fuel cell for Chem, Raspberry Pi’s for ECE, and plenty of other things.

Thea: Right now, the fund is structured like this. You pay a student fee that goes into a discipline fund, and each discipline gets a fund. Money rolls over, if you’re in fourth year it’s invested and makes money. The general fund has up to 50k in it. These are relative numbers on the screen here. Right now we’re thinking about eliminating the student fee because of the endowment fund. We’re also thinking of changes to how to fee will be split up between the disciplines. Now this is just under investigation. We just wanted to discuss this. The first reason we want to change things potentially, Geo gets about $3500 in donations, and $6000 in rollover. This year they can’t make a purchase due to insufficient funds. First year makes small purchases for the most part, and has more money, and it’s same with Mech. The ECE budget was $17k this year and they only spent $12k. Smaller disciplines are suffering in this system, while larger aren’t disciplines aren’t maximizing the money. We came up with a few different ideas for how to restructure the system, but we’re open to other ideas. Option 1; sharing is caring. Divide the fund equally between the disciplines. ECE counts as one discipline still. This isn’t representative of the number of people in the discipline. Option 2; bucket option, so we divide the disciplines into small, medium and large categories. Large being general, first year, Mech and Civil. Each bucket gets the same amount of money, equalizes playing field. Option 3 is a math equation, that I can show you on the board. Basically, the general fund gets 10% then each discipline gets a base amount, and the rest is split by enrollment, but everyone gets a base amount. We can still change the numbers. The fourth option is what it is right now, now it’s your money, but when we remove the fee it’s just the investments that make money. When we divide it after that it will not be anyone’s money whose still here. Assuming the BED Fund generates 100k, here’s what each option will generate for your discipline. Which idea seems the most fair? Any other ideas?

Kaija Edwards: You have a lot of ideas, have you considered doing a draft or auction, where faculties can bring motions to your committee, and a discipline can argue for their request? When people don’t request things then they won’t be wasting money.

Thea: We thought of that, its arbitrary, especially now given we’re all in Chemical engineering right now, so that introduces bias. Also, the purchasing timeline is very tight. First semester is for idea generation, then proposals are due the first week back, then BED Fund decides, the Dean approves, then council. The process of fitting proposals and the committee into that would be too tight.

Andrew Vasila: Some disciplines have contributed more to that excess, which is worth considering. We want everyone to succeed. As a whole trying to remember that in the past the larger disciplines contributed more, more students generate more benefit logically. In my opinion option three does that best, but as it is right now it should be flexible.

David Hoskin: Would we consider some historical data set, which disciplines have made purchases then?

Helen Rotenberg: There’s no good documentation past two years ago, which is bad. We’ve had a difficult time finding things past two years ago, we’re in a good documentation place now.

David Hoskin: Does the general fund have to be used to benefit all eng, or could it be accessed by disciplines that need a little extra?

Thea: Right now, it’s for things for the ILC and things everyone can use, we have a fund right now that supplements for other funds. I don’t think that’s necessarily a good option, because if the general representative wants to use their whole budget they shouldn’t be limited.

Melissa Young: I’m the Mech President, I’ve done our BED Fund. First, we struggled with getting student involvement, considering instead of electing BED Fund representatives, hiring them would work. Could make more interest in the position so that the fields with roll over use more of their money. Instead of rollover, you can only roll over half your money. Personally, I’d support option 3. Suppose we do that, we split the rollover, then the other half goes to investment or other disciplines for application. People would be more interested in sharing if they can’t keep the money they don’t spend.

Thea: I’ve talked to someone in civil, and he thought we should send excess money to Geo or Mining, where if you don’t spend your money, you just lose it, which is incentive. They can’t apply for your rollover because of the purchasing timeline, so that part isn’t quite feasible.

Melissa Young: When I was working on my BED Fund, Apple didn’t need to spend a lot. A lot of what Mech is purchasing is going towards our 399/398 labs, which is for some Apple students as well. It would help to be able to share funds if things are interdisciplinary.

Natalie Arpin: It’s great that you’re doing this, I think that something to consider is that Geo and Mining are still only getting under $10k, which really limits them. It’s important that they can get things that make a significant impact, not just a bunch of small things every year. It’s not only size, but what’s reasonable.

Thea: That’s the problem, we want people to be able to even the playing field. Geo and Mining are equally important. No punishment for being in a small discipline.

Peter Matthews: My opinion, option 3 is probably the best, but with a higher base amount closer to 5%, because Geo and Mining still would only get small funds. As general fund representative, I didn’t come close to maxing out the budget, and this year Geo wasn’t able to make a purchase. I think the rules should be made so that other disciplines can be helped by general if there’s money there.

Matt Julseth: I had the same point, because from my experience as first year representative, I had a crazy budget and couldn’t spend it all. It was really difficult to make the most of the money. Even with option three. That’s a lot of money for them.

Thea: This year they’re tending towards spending most of their budget.

Matt Julseth: That might not happen every year, if you don’t spend it all, other disciplines should be able to access it.

Felix LeClair: Today is there a form of interdisciplinary spending? In terms of rollover, we could set an upper cap on what can rollover. Anything above that could be put in a general rule of redistribution. Not punishing everyone, but puts money back where it’s needed. With how much we generate, that’s relevant for big and small groups. It would essentially make sure that smaller disciplines won’t reach this cap. Instead of it going into the fund it makes sure that no one is being punished.

Sam White: In terms of big purchases like the 3D printers, when you want things like that we already have those things. They aren’t used all the time, it’d be nice to show the demand for the purchases. If there’s no demand or proof they shouldn’t happen. Because school is a fast turnover, people might have a saving vision, but when they leave its lost. Each faculty should get 3%, then apply for money from a pool with proof for want and demand. People will then think bigger. Get bigger faculties thinking. You shouldn’t be able to just spend all your money on whatever cause you have it.

Thea: They’re implementing 3D printing into first year so demand will be going up.

Evan Arsenault: Rules for rollovers, will that stay the same?

Thea: It’s up in the air, it’s based on if you’re still here. Could be immediate, or a four-year rollover, or not at all.

Kaija Edwards: We’ve had people talk about shared resources, Geo engineering is small, but there’s also the geology department in Science too. Could we work with them to give them the option to opt into the fee because they would also benefit from these resources. Is there a way we can give them the option to contribute to boost smaller budgets?

Thea: We’ll look into that, realistically it won’t happen under me, I could leave that for the next head manager. Could be difficult.

David Hoskin: We could implement a factor associated the need within each discipline in the math equation. More potential to purchase would be weighted heavier to add into the equation.

Thea: The problem with that is that its subjective, it would come from a committee that isn’t totally unbiased, I just don’t know how to quantify that.

Andrew Vasila: I like putting a floor on every discipline, but raising that floor. That money could come from the higher disciplines. The use it or lose it mentality promotes reckless spending. It will bring about more purchases, but could make people buy more expensive options they don’t actually need. Allocate that money towards the disciplines that need it more. A floor would remedy that.

Awards restructure

Zaid Kasim: Ben and I have been discussing revamping the awards committee and how we consider and distribute awards. In the last few years, we’ve witnessed the process and it’s bad. We have an awards committee composed of Internal Affairs and executives and other people, we open an awards vote for everyone, anyone can go to nominate. The awards committee can only look at those nominations, and the things that the person has brought forward. It’s usually the same people every year, and we don’t think it’s a fair reflection and we have an idea for doing better. A lot of these awards come with a lot of money, so this isn’t just titles and formalities. Adding the president and vice president of operations, and 8 discipline club representatives, so there is ideally representation from every group. That group would make all the decisions for nominations and awards. There would still be a suggestion form for the public. But the awards committee should have the power to make the decisions.

Felix LeClair: The role is to make it less of an insider club, it’s fair to say the large amount of club are insiders? Doesn’t this perpetuate the problem?

Zaid Kasim: Ideally, everyone has been voted in fairly, and it is fair for us to assume that the disciplines voted you in fairly. I feel that’s a fair assumption.

Kaija Edwards: I noticed that it tends to be a long process at the end of semester. I wasn’t supposed to be there, I had to go instead of the president since it was a lot of time. I think there’s a very good chance that these people will be busy at the end of the year. Is there a way to break it up? Using a shared secured IP perhaps? Everyone can plan around their own schedules that way? Could result in a better turnout on the diversity of those who contribute.

Zaid Kasim: We’re just getting ideas hereto then propose a motion. We’re thinking about adding specific metrics to all awards, so that there’s less bias. It will mean a lot of policy writing. The process I have in mind would be longer, so giving people more time and splitting in multiple days might be best.

Melissa Young: I never sat on the committee, I was asked to but didn’t have the time. You could have to bring someone with them who isn’t involved in Engineering Society, which would give an outside opinion. Quick straw poll of the elected members in the room, how many of you ran for your positions unopposed? There are a lot who ran here because we’re the only ones who ran, how much does that matter if you didn’t have to compete?

Sam White: You still have to beat a vote of confidence.

David Hoskin: The issue isn’t fairness, I’m sure you’ll be fine there. The only reason I know about these awards is because I was there. Maybe focus more on advertising so more people can nominate rather than the insiders.

Zaid Kasim: One of the plans was to advertise severely because that’s a good point. We’ll be marketing with the communications team and shining a light on these awards and their benefits.

Peter Matthews: I think we should market more heavily, sending out emails not just in the All Eng, but like multiple emails about the awards coming out. Instagram and Facebook posts as well, which might get more reaction, and Engineering affiliated groups could promote them rather than just the Engineering Society.

Zaid Kasim: One of the reasons is because even with the marketing were planning on, we’re going to use multiple streams, historically speaking we never get many nominations, I don’t think marketing will make people take the initiative, which is why I still want to restructure.

Spencer Lee: Do you mean each discipline head or just making a new role for each committee. Regarding breaking up the time where they vote, the problem with this is that you have to have the same committee back, which may seem easier, but you need to free up more of your schedule. Bringing friends could be a good idea, but people tend to have friends with similar points, and it may not eliminate as much as you think. More emails might not help, just make people ignore the information or other information coming through. It shouldn’t deprioritize other things.

Zaid Kasim: Fair point, splitting is a good idea, not sure about the discipline clubs yet, I wanted people’s opinions. I wanted someone from everything to be represented.

Jonah Opler: About time commitment, people could send in their thoughts and opinions, but without meeting and discussing there is no use. Regarding the time commitment in general, they signed up for a role of power, perhaps they didn’t know that and that should be expressed better. You signed up for this, so you should be prepared to go through with it. Introducing metrics in policy is risky in case one person doesn’t deserve the award, but they meet the metrics better opposed to someone better.

Kaija Edwards: If anyone has a specific reason they feel they can’t make a choice, they have a duty to recuse themselves from that trial. Ideally people will fill things out honestly, we can’t make choices based on stuff not on the paper.

Jonah Opler: Awards are more general than specific metrics. I think the idea of having someone else is a good idea, bringing someone totally not involved isn’t the best option. Someone involved often best represents the Engineering Society, and the friend they bring should be involved in the Engineering Society but not the government.

Carson Cook: Advertising can be put in policy, I recommend the shell fund process. I think its important to have external nominations, I don’t know if that’s the same as suggestions.

Zaid Kasim: I meant to say it wouldn’t be that the committee couldn’t go off information off the nomination information.

Wilson: Discipline clubs would be helpful with spreading the word.

Zaid Kasim: Talk to me afterwards. I’d like to hear more from people in clubs.

Jeremy Ngyuen: You mentioned ads, how would you do this? Emails and Facebook are less well received. As a section representative, I know that class talks have been well received, I know there are people with direct contact, could you use these people?

Zaid Kasim: We’re planning on using other social media, Mail Chimp, hopefully involving discipline clubs would be great. With class talks we would need to find people to do the talks.

Natalie Arpin: If you’re allowing representatives to consider outside information you’re introducing insider bias. A director might know more about what they do. There’s a reason we have all this policy. Making the form shorter could help encourage involvement.

Felix LeClair: What’s the current process for nomination?

Zaid Kasim: I believe it was that you could do it in person, but it was generally Google form.

Melissa Young: Nominations aren’t self-nominations. Maybe a consideration is allowing self-nominations. People might not make a nomination for all their friends. We don’t always have time for that. There are definitely people who are deserving who could nominate themselves.

Kaija Edwards: How about jury duty? No one needs to be forced to come, but a randomly selected group gets an email saying, “Hey you’ve been invited to be a part of the democratic process”. Getting to go to the ceremony could be incentive.

Zaid Kasim: Quick poll, are people for or against revamping the policy?

# x. New Business

Motion to Extend Council

Moved by Carson Cook

Seconded by Felix LeClair

**Motion passes 9:16 PM**

##### Motion 4

Whereas: There is a need for Executive Director Team restructuring;

& whereas: The Executive workload needs to decrease;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to Policy Section β - Society Leadership as seen in APPENDIX “FUNDIRECTORS”.

Moved by: Delaney “Exec” Benoit

Seconded by: Zaid “Loves” Kasim

Thirded by: Jinho “Directors” Lee

**Felix LeClair, Jinho Lee, Delaney Benoit, and Zaid Kasim Abstain**

**Motion Passes, 9.28 pm**

Delaney Benoit: We have some ED team restructuring, the spirit is outlined in the motion, it’s basically redistributing the workload, making things make more sense and ensuring that the opportunities are fulfilling and rewarding. First, we’re removing the Director of Events, it’s been shrinking and shrinking, and is better suited to other directorships. We’re also renaming the Director of Conferences to the Director of Clubs and Conferences, and the Director of Internal Affairs to the Director of Governance.

Zaid Kasim: We’re removing the banquet from the Director of Governance, because the Director of Governance has a lot going on in March, with the awards, AGM, and transition. It would be more fair to move that elsewhere.

Delaney Benoit: This new directorship will be a way to offload some of the technical work the Vice President of Operations performs, and would free them up for more management. We think it would be a fulfilling role, it would include space management, administration, key scheduling, internal events, attending council. This is how the structure would be redistributed.

Spencer Lee: Wondering how you expect the additional events to be handled by the directors? With moving a lot of the events are under Christina, would those structures be moved to the new directors? That’s a lot more people to oversee.

Zaid Kasim: Since the current Director of Events no longer has someone to transition, she will go to the new directorships and train them and reallocate. We believe this works and is a fair workload, if anything it levels things out. TBallz and TSledz have been moved under the Director of First Year. The committees have been removed.

Nick Neokleous: One thing, I can’t speak for next year, I think the portfolio will benefit from this. It feels like there are parts of the year where it’s hard to connect, and these events will help the Director to stay interpersonal with the first years.

Melissa Young: The Director of External Affairs will take Movember and the Terry Fox run, and the run won’t have a coordinator?

Zaid Kasim: They will have a coordinator?

Spencer Lee: The teams this year have co-chairs underneath them, since those aren’t covered under policy.

Zaid Kasim: That’s up to the next executive and ED team.

David Hoskin: On EngChoir Exec, that funding came from the Events portfolio, will we then work with the Director of Clubs and Conferences to get our budget?

Zaid Kasim: Yes, that will just move to the new directorship.

Melissa Young: Can we see the associated policy?

Delaney Benoit: Everyone involved has been spoken to, and we’ve made sure that the workload is reasonable and discussed with our ED team. Everyone who this effects has given us their blessing that this makes sense.

##### MOTION 5

**Whereas: The associated changes to the Executive Director Team also require By-Law changes;**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT:**

**Council approve the changes to By-Law Section 8: Engineering Society Directors as seen in Appendix “COOLDIRECTORS”.**

**Moved by: Delaney “Directors” Benoit**

**Seconded by: Zaid “Love” Kasim**

**Thirded by: Jinho “Exec” Lee**

**Felix LeClair, Delaney Benoit, Jinho Lee and Zaid Kasim Abstain**

**Motion Passes, 9.29 pm**

Melissa Young: There was a thing I brought up that hasn’t been fixed about Dec 6.

Zaid Kasim: That was changed.

##### Motion 6

Whereas: The Agnes Benedickson Tricolour Award is the highest honor in the Alma Mater Society;

& whereas: We need a new representative from The Engineering Society to help decide who wins the award;

& whereas: This person must be available for the entirety of the weekend of February 1st and 2nd and not be nominating someone or nominated for the award

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council elect Felix LeClair, as the Engineering Society representative for the Agnes Benedickson Tricolour Award Selection Committee 2020.

Moved by: Delaney “New Decade” Benoit

Seconded by: Zaid “Same Council” Kasim

**Felix LeClair Abstains**

**Motion Passes, 9:40 pm**

Delaney Benoit: We want someone who can choose fairly, but it cannot be someone who is involved in nominations at all.

David Hoskin: Is this position open to anyone or just voting members?

Delaney Benoit: Anyone.

Sam White: What if I don’t know if I’m being nominated or not?

Delaney Benoit: Then we would re-elect you. If you don’t know then there’s nothing you can do.

Andrew Vasila: I did this last year, it was a cool opportunity and met a lot of great people. To hear the stories of the impacts at Queen’s, and the scope of impacts, I highly recommend it. A point of caution this is not a small commitment for that weekend, it is the whole weekend.

Felix LeClair: Have nominations closed?

Delaney Benoit: They’ve closed.

Nominations:

Felix LeClair

Delaney Benoit: What criteria would you look for in a recipient?

Andrew Vasila: I would want to place a lot of emphasis on general impact in the university community, self-driven club, causes, and overall impact. There are a lot of different scopes and weighting those appropriately is important.

Felix LeClair: I would look for contributions towards the greater Queen’s community, it’s a great place that’s given a lot to us. Looking at how you can give back and grow the community. Going above and beyond the call and helping the Queen’s family.

Andrew Vasila: How would you ensure you’re providing an objective scope?

Felix LeClair: Taking into account the engineering student body and society in the Queen’s place, we tend to have taken an oath to the society as a whole. It’s important.

##### Motion 7

Whereas: The Advisory Board needs restructuring to make it more effective;

& whereas: The procedures of the Advisory Board need to be clarified;

& whereas: There are some inconsistencies with practices and policy;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to By-Law 18.B – Advisory Board Membership as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Membership”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to By-Law 3.I.3 – Engineering Society Elections as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Membership\_Removal”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy ζ.C.2 – Selection of Board Members as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Membership\_Selection”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy ζ.C.3 – Responsibilities and Duties of the Officers of the Board and Policy ζ.C.5 – Responsibilities and Duties of the Board as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Responsibilities”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy ζ.C.4 – Standing Committees of the Board as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Committees”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy ζ.C.6 – Rules of Order as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Rules”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy η.M – Advisory Board as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Duplicate\_References”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy θ.D.5 – Corporate Initiatives Accountability as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Accountability”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy θ.D.8 – The Capital Planning Committee as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Capital\_Planning\_Committee”.

& BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the first reading of the changes to Policy θ.D.9 – The Capital Fund as seen in APPENDIX “Board\_Capital\_Fund”.

Moved by: Carson “Gotta love Advisory Board!” Cook

Seconded by: Andrew “The new and improved Advisory Board” Vasila

**Andrew Vasila and Carson Cook Abstain**

**Motion Passes, 9:47 pm**

Carson Cook: Sorry Thomas, the reason it’s written like this is that we are able to divide the motion and vote clause by clause. The things that are contentious may not get approved while those that are not can still. The first is spirit, we need to restructure that the 2 spirits of this motion are to get more engaged members on the board and clarify and streamline the processes.

Felix LeClair: This is the 4th time we’ve made major changes to the advisory board, is that due to the systematic issues in the Engineering Society, or that these changes will end the problems once and for all.

Carson Cook: The goal is to fix problems, to my memory we haven’t had 4 changes though.

Jonah Opler: No one here is a professional, changes shouldn’t be frowned up since we’re all learning the process here and it’s a good experience to make motions you believe will help.

Melissa Young: Bylaw will come back, I would like to recommend that we all actually do read those and come back to Carson. I personally did not have enough time this week.

Carson Cook: To add, the advisory board hasn’t fully vetted these changes, there will be amendments for the second reading. If the board is not able to come to a consensus, I will be tabling the motion. Vote based on sprit.

##### Motion 8

Whereas: Golden Words Policy is seriously outdated and needs to be edited to reflect current practices;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to Policy Section β - Society Leadership as seen in APPENDIX “GOLDENWORDS”.

Moved by: Sarah “Golden” Hatherly

Seconded by: Oren “Words” Katz

Thirded by: Seth “Slaps” Davis

**Motion Passes, 9:52 pm**

Seth Davis: We’ve had a lot of changes, due to lot of factors. What this policy is doing is protecting and updating us. It does some name changes, we have to talk about operations, and our system is updated. If you have issues or questions please bring them up.

Carson Cook: Move to amend G.6.1, I move to bring it back, editorial autonomy is important but it is important that those are laws and should be included. Secondly b.4.1, I would amend to add a sentence. Was a lawyer consulted for these changes?

Jinho Lee: Yes, the lawyers were consulted.

##### Motion 9

Whereas: CSE is at the end of reading week this year;

& Whereas: We under budgeted for travel assuming everyone would be in Kingston;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Council approve the changes to the President Budget to increase the cost of CSE Delegate Travel to $610 as seen in APPENDIX “CSE”.

Moved by: Delaney "Not going to Waterloo" Benoit

Seconded by: Jonah "Going to Waterloo" Opler

**Delaney Benoit Abstains**

**Motion Passes, 9:54 pm**

Delaney Benoit: CSE is the Canadian Federation conference on sustainability in Engineering. It was always in the budget, we’ve never attended before, we’ve just hired delegates to attend with Jonah. I didn’t realize that this is at the end of reading week, and won’t be in Kingston. So, travel costs went up since they are going on our behalf, and will no longer all be leaving from Kingston.

Jonah Opler: Most of the incurring cost would be to get people to Toronto, then to Waterloo, and back to Kingston.

# xi. Executive reports

##### i) President

Delaney Benoit: I think although things were scattered, we were hoping to take a straw poll on the thoughts on endorsing political groups? *Council does a poll.* It would be nice to hear both sides of the story, thanks for voting and discussing. Election coming up, everyone vote, and thanks for attending debate night. Good job everyone on starting first semester strong, everyone’s been on top of it.

*Council sings the engineering hymn.*

##### II) Vice president of operations

Jinho Lee: Not much going on other than everything is happening. Operations portfolio, payments, server issues, banking, affiliated groups, all going on. Lots of engagement in the Engineering Society. Also, a lot of the people in my portfolio are students in volunteer positions so expecting to get things done in the next day may not be feasible, please plan in advance to make their lives easier. That all I have to report.

##### II) Vice president of Student Affairs

Zaid Kasim: First, before the break I took a mental health break but am back on. Been catching up with directors, OEC, affiliated groups, design teams, Clubs and Conferences. Thanks to Allison for QGEC, that went great. I’m stepping in for Ben this week, and working with everyone on the changes coming through.

Motion to extend Council

Moved by Felix LeClair

Seconded by Andrew Vasila

**Motion passes 10:00 pm**

# xii. Director Reports

##### i) Academics

Helen Rotenberg: I’ll keep this brief, Englinks is making money, iCons are going well, please send Thea or me feedback on their presentation and any ideas you think of, we’re very busy with BED Fund right now. Really happy with the discussion period we had today though, it was very helpful. I’m also going to be planning the caucuses.

##### II) Communications

Zaid Kasim: Ally is really sick right now, she’s been working on elections, and meeting with mangers. She’s doing a great job.

##### iII) conferences

Allison Finer: Conferences season is now, so there’s a conference every week until reading week, QWEC is still open and is the weekend before reading week. I’m staying on top of budgets and having meetings. We’’ll be changing club hiring so keep an eye out for that.

##### IV) Design

Zaid Kasim: Max is working on funding mostly, shout out to all the design teams, we attended the PD alum networking summit as well. A few teams got big donations and we’re working with that. We’re also getting ready for competition season and his transition manual

##### v) Events

Zaid Kasim: There are no events.

##### VI) External Relations

Jonah Opler: I’ve been working with my FYPCO, there will be an event at the Boys and Girls Club of Kingston in March for the Frecs. The Outreach team is doing a snowman and clothing drive, that’ll be fun. We are also pairing with Con-Ed for reading buddies, volunteering with the soup kitchen, and are sponsoring a house hockey team, we love them. Events with nursing and commerce are on the horizon as well. There’s another blood donation trip February 11th, and another Fix’n’Clean event in February.

##### viI) Finance

Jinho Lee: Liam’s team is fully operational, there are lots of questions for the bank of EngSoc. It’s being updated twice a week, we’ve been getting lots of emails about cheques, but please keep checking until either Wednesday or Fridays, because it may just not have updated yet. If you would still like to be added, instead of sending Liam an email I recommend you visit on Wednesday or Saturday night when they’re working in the lounge. The bank of EngSoc has been implemented, but we haven’t gotten much feedback, we’re looking to improve so please come talk to us.

##### viIi) First Year

Nick Neokleous: Working mainly on transitions and the discipline fair. The all discipline fair ran, it ran in Grant which was more accessible. Huge success, shout out to the booth volunteers. I’ve been fleshing out policy with my FYPCOS and meeting with year executives. I’m working on my transition manual, and continuing to interact and engage with the first years. FREC hiring is going on, give them support of you see them.

##### IX) Human Resources

Zaid Kasim: The biggest thing she’ll be doing Is transitioning, also she’s helping out with hiring season for managers for next year. This rush is all the directors and managers, if you’re interested in applying for any position feel free to reach out to her or myself and we’ll help you.

##### x) Information Technology

Jinho Lee: We are switching platforms, as this new one is more cost effective and has more capacity to grow. That’s taking a lot of time, so that’s taking a lot of the Director’s time and is the source of the ticketing issues he’s having. We just need to sit and wait for the error to pop up. If you have questions, send them to Andrew, he’ll address them as soon as possible.

##### xI) Internal Affairs

Zaid Kasim: This week I did council, and I helped with elections.

##### xiI) Professional Development

Liam Hough: We ran Summit, had over 100 people register which is great. A feedback survey came out for next year. Bell and PD workshop for students to get advice ran smoothly. Lots more preparation in the few weeks, a Clark social, workshops, and consulting week is coming up to look past the regular engineering jobs. More resources for the student and opportunities are coming out so keep an eye out.

##### xiiI) Services

Sarah Hatherly: We did services feedback surveys and got some great ideas, we may be moving some training to online. We did some restructuring, lots of meetings, and there’s Ritual tomorrow!

##### xiv) social issues

Delaney Benoit: The conference she went to was months ago, she’s working on sexual violence prevention and response, looking into accessibility. Also looking into the engineering wellness centre that we lost, the equity team, and bursaries as it’s conference season, so there are lots of bursaries open to all members for any event. The bursaries are internal Engineering Society bursaries, for conferences we can’t give bursaries to commerce students to clear that up.

# x. Question Period

Jonah Opler: I wanted to touch on this, regarding sending the Director of Social Issues, I was hoping to go to the conference, ideally the Director of External Relations and or the Director of Social Issues would go. It’s not like the Director of Social Issues goes, or no one does.

Felix LeClair: As former CRO, I don’t know if I’ve missed it but I haven’t seen any information on whose running and what’s happening with elections

Zaid Kasim: All of their platforms and everything is coming out tomorrow. For elections committee, we are planning on doing a few posts for the next few days.

Thomas Wright: Voting is next Tuesday and Wednesday

Michael: Will the budgets ever be posted?

Zaid Kasim: We’ll get on that.

# XI. Faculty Board Report

Miranda Bundgard: We haven’t had a meeting, that’ll be next Wednesday. We’re discussing student’s thoughts on the new program. That’ll be Monday or Tuesday. That’s going to come to the actual meeting then.

Felix LeClair: One of the things that’s really relevant with this, is that it seems to be similar to the innovation stream but it’s being accredited completely differently. That’ll be the first engineering program we’ve added, and students being brought into MRE, there are a total of 70 spots, so with that there will be 20 spaces for students to transfer in. It wants to hit other needs, and compete with other schools and strengthen bonds between Mech and Elec. Please contact your year faculty board representative with questions.

# XV. Alma Mater Society Report

Natalie Arpin: We had two meetings. In December we approved financial statements, the services are losing money, things are happening at The Journal as well. Last week there was an Iranian student fund being set up, feedback given by the AMS as to people’s feelings on fall reading break is that they don’t like it, and would prefer it was added to Thanksgiving, however that was rejected. The University has not put out a poll on this. They’re planning events, there is a new form and resource guide to get sanctioned. SCI updates are coming. There are changes to job structure. Undergraduate student trustee election is coming up, it’s a big position, consider that it’s a one year term. They approved the rector and AMS executive team candidates. Approved club fees and deratified some.

Sam White: This is coming into senate, we’ll probably get them to send a poll out.

# XVi. Senate Report

Peter Mathews: Nov 26, we were given an update on the OSAP cut situation, approximately 160 Queen’s students dropped due to cuts and the university is trying to counteract these cuts in the form of bursaries to high needs students. The next meeting is Wednesday, and the fall term break will be discussed.

# XvIi. Engineering Review Board Report

# XViii. Advisory Board Report

Carson Cook: We met and heard the review from CEO, iCons, Clark, and Golden Words. Looking at restructuring.

# Xix. Club Reports

##### I) eng phys

Ally: Last semester we had a wellness week to improve mental health. We were approved by the faculty to have biweekly therapy dogs in Sterling, we had a painting night, Pool with Prof. We have a Phys hockey tourney and game of gotcha! coming up

##### ii) ece

Wilson: We have two events coming, Trivia at Clark with profs, and the banquet in March is in the early planning stages. Merch orders are still ongoing. Discipline night is coming up, and we’ve made a BED Fund decision, and we spent most of it this time.

##### iii) mechanical

Tyson Wilkins: Discipline night is upcoming,

Melissa Young: We eent to the department meeting, Thomas is working on merch, we’re getting academic forums, the banquet is being organized, and hopefully we’ll be getting WileyPlus banned in Mech.

##### iv) mining

Not Present

# Xx. Year Reports

##### I) Sci’20

Melissa Young: We’re also trying to work on merch, and we got The Griz booked for the iron ring ceremony.

##### II) Sci’21

Matt Julseth: We had an event, Sci 21’ and chill. That went well. We did a crest rehanging! Still working on the QUIP farewell event so stay tuned.

##### III) Sci’22

Kaija Edwards: We did some small cups, some are leftover. Planning a meeting this week, and our Clark Hall takeover.

##### IV) Sci’23

Noa Wyman: We had a slow start, we have several executive members on FC and others are sick, but we met and have goals. Year merch is getting worked on. Super-Semi; we don’t have information on that yet but we’re working on it, as well as another mental health day.

# Xxi. Statements and Questions by Members

Felix LeClair: Elections are next week, these are super important. It sets the framework we’ll operate under, take part, engage, and pass on the legacy.

Delaney Benoit: In the same vein, please vote in the engineering elections, please vote in the rector elections as well. You may not see it directly, but how the rector approaches their term can directly affect us. Any interest in directorship and manager jobs, please feel free to ask.

Melissa Young: OEC happened, and we placed for that. That was great and our Director of IT got second and will be going to CEC. Congratulations to them. Compete next year!

##### Motion to Close:

Moved by Andrew Vasila

Seconded by Kaija Edwards

**Motion Passes, 10:35 pm**