

Minutes for ASUS Assembly on March 13th, 2014

Starting Time: 7:03pm

Speaker Stemp will henceforth be known as Speaker

Motion 1: "That ASUS Assembly approve the agenda for the March 13th, 2014 Assembly"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

President Mason:

Move motion 5 to the second position of the agenda

Seconded by Representative Pang

Vote:

For: 16

Against: 3

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

International Representative Pang:

Merge discussion topics 2 and 3 into one discussion topic

Seconded by COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Vote on motion 1:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 2: "That ASUS Assembly approve the minutes for the February 27th, 2014 Assembly"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Vote on motion 2:

For: 21

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Speaker's Business

Speaker:

Trevor is unable to make it this evening, so I will be speaker

That'll be fun!

Guest Speaker

QPID General Director Gemme McEachern:

Member McEachern:

Hello! I am part of Queen's Project on International development
You've probably seen us in the past 4 days, outside of Stauffer.
We're doing a national campaign called 5 days for the homeless
We're raising money for Kingston Youth Shelter. We sleep outside for 5 nights, stay outside for 5 days. The only night we didn't sleep outside was last night, because it was -30, so we took shelter in the JDUC. We've been outside all day every day other than that!

Our goal is 7'500\$. I'm going to every resource I can to see if there is any support that Queen's can offer us.

At engineering AGM, I passed a hat around

All donations go straight to the youth shelter.

They have 15 beds for people aged 16-24.

They also offer day services for job and house hunting, as well as mental health support

It's a very valuable resource to the Kingston Community.

It not only affects the Kingston community, but the Queen's community.

If you can help us out with any sort of donation at all, that would be greatly appreciated

ASUS Chief Returning Officer Mandeep Wraich

Member Wraich:

I'm going to give you a quick summary about the past election!

Everybody got their ballot, so we didn't have the same problem as last year

Voter turnout was 28.1%. Average is ~25, so we did better than normal

There were slight complications for people in PHE/KIN. When we tallied up the votes, they were excluded.

Comp.Sci ballots arrived later, but they did get their ballot.

We changed the way debate happened.

It was put in a separate hall and we got a lot of positive feedback

It was uncontested, but hopefully in the future we'll have separate debates

It's an initiative I want to continue for the next semester, so I will be putting it in my package.

You can send all the e-mails you want, but the ballots come in the e-mails. So we either have a culture of students who don't want to vote, or that are uninformed.

One way to rectify this is to get DSC representatives to go in front of classes.

The first time, they say "You should run". The second time, they say "You should vote!"

It's harder to ignore somebody talking in front of you than it is to ignore an e-mail

Another thing, voteNet (for those of you who hate it), chances are that we may not be using it in the future

The original plan was to have everybody receive one ballot. One for AMS and ASUS, which would be ideal.

VoteNet is so complicated to do that, that it isn't even an option.

That is all!

Senator Duchaine:

Now that we've standardized the DSC elections portfolio,
Is it within the portfolio for CRO, or under Academics Commission?

Commissioner Grotsky:

That's a large task to put on the CRO. I think it went well within the academic commission this year.

Director Ismail-Teja:

Is there a difference of the number of people who vote in AMS vs ASUS? Only counting arts and science students

Member Wraich:

I'm not sure.

Senator Smolej:

It's great to see all the work you've done.

Quick question about goals expressed previously.

You mentioned we might see the candidate blurbs attached to the ballot, so that when you're looking through the list, there's some actual information.

Is that still in the realm of possibility?

Member Wraich:

VoteNet isn't as user-friendly as we would like. When we tried to implement that, it wasn't very functional.

When I write my package for the incoming CRO, all the ideas are still there

Senator Duchaine:

In that package, can you include that senators' e-mail addresses are found through the secretariat?

Representative Chinniah:

What effect did you see from the extended nomination period? Did it make any position contested that wasn't?

Member Wraich:

The only thing was the ASUS Representatives to AMS. Before it was uncontested and after, it was contested.

Executive Reports

President Mason:

Hello! Not much to add to my report.

Who read my report?

I will take you out for tea at some point, though there is a lot of you

Vice President Jacobs:

I think this is the last regular assembly we have together.

I'm sure you all love me as much as I love you, and we'll keep it that way forever.

One quick thing: I talked about the photocopier. It caused a fury at this assembly, but we get a lot of good things out of it:

Free ink next-day delivery, technical assistance any time we want.

I don't have time to learn the mechanics of the XEROX machine

Grants and Funds will be ratified at the next assembly. Not the AGM but the assembly after that, where the new people take over.

The same thing happened the past two years, this is standard procedure.

Society Reports***Business of the Senate:*****Senator Duchaine:**

I think it's important to point out that Board of Trustees was last weekend.

They meet and approve a lot of policy or changes that have come through senate.

The campus master plan was approved, as well as the new tuition framework.

It was voted on last year, so we can expect to see 3% increase for years to come

Much much much higher increases for international students. Over 84'000 per year for international medicine

Tuition fees are rarely spoken about, and we can expect that the university will raise it as high as it can. Up until last year, that was 5% in non-professional, and 10% in professional, and N% for international. Sometimes as high as 17%

For the foreseeable future, we have a 3-year framework, this is the first year.

No stability for international students.

In terms of why it's increasing so much, the one I believe is that there are a couple of expensive cost-drivers in the secondary education sector. Faculty salaries and compensation is the largest cost-driver.

They will look at the collective bargaining agreement next year.

It's 7% for graduate programs.

Thank you to Scott, Irfan and Adam, as well as other DSC representatives who came out to faculty board last friday night.

Please come talk to me if you have questions about the new tuition framework.

The argument made by the administration was that we can't afford not to increase it.

Business of the AMS**Representative Wiseman:**

We got rid of the Kingston opportunities officer

Voted to create an outreach committee within the campus activity commission

We also merged publications and the social issues commission into one.

We had a very long discussion on AMS clubs and insurance. ASUS Caucus is very vocal to that motion.

Had a presentation from Jill on the student learning experience. I highly suggest you read it

Statements by Members

Commissioner Bourne:

I will be sending this out by e-mail later on.

There's a volunteer appreciation dinner for ASUS on March 23rd at 5:00PM at the University Club.

We can't use the Grad Club. They are different places.

Cash bar and concessions from 5-6, and then dinner and hangouts from 6-10pm

If you'd like to come, please e-mail me personally.

Chicken, Salmon, and vegetarian are the meal options.

My e-mail is internal@asus.queensu.ca

Representative Zarzour:

There was a journal article posted not too long ago.

It referred to my name among others, saying I would be impeached.

After setting the record straight with Ben, Irfan and Scott, that's not true.

I wanted to point out that it was wrong.

DSC elections went amazingly. We had a higher turnout rating than the AMS

LifeSci had 43%, one or two others had above 40%

Commissioner Grotsky:

Voter turnout was 25% for all faculties.

Some did not have anybody running, but we left polls open

Thank you to Representative Lucas working on the elections software.

His technology skills are far above par.

Very much appreciated

COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman:

I'm trying to promote this as much as possible.

Computing's end-of-year formal is on April 4th at 7pm in the Donald Gordon Center.

Tickets are 40\$ (early bird) and \$50 normally.

If any of you know anybody who's interested, if you're interested, let me know!

Representative Wiseman:

Applications for deputy commissioners (not just internal) are due tomorrow!

If you want to be the CRO, those applications are due next friday at 4pm in the ASUS Core

Representative Chinniah:

I read the Journal article with much interest, and I do believe that they err'd in covering that incident.

I don't think the internal affairs commissioner gave enough notice to members of assembly, and I don't think it was responsible to continue with the impeachment when the Journal was here to drag the name of that first year through the mud.

Impeachment votes need to have proper notice to the member in question, way before the vote is scheduled to take place

I hope the internal affairs commissioner will transition their successor with that in mind.

I do believe Representative Zarzour has the right to e-mail the Journal and make a correction

Vice-President Tahiri:

Regardless of whether the journal comes or not, there is procedure.

We took a break to figure it out.
We can't care what they're writing about.

Representative Chinniah:

Vice-President Tahiri, the defensiveness is not helping at all.
That's not good enough for the society.

When a member is not given enough notice before assembly, I consider that an oversight in leadership.

Commissioner Bourne:

I would point out that because of the tortured and ambiguous nature of policy, I was actually not required to give them any notice at all.

I am endeavouring to change that tonight, so that there will be more oversight and a less adversarial tone

Senator Stanley:

I would like to commend Commissioner Bourne on the quick turnaround on this issue.
There was a grey area not in the spirit of assembly.

Question Period

Senator Smolej:

To Vice-President Tahiri: I applaud your leadership in your investment of funds in a risk-adverse manner, not consulting Jordan Belfour on how to do so. My question relates to Arts and Science formal. What was the deficit this year?

Vice-President Tahiri:

Last year we lost 14'000\$, this year we lost 18'000\$. It sold out days before reading week, so next year there will be a price increase.

Senator Smolej:

Reading through policy, there are countless individuals who are granted free or half-price tickets. One thing I found concerning was the inclusion of the Orientation Committee members. That is quite a number of individuals.

If we're already losing so much money, why are we giving out so many discounted tickets?

There is such a high demand from the 4th year body who couldn't go, when many 2nd years did

Vice-President Tahiri:

OCs volunteer in their 2nd year, they do coat check, drink ticket, clean up after. In 3rd year, they enjoy the evening, get half off, and a thank you for helping before.

Formal is a structural deficit. If there's a strong feeling from assembly, we can change it.

We have to go to Ban Righ, because it's the biggest venue in the city.

Very little choice, because Queen's Events Services does a lot of work about decorations, food, drink.

You can put forward a motion, but I would not look favourable upon that.

President Mason:

The free and discounted tickets are stipulated in Section 2.05.

Senator Smolej:

I had the opportunity to attend the Board of Trustees open session.

One point raised was a problem related to camps offered by Queen's.

There was a systemic policy breach, but they were looking to rectify the issue for the summer.

I know Queen's offers 10 different camps, is ASUS camps one of them?

Vice-President Tahiri:

New committee that was struck last year.

Yes ASUS Camps is one of them.

We have not heard any issues from the results of our safety audit.

All camps undergo this audit

President Mason:

A working group has been struck for members of each camp

Senator Smolej:

My last question is to Representative Grotsky.

I think it's exciting that he's instigated a discussion with the Arts and Science faculty about a business certificate offered by the School of Business. Interdisciplinary learning is great.

Could you provide some clarification?

As it stands, a survey states you would need to take 6 commerce courses, 2 of which were in your degree at Arts and Science tuition, and the other 4 at an unknown tuition. The 4 would not be part of your degree plan.

As it currently stands, you can take 8 commerce courses while paying Arts and Science tuition.

This may be an issue with economics students. They can take 4 commerce courses and have it count to their degree plan.

How will this change in the future?

Commissioner Grotsky:

I am more than a messenger than anything.

With regards to your question, I can't answer it right now. I will figure it out and get back to you within the next couple days

Representative Goodman:

It's been stated that the Journal erred in its writing about Representative Zarzour.

If I'm not mistaken, he did miss a requisite number of things. Is that true, or not true?

If it is, why is the policy not being implemented?

Commissioner Bourne:

My records at the time indicated that they did miss enough.

Due to a technological problem (phone issues), they couldn't contact me in advance.

It is up to my discretion and I did not want to count a messed iPhone as a reason

Representative Goodman:

So when Representative Renwick was brought at last assembly, was he given a chance to notify you as to why he missed the assemblies?

Commissioner Bourne:

He didn't indicate to me the reasons for the absences.

The explanation only happens in an assembly context.

Representative Goodman:

This is rhetorical, but why is one member of assembly being given a chance before their name shows up for everyone to see next to an impeachment motion, while the other one isn't?

Representative Zarzour:

First of all, in addition to the technical concern Ben mentioned, I had an e-mail express noticed and I did provide records of those e-mails.

This was me seeking it out after the fact. I contacted Irfan, Scott, and Ben afterwards.

Neither myself nor Year Society Representative had an opportunity to defend ourselves or defend ourselves prior to the Journal article.

It was me seeking it out after the fact, not Ben seeking me out to see if I had an excuse

Commissioner Bourne:

According to my records, the person in question brought forward had missed 3, whereas Representative Zarzour had only missed 2. He should only have received a warning if they were valid absences.

New Business

Motion 3: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section L of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix A"

Moved by: Ruhee Ismail-Teja

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Director Ismail-Teja:

Our policy was written quite awhile ago

We just updated it to reflect how we actually operate.

Most of it is pretty basic. If you have concerns, please talk to me.

Representative Goodman:

I noticed there's been a change made from simple majority to 2/3 majority to overturn a decision made by the Board of Directors. That's under Section L, 5.01

Director Ismail-Teja:

There are a lot of things that the Board does that assembly doesn't know about.

When there is something wrong, 2/3 makes sense.

Vice-President Tahiri:

I want to apologize for not saying it.

This policy is a bit older than the other ones.

That kind of discussion came out around Board, saying that assembly was definitely subject to purview and to act as a consultation body for financials.

I think with regard to a lot of projects we do, the executive go to the board for authorization of funds.

If there's an already existing committee needing more money than originally allocated, that's going to the board.

The board was created by Jacob Mantle to handle the Board Discretionary Fund.

Now they're the de facto financial board.

Yes assembly should be there, but the mandate should be difficult to overturn significant decisions.

I can't think of anything that would be so politically charged that it would pass at Board but not at ASUS Assembly.

This just reflects which body knows more about what's being talked about

Representative Lucas:

I think part of what has to be taken into account is the respect we have for the board.

If a simple majority disagrees, we are already saying we respect.

If a simple majority does disagree, they probably have an issue above and beyond their trust

President Mason:

This is very similar to the way we treat the speaker. We choose and elect them as a group.

The speaker can make a speaker's ruling that requires a 2/3 majority to overturn

The board works with our banks and our finance

In the event of an egregious error, assembly can still overturn issues

Senator Smolej:

In section L 2.01.6, it talks about this long-term investment fund and about how we're going to be using the interest to pay for year society budget allocations.

“The allotted amount will be fixed at 4'500\$” Why does this have to go through policy?

Vice-President Tahiri:

That's a good question. I don't know why this should be on.

The amount that the executive is allowed to spend is based on the interest rate.

They begin in may. In April, we find the rate, and then they know.

We don't have to put it in there, the only reason is because if the board says “What happened in the first year”, it's right there.

Senator Smolej:

Each year society, 14, 15 -

Vice-President Tahiri:

These are not year societies. That word is not there.

Senator Smolej:

Is there a budget each year society gets every year?

Vice-President Tahiri:

There is a budget. When I looked at policy last, it's a loan of 400\$/year that they are entitled to, which they must pay back by the end of their 4th year. They use that money to put on events, and to spur donations for ThankQ.

Vote on motion 3:

For: 21

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion passes

Motion 4 (Package Motion 5): "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section G of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix C"

Moved by: Carson Falk

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Commissioner Falk:

I am here to talk about a motion I've put forward for a potential code of conduct for ASUS assembly members and volunteers that represent ASUS.

I'm going to talk about two things specifically, hopefully clarifying issues.

The first thing: Where is it coming from?

To be straightforward, it's coming out of an incident that occurred last year. I'm not talking about remarks that were made, but the repercussions that came out of it.

A member of this body made comments on a social media outlet. There was a lot of unrest about these comments, and a special assembly was held regarding sanctions being brought against this individual.

At this assembly, it was nothing short of a kangaroo court.

It became adversarial, aggressive, and was an unsafe space for everyone involved.

When we're thinking about this policy, we're thinking about two entities.

We're thinking about the ASUS Council and Executive, so that they have a framework to deal with these issues.

We're also talking about people who may be affected by these issues.

This way, we maintain a safe space, and are not attacked like they were last year.

As it stands currently, ASUS has no policy on these types of issues.

It stands to reason that if something happened again, a kangaroo court would ensue again, and that doesn't achieve anything.

The point is to put something in place for ASUS executive to be able to deal with these issues.

The most substantive aspect is in Section G8.07.

This is plainly a handbook on how to deal with these things.

It is complaint driven.

Action by any body will be complaint driven.

It happens in 7 parts:

Potential breach of the above sections, where clarification of what is tacitly going on.

Potential breaches are brought to JCOMM and the Equity Commissioner.

People are allowed to express their opinion on this issue.

The committee would take these into account.

After they meet, a ruling would be arrived at by this committee.

The ruling is either a censure, or not to censure. Those are the only rulings that this joint committee can bring forward. They cannot move for impeachment.

After that, the speaker will read the ruling at a closed session of assembly to ensure a safe space is maintained, and debate on that ruling will occur on that motion.

If we debate a motion, it distances the individual from the debate.

We can diminish the adversarial nature of these debates.

At the end of the day, assembly can agree to move forward with this decision.

The debate and ultimate resolution of what will happen is in the hands of assembly.

To reiterate: This is to give a handbook, to limit aggressive debate that happens and to ensure a safe space surrounding these types of issues is maintained

Commissioner Bourne:

Coming from an internal affairs point of view:

This came about as a result of the atmosphere, not necessarily the incident.

There was a policy regarding equity issues, but I think it is egregious.

Myself and Commissioner Falk sat down on how to approach this.

A draft policy was produced by the equity commission, completed just before the end of the first semester.

It was given to JCOMM after that.

The completed version was given to me in the middle of last week, and it now on the floor tonight.

I've heard some official talk about the length of time it's taken, and I want to clarify that it's taken the amount of time it has so that it is solid and concrete.

We are also in accord with AMS equity policies by doing this.

I've also heard concerns about the scope of this policy. The danger that it may devolve into Equity Thought Police. As of right now, there is no structural mechanism for Equity Commission or JCOMM to monitor or supervise issues online. It is a complaint-based system.

Somebody will have to approach with an issue of equity infringement before they will do anything.

President Mason:

I move we enter committee as a whole

Seconded by member at large

Vote:

For: 22

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Representative Zarzour:

In the e-mail package that was posted, is that the updated version? Or is the one on the Facebook page the most updated one?

Vice-President Tahiri:

There are two links on the ASUS page. Those are the most updated ones.

*Speaker will now be known as 2015 Year Society President Stemp
Commissioner Bourne will now be known as Speaker*

President Mason:

Right now, ASUS has no codified way of handling equity complaints.

Section G.07 indicates a process.

It's a fairly reasonable system!

Somebody files a complaint → JCOMM convenes with equity commissioner → They accept letters from individuals → Come to a consensus → Ruling is read out at a closed session of assembly → debate is structured around the ruling.

The last part is what was missing last year.

This policy reaffirms the privacy of assembly. Nobody is getting impeached unless assembly wants them to.

We will put forward a motion to censure, or not censure.

JCOMM will arrive with all relevant pieces of policy, and their take on it.

In closing: I'm interested in hearing everyone's thoughts

This is a reoccurring issue with ASUS. We had an issue with the President, several years ago. Last year we had an issue with an elected individual.

We have to have a mechanism and framework to enter into these types of discussions.

We have a pretty solid policy, and I'm looking forward to discussion.

Representative Lucas:

What is censureship?

President Mason:

A censureship is where ASUS says that you did something not in line with the views of the society

Representative Lucas:

If you said it outside of your capacity as president, this policy wouldn't have any bearing on that?

President Mason:

That's a big part of this policy. How far do we want it to extend?

I believe as the President of ASUS, I believe my duties extend much further.

I believe if I said anything on Facebook of an offensive nature, it would reflect poorly on the society.

2017 Year Society Vice-President Smyth:

Was every ASUS member supposed to get an e-mail?

We haven't been getting anything

Commissioner Bourne:

You need to let me know if you aren't getting anything

Senator Smolej:

Constitution does say that we need to receive the agenda 72 hours before assembly.

I haven't been receiving the packages 72 hours in advance.

Speaker:

I know this is weird to speak right now

In first semester, we tried to follow the rule.

So many people had late additions or reports, so it didn't make sense to keep it at 72 hours.

I found out unfortunately that extending it to Tuesday nights hasn't made much of a difference

Senator Duchaine:

Considering much of the discussion will likely revolve around the Commissioner of Internal Affairs, can we have the deputy speaker sit in?

Speaker will henceforth be known as Commissioner Bourne
2015 Year Society President Stemp will henceforth be known as Speaker

Member Sherman:

There is a lot of discussion about this policy.
I'm sure there's been a wide breadth of consultation.
How did you refer to the CESA code of conduct?
Who did you consult?

Director Ismail-Teja:

This comes from student equity code of conduct across the country.
We've done research on other Universities and what they did.

Member Sherman:

I asked what Human Rights Office, Equity Office, etc

Director Ismail-Teja:

Some of it's been Queen's, and a lot of our research has been done with other universities.
It's implemented across different faculties at Queen's and we've received support from everyone

Commissioner Falk:

The equity aspect of this is pretty straightforward.
These are uncontested definitions.
Even when you talk about G8.04 (Society-wide standards of tolerance)
None of these are controversial.
The real meat of this policy is the discipline procedure and how we handle it.
In my mind, that's what the policy is really about

President Mason:

The very first documentation we looked at was the CESA code of conduct.
I'm not sure what came of that, but we worked with

Member Sherman:

When AMS re-did rules of order, they did send it to the Human Rights Office.
I'm assuming it was brought to equity caucus, and I want to know what they said.
I haven't heard an answer to either of these

Commissioner Falk:

Most recent equity caucus meeting happened on Saturday, and it was the first one.
Had we brought it there, it wouldn't be brought here today.

Senator Duchaine:

Why not?

Commissioner Falk:

JCOMM sent it to me, and I received it after that assembly
It's been worked on for the better part of this school year

Senator Duchaine:

So you've had this for less than a week?

Commissioner Falk:

Yes

Member Sherman:

Human Rights Office?

Director Ismail-Teja:

We haven't talked to them

Senator Duchaine:

I'd like to thank Commissioner Bourne and everybody else who met with myself yesterday.
The version we see now is heavily adjusted from the version from a few days ago.
I have a lot of issues with this policy and have brought it up with the executive.
I'm very concerned: This is the first time we're seeing it now. They hadn't seen it until 5 hours ago.

This requires much broad consultation than the committees involved.

I agree with Member Sherman that Human Rights Office should be involved.

But also EngSoc, ComSoc, University Secretariat.

When I was meeting everyone yesterday, the Mayor of Toronto (Rob Ford) and I apologize for the victimization which is not in the spirit of this policy.

He is literally smoking crack cocaine, driving drunk, consorting with gang members, and continues to be mayor of the largest city in this country, 4th largest city in North America.

There should be a way for us to react and remove him, but these are the kind of situations that are foundational to how we run democracies.

If we don't take ourselves seriously, then we can't expect the administration to take us seriously either.

These changes are dramatic, and establishes boundaries between personal and political self.

In terms of a substantive "what can cause that", intimidating or confrontational language

A lot of the language we've heard earlier would qualify as that.

Tempers do flare, but that's the reality of a political conversation.

I think a good idea would be to table it until after the AGM.

There's a concern that we need to get it done this year.

ASUS is over 120 years old. We can trust new executive, members of assembly to figure out a policy that works out best for them.

Even the people who are seconding this motion haven't seen it until 5 days ago

President Mason:

I would say that I think the policy in the way it stands right now.

It's a fully-baked policy. There are substantive changes, but they aren't big.

We put a simple procedure in place.

I was unaware of the lack of consultation with bodies around Queen's.

We are designing a very small mechanism on how to deal with issues.

G8.07 is a 7-step procedure. Still gives us a chance to debate the ruling.

I think it would serve the society well.

Member Duchaine brought up our crack-smoking mayor in Toronto, and I think they would be well served by a policy much like this.

COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman:

I think this is a good policy.

We'll be looking at putting something in COMPSA as well.

What constitutes a breach or violation?

A Facebook post, there's textual evidence.

What if somebody says something at a party? Can it be validated or proven if it's just something said in the context of their friends?

Commissioner Falk:

It depends on the context and circumstances of the potential breach.

If you take a look at G8.07C, there are a whole bunch of things laid out for what needs to be taken into consideration.

It's up to the discretion of that joint committee to take all factors into account, and make an adequate ruling.

If it's at a party, if they can't determine that it was the individual that said the thing, then they wouldn't go forward with the censureship

CESA Vice-President Ferguson:

If you want to see our code of conduct, queenscesa.com, click Documents → Association Documents.

We voted on it last year in October. I know that they practically wrote it with the Human Rights Office, so they were heavily consulted.

I have one question about the appeal process outlined in G8.07B.

You appeal to the joint committee. It's strange to appeal to the committee that made the decision in the first place.

Suppose a concern or violation was about myself, and there was a call for letters, I would be inclined to defend myself.

What if the decision is one I don't like. Do I resubmit the same letter?

Commissioner Falk:

That's a greater discussion on what JCOMM and ASUS do.

This is a reflection of other ASUS policy, where the default appeal process goes back to JCOMM.

I think that that's something that needs to be changed. If it does change, which I hope it does, then this policy will change according to that.

CESA Vice-President Ferguson:

Isn't usually the appeal process given to JCOMM a decision made by a different group?

Commissioner Bourne:

JCOMM is allowed to reconsider rulings they've made if new evidence has come up.

They also are an appeal process for other bodies.

Senator Smolej:

To relay some concerns, we are here and representing and fulfilling our goal.
Discussing what it means to be a member of this society.

Questions of jurisdiction: where is there overlap with non-academic discipline from Queen's code of Conduct.

It was raised that this is not the Equity Police, and in bold, numerous times, it says that it relates to our presence within and outside of assembly.

It has been worked on for a year, and not once have we had a discussion topic related to this.

The equity office was not consulted, the human rights office was not consulted, and we are rushing to get this through today. It's going to take two readings because it's a constitutional change.

It will arrive in the "Kangaroo Court" of AGM

At a meeting yesterday, Senator Duchaine, Senator Stanley and I raised the concern about having more discussion, and President Mason said it had to come through.

Director Ismail-Teja:

We did consultation prior to writing it, just not after consulting with JCOMM.

It's based on many other codes of conduct. We're taking into account the work of other organizations.

Senator Smolej:

In our meeting yesterday, you said you did not talk to JCOMM of AMS.

Did you talk to the human rights office or equity office through e-mail?

Director Ismail-Teja:

In October, yes.

Senator Smolej:

So they have not seen this final document

Director Ismail-Teja:

All the content has undergone consultation and is the final product.

Senator Smolej:

But there hasn't been any consultation with members of assembly.

Commissioner Falk:

Outside of my November 14th assembly report, no. But it was brought up

Senator Duchaine:

My concern is that this version does stem from the one we saw yesterday.

The committee deemed it worthy as passing

For those unfamiliar with that version, it included a statement that the equity commissioner would be able to remove a member of assembly on the second instance of written violation of equity.

President Mason, and Commissioner Falk are saying this is a good document.

You didn't know this document existed until Sunday. Yesterday you heavily amended the document.

Had we not brought those concerns forward yesterday, we'd be seeing a substantially different version than the one we have now.

We are at least several review sessions away from having a passable document

This is the right way to move, but we are putting the cart before the horse.
I'm not sure which faculty societies have been consulted.
More information about the genesis of this process and how it moves forward.
I don't think this is the right time. I would look favourably upon voting it down.
We can't do it now. It's so incredibly new.

President Mason:

That is simply not true.

That policy was erroneous. The policy you see today was developed after a recent council meeting where we struck all statements about the equity commissioner having too much power.

I nearly had a heart attack when I saw the original one.

Consultations finished before it went to JCOMM, and they produced what it is right now.

I think it's solid, specifically the procedure.

You haven't provided any issues with the policy, just that you don't believe it's been reviewed enough

Senator Duchaine:

I posted on the ASUS Facebook page, specifically what we mean by “condescending language”, and how does this differ in what's deemed acceptable from the regular rules of order.

Another question unanswered is the jurisdiction between personal and professional life.

Perhaps they aren't substantive in a sense, but I think this policy is making claims about what members of assembly should be.

It's hard to outline a specific equity breach. What is a breach of equity? It's such a nebulous term.

Those are two examples of points I've brought up tonight specifically dealing with the content of this policy in addition to the 7 or 8 brought up yesterday.

President Mason:

What is to be determined as a breach of equity is to be determined by JCOMM. They'll look at ASUS Policy, and parse the nebulous world of equity to make a claim.

What is the first point?

Senator Duchaine:

What do you mean with respect to “condescending language”?

President Mason:

It's to the purview of JCOMM and to give a recommendation about that.

Senator Duchaine:

This is the same JCOMM that proposed the idea that the equity commissioner would be able to eject somebody from assembly.

Representative Zarzour:

Can we restrict discussion to the policy on the floor?

Representative Goodman:

If we can't trust them to put forward a policy without our editing, why should we trust them to make this decision?

Senator Stanley:

I think it's relevant insofar that we're talking about how this policy arose.
There was an earlier version circulated to all members of assembly

Representative Zarzour:

If anybody were to make a really bad motion, and it were struck down
If they made another motion, I would find it inappropriate
What we're being asked to vote on should be what we're discussing

Member Sherman:

The first line of the code “equity is a systemic issue not only at Queen's University.”
Equity is not a systemic issue, oppression is. Equity is whatever you want it to be.
Editorial autonomy is never talked about. It is substantial and must be addressed
When you say it's going to cover assembly members and volunteers, and in Section
G.8.05D “all written or graphic material endorsed by the society”

Vice-President Tahiri:

With regards to editorial autonomy, we could add that onto the motion.
With regards to the terminology, I am not well-versed in equity lingo.
That is an amendment we can make. They are not substantive criticisms of the policy.
If you wanted to bring up editorial autonomy of certain groups, we can talk about that.

Member Sherman:

In terms of saying it's not substantive, it says “Code of conduct for ASUS volunteers” and
it's already false

Vice-President Tahiri:

That's not a black and white issues. You're saying it's not adequately characterizing the
issue

Member Sherman:

Aside from the lack of consultation, it wasn't properly vetted, and it does speak to the heart
of this issue.

I oversee a publication that has editorial autonomy. There was a lack of consultation with
all of those bodies.

Vice-President Tahiri:

If that issue were to arise, the overwhelming majority of policies passed do not cover
everything.

If the situation arose that a Politicus member had an issue of equity, we could discuss that.
It's not substantive, it would be dealt with in context.

Senator Stanley:

I think that for all the flak this policy has taken, there are some good parts of it.
Process of equity complaints system, and individuals being allowed to send in letters saying
“The opinions of other individuals who might have more experience in this role might help”
It allows for any of these to occur in closed session so that we don't have a witch-hunt like
we did at last year's special assembly.

The issue is not whether we need a code of conduct. I think one is needed

It's hammering out the kinks in it. There are more areas of concern than there are things that can stand under their own weight at this point. I would strongly recommend to take a little while, maybe a few months, to do further consultation on this exact policy. Not on the idea of a code of conduct.

We need to put out a framework to the Human Rights Office, Equity Office, etc.

If we are going to pass this, we need to do it right, and do the best job that we can.

I commend the current writers of this policy, but think we need to take a step back

Vice-President Tahiri:

I've been patiently sitting and listening.

First of all, I want to say I know people like to have a good time but if we're addressing other peoples' opinions, the Rob Ford argument:

For example, we could say that parliament doesn't use gender neutral language (Mr. or Ms. Speaker)

We just want to create the environment students want to be in.

President Mason:

I've come to the realization that I am taking this too personally, maybe this does need more consultation.

I'll allow Irfan to continue, but I'm looking at the policy and hearing the critiques, but maybe this isn't as fully-baked as I thought it was and I wanted to clear the air. I appreciate the constructive criticisms

Vice-President Tahiri:

The big point brought up was the definition of "Equity issues". That can't be resolved by anybody.

I see the point with regards to it being vague as-is, but as it stands right now, the concepts outlined in policy, that's what JCOMM does.

This assembly is a body that operates as part of the process

If somebody from assembly doesn't agree with the idea, then they get to bring it up.

If you divorce it from the root of where it's coming from, you'll arrive at the realization that this is all over the place.

There's a reason that ASUS is doing this: We have people who make statements that are not appreciated by everybody.

There has to be something in constitution to help the executive use it as a process.

I know I would want something like that. I know Adam and Blake would too.

Let's keep things real with regards to the policy. Queen's spoke out loudly about what they will and won't accept. When Nick Day came out, he made a strong statement against the state of Israel.

He did not say anything anti-semitic, he said something anti-Israeli.

You cannot sign off as "Vice-President Irfan Tahiri", but I can as Irfan Tahiri.

If for example a representative posts something inequitable or sexist and do not sign off on their name, and we still find that wrong, then it's about the comments themselves.

With regards to giving the power to the equity commissioner, it was because the implication being brought forth was we'd be giving power to the equity commissioner.

We discussed this, and knew it would be contentious. We just want to put something here to show that we have something

We anticipated the policy change. Give us some credit.

With regards to the lack of consultation, there was consultation. They resorted to different

places. I'm hearing from many people that the lack of consultation is something that they're uncomfortable with.

I don't think this should go to the AGM. All of us here as elected representatives have talked about it.

The new Dean of Arts and Science said “action without explanation” will create shock and worry.

We have some stuff that's good, we have some stuff that we don't want.

President Mason:

We're at a turning point. I think assembly knows best.

We can go into surgery mode, see things we like or don't like.

Or we can table the policy, throw it back to research and have them contact appropriate bodies to be brought forth to AGM or next year.

Strawpoll:

Surgery: 1

Research: 21

President Mason:

Move to exit committee as a whole

Seconded by Vice-President Tahiri

Vote:

For: 20

Against: 2

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Commissioner Falk:

Can I motion to table this?

Senator Duchaine:

If we table it, it comes back to AGM automatically.

Representative Zarzour:

Point of information about that: I've never been to an AGM.

Why is it being called a “kangaroo court”?

Why can't we have a productive conversation there?

I personally have participated in huge annual general meetings, and we had unbelievably productive discussions.

Is AGM just a bunch of beer-drinking hooligans?

Commissioner Bourne:

I think the “kangaroo court” people were quoting was the special assembly, not the AGM.

Vice-President Tahiri:

The reason we don't want to have it at AGM, all members of the faculty can come.

CESA Vice-President Ferguson:

It's not only that everyone can come, but every student gets a vote.

Vice-President Tahiri:

Everything happens as it currently does, but with everyone there. Unlimited time to speak.
It is actually not as productive as you think it is.
A lot of motions are better if they're hashed out previously
At AGM, that's the main issue. The volume of people

Representative Zarzour:

Fascinating

Representative Lucas:

I think a few concrete examples might help.
First AGM I attended was last year when it was tabled that they remove the DSCs.
How long was it before we approved the agenda?

President Mason:

1.5-2 hours.
Motion to table, because it still gives us the option.

Representative Wiseman:

How many people do you have on the speakers list?

Representative Goodman:

Is there a limit in committee of a whole?

Speaker:

Not that I know of.

Vice-President Tahiri:

I feel like members might want to make their statements heard. Can we close debate, remove the motion after the 8 speakers on the list have spoken.
I see many discomfited faces.
They'll express their views and incorporate that.

President Mason:

I rescind my motion.

Vice-President Tahiri:

Motion to end speaker's list
Seconded by CESA Vice-President Ferguson

Vote:

For: 24
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Representative Chinniah:

I think it's a good decision to table it, but I would suggest to the executive to do a special assembly on this, specifically to talk about this motion.

It is big enough to warrant additional scrutiny.

The problems have been stated, but I think the problems should be evident by now.

With respect to Commissioner Falk and Vice-President Tahiri, I will go on record saying that I've enjoyed my time working with them.

I appreciate where this is coming from.

The only hesitation I have is that it isn't clear.

As CESA Vice-President Ferguson mentioned, you appeal to the body that just gave you the ruling.

Section G8.06E3 says you need to participate “constructively” rather than “critically”

If there were a less-than-enlightened executive, how do you make that distinction?

My Facebook presence, I have a picture with Justin Trudeau which I consider offensive.

It's things like this that deserve more clarity, and a policy of this substance deserves more clarity.

Between now and special assembly, if you choose to take that route, there should be consultation with other bodies.

Also, I need to leave for duties that pertain to my position next year

Vice-President Tahiri:

I like everything you said.

I would not look favourably upon a special assembly.

I'll make sure that it'll be up early.

My issue with the special assembly is that it makes it all about that specific issue.

Representative Chinniah:

Precedent states that we can hold one if something is more than substantive.

I don't think that this would be up for trial, as the special assembly did last year.

I personally believe that because it was this executive and this council that worked on this policy, it only makes sense that this executive brings it forth for deliberation.

Representative Zarzour:

This motion was brought forward regarding safe spaces, situations arisen in the past.

To my mind, this policy is important in that it provides a guideline for dealing with complaints.

However, it does not solve the issue of tensions in the room, and people feeling unsafe in the room.

It creates a path for that person to pursue adjudication after the fact.

In the remolding of this piece, we should consider how we keep this discussion safe and non-oppressive.

It seems right now that the role of censure and stopping inequitable comments resides with the Speaker.

The rules of order have built into them policy about our meetings here.

We are casual about how we use procedure in this room. We can go back to that.

Prioritize how people are speaking here, preventing complaints before it happens.

What you opened with, but the policy does not correlate with what you've said.

I'd like to emphasize the importance of keeping this space safe, and the internal affairs commissioner and speaker's role in doing that.

Representative Goodman:

You will have to forgive me.

I apologize at the outset of this.

I do thank you for giving myself and the rest of those people the ability to speak.

The reason I wanted to do that is because it's going to get sent back, and I want a chance to speak on it.

There is no portion of ASUS Policy or Constitution that acknowledges that its volunteers must abide by the code of conduct.

That's not put in this policy either. It should go without saying, but it's extra backup to say "You aren't even following University's policy with regards to code of conduct, let alone ours"

Reading the CESA document, they had 955 words in their definitions of their key terms.

"Harassment, heterosexism, transphobia, race, racism, discrimination" and many more.

This document had 512 words, and the only overlap was "discrimination"

Condescending language and constructive vs. critical: I don't think JCOMM should be the ones who decide, but what is condescending, constructive, or critical?

The point of this policy is to make this a safe and equitable space.

I see that these two types of rules surrounding it are different from that role.

There is a difference between being critical and being inequitable, as is there a different between being condescending and inequitable.

There is no tie into equity issues, which I think is problematic.

They've outlined things for JCOMM to take into their decision. It's interesting that they asked to take into account elected vs. non-elected, who their constituents are if they have any, whether or not it was a personal or professional violation, whether or not they receive an honoraria.

Should we not hold everyone to the same standards? Do we believe that somebody who receives honoraria should have different expectations?

In the CESA policy, they mention the ability of you as a person to go and interact with the Human Rights Office, which is not mentioned in this policy.

They are experts in dealing with equity issues.

Senator Utioh:

This is just about defining what is a breach of equity

CESA policy has strong definitions about racism, transphobia, etc.

This is a good standard for JCOMM to look at.

Consulting with Human Rights Office is a very good idea.

Commissioner Falk:

Pull this motion from the agenda

Seconded by COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman:

Vote on motion 4:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 5 (Package Motion 4): "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section E of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix B"

Moved by: Krysten Cutajar

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Commissioner Cutajar:

Something I came up with was called ASUS trips.

We had a successful event. We had a lot of students who came out there.

Went to Ottawa and had a great time.

I wrote some policy regarding it. It's not the most descriptive because it's a brand new service.

Put out a very straightforward policy, especially for hiring purposes.

Incoming commissioner should hire 2 chairs, and however many committee members are needed.

Co-chair responsibilities include working with marketing commission, receiving applications and hiring the committees.

Regarding funds, it would be allocated in the ASUS budget under the services commission.

I'd ask that everyone passes this so that it can continue to grow.

Representative Lucas:

If you could clarify, what is the goal? Is it exchanges, coordinating trips?

Commissioner Cutajar:

Open to all Arts and Science students, but we also worked heavily with the exchange buddies group which contained students who had not been to Ottawa before.

It is for everyone, but it was particularly successful with exchange buddies.

Representative Lucas:

We have exchange co-chairs this year, and the IPO is very excited about it.

Would they consider adding that as a responsibility to this position?

Commissioner Cutajar:

We have a committee called exchange buddies, so it would be more pertinent to them.

We also work with the IPO and they've been a great resource.

In terms of trips, I think we should keep it open to everyone

But I think this is a great idea!

Senator Smolej:

I think this is a great initiative.

However, if you are regularly doing this, does it impede on any licensing restriction?

As we know, a bussing service got pinged by Coach Canada.

Are there any liabilities?

Commissioner Cutajar:

Could you elaborate on this event?

Commissioner Grotsky:

For what is planned with this service, it is not just a shuttle.

It is a trip where you do something concrete while there.

You would for example: go to Ottawa, see a Sen's game, and come back

Senator Stanley:

Point of information: The issue was that they were operating the bus service themselves.

Presumably ASUS will be hiring outside.

Commissioner Cutajar:

Correct. We chartered a bus. It was advertised as a trip, not a free ride.
It is a day event, hopefully a weekend event in the future

Senator Smolej:

Is there any predicted structural deficits associated with this trip-service?
There are no new positions, right? Just an additional set of responsibilities in managing this.

Commissioner Cutajar:

Since I made it up this year, I did all these positions alone.
If this were to grow, adding positions such as 2 chairs and committee members would be helpful.

They are not paid positions, so we get more students involved at no cost!
We had about 10 empty seats this time, but it was also the first time.
ASUS did not lose a significant amount of money.
Hopefully there won't be any losses, but revenue.

Vote:

For: 22
Against: 0
Abstain: 1

Motion passes

Speaker:

Anybody interested in being Speaker please come forward
30 seconds for each candidate
Please no questions

Representative Wiseman:

I'm Jon Wiseman!
I'm incoming internal affairs commissioner.
I'll be looking over this assembly next year, why not get experience right now?
I'll try my best, here we go. Let's do this!

Senator Stanley:

I'm going to withdraw.

Vote on motion 5:

For: 21
Against: 1
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

*Speaker will henceforth be known as 2015 Year Society President Stemp
Representative Wiseman will henceforth be known as Speaker*

Motion 6: "That ASUS Assembly commence first reading on the changes to section 3.02.04 of the Constitution as seen in Appendix D"

Moved by: Carson Falk

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Commissioner Falk:

Motion to remove this motion as well

Motion 7: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section I of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix E"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Commissioner Bourne:

Before I begin, there is some talk about what happened 2 weeks ago.

One comment was made about why one issue was discussed in public, and one in private.

After three real or alleged missed meetings, it goes to assembly.

Before that, it's a personal discussion.

There was no singling out or granting of privilege based on policy as it stands.

Representative Chinniah said there was a failure of leadership on Vice-President Tahiri's part.

There was an administrative error on my end, and it was my fault completely.

This change radically changes how assembly will deal with its members.

Procedurally, what happened was not good.

I want to walk through the changes:

The first thing in section 25.2.2, states that you need to notify me 24 hours before assembly.

Had I counted not 24 hours beforehand as an absence, a lot more people would be up for impeachment.

There were two different procedures with same outcome: One was impeachment, as the result of a motion, but there was also removal.

Apart from the questions it raises, in terms of how it applies internally, some references to removal

Crucially, the one that takes precedence, makes no mention of any required notification.

The way it's worded now, they are just summoned after 3 missed meetings

A motion of removal is only required for 2 of the causes. These are for theft or embezzlement, or just cause. You'd need to have 2 weeks to mull it over.

Changing it so that any issue that could cause removal takes 2 weeks beforehand

As it is in the case with impeaching an executive, removing a member must result from a motion included in the package.

After it starts, JCOMM will be notified, have a chance to meet with the person in question privately in a non-confrontational manner.

At the following assembly, JCOMM will present their findings. If reasons for lateness or absence were not valid, then they will inform us. Based on their recommendation, assembly will act.

Personal pressures and tensions will be completely avoided this way.

It also states now that any issues of impeachment or removal must occur in closed sessions of assembly.

I've also standardized all mentioned of impeachment or removal so that they're similar across the board.

This is where, for example, if there was a drive to impeach a member of JCOMM, or an

executive, there is now one standard system of procedures.

We can manage our affairs in a more judicious and non-confrontational manner.

2017 Year Society Vice-President Renwick:

What is the policy then in terms of presenting defenses?

Representative Zarzour was given a chance to defend himself to Internal Affairs Commissioner Bourne and that was resolved internally?

Representative Zarzour:

After the meeting was discussed, after my name was released, and after the article was published, only then did I go seek out.

There was no unfair opportunity awarded to me.

2017 Year Society Vice-President Renwick:

Facebook post February 26th at 9:06pm

“If there are personal reasons as to why you can't attend, please notify me”

At this assembly, I don't recall you speaking in my defense as you said you were going to.

Commissioner Bourne:

To address your question about the defense, that was a personal thing.

I wanted to know if everything was alright so that if people were treated unfairly, I could speak up for you.

Based on what I remember, I did point out that one of the absences was not valid.

If that's not an adequate defense, then I apologize.

The way it works now, the person is summoned and asked to defend themselves in front of assembly.

It's very prosecutorial. JCOMM will assess the individual privately, and then assembly will merely vote on the issue.

2017 Year Society Vice-President Renwick:

This isn't assembly debating openly whether to impeach or whatever to the individual, it's JCOMM doing it

Commissioner Bourne:

If the reasons for being late or absent can be explained, then it will be explained to JCOMM.

Senator Stanley:

I'd like to commend Commissioner Bourne on this. As it was iterated in last assembly and this, it turns out Commissioner Bourne was right in his conduction of the last assembly.

It takes a special kind of someone to make such a change even when you know you're right.

I was a bit unsure about one part in particular regarding motions of impeachment being carried out in closed session, and afterwards individuals being allowed to ask to be present at those sessions.

How do we ensure that the integrity of Assembly remains closed?

Commissioner Bourne:

He's asking what is the new section 31.0.4

It says censure or impeachment would occur during a closed assembly.

Permission for attendance is through the discretion of the Internal Affairs Commissioner.

For example, special assembly from last year we would want Human Rights Office people, but less press or partisan interest groups.

Particularly with something like this where it's a personal matter, keeping the press out would be wise.

If you think there's a way to improve this mechanism, I'm happy to entertain an amendment.

As it stands, it is up to the discretion of the internal affairs commissioner.

Representative Zarzour:

Would you mind providing some background as to why after two attendances, a person's name should be made public?

It seems like that causes more problems than it solves.

Assumably if your elected representative does not show, then you would want to know.

We don't know what assumptions people make once they hear that.

Why for a less grievous mistake would we make it public?

I'd motion that we strike that change, and keep it the way it was, where you don't announce names after 2 missed assemblies

Commissioner Bourne:

I see that as friendly.

I still would like the attendance of who came and didn't public, but singling people out after two isn't fair.

In closing, I was told that attendance was not really enforced.

It sucks that at the special assembly last year, it took an incident to realize why certain procedures didn't work well.

Vice-President Tahiri:

Does that mean that there's no longer any public knowledge of members who have missed assembly?

Commissioner Bourne:

No. There won't be any notification after you've missed two meetings.

The attendance lists are still made publicly available

Representative Zarzour:

It is supposed to be the scribe that documents the names of everybody in attendance

Commissioner Bourne:

It is the responsibility of the internal affairs commissioner

Speaker:

It's actually under section C2-02.3 "Keeping track of attendance of all assembly members" as the responsibility of deputy internal affairs commissioner

Senator Stanley:

I didn't realize I had another question that I forgot to pose.

In the meeting yesterday held between various members of ASUS Council and assembly regarding the code of conduct policy, it was mentioned that JCOMM would be judging on whether an

individual should be censured or not would not also deal with impeachment, because the institutional force of ASUS regarding impeachment might not be fair and creating a safe space.

Would you look favourably on removing the mention of impeachment in sections 31.0.0.2, 31.0.03, and 31.0.04 so that these clauses refer only to censureship.

Commissioner Bourne:

If you deleted those, then we wouldn't need JCOMM at all.

If you want to soften the language?

Unless I'm misunderstanding you.

Senator Stanley:

I have no issue with JCOMM meeting.

My hesitation comes from where it deals with impeachment, because as I said, having the institution of JCOMM and ASUS itself recommending for your removal from a body, can create a rather unsafe space for one representative who felt on trial.

Commissioner Bourne:

I would say that that's not friendly.

Part of the reason is because there is not a trial

If there is a strong feeling that this is too prosecutorial, then I'd be willing to amend it

Option 1: JCOMM assesses issues privately, and then gives that recommendation to assembly.

Option 2: JCOMM only deals with matters of censureship, and absence is dealt with person to person.

Strawpoll:

In favour as-is: 2

Change it: 14

Commissioner Bourne:

In that case, I will consider it friendly.

It may need tweaking afterwards, because that was an essential part of it.

Representative Zarzour:

I know I had to re-summarize prior to the strawpoll.

Summing the friendly amendment: JCOMM takes care of censureship issues, but not impeachment issues related to attendance?

How would those issues be dealt with?

Commissioner Bourne:

As it stands now, we'd refer to a personal "are you okay", "please make sure to tell me if you aren't coming".

Representative Zarzour:

So the amendment is such that the internal affairs commissioner would reach out to the person?

Commissioner Bourne:

Yes. The amendment kneecaps the policy in some ways. I will amend it in the future to

make sure that those standards are there.

Representative Zarzour:

I just wouldn't want to leave somebody in the position saying that you or Jon did it the wrong way.

Commissioner Bourne:

Do you want an amendment, then?

Representative Zarzour:

If there was a line saying "the internal affairs commissioner has the responsibility to follow up with the person who wasn't attending on an informal basis, recommending action"

Vote on motion 7:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 8: "That ASUS Assembly commence first reading on the changes to Section 5 of the Constitution as seen in Appendix F"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Commissioner Bourne:

Constitutional follow-up to what we just passed.

Even though we removed impeachment from the purview of JCOMM, there are still other instances in policy where people can be impeached.

This just replaces "removal" with "impeachment" on an ASUS-wide level.

Vote on motion 8:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 9: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section C-9 of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix G"

Moved by: Adam Grotsky

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Commissioner Grotsky:

One-line addition to the HR policy that was passed two assemblies ago.

For obvious purposes of conflicts of interest, it's a quick clarification.

Commissioner Bourne:

I have applied for this position next year. If anybody has an issue with this, I'm happy to entertain them. I just want to be forthright in my seconding

Senator Duchaine:

I'm sorry, I should know this.

Does this have a salary or honoraria attached?

If it precludes you from other opportunities that could pay, I wouldn't want it to disadvantage students that come from a specific income bracket

Commissioner Grotsky:

There will be an honoraria brought forth to AGM, but you have it figured out.

Representative Goodman:

Is the expectation of this HR Officer also that they're completely neutral, like they wouldn't be volunteering for campaigns? Things we wouldn't expect the Speaker to do.

Is that something expected from them? Or no?

Commissioner Grotsky:

Great point! Not included in the policy, but maybe it should be.

HR shouldn't participate in campaigns and should be non-partial.

I will make that change.

Vote on motion 9:

For: 20

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 10: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section A of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix H"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Irfan Tahiri

Commissioner Bourne:

This is something JCOMM has been working on.

It's based on experience we've had.

There are no rules governing how the scribe is hired or performs.

The wages and hiring is a "Gentleman's agreement".

We've standardized it, to make sure that it's followed in the future.

The biggest one is that they're hired by the work study

It sets specific conditions for their work and how they're compensated.

It also helps them make aesthetic improvements to policy references.

No internal affairs commissioner has time for that because of the demands of their job

From a financial point of view, we are getting work study to pay for the scribe instead of us

Scribe:

When is the application period?

Commissioner Bourne:

Late summer

Vote on motion 10:

For: 17
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 11: "That ASUS Assembly commence first reading on the changes to Section 2 of the Constitution as seen in Appendix I"

Moved by: Scott Mason
Seconded by: Adam Grotsky

President Mason:

This is a short policy, but will have a big impact.

Part of Irfan and mine's platform was to bring forward a debate regarding whether or not to bind future executives to financial audits.

This is the first reading now, second reading at AGM.

It would bind all executive to produce a 3rd party review of the society's finances.

Commissioner Grotsky:

Speaking here as incoming president for a minute, it also means Blake and I are interested.

I don't want to waste your time, let's just vote.

Vote on motion 11:

For: 19
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 12: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section C-4 of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix J"

Moved by: Adam Grotsky
Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Speaker:

J for Jon!

Commissioner Grotsky:

This motion removes mid-year trans mans

Since commissioners are here during the time of transition in mid-year, they fulfill certain numbers of hours to perform that transition.

The purpose of the final manual is to give the commissioners something to have once they're gone.

We've also increased the number of one-on-one hours of transition that they must do

Speaker:

I'd recommend that you do not use the language "trans man" to describe the transition manual with respect to equity

Vote on motion 12:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 13: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to section E-8 of the Policy Manual as seen in Appendix K"

Moved by: Adam Grotsky

Seconded by: Krysten Cutajar

Commissioner Grotsky:

This is a motion being brought forward on behalf of the incoming services commissioner.

Policy stipulates that someone sit on the good times diner hiring committee.

There is no time needed to pick somebody to sit on this committee, so we are going to remove it

Commissioner Cutajar:

To reiterate, I've spoken with the current director of Good Times Diner, and that they support and are okay with this change.

Representative Zarzour:

What is Good Times Diner?

Commissioner Cutajar:

It's a soup kitchen run by Queen's students to serve people in the Kingston community every Tuesday and Thursday

Senator Smolej:

Is this in the assembly package?

Maybe I have the wrong package.

Speaker:

It is Appendix K, on page 49

Vote on motion 13:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion passes

Motion 14: "That ASUS Assembly select one (1) member of assembly to sit on the Human Resources Officer Hiring Committee"

Moved by: Adam Grotsky

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Commissioner Grotsky:

This is the last of my series of motions, I promise!

This is to pick someone to sit on the hiring panel for the brand new HR officer.

We will be doing hiring this Sunday, it will take ~5 hours of time.

This is to select one of the great new servants of our society.

Representative Goodman:

What is the timing?

Starting when?

Commissioner Grotsky:

Probably 11-4 or 12-5? We can grab some dinner afterwards if you're interested.

Nominations:

Senator Chishti – Accept

Commissioner Grotsky:

Motion to close nominations

Seconded by member at large

Vote:

For: 17

Against: 1

Motion passes

Vote on motion 14:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Discussion Period

Representative Pang:

Motion to open the agenda

Seconded by Commissioner Bourne

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Representative Pang:

Motion to merge both discussion topics together

Seconded by Representative Goodman:

Vote:

For: 16

Against: 0

Motion passes

COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman:

Motion to close the agenda
Seconded by Representative Pang
Vote:

For: 14
Against: 0

Motion passes

Survey Results (As seen in Appendix L)
Establishment of ASUS International Student Cultural Awareness Award
Eligibility and Responsibility of ASUS International Student Representative
Presented by International Representative Pang

Representative Pang:

This is a survey conducted around January.

You can see the results in Appendix L.

There are some issues, you could skip questions, that's why the numbers are different.

Some questions might be ambiguous, but I've tried my best to word the questions.

I got 57 people to do the survey, which I think is pretty good.

The common issues I've noticed when asking people to run from my position, the definition of "International Students" is sort of ambiguous.

There are no specific definitions as to who is an international students.

I wanted to raise the topic, so that we can establish a definition of international students.

In my opinion, international students shouldn't contain people who are permanent residents, should not contain dual citizenship, and should not pay the extra fee.

The second thing: based on the result of cultural awareness award, 87% of people think that having this cultural awareness award will have a positive influence on the faculty of arts and science.

The question is there are some cultural issues drawn by non-international students

If I were to establish this award, should we include international and domestic students? Or not open to all?

President Mason:

Those all sound like really good metrics to measure international students.

It might just be easier to limit it to people who pay international tuition in the faculty of arts and science

Representative Zarzour:

For the purposes of our constitution, does the definition of international students encompass services targeted at international students?

If it's service-oriented, then we should try to make it as far reaching as it can.

Whether or not they pay the fee, they may benefit from targeted services.

This may be an issue of my lack of knowledge on why we need the definition.

Otherwise, I think President Mason's definition works well.

Representative Pang:

The need for this definition is because we have an International Representative.

It's required to have a clear line who should be running for International Student Representative, and who shouldn't.

One more question: I'm not an exchange student myself. This position is not representing

exchange students properly, and I don't think I did a good job of representing exchange students and reflecting their views.

Maybe we should remove that responsibility?

Representative Zarzour:

Do you think an exchange student, or a student who doesn't pay the international student fee would be good in this position?

I would lean against restricting the pool

Representative Pang:

Exchange students are usually here for 1 or 2 terms, meaning they won't be returning the next year.

They aren't eligible to run for this position because they aren't returning the next year.

Representative Zarzour:

Are there any students who wouldn't be considered international students but would pay the fee?

Senator Duchaine:

First of all, the differentiation between international and exchange students is often confused.

When you go on exchange, you pay all fees to your home institution.

A student coming to Queen's from Australia, they don't pay AMS, ASUS, A&R fees.

We accept that they've paid various fees at other universities.

It would be very confusing to sort out all of those issues.

This is contrastive to international students, who come to Queen's for a large portion of their education

Queen's is looking to move into several dual-stream programs, where you would do 2 years here and 2 years elsewhere

I think the issues for international students are different enough to warrant differentiation.

Sometimes it takes some time to become accustomed.

Limiting the role of International Student Representative to students who pay the International fees would really allow that student to make use of all of the opportunities that they have.

I agree with so much of what you have!

I agree with President Mason's definition as well as your definition.

There was one point, which is "Returning to Queen's the next year", which would preclude 4th year students if they wanted to run.

I think any student in arts and science also registered as an international student would be good.

CESA Vice-President Ferguson:

I have a question about the award.

I'm all about this award!

Is the award going to be restricted to international students?

The award is set out to offset some of the tuition fees, and I think it should be more of a bursary than an award.

If it's an award, then it should be open to all students.

You don't have to be an international student to promote culture

Representative Pang:

That was my question stated earlier. I want responses.

Vice-President Tahiri:

A few things I want to touch on.

My middle name is "productive".

Some stuff we're taking too seriously, like what constitutes an international student?

International students who pay that tuition should be eligible.

Exchange students shouldn't be allowed to run. They can't.

I think that the international representative should still look after the exchange students within their portfolio.

I'd like to remind you that it started only a couple of years ago. Other members of assembly don't know what this position should be.

It's at a critical period right now, letting you mold it into what you want it to be.

If we're going to do the award, with regards to money or no money, I don't know how much ASUS would be able to support.

I think a better idea would be for this award to be non-monetary, and to present the award at the ASUS Volunteer Gala.

That being said, I think the big question is which faculty this award should be given to.

If it's from ASUS, the international students community does not stop here.

Because it already is such a small community, then it should be extended to every student on campus. No other faculty society has this mandate.

This award, is it only open to international students? Only arts and science students? Cross-faculty?

In terms of the responsibility for the representative, we are trying to work that out.

When issues arise, we can fit them into the bill.

A lot of stuff you have is good, but I think that international student representatives should take care of exchange students

I believe we should have a non-monetary based award, but who is it limited to?

I think it should not be limited, but open to all students.

I would like to echo Representative Ferguson's comments, that every student has the capability to contribute to culture at Queen's.

If you give it to an international student, you target specific people in that community.

Senator Smolej:

A couple things related to the discussion we just had.

Comments about productivity are not warranted for this discussion topic.

I applaud you and your initiative. It's nice to see some metrics, regardless of their limit.

I'd like to commend you to be as self-reflective as you've been.

It might be necessary to look at how you can most effectively represent these people.

I would agree with comments from you and Senator Duchaine with regards to exchange students.

It's going to be ever-more important as we increase our number of international students.

The strategic framework plan, and those are 4 major goals we want to fulfill within 5 years.

25% of this initiative is with regards to increasing numbers of international students.

This speaks to a much broader discussion on what our role here is, and how we advocate for students.

We could bring this back to the year society member(s).

Senator Duchaine:

It's an interesting point, and Irfan raised a good one.

Should it be limited to Arts and Science students?

A lot of the work you've done this year has been limited to Arts and Science students.

Engineering has the highest percentage of international students out of their population as a whole.

This isn't an issue limited to Arts and Science students.

We could be protective, or say "we're at the forefront of this initiative" and hopefully that would increase dialogue.

We should recognize members of other faculties, as long as it's not a financial award.

I would be uncomfortable with ASUS funding international engineering students.

Representative Pang:

Thank you for all of your inputs.

In terms of should we present this to other faculties? I think we should.

Make it open to all students in Queen's.

Say if I take some money out of ASUS, we should still emphasize this individual's contribution to the faculty of Arts and Science.

If they have a greater contribution to ASUS, we should award this person more.

I think I have a good general idea here.

I will draft something out before the end of my term.

Senator Stanley:

What are the next steps to be taken on this?

Are you going to work with the incoming international student representative to ensure that the incredible body of work you've created continues?

Representative Pang:

Yes, I'm going to work with the next person. His first name is Bon.

I actually sent out an e-mail and he hasn't replied to me, but hopefully will soon.

Representative Zarzour:

You mentioned earlier, being very candid, that you felt there was room for improvement with regard to exchange students.

Exchange students are a different but valuable body here. They bring a lot to the table when they participate in projects.

Just for your successor, if you think it would be beneficial in some capacity to get an exchange student here at ASUS assembly, or if you think there was a way we could institutionalize exchange students.

Maybe this isn't a discussion for today, but we could chat later as to how to solve that problem if there is one

Representative Pang:

Yes there's room to improve on this.

Honestly, I don't know many exchange students myself.

I can't really bring one to the discussion.

Representative Zarzour:

Is there a way we can access the list of exchange students and find out where and who they

are?

Is there a way to make the line of advocacy for international or exchange students more clear?

Commissioner Bourne:

When trying to corral a list of international students, I was told that the registrar's office does not keep a list of that.

Representative Zarzour:

I think that's a huge issue. There's a huge body of students that have a lot to offer Queen's and ASUS, and we aren't tapping into that.

You've done a good job of highlighting that.

I want that to be noted by everybody.

Speaker's Last Words

Speaker:

Whatever

Motion to adjourn

Moved by : Vice-President Tahiri

Seconded by: 2017 Year Society President Clark

Vote:

For: 16

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Finishing Time: 10:25pm