



# **42nd Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students**

---

January 6-7, 2010  
Hamilton, ON



## **Agenda**

1. Opening of the assembly/Call to order
2. Call for Quorum
3. Election of the plenary chair, CRO and secretaries
4. Adoption of the agenda
5. Adoption of the PM 2009 Minutes
6. Adoption of the Congress 2009 minutes
7. Membership proceedings
8. Hearing of Proposals
9. Hearing of Counter proposals
10. Elections/ratifications
11. Voting
12. Closing of the assembly/Adjournment

**Session opens at \_\_\_\_\_ EST**



## 1. Opening of the assembly/Call to order

The chair calls the assembly to order at 3:50pm EST

## 2. Call for quorum

The number of voting members present is 38 out of 47

## 3. Election of plenary chair and secretaries

	Proposal <b>42-CFES-1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Election of the plenary chair
<b>Mover:</b>	National Executive
<b>Language :</b>	Français

<b>Goal:</b>
To elect those individuals that will lead the plenary.

<b>Where as:</b>
------------------

<b>Be it resolved that:</b>
Ryan Campbell be elected as plenary chair.

<b>Result: carries</b>
<b>For:</b>
<b>Against</b>
<b>Abstain</b>



Proposal  
**42-CFES-2**

**Title:** Election of secretaries  
**Mover:** National Executive  
**Language :** Français

**Goal:**

To establish who will be the individuals taking the minutes for Congress plenary 2010.

**Where as:**

**Be it resolved that:**

Marie-Claude Hamelin and Marc Lindstrom (French) as well as Shahrzad Pedram and Julia Coleman (English) be elected as secretaries for the plenary session.

**Result: carries**

**For**

**Against**

**Abstain**



## 4. Adoption of the agenda

	Proposal
	<b>42-CFES-3</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Agenda
<b>Mover:</b>	National Executive
<b>Language:</b>	Francais

<b>Goal:</b>
To establish the order of proceedings for Congress 2010 plenary.

<b>Where as:</b>

<b>Be it resolved that:</b>
The agenda be adopted as circulated.

<b>Result: carries</b>
<b>For</b>
<b>Against</b>
<b>Abstain</b>

Note from N.E.: interim report will be mailed out with auditor's report in March.



## 5. Adoption of PM 2009 minutes

---

Proposal  
**42-CFES-4**

**Title:** Adoption of PM 2009 minutes  
**Mover:** National Executive  
**Language :** French

**Goal:**

To provide the members with documents that inform them of the discussions on the previous plenary motions.

**Where as:**

**Be it resolved that:**

The membership adopt the minutes of President's Meeting 2009 as detailed in the document "3rd General Assembly at President's Meeting of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students".

**Result: carries**

**For:**

**Against:**

**Abstain:**



## 6. Adoption of Congress 2009 minutes

---

Proposal  
**42-CFES-5**

**Title:** Adoption of Congress 2009 minutes  
**Mover:** National Executive  
**Language:** French

**Goal:**

To provide the members with documents that inform them of the discussions on the previous plenary motions.

**Where as:**

**Be it resolved that:**

The membership adopt the minutes of Congress 2009 as detailed in the document "41<sup>ST</sup> Annual General Meeting of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students".

**Result: carries**

**For:**

**Against:**

**Abstain:**



## 7. Elections and ratifications

	Proposal <b>42-CFES-6</b>
<b>Title:</b>	Vote tallies
<b>Mover:</b>	National Executive
<b>Language :</b>	English

<b>Goal:</b>
To increase interest in the election as well as understand the level of membership support for elected individuals.

<b>Where as:</b>

<b>Be it resolved that:</b>
The number of votes for each officer candidate and event bidder be noted at the end of the election.
<b>Be it further resolved that:</b>
Ballots be destroyed following announcement of results.

<b>Result: carries unanimously</b>
<b>For:</b>
<b>Against :</b>
<b>Abstain :</b>

NE: something we pass each year for following year. If there are people that vote 'no' you can seek out those people. Amendment: BRT ballots be destroyed.  
UofT: If we add this policy, does that mean we have to pass this motion every year?  
NE: In this case I believe we should re-evaluate this given the new voting system.  
Suggestion, have national councilors come up with the policy.



Proposal  
**42-CFES-7**

**Title:** Board of Directors for 2010-2011  
**Mover:** National Executive  
**Language :** English

**Goal:**

To ratify the CFES BOD for 2010-2011.

**Where as:**

**Be it resolved that:**

The CFES Board of Directors for 2010-2011 be :  
(For/Against/Abstain)

<u>Rob Stalker</u>	<u>President</u>
<u>Kevin Liu</u>	<u>V.P. Finance &amp; Administration</u>
<u>David Sharpe</u>	<u>Atlantic Ambassador</u>
<u>Athena Fotiou</u>	<u>Québec Ambassador</u>
<u>Brendan Wood</u>	<u>Ontario Ambassador</u>
<u>Morgan Tien</u>	<u>West Ambassador</u>
<u>Suzanne Smith</u>	<u>Congress Activity Manager</u>
<u>Courtney Lessard</u>	<u>CEC Activity Manager</u>
<u>Jeet Zandawala</u>	<u>ProMag General Manager</u>
<u>Sean Walsh</u>	<u>National Councilor</u>
<u>Shaunvir Sidhu</u>	<u>National Councilor</u>

**Result: carries unanimously**

**For:**

**Against :**

**Abstain :**

Western: How is ProMag Activity Manager normally chosen?

Chair: Chosen by Project Magazine, similar to how CEC and Congress select chairs.



Proposal  
**42-CFES-8**

**Title:** Vice-Presidents 2010-2011  
**Mover:** National Executive  
**Language :** English

**Goal:**

To ratify the Vice-Presidents for 2010-2011.

**Where as:**

**Be it resolved that:**

The following Vice-Presidents be ratified for 2010-2011:

Darshni Pillay

*VP Communications*

Charlsie Searle

*VP Services & Development*

**Result: carries unanimously**

**For:**

**Against:**

**Abstain:**



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-9

<b>Title:</b>	Commissioners 2010-2011
<b>Mover:</b>	National Executive
<b>Language :</b>	English

**Goal:**

To ratify CFES Commissioners for 2010-2011.

**Where as:****Be it resolved that:**

The following commissioners be ratified for 2010-2011:

_____	<i>Official Languages</i>
_____	<i>Social Issues</i>
_____	<i>International Relations</i>
_____	<i>National Capital Liaison</i>
_____	<i>Information Technology</i>
_____	<i>Charity</i>
_____	<i>Academic</i>
_____	<i>Complementary Education</i>

**Result:****For:****Against :****Abstain :**

NE: Motion to table until 3rd session tomorrow. Have not been selected yet.  
Carries unanimously.



## Proposal

### **42-CFES-10**

**Title:** Event Hosts  
**Mover:** National Executive  
**Language :** English

**Goal:**

To ratify CFES Event Hosts.

**Where as:**

**Be it resolved that:**

The following commissioners be ratified for 2010-2011:

<u>UVic B</u>	<u>Congress 2012</u>
<u>---</u>	<u>CEC 2012</u>
<u>ETS</u>	<u>PM 2010</u>
<u>U Ottawa</u>	<u>NCWIE</u>

**Result: carries unanimous**

**For:**

**Against :**

**Abstain :**



## Proposal

### **42-CFES-11**

<b>Title:</b>	Term of Ambassadors and Councillors
<b>Mover:</b>	National Exec
<b>Language :</b>	English

**Goal:**

To have ambassadors and councillors transition at the same time as the rest of the CFES

**Where as:**

The transitions of regional ambassadors and national councillors occur in February;

The rest of the CFES transitions occur later in the year;

**Be it resolved that:**

The term of ambassadors and councillors be changed to start on April 1.

BIFRT: Chapter IV, section 50 be changed to:

The term of office of the two (2) Councillors and of the Regional Ambassadors last from April first (1st) of the current year to March thirty-first (31st) of the following year.

**Result: unanimous****For: 38****Against: 0****Abstain: 0**



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-12

<b>Title:</b>	Topical Changes to NCWIE
<b>Mover:</b>	Université de Sherbrooke
<b>Seconded:</b>	University of Alberta
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**

To change the perception of NCWIE in order to reflect the sentiment of the conference.

**Where as:**

The title 'NCWIE' gives the wrong impression of the goals of the conference;

A new title would more clearly reflect its purpose;

**Be it resolved that:**

The title "National Conference on Women in Engineering" (NCWIE) be changed to "National Conference on Diversity in Engineering" (NCDE).

**Be it further resolved that:**

This change come in effect for the 2011 event.

**Result: FAIL by CP**

For:

Against:

Abstain:

Lauren, Alberta: Inspired by NCWIE session at this conference. To broaden the possibilities discussed.

Claire, Alberta: add amendment: take place for 2011 event, not 2010.

Curtis, Western: Being changed just for 2011?

Chair: Permanent change following 2011.

Abbie, U of T: why 2011?

Claire, U of A: Logistically, have already voted for 2010 event.

John, U of C: requires constitutional amendment, since we ratified NCWIE as a CFES event last year at Congress?

Chair: yes, it does require amendment to Policy Manual. Amendment to have changes made to policy manual.

U of A: friendly.



Justin, Dal: Diversity in engineering can mean races as well.

Claire: Just because we are changing the name to 'diversity' does not mean we cannot hold sessions for women. Broadens scope of conference. Hosts can choose what to make it.

Mike, Queens: Would like to see more specific changes to Policy Manual. Just changing name to diversity does not change the perception of conference.

Jonathan, UOttawa: One of best things about NCWIE is the focus on gender issues. Broadening will not do conference justice. Can hold alternative conferences for other diversity issues. Favourable though not amending to have the name changed to "national conference on gender issues in engineering"

NE: This is talking about strategic / directional change in the event. Suggestion: counter proposal to have social issues commissioners, members at large, etc. look into seeing how the conference will be moving forward. Not something we can decide here. Can be further discussed at President's Meeting.

U of A: Would be nice to discuss this issue tonight outside plenary.

Chair: interest in partaking in discussion?

[straw poll]



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-13

<b>Title:</b>	Create an audio recording of plenary sessions
<b>Mover:</b>	Queen's University
<b>Seconded:</b>	McMaster University
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

Create a more reliable and thorough record of plenary sessions to ensure that delegates (especially new ones) are better informed and prepared for future sessions by having a better understanding of previous sessions.

Specifically, the goal is to make an audio record of plenary sessions at PM 2010, congress 2011 and PM 2011 and let council decide at congress 2012 if this is an efficient method to help delegates be better informed and better prepared for plenary to the point that it justifies the extra work.

#### Where as:

The majority of the delegates at CFES congress have not attended the congress and PM plenary from the previous year;

Minutes are good for reporting what happened in meetings but audio recordings can serve as a piece of supplemental information that will be effective at conveying the most accurate degree of information;

#### Be it resolved that:

An audio record of plenary sessions at CFES PM 2010 and CFES congress 2011 and CFES PM 2011 be created along with the simultaneous translation if available.

BIFRT: At CFES congress 2012, council assess if the recorded documents were useful and recommend whether or not CFES should continue to create audio recordings of plenary sessions.

BIFRT: Each motion is saved in its own file in order to make it easier to browse through the documents.

BIFRT: These files are included in the delegate information package along with the written minutes.

**Result: FAIL by CP**



**For:**

**Against:**

**Abstain:**

Kas, Queens: Some delegates had questions about things that may have happened before. Would be a good resource to have them to go to. All conversation must be recorded on a mic hooked up to a laptop. Only work required is editing after the fact. Can make translation easier.

NE: This would be a 1 year mandate. Will only be good for a year. Cannot decided for PM 2011. PM is a smaller session. Could be implemented at PM but may raise delegate fees.

Sherbrooke: Amendment: to have 'if available' omitted.

Lakehead: Does this mean that all recordings must be edited and be added to minutes?

Queens: If there is a motion to strike something out of minutes, recordings would be omitted.

NE: would the intent of this would be to have motions / minutes available immediately after the event?

Queens: Intention not to have them available immediately but to have them available for the following year. Can go back to recordings as a reference as to what actually went on.

Gabrielle, ETS: An idea on how much the equipment will cost? PM has a smaller budget.

Queens: Can be easy to do recording for \$10. Mic (\$50-\$100) can record sound with fairly high quality.

Lakehead: No need for audio recording when we have minutes. This can add extra work for the organizers and is not necessary.

Chair: Robert's Rules of order requires that you either don't record anything or record everything with consultation of a professional.

Suzanne, Mun A: \$10 / headset for audio recorder is a rental fee or purchase cost?

Chair: Up to organizers how this happens.

Athena, Concordia: Who would be mandated to do this? Seems like a lot of work to update bylaws.

Queens: Motion implied this is something that should be done. Every organizing team can have the technical knowledge.

U of S: where would all this be stored? The information can take a lot of space, and may be costly.

NE: 1 TB hard drives are cheap, hosting expensive. Hosting can get expensive overtime. Considering financials, this will cost money.

Nicholas, Laval: I will talk on my behalf, not my school. If I had access to this audio info from previous years and all verbal processes from the CFES, that a delegate would digest from the CFES, not certain if I would undertake this because at one point it would become saturated. Audio recordings may become very lengthy. The cost and logistics and storage does not make this worthwhile. Minute taking should be sufficient.

Lakehead: Taking note of important points in minutes

U of A: is it feasible considering time, money, space?

Sherbrooke: Direction toward more interactive media types. Exploring audio / video should be beneficial. Not setting consequences, but should allow this to be a strategic direction.

Queens: Would like to remind council that this is a motion that asks for a trial year. There is benefit for the association. Not necessarily beneficial in that not everyone will go through entire plenary. The right to have very accurate info is worth doing. Good to give this a shot. If not necessary, can be revisited and re-evaluated.

Patricia, Poly: At Poly we have a lot of audio equipment. For first few years we can loan the equipment. With regards to space, the information can be stored on a CD / DVD. Why not try something that is not an official document. Can try it out and evaluate.

U of T: Can make it easier for people that have not been to Congress. Wouldn't availability of audio defeat purpose of minutes?

Queens: e.g. motion past Queens president had spoken on. There was much controversy with motion, nonetheless motion was passed. This does serve a purpose. Can help us keep our policies in check.

Kaitlyn, Manitoba: Can this bring up privacy issues? Get delegates to sign waivers for having voices recorded?

NE: no. e.g. when making minutes available you use their name directly. By being able to participate to already sign your name off on that. These are details that the future organizers can



sort out. If not possible to be implemented, the N.E. can find that out. If not legally possible, it should not be implemented.

Chair: Standard in Canada, no confidentiality, can spread that as much as possible.

Nicholas, Laval: Come back to point brought up by Nicholas from Sherbrooke. Should explore a path we have not explored before. Must ensure what we do is useful.

Lakehead: Should mandate to explore all possibilities that we can yet we don't want to burden our volunteers.

U of A calls to question. UVic A seconded. Carries unanimously.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-14

<b>Title:</b>	Qualité de la traduction orale
<b>Mover:</b>	École de technologie supérieure
<b>Seconded:</b>	Concordia University
<b>Language:</b>	Bilingual

#### Goal:

Assurer la qualité de la traduction orale pour améliorer la compréhension lors du Congrès

\*\*\*

Assure the quality of oral translation to improve comprehension at Congress

#### Where as:

La qualité de la traduction orale varie beaucoup d'un Congrès à l'autre;

\*\*\*

The quality of oral translation varies greatly from one Congress to the other;

#### Be it resolved that:

Le Commissaire aux langues officielles fasse un essai avec la personne engagée pour faire la traduction orale, si celle-ci n'est pas un professionnel.

\*\*\*

The Official Languages Commissioner do a test-run with the individual hired to do the oral translation unless it is a professional.

#### Result: fail by CP

**For:**

**Against:**

**Abstain:**

Gabrielle, ETS: it is pretty clear that all that we want is for translation to be done properly.

Athena, Concordia: Want to ensure that next time translation is understandable.

Laval: Not talking about Marc here...

NE: As OL commissioner, I believe the proposition is narrow. Amendment: make it a mandate under OL commissioner. Have them collaborate with event organizers.

ETS: I understand that there would be a change in policy manual if we do this?

Chair: If we were to mandate this under a position we would have to evaluate policy manual.

ETS: important to do a trial, in order to ensure we have quality assurance.

NE: Section 4.3 under policy manual. This could be changed such that if a professional is involved, it is struck.

ETS: Can we make a friendly amendment now, or need to make C.P.?



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-15

<b>Title:</b>	Executive Accountability Contracts
<b>Mover:</b>	University of Calgary
<b>Seconded:</b>	University of Alberta
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

Continuity in the terms of elected officials is critical to the success of the federation. The premise of an executive accountability contract is to bind an elected official to their portfolio. This document does not have legal repercussions, but it allows members to hold executives accountable.

#### Where as:

An executive accountability contract includes the portfolio of the elected position and charges the executive to be responsible for it. In addition to the portfolio, time commitments and any mandates from congress for the elected position will also be included;

#### Be it resolved that:

Each elected national executive sign an executive accountability contract and be made available to member schools at the beginning of their term.

#### Result: carries

**For: 32**

**Against: 4**

**Abstain: 2**

Uof C: have each executive sign a document at the beginning of the term to their accountability, and saying they will be committed to their position.

UofA: came from accountability closed-session. Having a piece of paper to compare to.

Uof S:

Uof C: this is something we have in place at U of C. Have had no issues. This is more for the individual elected. Putting your signature to paper.

Sherbrooke: last session on accountability, disappointed to see that people verbally talked about their work and showed no proof of what they had done.

Lakehead: would like to ask for an example of such a document and its legal percussion.

Chair: there can be legal percussions.

NE: 2 principal purposes. 1. easier format for members. 2. Better reminder for position-holders.

More committed to something with a name signed off.

Lakehead: Clarification: what are the consequences of not abiding to the contract?



NE: what consequences are there for any volunteer position? If a mandate is not fulfilled, consequences decided upon by members and can take place at any event.

Kevin, Waterloo B: Who will be in charge of creating contracts? Will elected executive come up with contract or something the council will come up with?

U of C: will be based on portfolio in policy manual plus additional mandates.

Poly: When would these contracts be signed?

UofC: beginning of their term.

UofS: Who would be in charge of creating the contract?

NE: we are, again, delving into details. If mandated here, would go to national councillors to ensure adequacy. Type of thing to have national councillors to look into. Details can be done at a later date.

Waterloo B: beneficial to have all candidates of positions to submit platforms.

Laval calls to question. Secunder ETS. Carries unanimous.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-16

<b>Title:</b>	Attendance of Regional Ambassadors at Board Meetings
<b>Mover:</b>	Memorial University of Newfoundland B
<b>Seconded:</b>	Memorial University of Newfoundland A
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

To ensure that constant representation at meetings is maintained, quorum is met on a regular basis, and information is regularly transferred between regional organizations and the CFES.

#### Where as:

A decrease in the Regional Ambassador's attendance at board meetings decreases communication and involvement of the region's schools and hampers the decision making ability of the CFES Board of directors;

#### Be it resolved that:

That if a Regional Ambassador does not attend two consecutive board of directors meetings without being excused from the meeting it will be taken as a formal resignation from the position. A bi election must occur within the region for a new regional ambassador.

#### Result: fails by CP

##### For:

##### Against:

##### Abstain:

Jill, Mun B: regional ambassadors are main connection between members and CFES. Issues in the past where info has not been accurately conveyed.

ETS: Want to know why the proposers of the motion in French are N.E.?

Chair: corrected.

McGill: How much time to send in regrets?

Chair: BoD meetings set at set times at the beginning of the year.difficult to schedule meetings for everyone to attend.

NE: type of thing to have judgement of the chair. If regrets not sent in, before / after, not accepted.

Chair: e.g. November meeting cancelled due to absence of several BoD members.

Patricia, Poly: Why is motion not pertaining to entire BoD? BoD has the same responsibilities as ambassadors with regards to attending the meetings.

Mun B: Ambassadors are the only liaison between CFES and members. These are the positions that are directly impacting us.

UofA: procedure with proxies?



Chair: no proxies allowed according to Robert's Rules.

Fred, Sherbrooke: one month time frame.

NE: will make this work for all regions.

Jonathan, Ottawa: some regions, ambassadors selected by regions. Does this go against their mandates?

NE: motion does not violate other constitutions / policy manuals.

UofC: Conflicting with constitution?

NE: article 53. Need to call a special meeting to dismiss. Given this is a mandate motion, it would survive no more than a year. Should be mandate for the BoD. Suggest a C.P. to have BoD to call a special meeting.

UVic A: we believe this would go against our regional constitution as this mandate would remove our regional president as regional ambassador. Have no other way of electing a regional ambassador.

Chair: regional associations' bylaws do not cover the CFES bylaws.

NE: as long as the president-elect was ratified ambassador, they would fall under CFES bylaws.

Mun B: ambassador is the only link between CFES and region. Up to CFES board to notify if ambassadors not attending meetings.

Curtis, Western: need BoD to be there to their job. Is it important to have entire BoD to be accountable to be there?

Chair: poll: interest in meeting for counter proposal.

Claire, UofA: this is an issue that must be taken up region by region. I feel like in our region is it up to the Western region to have consequences for the ambassador. Must be dealt with regionally not nationally.

Poly: understand that West is stressed because of this situation. Missing BoD member affects the entire BoD regardless of their region.

NE: Atlantic and West, the ambassadors hold two exclusive positions. Person may do poorly as an ambassador but may perform well as regional president. In which case must find a better representative for BoD.

Athena, Concordia: appreciate the spirit of the motion.

UofT calls to question. Seconded by ETS. Favour 31, Oppose 4, Abstain 3.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-17

<b>Title:</b>	Direction for Social Issues Commissioner
<b>Mover:</b>	University of Western Ontario
<b>Seconded:</b>	University of Guelph
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

To give the member schools a chance to discuss the social issues affecting engineering students in Canada and give direction to the incoming Social Issues Commissioner.

#### Where as:

The Canadian Federation of Engineering Students exists to represent the interests of all engineering students across Canada, pressing social issues concerning Canadian engineering students should be discussed at the annual CFES Congress;

The ideas stemming from these discussions are invaluable in guiding the efforts of the upcoming Social Issues Commissioner for his or her term;

#### Be it resolved that:

Congress contain at least one session focused on discussing current social issues relevant to Canadian engineering students.

#### Result: carries

**For: 21**

**Against: 11**

**Abstain: 6**

Curtis, Western: looking through portfolio of Social issues Commissioner, the position is very open. Having a session on what members want can deliver what is important to members.

Jenny, Guelph: motion following is related.

Laval: if we didn't have this motion, what would the social issues commissioner do otherwise?

NE: S.I.C. is a new position, created ~3 years ago. More education on social issues in CFES but direction unclear. This year Emily Fay collaborated with Cyrene on NCWIE, gave sessions on Going Green, and coordinated the Engineering Song Competition. Up to the position holder.

Laval: S.I.C. should advise the other member schools not pursue their own interest.

Western: Amendment: to make changes to policy manual. Mandate effective for one year?

Chair: policy manual meant for long term mandates.

Claire, Uof A: set up something at last Congress to receive feedback on every session. Not necessary for a motion.

Western: point of having this as a motion every year, as opposed to having it mandated indefinitely.



Jessica, Laurentian: Much better to have this mandated than to revisit every year.

John, U of C: want to have this in place at every Congress? E.g. focus of sessions at Congress are changing from year to year.

Curtis, Western: as long as this position exists, it is necessary to guide them.

Marybeth, UNB: social issues change from year to year.

NE: motion for 5 minutes recess. Seconder: UofR. Passed. 5:42pm EST.

Meeting resumed at 5:57 pm EST.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-18

<b>Title:</b>	Direction for Social Issues Commissioner (Part 2)
<b>Mover:</b>	University of Western Ontario
<b>Seconder:</b>	University of Guelph
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

To ensure that the Social Issues Commissioner focuses on at least one issue that the member schools determine to be of importance in the upcoming year.

#### Where as:

CFES commissioner positions exist to serve the interests of member schools;

The social issues commissioner is very open-ended and receives minimal direct guidance from member schools;

#### Be it resolved that:

The Social Issues Commissioner shall retain his or her freedom to investigate additional social issues or concerns he or she feels is relevant and/or important, however, one social issue shall be chosen by the members of the CFES at large to be addressed and investigated during the term of the upcoming Social Issues Commissioner.

BIFRT: This topic be chosen via a majority vote during CFES Congress plenary.

#### Result: fails

**For: 14**

**Against: 16**

**Abstain: 8**

Curtis, Western: extension of motion 17. This is so that we ensure that they are mandated to explore one topic we decide as a group that is important.

Andy, UofS: independent proposal?

Chair: yes.

Andy, UofS: If topic chosen is "going green" would have 2 sessions

NE: social issues commissioner will address whatever issue they will see fit. Social issues commissioner has freedom to choose that.

Abbie, UofT: we are mandating social issues commissioner, why not place in policy manual?

NE: why not require every year for social issues commissioner to explore a certain topic.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-19

<b>Title:</b>	CFES Going Green
<b>Mover:</b>	Queen's University
<b>Seconded:</b>	Lakehead University
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**

Developing a greener CFES

**Where as:**

Engineers Canada has set a precedent by adopting the following environmental strategy as outlined in the Engineers Canada Green Meetings Policy Statement:

Engineers Canada will consider and implement, where possible, environmentally preferable features and practices at every stage of planning and delivery of its meetings, events and activities, including selection processes, acquisition of meeting supplies and services;

The CFES strives to be a leader in innovation and social change;

**Be it resolved that:**

The Social Issues commissioner research and create an environmental policy and strategy for the CFES. At the Presidents' Meeting held in 2010, a midterm report will be presented to member schools, with final findings and recommendations being presented at Congress 2011.

BIFRT: A database of successful environmental strategies and initiatives from member schools and other associations be compiled and made accessible to member societies on the CFES website.

**Result:**

**For: 34**

**Against: 0**

**Abstain: 4**

Kas, Queens: after "going green" session, it was found that Engineers Canada has a really good green policy. Would be good to have something of resemblance in CFES. Good to have one-policy strategy on what CFES can do to be more sustainable. Especially useful for event organizers.

NE: could be interpreted as 2 different proposals as it stands.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-20

<b>Title:</b>	Well-Rounded Engineers
<b>Mover:</b>	McGill University
<b>Seconded:</b>	Concordia University
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

This motion is the result of the "Future of Engineering Education" session, where it was agreed that courses taken outside of the Engineering discipline are important to training the best quality of engineers. Courses outside of Engineering promote soft skills and good communication skills.

#### Where as:

The "Future of Engineering Education" session reached consensus on the value of non-engineering courses in training the best engineers;

Communication skills were identified as vital skills for engineers to succeed;

Many engineering programs across Canada do not allow for or encourage the taking of non-engineering courses;

#### Be it resolved that:

The Academic Commissioner, in consultation with the National Executive, be mandated to produce a position paper detailing the merits of taking courses beyond engineering.

BIFRT: The President present this paper to the National Council of Deans of Engineering and Applied Science.

#### Result: fails by CP

##### For:

##### Against:

##### Abstain:

McGill: following future of eng education session, want to make sure the concerns are expressed to the NCDEAS. Communication skills are essential to well-rounded engineers.

Concordia: President of Engineers Canada also touched on the importance of communications skills. People skills would benefit everyone in engineering.

Liam, UVic A: what does this motion hope to achieve? Just to send a paper?

McGill: trying to make sure it happens. We want to see some trying to make those classes accounted for.



Western: idea of motion is to raise awareness. Beneficial to have communication skills, yet difficult to convince the faculty.

NE: yes, must identify the action we want to take. Mandate here should strictly refer to having the present *lobby* to the NCDEAS, otherwise as it stands it implies the creation of document and no further action.

Laurentian: What kind of communication classes? This needs to be outlined.

Concordia: broadening communication skills can include an oral speech class. A way to strategically communicate to people can be participating in a liberal arts class.

U of T: spirit of motion is great, but we need to have some kind of goal down the line. Should have a meeting after today and amend the motion for tomorrow.

Patricia, Poly: more interested in seeing something that focuses more on soft skills. Easier to implement to the deans and to the accreditation board. Not only NCDEAS, but also Engineers Canada.

NE: end goal of this proposal? Integrate communication courses in curriculums? Restrictions to allow additional humanities courses. Also, what you want the president to do with this. C.P. the academic commissioner look into this issue. Suggest a C.P. with more specific detail.

Nicholas, Laval: the point was brought that we should see if there is other ways we can let universities go about this. Not sure if adding a conference will change anything. We cannot force the universities. Can make recommendations, and they can choose what they deem necessary.

Claire, U of A: suggestion: easier to have a round table discussion at PM to discuss what we see as problems. In order to have a stance we need more discussion on this.

UofT calls to question. Seconded by UofS. Carries unanimously.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-21

<b>Title:</b>	WESST Regional Agreement
<b>Mover:</b>	University of Alberta
<b>Seconded:</b>	University of Victoria A
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

To define a relationship between the CFES and WESST.

#### *Western Engineering Students' Society Team Regional Agreement*

This agreement constitutes a bare minimum of commitments, and it is encouraged that both parties seek involvement in each other's organizations beyond what is outlined in this document.

BETWEEN : The Western Engineering Students' Society Team (hereby identified as WESST)

AND : The Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (hereby identified as CFES)

The CFES commits to:

Inviting, at a fee equivalent to the one paid by its Member Associations, up to two (2) representatives from the WESST Executive to the following events:

Annual Congress

President's Meeting

This agreement will be in effect as of \_\_\_\_\_ until it is further updated, or forgotten.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shahrzad Pedram President 2009-2010

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kyle Ruttan President 2009-2010

CANADIAN FEDERATION OF ENGINEERING STUDENTS FÉDÉRATION CANADIENNE DES ÉTUDIANTS ET  
ÉTUDIANTES EN GÉNIE

#### Where as:

No such agreement exists, WESST has approved the agreement;



**Be it resolved that:**

The CFES adopt the CFES/WESST regional agreement.

**Result: carries**

**For: 31**

**Against: 0**

**Abstain: 7**

Claire, Uof A: talked about this at WESST AGM. This is what we agreed on.

Sherbrooke: we already signed contracts with other regions, why not one contract for all regions?

NE: different regions, different organizations. CREIQ exec require invitation, whereas WESST exec is West Ambassador. Have already looked into a general agreement.

Laurentian: wondering why WESST needs to be included at PM?

UofA: Ambassador is there to interact with schools present.

NE: if West Ambassador if there representing WESST, no need to invite additional WESST delegates.

Sarah, Windsor: includes ambassador? Otherwise would include 2 additional members other than ambassador.

NE: up to N.E. to decide. WESST does not get to decided this. CFES gets to decide upon representatives.

Patricia, Poly: even though it is not applicable, it should be made clear that CFES be invited to WESST.

UofA: This is what we decided on and passed.

UofT: noticed an incosisntency that ESSCO would not be invited to PM, whereas other regions would be.

NE: could strike out PM, but it implies 'up to.' In the event the CFES chose to invite additional representatives, the invitation would be forwarded to all regions.



## Proposal

### **42-CFES-22**

<b>Title:</b>	Atlantic Regional Agreement
<b>Mover:</b>	National Exec
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**

To strengthen the relationship between the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students (CFES) and the Atlantic Council of Engineering Students (ACES).

**Where as:**

There is concern that ACES and its member societies may lose focus of the role of CFES or otherwise not be kept up to date with the Federation's activities, and there is a desire to inform CFES member associations on relevant issues in the Atlantic region;

**Be it resolved that:**

The ACES Regional Agreement be passed at CFES Congress 2010.

**Result: carries****For: 31****Against: 0****Abstain: 7**

Julia, Atlantic Ambassador: agreement adopted at Atlantic AGM.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-23

<b>Title:</b>	French Sessions
<b>Mover:</b>	Concordia University
<b>Seconded:</b>	École de technologie supérieure
<b>Language:</b>	Bilingual

#### Goal:

To encourage francophones to facilitate and do presentations.

To encourage bilingualism at CFES.

#### Where as:

CFES would like to improve their bilingualism at Congress;

There aren't many French presentations or presentations by French schools at Congress;

#### Be it resolved that:

When there are many sessions given at the same time, CFES will plan at least one French session and encourage francophones to do presentations.

#### Result: fails by CP

##### For:

##### Against:

##### Abstain:

Athena, Concordia: came up when discussing bilingualism at CFES and Engineers Canada session. Would be beneficial for francophone schools to host sessions. Would be a great opportunity for everyone else to be exposed to French speaking sessions.

ETS: more sessions bilingually ran by French sessions.

Abbie, UofT: Would have liked to attend 'Eng Soc Structures' session. Would have preferred to have translation provided for English speaking delegates.

NE: Many sessions offered solely in English. This year multiple requests were sent out earlier for a call for sessions in French.

Nicholas, Laval: 2 points: 1. Amendment: presentations be translated in English for presenters. 2. Ready to help you with presenting

Concordia: Not Friendly

Western: 'sessions happening at the same time' meaning e.g. 3 sessions happening concurrently?

Laval: where at least one session is being run, at least one session is translated.

Chair: suggest: BFRT that live translation be provided.

Laval: Clarification, not only written translation. Only written is not sufficient. i.e. have live and oral translation available for English speakers to understand.



McGill: Agree with Laval. Even though people might be able to read French, everyone needs to be able to understand what is going. Oral presentation is necessary.

Gabrielle, ETS: goal of this proposition is for English speaker to at least have the choice of attending French sessions.

MC, OL Commissioner: objective of this is for French people that do not understand English can participate in the session. Must treat all

Jenny, Guelph: Attended French session, and having English on slides was sufficient. Simultaneous translation would take away from round-tables.

Laval: never an issue that French translation has not been available.

Chair: clarification: all sessions translated.

Poly: motion from last Congress on % of French sessions?

Chair: 25%

Poly: should just make sure that next Congress organizes itself properly and does host French sessions.

Not necessary to have organizers tied up with another mandate in addition to 25% French sessions.

UofT: point of Congress is to better eng socs. If majority do not understand French, not as effective.

NE: Motion illustrates CFES is truly bilingual.

Western calls amendment to question. NE seconded. Passed, 2 abstentions.

13 in favour of amendment

21 against

3 abstain.

Western: saying where and when sessions take place should be up to organizers, as long as 25% French sessions is satisfied.

Sherbrooke: Both Anglophone and Francophones *should* be hosting sessions. We should push for everyone to have the opportunity to host sessions.

Concordia: the point of this not so that we understand. It emphasizes bilingualism.

McGill: motion implies that we have 1 session in French when 3 are running. Amendment: change 'Congress 2011' and have it apply to all Congresses.

Concordia: friendly.

Called to question. 1 oppose , 1 abstension.



## Proposal

### 42-CFES-24

<b>Title:</b>	Evaluation of Congress Costs
<b>Mover:</b>	University of Victoria A
<b>Seconder:</b>	University of Saskatchewan
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**

To identify ways, and their value, by which Congress can be restructured to reduce the cost of the event.

**Where as:**

Congress is expensive;

Delegate fees are regularly contested;

A committee may identify ways that Congress could run equally effectively at a lower cost to delegations;

**Be it resolved that:**

A committee of 6 people *selected by the National Executive* be created to investigate methods by which congress may be run for less.

BIFRT: The committee prepares a report and presents their findings at Congress 2011.

**Result: carries**

**For: 36**

**Against: 1**

**Abstain: 1**

Sean, UVic A: when asking my students who wanted to go to Congress, they implied they got more out of WESST Retreat. Congress costs more. Just looking at possible solutions, and making recommendations to Congress organizers.

Chair: to identify 6 committee members, nominate people, have exec appoint, or submit C.P.

Andy, UofS: Amendment to have N.E. to select committee.

UVic: friendly.

Guelph: need chair?

Chair: committee picks their own chair.

Chair: meeting adjourned at 6:57pm EST.



## 8. Counter-proposals

### Counter-proposal

#### 42-CFES-11-CP

<b>Title:</b>	Term of Ambassadors and Councillors
<b>Mover:</b>	Laval
<b>Seconded:</b>	UVic B
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**  
To ensure a smooth transition between the new and old Regional ambassadors and National Councillors.

**Where as:**  
Transition can be difficult.

**Be it resolved that:**  
The term of ambassadors and councillors to be changed to a sixteen month term, starting January and ending in April of the following year.  
  
BIFRT: For the first four months the new ambassadors and councillors will not have voting rights on the CFES BoD.

**Result: fails**  
For: 1  
Against: 37  
Abstain: 0

Nicholas, Laval: Pretty simple. Want to make sure transition happens properly. Want to allow for 16 month mandates. The first 4 will be a transition period with no voting rights. Last 4 months will be for transitioning the new position holders.

UVic B: no further comments.

NE: Agree with the sentiment. Would be creating a "second class" of regional ambassadors. Multiple regional ambassadors on BoD adds additional confusion. All other position is April 1st – March 31st. All officers meet in March for 3 days to do transition. Having the ambassadors on a April 1st – March 31st term would be more consistent and simple.

Lakehead: 2 ambassadors per region on the BoD. Would that not count as 1 vote per region?



Chair: ambiguous.

NE: ambiguous. For a 16 month term, would need to need a notification for non-voting members, ambassadors vs. ambassadors-elects. Could be argued the ambassador-elects should get a vote. Much ambiguity that can result in confusion.

Nicholas, Laval: Bring attention to another point. Is it true that ambassador and National Councillors are elected in January? Would it be useful to have a partial transition in January?

NE: as newly elected regional ambassador, 30 days later, expected to act as regional ambassador and assume the position's roles and duties. Does not make sense for them. Term should begin on April 1st.

Lakehead: What is the definition of a regional ambassador according to the Constitution? Defined as *one* person?

NE: section 3 of Policy Manual. One ambassador per region. Also, article 44 of constitution, 11 BoD members.

Patricia, Poly: Most important part of transition is communication. Being elected 4 months in advance not necessary.

Liam, UVic A calls to question.



## Counter-proposal

### 42-CFES-12-CP

<b>Title:</b>	Topical Changes to NCWIE
<b>Mover:</b>	Alberta
<b>Seconder:</b>	Sherbrooke
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**  
To change the perception of NCWIE in order to reflect the sentiment of the conference.

**Where as:**  
  
The title 'NCWIE' gives the wrong impression of the goals of the conference;  
  
A new title would more clearly reflect its purpose;

**Be it resolved that:**  
  
The title "National Conference on Women in Engineering" (NCWIE) be changed to "National Conference on Gender Issues in Engineering" (NCGIE).  
  
BIFRT: This change will take place for the 2011 event.

**Result: carries**

For:

Against:

Abstain:

Claire, UofA: no comment

Charles, Sherbrooke: The goal is to change the perception people have on this conference to encourage male support of the conference because males don't feel welcome. It would encourage male attendance.

NE: Issues we had with translating name. Should be considered more in depth. If change only in effect for 2011, would give us more time to investigate in depth. Amendment: a committee of 2 members at large, the 2010 conference organizer, CFES Social Issues Commissioner, and CFES VPSD to investigate this.

For 35

Against 2

Abstain 1

Open nomination for member-at-large.

Claire, UofA: Lauren Brunet from UofA - declined

Fred, Sherbrooke: Charles from Sherbrooke - accepted



Waterloo A: Cara from Waterloo – accepted  
Motion carries.



## Counter-proposal

### **42-CFES-13-CP**

<b>Title:</b>	Create an audio recording of plenary sessions
<b>Mover:</b>	Queen's
<b>Seconded:</b>	Lakehead
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### **Goal:**

Create a more reliable and thorough records of plenary sessions to ensure that delegates (especially new ones) are better informed and prepared for future sessions by having a better understanding of previous sessions. The executive should use CFES PM and CFES Congress as grounds to explore new ways to report information that happens in sessions to members.

#### **Where as:**

The majority of the delegates at CFES congress have not attended the congress and PM plenary from the previous year, and that some members who cannot make it to CFES meetings could still benefit from sessions that happen in said meetings.

AND WHEREAS

Minutes are good for reporting what happened in meetings but the CFES executive should look into more ways to report information that can serve to convey the most accurate degree of information

AND WHEREAS

Congress each year is limited to a small group

#### **Be it resolved that:**

Sessions at CFES PM 2010 and CFES congress 2011 and CFES PM 2011 are used as grounds to explore new ways to report information that happens in sessions to members

At CFES congress 2012, council assess if the means utilized by the CFES executive were useful and effective.

#### **Result: carries**

**For: 21**

**Against: 14**

**Abstain: 0**

Kas, Queens: Spoke with people yesterday to better present spirit of motion. Had discussion with Kyle Ruttan and Ash B. Good for CFES to look into other ways of recording what happens in sessions. Have a professor give a session and ask questions through skype. Would benefit members better.

Lakehead: Allow us to share the conference. Small schools that cannot afford to attend can have some form of communication. A means of chat, and sessions streamed through the net. Not costly. Can allow us to expand our horizon. If can't afford to come, should still be given opportunity to benefit from conference.



Jonthan, UOttawa: Concerns me that the mandate is not given to a specific portfolio. Should be targeting a specific person.

Fiifi, Lakehead: Intended for organizers to evaluate this themselves. The option is open to the organizers to explore options.

Kas, Queens: It would be best for the VPSD portfolio if council feels strongly for a specific position.



## Counter-proposal

### **42-CFES-14-CP**

<b>Title:</b>	Quality of oral translation
<b>Mover:</b>	ETS
<b>Seconded:</b>	Concordia
<b>Language:</b>	English

**Goal:**  
Assure the quality of oral translation to improve comprehension at Congress.

**Where as:**  
The quality of oral translation varies greatly from one Congress to the other.

**Be it resolved that:**  
The Official Languages Commissioner do a test-run with the individual hired to do the oral translation unless it is a professional. Moreover, the commissioner has the final word on the translator hired, and will be responsible for the quality of translation.  
  
BIFRT: The above responsibility be added to Section 4.3 of the CFES Policy Manual.

**Result: carries**  
**For: 37**  
**Against: 0**  
**Abstain: 1**

Gabrielle, ETS: when we proposed this point yesterday, there was much discussion. Made amendments to make it more clear.  
Concordia: No further comments.



## Counter-proposal

### 42-CFES-15-CP

<b>Title:</b>	Executive Accountability Contracts
<b>Mover:</b>	Lakehead
<b>Seconded:</b>	Queens
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

Continuity in terms of elected officials is critical to the success of the federation. The premise of an executive accountability contract is to bind an elected official to their portfolio. This document does not have legal repercussions, but it allows members to hold executives accountable.

#### Whereas:

An executive accountability contract includes the portfolio of the elected position and charges the executive to be responsible for it. In addition to the portfolio, time commitments and any mandates from congress for the elected position will also be included

#### Be it resolved that:

Each elected national executive sign an executive accountability contract and be made available to member schools at the beginning of their term.

BIFT: If they violate the terms of their contract ; *at the discretion of the BoD*, the said executive be banned from *holding* any and all CFES positions

BIFFT: The National Councillors will develop necessary arrangements to restrict violators of the contract from holding CFES office.

#### Result: fails

**For: 15**

**Against: 23**

**Abstain: 0**

Lakehead: amendment to motion put forth by UofC. The consequence was determined to be too extreme.

Kas, Queens: Prefer this.



Jessica, Laurentian: Would like to know if there is a time constraint on the restriction on running for a CFES position?

Chair: interpreted to be indefinite.

Abbie, UofT: Accountability to be presented at PM, can remove person from position at PM?

Chair: general meeting could be called. Not PM.

John, UofC: spirit was to have executive sign a document and make them think twice about commitments. If they are to be penalized for not abiding by one of their mandates so be it.

Gabrielle, ETS: Ambassadors could be good at some position but not good as an ambassador. I don't agree with this proposition.

Lakehead: We are here on behalf of our schools. You should be able to determine your commitment before you run for a position

Jonathan, UOttawa: Does this preclude people from becoming conference chairs? "Running for" implies an elected position. Event chairs can be appointed.

Chair: interpret this as any event chair position, commissioner position, national executive position.

Laval: I think that sometimes it is regrettable to punish volunteers. It is up to the executive council of the CFES. We are not here to waste our time, take a risk. For somebody who does not do a good job in one position, I don't know why we would risk the chance of having them for another position.

Athena, Concordia: see this as a way of protecting new head delegates that will be voting for incoming position holders. Prevent repetition of electing someone that can't make a commitment.

Patricia, Poly: we all know that the CFES does not have enough volunteers to be on the executive. It could be a lot of risk. We do not want to risk losing these people.

NE: at the end of the day it is determined by the BoD. Judgement made by human hands. It is reasonable.

Jonathan, Ottawa: clear up wording. Amendment: "to be determined by BoD, *at the discretion of the BoD*, the said executive be banned from *holding* for any and all CFES positions.

Lakehead: friendly

Sherbrooke calls to question. Seconded by Laval.

Abstain 3

Oppose 2

For 33

NE: Move for a 5 minutes recess at 11:10am EST.



## Counter-proposal

### 42-CFES-16-CP

<b>Title:</b>	Attendance of Regional Ambassadors at Board Meetings
<b>Mover:</b>	MUN B
<b>Seconded:</b>	UNB
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### Goal:

To ensure that constant representation at meetings is maintained, quorum is met on a regular basis, and information is regularly transferred between regional organizations and the CFES.

#### Whereas:

A decrease in the Regional Ambassador's attendance at board meetings decreases communication and involvement of the region's schools and hampers the decision making ability of the CFES Board of directors.

#### Be it resolved that:

That the following statement be added to Section 53 of the CFES constitution that "If two (2) consecutive or a total of three (3) BoD meetings are missed without excuse by an NC or a RA, the BoD must determine the dismissal of the director in question no later than the next meeting of the Board."

#### Result: carries

For: 37

Against: 0

Abstain: 1

Jill, MunB: Friendly amendment: "If two consecutive or a total of three Board of Directors meetings are missed without excuse by a National Councillor or a Regional Ambassador the person in question must be dismissed."

Chair: Out of order.

Kyle, NE: Amendment: That the following statement be added to Section 52 of the CFES constitution:

"The office of a National Councillor or Regional Ambassador will be vacated if two (2) consecutive or a total of three (3) meetings of the Board are missed without excuse."

Kyle, NE: This is the correct way to implement this change into the Constitution.

Jill, MUNB: This is better and more accurate.



Chair: This change allows the vacancy to be automatic versus at the discretion of the board.

Claire, Alberta: I agree with the original motion. We've lost the safety net and now the post is vacated without looking at the circumstances surrounding the dismissal.

Chair: We're discussing the amendment made by the NE.

Jill, MUNB: You still have the option of giving an excuse, which still gives the Board some discretion.

Ottawa: Agreed.

NE: If we're not making quorum, we'd need quorum to approve the dismissal.

Chair: There are provisions for when you don't have enough directors to make quorum.

Sask: Can we reject the vacancy ever?

Chair: That's what we're discussing – whether or not the Board should have discretion or if it's an automatic process.

Ottawa: Is there no way to remove someone from the board without having the board discuss it.

Chair:

Pat, Poly: We don't have to discuss the Constitution. We're only discussing whether it should be automatic or not.

Chair: We should not be discussing quorum right now. Another motion would have to be proposed to change or define what quorum is. We're talking about discretion versus automatic process.

Abi, UofT: Do we need 2/3 majority?

Chair: For the original proposal/CP, but not the amendment.

Kyle NE: I suggest that the amendment be defeated and change the original to a plan statement of what you want so we don't miss anything.

Fifii, Lakehead: I think that it's important to do this here instead of putting this to a committee. Members are here now.

Kyle, NE: Decide what you want to do, and we'll draft a policy to bring to you at PM. Involving the Constitution now may cause confusion.

Abi, UofT: Call to question.

Jon, Ottawa: Second.

For 20

Against 14

Abstention 4

Motion to call to question fails.



John, Calgary: I like Kyle's idea. We aren't that familiar with governing docs and Calgary thinks the BoD should be put in charge of implementing the decision.

Chair: Remember we're talking about the amendment.

Curtis, UWO: I agree that we should mandate the exec to draft something. But we should talk about whether or not it should be automatic or not right now.

Jon, Ottawa: Move to 10 minute recess.

Abi, UofT: Second

Motion fails.

Vote on amendment.

For 8

Against 29

Abstentions 1

Pat, Poly: Can we just discuss how it will be done, not how it's written in the Constitution?

Jill, MUNB: I'd like to propose that we add "no later than the next meeting of the Board."

Ted, McGill: Seconded.

Andrew, Sask: What if the person being dismissed is unavailable to defend themselves?

Chair: That shouldn't matter. Probs why they're being dismissed.

Athena, ConU: Does this imply that there has to be quorum for the BoD meeting in question?

Chair: Yes.

No opposition, amendment passes.

Curtis, UWO: The BoD already has the power to dismiss someone. We're forcing them to make this decision.

Liam, UVic A: Call to question.

Abi, Toronto: Seconded.

Motion passes.



## Counter-proposal

### **42-CFES-20-CP**

<b>Title:</b>	Well-Rounded Engineers
<b>Mover:</b>	Alberta
<b>Seconded:</b>	Guelph
<b>Language:</b>	English

#### **Goal:**

This motion is the result of the "Future of Engineering Education" session, where it was agreed that courses taken outside of the Engineering discipline are important to training the best quality of engineers. Courses outside of Engineering promote soft skills and good communication skills.

#### **Where as:**

The "Future of Engineering Education" session reached consensus on the value of non-engineering courses in training the best engineers;  
Communication skills were identified as vital skills for engineers to succeed;  
Many engineering programs across Canada do not allow for or encourage the taking of non-engineering courses;

#### **Be it resolved that:**

The Academic Commissioner, in consultation with the National Executive, be mandated to produce a draft position paper detailing the merits of taking courses beyond engineering for Presidents Meeting 2010.

Be It Further Resolved That: The draft paper will be presented and discussed with the member schools in a round table setting at Presidents Meeting 2010.

#### **Result: carries**

**For: 35**

**Against: 3**

**Abstain: 0**



Claire, Alberta: I think that this is an issue that we have to look at and speak about as a group less formally than we are here at Plenary. Bring research and opinions to PM and take action there. But we need to have discussion.

Jenny, Guelph: Waived.

Tedi, McGill: What is the purpose of the draft?

Claire, Alberta: So that there's some background done before the session at PM. There were a lot of issues presented this week. The goal is come up with a comprehensive document that we can bring to our constituents and school about how the engineering students of Canada feel about their education.

Tedi, McGill: Motion to reopen debate.

Jon, Ottawa: Seconded.

Motion fails.

---

## Counter-proposal

### **42-CFES-23-CP**

---

<b>Title:</b>	French sessions
<b>Mover:</b>	Concordia
<b>Seconded:</b>	uVic B
<b>Language:</b>	English

<b>Goal:</b>
To encourage francophones to facilitate and do presentations. To encourage bilingualism at CFES.

<b>Where as:</b>
CFES would like to improve their bilingualism at Congress. There aren't many French presentations or presentations by French schools at Congress.

<b>Be it resolved that:</b>
"The language of each session and availability of translation shall be announced beforehand" be added to Section 6.1.6 in the CFES Policy Manual.

<b>Result: carries</b>
------------------------



**For: 32**

**Against: 1**

**Abstain: 5**

Athena, ConU: I want to clarify that when we say this, we're not restricting translation if available. An English presentation translated to French is an *English* presentation. Forces French presentations to be made.

Ryan, UVicB: Congress2012 is for this. Many schools have French-speaking delegates and this is beneficial to them and everyone.

Claire, Alberta: What you just read out is this, right?

Chair: Yes.

Andrew, Sask: This says that a French presentation is one with a primary language in French.

Kyle, NE: Section 6.1.6 of the Constitution. My interpretation is that we can have presentations translated, but 25% of the sessions must be presented in English and 25% in French. Both languages is great. We want French and English presentations. Suggest that adding "Language announced prior to Congress" be added to Section 6.1.6.

Pat, Poly: Call to question.

Jon, Ottawa:

Motion fails.

Curtis, UWO: Amendment: Strike bullet points. Adding BIFRT statement into the Policy Manual.

Athena, ConU: Has to be in French.

Kas, Queen's: I think the Policy Manual is clear as it is, but we should add the language announcement.

Jenny, Guelph: How far in advance must the announcement be made?

Chair: Discretion of Congress organizers.

Amendment passes unanimously.

Hilary, Carleton: Maybe we can add an announcement about whether or not there will be translation.

Liam, UVicA: Amendment: Language and availability of translation be announced beforehand.

Fred, Sherbrooke: Seconded.

Curtis, UWO: We're getting specific and organizers don't always know what's going to happen.

Pat, Poly: It's almost exactly the same as what is in the policy manual now but we're adding the announcement.

Kas, Queen's: We're tying their hands with the announcement of translation.



Kyle, NE: We're talking about really small issues. We'll tell you when we know. Rob will probs give accountability in English. There's no need for this.

Nicolas, Laval: Call to question.

Ted, McGill: Seconded.

Motion passes.

Amendment passes.

Kyle, NE: Motion to recess until 2pm.

## **9. Voting**

Adjourned at 2:53pm EST.

## **10. Close of the Assembly**