



4th General Assembly at the President's Meeting of the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students

September 30-October 3, 2010
Montreal, Quebec



Agenda

1. Opening of the assembly/Call to order
2. Call for Quorum
3. Election of the plenary chair and secretaries
4. Adoption of the agenda
5. Hearing of Proposals
6. Voting
7. Closing of the Assembly/Adjournment



1. Opening of the assembly/Call to order

The chair calls the assembly to order at 9:26am EST, on October 2nd, 2010.

2. Call for Quorum

The number of voting members present is 33 out of 39

3. Election of plenary chair and secretaries

	Proposal
	04-CFESPM-01
Title:	Election of the plenary chair
Mover:	National Executive
Language :	English

Goal:	
--------------	--

Where as:	
------------------	--

Be it resolved that:	
	<u>Abe Kohandel</u> be elected as plenary chair.

Result: Passed
32 For
0 Against
0 Abstain



Proposal
04-CFESPM-02

Title: Election of secretaries
Mover: National Executive
Language : English

Goal:

Whereas:

Be it resolved that:

Marie-Claude Hamelin (French) and Brendan Wood (English) be elected as secretaries for the plenary session.

Result: Passed

32 For

0 Against

0 Abstain



4. Adoption of the agenda

	Proposal
	04-CFESPM-03
Title:	Agenda
Mover:	National Executive
Language :	English

Goal:

Whereas:

Be it resolved that:
The agenda be adopted as circulated.

Result: Passed
32 For
0 Against
0 Abstain



5. Hearing of Proposals

Proposal 04-CFESPM-04	
Title:	Membership Dues Adjustment
Mover:	Waterloo B
Seconded:	Queen's
Language:	English

Goal:
To help remove the ambiguity related to students in engineering programs seeking accreditation in member schools.

Whereas:
The CFES represents and serves all EngSocs of member schools;
and, whereas:
Those schools' EngSocs represent and serve all students in their undergraduate engineering program, including those in programs seeking accreditation;

Be it resolved that:
The membership dues be adjusted to include students in new undergraduate engineering program seeking accreditation *at schools whose engineering societies are current members of CFES.*

Result: Passed
23 For
9 Against
1 Abstain

Waterloo B: this debate has come up again and again, we would like to settle this

Exec: the motion is fundamentally incorrect in its wording, the engineering society is the member; we get our numbers from Engineers Canada which only reports the number of students in accredited engineering programs; if this motion passes we would need to get numbers from each school individually, this would be unreliable; this would fundamentally change what the CFES is about; we would need to track every "engineering" program regardless of their accreditation status; as it stands, we're unsure how to do this

Poly: is this something we can discuss at PM because we are dealing with membership fees?

Chair: we can change the policy manual, not the constitution



Waterloo B: the reason we left this motion intentionally vague is so that it's up to the exec to decide how it is implemented

Exec: we would charge a flat fee to all schools that have an unaccredited program?

Waterloo B: that would be up to Exec

Ottawa: during discussion yesterday, it was focussed around CEC eligibility – is the goal of the motion to redefine the membership of the CFES? Or just for CEC eligibility?

McMaster: just from what we saw at the budget yesterday – it doesn't look like we require more money

Queen's: the point of the motion is not for the funds, but to define the members who we are serving

Poly: we can find numbers for students enrolled in engineering programs that are seeking accreditation

Alberta: there are other motions on the agenda that might better address this problem

Queen's: can you reference a specific motion on the agenda?

Ottawa: are the numbers of the members seeking accreditation current or from 2008?

Alberta: for example, motion number 5 has the same spirit but a better wording

Queen's: move to consider the motion informally, seconded by Waterloo B (24 for, 7 against, 1 abstain)

Concordia: just to clarify, aren't we looking at 2008 data for everybody anyway?

Poly: yes

Ottawa: for the purposes of membership fees, looking at 2008 is okay, but programs seeking accreditation might change from year to year significantly

Waterloo B: we're looking at out-dated data anyways for member schools, so I don't see how this would be an issue

Exec: we just use data from Engineers Canada

Concordia: we are going to miss people regardless of their accreditation status so it doesn't really matter

Waterloo B: realistically, I don't feel like the numbers would affect the budget significantly, this is more of a political move

Ottawa: this isn't really about the fees

MUN B: agree

Queen's: I think we're getting away from the spirit of the motion, the whole point of this motion is to clarify the place of the CFES to programs seeking accreditation; these programs are represented on their EngSoc, but do not have representation at the national level

Exec: I think if we want to redefine who the CFES serves and who our members are, we need a clear motion to state this; adjusting our fee structure seems like the wrong way to address this

Poly: the CFES does actually represent these students whether they like it or not since the members are actually the engineering societies of the schools

Waterloo B: in the policy manual or constitution it doesn't really define who the CFES serves (in terms of accreditation)

Queen's: there were originally two resolutions involved in this motion, one was to amend policy but we removed it because we couldn't find an appropriate place in the policy manual / constitution

CEC: aren't we already representing unaccredited students? They're just not paying dues

Alberta: call the question, seconded by Carleton (32 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)



Proposal **04-CFESPM-05**

Title: CEC Rule Revision
Mover: Regina
Seconded: Ryerson
Language: English

Goal:

To ensure fairness in the application process for the Canadian Engineering Competition.

Whereas:

Students attending CFES-member schools whose degree program is currently seeking accreditation are excluded from competing at the Canadian Engineering Competition.

Be it resolved that:

The CFES recommend that the CEC Advisory Board adjust the CEC Official Rules to allow students studying in new engineering programs seeking accreditation at a CFES member school to compete.

BIFRT: The CFES recommend that the CEC Advisory Board adjust the CEC Official Rules to disallow students studying in an engineering program that has previously failed accreditation ~~will not be allowed to compete~~ from competing until accreditation has been achieved.

Result: Passed

32 For

0 Against

1 Abstain

Regina: sparked by yesterday's discussion about CEC; there's really no way to enforce which students are accredited or not at competitions; it would be very difficult for the CEC organizers to confirm their accreditation status; if non-accredited students can attend PM or Congress, then it should be uniform for all CFES services

McMaster: how would the rules change based on the fact that teams with half non-accredited students can compete?

Regina: a team consisting of entirely unaccredited students could compete

Exec: the first resolution is a recommendation and the second resolution is a mandate, I would suggest consistency across the resolutions; also, currently in competitions where only one person competes, they must be from an accredited engineering program

Concordia: the "whereas" clause doesn't address the fact that teams with half non-accredited students can compete



Proposal

04-CFESPM-06

Title: Website Improvement
Mover: Alberta
Seconders: Calgary
Language: English

Goal:

To greatly improve the readability, functionality and maintainability of the CFES website.

Whereas:

Having a website that is user friendly would attract more interest from member schools as well as the general public to CFES and the events and activities run by CFES.

Be it resolved that:

The current budget be amended to include a \$2000 allocation for outsourced website improvements.

BIFRT: This allocation of funds be consumed prior to April 1, 2011.

Result: Tabled until Congress 2011

For

Against

Abstain

Alberta: the reason we came up with this motion is because from discussion yesterday, as VP Externals it is difficult to promote the CFES to our students; having a more user-friendly and accessible website would improve

Exec: we agree that money should be spent on the website, but \$2000 might be too much to commit to a project like this; our audience isn't the general public and students, our audience is the engineering societies; it's not necessary to cater the website to students or the general public; I would recommend that the motion be tabled to Congress for consideration by next year's Exec

McGill: we can't expect everything from the VP externals, we should have more information on the website for students; also, how did you come up with the \$2,000 figure?

Queen's: I think it's a great idea to spend money on the website, but specifying the amount of money seems unnecessary, we should leave that up to the Exec; I would suggest an amendment for an unspecified amount

Poly: I don't understand why we are putting money into the look of the website when the French translation isn't up to par – if we are putting money into the website, it should be put into translation instead of the look of the website



Manitoba: the fundamental problem that I've heard is that the website is difficult to maintain and update, the money should be put towards a complete overhaul so that it would be easier to maintain a bilingual website that is simpler to update

McGill: perhaps \$2000 is too much in the short term, but maybe we should consider this as a long-term project, this will allow time for the translation issue to be addressed

Alberta: the dollar amount was determined from a quick internet search; I would like exec to comment on the dollar amount and a timeline; it's important to keep a timeline on this to ensure that it does happen

Exec: I would recommend leaving this to Congress – from our end, this wouldn't get done by Congress anyway ; leave this up to the discretion of the new exec, or mandate the new executive with a timeline; websites designed by professionals would cost much more than this (minimum \$10,000, not including translation fees)

Dal: searching for somebody to design the website could be a project for next year's exec

Laval: what is the procedure to address this motion at Congress?

Chair: you can table it

Exec: move to consider the motion informally, seconded by Queen's (22 for, 6 against, 4 abstain)

Wat A: move to invite Sherbrooke to the table to participate in discussion and voting, seconded by Saskatchewan (31 for, 1 against, 0 abstain)

Exec: while I like the spirit of the motion and this project, I think the timeline is too short; the budget is already tight as it is and has been approved at the beginning of the year; it isn't feasible to take \$2,000 from the budget to create this new project

McGill: I understand that, but it's important to start acting on this as soon as possible; we should start looking at finding somebody to execute this motion and potential sponsorship

Queen's: have we considered including a commissioner for web design? We could combine this with translation services is this person is bilingual

Wat B: call the question, seconded by Saskatchewan (9 for, 17 against, 7 abstain)

Laval: motion to table this until Congress 2011, seconded by McGill (29 for, 3 against, 1 abstain)



Proposal

04-CFESPM-07

Title:	Well-Rounded Engineers
Mover:	Alberta
Seconded:	Calgary
Language:	English

Goal:

To complement motion 42-CFES-20-CP passed at CFES Congress 2010, which had the following 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."

Whereas:

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 for CFES Congress 2011.

BIFRT: The paper will be presented at CFES Congress 2011 and be made available to all member schools *for presentation to their faculty*.

Result: Passed

29 For

0 Against

4 Abstain

Alberta: this motion is a follow up to a motion at last year's congress which passed with an overwhelming majority; it's important to follow up with that and complete the draft proposal with a full paper; the manner in which schools structure their programs is very different (e.g. at Alberta, you can't take a minor in another discipline); a paper representing the views of all engineering students across Canada would be more powerful and useful to present to our deans, for example

McGill: I think this should be a broader motion to include other skills (e.g. business/management skills, etc)

Alberta: it is almost the exact same wording from the previous motion, except that it's a full paper



Queen's: the motion mentions "taking courses beyond engineering" which would include all sorts of courses

Exec: it would be helpful to Kathryn to clearly define the audience of this report (e.g. deans, CEAB, students, etc.), if we could get an amendment

Vic B: amendment to define the audience to the schools' faculties (friendly)



Proposal
04-CFESPM-08

Title: VP Official Languages
Mover: Calgary
Second: Manitoba
Language: English

Goal:

To lessen the work load currently allocated to the Official Languages commissioner and to ensure the bilingualism of the CFES.

Whereas:

Bilingualism in the CFES would benefit from the addition of a Vice Presidential position on the CFES National Executive.

and, whereas:

The work load of the Official Languages Commissioner is beyond the scope of a commissioner position.

Be it resolved that:

The creation of a Vice President of Official Languages position be investigated *by the executive*.

~~BIFRT: The position of Official Languages Commissioner be over seen by the proposed Vice-President of Official Languages and maintain day-to-day translation responsibilities.~~

BIFFRT: The VP Communications propose changes to the constitution reflecting this position and propose changes to the policy manual outlining the responsibilities of the *potential* VP Official Languages, to be ~~adopted~~ *considered for adoption* at Congress 2011.

Result: Passed

16 For

9 Against

8 Abstain

Calgary: there was much discussion yesterday about the workload on the OL commissioner; if these duties were moved up to a VP position and we kept an OL commissioner, this would split the work; it would be good to promote bilingualism at the executive level

Exec: this doesn't change the situation, the workload won't change, the OL commissioner would just be working at under a different VP, if the VP Comm wanted to send out an e-mail it would have to go through the VP OL, which would just take more time; I think you're really looking for a bilingual VP Communication and an extra person to translate



Queen's: the second resolution looks like it is narrowing the scope of the motion, perhaps we should remove this

Ottawa: the motion is a little unclear; it isn't defined well enough as it's written

CEC: the duties of the VP OL wouldn't need to be the same as the OL commissioner, perhaps the VP OL could look into long-term goals for translation of the organization

McGill: I don't think this motion is the right way to go about this – having one or two people doing translation would still be a lot of work, we should look into addressing the root of the problem

Exec: communications is really the backbone of this organization, it looks like this motion is breaking up the VP Comm portfolio into two positions

Alberta: we should really consider the Exec's opinion on this matter since they are currently dealing with this situation

Manitoba: by creating this position we would be having a bilingual person at all meetings, and somebody who could pick up the slack of the OL commissioner

Exec: move to consider the motion informally, seconded by Queen's (27 for, 2 against, 4 abstain)

Dal Sex: I think it's a really good idea to have translation and bilingualism, but it seems like nobody has a distinct idea of what the position should be – it's not well defined in the motion

CEC: the wording of the motion is just to investigate the position – we can figure out the details later

Calgary: the OL commissioner would take care of most of the day-to-day translation work, and the VP would take care of other things such as the policy manual, etc

5 minute recess

Ottawa: call the question, seconded by McGill (17 for, 14 against, 2 abstain - fails)

Exec: what you're really asking here is for two OL commissioners, we've cycled through OL commissioners quite regularly (e.g. 2 years ago, we had 4 OL commissioners in one term); we're already struggling to fulfil the one commissioner position, filling two positions would be much harder; being a VP requires a lot more work (e.g. strategic planning of the CFES) and wouldn't be necessary for an OL position which is already overburdened

CEC: official languages should be considered in the strategic planning of the CFES as a long term goal of the federation

Exec: that falls under the portfolio of VP Comm

MUN B: this is a large issue and should be looked at in the long-term

Concordia: having a VP position for this would bring more attention to this issue and would give the person more opportunity to promote bilingualism in more ways than just translating

Wat A: I feel like the spirit of this motion is to investigate on how we can do this better, but then it defines how we should investigate it; maybe we should mandate the exec to look into it and ask for their input

Queen's: we are trying to get the exec to investigate this, we shouldn't have it so focussed, I suggest somebody amend the motion to leave it more open ended and up to the discretion of Exec

Vic A: pass speaking rights to Sean Walsh, National Councillor: in my time in the CFES, I've only seen bilingualism decrease in the organization; we definitely need to look into a long term solution for this issue; we won't always have somebody who will work as hard as our current OL commissioner; we need to establish a more sustainable method for long-term bilingualism

Queen's: amendment to strike the second resolution, seconded by Ottawa

Alberta: by removing the second resolution, it would remove the idea that we would maintain the OL commissioner and keep to positions to maintain the bilingualism of the CFES

Ottawa: the exec should be suggesting ways in which to go about this, the exec would consider having two positions for this and that will be presented in their report; we don't fully understand the work involved in these positions and exec would be best suited to address this

Alberta: I don't think we should leave it fully up to the exec since we have known this has been a problem for a while and we haven't been able to come to a solution

Laval: this motion just wants to find solutions and doesn't require any implementation

Wat A: the second resolution is too restricting, the exec should be able to come up with their own recommendations

MUN B: agree, we should look at all sorts of solutions and debate on them at Congress



Queen's: I don't know if multiple solutions should be investigated because this would involve constitutional changes and might involve a lot of work

Wat A: I think they should look into multiple solutions, but only present relevant solutions; they don't need to present constitutional changes to multiple solutions

Queen's: call the question on the amendment, seconded by Ottawa (27 for, 1 against, 5 abstain)

Voting on the amendment: 32 for, 0 against, 1 abstain

Concordia: call the question, seconded by Poly (16 for, 11 against, 6 abstain - fails)

Exec: you are asking us to investigate this – we already discuss this almost every exec meeting already, we've been looking into solutions but it has been very tough

Poly: that's great, then let us know!

Calgary: if there were two positions it would be easier to find people to help out because it is a position with a title instead of just asking volunteers

MUN B: you'll also be enticing two different types of people – people who might want to take more responsibilities and have decision making powers at an exec level, and people who might want to be involved at a lower level as a commissioner

Manitoba: if you consider what you can put on a resume, being a VP of the CFES could motivate somebody to step up and be accountable to solve these issues

Pro Mag: would you need to be an engineering student to take up the position of VP OL?

Exec: yes, you need to be a member of an active member of the CFES

McGill: there's another motion that addresses translation, we should move on

Alberta: this is an issue that we've been facing all the time, and although the exec has been discussing it, if we mandate the exec to investigate this and present it at Congress we can ensure that this gets taken care of and is addressed in a long-term manner; also it is the members' responsibility to bring potential candidates to Congress who could take on the translation role

Pro Mag: this role would require a lot of time, could there be an exception for this position to open it up to non-engineering students? Is this possible?

Western: pass speaking rights to Shaunvir Sidhu, National Councillor: there's policy in place to deal with a lot of these OL issues, there's supposed to be an OL committee to address this but it has been inactive, there was a time when it was active and we should look into how we can incentivize people to address these issues, I don't think having a VP position is necessary – we already have the structure in place and we just need to find people to step up

Calgary: the worst case scenario of if this motion is that it is investigated and a new position isn't created, we discuss this issue again and again, but this motion at least tries to address it

Exec: we need to understand exactly how the VP Comm portfolio would change based on this

Poly: I don't think we should be discussing solutions right now or tell somebody to do something; we should all think of solutions on our own and bring any ideas forward to the exec and to OL commissioners; we should all think about this individually between now and Congress

Ottawa: if somebody has a solution, it would have come out in discussion already

Alberta: call the question, seconded by Ottawa (26 for, 2 against, 5 abstain)



Proposal **04-CFESPM-09**

Title: Improving the Translation Coordination
Mover: McGill University
Seconded: Ryerson
Language: French

Goal:

To facilitate the translation of documents and ensure ergonomic usage of human resources

Whereas:

Currently there is only one translation officer that translates all official CFES documents.

and, whereas:

The workload is substantial and often implies very tight deadlines that cannot be met that easily by a translator who also studies full time.

Be it resolved that:

CFES contacts different departments of Translation Studies within Canadian universities to see if it is possible to establish working relationships with them on translating the official CFES documents under the guidance of the translation commissioner.

BIFRT: Given a positive response, the universities will rotate on a previously established order with each society doing translation workload for 100 hours.

BIFFRT: The documents for Congress will be translated separately, exclusive of the rotation, and with the help of exactly 2 universities plus the commissioner.

Result: Defeated

1 For

32 Against

0 Abstain

McGill: given the lengthy discussion on the other motion, we know that translation is a huge issue with the CFES; we are having trouble finding people to volunteer for translation, but we have 10-15 universities in Canada that have translation departments; if we reach out to these groups we might be able to attain translation services at a substantially lower cost

Windsor: do we actually expect that a rotational system like this would work? Considering we couldn't have our member schools fill out a 30-minute survey...

Exec: pass speaking rights to Marie-Claude Hamelin, OL Commissioner: finding one person is hard enough, finding an entire department to help us out would be difficult, and we're severely limited to



a few schools (e.g. Quebec schools or uOttawa); having the schools translate for 100 hours doesn't make much sense either

McGill: the idea is that the CFES would partner with these departments, and 100 hours was just an estimate; it's not up to the members to decide where the translation would come from, it would be up to the exec and/or OL commissioner

Exec: it might be too much of a burden for the exec to establish and maintain these services; we work on a tight deadline and we might not be able to rely on an ad hoc translator who has no official commitment to the CFES

Alberta: call the question, seconded by Guelph (27 for, 1 against, 5 abstain)



Proposal

04-CFESPM-10

Title:	Addition of students from an engineering program in process of accreditation to members of CFES.
Mover:	Laval
Seconder:	ÉTS
Language:	French

Goal:

Allow students from an engineering program in process of accreditation to be members of CFES

Whereas:

Presently members of CFES have to be from an accredited engineering program.

Be it resolved that:

Students from an accredited engineering program are allowed to be members of CFES.

BIFRT: These students pay for the CFES membership.

Result: Defeated

0 For

33 Against

0 Abstain

Laval: I would like this motion to be voted down since we've already discussed this issue at length

Queen's: call the question, seconded by Laval (33 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)



Proposal

04-CFESPM-11

Title:	Participation of students from a program in process of accreditation to CEC.
Mover:	Laval
Seconded:	ÉTS
Language:	French

Goal:

Allow students from an engineering program in process of accreditation to participate at CEC

Whereas:

Presently participants of CEC have to be from an accredited engineering program.

Be it resolved that:

Students from an engineering program in process of accreditation are allowed to participate at CEC at the condition that they give the VP competition a proof that they belong to such a program at least a week before the competition.

Result: Defeated

0 For

31 Against

2 Abstain

CEC: where would this go? Would this be added to the Policy manual? Constitution? CEC rule changes?

Exec: it should go into the official CEC rules

CEC: if we're changing the CEC rules, the motion should recommend to the CEC Advisory Board to change these rules

Alberta: I would like everybody to consider this motion along side CFESPM-05 which is quite similar...

Concordia: there might be some confusion regarding the members of CFES being EngSocs or students...

Queen's: call the question, seconded by Ryerson (28 for, 0 against, 5 abstain)

Exec: move for 15 minute recess, seconded by Windsor (33 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)



6. Voting

7. Closing of the Assembly/Adjournment

Moved by: Carleton

Seconded by: Waterloo A

33 for, 0 against, 0 abstain

Meeting adjourned at 12:12pm EST, October 2, 2010