

Minutes for ASUS Assembly on October 3rd, 2013

Starting Time: 7:02pm

Speaker Davis will henceforth be known as Speaker

Motion 1: "That ASUS Assembly approve the agenda for the October 3rd, 2013 Assembly"

Commissioner Bourne:

I don't believe there's any changes that need to be made

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 2: "That ASUS Assembly approve the minutes for the September 19th, 2013 Assembly"

Commissioner Bourne:

I'd like to move a motion to stamp motions 4-14

These were for updating the receptionist job description and removing PHEKSA from our constitution

Member Prescott:

Isn't stamping the agenda supposed to happen prior to the approval of the agenda?

Speaker:

If we approve the stamp, we will reapprove the agenda

Speaker:

Any opposition to the stamp motion? Any member opposing will deny the stamping

Representative Chinniah:

I oppose the motion.

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Vote:

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion passes

Speaker's Business

Speaker:

There will be four people joining us late or not at all, this has been
Maury Rubin, Kat Lormer, Jessica Sherridan, and John Stanley.

We'd prefer to start on time. Please come on time

If you do not submit your report before assembly, you do not get to speak unless assembly votes to
allow you to speak. Please get your reports in on time

Guest Speaker

No guest speaker

Executive Reports

President Mason:

Nothing to add to my report.

Update on big things that have happened with our hiring policy

Vice President Jacobs:

The account for the review has not been finished. That will come to next assembly

Council Reports

Commissioner Grotsky:

Nothing to add

Commissioner Liu:

Nothing to add

Commissioner Falk:

Nothing to add

Commissioner Bourne:

Nothing to add. Sorry about the stamping mixup. Nominations for elections are now up!

Four ASUS reps to AMS

2-year senator

Commissioner Colocato:

Nothing to add

Commissioner Cutajar:

Nothing to add

Society Reports

Business of the 2014 Year Society:

2014 Year Society President El-Rahimy:

Thank you for letting me speak. I apologize for being late and not having a report

Will and I have a lot of people interested in joining our year committee
We're hoping to get the word out even more
Once we get that going, we'll have a more concrete year society.

Business of the 2015 Year Society:

2015 Year Society President Stemp:

Cat apologizes for not coming. She had an allergic reaction and will hopefully be better tomorrow
Highlight: Hiring volunteers for the committee. If you are 3rd year arts/sci, we hope you will apply
The applications are available at the core and online, and are due next Monday at 2pm.

Business of the 2016 Year Society:

2016 Year Society President:

Thank you for allowing me to speak
Sorry for not having a report. My Vice-President could not be here today
I'm trying to get into contact with artists to get the 2016 year crest up and running
We want to build a small committee to help us with that

Business of the 2017 Year Society:

Business of the Senate:

Senator Duchaine:

Highlighting from my report:

Board retreat is 7am on Saturday

Board meeting is tomorrow

We may be looking to censure Senator Prince if he does not attend an assembly
If he misses up to 3 senates, he can be impeached and we would not be afraid to do that.
Arts and Science students deserve great representation.
Senator prince's inability to show up to meetings or respond to e-mails is unfortunate

Business of the Undergraduate Student Trustee:

Undergraduate Student Trustee Aulthouse:

Not Here

Business of the Rector:

Not Here

Business of CESA:

CESA Vice-President Ferguson:

We did all the hiring for extended council yesterday
Today's a voting day, tomorrow's a voting day.
We will have full council for meeting on sunday

Business of COMPSA:

COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman:

Academic Representatives:

Representative Pang:

Nothing to add, looking to set up a meeting with student works regarding the international student awards that I referenced last assembly. Hopefully that will work out soon

Business of the AMS

Representative Wiseman:

AMS is hiring 3 deputy returning officers

Business of the Board of Directors:

Director Ismail-Tera:

The budget was created last week, approving at next assembly

We completed hiring so we are now a full board of directors

We approved 800\$ out of the board discretionary fund for Politicus

Statements by Members

2015 Year Society President Stemp:

Point of information, what kind of statements can we make?

Speaker:

This is part of policy for members-at-large to add to anything, considering everyone else has had a report

Question Period

2014 Year Society President El-Rahimy:

Is there a specific policy on how we choose our committee members?

Is there a defined way to do that, or is it up to us as a year society?

President Mason:

What do you mean by committee members?

2014 Year Society President El-Rahimy:

We were planning quite a few things, so we were looking for some people to help us

Asking friends if they'd want to join the year society

We weren't sure if there was a specific policy or if we were to wing it.

President Mason:

Wing it, but review hiring policy. You need to read them a preamble, more than 2 people present, all in section 17 of the ASUS Constitution

2014 Year Society President El-Rahimy:

Second question: Are the DSC meetings once per month, and when are they?

Commissioner Grotsky:

Once per month, on the last Wednesday of each month. This Monday it's on October 30th

Representative Chinniah:

Point of information: Can you ask more than one question?

Speaker:

One question with a supplementary followup

Representative Pang:

I just want to know. I was trying to set up a questionnaire. Is there a policy, regulation or restriction in terms of collecting information? Student number, name, etc? Does it have to be anonymous?

Vice-President Tahiri:

There are a few things you have to be aware of

If you want, we can discuss it at The Core

There should be options for gender for them to say no, etc

Representative Chinniah:

A question for Senator Duchaine.

Is it possible for students to undertake an impeachment process and if so, how would it work?

Senator Duchaine:

This is a great question.

Not exactly sure what the process is. It would probably fall under the same procedures as ASUS

There's no senate-wide policy for impeachment of senators. It falls under their academic body

Once a senator has missed 3 senate meetings, it would be up to this body or students at large to undertake that process.

Representative Chinniah:

If an impeachment process were to happen, is it in the power of assembly to remove an ASUS senators

Commissioner Bourne:

I've been googling this. Based on what I can recall, yes assembly has the ability to remove elected members for not showing up to 3 or more meetings. Required a 2/3 majority for it to pass. Based on what Senator Duchaine has told us, we would look at this at next assembly

Senator Duchaine:

I was wondering if someone could speak to the production schedule and current financial status regarding the Arts and Science Publication called the Tartan which has not published anything since april 21st, 2013

Vice-President Tahiri:

I'm in contact with Member Jacobs and Member Whittaker

I will say that nobody has followed up with it

I will come back with the responses that you require in 2 weeks at next assembly

They've had meetings, though

Senator Duchaine:

Is there a production schedule expected of The Tartan?

Vice-President Tahiri:

Over the summertime they moved into an online component.
They should be publishing that information

Member Prescott:

My question is regarding the lottery process that picked the ASUS Reps to the AMS
What changed this year for the lottery to occur, as it was not the case last year?
There's a by-election coming up anyways, and that would be a more appropriate time to select

President Mason:

The lottery process was designed because there was a number of vacancies. The executives picked people to sit there.
We wanted individuals to sit in those vacant seats to represent Arts and Science students. We wanted to open the process up and not pick our friends
We put it out in three newsletters. Put all the names into a box, shook it, and those are the people sitting here
Those individuals who were selected, if they want to run in the upcoming by-election, they are encouraged to do so

Member Prescott:

So they have to go through the same nomination process to run for the election of these positions?

President Mason:

The same process, but additionally, this body reserves the right to allow or not allow them to run.
They have to submit a motion very soon to allow themselves to run

Representative Chinniah:

With regards to the spelling of honoraria, could we alter everything that has the misspelling?

Commissioner Bourne:

I'll be going through it. I have the ability to make trivial changes to constitution. Keep on my case.

Senator Duchaine:

In regards to having the ASUS Representatives approved by assembly before they're running, when does that have to happen by?
We're meeting now, and we won't be meeting for two more weeks, but the nomination period has already begun

President Mason:

If they're interested in running, they'd have to have a motion passed at tonight's assembly

Member Prescott:

As a member, can I waive my right to not be considered gender neutral and be called 'Mister' and not 'Member' Prescott?

Commissioner Falk:

The whole point of the gender neutral language is that we don't force other people to have to identify.

You are welcome to identify however you want, but in this room, you don't have to identify. If you want to identify as something, for the sake of everything in the room, if we keep it on the same level of gender neutrality, I think that would be best for everybody

Member Prescott:

I understand the heart of the matter, but for someone who is oppressed, I would like to identify. I want to declare myself as a male. Can I henceforth be recognized as a male?

Commissioner Falk:

In policy, it does say that language should be gender neutral. This is more of a policy question. We could amend this

Representative Tanwani:

I move to open the agenda

Vote:

For: 19

Motion passes

Representative Tanwani:

I would like to propose a motion to allow interim ASUS Representatives to run in the fall by-elections

COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman:

Does that apply to all four interim? Or just the person proposing the motion?

Commissioner Bourne:

That one would apply to all four. Representative Tanwani has indicated a desire to run, but this would apply to all

Senator Duchaine:

Amend to also include interim senators?

Member Prescott:

Can amendments not only happen when the motion is read?

Speaker:

Yes that was my error, sorry.

Representative Chinniah:

Would it not be easier to put this in a separate motion?

Senator Duchaine:

Motion to allow interim senators to run in the fall by-elections

Speaker:

All in favour of interim

Vote:

For: 16

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Senator Duchaine:

Motion to allow interim senators to run in the ASUS by-elections

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

motion passes

Representative Wiseman:

Motion to omnibus motions 10-14

Commissioner Bourne:

I'd like you to withdraw that. I'd like to omnibus 4-14. All constitutional stuff

Point of information: You do do the stamping process during the approval of the agenda, not the minutes

I move that we omnibus motions 4-14

Speaker:

Setting that aside until new business

Member Prescott:

Were those motions that were not stamped not removed from the agenda?

Commissioner Bourne:

Stamping is a way to carry motions that are very mundane. If a stamp fails, it does not mean they are not agenda, it just means they cannot be stamped. They can still be omnibussed later

President Mason:

Motion to close the agenda

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Old Business

No old business

New Business

Motion 3: "That ASUS Assembly ratify Connor McLean as one of the Deputy Academics Commissioners"

Commissioner Bourne:

I now formally move to omnibus motions 4-14
Seconded by President Mason:
Vote:

For: 16
Against: 1
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Commissioner Grotsky:

I want to encourage you all to ratify Conor. I hired him at the end of last school year. He entered a brand new position. This has never happened before and he's doing a tremendous job. Overseeing the ASUS Peer Tutoring program. It's been the most successful one to date. He has lots of experience in the Academics Commission. He was a chair before he came to deputy.

Senator Duchaine:

Congratulations!

What would you say is the most pressing academic issue

Member McLean:

What I'm focusing on right now is peer tutoring and the Undergraduate Review
We're looking to expand into high schools to increase participation from first years.
I think something to improve on is academic advocacy and support for students.
We are a resource to students.

Member Prescott:

With the creation of QSURJ and Politicus, what role do you see the undergraduate review playing as a third journal in the academics affair?

Member McLean:

I think Undergraduate Review is way different. It focuses on creativity and arts, whereas the others focus on science. We publish poetry, art. All different areas of creativity

Member Prescott:

Point of order, I believe candidates must leave the room during a ratification

Speaker:

We do not applaud unless the motion is carried unanimously

Moved by: Adam Grotsky
Seconded by: Irfan Tahiri
Vote:

For: 19
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 4: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to Section 16.01.05 of The ASUS Constitution seen in Appendix A"

Moved by: Scott Mason
Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Motion 5: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to Section 5.01.03 of the ASUS Constitution seen in Appendix B"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 6: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 17.11 of the ASUS Constitution seen in Appendix C"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 7: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 1.01.01 of the ASUS Constitution seen in Appendix D"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 8: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 3.01.01 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix E"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 9: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 5.01.01 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix F"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 10: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 5.03.06 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix G"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 11: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 5.03.18 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix H"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 12: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 5.04.04 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix I"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne
Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 13: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 17.03.02 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix J"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Motion 14: "That ASUS Assembly commence second reading on the amendment to section 17.04.07 of the ASUS constitution seen in Appendix K"

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Scott Mason

Omnibussed Motions 4-14:

Commissioner Bourne:

These were all discussed last assembly

Appendix A deals with updating responsibilities of the business manager, who has certain new powers as per the elimination of general manager of ASUS.

Appendix B deals with the membership assembly. This adds rector and business manager as observer members of assembly. It would be unfair to not have them be members

Appendix C regards confidentiality of keeping documents of past members

Appendices D-K regards PHEKSA's move to disassociate themselves from ASUS. We are formally amending constitution anywhere their name appears

Representative Chinniah:

I'd like to commend the executive on updating the managers' descriptions.

The reason I didn't want to stamp it is because I wanted more reflection on it as it is a constitutional motion

Member Prescott:

Echoing the comments of Mister Chinniah, I'd like to also commend the executive on this decision. Considering the jobs that were done, the money that was spent, I think this is a good decision

Vote:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 15: "That ASUS Assembly commence first reading on the amendment to section 18.03.04 of the ASUS Constitution seen in Appendix L"

President Mason:

Scroll down to appendix L. This is a small but big change

Clarifies the policy of the review committee

The change we've made is that it reads "The committee is given three options:

As it stands now, they can make any change to an honorarium that they see fit

Three options:

Full honorarium

Half honorarium

No honorarium

The reason behind this is because previous executives would have problems with the review committee

The honorarium would shave between 10-15% of the honorarium with reasons they cannot disclose

The belief that people receiving an honorarium are volunteers. They are not working for us. They should be entitled to the full honorarium if they fulfill their duties, and it should only be cut in half or reduced entirely if they haven't performed their duties

Commissioner Bourne:

Based on some consultation done with previous executives, the way in which the committee was struck, which on the one hand is necessary, on the other hand is too secret.

Led to issues where people were accused, with petty personal reasons

Council has the ability to vote on it.

This is about ensuring that we have a positive work environment. We're doing a pretty good job so far, but that'll be up to the review committee

Member Sherman:

Can you explain what the review process is, who sits on it, and what the rationale for striking this committee in the first place was?

President Mason:

The rationale behind it is this.

When I came to ASUS in first year, it's a process that's always been done. It's an accountability procedure.

This is the way that ASUS made sure that individuals volunteering for the society are doing the good work that the society wants them to do

In terms of the composition, it's in policy. I can't speak too much to it, but I believe the Vice-President is on it.

They meet in the ASUS Core. No-one else can be present during these meetings.

Our general manager played a part in this

The committee received a set of anonymous letters from members

Every member of council is assigned to review another random member of council

They answer the questions honestly, the review committee sees these, and changes the honorarium accordingly.

The issue previous executives brought to our attention was that the review committee felt that they had to do something, which was to find nitty-gritty things and shave off honorarium amounts.

We felt there needed to be more clarity in the policy itself so that it was doing specific things

Commissioner Bourne:

The purpose of the committee is so that volunteers receive fair compensation and to provide feedback on their performance.

As Scott mentioned, it contains 5 voting members of assembly, one of which are the executive

Member Sherman:

I'll speak to my issues with the concept.

This is a practice that's not done by the AMS.

By virtue of being their supervisor, you decide on their honorarium

I think that evaluation processes are good, but that it should rest with the supervisors to determine whether or not the individual deserves the full honorarium, not members of assembly who have not interacted with them at all.

There might also be conflict of interest. It's a very small group of people.

I don't feel comfortable putting judgment on people I do not know and do not supervise.

Member Prescott:

I'd like to speak to the heart of this.

I see it as something where we want to grade somebody, give them an A for effort, a C for okay, and an F for failure. That's not how life works. It's not just three grades, there's a continuum. 0-100, not 0, 50, and 100.

I can see where it simplified the entire process of the review committee, but I also think that it should be a checklist system.

Did they do their responsibilities to the best of their abilities?

For each check you miss, knock off 200\$ or something. Not 100%, 50%, and 0%.

If they only show up $\frac{1}{4}$ of the time, should they get paid 50% or 0%?

I like that we're trying to clarify what they do, but the sticking point is that there are discrete numbers

I'd like to ask the mover of this motion why they came up with the arbitrary full, half or null values?

Commissioner Bourne:

First of all, I respect your opinion but I'd like to explain the rationale

You mentioned having a specific checklist for the positions

If I recall correctly, it's something we came up with

While that list is sufficient to describe the responsibilities, there are inevitably more responsibilities than what is listed in policy.

Such a checklist would be too comprehensive to compile

This job is not something I'm doing for a business card. It's a learning experience

In a real job if somebody was not fulfilling their duties, the supervisor's first reaction would not be to take money off of your salary. That's not how jobs work. In the spirit of how ASUS works as a society, the honorarium should only be taken off in the case of a grievous error. If I forgot to run elections, I would hope that there would be a reduction in honorarium.

Member Prescott:

I see your point and it is indeed a learning experience as well as an opportunity.

I think at the same time, as a member who has seen the benefits, if those jobs are not being fulfilled to the greatest possible ability, there should be some sort of checklist.

The real check then is to ensure they're getting paid the right amount

That's why the committee exists

I'd like to see more detail about the committee. What they're looking at, what they're looking for, and to see if their honorarium should reflect the job that they do. The 0, 50, 100 is a little too discrete.

I'd like to leave it very open to leave the committee to do their job, to see if the person has met the qualifications of their position

Senator Stanley:

I think that it's very important to bring this motion forth and to really look at the scope of what the committee is doing. We can't have this committee about nothing.

If they're going to exist, they can't exist just for the sake of existing.

It needs to have a mandate, and a clear and defined purpose

What was seen with the committee meeting and essentially looking for things to dock off because they didn't have any other point or purpose in their mandate; I think that's a problem.

This doesn't happen in the AMS. And I think the reason it doesn't happen is because they have an HR committee.

Commissioner Falk can only do so much. He is not an institutional HR structure

The idea of this committee could be really useful if its mandate were tweaked in such a way that it served as almost a check on the commissioner's individual discretion

Maybe Commissioner Grotsky thinks that a deputy did not do as good of a job, and should only receive a partial honorarium

If that person thinks that that isn't fair, then they can go to the review committee and they can arbitrate what the number should be.

I think that if you're going to have this committee, you can't just have the discrete whole, half, nil spectrum.

You need to give them the ability to exercise some discretion

Somebody doesn't just do all, half, or none of their job. There are several large grey areas that I think have a lot of nuance that this three-point scale does not do justice to.

Would the mover or seconder be interested in tweaking the mandate of this committee in such a way that it serves as a check on the commissioners' or executives' judgment. This will take more finagling, but I think it will produce a better result

Vice-President Tahiri:

The review committee is an uncontrollable monster. It changes from year-to-year, there's a lot of inconsistencies.

I don't see how changing the motion would

Senator Stanley is proposing the opposite of what we are doing right now, which is keeping the status quo

I think that there is a separate discussion regarding commissioners or the review committee deciding on honorarium

This is actually realistic. The nature of the review committee is exactly what it should not be

They should not be saying "How can we dock off marks?"

The main point I'd like to

We have hundreds of volunteers. This is important, because they're putting their time in.

It's not the salary that they're looking forward to, but it makes it accessible.

I can't do this position unless there's some compensation. I'm on OSAP

The point of the committee is to review the honorarium.

It's ridiculous. The reason we have the three discrete values is because that will tell you how the individual is doing

The commissioner will know that they are not going in the proper direction as the first review is in December

Commissioner Bourne:

Point of Information: I wanted to clarify something. I alluded to it indirectly.

I wanted to remind everyone that they do work off of certain sections of constitution. They deal with a list of activities that they may or may not have undertaken over the course of their jobs.

We do have rules set in place.

They do have regulations other than their feelings

Senator Stanley:

I would like to thank Vice-President Tahiri for his points.

We aren't far off. We both agree that it shouldn't be a committee that's just checking off and exercising ultimate discretion over every little thing that somebody receiving an honorarium does or doesn't do

I am saying that this committee shouldn't do that, but it also shouldn't just be limited to three options. It should not work as the initial determinant of "this person will get this honoraria or percentage of it"

It should only work as a failsafe. Ultimately, the discretion, as Representative Sherman put so eloquently, that permission should fall onto the commissioner or executive.

They were the person working in close quarters with that person

If they deserve their full honorarium or only a percentage of it.

I don't think that this body or a percentage of members of this body is the best way to decide who gets what honorarium

To get sent into that nit-picky combing procedure

To say 98% instead of 100% is splitting hairs.

To restate the original point: This should fall on the shoulders of the commissioners. They were hired for a reason. They have a mandate to do whatever is in their portfolio. It should also extend to them to be able to evaluate their hirees performances. They can say 'they did a good job, they deserve an honorarium'. I will again open up to any further debate as to whether or not people would be going that way.

Maybe not on this motion particular, but over a series of future motions and amendments, this should happen

Senator Duchaine:

I'm going to expand on the point Member Prescott made, which is understanding honoraria in terms of understanding grades. We do not use a percentage scale at this institution, but a GPA scale; which could be applied to this. What if we used an A,B,C,D,F scale with pluses and minuses. These can be assigned a numerical average.

Instead of having a 0, 50, 100, I think that a 97 vs. a 95 is much too arbitrary

Multiples of 15 or 25 would be much better, I think

I'm not sure that this is the time for that.

I'd like to see an amendment to the motion to be 100, 75, 50, 0.

I'd be very surprised if somebody received 0% and had not already been

President Mason:

Move to committee as a whole

Seconded by member-at-large

Vote:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Vice-President Tahiri:

Why do we have a review committee?

The exec should determine commissioners, the commissioners can decide their subordinates

Then if they are unhappy with the decision, then there would be a review committee to talk to Scott and I are proposing a motion to change this.

Currently you could shave off 5% if they were too late, or 10% if people were dissatisfied with their work

After speaking with last year council, there's a consensus that the system is broken.

Isabelle has brought forth an amendment to be 100, 75, 50, 25, 0

The fear is that the review committee might go to the 75% as a go-to.

To get 100% of the honorarium, you'd have to be a shining star

75% is still a decent chunk. They shouldn't be complaining.

The honoraria committee is whenever they're together and reviewing, they're already thinking they need to find something to dock.

If the committee were actualized in the way that it should be, then what you would have is them

sitting down that way giving out 100%.

They have not been acting like that. Taking off 40% off one person, 5% off for someone else

They find out that they lost 5%, but don't know what to improve on.

It turns into more of a bitter taste in your mouth, rather than a note to improve

Senator Stanley:

What is the actual process through which review committee is presented with an application, or a proposal for honorarium and makes that recommendation?

Is a commissioner brought in and they say 'this is what has happened' or are they doing it blindly?

Even just having the person's immediate supervisor coming in and offering a recommendation would be so much more in the right direction in eliminating the sense of arbitrariness

It is operating at times as an arbitrary body, and that's not okay. Any recommendations it makes have to be made upon substance

2014 Year Society President El-Rahimy:

How difficult would it be to have someone from the executive to go and talk to a professional in auditing.

The school of business could help us out, point us in the right direction

It doesn't need to be a formal audit, just something a bit more concrete

That person could have confidentiality

They can say 'we reduced X% and here's why'

Vice-President Tahiri:

The policy is concrete.

There's a reason as to why they do it that way

Representative Chinniah:

Can we just table this motion to a later assembly and come here with a more concrete proposal?

President Mason:

I'd like to make the case for why we motioned for the current change.

Isabelle is right. A bench system is great. 90%, 80%, 70%, etc

This is my personal opinion: We have individuals who spend a lot of their time volunteering. This is not a performance review. 'Did you increase the voter turnout, did you inspire people, etc'

This is not a performance review. It's a check to make sure that you're doing all of the things that you're supposed to be doing

The idea between the 100, 50, 0 is that it's cut and dry.

If you aren't doing your job, you're going to get 50.

Within the framework of this committee, if we go ahead with Senator Duchaine's suggestion, we'll stay in the same paradigm in which we are now.

They'll say "this commissioner wasn't as good as the last committee. Let's take off 15%"

Given the spirit of this discussion, maybe we can move away from a review committee?

But this would be a huge conflict of interest for me to come here and propose that

The 100, 50, 0 is cut-and-dry and it minimizes conflict of interest

Member Sherman:

Can we table it for now and come back in two weeks with an alternative policy?

Senator Stanley:

So that we don't create a policy to be removed

Member Sherman:

Leave it up to the discretion of the supervisors, whomever they may be, would be the appropriate way to do it

President Mason:

I'm more than happy to table it.

I would suggest that we debate this idea, or amend it to include something that Senator Duchaine is suggesting.

The committee is struck in two assemblies from now. If we want to keep the present framework, we have to pass it tonight for next assembly to have the second reading.

Perhaps if you want to come with a new idea at next assembly, we can mix it in during the second reading

Member Prescott:

I'd like to speak more to the non-performance review culture. If we're not using it as a performance review, why not scrap it? Let the commissioners do it. At the end of the day, have it as a check.

The person can go back to the review committee for conflicts.

That's if it must exist.

I like the idea of having 3 performance reviews within the term so that we also get that performance review culture which I believe to be very important.

This also ensures that services are provided.

As opposed to having this committee and become that situation where things are taken off

Why don't we just have in-term performance reviews?

Vice-President Tahiri:

Given the way time is working right now, if this does not pass, then whenever we are reviewing honoraria, the current system will still be in effect, which we do not want.

The issue of revisiting the committee is much greater. A full-out policy cannot be done tonight. We can bring it to next assembly. And if that passes, it can substitute for what we are passing now

Member Prescott:

Table it now, come back with a better policy at next assembly where everyone brings their input

Come back with something better so that we can do it next assembly instead of putting a band-aid on the wound.

Vice-President Tahiri:

We will do that, but we will go forward with this motion

This is how the executive feels that it should move forward

Having it at full, half, or zero will change how it is currently done

Member Prescott:

We're seeing an issue where the status quo is not satisfactory, the alternative is not satisfactory

Member Sherman:

Straw poll on my suggestion?

Senator Stanley:

A better idea maybe is to go over the motion to see what we need to amend tonight. For example, 100, 80, 60, etc.

And after that, the attitude on a complete overhaul

Senator Chishti:

Point of information: Why does it have to be struck at that time?

Commissioner Bourne:

It's in policy

President Mason:

Straw-poll of supporting this assembly?

So nobody supports it?

What is assembly's thoughts on Senator Duchaine's suggestion?

How about 100, 75, 50, 25, 0

Senator Duchaine:

It is my understanding that this committee looks at reviews made by other members

Vice-President Tahiri:

This affects a lot of members in ASUS. Deputies, commissioners, etc.

We do work hard.

Vice-President Tahiri:

Eliminating the committee will not happen tonight

All in favour of the 100, 80, 60, 40, 20, 0 or 100, 75, 50, 25, 0, or some variation of that

President Mason:

Let's hash out some numbers, then

Member Sherman:

Get rid of the review committee, institutionalize at least two performance reviews done by the supervisors, and its up to the supervisors to allocate the honorarium as they see fit

I don't think assembly should be overseeing HR matters.

President Mason:

Member Sherman, if you can write up that policy for next assembly that would be great.

Let's come up with a framework for the current one

There's no guarantee that this new framework will pass

What are the most amicable increments?

0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100 is the most popular

Motion to end committee as a whole
Motion passes

President Mason:

I'd like to change the motion to be 0, 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100 instead of 0, 50, 100

Representative Chinniah:

With respect, can we please just table this and wait for Member Sherman to develop a policy that assembly agrees with

It's better to have a proper policy change instead of doing a policy change that not everyone wants to do.

President Mason:

I agree with you, it's not a great situation.

I think Member Sherman's proposal is great.

I'd like to see nothing more than to have this whole system changed.

In case that fails, our volunteers won't be subject to the review committee as it stands today

We need time to have two readings

Motion to put into question

Vote:

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion passes

Moved by: Scott Mason

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Vote:

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion passes

Motion 16: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to Section B-9 of the ASUS Policy Manual seen in Appendix M"

Member Khan:

Greetings, I'm from Toronto

This person next to me is Daniel Myers

Member Myers

I am from Winnipeg, take that as you may

Member Khan:

We want to approve QSURJ into the ASUS policy

AQURJ is an open-access scientific research journal to fill the void in undergraduate research that we

currently have

We want a legitimate academic platform for students to publish their research

Students will learn about the publishing process and how to write scientific articles

We hope that this will elevate the scope of undergraduate research

Member Myers:

Why do we want to be part of ASUS?

We do only have two more years here at Queen's.

Our partnership with ASUS will ensure that it will be carried for years to come.

The exposure and visibility we will receive from ASUS will go a long way for Arts and Science

Undergraduate students to have the chance to be published

Member Sherman:

Motion to move to committee as a whole

Motion passes

Member Prescott:

We already have Politicus, we have the Undergraduate Review, and as a science student, I feel as though there's a disconnect between ASUS and the science students.

Many science students don't care about what's really going on

It's good to see that we will have this to connect us with ASUS.

Research to help with theses

I think this is a great idea and am happy that you have brought it to the table.

Representative Ruprecht:

It can be difficult as an undergraduate to get your own research

Is there going to be an opportunity for students to come see you?

Member Myers:

Part of the board is student liaisons and academic coordinators

The liaisons will be in charge of connecting the students with us

We will be attempting to make those connections if they're not aware of them

It will also be open to Queen's students for research they are not doing through Queen's.

Member Ruprecht:

Is there an opportunity to expand the workshops to reach out to first and second year students with regard to how they go about their research?

Member Khan:

Part of our mandate is to run workshops, and in general, the process to publishing an article

We understand that it is daunting and we are willing to put on workshops

We have an extensive review board, and we know them personally now.

We can't make the professor take students, but we can give students credibility as they're coming through us

CESA Vice-President Ferguson

Looking at the clauses 'Submission must be within sciences'

They're mostly biology related

There are a lot of people in chemistry, math, and a lot of them go into research

Is this going to branch out similarly to what Politicus did?
It is called the Queen's Science, not just Health Science

Member Myers:

If you look across scientific journals, they fill a void
The success of this journal is reliant on the fact that we stick not too strictly
We have meetings setup later this month for Biology and Psychology. We'd like to expand next academic year
These would be different journals
Right now, it's health sciences, which is life sciences, its incorporated fields, and biochemistry.
We want to make sure that this journal is successful at all before we go and extend ourselves

Senator Smolej:

This is important, and congratulations for bringing this forth
To add on to the other speaker, I'd like to congratulate you for including health sciences
I'd also like to point out how the clause of submitting an article is that the student must be the first author. This is very important. Often times you'll find yourself in a senior researcher's lab, making them the primary author.
What's the criteria you'll be looking at for the student reviewers? We have a certain expectation of them

Member Khan:

Our applications are out now. We hope to have interviews for the review panel
Through those questions, we'll see if that student is qualified
We're also putting together a checklist to make it easier for student reviewers who are not used to reviewing things like the faculty is

Representative Rubin:

This is about finding your niche. From the beginning, would it not just be good to accept your niche as the only undergraduate science journal on Queen's campus meant for Queen's science students?
I think that that might get you many more submissions and increase the popularity
Once the popularity for that broader audience is established, you could section off into niche journals
Second question, this is about a wording "All undergraduates are allowed to submit articles"
Does it have to be an undergraduate queen's student that is the first author of the paper?
I'm confused on what clauses apply to whom
Can you clean up what's going on in that section?

Member Khan:

We've narrowed the scope because most journals are very specific in their scope, and that's the reason that they're successful. If we broaden the scope too much, it will be a mixup of different articles and people wouldn't read it. We also want to make sure people are reading this journal.
The ideal success of the journal this year, we hope to expand into other realms.
For your second question:
I did research over the summer, so I would be able to publish in the journal given that I'm first author.
As long as it is in an academic institution, anybody else can be an additional or co-author

Senator Chishti:

What faculty do you have involved with this?

Member Myers:

We have the associate dean of biochemistry. He has been involved with other professors
We have Dr. Ken Rose in neuroscience, Dr. Katsu who is pharmacology, Anna Kadri who is community health, Dr. Taiti and his wife who are reproductive biology. We have a meeting with Dr. Louise Win who is Cancer Biology.

Senator Chishti:

We can only accept authors from fields that we have faculty from.

Member Myers:

In order to expand to other parts of science; math, chemistry; we need to establish a peer review board and a faculty review board. Not everyone is 100% on board from the get-go. You have to sort out details

We are interested in other departments, but this is the department in which we're comfortable and have connections

Easiest to start here to ensure success

Senator Stanley:

Congratulations, this is a big accomplishment

Let's hope we can get you a little further tonight. It's an admirable initiative

When are you guys planning on launching by?

Member Myers:

By the end of this academic year. This journal is rolling submissions. As soon as someone has a paper and it is approved, it is indexable. We will release one at the end of the year, with the first one to be in April 2014

Senator Stanley:

Are these going to be themed? Or broader

Member Myers:

As long as it falls under the topics we are including, that is fine.

Senator Stanley:

Have you secured sources of funding?

Member Myers:

We have a meeting with the vice principle, set up by Member Sherman

The associate dean of biochemistry told us to go to his office and ask for money whenever we need it
Dr. Taiti also echoed that sentiment

Senator Stanley:

Would you guys be looking at coming to ASUS for contribution?

Member Khan:

We have approached the president and VP.

Once we have a more concrete budget, we'll likely approach the board of directors

Vice-President Tahiri:

If this passes, we can pass a budget.

Senator Stanley:

You've evidently done your homework. Hopefully this will be with ASUS for a long time

Commissioner Falk:

I think it fills the void very nicely

You said the goal of the journal was two-fold. The opportunity for students to be published, but also to disseminate scientific research. What is your plan for disseminating that information beyond the journal. Are you contacting other undergraduate journals?

Member Khan:

We've approached WURJ which is the Journal at Western.

We plan on contacting other journals, but our priority right now is to get this up and running and have people submitting articles. That takes precedence over expanding out of Queen's

Member Myers:

It's difficult to us as third years to disseminate our research

This is where our faculty board will help us. They're all respected and published and their approval will go a long way

Representative Pang:

There are some international students under exchange to other countries

Are those students allowed to post those research reports to QSURJ?

Member Khan:

While you're at Queen's, you're an undergraduate Queen's student.

If the research is done at your time at queen's, and you are officially an undergraduate student, and you're the first author, it should be fine for publication

Senator Stanley:

Assuming that this does get put into policy, what's the role you two will have while this publication carries on? Will you be applying to be the editors-in-chief? A more supervisory role above that?

Member Khan:

We are the editors-in-chief this year.

Our integration into the policy is contingent upon our previous policy being brought forth as well

Representative Chinniah:

I noticed that there's a 12-month volunteer position.

Will they be in Kingston the entire 12 months?

Would you be willing to change that to 8 months or explain the rationale

Would you follow Politicus' example and allow non-science students to submit articles provided its within the scope of the article?

Member Myers:

We said 12 months because the internet exists.

I don't know if it's a problem for you if we're not in Kingston for the whole 12 months.

We'd be open to changing this to an 8 month position if that's what everyone prefers

This journal is open to anyone who is in undergraduate arts and science. What they're submitting just

has to be within the scope of our journal.
A stats major writing about epidemiology would be fine.

Member Khan:

The only 12-month positions are the co-editors-in-chief and the marketing manager.
It's very easy to maintain communication between three people.

Representative Chinniah:

I don't see a lot of things you can do in those 4 months.
As you move forward with this, if you find the summer is really dead then you should change it or let your successors know that they should change it

Member Khan:

It needs to be open during the summer in case students submit things throughout the summertime

Senator Smolej:

It's important that you guys remain open during the 4 months
I would assume and predict that most students' research would be over the summer during the 4 months that they have off.

Motion to end committee as a whole

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Motion passes

Motion 16 Vote:

Moved by: Rishad Khan

Seconded by: Daniel Myers

Vote:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 17: "That ASUS Assembly appoint Rishad Khan and Daniel Meyers as the Co-Editors-In-Chief of QSURJ until April 30th, 2015 in order to facilitate the transition of QSURJ into ASUS"

President Mason:

This is a motion to appoint these two individuals the head of the new research journal we have just approved

We want them to serve for two years to establish the journal. This has never been done before

The policy was just put into place, but we are not sure how pragmatic the policy will be

Moreover, these individuals need to hire an entire staff. They need to create a network with the faculty of Arts and Science.

The idea behind this motion is that we want to give these individuals the time they need to create this institution

Commissioner Bourne:

Although you're free to ask Members Meyers and Khan, I think that we should keep the questions relatively brief.

Moved by: Scott Mason

Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

Vote:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 18: "That ASUS Assembly strike the Remembrance Day Committee, to consist of two (2) chairs selected from Assembly and unlimited members-at-large"

President Mason:

This is something we do every year. ASUS has a remembrance day committee.

We have two chairs, making a four-person committee to promote the remembrance day assembly

This is a great tradition and it is a great honour to be a co-chair

President Mason:

November 1st-11th, you will put up posters, run a social media campaign, working with the marketing commissioner

We also work with our sister societies, you can talk to the rector

The idea is to be creative and making remembrance day the good holiday that it is

Commissioner Bourne:

If you want to serve on the committee, even if you don't serve as a co-chair, there shouldn't be a prohibition on participation

Co-Chair Nominations:

Representative Wiseman – Decline

Senator Stanley – Decline

Speaker Davis – Decline

Senator Duchaine – Decline

Representative Chinniah – Accept

Representative Pang – Decline

Representative Wilson – Accept

Senator Chishti – Decline

COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman – Decline

President Mason – Decline

Unlimited Member Nominations:

Member Prescott - Decline

Assembly chooses Representative Wilson and Representative Chinniah as Co-Chairs

Moved by: Scott Mason
Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne
Vote:

For: 17
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 19: "That ASUS Assembly ratify Heather Salema as the Head Gael for 2014"

Moved by: Scott Mason
Seconded by: Daniel Gonçalves

President Mason:

Heather is unfortunately unable to come, so we will table this until the October 18th assembly. She is simply unavailable at this time

Member Prescott:

Is there a vote required to table?

President Mason:

Yes there is
Motion to table this

Vote:

For: 29
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 20: "That ASUS Assembly strike the Orientation Committee Chairs Selection ommittee, to consist of the new Head Gael, a member of the ASUS Executive, two (2) members of the previous Orientation Committee, and one (1) member of the society who, the previous year, was neither an orientation chair nor on the orientation committee"

Moved by: Scott Mason
Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne

President Mason:

Most of the committee will be selected by the Head Gael.

One member of assembly must sit on this committee, so on October 18th (two days before the weekend for the chair selection committee)

I was hoping we could straw-poll some individuals to set aside a weekend there

Is there an individual would like to participate in this?

Or one that assembly would like to select to participate in this?

Commissioner Falk:

I nominate Commissioner Grotsky.

Vice-President Tahiri:

If you're interested, this will be a weekend for hiring, not a weekend for you.

Speaker:

Can we please discuss this outside of assembly, given it is not a formal business

President Mason:

Motion to table

Vote:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Motion 21: "That ASUS Assembly strike the ASUS Camps Business & Program Director Selection Committee, to consist of the ASUS Summer Executive, the previous directors, and two (2) members of assembly, one (1) of whom must be from the Science Concentration and one (1) of whom must be from the Arts Concentration"

2015 Year Society President Stemp:

Point of information: what is the time commitment?

Senator Stanley:

Point of order: can we please have the mover speak to the motion?

President Mason:

This is a committee to pick our new business manager and program director for ASUS camps.

This will be done over a weekend (two days)

It will be a series of interviews.

In all likelihood, it will be ~10 applicants for each position

It will probably take an evening, but I would wager that you set aside two days for when this is scheduled

Senator Stanley:

Point of information: when exactly is it scheduled?

President Mason:

The individuals, once selected, will pick a schedule that suits them.

In late October, or early November.

Nominations:

Representative Wiseman for Arts Position – Accept

Senator Chishti for Science Position – Accept

Moved by: Scott Mason
Seconded by: Benjamin Bourne
Vote:

For: 18
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Commissioner Bourne:

I move to omnibus these two motions: (22 and 23)

Vote:

For: 17
Against: 1
Abstain: 3

Motion 22 and 23:

Commissioner Bourne:

I think we went over this at the beginning to allow any interim senators or representatives to run

Senator Chishti:

I think given the fact that we hadn't conveyed it in the hiring processes, that these people would no longer be allowed to run in the by-elections

If we didn't want them to run, we should have thought of that beforehand

The question was posed before, and we said they would definitely be able to run

I think it's only fair that we allow them to run

Member Prescott:

I think it should be open to any ASUS member for any position, except for those who have done it for two consecutive terms. Apart from that, anyone should be able to run

Representative Tanwani:

Does this happen every year? The interim representatives always have to seek approval if they want to run?

President Mason:

No, this is the first year we're doing this, because of the lottery system.

We thought it would be best to bring it forward to assembly as to whether or not these people should be able to run.

For the senators, I sat on the hiring panel with Isabelle, we thought we should put it forward to assembly

I am in favour of this motion. All individuals should be able to run

The added credibility that this society can give these individuals will put any questions that have come up to rest

Representative Chinniah:

I am in favour of allowing them to run

I will vote for the omnibus motion

Senator Duchaine:

Is there anything in policy about them having to take a leave of absence during the campaign period, because that would make sense

President Mason:

That is a wonderful suggestion as there is nothing in policy, given that this is the first year this has run. We have nothing in policy about that, but we would highly recommend to individuals to take a leave of absence during that time, mostly for their own campaigns and to avoid any conflict of interest.

Senator Stanley:

If there is a stipulation that members cannot hold a position for more than 2 consecutive terms, what are the interim people considered to be running for? Their first term?

Commissioner Bourne:

The interim would not be considered their first term as they were appointed rather than elected. I think in this case, that would not be the case for the people running.

Senator Smolej:

4.01.08 states that “no person shall run for re-election for a position if they have served for two one-year terms or one two-year term”. That sort of clarifies things on what positions interim representatives and senators can do.

Vote to call into question

Vote:

For: 17

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Omnibussed 22-23 motions vote:

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 4

Motions pass

Discussion Period

Senator Chishti:

I want to see if people would be interested in the board senate retreat this Saturday. We have a number of topics each of us is assigned. Board Retreat is the topic.

Senator Stanley:

The potential rejigging of the review committee and any questions resulting

Senator Chishti:

All of our questions:

Second annual year for a board retreat

We're all really excited

The topic is enrollment. We've been divided into different groups with different questions

What opportunities are there at the undergraduate level?

What incentives can be put into place?

What role can Queen's researchers play in academic planning?

What are the unique values and outcomes of a Queen's Arts degree? How can this be articulated to encourage others to apply?

One of the directors said that he could not say anything about this last question, so if you have any ideas on how Queen's can attract students to the Arts program, develop new programs under the Arts and Science faculty, or for research activities on campus and what they can do for enrollment, please share them now

Senator Smolej:

I wanted to convey discussion. It doesn't have to be in such a formal setting. The posing of such a question

I posted that as a student, but also as a representative to gain further insight and to help shape my context and views when discussing things.

Feel free to come to us at any time to discuss and share opinions

Vice-President Tahiri:

Where is the forum where we can go see all of these questions?

The senate would like us to send our ideas and thoughts, but where can we find it?

Senator Chishti:

It's actually confidential, but we can post the questions on the ASUS webpage.

Vice-President Tahiri:

We can get a chain going

Commissioner Grotsky:

Are you looking for information right now or just posting the questions to be answered later?

Senator Duchaine:

I'd be willing to have this discussion over a beverage at the Queen's Pub. Or talking openly whenever.

If you have any questions regarding enrollment, this is your first and only opportunity to direct them to the board

Senator Smolej:

Just a clarification: The questions all resulted from the town hall undergraduate enrollment. I have the list of questions. I will take a picture and upload it to Facebook. There are 10 or so questions to be answered. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, I would be more than happy to answer them

Representative Sherman:

Housing, resources, etc. How are we going to accommodate 2000 more students? Where are we going to house them? How are you going to build the infrastructure and resources for all of these new students, and what role does the University play?

The university has been noticeably absent at every level of discussion regarding this.
Many groups don't know what they're doing
When there is a controversial subject regarding this, nobody from the University shows up to defend the anti-student and anti-university views.
How are they willing to step up in this process?

Member Prescott:

I guess my comments are also on the topic of enrollment increasing.
Very important to know what the university will do as enrollment increases 2000. Where will these people live? Why haven't we been working towards zoning law changes so that these students can live in appropriate places to make sure students aren't encroaching upon Kingstonian land.
My other big question is health resources. Seeing so many more students will result in more health issues. Where has the university been on these things? They have been terribly absent. It won't affect us directly, but as alumni, we will see these conditions persist.
What are they going to do about it?

Representative Rubin's Proxy:

Of course housing should be questioned, but I can also see it being a problem with dilution of the Queen's brand.
What's happening when people choose to come to Queen's, they're choosing to brand themselves with that name in a form of a degree which will help them with a return investment on that degree
The more students Queen's allows into the university, and as entry averages go down, that brand becomes more and more diluted.
As people are becoming alumni soon, we want to see our degrees stay strong for the next 25, 30, 35, 40 years in the work force and public perception
How will the university keep that Queen's brand strong while allowing evermore students into the university?

Representative Sherman:

If you guys want to know where to look in terms of documents, I can help you with that
I'm more than happy to cover transportation, downtown review, etc

Member Prescott:

The dilution of value of Queen's University is definitely something to be concerned about.
Where is this university as an institution going to step in and say enough is enough
We want to keep Queen's prestigious and keep the value of the degree 20 years from now the same as it was 20 years before
It's disheartening that this will persist and I do hope that our senators can change that culture of indifference considering the fact that there are many questions that need to be answered and they are not doing the job answering them for students today and students to come

Senator Duchaine:

The reason the university is looking for more enrollment is because there is a larger financial issue
This is the easy way out
The concern of academic quality is something that affects all of us, and I am excited to work with Commissioner Grotsky and other DSCs
I asked departments how many more students they could accept, and they said 5%.
We are looking to expand by 10%, which is too much

Vice-President Tahiri:

This Friday, I read in the report that it's a discussion. Will there be a result from this? There's a lot of stress on this Saturday coming up. In addition, how will you factor the issue of space into the issue of increased enrollment?

Senator Chishti:

The university released a paper on what the university wants out of enrollment two weeks ago. That came from a senate group, and senate has been addressing this issue for at least a full year. Board of trustees has not really addressed this.

This is the first opportunity that the board of trustees has regarding where enrollment at the university is going and what it means from an academic perspective.

It looks like senate doesn't want to touch the issue anymore, which is fine because it's going to the board.

The university does recommend moving towards increasing enrollment.

We had a small group discussion with the chair of the board of trustees earlier, and she said that the new residences were approved by city council last week. Discussion is set to start October 16th.

Vice-President Tahiri:

I meant space to book out rooms, space to book a meeting for a club.

Senator Stanley:

Point of order: Perhaps we could still respect the rules of order. I'm not sure if asking the questions without any acknowledgment from the speaker is a good idea.

Vice-President Tahiri:

I apologize.

Senator Stanley:

Motion to move to committee as a whole.

Vote:

For: 14

Against: 2

Abstain: 3

Motion passes.

Senator Chishti:

When looking at academic space especially, the university has done a survey on when there is actually space to run things. Apparently there's a lot of empty space on Friday afternoons. Given how much space there is, there is time and space to accommodate those students.

President Mason:

You can Google Queen's University budget. They have a section in there on enrollment strategy, budget models. If you can't find it, I can send it to you. It's ~800kB. It's a little long at 60 pages, but all of the information is there. E-mail me there at president@asus.queensu.ca

Member Prescott:

I find it troubling that they want to increase enrollment but still want to make cuts.

We will also need more money to accommodate those people. We should focus more on resources that students require, and yet they continue to not listen to us. I think if they want to bring in 2000 students,

we need to ask ourselves how many more vice-provosts and assistant vice-provosts do we need?
We don't need assistant deputy nonsense.

I think it's already overbloated as it sits, and that's why we need to bring in more students

I hope that our senators can properly bring that to the table

The biggest issue is the coverup by bringing in these 2000 students without having the proper town-gown relations and making sure the city can properly handle 2000 more students.

Senator Stanley:

I think it's important to realize that from the tone that this discussion has been, most people have concerns with the decision to increase enrollment by 2000 students. I think what might be good is to hear more from more people about what exactly, coming along with those 2000 students, are you concerned about? Member Sherman brought up town-gown relations. There simply isn't enough space to house those 2000 students. Member Prescott brought up other resources being stretched thin. If every student tried to get what they could from HCDS, it would be crushed. It is not built for the amount of students we have now, let alone 2000 more. What else are people concerned with?

Representative Rubin:

I'm concerned with how they'll be spending the money they're getting.

If you look at the way it's spent now, the division is definitely not equal among the faculties. I am in Political Science faculty. The second year courses have over 200 students. A good friend of mine is in fourth year English who has had professors tell them that they cannot do smaller research-based classes. The number of professors is not going up with enrollment. If they're going to accept more students, then we need more professors to accommodate those students. We need professors able to handle those extra students

Senator Duchaine:

I'm not sure if you're aware with the university's financial system, but we moved from one financial model to another. Political Studies is posed to make the most gains through this budget change as we have the most students and the fewest faculty. There was a hiring freeze several years ago because the hiring cost of professors went up from Q-FA. The new promotional budget model gives a better idea of separating funds based on number of students. It doesn't work as well for smaller faculties, but it is something we are looking to address. They have not worked out how the new budget works exactly.

Senator Smolej:

It's interesting because lots of this is echoed in the AMS enrollment policy passed as the special assembly. It's a huge policy paper written by the Acs Commissioner of AMS regarding allocations of enrollment and how we can proceed forward in an alternate direction. Myself, I'm also working with Academics Commissioner of the AMS. There is some discussion about whether or not this enrollment will occur. It is ultimately up to the Dean of Arts and Science. As time goes forward, this enrollment might not happen if we can find alternative financial strategies. The core of the problem is how we're funded as an institution. There is a proposal for how Ontario Universities should be funded. The current system is archaic and from the 60s. It solely promotes growth

President Mason:

Motion to committee as a whole

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Representative Pang:

One more suggestion quickly. Instead of increasing enrollment, why don't we just recruit more international students? If you have 1000 new students internationally, you'd get 250 million dollars right away.

Senator Chishti:

Not all of that money goes directly to the university. A lot of that money comes from our taxes. The university doesn't actually get 4 times the money from international students. They get some, but it is not significant in an undergraduate program. In a graduate program, it can be insane. It used to be 5%, now it is at 3%. You can only increase costs by 3% now. The Health Science is trying to recruit more students from the Middle East to increase funding, but it doesn't help much in committee as a whole

President Mason:

Part of the university's plan is to increase international student enrollment
The policy states that we should not use international students as cash cows

Representative Pang:

My point is that if you read some of the magazines, Queen's University has been decreasing in terms of international student ratio and international student ranking. What I'm saying is that we can try to recruit some of the "top students" and try to increase the international ranking, and it would also solve a lot of problems like room size. And it would also increase the diversity of international cultures

Senator Smolej:

Personally, I am in favour of increasing international student enrollment. The diversity adds a lot to the undergraduate education. Unfortunately, as a publicly funded institution, there is sentiment from others that spaces should be reserved for students in Ontario and Canada. Commerce does not want to increase international enrollment because they're reserving spaces for Ontarian students.

Senator Stanley:

Move to strike the second topic from discussion period
Seconded by COMPSA Vice-President Bannerman
Vote:

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

motion passes

Senator Chishti:

In terms of helping town-gown relations, we had representatives from the community.
Graduate students would no longer be part of the Queen's housing plan.

Watts hall went 60% upper year, whereas it was 100% upper years a few years ago

The student affairs office may want to continue with that.

They've also been working with the university looking at 46 common rooms to be converted back to common rooms from double rooms.

It's never going to be more than 350 students. It won't actually be 2000 students.

In residences, they've increased one outreach councilor and will be acquiring one more

HCDS will have one more outreach councilor when the new residences open

In terms of entry averages, they've gone down 2.3% in the past four years
The international student stats say 5.2% international students in our first-year class which is higher than it has been in the past three years

Representative Sherman:

I know they're taking great strides to develop that
They were supposed to hold an open house but they have pushed it back
What will the campus master plan look like for the development of west campus?
There's supposed to be a comprehensive housing plan or strategy, which during my time here has been very elusive. I've never actually seen it.

Senator Smolej:

I know I was quoted "I will expire in October", but this may be a suggestion. Maybe for the future, although I love discussion, I would never suggest to cut it short in the goal of efficiency. If we write more detailed reports, we can be more informed at the start. It's a lot of information and we don't all have time to be informed, but if we have specific things we would like to know, we can prepare them in advance

Senator Stanley:

Motion to close discussion period

For: 19

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion carries

Speaker's Last Words

Speaker:

I beat Senator Stanley in the bet. I revel in that

Motion to adjourn

Vote:

For: 17

Against: 2

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Finishing Time: 10:12