

Waterloo Engineering Society 'B'

Spring Meeting #4

Date: Wednesday July 6th, 2016

Location: CPH 3607

Chair: Lexa Michaelides

Secretary: Sarah Martin

Attendance:

2020		2019		2018		2017		Other	
1B CHEM	P	2B BME	P	3A CHEM	A	4A CIVE	P	Reduced CL	A
1B ECE -1	P	2B CIVE	A	3A ECE-1	A	4A CHEM	P	Executive	P
1B ECE-2	P	2B CHEM	P	3A ECE-2	A	4A ECE4-1	P	Off-Term Prez	A
1B ENV	P	2B ECE	A	3A ENV	P	4A ECE4-2	P		
1B GEO	P	2B MGMT	P	3A GEO	A	4A ECE8	P		
1BMECH	P	2B MECH	A	3A MECH	A	4A MGMT	P		
1BTRON	P	2B TRON	A	3A TRON	P	4A MECH	P		
1B SYDE	P	2B NANO	P	3A NANO	A	4A SOFT	P		
		2B SOFT	A	3A SYDE	P				

Total Votes Available: 37

Total Votes Present: 24

1.0 Welcome & Call to Order:

Time: 5:33pm

Quorum established at 24/37 voting members present.

2.0 Approval of Minutes:

Motion:	Approval of Spring 2016 Meeting #3 Minutes
Mover:	SOFT 2017
Second:	TRON 2018
Result:	Motion Passes

3.0 Approval of Engenda:

Motion:	Approval of Spring 2016 Meeting #4 Engenda
Mover:	MECH 2020
Second:	ECE 2020
Result:	Motion Passes

4.0 Guest Speaker

4.1 Course Critiques

Speaking: Gordon Stublely (stublely@uwaterloo.ca)

- Associate Dean of Teaching
- Student course evaluations are happening
- Over the past 2 years, a task force from needles hall was set up with reps from the faculty and various student groups. The idea is that we want to have a uniform course evaluation process across campus This would entail a uniform set of questions, the same method of delivery and identical uses of questions
- The task force anticipates all of campus moving to an online system called Evaluate. As of Winter 2016, this has been done in engineering.
- The new set of questions is in progress, the questions may vary a little bit, but common questions will be asked across all faculties in the future
- Science and Computing developed the Evaluate system. It has already been used for 2 years in Science and Math. AHS also has been using Evaluate for a year. In Fall 2015, Engineering conducted a small trial with 20 of the 300 courses evaluated online. In Winter 2016, Engineering used Evaluate for almost all courses
- The courses excluded were those taught by faculty members who have not yet received tenure. These instructors had a choice about whether to deliver their courses critiques by paper or online.
- The Winter 2016 trial went relatively well. The overall response rate in Winter 2015 was 62% and was 59% in Winter 2016. This is a minor drop but not the massive decline often associated with online responses. Some individual courses had low response rates, but there also were lots with 90% response rates
- Engineering is going to carry on with online delivery, and this term is also online
- The delivery should be similar to before, instructors introduce the process and discuss the importance of feedback, direct students to evaluate.uwaterloo.ca, then leave the room
- Evaluate requires students to sign on with their WatIAM id and password. From there, they can see all courses they are enrolled in and have the opportunity to fill out a course evaluation for each
- We are encouraging instructors to maintain good habits developed while using the paper delivery method. This includes professors speaking to the importance of feedback, giving students time in class to complete the evaluations, and leaving the room while evaluations are being completed
- Online feedback also gives students the option of completing feedback outside of class during the two week period when evaluate is open
- With respect to the process of creating common questions, coming to consensus is quite a process. I'm not sure when these questions will happen. The goal was that we would have been talking to faculty for approval this summer. That's not happening, so maybe in the fall. In any case, it will be some time yet before the questions are used for course evaluations
- Before we start to use these questions, we want to determine that the students filling out the questions are answering what we think they're answering. This process will require

volunteer testers. We want a reasonable number of engineering students participating so that the results reflect what we think they should reflect. This process should be starting within the next year.

- Rest of campus envies the way Engineering runs their course evaluations. Engineering is unique in the screening process which is used to filter out inappropriate or unprofessional feedback. Furthermore, other societies don't have the same face to face connection as nobody talks to the other student societies like I do with EngSoc.
- Q: When you put out the call for volunteers, how many people will you be looking for and can the process occur online?
- A: I suspect that there will be a component of online and then an in-person focus group. From engineering, I expect at least 4 or 5 volunteers
- Q: Have you considered making an infographic about how many course evaluations come in, how they get used, etc.
- A: We really like that idea. We currently have a co-op student working on data, looking at historical data and comparing it with information from winter term. Once that is done, we can definitely consider making an infographic. The task force recommends that at the university level there be a method for people to find out what others think about a professor.
- Q: Class reps have traditionally been responsible for distribution of course critiques. How will their role change?
- A: Class reps typically distribute the papers, explain the process if necessary, and then return the papers to the Orifice. Their new role is to assist instructors in getting course critiques done. This could include once the instructor leaves, reminding classmates how important course critiques are.
- Q: You stated that other faculties admire how we handle course critiques. Can you clarify what you mean by this?
- A: The other faculties envy the screening process of EngSoc. After results come in, before the faculty get access to the surveys, student representatives screen the written responses in order to remove evaluations which they do not believe are in line with how engineering students should represent themselves. This process is totally student run, and is an accepted best practice. However, it requires the faculty to trust its students which other faculties don't know how to do. This partnership is taken for granted in engineering, but other faculties don't know how to make it work. Furthermore, Engineering presents results as available to anyone. Some other faculties are struggling to get to that point.
- Course critiques are very important to faculty, especially the written comments. For instance many professors try new things each term. They want to know whether or not the changes are working. They do really look at feedback and are encouraged to take it seriously.
- Q: Can you speak to the anonymity of the process?
- A: In paper mode, there was a period of time where all envelopes were sitting as the faculty do not get exposure to results until after the marks for the term are finalized. In the online system, the same steps will be taken. Realistically, in the digital world, somebody somewhere could track the information down, but that is far from us. We recognize that for course critiques to work well, they have to be anonymous. The same goes for the screening process.
- Q: Is the online system being tested or fully implemented this summer?

- A: This is fully implemented now as of Winter 2016. However, there are still a small number of faculty members are allowed to choose between this and the paper method if their career could be severely impacted. These are the faculty who do not yet have tenure. This term, that is about 15 out of 200 courses.
- Q: What about the professor that never changes. How can we deliver this feedback?
- A: There probably are lots of faculty members you take for granted as being competent. However, most of them don't start out that way. The things that shaped them into their current state is the feedback they've gotten from evaluations. Many times before, I've sat down with instructors and helped them work through the items they need to improve. As we are continually bringing in new instructors, their professional development requires ongoing feedback.
- Q: Whenever I tell my cohort about course evaluations, I can't necessarily give them a clear answer of how the feedback affects the professor. Between every professor, there seems to be a difference of opinion regarding what really matters in the evaluations. Could there be an information packet to clarify this? Like I don't actually know what the feedback does towards their career or how they teach.
- A: The importance of feedback is described on waterloo engineering website on the teaching page. Look for the piece on student course evaluations. This will describe what typical results look like and how they are used. Instructors use for the results for specifics, especially in evaluating the success of changes in course structure. Each year, a professor undergoes an annual merit process. After 6 years they undergo the tenure and promotion process. The student course evaluations are taken into significant consideration in those meetings
- Q: If the engineering faculty were to receive overwhelmingly negative reviews for a professor, what happens?
- A: When we get overall results for the term, we identify very good instructors. They get acknowledgement in the form of a letter. We also identify particularly poor instructors. They and their department chairs receive a letter informing them of the situation. They then are involved and work together to create a plan for improvement. Furthermore, the letter goes into the instructors file. For new faculty without tenure, they meet with me to identify areas for improvement and develop a plan to improve.
- Q: Are there other pathways to review professors outside of course critiques?
- A: Some departments have a student faculty meeting. Information that comes there does not get forgotten. Information may come up in a different way which is illuminating when considered in conjunction with the course critiques.
- Q: You mentioned that there are 15 courses which still conduct their critiques on paper, why?
- A: These courses are taught by professors who are still relatively new in their career. These instructors have not yet gone through tenure and promotion process. Since course evaluations have a significant impact in this process, we recognize that there is anxiety associated with change. Giving instructors the element of choice eases their anxiety by giving them more control in a tricky and stressful process.
- Q: In the future, will this option still be available to new instructors?
- A: No, new professors will begin in the online system.

4.2 PD Courses

Speaking: Marc Aucoin (marc.aucoin@uwaterloo.ca)

- I typically come to all first year classes in 1A to give an overview of WatPD
- WatPD is a university initiative that came about because there was an employer survey which indicated that students require soft skills in addition to technical skills in order to perform optimally in the workplace
- We set out to develop a program to help students gain these skills and make them better employees
- We want to challenge students to master these skills in a non-academic mindset without changing their marks. Realize that the best way is to develop skills over work terms. Every student across campus in a co-op program goes through WatPD.
- Put together by the Engineering PD curriculum committee which includes Anson, a co-op rep and a faculty member from each program
- Charted out the best course offerings and a selection of courses to improve skills
- 2 core courses all students take first and then 3 that you choose to further develop your skills
- This is the first meeting I've had to talk to students above first year. I've always got people ready for WatPD, but have not sought feedback from upper years before
- I want to know how you feel about the program. I'm committed to professional skills development and I want to make a program to enable you to gain these soft skills. Lots of feedback from employers is indicating that these are important.
- Q: If this is a major initiative directed at us by employers. Have we asked employers how they think we should develop these skills?
- A: Employers are quite impressed, we have some responses from them. PEO reviewed PD 22 – ethics and professional development. They were pleased by the case study and the depth of content. They felt it was a great improvement from the typical point by point reading of the PEO code of ethics.
- Employers see content. But if people are getting 50s, are they really learning the content.
- Q: How did we decide to teach soft skills through a website?
- A: We're using the 70/20/10 method. You can't learn a skill just by reading, it requires 10% theory, 20% mentoring, 70% doing. That's why we do PD courses during co-op. You get the theory during the course and then to apply it in the workplace. WatPD is intended as 20 hours of time or that 10% to help you practice your skills in the workplace
- Q: In mechanical, we focus on soft skills in our courses. We have to cover content which is included in assignments and projects. If the best way to apply them is to do them, why is this not sufficient?
- A: No reason why we shouldn't have these skills reinforced on co-op. We want to develop graduates with strong attributes. In that development, there's stages of introduction, reinforcement and mastery. Just because you have time devoted to it in academic courses doesn't mean you shouldn't reinforce that while on co-op. In those situations, you are getting material as close to the place you're going to use it as possible. Wouldn't want to just have skill development during academic terms as the point of the program is to be comprehensive and build skills over both academic and work terms.
- Q: Is this motivated by funding associated with students enrolled in courses on co-op?

- A: No, the decision isn't motivated by the funding, however, it couldn't happen without funding. The money we get in grants flows back into program and resource demand is enormous. All of engineering goes through WatPD, and 40% of the student in WatPD are engineering students. We're definitely not doing it just for the money but money enables us to do it.
- I've taken a couple courses that I enjoyed the content of but there are three things I found make it hard to enjoy or take the courses seriously. One is the pass/fail nature of the course and the work term tends to take priority. Potentially having assignments not timed, and just requiring completion would improve it. Also in some courses, particularly those which relate to ethics or morals, students feel judged for having a different opinion and have even been docked marks. It makes it hard to take the course seriously. E.g. PD 10 has a question explaining as a recruiter to a male student why they picked the female student over the male student. Students feel this is teaching them how to repeat instead of thinking about why. Arguing both sides would be more beneficial to the students' understanding. Also, I have sometimes put a lot of effort into answers, for instance when I was taking the cultural PD course, I was asked to give an example of miscommunication in a cultural setting where I lost marks for unprofessional communication in a direct quotation from my life, even though I clearly valued the assignment and was giving personal answer. I did not feel encouraged to put in the effort again in the future
- People are being penalized for their honest answers if they're not in line with what the TA thinks. It would be more beneficial to have to argue both sides and evaluate their opinion
- As long as a position is well argued, it should be respected. If that was not the case, that's something we can work on
- I think PD overall as an online course is generally well done. Other online courses have been worse in many aspects. I believe that these skills are important to learn, but from where I stand, the core issue is that students do not like it. When talking to my class, nobody is excited to do PD. These skills might be important, but we are forcing students to do things they don't to. Also, because the courses are pass/fail, many students make it a game to get 50% on the dot. As long as students dislike PD, there is no way to do it well. I don't remember most of what I've done in PD because I had so much else going on during co-op
- As an undergrad, we didn't have PD. I do know that there are some things you need to do to get better at them, and it's not always because there's a reward. Part of doing PD is that we don't want to force you to get 100%. If you jump off at 50%, it's your own fault you're not getting much out of it.
- Completely agree that 50% jump off is not the problem, it's a symptom. Increasing that percent is not fixing the problem, it's hiding the symptoms. You want us to take something from PD, but for so long as we don't care, we're not going to get much out of it.
- Some of these things you'll see in the future that there are concepts which will keep coming back. Right now not it's not as tempting
- Going way back to PEO letter. I think it's useful to hear from the PEO, but it would be better to hear from people who actually hire students. PEO has an overview but limited experience with students.

- PD 22 is designed to be useful for the students, it's built to help students pass their professional practice exam. We're trying to get employers to review courses on a regular basis but it's tricky to connect with employers
- We don't see PD as beneficial and you do. Neither of us are really willing to compromise. We talk to people who graduated 4 years ago who still don't feel it has benefited them. Rumour is that you get PD credits relating to concepts taught in courses to override courses to achieve in alternate means which gives more tangible value.
- Challenge for credit will be administratively difficult if not impossible. Don't disagree with sentiment but getting it done would be hard. It's not an approach that we could actually accomplish. If you have great communication skills, that's why there's 13 courses, you could take a different course. If there's things not being taught, we could talk about that.
- I thought a good way to do it would be we have an employer evaluation form linked to PD. There are people who don't need PD because they already have skills. These could be linked together. If you're already getting 7s in communication, why would you need to take the communication skills course.

5.0 New Business

5.1 Info From Feds Council

- I sent out a draft of the sexual violence policy and want your opinion on it
- Background is that Feds was mandated to draft this policy, and they need it approved by 2017
- Q: Should the sexual violence policy be its own policy or bundled into the harassment policy?
 - Sexual violence can be a lot more specific and more severe than harassment. Being separated allows the policy to have more specificity
 - The structure of policy is to have sections and subsections, sexual violence could be a subsection of harassment
 - Options are having it in a new policy or included in general harassment
 - Q: Shouldn't sexual violence be included in the policy anyways?
 - A: There is a policy, it is just very general and broad. They want to make it more specific and in detail about the associated punishment
 - Talking about severity is misleading. To say that sexual violence is more severe than other acts of harassment is dishonest with how people experience trauma. If our goal is sufficiently robust policy, the harassment policy should be made robust enough to handle it
 - Two completely different acts which shouldn't necessarily be bundled together
 - It's not the extent or severity, but the nature of these things which leads them to need to be treated differently. Sexual violence needs its own subsection or policy because of its nature
 - In terms of seeking help afterwards, they're completely different issues. They need to be approached differently so it may be easier to separate them in policy as well.
 - One of the issues being dealt with on campus is making the lines of what constitutes sexual violence clearer. Unless there is a good reason for it not to be its own policy, making the handling of sexual violence clearer is good
 - Implementing a policy will take the decision of how events should be handled out of the hands of whoever is in charge and will lay a basis for whatever is done
 - Q: Does it make any difference whether it is on its own or underneath harassment?
 - A: It impacts readability and how people will interpret it, but the actual effect is the same regardless of where it is written.
 - Current policies in place are not sufficient to cover all cases, that's why we need to draft more policy
 - Straw Poll Result: The policy should exist but we don't care where it goes
- Q: Currently have a sexual violence response protocol. Part of that is that Waterloo Police is contacted if a complaint is vexatious. This is an agreement at the moment but Feds wants to know if it should be included in the policy?
 - That is intended to say that intentionally false accusations will be reported to Waterloo Police. The legal definition of vexatious is the important one
 - Sexual violence is a crime in Canada and should be reported to the police always
 - Policy is that campus police deal with it first and then it gets reported to the Waterloo Police

- Yes, all things should be reported. That's what happening. The question is whether we should specifically include vexatious reports in policy.
- They carry the same severity for the person who is being accused. False or true accusations should be treated the same. However, there are also consequences for the slanderer.
- There should be consequences, but it may not be relevant to the spirit of the documents to have specific cases about vexatious reports in the policy
- In the event that you are accused, it's possible that you are banned from campus until the results of the hearing. This is that case for real or fake accusations. Having specific wording to discourage vexatious cases is good to reduce the frequency of unnecessary bans
- There will be a new position created if this gets implemented who is responsible for overseeing the process. This person will provide guidance to various parties before the case is reviewed. At their discretion, the accused could be deemed hazardous or detrimental to the accuser and could be given essentially a restraining order restricting their ability to be on campus
- Worry about who determines if a complaint is vexatious or not. Will people be more focused on that it is vexatious, which puts the onus on the reporter to prove that it's not a vexatious accusation. False accusations happen and are devastating but if it's in the policy, people may try to prove that things are vexatious
- Policy does encourage people to prove that it is vexatious because it is evaluated on a balance of probabilities. It benefits people to try to prove that the other person is making a false accusation. This is as opposed to the beyond reasonable doubt process used in law. I believe this is a flaw in the whole policy.
- Isn't proving that they didn't do it what they're going to try to do anyways?
- In a balance of probabilities system, there are questions asked which delve into the accuser's background. In the beyond reasonable doubt process, investigation into the accuser is not encouraged.
- Policy should more than likely follow the law. In law, the accuser needs to prove that the accused did something
- As a victim of harassment, the current policy has let me down. Sometimes it is the university's job to do something beyond what the law will do for you because it involves students and what the university believes in.
- We distributed a diagram on the current reporting and disclosure pathways. Look it over and email feedback to me
- Q: Does anyone feel that the current timing of the Feds elections is not good?
 - They describe it as in the "busiest week" of winter term
 - What is the busiest week of term? Who decides it's the busiest? This is not a good question
- Q: Feds has opt-out health and dental insurance. How do you feel about opt-out legal insurance?
 - Q: What legalities would it cover?
 - A: Not sure
 - Reasonable option but should be opt-in not opt-out

- Q: Why is health insurance opt-out?
- A: Legally you need to be covered under insurance of some kind. Especially minors and people living on campus. Over 18, you can opt out if you want to. Also lots of international students are not eligible for universal health care in Canada. It is better for them to get health insurance by default

5.2 Sponsorship Committee

Motion:	APPENDIX A – Views from the Sixth (If You’re Reading This Motion Its Tu Late)																
Mover:	Executive B																
	Thanks to everyone who laughed at Drake references. Sponsorship is meeting this Saturday to deliberate on the proposals of about 16 teams. The work involved is to read through the proposals, watch about 6 hours of presentations and then deliberate with the rest of the committee. It’s a good role because you get to see the teams that benefit from EngSoc and things they’re trying to do.																
Secunder:	MECH 2020																
	This is important.																
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepted Nominations: Mark Frayne, Theresa DeCola, Kris Sousa, Kevin Zhang <table border="1" data-bbox="446 913 1429 1077"> <tr> <td>Motion:</td> <td>Move into Camera</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mover:</td> <td>CHEM 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secunder:</td> <td>ECE 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Result:</td> <td>Motion Passes</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moved out of camera • Congratulations Kris <table border="1" data-bbox="446 1150 1429 1314"> <tr> <td>Motion:</td> <td>Amend to Include the Name of the Elected</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mover:</td> <td>ECE 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secunder:</td> <td>TRON 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Result:</td> <td>Motion Passes, TRON 2018 Abstains</td> </tr> </table>	Motion:	Move into Camera	Mover:	CHEM 2020	Secunder:	ECE 2020	Result:	Motion Passes	Motion:	Amend to Include the Name of the Elected	Mover:	ECE 2020	Secunder:	TRON 2020	Result:	Motion Passes, TRON 2018 Abstains
Motion:	Move into Camera																
Mover:	CHEM 2020																
Secunder:	ECE 2020																
Result:	Motion Passes																
Motion:	Amend to Include the Name of the Elected																
Mover:	ECE 2020																
Secunder:	TRON 2020																
Result:	Motion Passes, TRON 2018 Abstains																
Result:	Motion Passes																

5.3 Reusing Exams

Motion:	APPENDIX B – I hope weve all learned something
Mover:	ECE 2017-2
	The reason for bringing this up is that a midterm for a popular ECE elective was reused verbatim with only one addition. This midterm was available online but not on Learn or in the exam bank. I feel that exam reuse discourages deeper learning because people may decide to spend their time searching for exams rather than learning the content
Seconders:	ECE 2017-1
	Just to clarify, I'm not actually seconding my own motion. I talked to the other class rep, they are just not attending this meeting.
Comments:	<p>Q: You said that the midterm that was posted, where was it available?</p> <p>A: On the professor's personal website</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way the professor selected to fix the issue was to take only the marks from the top 2 questions. So anyone who split their time on all 3 got questions got stuck. • This motion comes after the bad publicity of the Math 136 exam. Reuse of exams is unprofessional and unfair, and people will always be upset • There were multiple news outlets who ran articles on the Math 136 situation • For some courses, there are only so many ways you can ask the questions, prohibiting reuse may be challenging • We're presenting a stance not coming up with a solution. The motion is worded such that the university needs to figure out how to solve the problem, that's not on us • Could we reword the motion to say strongly discourage instead of prohibit • Don't think we should disallow reuse. We've had professors post midterms or exams on learn and have told people to do them. One of the ways they incentivize practicing with the posted materials is including one question from those exams on the actual exam. • Also want to have it prevent professors from using questions from the test banks that come with the textbook as some but not all people download those online • There's a difference between reusing 1 question and a whole exam • The point of this motion isn't about fairness but is to improve the learning of all students. The goal of engineering is solving problems not memorizing solutions and I want the tests to reflect this. • Just want to be sure that when we're presenting this, we don't want to put the blame on students. • It is easy for us to bring attention to the issue of exam reuse to the faculty. They can then come up with whatever plan for action they like in order to solve the problem. • Also want to be precise in this motion in case we create a document of stances. The stance shouldn't be open to interpretation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current justification of you having to take a day off co-op to come to campus and review exams is so the professors can reuse exams. For how much they are paid, they can come up with fresh content for exams • It is important to keep in mind that there are certain professors where it is very well known that if you don't memorize old exams you just won't pass, even if you understand the concept. When we think about this, we should think about those professors as well • I've seen professors working on exams before. It takes effort to make exams, even if all they are doing is changing the numbers. Professors are also responsible for research and grad students. Having to rewrite exams each time would be considerable additional work for them. • What may be a possible solution would be allowing reuse of questions if those exams are provided to students • Agree that professors already have work. That's why the motion is saying that the university needs to solve the problem and our stance is only restricting not eliminating the reuse of exams <p>Q: In document of stances, is it just the BIRT of the motion, or also the context? A: It will indicate the date and meeting number and then stance adopted. If people want more information on the discussion, they can look up the minutes for that meeting.</p>
Result:	Motion Passes

5.4 Class Rep Elections

Motion:	APPENDIX C – Let's Do It Right!
Mover:	CHEM 2019
	This motion is based on sentiments expressed at JAGM and the incoming exec are behind them. This motion is only impacting you as current class reps to hold elections for next term's reps.
Secunder:	NANO 2019
Comments:	<p>Q: Whose responsibility is it currently to run elections? A: The Exec run the first year elections, class reps are supposed to run the elections after that. This motion mandates that an election must happen every term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue with the wording, in that a conditional addition to the policy manual may not be possible. Even if it is possible, we need to pass this motion on A-Soc before anything can be done. • Absolutely can't say that they will add. The motion can say that the Exec will propose its addition to the policy manual. • Friendly amendment to have the motion read Exec will propose rather than will add
Result:	Motion Passes

5.5 Class Rep Accountability

Motion:	APPENDIX D – Reppin’ It																
Mover:	NANO 2019																
	Another item discussed at JAGM and further discussed by the incoming exec. People wanted more accountability for their class reps																
Secunder:	MECH 2020																
	When the CRC report went out, people in my class talked to me about liking the accountability provided by the proposal. They want to see that happen.																
Comments:	<p>Q: Proxies currently are sent to the speaker. Who will be responsible for keeping track of proxies?</p> <p>A: This responsibility could fall under the president.</p> <p>Q: Who are proxies sent to?</p> <p>A: One possibility is that the speaker could note the issue, and pass it on to the president to deal with.</p> <p>Q: What happens if nobody in your class wants to go for you to proxy to?</p> <p>A: You can proxy to someone in another class.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If neither of your class reps show up, and you’re at a meeting, the speaker can give you the rights to vote on your class’ behalf for the meeting. These cases won’t show up in attendance sheet as the attendance is marked as present. • If you’re removing a rep, you no longer have someone reporting results of the new class rep election to the exec. • Incoming exec will have to figure out that class’ elections • Would suggest that it is appropriate for a class to send only one rep to a meeting. I would like to make the motion read only if both class reps do not attend. <table border="1" data-bbox="446 1165 1429 1501"> <tr> <td>Motion:</td> <td>Amend the Motion to read “both” rather than “one or both”</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mover:</td> <td>CHEM 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secunder:</td> <td>ECE 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comments:</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only one rep is there, the class appears on the attendance list as present • Each class has only one vote, so can only proxy once • If only one rep can’t attend, they can inform their other rep or the speaker, but cannot actually proxy </td> </tr> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="446 1533 1429 1701"> <tr> <td>Motion:</td> <td>Table the Motion until Meeting #5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mover:</td> <td>CHEM 2019</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secunder:</td> <td>ECE 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Result:</td> <td>Motion Passes</td> </tr> </table>	Motion:	Amend the Motion to read “both” rather than “one or both”	Mover:	CHEM 2020	Secunder:	ECE 2017	Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only one rep is there, the class appears on the attendance list as present • Each class has only one vote, so can only proxy once • If only one rep can’t attend, they can inform their other rep or the speaker, but cannot actually proxy 	Motion:	Table the Motion until Meeting #5	Mover:	CHEM 2019	Secunder:	ECE 2017	Result:	Motion Passes
Motion:	Amend the Motion to read “both” rather than “one or both”																
Mover:	CHEM 2020																
Secunder:	ECE 2017																
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If only one rep is there, the class appears on the attendance list as present • Each class has only one vote, so can only proxy once • If only one rep can’t attend, they can inform their other rep or the speaker, but cannot actually proxy 																
Motion:	Table the Motion until Meeting #5																
Mover:	CHEM 2019																
Secunder:	ECE 2017																
Result:	Motion Passes																
Result:	Motion Tabled																

5.6 Exec Feedback

- Provide additional feedback at bit.ly/CouncilFeedback

Motion:	Move into Camera
Mover:	GEO 2020
Secunder:	ENV 2020
Result:	Motion Passes

- Moved out of camera

6.0 Executive Updates

Motion:	Have Exec Deliver Updates Online via Blog Post
Mover:	Executive B
Seconded:	TRON 2018
Result:	Motion Passes

7.0 Affiliate Updates

7.1 WEEF

Not Present

7.2 Iron Warrior

Not Present

7.3 Senate

Not Present

7.4 Feds Councilors

Not Present

7.5 Engineers Without Borders

Not Present

7.6 EngFOC

Speaking: Netharyn Gourenzel (engfoc@uwaterloo.ca)

- Finished up and submitted the event action plans
- Very busy time
- Working on ordering swag

7.7 Gradcomm

Speaking: Mattrise Dickhowe (UWgradcomm@gmail.com)

- Casual yearbook photos talk to us
- Class visits to explain casual yearbook photos
- Everyone buy pizza
- Dusting things tomorrow. There are still tickets available on the second bus. Come out if you're legal

8.0 Varia

8.1 How many days, 4th years?

213 days 'til IRS!

9.0 Adjournment

Time: 8:04pm

Motion:	Adjourn Spring 2016 Meeting #4
Mover:	MECH 2020
Second:	ENV 2020
Result:	Motion passes