

## **Minutes for ASUS Assembly on Thursday February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013**

Starting Time: 7:08

**President Whittaker:** Point of information. Given the timely nature of events, I wish to begin by addressing statements made by Member Prescott on Monday evening. It's a position that ASUS does not endorse. We have spent 3 days formulating our stance on this issue. We've consulted numerous student groups and other resources on campus. There will be a special ASUS assembly for next Monday or Tuesday, at which there will be a motion to censure member Prescott's statements. This will need to pass by 50% of the votes. We will not be pushing for Prescott's removal. I can answer some questions, but I'd prefer to do the bulk of the talking at the meeting.

I would also like to take member Duschaine's discussion period to the start of assembly

14 for

0 against

### **Representative Robin:**

I'd like to add a discussion topic to the end of assembly for this society's position on the resignation of Peter Green.

16 for

0 against

**Speaker Kasraee:** Any concerns?

### **Motion 1: "That ASUS Assembly approve the agenda for the February, 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Assembly"**

Moved by: Zaeem Anwar

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 16

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passed

### **Motion 2: "That ASUS Assembly approve the minutes for the February, 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Assembly"**

Moved by: Zaeem Anwar

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 14

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

### **Speaker's Business:**

**Speaker Kasraee:**

- Great day outside.

Speaker Kasraee will henceforth be referred to as Speaker

### **Guest Speaker:**

### **Executive's Report:**

**President Whittaker**

- The Mark R. Wilson award is due next Monday, March 4<sup>th</sup>.
- It is the most prestigious award for an Arts and Science student for non-athletic, extra-curricular involvement
- The link to the award is in my report, as well as on the website

#### **Vice-President Jacobs**

- There is an update on Arts and Science Formal
- We hit our target and went \$2'000 above
- First time we've sold out in 10 years
- ASUS funds and grants are due on March 8<sup>th</sup>, next Friday
- If you were on a committee last semester, you are also on one this semester
- I'll be sending out a WhenIsGood to find out the best time to meet
- Ratify everything on March 14th

#### **Senate Business**

**Senator Aulthouse:** Nothing to add

#### **Society Reports:**

##### **Representative Allan:**

- Point brought up by Member Prescott that CFRC would bring in an extra \$37'000 of funds
- Representative Basilio brought up the fact that the CFRC caters to a wide audience
- Overall, we agreed that increasing student fees should be a last resort
- We approved all of the AMS grants
- One big issue: Political parties can't get funding.
  - CIA and CRO policy was brought up, but AMS executive took it back and we will review next week

*Online Learning and Virtualization Discussion – Presented by Isabelle Duschaine:*

##### **Isabelle Duschaine:**

- Academic affairs commissioner for the AMS
- I am ready to take all of your questions regarding the topic of online learning at Queen's
- I want lots of feedback from you guys
- A subcommittee of senate is running a draft report about online learning (rumoured to be ~60 pages)
- Much more student feedback is needed
- Queen's does not have an online learning strategy, nor do we have a concrete definition of what online learning truly is
- Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance is also writing a policy on online learning at the provincial level
- Online learning isn't just all online
- It can also be using things like Moodle, the use of blended formats (some in-class and some online tutorials, also massive online learning courses).
- We're trying to understand online learning within the Queen's context
- What are some things that are important to you in an online course?

**Representative Basilio:** Flexibility

**President Whittaker:** Same quality and professor engagement as in a traditional course

**Representative Allan:**

At Athabasca, it's very different. They shied away from the whole idea of doing things on the web. As I see the transition between blended learning, it's difficult for a professor to know what a student should know. I'm worried that moving to an online approach is potentially more confusing to the student.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

More clearly-defined learning structures, would be good then.

**Member at Large:**

I've always had trouble with the idea of using online programs to replace in-person instruction. To me it's a good supplement, but it shouldn't replace.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

That's a good point, differentiating the classroom experiences we get now. I always say it's different than putting 400 people in a lecture hall, rather than 15 people in a small room with a dynamic discussion. So in terms of bracketing the course types we have, they're all very different from each other

**Representative Merrithew:**

I would hope that the online course offers the same amount of resources as an in-class one, such as Tas

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

The writing centre

**Representative Lively**

I just want to make sure that students aren't getting gouged for online courses, and that it's relevant to the cost of the course

**Year Society '13 Vide President Geyer:**

I know some online lectures use previously recorded lectures. The professor could be getting paid multiple times for the same lectures. They should be updating, revising, and changing their lectures.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

On the flip side of that, there are professors that teach the exact same lecture in the exact same style for the past 20 years, they're just doing in person. It's also harder to directly improvise or engage in the material.

**Senator Yang:**

Some academic resources were maintained when transitioning to an online environment. I took an online course during the year, and there were office hours offered online. You'd ask them through typing, and they would respond with text as well. It wasn't possible to have dialogue.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

That person-to-person contact is called "contact hours" in the online learning community. Contact hours are the same whether it's a 300 person 3 hour lecture, or an 8-person 1.5 hour seminar. There's definitely a quality of education to be gotten from a one-on-one discussion with a professor. Speaking specifically to Moodle, what suggestions, improvements, or glowing praise do you have for Moodle?

**Member-at-Large:**

I like Moodle, I just don't like the copyright that prevents teachers from putting up resources that we need directly to the sight

**Senator Aulthouse:**

My issue is with the consistency of professors using it. Most of my courses don't even have a Moodle page; and those are classes with lecture slides

**Vice-President Jacobs:**

If Moodle was more widely used, students would be more appreciative of that. As an Economics student, our website is very poor. I couldn't even get a syllabus from the website, I had to e-mail a professor. Moodle is an alternative for departments to figure it out themselves

**CESA VP Franey:**

We don't use Moodle at all. If it was more consistent, we would know how to use it

**Representative Merrithew:**

There are a lot of aspects to moodle that don't need to be there. It just makes it cluttered and complicated.

**Representative Zahid:**

The way that Moodle is set up, and with the user interface functionality: Moodle is a free software that the university made it however they want. They didn't pay for the software but they paid for it to look nice, which it doesn't. If the user functionality, would you guys be more inclined to use it?

**Officer Lopez:**

But what are the alternatives, really?

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

Commerce uses something other than Moodle, as well as medical students

**Representative Zahid:**

Med students got really annoyed so they came up with their own thing called Helix. I used it last semester – it's better than Moodle but not quite there. Commerce uses QSB, I think. It's a lot nicer, and laid out better. Moodle is definitely the bottom, then Helix, then commerce, then Sidneyeve Matrix's platform

**Member at large:**

Especially with new TAs coming in, they don't know how to use Moodle.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

One of the biggest misconceptions about online learning is that the initial startup cost for migrating courses online. Putting lots of people in a big lecture hall is the cheap option.

**Vice-President Jacobs:**

I'm not in favour of one platform, I would just like consistency

**Year Society '15 President Stemp:**

I find a lot of courses that use Moodle, the professors take longer to put up the marks on Moodle.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

Professors have a tonne of complaints about Moodle. You can't export grades directly from Moodle to peoplesoft or solus. They have to go through everything again, and then input it in another

program. There is a lot of time wasted by professors or TAs doing that monotonous work.

**Representative Zahid:**

One of my profs has a script that does that for them automatically

**Representative Allan:**

I'm not particularly attached to any platform; but how many teacher hours have gone into learning Moodle. I'm worried that we've wasted all that training

**Year Society '15 President Stemp**

Do professors get training on Moodle? I have a lot of profs that say they don't know how to use it

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

Training is not required, but it is available.

**Year Society '15 President Stemp**

Do they get paid for this training?

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

I don't believe that's the case

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

It's just a matter of them going and being willing to learn. The resources are definitely available.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

If a professor is interested in putting material online for a class, there are financial resources that would help train them to do that

**Representative Allan**

Point of information: ITS has services to train people, and if the professors don't know that it's there, it's their ignorance

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

This next point is more about flexibility in terms of taking transfer credits from other institutions, and managing your time on campus. Have you ever skipped a class, or handed in something late due to other required activities? One of the proponents of online learning allows for increased flexibility at times where students have a lot of external or additional pressures. I would love to be in online courses right now, because my work interferes a lot with class. If you guys could give me a feel about how Queen's currently stands with online learning courses.

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

I wouldn't have been able to do her minor without online learning. My minor is psychology

**Representative Merrithew:**

I don't like it when professors add an online component just to flesh out the course. E.g. Online discussion groups I hate. You're supposed to read the essays that other people write and respond to them as well.

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

I don't want to say trapped, but there may be an expectation that you have more time to devote to this. There is a learning hours formula that says every student should spend 12 hours per class per week, whether in-person, online, reading, etc. This is the formula professors or departments use

**Year Society '15 Vice-President Suave:**

I like that online courses can be used as a backup. I switched my major this year, and online courses have let me stay within the 4-year undergraduate plan. I switched from Bio-Math to Bio.

**Year Society '15 President Stemp:**

In terms of assignment deadlines, if you have a personal issue and your professor has a policy, it's easier to go them in person. A family member passing or illness is hard to get through to a professor who has never met you before. My in-class professors were very understanding when I had pneumonia, but my online professor was not. There's a disconnect with online learning, you aren't as much their student

**Isabelle Duschaine:**

If you want to e-mail me at [aac@ams.queensu.ca](mailto:aac@ams.queensu.ca), you can ask any other questions that you may have. And don't forget that if you didn't get enough of this, there will be a town hall on this on the 12<sup>th</sup> of March, featuring catering provided by Common Ground.

**Statements By Members**

**Director Morphy:** As promised by Vice-President Jacobs, Board of Directors applications will be online tonight at midnight. They will be due March 7<sup>th</sup> at 4pm

**Representative Basilio:** I'd like to thank the executive council. I feel that Representative Prescott is not doing his job as an ASUS representative, and I would like to see him impeached instead of censured

**Member Draeger:** Speaking for myself, I am embarrassed to hear this society monitor the thoughts of others when they don't speak or act as members of a body like this, but as private people; saying things that may be unpopular with some of us. I don't necessarily agree or disagree with things that he says. To bring it forward as a censure or impeachment is equally inappropriate in my eyes, and there's no difference in my eyes. It's all an attempt to publicly discredit someone. A public censure is no different from that, and is no difference because it is a bigger public spectacle. What is the virtue of trying to remove someone who is nearing the end of their term as a member of this assembly, who in my eyes has never done anything to breach their responsibilities as a representative of students, and who has never done anything that intersects with the responsibilities of this body in that regard? I cannot wrap my mind around what went around this entire process. I think that this is something to even be this far is shameful. Why are we even talking about this? To have a special, public assembly about this. I'd like to make a point of information: What is the policy for a representative to step down from ASUS?

**President Whittaker:** I know truthfully that I don't know what our procedure is, but if you would like to make a motion then we can entertain that

**Member Draeger:** I have no intentions of doing that tonight, though you will be hearing from me in 2 weeks. If anything wants to address anything he talked about, I'm happy to answer those questions

**Speaker:** That's the reason why assembly has been called – to discuss these things where something other than assembly is happening. Any discussions or questions you have, I would like it if you left those for Tuesday. That's the whole point of the meeting being on Tuesday.

**Member Draeger:** I don't think it makes a lot of sense to only discuss it while they're going on.

**Speaker:** These are things we can bring up on Tuesday

**Year Society '13 President Galloway:** Before things happen, it's normal to discuss it. Not discussing things before it happen...It seems justifiable. What if I'm not available for Tuesday's assembly? If I don't have that right to do it here at the normal assembly, it's unfair to the members of the voting body. Other students might have other commitments on a Tuesday night

**Speaker:** We can take a poll, then, on whether or not to discuss it tonight or Tuesday

**President Whittaker:** Point of Information: You're totally allowed to discuss things tonight. The reason we made the decision to postpone the discussion for the special assembly was primarily because Representative Prescott wasn't able to attend tonight, and for people to prepare for the nature of the debate. If we want to discuss it tonight, we absolutely can. Given that the motion will be happening in this assembly, it's nice for our discussion to have a meaning, but we can talk about it tonight if you would like to.

**Member at large:**

There's a bit of a snag going on here. We're saying we don't want to have the debate tonight, but we're also having a discussion about converting the equity position to a commissioner position. I think we should have a discussion tonight to hear as many voices as possible

**Officer Lopez:**

We're actually striking that from the discussion period, and those two motions will be addressed later

**Representative Palia:**

President Whittaker talked earlier about comments Representative Prescott made earlier. I would like a clarification on what he said.

**President Whittaker:**

It was a post made on a member's Facebook, I can distribute if needed.

**Speaker:** Let's keep that until question period

**Year Society '13 President Galloway:**

Apologies for being late, I had my ThankQ right before this

**Representative Basilio:**

My wish to discuss this tonight is because we as a society have to give 2 weeks notice for impeachment. I believe we should take a poll on whether the society would like to censure or impeach, for that timing reason. Regardless of the timing of the year, it is inappropriate for a representative to be making those comments

**Member Draeger:**

What's always inappropriate is to pretend very publicly that what the member is doing is something other than expressing – (cut off)

**Representative Basilio:**

Point of privilege, I take offense

**Member Draeger:**

I think that it's ridiculous that we can remove somebody from the society for comments made as a person

**Representative Allan:**

My two cents: I'm worried by your comments, and you do have to represent the society as a representative

**Speaker:** I'm going to end this now.

**Question Period****Old Business****New Business****Motion 3: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy, as seen in Appendix A"**

Commissioner Ghavami:

- What was formally known as mind-find is rewritten to ASUS tutoring
- It's a fairly standard policy, just reflects some of the daily operational changes
- Matching is now done online and is facilitated by 3 directors and a deputy
- If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them, but the policy is pretty self-explanatory

Moved by: Kimia Ghavami

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passed

**Motion 3.5: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy regarding the change of Equity Officer to Equity and Diversity Commissioner"****Equity Office Lopez:**

- We're changing the policy tonight to coincide with the hiring of next year's council
- Even though the application went out, the position is changing
- We want these changes to go forward to help transitioning for the new individual who is sitting as equity commissioner (if this motion passes) to give them a better sense of the responsibilities for next year
- Changes in policy mainly deal with changing the word "officer" to "commissioner"
- We restructured the office hours such that most hours are in the core, and some are outside of the core to be more accessible
- Last semester I was in the Polson room
- The equity commissioner can figure out what would work best for them
- With section C-19 in the ASUS policy (in regards to the Human Resources officer), we're transferring internal disputes to be more in this external body.
- We're also adding (in C-21) that the equity officer has more of a focus on advocacy
- Other bodies are developing these policies
- We want a commissioner who can respond strongly to Arts and Science concerns
- I've also added a provision for the equity handbook to be regularly maintained
- Developing equity training for chairs
- I'd like to ammend this to say speaker instead of CEO, because it's more in their role
- If you have any questions, let me know



**Representative Basilio:**

- Concerned about ASUS human resources officer. If ASUS does not approve this, then the policy changes will be dead

**Officer Lopez:**

This is currently in policy, they just haven't currently been hired

**President Whittaker:**

I believe it's policy C-9. It's in the works for having a human resource officer

**Member at large:**

Are there any further changes to be made?

**Officer Lopez:**

- Only honoraria changes.
- If the assembly package is correct, there should be a few more motions coming up that change an existing committee, as well as adding a new one.
- There are also the language changes of officer to commissioner

**Member at large:**

- I noticed one change is what the equity commissioner would be advocating. We're getting rid of political ideology. I think that the society should be respecting political ideologies. My other point is that I'm afraid that we're getting into an area of redundancy. Why should this body be recreating something that's already being done, which would just increase costs

**Officer Lopez:**

- I'll address the first one. I'm open to an amendment to not have that change. ASUS is supposed to be a politically neutral body, so I didn't feel that that would be reflective of our constitutional policy. I would consider that change friendly
- Your second concern: The media shapes certain stereotypes for race, orientation, etc. Two seminars were had on body image and cyber bullying. That's why these policy changes are being brought forward in the sense that we're expanding our role. The equity office was originally external to ASUS. There was a fallout back in 2008 when an ASUS member made a comment that was inequitable, and it caused a huge public concern. It brought forth the question "Does ASUS care about equity issues?". Slowly the equity office has grown. We've taken on new initiatives. We want to engage the public and make sure students are aware that these issues exist, and that there's somebody advocating them for the Arts and Science side. The difference is that we've had two assemblies discussing mental health, and that there are different issues that affect Arts and Science students
- We want all views represented, which the AMS might not necessarily do
- This is why the equity officer role is being expanded

Moved by: Nikolas Lopez

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

**Motion 4: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy, as seen in Appendix B"**

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- This year, we've felt that it was necessary to introduce a second deputy who would be largely responsible for the tutoring service
- The service now includes nearly 900 students, and management of that number of students is very time consuming
- The directors for the service each have 5 office hours
- They are volunteers, and it seemed like it was a large load to place on just the directors
- The deputy position would be able to take a bit of that load off, as an honorarium receiving position
- I think with this justification, you can see why we need a second deputy

Moved by: Kimia Ghavami

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion approved

**Motion 5: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy, as seen in Appendix C"**

**Officer Lopez:**

- Most of the changes are for wording

Moved by: Nikolas Lopez

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 14

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion approved

**Motion 6: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy, as seen in Appendix D"**

**Lopez:**

- Something I developed on my own
- This committee engages in various social media environments
- They'd look at equity issues on campus and around the world
- Engaging Kingston as a whole
- To get a greater sense of what really goes on
- I think one of the concerns that we might have regarding this is cost
- I don't think this committee will incur a large cost
- It is local, they won't have an exorbitant budget
- They will be working with various groups on Queen's
- An on-campus discussion about these issues is a creative outlet for people to develop skills regarding media relations
- Queen's doesn't offer a media related program, and this would be a perfect route for it

Moved by: Nikolas Lopez

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 12

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion approved

**Motion 7: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy, as seen in Appendix E"**

**Officer Lopez:**

- Section G3 is the outreach committee. I'm scrapping that entire committee and putting this one in place
- Ongoing role for the Equity Commissioner
- Looks at what Queen's and other universities are doing
- Develop our own recommendations as to what works well, what doesn't
- Having students who are interested in this policy research and who have a passion for dealing with policy, it's something they'd definitely want to apply to
- A chance to see how institutions address these kinds of issues

**Member at large:**

- Quick question about what the prior committee did: was this a broader committee, and now it's focused directly on equity?

**Officer Lopez:**

- Research and outreach committee was the old name
- I don't think it currently runs in an effective way
- Focusing it on public advocacy is more important
- They can still do their research and outreach, but it's more based on how this impacts students, and what ASUS should be doing in terms of advocating for student issues

**Member at large:**

- Did you consider the reason it wasn't effective is because it was a committee?
- Would it be better to have one or two officers who did this?
- Delegating research roles is ineffective

**Officer Lopez:**

- The reasoning I saw it being ineffective is ultimately because the equity office added the committee at AGM last year, it was poor timing for chairs and members to apply
- Doing this early will let us have a foot-in for a new equity commissioner to be hired
- In terms of your concern about the equity officer, there is a wide range of issues on campus and it's difficult to tackle them all as two people. Having a team brings different perspectives in, and it really strengthens the relations

Moved by: Nikolas Lopez

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 18

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion approved

**Motion 8: "That ASUS Assembly select one (1) assembly member and one (1) member at large to sit on The Tartan Hiring Committee for next year's Editor-In-Chief and Business Manager"**

Sarah Kucharczuk:

- Next year is going to be huge for the tartan, and you can be part of the hiring committee

**Nominations:**

Year Society '15 President Stem decline

Representative Zahid accept

Member Williams accept

Member Mattiusi accept

Member Defrancesco accept

**Speaker:** Can the three members at large come up please?

**Member Williams:**

- My interest as somebody currently working with ASUS:
- I was at board of directors meeting where they announced their hard launch
- I'd really like to be on the team, having followed its first year closely

**Member Defrancesco:**

- I work for The Journal now, I'm here on Journal business
- I'm happy to take this on
- I have experience on the production side of the journal

**Member Mattiusi:**

- I'm an ASUS member and I want to get more involved

**Representative Basilio:**

What is the biggest issue in your opinion for The Tartan in the coming year?

**Member Williams:**

- It's a startup. Just the fact that it's new is a double-edged sword. It needs to be managed carefully to make sure it stays in a positive direction

**Member Defrancesco:**

- Editorial autonomy and the lack of print publication. Coming from The Journal perspective, it's well established. To have this as direct competition, you either want to emulate or innovate. Whether or not to bring in print aspects, and what level of editorial autonomy is actually needed

**Member Mattiusi:**

- Management, because it is a startup
- Any member of this committee should be focusing on the best team that can get it properly running and working

**Representative Allan:**

- What's one thing you hate about the Queen's Tartan website?

**Member Defrancesco:**

- Honestly, I only have good things to say about it
- The aesthetic elements are great
- All criticisms are strictly editorial

**Member Williams:**

- I think it looks great as well
- One thing I noticed is that it's tough to navigate on the smaller screen
- It also doesn't work well on a smartphone because Twitter/Facebook plug-ins are too small

**Member Mattiusi**

- In terms of critiquing the website, though I haven't seen the website, The Tartan should be aware that it remains at the level that it currently is on all devices, small or large.

Vote:

Allie: 12  
Defrancesco: 1  
Mattiusi: 3

**Speaker:** Member Williams, and Representative Zahid, can you speak to this issue?

**Representative Zahid:**

- Working at the journal this year, I've seen what they've struggled with and what can improve
- Also working as a web developer, I can help from that perspective
- I hate that massive banner on the front of the website
- It's good to have competition because it makes everyone else strive

**Director Morphy:**

- What characteristics do you think make a good business manager?

**Representative Zahid:**

- Somebody who's cutthroat. I'd quantify them as a hustler.
- Also somebody who has the authority to work the editorial side
- A good people person

**Member at Large:**

- My question is that with Allison Williams as the incoming Academic Affairs Commissioner, is there potentially a conflict of interest for anything that is written in The Tartan that covers the academic affairs commissioner portfolio?

**Member at Large:**

- We don't feel that there's a large conflict of interest because the person coming into their role won't be actively in that role until May 1<sup>st</sup>, by which point the other position will have ended

Moved by: Sarah Kucharczuk

Seconded by: Jeremy Bruce

Vote:

For: 15

Against: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion passes

**Motion 9: "That ASUS Assembly approve the changes to ASUS policy, as seen in Appendix F"**

**Deputy Commissioner Bourne:**

- Proxying for Zaeem because he has a midterm
- This policy amendment came as a result due to the electoral results
- I will say that from our experience (myself, Speaker Kasraee, President Whittaker), in terms of moving forward for ASUS, there's a section in policy about paper balloting procedures if there was a mix-up, but not for electronic
- This new policy reflects AMS policy
- We have a mechanism in place to ensure everything is resolved equitably and in everybody's best interest

**Representative Basilio:**

- If only 2 teams remain and neither has reached 50+1%, the team with the highest number of votes shall win

**President Whittaker:** Point of information: Objections are considered spoiled ballots

**Representative Lively**

- My concern is that any ballot which doesn't put on a second preference will be considered spoiled
- If we don't force people to vote in the first place, they shouldn't have to vote for more than one team
- If they believe that only one team is fit to run this organization, then they should be able to only vote for one team
- If they're given the choice to only put down one person, but their ballot becomes spoiled, they would probably be pissed off if they knew about it.

**Deputy Commissioner Bourne:**

- Nothing forces a second preference ranking
- If I felt there was only one candidate running that I felt was suitable, there's nothing preventing me from only voting once
- If there are objections, and spoiled ballots and it ends up being less than 50%, then there are methods in place for the CEO to determine the outcome

**Representative Lively:**

- I'd like to amend the motion to remove "IV part D if there is no second highest preference indicated on the ballot, then the ballot shall be spoiled"

**President Whittaker:**

- Friendly

**Vice-President Franey:**

- It wouldn't let me submit my ballot if there were two positions and you only wanted to vote for one

**President Whittaker:**

- What position was that for?

**Vice-President Franey:**

- Senator

**President Whittaker:**

- It shouldn't have been that way.

**Deputy Commissioner Bourne:**

- There will be a ranked set of preference, instead of "pick two"

**Representative Basilio:**

- Speaking to that amendment:
- "If your votes are redistributed and your first choice has the lowest pick, what happens to your vote after that?"

- If you only picked one and that team didn't win, what happens to the vote?
- Their vote would be considered spoiled

**President Whittaker:**

- Wouldn't that depend on whether or not we were using a STV vote?

**Representative Basilio:**

- That's what this policy is for, to prevent run-off votes
- We should say that it is spoiled if you only pick one and your team drops off

**Member at large:**

- I think we're making a mountain out of a molehill
- If you don't vote for someone, your vote won't count for them
- I don't think we need any additional spoiled language involved in that

Moved by: Benjamin Bourne

Seconded by: Zaeem Anwar

Vote:

For: 9

Against: 0

Abstain: 3

Motion passes

**Discussion Period:**

**Representative Basilio**

- Add a discussion topic about Representative Prescott

Vote:

For: 12

Against: 1

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

*Changes to the ASUS Board of Directors – Presented by Chelsey Morphy*

**Director Morphy:**

- First year that board has been active and fulfilling their mandate
- Myself and other members of the board have found there are gaps in policy, and areas to be improved upon
- I'd like your feedback on those changes
- They'd be going forward in two weeks
- I want the feedback now so that changes can be made based upon it
- There's a series of smaller things and two major things
- The addition of two new directors:
  - Currently we have 9 directors
  - Proposal to add one 1-year director (equity office/equity commission portfolio)
  - Proposal to add one 2-year director (special projects, which would cover formal, The Tartan, and Orientation)
  - We want to expand the scope of board to match the scope of society
  - We'd like to have directors that match all of the different portfolios that we have currently going on

- Lots of other things are wording, defining what the job of a board member is specifically
- Changing my role so that this role only gets a tie-breaking vote, rather than a vote and a tie-breaking vote
- Constitutional changes for those two directors, and policy changes for wording and otherwise

**Officer Lopez:**

- That's fantastic
- For those who are concerned that there isn't enough accountability, it increases our accountability
- We ran into this issue when we were approving strategic plans and the budget with the board because there was nobody there to review my strategic plan or budget, so it was an awkward situation
- I didn't have the same relationship as other people did with their respective board members

**Vice-President Jacobs:**

- Fantastic direction for the board to be taking
- They can only increase their portfolio and continue to do the job that they were assigned to do with the extra hands that these positions lend
- Board of Directors has done a fantastic job this year, looking forward to what they do next year

**Member at Large:**

- Question: When the board meets, can people come out and watch it? And where do you meet?

**Director Morphy:**

- We've jumped around a lot. We tried to stay in the Polson room, then the Red Room, then the Red Room was busy
- They are open meetings, similar to the AMS board of directors we can have a closed session, but we have not chosen to do so

*Equity Office to the Commission – Presented by Nikolas Lopez*

- Struck from the Agenda

*Peter Green's Resignation – Presented by Representative Robin*

- Peter Green has submitted his resignation as Vice President Operations for the AMS
- There is a special assembly on Sunday to discuss this and to fill his vacancy
- What would this body like the AMS representatives push forward at this assembly, whether it's another election or who the current executive elects have put forward as a candidate

**Officer Lopez:** What's the procedure?

**Representative Lively:**

- The executive elect have already put forward their candidate, who is Nicola Plummer
- She would need to be ratified by a 2/3 vote from assembly, and she would be Vice-President Operations for AMS

**Senator Slobodin:**

- Point of information: If that vote fails, assembly can put forward their own recommendations or call for a referendum for that position



**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- The currently policy is pretty fair in that the students elect a team of three, we still have two students who are elected
- If we put our trust in those two and the room full of elected individuals, then the best decision will be made
- I see democracy present in the existing policy, in that there are already a lot of elected positions who would have a say

**Senator Yang:** Point of information: If assembly puts forth their own representative, how does that process?

**Senator Slobodin:**

- They would be put forward the same way that the other nomination was. It would still require a 2/3 vote

**Representative Robin:**

- There's a gray area on whether policy lets the two executive elects appoint the third member
- The constitution states that it doesn't handle with incoming executives, so assembly is in charge of interpreting that.
- To my knowledge, this hasn't been an issue in the past
- The other thing to consider was elected, and many of the votes placed to BGP were potentially put there due to the trust in Peter Green as a candidate

**Member at Large:**

- Constitution is clear that it's well within the purview of the two remaining executive members
- If two elected members remain, then I believe it is okay to nominate and appoint a new member
- I do however agree that the constitution is ambiguous

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- I agree with the ambiguity and it should be adjusted
- The spirit of the constitution is the same whether or not the position is elected
- In previous terms, representatives make the decision for the following term
- Fourth years have the right of voting for next year's AMS executive, even though we won't be here next year

**Senator Aulthouse:**

- Regarding the ambiguity: the policy refers to the current executive
- When you get elected as executive, there is no further ratification required

**Year Society '13 President Galloway:**

- Other students have approached me and they feel like the AMS having the vote for the new member of the three of them is too small of a body
- Many have told me that all of the power to decide who the new person is is within a small group
- Students feel more pushed away than ever from the AMS
- We want students to feel comfortable
- I have to agree in that it's a huge decision to be made

- So many students cared about the voting for the place to be decided so quickly

**Member at large:**

- I believe in representative democracy, but I don't believe there's anything wrong with that assembly making the decision
- It's not just a question of democracy, it's a question of trust
- There could be a breach of trust with the public
- It is not a question of can we do it, but whether we should

**President Whittaker:**

- We have an interesting precedent in our own assembly
- Both Representative Zahid and Representative Allan were nominated for elected positions after they weren't filled
- Obviously Berkok and Pritchard are qualified members, but I think Year Society '13 President Galloway's point was a good one
- It might turn people off and make them feel disenfranchised

**Officer Lopez:**

- Going from what president Galloway said, as well as member Donaldson: What do we want from this discussion?
- Is it to say "What should the ASUS representative do?"
- Or "Listen to the qualifications that the nominee has for the position and then make a decision, or just to stamp our decision on it here?"

**Representative Robin:**

- This is part of the process, consulting this society, to get some feedback on what they want to see in terms of this

**Member at Large Allan:**

- Policy Section about assembly's availability to appoint somebody new. Section 2.02.04
- First, the executive AMS by nature is elected
- They are also interacting with the administration
- When you have one executive who has not gone through that elective mandate, it could change the ability of that executive to effectively represent students, as they were appointed
- The issue will become that it is important that VP Ops be replaced quickly for the smooth transition of the AMS
- We have to set the precedent that democracy will always prevail
- Holding a by-election to replace VP Ops would throw a wrench in the operations of the AMS, but I think the ASUS representatives should be going to assembly and proposing that assembly follow section 2.02.04 in policy

**Representative Robin:**

- The default assumption is that May 1<sup>st</sup>, the new executive takes over
- The problem is, to my knowledge, that this has never occurred in the history of the AMS
- We don't know that this is directly applicable
- We also don't know what affect a nomination would have in student confidence in the incoming AMS executive
- We don't know the effects of a bi-election and its implications on the effectiveness of the executive next year

**Vice-President Jacobs:**

- I think one of the most important things for an executive to have is a team dynamic so that the AMS can be as effective and as strong as they advocate
- Ensuring that the current two executive members can work well with whoever replaces the resigned member
- You're looking at two not great options
- Democratic route: Person might not work well with the group
- Non-democratic route: Person would work better

**Member Anwar:**

- With ASUS policy, you can call a society general meeting, where every member of that society has a vote. Sort of like our AGM
- If the issue becomes that the AMS assembly is too small of a body, the middle ground between just assembly and a bi-election is to call a general assembly for AMS, where every student would receive a vote
- This is a collection of positives from both options

**Senator Slobodin:**

- The AMS does have policy that can be called with relative ease
- AGM and referendums are not viewed as substantially different, the only difference is that people need be physically present

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- If I was electing a team, a president, and a Vice-President of University Affairs, I'm trusting these individuals with very big decisions regardless
- If you have a Vice-President of University Affairs who is in charge of serious academic issues, and a president who is working with administration at the highest level, why is there concern (save the small percentage of people who voted solely for Peter Green) for the decisions of the team?
- Perhaps the manner in which the news was released, and the portrayal of the resignation has a big role in the lack of trust and perceived lack of trust
- This is unfair, we're viewing a biased representation of the constitution and what it means to be democratic
- Whenever you elect a democratic individual, you put your trust in them
- Furthermore, you have assembly which is a room full of elected individuals chosen to represent you
- Perhaps trust is shaky, but I think that we need to look at if students have trust in those members, which is a much larger issue than this

**Member at large**

- We elect MPs
- My only reservation is the idea of trust
- I want to respond to the point of the vice president
- Let's not forget that they decided to be a team
- This process wouldn't guarantee that even if they appoint Nicola Plummer that they would get along with her, because they ran on the pledge that they would work well with Peter Green
- Nicola Plummer was with team TNL, who lost the election
- We're going to replace somebody who won the election with somebody who lost the election? That's very problematic

- We don't know if Green was the most popular member of BGP
- To replace an elected person with a non-elected person is almost "read-between-the-lines" and saying to the students that they made the wrong choice, and that the executives have to make the decision
- We should preserve the incoming class' trust in the system
- If there's no trust in the system, then people won't listen

**Senator Slobodin:**

- I supported team BGP
- I like that the ASUS reps to the AMS bring forth this conversation to hear our thoughts
- It speaks to the dedication of your role
- That being said, I think there are a lot of gray areas
- Take our thoughts, but don't use anything we say as binding
- Don't take a single mandate walking away from this vote

**Representative Lively:**

- I'd like to address trust: Trust is revocable
- Given the allegedly unscrupulous behaviour that happened and later led to this resignation, I believe we should wait for more information about what actually happened before making this decision
- We should be questioning the backroom politics that has happened given the quick nature of the executive's decision
- How did they come up with Nicola Plummer as VP Ops so quickly?
- The meeting is set to happen in several days, and many students won't even be aware or be able to go to this meeting
- We can sit here and discuss it, and then myself and other representatives can go to the AMS to discuss it, but that's still a very small fraction of the society
- Given the timely nature of this, we should question the decision making
- If assembly rejects the nomination, I don't believe we have the right to nominate another candidate at that meeting, because there has to be a certain given notice (that is in policy) before you nominate someone
- I don't believe anything could happen other than Nicola Plummer being elected or not

**Senator Yang:**

- Adding to the recurring theme of trust and to allude more to BGP specifically, I recall during the debates throughout their election, they emphasised a lot of two-way communication and consultation with students
- For those reasons, I think it was very hypocritical to take such quick action without consulting the students
- Perhaps it's not BGP specifically, but the process
- It just seems to skip the student voice, and it seems that there isn't that two-way communication that was outlined when BGP was advocating their candidacy for AMS
- It impedes with transitioning, given the timing, but I also think that there is more communication required from the students

**Representative Zahid:**

- I have the utmost trust in the two candidates right now, and what they're doing is the best for the student body and for the AMS, and nothing for themselves

**Representative Allan:**

- Building on Representative Zahid's point
- I agree that there is a lack of two-way communication; however, they are also trying to respect each others' privacy and remain business-like

**Member at Large:**

- Hopefully the ASUS rep to the AMS does the right thing
- I think something that's lacking from this equation is the public communication
- There's been no real communication from members Berkok and Pritchard publicly
- I'd like some communication directly from those two because of the absence

**Year Society '15 President Stemp:**

- There was a statement made on the AMS website or Facebook, so there has been a formal and public explanation, though it was recent and so it may not have been available to everybody before the meeting

**Representative Robin:**

- I'm going to leave it after this
- One problematic thing after this, from the AMS constitution, the executives are voted in by the student body at large, not by AMS assembly
- There's a reason why it's that way
- One thing that's problematic is that whoever is nominated to this position will have a different mandate than the rest of the executive team in that they will be put in their position either by the executives or by assembly, and not directly by the student body, unlike the other two candidates

**Member at Large:**

- There is a post, but it reiterates that they were reconciling differences with team members, and I don't believe it to be sufficient information

*Discussion regarding Alexander Prescott's Comments – Presented by Daniel Basilio*

**Representative Basilio:**

*Straw poll:* 5 people do not know what the comments were

- The reaction should be more severe than censureship
- I'd like to discuss whether to remove or censure, without talking about whether or not to do so
- I'd like to gauge the feelings in the room on whether it should be a discussion of censureship or removal

**Senator Slobodin:**

- Censorship would be shutting them up
- Censureship is reprimanding

**Speaker:**

- There was a picture on someone's wall
- The picture conveys that when there is a case of rape, it is never the victim's fault.

**Representative Robin:**

- Can we get this on the projector?

**Officer Lopez:**

- This discussion is about how to run the discussion on Tuesday.

- We want to have a discussion on what this body's mandate should be, and what we should be doing to complete our functions within the constitution of ASUS, especially regarding equity and social justice
- Important to create an inclusive environment
- It shouldn't be a summary

**Representative Robin:**

- I don't think we can have this discussion if everybody isn't on the same page
- We should be discussing the procedure, but without the proper context, we're walking into the dark

Strawpoll on whether or not to see the comments:

For: 14

Against: 3

***Warning: Trigger language regarding sexual assault and rape is used both in these comments and throughout the rest of the minutes***

**Speaker:**

- Here are the comments:
- "It's important to note, however, that some of the onus in these situations should lie with the victim. I'm not condoning rape in any circumstance; it is a violation of one's liberty and must be treated as the despicable act that it is. I am saying, though, that it's akin to an unarmed person wearing valuable jewellery walking down a street in a rough neighbourhood at night; they'll be at a higher risk to have their property stolen. The thief still commits the crime, like a rapist is the one to blame with rape. However, the victim was in a situation where there was a high risk for such a crime to occur. Thus, the victim showed negligence and naïveté for putting themselves in such a position. We cannot simply ignore the context of these milieus."

**Representative Basilio:**

- The purpose of the discussion is not directly about the comments, but about whether there should be a censure, a removal of position, or nothing

**Year Society '13 President Galloway:**

- I agree with Representative Basilio
- If my decision was to argue for an option that was neither of those, would we not be getting into the content?
- If you think it's bad, then you're going to pick one of those two options, if you think it's good then you pick something else

**Speaker:**

- We as a society are not discussing the ethics of the comments, but our actions as a society moving forward

**Year Society '13 President Galloway:**

- The implications of these two options is that there is something unethical about this

**Member Draeger:**

- The contextualization of the question at hand is one that presupposes the negativity and inappropriateness of this

**Representative Basilio:**

- As reps to the AMS, we are in the public eye. Because of that, we are representing this society as elected members
- Saying something against the mission statement against this society, is a breach of your position
- Saying something that alienates people, is a breach of your position
- The representative cannot claim to be representing all students

**Member Draeger:**

- On what grounds have students given us the authority to remove him, as an elected position?

**Representative Basilio:**

- Students elect them to represent them
- We as a body can determine whether or not they should be representing students
- We can choose if they are effectively representing students

**Member at large:**

- I want to make the point that if you are a representative, every decision you make will alienate someone
- If you propose a budget, some people won't want that budget to pass
- This body needs to decide whether it thinks these issues poorly represent what the member was elected for
- He is presenting an argument, and if we are saying that by presenting this argument he is out of line, then that doesn't make sense as it is his job to debate
- There's this idea that in a parliamentary democracy, you have to voice all opinions, no matter how ugly, to acquire the best option

**Representative Robin:**

- I know it's hard to separate what we just saw from the discussion at hand, but ultimately the discussion that we're having revolves around whether people can divide their public positions from their private lives
- I think that from experience, I have not agreed with every representative that has sat on this council
- In the past, there were representatives that made comments both publicly and very vocally in regular settings on campus and on Facebook which offended my identity, and offended almost everything that I believe in, but I did not see it as my place to take action, because even if they held these opinions which I found despicable, it was not my decision
- This was not a comment made by the Alex Prescott Rep Facebook page, it was a comment made by his personal account
- If we're talking about something the society should be done, I think that censure is the only available option
- Given that this isn't being done in an official capacity, we shouldn't be discussing an impeachment procedure
- If the society wishes to distance itself from the comments made by Representative Prescott, that's one thing
- However, it is not a mark of his ability to perform his duties
- How many of us haven't said things on Facebook that couldn't be construed as controversial somewhere

**Representative Basilio**

- Thank you for the points, I love the discussion
- If I were to come out publicly as homophobic, that is against the very mission statement and inclusiveness of what ASUS represents
- As a representative of ASUS to any other body, I may not necessarily be agreeing with those views, but you can't be

**Representative Robin:**

- Based in that are very heavy assumptions on whether the comments were right or wrong
- I believe that Representative Basilio is presupposing that the comments are wrong

**Member Draeger:**

- I would also like to say that rep basilio is presupposing that the comments are wrong

**Commissioner Tsukahara:**

- I think there's some confusion about having differentiating opinions and the ability to represent the fundamental rights of our members
- For example, if somebody were to make a decision on a budget that I was not happy with, there are many ways that I can go about arguing that
- In my opinion, in this issue, the purpose of this society is to represent the students, and their rights and comments, in particular like the one that was made here do not respect the rights of members, and don't allow people to contribute in the society
- The government of Canada recognizes that the victim is never to blame in instances of sexual assault and/or rape, and therefore it is a human right that we have to be upholding
- To compare the nature of the comments and the effect that it has on students to these other issues is extremely disrespectful to our students and against the nature of this society
- I urge us to think about the difference between differentiating opinions and creating a safe space for students

**Member Draeger:**

- We can censure Representative Prescott, we can impeach him, but let he who is without sin cast the first stone
- Living in a liberal and tolerant society, and building liberal and tolerant institutions around ourselves requires also tolerating those things that offend us. Those things that we don't like or that we don't agree with
- All of these comments condemning Representative Prescott have been that the things he had to say were fundamentally anathema to the mission statement of the organization. And you can't prove that
- He would say, and I would say for him that he did not have that intent
- People in this room who know him would know that he would not condone rape
- If that's the basis on which we are trying to professionally persecute and punish him, then I believe that to be quite shameful

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- In the language that we use, this is not a condemnation of Representative Prescott
- In debating about this, I'm not sure what the appropriate action is
- The discussion does presuppose that the comments were against the views of the society
- The comments that he gave were indeed putting his work as a representative
- The degree of alienation is not about disagreeing on a budget
- The comments that were made, as outlined by many of the objectives, not just the general



mission statement, there was definitely a violation of those

- I feel many members of the society have lost some trust and no longer feel represented by this individual
- Whether or not the comments were made condoning rape or rapists, it's the perception that we have to evaluate, because it is the perception that affects his role as a representative
- There is indeed a difference between disagreeing over a budget and causing a loss of trust or alienation

**Member Draeger:**

- Can you show me how that's not what I'm alleging?
- You're saying it's okay to say whatever you want on things that don't offend me.

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- When you bring up an opinion that is against the other members of the society, it is different
- Discussions about a budget are unlikely to create a space where a person might feel unsafe, whereas these comments have elevated to that level

**Member at large:**

- This body is making a value judgement on prescott's statement, which is if it is appropriate for a representative to be making these sort of comments
- Someone who has experienced rape or assault has fundamentally lost their liberty to be able to fully participate in society
- I believe Representative Prescott's statement is that someone who has gone through this can no longer fully regain their liberty, lest they put themselves at risk of this happening again
- I don't necessarily agree with this, but that is his view
- For somebody to read that who has experienced rape, or assault, that would be very hard to read
- To say that you can't be in a place where you were before the event
- I can say that his comment is stupid, and he has the same right to give his opinion
- It's under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that he can speak freely
- To censure or impeach Representative Prescott, that's violating his right to freedom of speech
- I do not see any association with ASUS or Queen's student government, and that's terrible
- Everyone around this table has to be able to speak freely in their own personal lives
- To say that someone cannot speak freely, regardless of their opinion compared to the social norm is wrong

**Representative Allan:**

- Point of information: The right to free speech is within a reasonable limit

**Representative Lively:**

- I'm going to stand because it's well within my right to do so
- You can all hear me when I'm sitting, but I have a right to do so
- Every person in this room has the right to express their opinions in their own private life
- As long as they don't bring their opinions within this room, I don't believe it is our right to even be considering a censure or impeachment
- I'm not going to say what I think about those comments. It is not relevant to this discussion
- Do we want to be thought police?
- Members at large who are not part of this assembly should be coming forward and complaining

- If the remarks he made were so bad, we would have people coming in and demanding those actions

**Commissioner Tsukahara:**

- I'm going to address the issue of value judgements on representative prescott's character
- I'm not going to comment on his motivation or intentions
- I'm going to respond about individuals coming forth with complaints:
  - We are approaching the subject of sexual assault and rape with a very limited understanding of the implications
- The amount of reported cases of sexual assault and rape is very low compared to the number of incidents. This is due to the shame associated
- To say that people should have come to us about this

**Representative Lively:**

- Point of personal privilege: What I was trying to convey was that those offended should be coming here as individuals to speak out

**Commissioner Ghavami:**

- Several people have come to us with concerns and I am not only speaking for myself

**Commissioner Tsukahara:**

- We are talking about the overall social pressure and implications of people coming forward
- People shouldn't feel unsafe coming here

**Representative Lively**

- If those people shouldn't have to defend their rights, should we not respect representative prescott's rights? He's not even here

**Representative Robin:**

- Point of information, I would like to know what exactly was meant by commiss tsukahara
- "Those who are offended should not have to defend their right"

**Commissioner Tsukahara:**

- What I'm speaking of is the issue of them coming forward publicly or to assembly
- If a member of ASUS has to come forward and argue that the comments were made violated their rights and that they aren't being properly represented by the representative is ultimately a violation of what we are arguing here, which is that someone who has been victimized should not have to come forward to defend their victimization

**Member Donaldson:**

- I think the problem that we have here is that there is a large divide here
- The points you make that you shouldn't have to defend your rights if you feel someone is infringing upon your rights
- I think it's wrong to make a value statement on the comments made by Representative Prescott on something that is obviously disputed
- There are varying degrees and opinions on what he said
- I also want to point out that if we censured or impeached him, it is not a victimless thing. This could affect him largely, especially through publications and impact his professional career
- I don't think we can prove beyond a reasonable doubt that what he said was harmful or

inequitable

**Senator Slobodin:**

- I think the path we should go down is censure and not impeachment, partially because we need to value how representative the statements are of Queen's students
- I've overseen a social issues commission whose goal was to mandate students
- We can't say that if we go too far condemning people rather than trying to educate them, then we lose that part of our mandate and we aren't doing our job
- Censuring for this body is a reprimand and distances the organization and demonstrates that we don't agree with his statements, but we can't argue that his opinions aren't representative of Queen's students
- Our opinions are not congruent and synchronized with students all the time, and we have to recognize that aspect of what we do

**President Whittaker:**

- We have the commitment to uphold the Charter of Rights and Freedoms
- Taking things off the face value of this offense is a tough game to get into
- Sexual assault cases have no place in a rational court of law
- I'm reaffirming our commitment to censure rather than removal
- We don't agree with certain aspects of the comments, though we don't agree with a removal because it does not agree with the democratic nature of the society
- Removing his representative power doesn't make a lot of sense given that he's primarily elected to keep us accountable
- My all-inclusive comment is that it's not our job to dictate his tenure, but that we can distance ourselves from his comment

**Member Donaldson:**

- Ignorant or offensive comments have to be proven to create an environment of unsafety or danger
- There has to be some sort of hateful environment created by the comments

**Deputy Commissioner Bourne:**

- There's been a lot of talk about the Charter of Rights and Freedoms
- We're not trying to stop Member Prescott from saying anything, just expressing our discomfort or disapproval of the comments

**Representative Robin:**

- We're the Arts and Science Undergraduate society. Nobody here is taking a law degree, so I'd like to be very careful when talking about legal precedents and how to apply the charter of rights and freedoms
- We don't have the experience to judge whether these comments do violate the charter
- There's been talk about representatives and making comments how they represent the society and combat themselves
- If we are talking about what Representative Prescott did in a private capacity on his private facebook, and how that should be cause for censure, then we should also hold others responsible for their private comments
- We should obviously take ourselves seriously here, as our decisions do impact students both present and future
- I'd wager that not many students in Arts and Science can pick us out by name or by face as a representative

- I think that it's a bit of a jump to say that this has brought impacts upon the society given that he made the comment on his private Facebook page
- Going forward deciding whether we should censure him, it's an uncomfortable topic with very heavy connotations
- We cannot speculate on his motives for making these comments, and what exactly his intent was making these comments, without him being present to defend himself
- Nobody has a monopoly on the single best way to prevent rape
- Nobody has a monopoly on the best way to treat LGBT issues
- To say that because they have been offended that this view should be silenced has very big assumptions attached
- The last thing I want to point out is that though I see censure as the only legitimate course of action that we could possibly take in the scope of actions available to us, we should take this very seriously
- The only case that I can recall is the censure of Rector Dave in 2010 for comments he made in an official capacity as Rector of Queen's University before a gathering of 2000 students.
- I don't know if there's been a precedent set by this society, but that is the last public case that I can recall of a censure

#### **Representative Basilio:**

Point of information: In 2008, ASUS President Jacob Mantle. He was asked to resign due to comments he made on a private Facebook account, and that they were no longer able to represent students.

#### **Director Morphy:**

- I was hoping not to have to do this
- I myself am a victim of sexual assault and I did not want to come to assembly tonight because I did not want to talk about this
- I have friends who were also victims of sexual assault who have refused to come to assembly tonight
- I'm not a voting member of this body, and so I say these comments as a general member of ASUS
- People should know that there are victims who have been sexually assaulted

#### **Representative Lively:**

- I'm going to read you a quote from Voltaire: "I do not agree with what you have to say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it"
- I may not agree with Representative Prescott's comments, but I will defend his right to say them
- We all have the right to say what we want as private individuals
- We retain the right to tell him that he is wrong, or to remove him from Facebook
- This to me makes more sense than coming here in our public roles
- I don't think if we were to censure him that it would actually work, were we to talk about the practicality of it
- I believe in the fundamental right to freedom of speech, and I urge you to do so as well
- If you truly believe that what he said was wrong, tell him

#### **Member Crawford:**

- Facebook is private?
- Representative Prescott has 804 friends on Facebook.

- The internet is not private, and he is a visible person on campus
- The notion that his statement was private I do not think is valid, because so many people have seen that

**Representative Palia:**

- Reiterating Representative Basilio, I feel a little upset that we're discussing it this way
- We're not saying he can't go into the world and say whatever he wants as a person
- To bring up the charter of rights and freedoms as a freedom of speech issues

**Member Draeger:**

- I'd like to note for the assembly's benefit that there are presuppositions for Prescott's comments

**Speaker:**

- This point has been reiterated several times. If you have a new point to make, please make it

**Member Draeger:**

- I find it inappropriate that you are mocking me

**Speaker:**

- I apologise, I was not trying to mock you.

**Member Draeger:**

- Well I can see who's side you're on

**Officer Lopez:**

- Point of order: Can we straw poll to move to censure or move to impeach?

**Representative Robin:**

- Point of order: We should take a straw poll, but given that members have just excused themselves, their votes will not be reflected in the straw poll

**Member Draeger:**

- Point of information: how is a special assembly called? How has it been decided that this is happening on Tuesday

**President Whittaker:**

- As president I can call two types of meetings, a special general meeting (similar to GM) in section 5.0.02, I can also call a special assembly at 48 hours notice, and I set the schedule

**Member Draeger:**

- Point of information: What does this "straw poll" mean?

**President Whittaker:**

- We all came into this discussion understanding that the decision from the straw poll would be what I would take as the motion to move forward. It's binding in the sense that we're using assembly's discretion to move forward on what to do

**Member Draeger:**

- How are you going to present the information in light of not being a motion but a straw poll

**President Whittaker:**

- Just as it is, I won't lie and say that it is a formalized motion, everyone at the assembly will know how it was

**Speaker:**

- Results of straw poll is to move forward with censuring

**Member Donaldson:**

- I think what's appropriate is that if we believe it is appropriate for him to be censured, why not do it now?
- We're just going to repeat this very painful process in a more public form
- If the decision is to censure him, then let us censure him right now

Motion to open the agenda:

**Motion: "That ASUS Assembly open the agenda"**

Moved by: Member Donaldson

Seconded by: Member Draeger

Vote:

For: 3

Against: 8

Abstain: 0

Motion fails

**Speaker's Last Word:**

**Motion: "That ASUS Assembly close assembly"**

Moved by: Speaker Kasraee

Seconded by: John Whittaker

Vote:

For: 14

Against: 3

Abstain: 0

Motion passes

Ending time: 10:55